

THE MAGAZINE OF THE SOCIETY OF KING CHARLES THE MARTYR, AMERICAN REGION
Serving our members in Canada and the United States of America



*ROUNDEL OF KING CHARLES THE MARTYR
STAINED GLASS BY CHARLES EAMER KEMPE
AS IT WAS IN HIS PERSONAL RESIDENCE
(photograph courtesy Philip Collins, The Kempe Society)*

Editorial – ‘King Charles Was a Leader’	2
COMMEMORATIONS 2012	
XXIX Annual Mass – All Saints, Appleton WI, 28 Jan. 2012 – reported by The Rev’d John D. Alexander, SSC	5
Supporters of the 2012 Annual Mass	7
Sermon at the 2012 Annual Mass – The Ven. Shawn W. Denney, J.D., Archdeacon of Springfield	7
Other 2012 Commemorations – America and Britain	12
UPCOMING ANNUAL MASSES (ALL ON SATURDAY AT 11 A.M.)	
XXX Annual Mass – All Saints, Ashmont, Boston – 26 January 2013	13
XXXI Annual Mass – S. Vincent’s Cathedral, Ft. Worth TX – 25 January 2014	13
XXXIII Annual Mass – Holy Communion, Charleston SC – 30 January 2016	13
NEWS OF MEMBERS	
Society of King Charles the Martyr, Inc., Board of Trustees	13
Three Bishop Members Elected to Membership in the Order of Laud	14
Roster of Order of Laud Members; Roster of Benefactors	14, 15
New Members & New Life Members, Fiscal Year 2012	15
News of Members	16
<i>Requiescant in Pace</i> – Notices of Death, Obituaries	17
Donors to the General Fund, Fiscal Year 2012	20
FEATURES	
Devotional, Caroline, and Monarchist Societies of Interest to Members	20
Errata and Addenda	21
In this Issue & Future Issues	21,23
LITERARY – POEM, HISTORICAL PIECE, ARTICLES, & REVIEWS	
St James Park London 2011 – Poem by Dorian Rose Borsella	25
‘A Conference between the Ghosts of King Charls, and Oliver Cromwell’ (1659; facsimile of original pamphlet; with Notes)	26
<i>When the Waves Ruled Britannia: Geography and Political Identities, 1500-1800</i> by Jonathan Scott – reviewed by Tristan Stein (Harvard Univ.) [an H-net review]	35
“Forum: Patriot Royalism”[<i>William and Mary Quarterly</i> , 3d Ser., Vol. 68, No. 4 (Oct. 2011)] by Eric Nelson, Gordon S. Wood, Pauline Maier, and Daniel Hulsebosch – reviewed by Suzanne G. Bowles, Ph.D.	38
<i>Queen Elizabeth in the Garden</i> by Trea Martyn – reviewed by John A. E. Windsor	43
<i>Queen of Scots: The True Life of Mary Stuart</i> by John Alexander Guy – reviewed by John A. E. Windsor	46
<i>Monarchy and the Chase</i> by “Sabretache” (Albert Stewart Barrows) – reviewed by Sarah Gilmer Payne	51
<i>Treatment of Head Injuries in the Thirty Years War: Joannis Scultetus and his Age (1618-1648)</i> by Louis Bakay, M.D., F.A.C.S. – reviewed by Sarah Gilmer Payne	53
‘The Uncommon Prayer Book’ by M. R. James - commentary by Sarah Gilmer Payne	54
Passive Obedience and Caroline Politics III – by The Most Rev’d Mark Haverland, Ph.D.	55
EDITOR’S MISCELLANY	
<i>Kalendar of Anniversaries, Devotional Manual</i> <> Byrd and Elgar <> Samuel Seabury	65

Apology

The Editor apologizes for the late (September) publication of this June 2012 issue of *SKCM News*. In April when the issue was about 90% complete, his computer was misbehaving, and when a computer expert 'helped', half of it was lost: "I think I lost some of your work." A month later the entire document was lost when the computer's hard disk failed.

EDITORIAL

King Charles Was a Leader

"I conceive that Episcopal Government is most consonant to the Word of God, and of an apostolical institution, as it appears by the Scripture, to have been practiced by the Apostles themselves, and by them committed, and derived to particular persons as their substitutes or successors therein and hath ever since to these last times been exercised by Bishops in all the Churches of Christ, and therefore I cannot in conscience consent to abolish the said government."

—King Charles I, Declaration at Newport, 1648

When we read King Charles's clear, succinct rationale for episcopacy, as delivered in the year before his beheading, even we, his clients, are tempted to think, "This must have been written by a ghost-writer, probably one of his bishops, or a team of theologians." It is so concise and complete, covering the subject in its Scriptural precedent, Apostolic authority, universal Christian Tradition, and overall Rationale, that we may doubt whether its words are the King's own. (Hooker's 'three-legged stool' of Anglican theology is Scripture, Tradition, and Reason. Andrewes's edition of Hooker was among the books given to the teen-aged Princess Elizabeth by the King on the eve of his martyrdom.)

Below are a few quotations from an important scholarly article on Clarendon's, various theologians', and the King's positions on the subjects of episcopacy and negotiations with the rebels: "**Undoubted Realities**": Clarendon on Sacrilege', by Martin Dzelzainis (Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, London), *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 33, No. 3 (1990), pp. 515-40. It will be seen to demonstrate that the situation was quite the opposite of what we might suppose: It was the *King* who had to tell his advisers, many of them bishops, what the correct position was. And so he did in very definite terms. ***Vivat Rex Carolus!***

The main topic of Dzelzainis's paper is the alienation of Church lands, which King Charles, Clarendon, Hooker, and many contemporary theologians (including Henry Hammond) considered to constitute sacrilege, the lands being God's, and that, twice over, since all Creation is God's, and gifts to the Church—land, goods, or money—are gifts back to God of what had been entrusted to men's care. This theological point explains why King Charles held his predecessor King Henry VIII in such low esteem, since the dissolution of the monasteries under the supervision of Thomas Cromwell in the previous century ('Act I') was primarily a venal act, confiscation of Church wealth, necessitated by the bankruptcy into which Henry's policies had plunged the Crown. In the XVII Century, King Charles's opponents hoped to perform 'Act II' of the play, 'Sacrilege', by abolishing episcopacy and now confiscating the lands attached to the cathedrals, their wealth and treasures, and the episcopal palaces. But more of this in a future article.

Here let us concentrate on the main issue that brought King Charles to his martyrdom, the issue of episcopal government of the Church. A group of King Charles's would-be advisers, called the 'Tew Circle' after their meeting place, Lord Falkland's residence, Tew, told the King that he had gone as far as he should with the conscience argument. They said that he had done all that he could, should have a clear conscience, and now should compromise. The RC court in exile in Paris, also urged compromise. They saw little difference between Anglicanism and Presbyterianism, so what would it matter to sign the Covenant or to forsake bishops in the C of E? The King did not agree. As Dr. Dzelzainis writes, "they had assured Charles that, if he was no doubt 'obliged' by his conscience 'to doe [*sic*; Note that in this and the following quotes, the original, archaic spelling has been kept to retain the statements' flavor and spontaneity. —*Ed.*] all' that was in his 'power to support and maintain that function of Bishops', then he had already discharged that obligation to the full, as 'all the world can witness'. Conscience, in this sense, had no further claims on him, or could it be more strictly interpreted."

King Charles wrote from Newcastle to Henry Jermyn, John Culpepper, and John Ashburnham in Sept. 1646, to express his "unexpressable greefe and astonishment" at the advice he had received from those Tew 'moderates' or 'compromisers'. He said that the advice was "not only directly against my conscience, but absolutely destructive to your ends, which is the maintenance of Monarchy."

According to Dr. Dzelzainis, "he took the position that conscience and policy 'go hand in hand', and that 'the prudentiall part of any consideration will never be found opposit to the conscientious'. In his view, the defence of the established church, which he was bound by conscience and oath to undertake, far from being at the expense of political considerations, was the only way to retrieve the situation: 'Belive it, religion is the only firme foundation of all power: That cast loose, or depraved, no government can be stable. For where was there ever obedience where religion did not teach it? But, which is most of all, how can we expect God's blessing, if we relinquishe his Church? And I am most confident that Religion will much sooner regain the Militia, then the Militia will Religion.'" (from Charles's letters dated 19 Aug., 7 Sept., and 21 Sept. 1646)

King Charles's faithful supporters in holding his position were Dr. Richard Steward (1593?-1651), dean-designate of S. Paul's and Westminster, and his Chancellor, Edward Hyde, later 1st Earl of Clarendon. Dr. Dzelzainis writes that "[Charles] particularly regretted that Hyde had stayed in Jersey in 1646 'and did not attend the Prince [future Charles II] into France; and that if he had been there, He would have been able to have prevented the Vexation his Majesty had endured at Newcastle, by Messages from Paris'. On the evidence of Clarendon's *Life* . . . , the king saw Steward and Hyde as twin guardians of the established Church. After the treaty of Uxbridge, for example, the king had noticed 'above all' Hyde's 'Affection to the Church, of which, He said, Dr. Steward had so fully informed him, that He looked upon him as one of the few, who was to be relied upon in that Particular'. And when he read Hyde's *A full answer to an infamous and trayterous pamphlet* (1648) he said he could

have sworn 'it was writ by the Chancellor, if it were not that there was more Divinity in it than He expected from him, which made him believe He had conferred with Dr. Steward'.

"In a letter to Sir Edward Nicholas [Hyde] condemned the equivocation of those 'in France, who (comforting themselves with their old subtle resolutions, of breaking any agreement as soon as it shall be in their power) do heartily wish . . . that the king would sign every article of the propositions'. (Hyde to Nicholas, 15 Nov. 1646) What was especially galling, however, was the knowledge that those who were morally pliant in this way were no doubt convinced of their own superior realism. As Hyde told another of his correspondents, Lady Dalkeith, 'the fixing upon honest principles, which all moral men must acknowledge, is reproached and laughed at, as delighting in metaphysical notions, and imaginary speculations'. (Hyde to Dalkeith, 20 Oct. 1646) Hyde struggled long and hard against such lethal reductiveness, convinced that it was those like himself, fixed 'upon honest principles', and not the shallow opportunists lost in the 'wilderness of prudential motive, and expedients', who had the surer grasp of what Charles had called the '**undoubted realities**'. (Hyde to Digby, 30 Nov. 1648) Thus Hyde shared entirely Nicholas's confidence that 'if his Majesty preserves his good principles . . . he will sooner destroy the Rebels, than he could have done any other way'. (Hyde to Nicholas, 27 Feb. 1647)"

Of course, we know "the rest of the story". We know that it was through his death and defeat that King Charles the Martyr successfully retained the Episcopal governance of the Church, and enabled the Restoration of Church and King in the twelfth year after his martyrdom. May we, his clients, likewise conscientiously honor and treasure the "**undoubted realities**" that Saint Charles held fast in his soul.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'L. Wuonola', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

—Mark A. Wuonola, Ph.D., Editor

Report of the 28 January 2012 Annual Mass at All Saints Church, Appleton WI

The Rev'd Patrick Twomey, Rector – Celebrant

The Ordinary, The Rt. Rev'd Russell E. Jacobus, D.D., Bishop of Fond du Lac – Presiding

The Ven. Shawn W. Denney, J.D., Archdeacon of Springfield (IL) – Select Preacher

by The Rev'd John D. Alexander, SSC, Rector of S. Stephen's, Providence RI

Wrapped up warmly against the cold, I made my way from my hotel past the dozens of restaurants and pubs lining Appleton's main street to All Saints' Church. A light snow had fallen overnight, calling to mind the snow that whitened the Royal Martyr's coffin at his funeral in 1649, as if in testimony to his innocence.

I had flown into Appleton a day early to spend some time with friends in the Diocese of Fond du Lac. Appleton was remarkably easy to get to: a half-day's travel from Providence, Rhode Island, comprising a plane change in Chicago and a direct flight into the regional airport on the edge of town. During my short stay I learned that Appleton is not only a paper-manufacturing center but also the home of Lawrence University, one of the more prestigious academic institutions of the upper Midwest; All Saints' Church stands across the street from its campus.

A handsome grey stone edifice constructed in 1905 and dedicated by Bishop Reginald Weller – better known as the bishop whose consecration photo became known as the “Fond du Lac Circus” – All Saints' was gutted by fire in 1949, reconstructed, and rededicated in 1952. On entering, I encountered an interior tastefully decorated in the style of that era. The Society Portrait of King Charles was prominently on display to the left of the high altar, flanked by two candles. About thirty people were seated in the pews waiting for the Mass to begin; I recognized several from S.K.C.M. Masses of past years. The total attendance was fifty-five.

A thurifer and boatboy led the entrance procession, accompanied by the rousing strains of “With thankful hearts thy glory, O King of saints we sing.” Bishop Russell Jacobus of Fond du Lac brought up the rear, carrying his crosier and vested in cope and miter. The Rector, Fr. Patrick Twomey, celebrated the Rite I Mass *coram episcopo*, in the presence of the bishop, who came forward to give the Absolution and the Pontifical Blessing. Organist and Choirmaster Frank Rippl – a retired music professor at Lawrence University – conducted the parish choir in excellent renditions of William Byrd's *Mass for Four Voices* and the Communion Anthem, Edward Elgar's *Ave Verum Corpus*. (see ‘Byrd and Elgar’, *EM*)

The Venerable Shawn W. Denney, Archdeacon of the Diocese of Springfield (Illinois), gave the sermon. Posing the question, “What do we say he stood for?” he offered the answer, “Clearly for us, it is catholic faith and order and a devotion to duty.” Then, after reflecting on the nature of Christian sainthood, Archdeacon Denney concluded:

The power of the Holy Spirit, strengthened in Charles with the sacramental anointing of the Church, is available to us all. The history of the church is replete with stories of those, who, empowered by the Holy Spirit, understood their call, and the imperatives of the Gospel, and were faced with persecution and martyrdom.

Following their Lord and Master, Jesus Christ, they humbled themselves, becoming obedient even unto death, all the while praying for their persecutors, patiently enduring their sufferings, as Peter enjoins, their mouths not filled with guile, but with the words of forgiveness. In the end they bore what they had to bear with dignity and with an otherworldly sense of hope and joy.

The Mass concluded with the enthusiastic singing of Parry's setting of William Blake's "Jerusalem." Following Mass Bishop Jacobus invited me – perhaps because I had traveled the farthest to be there – to join him, the preacher, and the rector in standing for photographs beside the Society's portrait of the Royal Martyr (back cover). All Saints hosted a delightful luncheon in its well-appointed parish hall. There I encountered one or two local members of the Society, but most seemed to be parishioners both of All Saints and of other parishes in Fond du Lac and the neighboring dioceses.

Uplifted and invigorated by the day's proceedings, I caught the 4 p.m. flight from Appleton to Chicago, and was back in Providence by 11 p.m., ready for Sunday morning services at S. Stephen's. The thought occurred to me on the return journey that despite the obvious risks of poor attendance, it is worthwhile occasionally to take the message of the Royal Martyr into parts of the country where it is perhaps less familiar than on the East Coast. Who knows whether some attending this Mass might be prompted to investigate further and indeed be led to join the Society? It was gratifying to have participated in a small way in such a potentially missionary effort.

[The Rev'd John D. Alexander, SSC, a life member of the Society, hosted the 2009 Annual Mass at S. Stephen's, Providence RI. We thank him for attending the Annual Mass to represent the Society at this, our major Annual event, particularly since it was impossible for any of the American Region's officers to be present. We also thank The Ven. Shawn W. Denney, J.D., for accepting our invitation to be the 2012 Select Preacher. When he accepted, we were planning to meet at Nashotah House, but when insurmountable scheduling difficulties there necessitated changing our venue, Archdeacon Denney nonetheless honored that invitation, traveling farther to the North than he had planned. Father Alexander and Matthew Payne, Fond du Lac's (Lay) Canon to the Ordinary, were instrumental in securing an invitation for us to meet at All Saints, Appleton, also in the State of Wisconsin. We thank its rector, The Rev'd Patrick Twomey, people, and Director of Music, Professor Frank G. Rippl, for their warm hospitality, the liturgy, which Father Twomey celebrated, the splendid music, and the luncheon. We are also grateful to The Ordinary, The Rt. Rev'd Russell E. Jacobus, D.D., who presided at the mass, for so graciously welcoming Society members to the historically important Anglo-Catholic diocese of Fond du Lac, and to the many generous members listed below who contributed financially.]

Supporters of the 2012 Annual Mass

(33, \$2,120)

Patrons (13)

Professor Thomas E. Bird, Ben.
Professor Charles R. Forker
Hugh G. Hart
The Rt. Rev'd Jack Leo Iker, SSC, D.D., OL, Ben.
Charles Owen Johnson, Esq.
The Rev'd Vern E. Jones, OL
Paul W. McKee, Ben., OL
The Rt. Rev'd Dr. James W. Montgomery, Ben.
John Douglass Ruff, Esq., Ben., OL
Colonel Robert W. Scott
Mark Randall Taylor, KtJ+
The Rev'd Elijah White
John Arthur Edward Windsor, Ben.

Donors (13)

Howard Bradley Bevard
David B. J. Chase, Ph.D.
James Irvine Whitcomb Corcoran, Esq.

The Ven. Shawn W. Denney, J.D.

Charles F. Evans
Theodore Richard Harvey
The Rev'd Philip C. Jacobs III
The Very Rev'd Canon Harry E. Krauss
The Rev'd Dr. Richard Cornish Martin, SSC, OL
Phoebe Pettingell
The Rev'd Canon William E. Swatos, Jr., Ph.D.
Allen L. Walker
Mark A. Wuonola, Ph.D., Ben., OL

Contributors (7)

Charles A. Calverley
Professor William L. M. H. Clark
The Rev'd Dr. W. Ralph Gardiner
Arthur L. Johnson
Richard J. Mammana, Jr., OL, & Mrs. Mammana
William Lee Younger

Sermon Preached by

The Venerable Shawn W. Denney, J.D., Archdeacon of Springfield (IL)

Select Preacher at the XXIX Annual Mass

***of the American Region of the Society of King Charles the Martyr
at All Saints Church, Appleton, Wisconsin, 28 January 2012***

The breath of our nostrils, the Anointed of the Lord, was taken to their pits: of whom we said, under his shadow we shall be safe. —*Lam.* iv: 20

Forty years ago this coming Monday, 30 January 1972, I passed through London for the first time. When I say “passed through”, I mean that literally. I was returning from a month in Europe on a January term college course, and our charter flight stopped in London to pick up fellow students who had been in London for a theatre course. We did not get off the airplane, but during the layover, the stewardesses, as they were called then, passed out copies of *The Times of London*.

I took a copy and perused it. It was the old fashioned newspaper, lots of content and no frills. I do not even recall that there were pictures, let alone pictures in color.

I noticed in that copy of *The Times* a rather unusual memorial (strange to me, though not beyond my ken as a history major) which read something like this:

In memory of Charles I, King of England, beheaded on this day in 1649.

The enemies of all he stood for are still with us.

I clipped the piece from the paper and brought it home, passing it along to one of my professors, whose field was Restoration England. He framed it and hung it on the wall above his desk where it remained for many years.

That one sentence, certainly something that could be taken as outwardly partisan, or perhaps even out of touch with the XX (now XXI) Century, stuck with me. The enemies of all he stood for *are* still with us.

The first question that this presents, of course, is what did he stand for? The response can be different things depending on one's perspective. Some might say he stood for tyranny, an outdated understanding of the role of a monarch (by contemporary reckoning), or repression of liberty, as expressed in a parliamentary system. We could posit arguments relative to and dispute many of those understandings or misunderstandings. What do we say he stood for? Clearly for us, it is catholic faith and order and a devotion to duty.

I remember well, in a debate long ago in our annual Synod, a respected older gentleman rising to his feet to object to the "removal" of King Charles from the Calendar in the 1979 Prayer Book. (He used the word removal because, up until that time, many of our parishes had used the Anglican Missal, which included the observance of 30 January.) His remark was: "Here is a man who, had he been willing to become a Presbyterian, might have saved his head."

Perhaps that might be overly simplistic, but it is compelling as an argument. If we value the catholic heritage of the Anglican Church, the maintenance of the gift of apostolic orders, we have one person to thank, more than any other—the one who laid down his earthly crown on 30 January 1649, to take up a heavenly crown, not having sacrificed for his own benefit that catholic heritage.

One can quickly peruse *Holy Women, Holy Men*, the latest proposed expansion of the Episcopal Calendar, and find many whose contribution to the faith is far less, and even whose commitment to Christianity is uncertain, but one searches in vain for Charles Stuart.

Many have fought the battle for his inclusion—our Society was founded to advocate for that—vowing to Remember! As a counter, we are given a litany of his imperfections and failures.

Where do they get the idea that *some* Saints have to be perfect? We know from history and the witness of the ages that saints are not perfect, despite the fact that we throw around comments about the sanctity of ones in whom we recognize goodness. We have probably all heard or said "He or she is a saint." It perhaps dilutes our ability to comprehend true sainthood, which recognizes how human beings, with all of their flaws, make themselves available to be used powerfully by God to convey His message and to sustain His church.

Our preconceived notions fail us when we are confronted with the human failures of those whom we would regard as saints. I think here of the descriptions of Blessed Teresa of Calcutta, hailed during her lifetime as a "living" saint, who left behind writings dealing with her struggle with faith. To many this came as a profound shock, but it should not have, for

she was a human being like the rest of us, with human doubts and failings. Through that, through her obedience in times of personal darkness and struggle, she continued to be used powerfully by God.

Blessed Charles, though called to an exalted role, was a human being. He made mistakes in judgment. His governance was not always as wise as the prayers at his Coronation would have hoped for, and difficulties ensued for him and for his kingdom. But his heart, as we would say, was (and remained) in the right place.

Ultimately, he was hauled before a tribunal founded in no warrant of law (as he was wont to point out), to receive what had been predetermined, by men whose definition of liberty was of their own making. He was condemned to death in an unjust manner, but he accepted his fate with grace and dignity, buttressed ever by a faith that did not flag. What he accepted, as he said, was “mortality crowned with martyrdom”. He lost that battle—but he won the victory.

While the enemies of all he stood for might still be with us, the good news is that the Power that sustained the Blessed Charles is also still with us, and that Power, today and always, remains greater than any power that is in the world.

The Power working in the Blessed Charles was imparted as he sought to follow Jesus as his Lord and master, as a faithful Christian, but also sacramentally. You see, Charles, like his predecessors and successors was anointed to his task, and set apart—undertaking a ministry that by outward signs and inward understandings, could be described as priestly in character, from the outward adornment with priestly vestments to the inward acceptance of an indelible vocation. It was not something to be cast away lightly for convenience or expediency, or even (or perhaps especially) for the avoidance of suffering.

In a few days, the Queen will mark the 60th anniversary of her Accession. The anointed Queen has given us a wonderful example of what this commitment entails. For years there has been speculation that Her Majesty would choose to abdicate, to retire like some of her continental counterparts (who, in general, are not anointed to their tasks). The wisdom from the inner circle is that she will never do that because she perceives her responsibility to be one for life. This anointed one, like her predecessor, has an unabashed commitment to the Christian faith, as evidenced in the devotion that has marked her life, as expounded upon in these words from her Christmas Broadcast:

Although we are capable of great acts of kindness, history teaches us that we sometimes need saving from ourselves—from our recklessness or our greed. God sent into the world a unique person—neither a philosopher nor a general (important though they are)—but a Saviour, with the power to forgive.

Forgiveness lies at the heart of the Christian faith. It can heal broken families, it can restore friendships and it can reconcile divided communities. It is in forgiveness that we feel the power of God’s love.

The anointing is a priestly act, with Old Testament origins, conveying a priestly grace to carry out the ministry with which the king is charged. Hear the words of the anointing prayers said over King Charles on Candlemas day in 1626:

God, the Son of God Christ Jesus our Lord who is anointed of his Father with the oil of gladness above his fellows, He by his anointing pour down upon thy head the anointing of the Holy Ghost and make it enter into the inward parts of thy heart, that so by this visible gift thou mayest receive invisible grace

God . . . , Vouchsafe in thy favour to be present with him that he, who desireth to be defended by thy protection, may be stronger than his enemies. Crown him with the crown of Justice and Piety, that with all his heart and with all his mind he may trust in thee, serve thee, defend and advance the holy Church, and govern the people committed to his charge in justice and equity. Kindle O Lord his heart with the love of thy grace, by that holy oil wherewith thou hast anointed him, as thou didst anoint Kings, Priests and Prophets; that he, . . . after the glorious course of this life which thou hast appointed him, may come to thine eternal joy.

The Blessed Charles lived in the power of this call and anointing, and, from all accounts, entered in strength and joy into glory.

The anointed king would not bend to the will of his persecutors, and this was a principal factor in their seeking to destroy him. As he said in *Eikon Basilike*:

With them My greatest fault must be, that I would not destroy My Self with the Church and State by My word, or not suffer them to do it un-resisted by the Sword; whose covetous ambition, no Concessions of Mine could ever yet either satisfie, or abate.

—(p. 95, Edition reprinted by General Books LLC, Memphis TN [Amazon])

The greatest challenge to the persecutor is not the life, which he might at will extinguish, but the soul, over which he may have no control unless given that control by the persecuted. The Blessed Charles would not, could not, relinquish that control. He resisted the enemy with all the cunning, strength and skill that God had given him. In the end, those who would have never been satisfied by anything but his removal from the vineyard and the usurpation of his inheritance, those who had and would take innocent blood, laid that charge only on him.

He went to his death in confidence, courageous to the point that he wore a second shirt so that the elements could not betray an appearance of fear that was not in him.

This past summer I was able to spend part of an afternoon in the Banqueting House. I wanted enough time, in comparative quiet, to reflect on the thoughts that must have been swirling in the head of the Martyr on that day in 1649, when he passed through it for the last time.

Places have the ability to evoke images, reflections, recollections. On that dismal morning in 1649, the glories of the room must have seemed hollow – the great Rubens paintings, celebrating at the center the Apotheosis of James I, must have seemed empty, distant memories of happier times, now extinguished.

In the midst of all that seemed to be passing away, there remained a greater truth, even as there awaited him a greater crown. At that point, no doubt, he had begun to glimpse it.

Once, following the death of a too young and much beloved parishioner, who had endured a long battle with cancer, I was surprised to have an acquaintance of his ask “was he already a saint?” At first, I was a bit thrown off by the question, but, in the end, I had to

say yes. Before his death, he had begun the journey into God's nearer presence, and he was already showing signs of what that looks like.

For Charles, that journey had its final earthly stages as he walked across the floor of the Banqueting House and stepped out onto the scaffold. He was emboldened by the power of God present with him. It has been said, perhaps facetiously, that nothing became him like his death – during which process he exuded both sanctity and a certain serenity, leading one to conclude that Charles's sainthood did not and does not need the proclamation of convocations or the pronouncements or determinations of a curial body. It is perceived and lifted up in the hearts of those to whom God chooses to reveal it.

The power of the Holy Spirit, strengthened in Charles with the sacramental anointing of the Church, is available to us all. The history of the church is replete with stories of those, who, empowered by the Holy Spirit, understood their call, and the imperatives of the Gospel, and were faced with persecution and martyrdom.

Following their Lord and Master, Jesus Christ, they humbled themselves, becoming obedient even unto death, all the while praying for their persecutors, patiently enduring their sufferings, as Peter enjoins, their mouths filled not with guile, but with words of forgiveness. In the end they bore what they had to bear with dignity and with an otherworldly sense of hope and joy.

God won for them, as he did for Blessed Charles, the victory, and he invites us, in our own struggle, to witness faithfully, endure patiently and to whatever earthly end is in store for us, but, more than that, he empowers those who admit His Holy Spirit to the inward parts of their hearts to do all He would call them to do. He invites us into the continuing knowledge that enemies of all *He* stands for are still with us, and will be to the end of the age, but that the power that is in us, through His Holy Spirit, remains far greater than the powers that are in the world.

For the life and ministry of Blessed Charles, King and Martyr, and for the example he continues to give us of the hope of God's call to faithfulness and service, we give thanks to God.

Amen.

[THE VENERABLE SHAWN W. DENNEY, J.D., was educated at MacMurray College (IL) (B.A., History, 1973) and earned the degree Juris Doctor at the University of Illinois in 1976. He worked in the Illinois Attorney General's Office in a number of positions, including Solicitor General (1987-8) and Senior Counsel to the AG (1999-2002). He was Commissioner and Chair of the Executive Ethics Commission (2004-present; 2007-9). The Illinois News Broadcasters' Assn. honored him as Illinoisan of the Year 1991 and in 1995 he received the James C. Craven Freedom of the Press Award. He read for Orders 1993-7, in 1995 passing the examination of the General Board of Examining Chaplains in the seven canonical areas, with a mark of Outstanding in Church History, and was ordained priest in 1998 by The Rt. Rev'd Peter H. Beckwith, X Springfield. He is Archdeacon of the Diocese of Springfield, Illinois, comprising the State's 60 central and southern counties. Archdeacon Denney served under Bishop Beckwith and now The Rt. Rev'd Daniel H. Martins, XI Springfield, in that position of responsibility and also serves as Vicar of Saint Luke's, Springfield. He is an Associate Alumnus of Nashotah House

Seminary. Archdeacon Denney is married and has one son; he has been a member of the Society since 1989 and is a pious and informed client of the Royal Martyr.

[The sermon was published in the March and April, 2012, issues of the Dio. of Fond du Lac Clarion.]

Other 2012 Commemorations – America

The Rev'd Douglas E. Hungerford, rector of **The Anglican Catholic Church of the Holy Trinity, Peru IN**, reports that the Martyr-King's feast was celebrated with a mass using the propers of the Anglican Missal, American Edition. At the offertory the hymn text by John Donne [chaplain to King Charles I] was sung to the tune 'Canticum Refectionis'. We thank Father Hungerford, a Society member, for writing on 30 January to report this commemoration promptly.

From **Trinity Parish in Canton (MA)**, Society member The Rev'd Philip C. Jacobs III writes to report that on 31 January the Feast of King Charles the Martyr was celebrated at the parish's customary Tuesday eucharist.

The Rev'd John D. Alexander, *SSC*, life member, rector of **S. Stephen's Providence RI**, informs us that the early low mass on the 30th was celebrated in honor of King Charles the Martyr. Father Alexander will be our Select Preacher at the 2013 Annual Mass on 26 Jan. at All Saints, Ashmont, Dorchester, Boston.

The London Area Celebrations 2012

by The Rev'd Canon William H. Swatos, Jr., Ph.D.

President, Society of King Charles the Martyr, Inc. (The American Region)

The Royal Martyr Church Union held its annual commemorative Mass of the Royal Martyr on Saturday, 28 January, at its traditional venue, the charming baroque church of Saint Mary-le-Strand, with luncheon following. The celebrant and preacher was The Rt. Rev'd Brian Smith, retired Bishop of Edinburgh and President Emeritus of the Union. The Mass was well attended and, as always, concluded with the Loyal Toast to the Queen, especially significant this year in light of the Jubilee. In his sermon Bishop Brian reflected particularly on the difficulties of assessing the long-term outcomes of decisions one must make and the importance of trusting oneself to God's mercy.

The Royal Stuart Society gathered at the Statue of Saint Charles in Whitehall for a wreath-laying on the morning of the 30th, preceding the Mass of the Society of King Charles the Martyr in the Banqueting Hall. The preacher for the Mass was the Bishop of Richborough, The Rt. Rev'd Norman Banks. Richborough is one of three bishops suffragan to the Archbishop of Canterbury with the special charge of serving traditionalist congregations within the Church of England. The Mass was well attended by over a hundred people, with an *a cappella* setting and anthem by choristers from Kings College, London, as

well as hymns specific to the S.K.C.M. cause, including one by Mrs. Greville-Nugent, foundress of the Society.

In the afternoon, Evensong at Saint George's Chapel Windsor also featured a wreath-laying by the Royal Stuart Society and prayer by the Dean at the beginning of the office, which was beautifully sung by the choir of men and boys.

Upcoming Annual Masses

(all are on Saturday at 11 a.m.; *S.K.C.M. member)

XXX Annual Mass: The Parish of All Saints, Ashmont, Dorchester, Boston. 26 January 2013. The Rev'd Michael J. Godderz, *SSC*, Rector, The Rev'd Dr. F. Washington Jarvis*, *OL*, Assisting Priest. Select Preacher, The Rev'd John D. Alexander*, *SSC*, Rector of S. Stephen's, Providence RI. Music of the Mass, Mozart's *Spaetzenmesse* sung by the All SS Choir of Men and Boys, Andrew P. Sheranian, Organist and Master of Choristers. Buffet luncheon, \$15 to the Parish Office, Parish of All Saints, 209 Ashmont St., Dorchester, Boston MA 02124.

XXXI Annual Mass: The Cathedral Church of S. Vincent, Bedford TX (Dio. of Fort Worth). 25 January 2014. The Rt. Rev'd Jack L. Iker*, *SSC*, D.D., *OL*, Ben., Bishop, The Very Rev'd Ryan Reed, *SSC*, Dean. Select Preacher, The Rev'd Martin C. Yost*, *SSC*, Rector of S. Stephen's, Sherman TX (Dio. of Dallas).

XXXIII Annual Mass: The Church of the Holy Communion, Charleston SC. 30 January 2016. The Rev'd M. Dow Sanderson*, *SSC*, Rector; The Rev'd Daniel L. Clarke*, *SSC*, Curate. Select Preacher, Father Sanderson.

Society of King Charles the Martyr, Inc. (The American Region) Board of Trustees

At its statutory Annual Meeting in January 2012, the Board of Trustees increased the number of Trustees to ten, re-electing the existing eight and adding two new members (*), with the result that the Board and its officers stood as follows:

The Rt. Rev'd Keith L. Ackerman, *SSC*, D.D., *OL* (Episcopal Patron)

John R. Covert (Webmaster)

A. Donald Evans (Chapter Liaison)

William M. Gardner, Jr., *OL* (*R.I.P.* 22 V 2012)

* David Lewis, *FAAO* (Treasurer/Membership Secretary)**

* Richard J. Mammana, Jr., *OL*

Paul W. McKee, Ben., *OL*

The Rev'd Canon James G. Monroe, Ph.D., *SSC* (Secretary of the Board)

J. Douglass Ruff, Esq., Ben., *OL* (VP, Asst. Scty., & Asst. Treasurer)

The Rev'd Canon William H. Swatos, Jr., Ph.D. (President)

**to whom all payments, dues, donations, and goods orders—and address changes, postal and email—should be sent

Three Bishops Elected Members of the Order of Laud

With effect as of the January 2012 statutory Annual Meeting, and announced at the XXIX Annual Mass, three Bishop Members were honored by election to inaugural membership in the Order of Laud. These men staunchly, constantly, and publicly have defended the Cause and the inclusion of King Charles the Martyr in the calendar of The Episcopal Church in the House of Bishops and at the Triennial General Convention, suffering disapprobation, marginalization, and ridicule as a result. We owe them an enormous debt of gratitude for their courageous witness to the Cause and to the Truth.

The Rt. Rev'd William C. Wantland, J.D., D.Rel., D.D., senior reigning bishop-member of the American Region 1980-97, IV Bishop of Eau Claire (ret.), sometime Bishop of Navajoland, assisting Bishop of Ft. Worth

The Rt. Rev'd Jack Leo Iker, SSC, D.D., Ben., III Bishop of Fort Worth, senior reigning bishop-member of the American Region 1997-present

The Rt. Rev'd Keith Lynn Ackerman, SSC, D.D., Episcopal Patron of the American Region, S.K.C.M. 1999-present; VIII Bishop of Quincy (ret.); assisting Bishop of Ft. Worth

All three bishops have served as Trustees of Nashotah House Seminary. Bishop Wantland has served as Chairman of the Board, and Bishop Ackerman as Vice-Chairman.

After **The Rt. Rev'd Joseph M. Harte, SSC, D.D., S.T.D., D.Min., OL**, Episcopal Patron 1972-99 (d. 1999), who joined the Society in 1944, Bishop Wantland, who joined in 1979, became the Second Bishop-Member of the American Region.

Roster of Members of The Order of Blessed William Laud, Abp., M.

(Each departed member's name is followed by a cross + and year of death; *Requiescat in pace.*)

The Rt. Rev'd Keith Lynn Ackerman, SSC, D.D.

Nick F. Behrens

Professor Bernard P. Brennan, Ph.D., Ben + 2006

Elizabeth Agnes Ballantyne Carnahan + 1972

Gary Adrian Cole + 1994

Richard G. Durnin + 2007

William M. Gardner, Jr. + 2012

The Rev'd Canon Robert S. H. Greene, SSC

The Rt. Rev'd Joseph M. Harte, SSC, D.D., S.T.D., D.Min. + 1999

Professor Martin Joseph Havran, Ph.D. + 2000

Richard J. Mammana, Jr.

Lee Hopkins

Everett Courtland Martin, Ben. + 2004

The Rt. Rev'd Jack Leo Iker, SSC, D.D., Ben.

The Rev'd Dr. Richard Cornish Martin, SSC

The Rev'd F. Washington Jarvis, L.H.D., D.Litt.

Robert Nicely Mattis + 2000

The Rev'd Vern E. Jones

Paul White McKee, Ben.

The Rev'd David C. Kennedy, SSC, D.D.

The Rev'd Andrew C. Mead, OBE, D.D.

Eleanor Emma Langlois + 1999

The Rev'd Alfred J. Miller, D.D. + 1984

Professor Ernest H. Latham, Jr., Ph.D.

The Rev'd Canon Marshall Vincent Minister + 2010

The Rev'd Canon Edmund W. Olifiers, Jr.
The Rev'd Canon Jonathan J. D. Ostman, SSC
James Bailey Parker
Sarah Gilmer Payne, Ben.
Charles F. Peace IV

The Rev'd William Harman van Allen, S.T.D., D.D., L.H.D., D.C.L., LL.D. + 1931
American Region Founder, 1894

The Rev'd Ralph T. Walker, SSC, D.D.

The Rt. Rev'd William C. Wantland, J.D., D.D., D.Rel.

The Rev'd Canon Professor J. Robert Wright, D.Phil.(*Oxon.*), D.D., D.Cn.L., F.R.Hist.S.
Mark A. Wuonola, Ph.D., Ben.

Stephen C. Petrica
Alexander Roman, Ph.D.
John Douglass Ruff, Esq., Ben.
The Rev'd Canon Barry E. B. Swain, SSC

Roster of Benefactors of the American Region, S.K.C.M.

(Each departed member's name is followed by a cross + and year of death; *Requiescat in pace.*)

Charles Barenthaler
Professor Thomas E. Bird, Ph.D.
Professor Bernard P. Brennan, Ph.D., OL + 2006
Charles Jerome Briody III
Emily Stuart Brown, R.N. + 1989
The Rev'd Osborne Budd + 2001
The Rev'd Wilbur B. Dexter + 2005
Mrs. Wilbur B. (Kathleen M.) Dexter + 1994
The Rev'd Kent Lambert Haley
Patricia Mayes Hines + 2010
Richard Towill Hines
Alan R. Hoffman + 2006
The Rt. Rev'd Jack Leo Iker, SSC, D.D., OL
Jonathan A. Jensen

Allan F. Kramer II
The Rev'd Dr. Joseph Walter Lund
Everett Courtland Martin, OL + 2004
Paul White McKee, OL
The Rt. Rev'd Dr. James Winchester Montgomery
Sarah Gilmer Payne, OL
The Rev'd Canon Robert H. Pursel, Th.D. + 2009
John Douglass Ruff, Esq., OL
Philip Terzian
James Noel Ward
The Rev'd Canon Dr. Charles Everett Whipple + 2009
Suzanne Schellenger Williamson + 2007
John Arthur Edward Windsor
Mark A. Wuonola, Ph.D., OL

New Life Members & New Members

(Fiscal Year 2012, 1 Oct. 2011 – present)

New Life Members

The Rev'd Dr. Joseph W. Lund, Ben.
The Rev'd Elijah B. White
John C. Workman, Esq.

New Members

The Rev'd James W. Browder III
Patrick A. Burns
Adam Joseph DeFelice
William W. Dilworth, Jr.
Kipp Gearhart

Matthew R. Hynd
John J. Klopacz
Frederick J. Langsman
Jordan Lavender
Nicholas John Louras
Andrew Mason
Patricia McClelland
The Rev'd Peter S. Miller, TSSF
Paul J. Murray, KHS
Edward "Ted" Rowlands

John Peter White, Jr.
Miss Mary Catherine Word (R.I.P. 6 IV 2012)

Reinstated Members

James Kobeski
Chad Michael Krouse
Mary A. Ostman

News of Members

At commencement ceremonies in May 2012, **The Rev'd Dr. Richard Cornish Martin, SSC, OL**, was awarded the degree **D.D.(h.c.)** by Nashotah House. Father Martin has served with distinction on the Nashotah Board of Trustees for over two decades and has chaired its Nominating Committee.

The Presentation of our Lady, 2011, issue of *Ave*, the magazine of The Society of Mary, is a reminder of the common devotional purposes and shared membership among the catholic devotional societies. Our stalwart member, **Father Martin** (see above), is the American Region Superior of the Society, and we note in 'News from the Wards and Cells' that the Dallas-Fort Worth (Our Lady of Guadalupe) Ward is under S.K.C.M. member **The Rev'd Martin C. Yost, SSC**, Superior, and that S.K.C.M. member **Phoebe Pettingell** is Ward Secretary of Our Lady of Providence Ward, S. Stephen's Church, Providence RI.

[Members in New England will find it of interest that on the English SoM's 2011 pilgrimage to Italy, at S. Marie Maggiore, Roma, its Cardinal Rector, **Bernard, Cardinal Law**, sometime Archbishop of Boston, was admitted to Honorary Membership in the SoM by The Rt. Rev'd Robert Ladds, Superior-General of the Society of Mary.]

According to the Summer/Christmas 2011 *Church and King*, at its AGM, following the Nativity of KCM service in November 2011 at Saint Katharine Cree, Leadenhall Street, City of London, the Society of King Charles the Martyr (Great Britain) made **Dr. Mark A. Wuonola** "a Vice-President of the Society in recognition of his many years of service to the cause of the Royal Martyr." He is honored and humbled by this designation.

Notices of Death*

The Rt. Rev'd James Pollard Clark, *Obit.* 15 Dec. 2011 [1985]

Joe A. Davenport II, *Obit.* 7 Oct. 2010 [Jan. 2010]

Gerald Eldon Fosbroke, Esq., *Obit.* 25 April 2009, *Aet.* 89 [1Q 1997]

Paul R. Francke, Jr., *Obit.* 25 Jan. 2010 [4Q 1999]

William M. Gardner, Jr., OL, *Obit.* 22 May 2012, *Aet.* 81 [1989]

Membership Secretary 1995-2008

Malcolm E. Jones, *Obit.* 16 Dec. 2011 [1988]

Major General William G. Mac Laren, Jr., *Obit.* 13 July 2011 [2Q 1998]

Colonel Stewart B. McCarty, *Obit.* 21 Nov. 2011 [June 2010]

Mrs. Betty R. Quigley, *Obit.* 27 Aug. 2011 [1Q 2005]

J. Scott Selby, *Obit.* 27 Aug. 2011 [1Q 2001]

Miss Mary Catherine Word, *Obit.* 6 April 2012 [Feb. 2012]

* Date of enrollment is shown in square brackets.

FRIENDS

The Rt. Rev'd Ambrose Walter Marcus Weekes, CB, *Obit.* 24 April 2012, *Aet.* 92

Sometime Bishop Suffragan of Gibraltar

The Rev'd Cody Carlton Unterseher, *Obit.* 25 April 2012 *Aet.* 36

Editor, The Anglican (magazine of The Anglican Society)

Obituaries

William M. Gardner, Jr., OL. When he and the Editor were parishioners of S. Clement's, Philadelphia, Bill volunteered to become **Membership Secretary** of the Society's American Region. When he moved to Palm Beach County FL in 1995 he did so, faithfully executing and enhancing the function until he chose to step down in 2008. He remained a valued member of the Board. In addition to his scrupulous accounting and record-keeping, Bill carried out an extensive correspondence with members, mostly by email. [He was succeeded in the role by J. Douglass Ruff, Esq., and the role is now ably filled by Mr. David Lewis, FAAO. Each of them has 'taken it up a notch', as indeed Bill did when he took over the function, previously performed by your present Editor.]

Bill had many interests, including sailing (especially off Boston's South Shore and Cape Cod), ocean cruises, opera, and working crossword puzzles. To the Editor's amazement, he could work the *N. Y. Times* Sunday crossword almost as quickly as he could fill it out. A favorite photo he took from aboard ship was of Diamond Head HI. He was an alumnus of M.I.T. (Course X [chemical engineering], class of '53), during his student years a communicant of The Church of the Advent, Boston, and spent his entire career working for

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc., as a chemical engineer, for many years based in Puerto Rico, where he was involved in the design and construction of chemical plants. He was an 'engineer's engineer'. He was a supporter of the Metropolitan Opera, and like his fellow Baltimorean, H. L. Mencken (who died while listening to a Saturday broadcast of Wagner's *Die Meistersinger*), religiously listened to the Saturday radio broadcasts from the Met. Saturday afternoon was *definitely not* a time to reach Bill by telephone. He served at the altar at the Advent and at S. Clement's, and served as treasurer of several Episcopal parishes, including Guardian Angels, Lantana FL, where he also served at the altar and as Master of Ceremonies with '*Ritual Notes*' precision. A requiem for the repose of the soul of William M. Gardner, Jr., who died peacefully on 22 May 2012, was celebrated at the Church of the Holy Guardian Angels, Lantana FL, by The Rev'd David C. Kennedy, D.D., OL. Bill was buried in his hometown, Baltimore.

Bill and I shared many experiences and interests; he is sorely missed. –MAW

Gerald E. Fosbroke, J.D., died on 25 April 2009. A native of Baltimore, Gerry graduated from the Univ. of Maryland in History (B.A., M.A.), and Harvard Law School (J.D.), all by the age of 21. He joined the firm of Peabody Brown (now Nixon Peabody) where he spent his entire career, focused on tax and estate planning. He served in the U. S. Army (1942-6). An avid outdoorsman, he joined the Appalachian Mountain Club in 1948 and served on its Board 1950-72, and as President 1955-6. Gerry was well read, articulate, and exhibited a sharp wit and keen insight. He was a member of the Church of the Advent, Boston, and later of S. John's Bowdoin St., where he sang in the choir. He was legal counsel to the Society of Saint John the Evangelist for over 40 years, starting in 1949. He was an organizing trustee of the Iona Community New World Foundation, Iona, Scotland. A lover of music and the arts, he served on the Boards of the Massachusetts Bible Society, the Shakespeare Club of Boston, the Pro Arte Chamber Orchestra, Inc., of Boston, the Massachusetts and Boston Bar Associations, and The Society of Philatelic Americans. He is survived by a daughter, two sons, and two grandsons. His obsequies were celebrated on 11 Aug. 2009 at the Church of S. John the Evangelist, Bowdoin Street, Boston. [based on an obituary in *MetroWest* (Boston MA) *Daily News*, 10 Aug. 2009]

The Rev'd Cody Carlton Unterseher, 36, priest of the Diocese of ND and editor of *The Anglican*, died on 25 April 2012 of complications of a brain aneurism suffered on 13 April. A native of Bismarck ND, he graduated from the Cardinal Muench Seminary in Fargo in 1998. In 1996, he made his final oblation as an Oblate of S. Benedict at Assumption Abbey, Richardton ND. He received the B.A. (Theology, U. of Mary, Bismarck), M.A. (Liturgical Studies, S. John's Seminary, Collegeville MN), and S.T.M. (Anglican Studies, The General Seminary, NYC). At the time of his death, he had just completed the coursework for the Ph.D. in Liturgical Studies at Notre Dame, and moved back to New York to become priest-in-charge of Christ Church, Bronxville NY. He was ordained to the priesthood in 2007 at S. George's, Bismarck, by Bishop Michael Smith. His obsequies were celebrated on 28 April at Christ Church, Bronxville, and his ashes were committed in Bismarck on 5 May, when a

mass was celebrated in his memory at S. George's, Bismarck. He is survived by his parents, a younger brother and sister, and a nephew. He was the author of *American Sarum: The Liturgy of Christ Church, Bronxville, New York, within the History of Anglican Worship* (2011).



The Rt. Rev'd Ambrose Walter Marcus Weekes, CB, 92, sometime Suffragan Bishop of Gibraltar (the Church of England in Europe, Turkey, and Northern Africa), was born on S. Mark's Day, 25 April 1919, and died on 24 April 2012, one day short of his 93rd birthday. "He had all the gifts necessary for his posts—warmth, friendliness, caring, and fun, combined with the devotional seriousness of a priest in the Anglo-Catholic tradition. As a result he was a popular figure wherever he went and was both a sensitive and generous counsellor to all ranks in the Navy and subsequently to the clergy and laypeople of the 300 Anglican chaplaincies in Europe."

Bishop Weekes had his early education at the Cathedral Choir School and the Joseph Williamson School in Rochester. Feeling drawn to Holy Orders, he read theology at King's College, London, and completed his degree in Bristol. He spent a year at Lincoln Theological College before heading to the Medway in 1942 as a curate at S. Luke's, Gillingham. Two years later he enlisted as a chaplain RNVR and when the war was over stayed on as a chaplain RN. He served worldwide on many ships and at shore bases and was chaplain of the aircraft carrier *Triumph* which was involved, with the U.S. fleet, in the Korean War. From 1953-5 he served with the Royal Marines with 45 RM Commando. In 1967 his seniority and skill took him on to the staff of the Commander in Chief of the Far East Fleet, with responsibility for overseeing the other chaplains in the command. He then became Chaplain of the Fleet and Archdeacon for the RN. He became a Queen's Honorary Chaplain in 1969 and was appointed CB the following year. Upon retiring from the Royal Navy in 1972 he spent a year as chaplain of S. Andrew's Church in Tangier before becoming Dean of Gibraltar. In 1977 he was appointed the first suffragan Bishop of Gibraltar. The diocese was later re-named Europe. Bishop Weekes made an impact on the chaplaincies, including those still in the Soviet empire. He was based in Brussels, where he was Dean of Holy Trinity Pro-Cathedral. When he retired in 1986, he became an honorary assistant bishop in the Rochester diocese and canon of Rochester Cathedral. After two years, he returned to Europe working from the chaplaincy of Montreux with Gstaad in Switzerland. He was a Fellow of King's College, London. He was a former RN colleague of The Rev'd Peter Laister and a frequent visitor to S. Clement's, Philadelphia, where he ordained Canon Swain to the priesthood. He often functioned at All Saints, Margaret Street, London. [based on and quotation from the 16 May 2012 obituary in *The Telegraph*]

Donors to the General Fund Fiscal Year 2012

(1 Oct. 2011 - present; 53; \$1,787.45)

\$50 and up (15)

John A. E. Windsor, Ben.
Professor Thomas E. Bird, Ben.
Dennis P. Casey
Benton H. Marder, Jr.
The Rev'd Elijah B. White
The Rev'd Dr. Ralph T. Walker, SSC, OL
Charles J. Bartlett
Forest A. Nester
James W. Davis, Jr.
The Rev'd Brian F. Duffy
The Rev'd Dr. F. Washington Jarvis, OL
The Very Rev'd Canon Harry E. Krauss
Sarah Gilmer Payne, Ben., OL
Rodney Roehner
William Lee Younger

Up to \$50 (38)

Captain Howard S. Browne
Allan F. Kramer II, Ben.
Colonel Robert W. Scott
Professor William L. M. H. Clark
Douglas W. Hoffman
James C. Kelly
Stuart E. Prall
The Rev'd Donne E. Puckle, SSC
Edward J. Ward
The Rt. Rev'd Keith L. Ackerman, SSC, D.D., OL
Robert T. Booms

Suzanne G. Bowles, Ph.D.
The Ven. Shawn W. Denney, J.D.
James W. Dodge
The Very Rev'd J. Charles King, Ph.D.
Dorian R. Borsella
David D. Butler-Chamberlain, Esq.
The Rev'd Cyril Crume
Randy Headley
Thomas H. Kiefer
Thomas A. Mason
S. Bobo Dean, Esq.
Benjamin Guyer
Kevin J. Hanratty
David Lewis, FAAO
The Rev'd Richardson A. Libby
Frederick T. McGuire III
Miss Eileen M. O'Leary
Professor James B. Robinson
Alfred J. Toombs
Mrs. Beverly A. Tschida
George L. Voltz
A. Weldon Walker III
The Rev'd Martin C. Yost, SSC
Charles J. Briody III, Ben.
Walter H. Morton
Daniel Rathbun
Richard T. Hines, Ben.

Devotional, Caroline, and Monarchist Societies of Interest

*S.K.C.M. Member

The Royal Martyr Church Union – 15 GBP p.a.
E. David Roberts, Esq., Sec. & Treas.
7, Nunnery Stables
St Albans, Herts, AL1 2AS U.K.

The Royal Stuart Society – 22 GBP p.a., 250 life
Thomas Fitzpatrick, Esq., Principal Secretary
Southwell House
Egmere Road
Walsingham, Norfolk NR22 6BT U.K.

The Monarchist League – 20 GBP or \$40 p.a.
P. O. Box 5307 (checks in USD are accepted)
Bishop's Stortford, Herts. CM23 3DZ U.K.

The Guild of All Souls \$5 p.a., \$20 life
The Rev'd Canon Barry E. B. Swain*, SSC, OL,
Superior General
Write to: The Rev'd John Lancaster*, SSC,
P. O. Box 721172
Berkley MI 48072 U.S.A.

The Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament \$5 p.a.
The Very Rev'd Dr. William Willoughby III*, \$100
Secretary General life
Saint Paul's Church, 224 East 34th St.
Savannah GA 31401-8104 U.S.A.

The Society of Mary \$10 p.a., \$250 life
The Rev'd Dr. Richard C. Martin*, SSC,
American Region Superior
Write to: Mrs. Lynne Walker

P. O. Box 930
Lorton VA 22079-2930 U.S.A.

The Guild of the Living Rosary of Our Lady
and S. Dominic \$5 p.a., \$20 life
The Rev'd Canon David Baumann, SSC, Chaplain
Episcopal Church of the Blessed Sacrament
1314 N. Angelina Drive
Placentia CA 92870-3442 U.S.A

Errata and Addenda

SKCM News, Dec. 2011

Front Cover. Date at bottom should be "28 January 2012", not "2011".

p. 1, last par., line 2. The notice appears at p. 11, not p. 3.

p. 2, par. 1, last sentence, should read "**is** so celebrated ... and **elsewhere in the U.S., e.g.**"

p. 2, col. 2, 1st full par., line 1 should read "My research and research by Mr. David Roberts ..."

p. 3, 1st full par., last line. Canon Wright's sermon appears at pp. 28-33, not p. 27.

p. 16, 2012 - Britain, line 1 should read "**The Rev'd Michael Burns**".

p. 27. Obituary for The Rev'd Dr. Ronald Conner. Fr. Conner received the D.Min. from Drew Univ.

pp. 46-9, throughout review, and in Table of Contents. "Rockford" should read "**Rockford**". The book's author is "**Julia Fox**", not "Rox".

p. 47, 2nd full par., line 5 should read "**Emperor Charles V**", not "VI"; "Pope Clement VI" should read "**Pope Clement VII**".

p. 48, par. 5, last line. "ahd" should read "**had**".

p. 49, par. 3, line 3 should read "**Maud Green, Lady Parr**", not "Maud Parr, Lady Laine".

p. 57, 1st full par. In two places "1794" should read "**1793**".

SKCM News, June 2011

p. 4, line 5 should read "Observe the Quatercentenary of the Authorized Version in 2012".

p. 16, 'Articles in this Issue'. Mentions of the article by Attorney Butler-Chamberlain (pp. 46-8) and Sarah Gilmer Payne's review of the book about Charles I and his Family (pp. 54-5) were omitted.

p. 47, par. 9, last line should read "economic **gift**", not "get".

In this Issue

In this issue appears the third part of Abp. Haverland's essay 'Passive Obedience and Caroline Politics'. It focuses on the theology of Henry Hammond, the subject of His Grace's doctoral thesis.

Our regular contributor Sarah Gilmer Payne is the author of three diverse reviews, one concerning *La Chasse*, that favorite royal sport, one on the medical management of head wounds in the XVII Century, and one on a ghost story by among the finest authors in this genre. It concerns a special edition of the BCP with an unusual addendum on 25 April, usually thought of as the Feast of S. Mark the Evangelist, but also the anniversary of the death of Oliver Cromwell.

Dr. Suzanne G. Bowles has provided insightful commentary on a scholarly article from the *William and Mary Quarterly*, giving us an understanding of American colonialists' attitudes toward the Crown, their complex reasons and practical consequences. Why did public portraits of King Charles I become popular in the colonies?

John A. E. Windsor has contributed a review of a work on Elizabeth I, ostensibly about gardens. The book, while it provides expert coverage of that subject, is very much about Elizabethan politics,

as is the superb new biography by John Alexander Guy of Cambridge University on Mary, Queen of Scots. Guy's painstaking analysis of all the extant, primary documents reveals a ravishingly beautiful Queen, mature beyond her years. This book, a 'must read' for Society members, provides a breathtaking reassessment of the much-maligned progenitor of the English Stuart dynasty. As Gerard Kilroy wrote in *The New York Times Book Review* under the headline 'Mary Stuart Living: How associates of Elizabeth I spun a web of deceit that ensnared her cousin, Mary Queen of Scots',

"The tragic history of 'this bewitching Princess', as Jane Austen called Mary Stuart, has won men's hearts, whether on the stage of her own life or in Schiller's play or Donizetti's opera. . . .

"As a great-granddaughter of Henry VII, Mary was thought by many Catholics to have a better claim on the English throne than her 'illegitimate' cousin, Queen Elizabeth I. [And many non-Catholics thought so, too. The superior claim to the throne, Henry VIII's will notwithstanding, in addition to Mary's regal grace, striking beauty, intellectual brilliance, and height—nearly six feet—were more than reasons enough to inspire Elizabeth's obsessive jealousy. Although they never met in person, partly due to circumstances and obstructionism by Cecil, at one point the cousins exchanged portraits: Elizabeth was slow to send hers, although Mary's was forthcoming. Elizabeth wanted to see what she was up against! That Elizabeth finally accepted Mary's claim was revealed when, on her deathbed, she assented by default to the succession of Mary's only son, James VI of Scotland, to the English throne as King James I. —*Ed.*] The Cambridge historian John Guy, one of the most distinguished scholars of the Tudor period, presents a queen of Scots whose life and death were determined by the fear that claim aroused in Elizabeth's principal adviser, William Cecil, Lord Burghley. Guy undertakes the most scrupulous examination of the documents, including many that had been previously unknown. . . .

"The main evidence against [Mary] consisted of eight letters, always known as the 'casket letters', which had been 'found' in Bothwell's rooms. . . . Guy examines them in detail, paying particular attention to two previously unknown transcripts. Cecil's autograph annotations on these show him doctoring evidence to prove that Mary was Bothwell's lover before the murder of Darnley. [Henry Stuart, Lord Darnley, was the father of James VI & I. —*Ed.*] In one case Cecil crossed out 'after' and wrote 'afore', which transformed a harmless letter into an incriminating document. . . . It was Cecil who convened the Privy Council to authorize [Mary's] execution, which Elizabeth was not to know about 'until it were done.' . . .

"Guy's scholarly biography, as enthralling as a detective story, provides a wider vision of Tudor history and shows with stunning clarity how the historical narrative was shaped. It shifts the focus from the murderous [Scots] nobles to the web of deceit woven by Cecil and [his spymaster,] Walsingham, a web that not only trapped this 'ill-fated queen' but also formed the basis for all future accounts. She said her heart was her own; but her story has never been."

This issue's H-Net review, by Dr. Tristan Stein of Harvard, addresses British insularity and its inter-relationship with Britons' self-perception. (H-Net reviews appear and are quoted *in extenso* with the permission of H-Net Review Publications. The H-Net Reviews are chosen by The Rev'd Donald H. Langlois of Chandler AZ, who participates in editorial work on *SKCM News* and the *Email Communiqué*.)

In this issue we are particularly graced to publish a poem by Society member Dorian Rose Borsella of Maryland, who admires and writes in the tradition of our Society's most famous member, T. S. Eliot. Her poem recalls the Martyr King's brisk walk from Saint James's Palace to Whitehall on that chilly morning of 30 January 1648/9.

Also in this issue, we are pleased to publish a 'Conference between the Ghosts of King Charles and Oliver Cromwell', an imaginative historical work dating from 1659. It provides insight into how clearly Cromwell's cynical machinations and opportunistic rationalizations were perceived by Royalists at that time. We thank our faithful contributor, Richard J. Mammana, Jr., for uncovering a copy of the original pamphlet, which we have directly reproduced for your inspection and enjoyment.

In Future Issues of SKCM News and the Email Communiqué

An essay by Charles Bartlett on James I's *Basilikon Doron*, providing insight into the Royal Family of Scotland—King James VI of Scots, his Queen, Anne of Denmark, and their sons Henry and Charles, both born before James's accession as King James I of England in 1603.

A review by Dr. Suzanne Bowles of *A Life of Frederick, Prince of Wales, 1707-1751: A Connoisseur of the Arts* by the late Frances Vivian, ed. by Roger White (Edwin Mellen Press, 2006). This book had its origin in a catalogue done by Dr. Vivian for an exhibit, *Princes as Patrons*, held at the National Museum of Wales in 1988. Prince Frederick's interest in art collecting paralleled King Charles's.

A review by Sarah Gilmer Payne of a detailed history of the most sensational trial of James I's reign, involving one of his favorites and his wife, the daughter of one of the most prominent noblemen of the realm, who were accused of poisoning an elderly government 'hack'. A number of their accessories were executed—what happened to them?

A review by the Editor of *Stepping Stones*, a history of the Pilgrims by a couple, she a librarian and researcher, and he, a Mayflower descendant twice over and the former Managing Editor of *The Portland Oregonian*. The brilliantly constructed work contains extensive quotations from Governor Bradford's works. He was, perforce, the main chronicler of the Pilgrims' early years in America, but you may not know that he was the *second* governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. The first was Governor Carver, elected during the *Mayflower's* voyage. Carver was working in the fields with the other Pilgrims on a hot April day during their first year, and succumbed of heatstroke. The review will be supplemented with short essay on Edward MacDowell, the impressionist American composer, and his moving work for piano, *A.D. MDCXX*, memorializing the landing of the Pilgrim fathers at Provincetown on Cape James, which they named for the King. Later they re-named it Cape Cod for the fish that kept them from starvation their first winter and later formed the basis for the Massachusetts economy. This is why the Massachusetts General Court (the Commonwealth's legislature) chamber is prominently adorned with a sculpture of a fish, called 'The Sacred Cod'. On display at the Massachusetts Historical Society is the Colony's charter, bearing Charles I's signature.

An essay by long-time member Eileen O'Leary of Minneapolis on her visit to King Charles's birthplace, Dunfermline, Co. Fife, Scotland. Miss O'Leary was among the teen-aged members with whom Mrs. Langlois (American Representative 1972-87) carried on a correspondence.

The Editor's commentary on an essay about a weekly news-sheet of the 1640s, *Mercurius Britanicus* [*sic*], which was used with the cooperation of its editor as a propaganda vehicle against King Charles by anonymous Parliamentarians. The essay, based on an exhaustive examination of each number of the original publication, was recently published in the scholarly literature.

An article by Charles Coulombe, Western States Representative of The Monarchist League, on the Kings of California. Most of South and Central America, as well as Mexico, Alta and Baja California, comprised New Spain. The State of California boasts a number of monuments honoring and given by

the Spanish monarchs. We are pleased to welcome Mr. Coulombe to our pages, a token of the fraternal and collegial relations we enjoy with the League. He is the author of several excellent historical works, one on the Popes and another on the Papal Zouaves. He was a network TV commentator on the occasions of the funeral of Pope John-Paul II and the election of Benedict XVI.

H-Net Reviews: 'Sir Richard Morison: A Tudor Humanist, Polemicist, and Diplomat Reevaluated', a review by C. D. C. Armstrong of *Renaissance and Reform in Tudor England. The Careers of Sir Richard Morison* by Tracey A. Sowerby (2010); and 'A Wounded Nation', a review by Kathlyn Morris (U. of King's College) of *Wounds, Flesh, and Metaphor in Seventeenth-Century England* by Sarah Covington (2009).

A commentary by the Editor on Lord Macaulay's essay on Milton. Accompanied by some remarks on the collected essays of Thomas Babington Macaulay, of whose essays the one on Milton was among the earliest.

A movie review—a first for *SKCM News*—by the Editor of 'The King's Speech'. Everyone knows of George VI as the great wartime king, who formed a friendship with Franklin D. Roosevelt, but not many knew, before this movie, of his speech impediment, which he overcame, much as King Charles had three hundred years earlier. Those of us who admired the dowager Queen Elizabeth, 'Queen Mum', in her old age realized what a daring and non-conformist young lady she was when she married the Duke of York, 'Bertie', as he was known, the young couple never dreaming that the awesome responsibility of monarchy would rest on them, or that they would bear the burden of leading Britain under relentless, demoralizing Nazi assault. Nor were we aware of how well-bred she was and from what a pious, traditionally religious home she came. Thence came the strength she exhibited, and with which she supported her husband, as they nobly led the British nation during those dark days.

Another first, a review by the Editor of a work of the 'graphic' genre, *Jimbo in Purgatory*.

An article on the poem/song "The Vicar of Bray", a satire of the many changes in ecclesiology, religion, and dynastic houses during XVI-XVIII Century England. Source information and a catchy tune were provided by J. Douglass Ruff, Esq., VP of the American Region.

An historical contribution summarizing the Annual Masses (1984-present), their venues, hosts, select preachers, music, postprandial speakers, and other details, supplemented with information on Society gatherings during our first two decades in the Americas, the 1890s and 1900s.

An essay on the popular early-XVII Century pocket prayer book, *Supplications of Saints*, by Thomas Sorocold, Vicar of S. Mildred's by the Poultry [Market], London. When first published, he dedicated it to Charles, then a Prince. The Society received a rare copy as the gift of The Rev'd Kent L. Haley, Ben., and in turn recently donated it to the Rosenbach Museum in Philadelphia. The particular copy, given to Fr. Haley in 1949 (the Tercentenary of the Royal Martyrdom) on the occasion of his diaconal ordination, by Society member The Rev'd Reginald A'Court Simmonds, rector of S. Mark's Portland OR, once belonged to the Percival family of Philadelphia, proprietors of The Church of the Evangelists, Catherine St., Phila., location of the first Shrine of the Royal Martyr in the Americas. (S. Mark's was founded and endowed by a member of the Percival family who moved to Oregon and architecturally patterned S. Mark's after the now-defunct Church of the Evangelists.)

King Charles's poem, 'On A Quiet Conscience', with fascinating information gleaned through the research of member Nancy Ehlke. Members may be surprised to learn that musical settings of this poem by King Charles, thought to have been written during his confinement on the Isle of Wight, have entered the lieder repertoire.

St James Park London 2011

by Dorian R. Borsella

The park was magical when I saw it last,
aglow with leaves of amber, rust, and gold,
leaves dropping slowly through the air, as though
it were an act of treason to abandon their trees.
And yet, the date was close to Halloween.
Old gents in shirtsleeves lured tame squirrels
with peanuts, while the smaller boys and girls
ran laughing through the paths, in chase and play.
Readers packed benches, munching their repast,
seizing the pleasure of this sunny day.

Contrast that day with a more distant time,
a day as bitter as bile and wolfsbane:
January sixteen forty-nine.
A man of regal bearing, unsubdued,
is marched across the frozen stark terrain.
A holy man and innocent of crime:
Allowed a space for prayer, a final speech.
The axe was sharp. Let history impeach.

[DORIAN R. BORSELLA of Fallston MD writes, "I am a native of Baltimore, MD. My official occupation had been social work. I have visited England almost yearly since the mid-1970s. My love affair with London led me to Anglo-Catholicism. I 'commune' with T. S. Eliot, Gerard Manley Hopkins, and William B. Yeats. I am a communicant at Grace and Saint Peter's Church, Baltimore, and am a member of Saint James Episcopal Church, Monkton (MD). I live with a good friend and a willful Pekinese dog. My idea of a perfect Summer evening is to sit on my back porch, reading, working a soduku puzzle, and watching the dusk settle in."

[Miss Borsella, a member of S.K.C.M., holds B.S. (Towson College), M.L.A. (Johns Hopkins U.), and M.S.W. (U. of Penn.) degrees. She published a book of poems, Shadows, Darkness and Sunlight, and is working on another with the planned Eliothian title, England and Now.]

A New ²⁸⁴
CONFERENCE
Between the
GHOSTS
OF
King CHARLES
AND
Oliver Cromwell.

FAITHFULLY
Communicated by *Adam Wood.*

LONDON,
Printed for Robert Page, living in Barbican, 1659; June 30.

(2)

A Conference between the Ghosts of King Charls, and Oliver Cromwell.

King. **H**ow now! who's this that disturbeth my dust, at Rest now some years?

Oliver. I am one that gave thee no Rest when we lived together upon the Earth.

K. What? Is it Oliver Cromwel, that grand Enemy of mine?

Ol. The same.

King. What? hast thou left thy station on Earth, and durst thou here also to own thy self my Enemy?

O. What is it that I ever wanted Impudence to do?

K. 'Tis true; neither didst thou ever want a base Hypocritical Temper to colour thy most absurd Actions.

O. Oh Sir! I did no other then Imitate most of our Rank, which, according to our Creed, viz. *Nicholas Machiavell's Prince*, who saith, *A Prince or Tyrant ought never to want good Pretences, to colour the worst of Actions with.*

K. What dost thou Rank thy self amongst Princes? Didst thou usurp the Kingly Office, after thou didst me that Ill Office?

O. I made a shift to gain the Supremacy; and because the Nation was under age, I made my self their Protector; and would have made my self King, but that I durst not accept of the Title, because I had a Hand in your death; the which the people all knew: therefore I could not find a colourable pretence: for besides that, I often Imprecated and protested against the Government of a Single Person, in the hearing of the Officers of my Army, who had somewhat tender Consciences, in regard I had not a Crown for every one of them to harden their Consciences with, they obstructed it once whilest it was under Consultation in Parliament, to bestow upon me that Bauble which only serveth to cheat People,

K. What

(3)

King. *What? Would that Parliament that took the Crown from my head, put it upon thine, and not upon one of my Childrens heads?*

O. Alas, Sir, that Parliament, I turned them all out of Doores, after they had declared *England a Commonwealth*; and then I became a Seeker, took the *Fifth-Monarchy* people in to ayd me in the turning them out of their Reputation; in which work several of that opinion did me good service, by defaming, railing, and abusing the Parliament, in the ears of the people, which made the work more easie and secure: So soon as that was done, I turned them to grass together, with the Eel-skin, *Aqua-vita*, or Lamb-skin Parliament, what shall I call it? and then I was made *Lord Protector*, forsooth.

K. *Then you were made Protector! Who made you Protector, I pray?*

O. Who? It was my Scullion, and Grooms, and Butler, and some other Nobles and great men, besides Sir *Thomas Viner* then Lord Mayor of *London*.

King. *Sir Thomas Viner! Why, who made him a Knight?*

Oliver. Who? I did, with many more doughty ones.

K. *Thou hast played a mad Game; it is strange that a Halter never caught thee: Didst thou not come out of the world by the Rope, or the Ax, or by the hand of some Felton or other?*

O. No; but I came by the Immediate hand of God, who never suffered that worm of Conscience to die within me, but it still lay Gnawing and Tormenting of me, brought an unusual Feaver upon me, that dryed up all my blood, that at my departure not one drop almost was left within me.

King. *What didst thou do with the Sectaries, when thou camest to that Power?*

Ol. I served them all alike; I made use of such of them as were as sound Trowts as my self; and turn'd off all that I thought had any principles; and made choyce of such onely as would serve me in any undertaking?

King. *How couldst thou secure thy self against so many sturdy*

A 2

and

(4)

and lofty spirits, as was raised in the warr between Me and the Parliament? or, how couldst thou charm them to quietness?

Ol. Thus; If any stirred against me, I at once struck off their heads; I did not Nibble about their Ears, as you did about Burton's, Prynne's, and Bastwick's.

King. Alas! At that time I could do no more, and it had been better I had never done that; for it discontented the Puritans so much, that they sought all means to work me Ill and Mischief, for my suffering that, and the Innovations in the Church in point of worship together with the Patentees and Monopolies; all which discontented my People so much, that it made way for that Cursed warr, in which I lost my self and Friends; by which you did arrive to what greatness you were at: These and such like follies I was guilty of, by being advised by none but a vitious Nobility, that spent their Estates in a Riotous and voluptuous manner, never minding Justice or Policy, Exhausting my Exchequer to support them, which brought me into want, which necessitated me to lay Burdens upon my People; the which discontented them. They would not submit to be ruled, but I must have a Parliament to prevent popular Insurrections: the which I was forced to do, in regard the Scots had their Arms in their hands; and the Forces that I raised, would not fight: and when the Parliament assembled, I lost my self, by not condescending to what ever they desired, according to the advice of my Gravest Council; and by my hearkning to such Counsell that advised me to Insist upon my Prerogative; which at length occasioned that warr. And after the warr was ended, that I should at all Refuse to submit to any Terms, when they offered me my Crown again; I having lost it in the Field, being a prisoner, and having no Forces to stand by me; that I should stand upon Terms. Alas, alas, I acknowledge I played a foolish Game; if I had not Refused to condescend to those Propositions at the Treay in the Isle of Wight, I had kept my head on my Shoulders, in despite of thee and all the rest of my Enemies. But, I prethee Oliver, now I have told thee how I play'd the Fool, tell me how thou didst play the Knave after my decease; part of which thou hast already discoursed to me.

Oliver.

(5)

Oliver. Let me tell you, now I do intend to be recall to you, and cast off those pretences I have hitherto cleaved my Actions with. The order of my under-hand dealing is in manner thus; First, when the Presbyterians were so hot for you, and intended foolishly to re-establish you, I began to be a zealous *Independent*, and promoted that Faction or Opinion above all other in the Army, and sent Cornet *Joyce* privately, ordering him to secure your Person, (though afterwards I denyed it with all the Imprecations I could devise) to bring you into the Custody of the Army. That I might make the better terms for myself; I set about a Treaty with you at *Oatlands*; afterwards I propounded to my self, That I could not possibly thereby attain to the End that I aymed at by that Action; then I contrived to foment a Jealousie in you of a surprize intended by the *Levellers*, to seize you, and bring you to Tryal. Upon this, you went into my Trap in the *Isle of Wight*. After I had taken off your Head, before I went to *Ireland*, I had to do with designing the destruction of the *Levellers*; the which I effected in this manner. They being in a Body, & likely to have sent me after you. (before I had tasted of the fruits of Sovereignty); I employed some amongst them to be Confederates, who betrayed all their Resolutions to me, and promised to obstruct their designs; for which I gave them Additional Honours; and I employed others to treat with them, and engage, that the Army should not advance upon them untill the Treaty was over; which cast them into a security at *Burford*: Thereupon I advanced the Army, and fell in to their Quarters, slew many, and hanged others. After which, I went into *Ireland*, with an Army. I furnished it with all the Anabaptists I could find fit to say Bo to a Goose, both in *Ireland*, *Scotland*, and *England*. Then my Lord *Fairfax* tamely, upon a scruple of Conscience, layd down his Commission; which act of his made my work easie to attain the Supremacy; else I must have pickt some holes in his Coat to have

(6)

have taken him out of the way by death or otherwise ; the which was not easie to be done, he walking so circumspectly ; If he had not done it, I should have suborned some that would have done my work effectually ; the which Art I alwayes found to serve my designs to good purpose, in taking away whomsoever I designed to destroy, unless it were one Dozen or thereabouts of subtile fellows, whom I fear will be revenged on my simple Son *Dick*, who hath not the spirit of Government upon him.

King. *What hast thou gull'd my People, so as to leave any of thy Brood behind thee in the Government ?*

Oliver. Yes, I left him *Protector*, and left my Secretary to protect him ; but I doubt he will not be able to hold it long. Well, but to the business in hand, I am upon Confessing my villany ; I say, when I had furnished the Artnies with Anabaptists, I was able to deal with the Parliament, who for the most part were *Independents* ; I by my self and Emissaries in the House, together with some of your Friends, did impede settlement by way of a *Commonwealth*, obstructed Justice in the House, promoted and countenanced all Villanies in Committees, thereby to render them odious to the people. Now some of the Anabaptists served me to good purpose, who were all for a *Fifth Monarchy* ; the which Opinion I fomented all that I could : The Parliament stood in their way when they became considerable, by whom they were defamed, abused, and slighted, their credit much weakened by such like means in the opinion of the People, I thereupon dissolved them.

——Oliver, ——Oliver, ——Oliver.

Ol. What ! who's that that disturbeth us ?

Genius. I am thy Son *Richard's Genius*, that come to tell thee, That he is Reduced to a private Capacity, and the *Long-Parliament* hath again Re-assumed their Authority, and he is little better then a prisoner ; He cannot stirre out of doors either to Hawk or Hunt, for fear of *Common Varlets*

(7)

lets and Serjeants ; There's one that intendeth to have him by the back for money for thy Wax Nose that belongeth to thy Effigies ; another for this ; and others for that.

Ol. What strange fate turneth the Wheel of the English affairs!

King. *Ha, ha, ha ! Is it come to your own door, Sir ? well, certainly they will, like David, give thy sons to the Gibeonites, to be hung a Sun-drying, for all the Indignities thou hast done them ?*

Ol. It's strange ! I ventured Body and Soul to get three Dominions, to leave him Lord of, and he would not sell his to keep them ; he is not to be pitied,---To our former discourse ; I then called together a parcel of Gentlemen from *Goatam*, and other parts of the Nation, which were the *Tinder-box*, *Lambskin*, or *Small-coal* Parliament I mentioned before. I made a shew of Devolving the power upon them ; made use of them to raise money, and do some other *Jobbs* of *Journeywork*. Then I procured one half to dissolve the other : Afterwards, I designed *Warr* with *Spain*, for several Reasons ; one was, to keep the *Active* spirits in the Army imployed ; and to waste them there, whom I desired to be rid of here. Another was, That a *Warr* with *Spain* would be least *Hurtful* to me, though it was the most *hurtful* to the People of *England* ; It would *Impoverish* them, and reduce the more of the needy sort of People to a *Necessity* of taking up of Arms to serve me, and render the other to be less *Hurtful* : But it so fell out, that the *Design* came off with ill successses ; My great preparations were *Expensive*, and drove me to *Necessities* : I was forced to *Invent* some *Plots*, and I imployed some of my cunning *Gamesters*, which drew in many of your party severall times ; then I *sequestred*, which served me to stop many *Gaps*. I repaired so often to that kind of practice, that every one suspected the *secrecy*, the last of which I intended to be put in *Execution* a little in *Doctor Hemytt's* *Plott*, to
the

(8)

the lighting of some Fires in the City, by the Heat of which I thought to have Illuminated the City and Nation with a belief of the Truth and Reality thereof, it being much like unto what our Brother Nero did at Rome; but I feared it might have gone too far out of my Reach, and the Effect might have been dangerous to my Person and Estate: therefore, forasmuch as they would not believe it, without some dyed, I gently sprinckled the City with the Blood of that Malignant Doctor, and some other silly Souls; by which means I came off believed by most, though suspected by the Ingenious.

King. *Oh horrid Villany! But why should I much wonder? since if it be well considered, other than this, and much worse, could never be expected from thee. Well, go on.*

Ol. Stay there, Sir! I have discovered enough at once; yet if you had not Interrupted me, I should at this time have Imparted more; but we will forbear untill another time; But it doth trouble me much to think, how that That Parliament should be again upon the Stage: I fear me now, neither your posterity nor mine shall ever attain the Supremacy: they will secure the Arms of the Nation from falling into the hands of one person. I have done them some good, in teaching them that Lesson. Next time we meet, we shall discourse of these things farther.

King. *Let it be so.*

FINIS.

[The 'Conference' was unearthed by our faithful contributor RICHARD J. MAMMANA, JR., OL, in the course of his library researches. We thank him for this contribution and acknowledge his resourcefulness.]

Note 1 (p. 2): When King Charles asks who disturbs his 'dust', the imaginary nature of the 'Conference' reported here is betrayed. King Charles in heaven must have known the state of his mortal remains, which were found to be incorrupt at his exhumation in 1813! They were not dust then, and surely were not dust at the date of this 'Conference', in 1659. Whether Cromwell was in the same place as the King, and even able to confer with him, is open to theological debate.

Note 2 (p. 3): 'Felton' became a slang or 'street' term for 'assassin' in the XVII Century.

John Felton (c. 1595 – 28 Oct. 1628) assassinated George Villiers, the 1st Duke of Buckingham, who had been James I's and Charles I's right hand man, at Portsmouth on 23 Aug. 1628 with a knife. The Duke died instantly and Felton, instead of 'getting out of Dodge', stupidly got up on a soap box, as a crowd gathered, and he bragged about what he had done. He was arrested and taken to London, where he was tried and hanged.

Felton, a lieutenant in the English army, had been wounded in 1627 in the Duke's disastrously-managed military expedition against the French at La Rochelle. In addition, Felton believed that Buckingham had corruptly withheld some of his pay and deprived him of advancement. Buckingham was unpopular in the land because of the disgrace of the defeat at La Rochelle.

Notwithstanding, Felton had assassinated the second most powerful man in the kingdom. The Privy Council attempted to have Felton questioned under torture on the rack. The judges declared unanimously that this was contrary to the laws of England [Jardine, David, *A Reading on the Use of Torture in the Criminal Law of England*, London: Baldwin and Cradock, pp. 10-12 (1837)]. Torture would seem to have been unnecessary, since Felton had publicly admitted and bragged about his act in front of many witnesses at Portsmouth. When Felton's body was sent back to Portsmouth for exhibition, rather than becoming a lesson in disgrace, it became an object of public veneration!

Felton's assassination of the Duke was fictionalized in Alexandre Dumas pere's *The Three Musketeers*. In this novel, Felton is a servant in Lord de Winter's household, entrusted to guard the fictional Milady de Winter. Milady's master, Cardinal Richelieu, has ordered her to murder Buckingham so that he will not aid the Huguenot cause in the protestant city of La Rochelle. She pretends to be a Puritan like Felton, seduces him, and tells him stories demonising the Duke. Milady and Felton escape together, and Felton stabs the Duke. Felton realizes that he has been deceived when Milady sails away without him and he is left to be hanged for his crime. [Wikipedia, 'John Felton (assassin)', accessed 10 Mar. 2012; thanks to Todd Strauss, Reference Technology Librarian at the Waltham (MA) Public Library, for his assistance; a street in Waltham is named for Felton!]

Note 3 (p. 3): A **trowt** (*arch.*, **trout**) was a slang term for a trusty servant or friend.

Note 4 (p. 5): The **Fifth Monarchy Men** were a fanatical sect in England at the time of the Commonwealth who maintained that the 'Fifth Monarchy' at which Christ would reign on earth a thousand years was near at hand and that they must assist to establish it by force.

When the Waves Ruled Britannia: Geography and Political Identities, 1500-1800
by Jonathan Scott

reviewed by Tristan Stein (Harvard University)

When the Waves Ruled Britannia: Geography and Political Identities, 1500-1800, by Jonathan Scott. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 240 pp. \$32.99 (paper), ISBN 978-0-521-15241-9; \$90.00 (cloth), ISBN 978-0-521-19591-1.

Published on H-HistGeog (April, 2012); commissioned by Robert J. Mayhew.

***Imagining the Island Nation:
The Historical Geography of British Insularity***

The idea that Great Britain's island geography has defined its history and the character of its inhabitants is an enduring theme in the development of modern British identities and of Britain's relationship to the wider world. The conception of Britain as an insular nation is also a myth, albeit one of the central myths of British history. Historically, the English Channel has been less a barrier than a bridge linking Britain to continental Europe through trade, conquests, and migration. Recent work has accordingly sought to emphasize the European and imperial contexts that substantially shaped British history. Yet, even as scholars have become increasingly skeptical of Britain's supposed insularity, the history of how the English and then the British came to see themselves as an insular people has remained largely unexplored. Studies of British culture have thus tended to take early modern Britain's maritime geography for granted, without exploring how the English or British came to see themselves as an island race.

Jonathan Scott's *When the Waves Ruled Britannia* is an elegant, incisive, but sometimes elusive book that explains how a nation inhabiting an island came to see itself as an island nation. This work has two distinct but interrelated goals. First, Scott aims to uncover the place of geographical language in early modern British political thought. To this end, he combines the history of ideas with the study of historical geography to examine how the evolution of conceptions of English and British insularity factored into thinking about British politics and society. Secondly, he seeks to demonstrate how early modern understandings of Britain's maritime geography contributed to the making of a maritime and commercial society out of one that had been overwhelmingly agrarian and rural. In particular, Scott argues that an important strain of early modern British political thought lay in the need for British society to respond to the challenges of maritime and naval competition. From the end of the XVI Century onward, the threat of naval invasion and Dutch commercial rivalry impelled a variety of writers to articulate new understandings of Britain's oceanic geography and of the relationship between that geography and British society.

Scott begins his study by establishing the continental context within which the early modern English initially understood their relationship to Europe. XVI-Century English

geographical thought reflected England's participation in a European geography of confessional and dynastic competition and underscored the ideological and intellectual hurdles that faced Elizabethan propagandists of naval power and overseas empire. Geographers like William Camden and Peter Heylyn followed Ptolemy in seeing the islands of Britain and Ireland as an integral part of a shared European geography of peninsulas, gulfs, and islands. However, naval warfare with Spain and the prospects of long-distance trade led John Dee, Richard Hakluyt, Walter Raleigh, and others to encourage the English to imagine themselves as an insular and maritime people. Scott then proceeds to survey how English writers, administrators, and politicians grappled through the XVII Century with the challenge of maritime competition. According to Scott, England's emergence as a naval and commercial power depended on this process through which the English mastered the "discipline of the sea." In particular, he contrasts contemporary recognition of the ability of the mid-XVII-Century English Commonwealth to harness commercial wealth and naval power with critiques of the subsequent English failures to maintain supremacy over the Dutch following the Restoration. The concluding chapters describe the XVIII Century triumph of conceptions of Britain as a commercial and island nation, and then examine in greater depth how writers, including Daniel Defoe, William Falconer, Adam Ferguson, and William Robertson, understood how Britain's insular and maritime geography shaped its society and its relationship to the wider world.

Scott thus traces the early modern connections between political thought and historical geography to illustrate how geographical knowledge, state building, and identity formation interacted in complex ways to shape how Britons understood their nation's island location. In the process, he effectively demonstrates that British insularity was less a matter of geography than of the social and cultural transformation of Britain into a maritime and trading nation. However, he also shows how Britain's changing relationship to the sea fostered the conviction that geography could indeed be destiny. When Elizabethan writers urged that the English transform their insular position into a maritime and naval destiny, they introduced into English political thought a discourse that Scott labels "maritime orientalism." Whereas Edward Said described an imaginary geography rooted in ancient Greece that defined European society by contrasting it with that of an Asiatic "other," Scott emphasizes an alternative imaginary geography, also rooted in Greek history, but instead based on states' and cultures' relationship to the sea. This discourse, which arose in England in the context of Anglo-Spanish competition, flourished in the eighteenth century as the growth of Britain's naval and colonial empire seemed to affirm the relationship between geography and culture. This imaginary geography was, however, highly unstable. No one conception of insularity dominated early modern Britain. Instead, while their predecessors had tended to view Britain within a European context, XVIII Century thinkers variously analyzed Britain's maritime geography to divide it from Europe, to link it to a continental Europe that was further differentiated from the wider world, or to highlight the corrupting influence of continental empire on Britain itself. Scott effectively captures these competing

visions of Britain's place in the world by illustrating how ideas of insularity factored into British political language in diverse and potentially contradictory ways.

When the Waves Ruled Britannia provides an excellent survey of the ways in which concepts of insularity and of the sea factored into early modern British political thought. The work's weaknesses lie in its efforts to demonstrate how this political language actually shaped Britain's imperial and naval development. Scott's portrayal of England's development as a maritime power reflects a somewhat uncritical engagement with XVII Century English naval history. In particular, Scott argues that England's XVII Century naval defeats stemmed from the failure of the Stuart monarchs to respond to the "discipline of the sea." During their reigns, aristocratic governance and royal "apathy" weakened England's naval power as gentlemen officers replaced experienced mariners in positions of authority. This interpretation relies, however, on the views of contemporary critics of Stuart royal naval policy and pays little heed to the admonitions of J. D. Davies and N. A. M. Rodger that XVII Century debates over the state of the Restoration navy rested on politically and ideologically motivated critiques of Stuart government rather than objective descriptions of conditions within the English navy.^[1] Scott thus offers a historical analysis of the myth of English insularity only to reinforce equally long-standing myths about the development of English sea power. Scott's observation that England and then Britain could only act like an island once it had developed the naval power to preserve its insularity is an important point. Further work is needed to demonstrate how early modern thinking about English insularity actually intersected with the complicated dynamics of state and social formation and of policymaking.

This slim volume covers an immense amount of ground and offers a highly suggestive analysis of the relationship between geography and political thought in early modern Britain. It also provides a strong foundation for further investigation of the relationship between thinkers and the relationship between these thinkers and Britain's development as a maritime and commercial power. *When the Waves Ruled Britannia* is thus a major addition to the study of historical geography and to the history of political ideas, and it also represents a significant step forward in historicizing questions of English and British identity in the early modern period. Scott deserves further praise for emphasizing largely forgotten XVII Century administrators and writers, like Samuel Pepy's secretary, Richard Gibson, and the engineer, Henry Sheres, whose positions within England's naval and imperial administration gave them an important perspective on Restoration naval thinking. Scott also illustrates the importance of the Dutch Republic as both a rival for early modern England and as a model for emulation. The Dutch invasion of 1688 illustrated that British insularity depended on naval dominance and the subsequent revolution in British government allowed Britain to realize its island geography in the XVIII Century. By describing the intellectual history of English and British insularity, Scott successfully illustrates the centrality of the European context for early modern British history.

NOTE

[1]. J. D. Davies, *Gentlemen and Taraulins: The Officers and Men of the Restoration Navy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991); and N. A. M. Rodger, "Queen Elizabeth and the Myth of Sea-Power in English History," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th ser., 14 (2004): pp. 153-74. See also Rodger's own review of Scott's interpretation of XVII Century English naval history in N. A. M. Rodger, "English Seas," review of *When the Waves Ruled Britannia: Geography and Political Identities, 1500-1800*, by Jonathan Scott, *The Times Literary Supplement*, 22 July 2011, p. 7.

Citation: Tristan Stein. Review of Scott, Jonathan, *When the Waves Ruled Britannia: Geography and Political Identities, 1500-1800*.

H-HistGeog, H-Net Reviews. April, 2012.

URL: <https://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=35969>

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 United States License.

“Forum: Patriot Royalism”

William and Mary Quarterly, 3d Ser., Vol. 68, No. 4 (Oct. 2011)

by Eric Nelson, Gordon S. Wood, Pauline Maier, and Daniel Hulsebosch

reviewed by Suzanne G. Bowles, Ph.D.

The William and Mary Quarterly is the premier scholarly journal of early American history. The October 2011 issue featured a forum entitled “Patriot Royalism.” The format of the forum includes a main article, several comments by other historians well known in that specialty, and then a rejoinder by the original author. The lead article of this forum is entitled “Patriot Royalism: The Stuart Monarchy in American Political Thought, 1769-75” and is written by Eric Nelson, Professor of Government at Harvard. But first some background is in order.

It is generally considered that colonial American protest against the British government (ultimately leading to a war for independence) was triggered by Parliament’s passing of the Stamp Act in February 1765. This was the first attempt by Parliament to tax *directly* the American colonists. The colonists adhered strongly to the notion of “no taxation without representation” which they believed was one of the so-called “rights of Englishmen” guaranteed to them by the British constitution. This concept dated back to the late 1200s and held that taxes could be legitimately levied only by one’s *elected* representatives. In the colonial American context this meant that since Americans elected no representatives to Parliament they paid no taxes to Parliament. Conversely, they did elect representatives to their own colonial assemblies and so they paid taxes to their own colony. Thus when Parliament under the leadership of Prime Minister George Grenville levied the Stamp Tax, the colonists were outraged and protested in a variety of ways from the non-violent (pamphlets, petitions, boycotts of British made goods) to the violent (vandalism, riots). While the principle of “no taxation without representation” seemed simple, the interpretation of it was more complicated. What, for instance, was the difference between a

law designed to regulate trade and a law designed to tax? The colonists generally conceded the right of Parliament to regulate trade through the imposition of customs duties (even though they routinely ignored those laws), but what exactly was the difference between a customs duty (which was really a form of sales tax) and a direct tax? Another issue which confused rather than clarified was the concept of *virtual representation* introduced by certain British MPs to respond to the Stamp Act protests. They claimed that a tax on Americans was legitimate because even if the Americans elected no representatives to Parliament the Americans were *virtually represented* anyway, by which they meant that since American interests (especially military defense) were protected by Parliament then it was permissible to tax Americans. Not surprisingly this argument did not go down well with Americans and much ink was spilled attempting to refute it. In any event the Stamp Act never went into effect and Parliament repealed it in March 1766.

In 1767 Parliament passed a new series of taxes on the American colonists known as the Townshend Acts. These imposed taxes on certain specific products, e.g. glass, paper, paint, tea. While these taxes led to more protests and boycotts, the rationale for opposing them was not as clear. Were these customs duties or taxes? If the former, then the colonial protestors had already conceded their legitimacy in 1765. If the latter, they were illegitimate, but that led back to the problem of how to distinguish between a customs duty and a sales tax. Many opposition writers, notably John Dickinson in *Letters from a Farmer in Pennsylvania* (1768), tied themselves in knots trying to explain the difference between a duty/tax designed to regulate trade (acceptable) and a duty/tax designed to raise revenue (not acceptable). This turn in the argument led nowhere since, in the end, no one could tell the difference. Enter “dominion theory” and Professor Nelson’s thesis on the resurgence of Stuart popularity among the American opposition.

As long as Parliament confined itself to taxing only specified goods the duty versus tax argument was no longer useful. Something new had to take its place and that something came to be known as “dominion theory.” As Nelson explains it, “the patriots had jettisoned their previous insistence that Parliament was sovereign over the colonies but simply lacked authority to legislate for them in particular respects [i.e. taxation] and had come to argue instead that America was ‘outside of the realm’ of Great Britain and that Parliament accordingly lacked any jurisdiction over it whatsoever.” (p. 535) Taking this argument one step further, it meant that the American colonies’ connection to Britain was not through Parliament at all, but “was simply the person of the king.” (p. 535) This theory was substantiated by the historic fact that the various colonies owed their existence to their charters which had been granted by previous sovereigns. This was a bold and stunning argument, shocking in its undercutting of parliamentary supremacy. Nelson is not the first scholar to note dominion theory, but his contribution to the scholarly discussion is in his thesis that dominion theory itself was dependent upon actions taken by James I and Charles I, thus leading to – even requiring – a positive reassessment of those two monarchs. This was a startling development since those two monarchs were not looked kindly upon in New England or the middle colonies.

The gist of dominion theory was that Parliament had authority only within the British Isles, but not in other territories that were geographically separate from Britain, i.e. colonies. Those colonies, because they owed their founding and legal existence to the king's prerogative, owed no obedience to Parliament but only to the sovereign.

Nelson discussed several colonial writers who made this argument (and some who opposed it), but two of the most interesting for our purposes are James Wilson and Edward Bancroft. Although Bancroft is not well known today his pamphlet *Remarks on the Review of the Controversy between Great Britain and her Colonies* (1769) achieved wide circulation and influence in 1770s America. Attempts by Parliament to legislate for America, including regulation of trade, were, according to Bancroft, usurpations of the king's legitimate power. "However extensive the King's Prerogative may be over his foreign Subjects, the *English Constitution* has made no Provision for this Species of National, External Legislation, the Power of Parliament being originally confined to the Limits of the Realm." (p. 553) Wilson's pamphlet *Considerations on the Nature and the Extent of the Legislative Authority of the British Parliament* (1774) made a similar point. The first colonists "who launched into the unknown deep . . . took possession of the country in the *King's* name. . . . They established governments under the sanction of *his* prerogative, or by virtue of his charters." (p. 541) Both these authors and others who espoused dominion theory needed, of course, actual historical evidence to verify their assertions. They found it in an obscure controversy regarding fishing rights.

In 1621 a bill was proposed in the House of Commons that would have allowed English subjects the right to fish off the coast of America. According to Bancroft, James I refused the Royal Assent based on the Virginia charter of 1612, claiming "that *America* was not annexed to the Realm, and that it was not fitting that Parliament should make Laws for those Countries." (p. 552) Bancroft also claimed that Charles I held to the same position as his father when the bill was introduced again in 1625. While Bancroft's account incorrectly puts words into Charles's mouth that he did not utter (Nelson thinks that they were first spoken by James), the point was nonetheless clear. Parliament had no jurisdiction over America and James and Charles both correctly saw that the real issue was not fishing rights as such but, in Nelson's words, "an unacceptable precedent, a usurpation of royal prerogative." (pp. 552-3)

Dominion theory was controversial, of course, and not all Americans protesting British policy were comfortable with it. Despite their quarrels with Parliament some were not ready to jettison the Glorious Revolution heritage of parliamentary supremacy. Others took a more pragmatic view that, regardless of rightness or wrongness, the precedent of American acceptance of parliamentary rule had already been set. Another obvious problem with dominion theory which only became apparent later was the awkward question of what happens if the king does not agree with the American position, or even actively opposes it. The answer to this becomes obvious once a shooting war starts but, according to Nelson, those Founding Fathers who most vigorously defended the Stuarts and the prerogative in the early 1770s "would all become leading Federalists a decade later" even modeling the

American presidency with its executive prerogatives on their conception of the crown prerogatives of dominion theory. (p. 572)

RESPONSES

Three distinguished scholars responded to Nelson's article. Gordon S. Wood, Professor Emeritus of History at Brown University, entitled his piece "The Problem of Sovereignty." He praises Nelson for bringing dominion theory back to a place of prominence and for "suggesting that the dominion model of the empire influenced subsequent American thinking about their federal system." (p. 577) However, he criticizes Nelson for his "failure . . . to deal with the problem of sovereignty," that is, the belief that there must be a final authority in government. "For the British this sovereignty lay with the King-in-Parliament." (p. 573) By not discussing this issue Nelson left out a huge piece of the puzzle and thus cannot explain how the dominion theory advocates "were not able to account for Parliament's previous and acknowledged regulation of their trade." (p. 575) He also chides Nelson for over-stressing the Stuart precedents.

Pauline Maier, Professor of History at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, also comments in a piece entitled "Whigs Against Whigs Against Whigs: The Imperial Debates of 1765-76 Reconsidered." More so than Wood, she stresses the point that Nelson overestimated the charms of Stuart precedent. While she agrees that dominion theory signaled an important shift in the tactics of American protest, she says that Nelson overlooks the extent to which American political thinkers had absorbed the Whig tradition of the Glorious Revolution and the King-in-Parliament. She claims that the Americans could only find dominion theory acceptable given the past 150 years in which ideas of royal absolutism "had been thoroughly defeated." (p. 582)

The third response is from David Hulsebosch, Professor of Law and History at New York University, and is entitled "The Plural Prerogative." Hulsebosch agrees with Nelson's claim that the proponents of dominion theory "were sincere rather than opportunistic," (p. 583) but thinks that his interpretation of their use of dominion theory is weak. He says Nelson does not clearly explain the concept of prerogative which was a "conceptually and historically elastic term," which could mean many things to many people. (p. 583) He points out the paradox that according to dominion theory the colonies "originated in the [royal] prerogative, but their charters granted substantial self- government and insulated them from many specific prerogative powers as well as the prerogative writ large." (p. 585) He is not convinced that Stuart-era precedents made an iron-clad argument against parliamentary supremacy, nor is he convinced that the dominion theorists provided a model for a future American presidency.

Nelson then responds in a rejoinder called "Taking Them Seriously: Patriots, Prerogative, and the English Seventeenth Century." His arguments here really do not lend themselves to summary since he addresses his critics' arguments point by point. Suffice it to say he does not back down from his thesis.

CONCLUSION

The last word on this issue has not been written and Nelson is to be commended for opening a fruitful line of argument regarding the origins of the American Revolution, and, more pertinent to the interests of our Society, showing how the role of Charles I was radically reassessed by American political thinkers. Brendan McConville's 2006 book *The King's Three Faces* (reviewed in the Dec. 2009 *SKCM News*) mentions that on the eve of the American Revolution portraits of Charles I began to appear in New England public buildings. He does not give any reason why, but Prof. Nelson's article may, in fact, supply that reason. Our members who have an interest in colonial America or the American Revolution will find this series of articles extremely interesting and well worth their time.

Our members who have access to JSTOR may access these articles there. Single copies of this issue of *WMQ* may be had for \$10. Contact William & Mary Quarterly, P. O. Box 8781, Williamsburg VA 23187-8781 or email kscraw@wm.edu for ordering information.

[Suzanne Bowles received a Ph.D. in History from Syracuse University. She is Associate Professor of History at William Paterson University. Her areas of specialization are early American history, naval history, American religious history, Anglican history, and British royalty. Under her maiden name, Suzanne Geissler, she has published numerous books and articles on these themes, including Lutheranism and Anglicanism in Colonial New Jersey (Edwin Mellen Press, 1988). She is a member of Saint Michael's Episcopal Church, Wayne, New Jersey, where she has just completed two terms on the vestry. Dr. Bowles now serves on the Editorial Committee of the Email Communique.]

***Queen Elizabeth in the Garden:
A Story of Love, Rivalry, and Spectacular Gardens***
by Trea Martyn

reviewed by John Arthur Edward Windsor

Queen Elizabeth in the Garden: A Story of Love, Rivalry, and Spectacular Gardens by Trea Martyn. New York: Bluebridge, 2012. 325 pp. ISBN 978-1-933346-36-6, \$22.95. Originally published by Faber and Faber Limited, 2008.

Trea Martyn has given us a selectively detailed and adroitly researched study of the intimacies and design of gardens and landscape in the Age of Elizabeth I.

William Cecil was 1st Baron Burghley, lord high treasurer and advisor to Queen Elizabeth. Theobalds Palace, park and gardens was his domain; Theobalds figures in the Queen's attachment to Cecil for his long and faithful service to the realm. Cecil had advised against the proposed marriage of Elizabeth to Henri the Duke of Anjou, and younger brother of King Charles IX of France, and later Cecil was against a marriage to Francois the Duke of Alencon.

When the Queen had been desperately ill from smallpox in 1562 it was Cecil who had blocked Elizabeth's attempt to make Robert Dudley Earl of Leicester Lord Protector.

Dudley had seemed close to marrying the Queen in the mid-1560s. That was a challenge to Cecil's candidate at the time, the Archduke Charles of Austria. Cecil had spread the rumor that Dudley was a poisoner who had murdered his own (Dudley's) wife.

It was in the garden at Hampton Court that Elizabeth had met the first of her royal suitors, the Earl of Arran, heir to the Scottish throne. Were Mary Queen of Scots to have died childless, the Earl of Arran would have succeeded her and he was Cecil's choice for Queen Elizabeth.

King James I died at Theobalds park which is in Hertfordshire on 27 March 1625. The cause of the King's death was kidney failure compounded by dysentery and a stroke. There was the usual suspicion of poison. The King-Martyr Charles I was proclaimed at the gates of Theobalds. Theobalds became even more a retreat for Charles than it had been for Elizabeth. Dr. Martyn tells us:

There was a painting entitled 'Charles I at Theobalds' attributed to Hendrick van Steinwyck which appears to offer a rare view of the palace interior and garden. (Some historians have suggested that the scene derives from images in Vredeman de Vries's architectural copy books.) Charles stands in front of the first of four arches forming a tunnel through to the garden beyond. He is wearing black and white, the colors of the Parliamentarians. Two large landscape paintings hang nearby. In the background, the last archway is green, leading to a column surmounted by an urn.

Entertainment and diplomacy went hand in hand with the design of gardens in the Age of Elizabeth. Dudley's spendthrift habits were resented by Cecil. Cecil limited the costly journeys to lavish palaces to twenty miles from London, which put Dudley's Grafton and

even Kenilworth out of reach, though Greenwich and Richmond remained, as well as Cecil's Theobalds, where exotic flowers from Peru were cultivated in the great garden.

Dudley had charmed Elizabeth with his garden and park at Grafton. By 1572 Dudley had become a close confederate of the financier Benedict Spinola who had a pleasure garden on Bishopgate Street. As Master of the Horse, Dudley had arranged for Prospero d'Osma to found a school of manege at Mile End. Dudley's father Northumberland had been made Master of the Horse to Anne of Cleves by Henry VIII. Dudley also shared his father's delight in classical and Renaissance architecture and had impressed Queen Elizabeth with his talent for interior design. Dudley had fruit trees imported from Munster, Ireland; only he and Secretary of State Sir Francis Walsingham had them in their gardens. Henry VIII's great round arbour or Tower of Babylon, a three-story pavilion, was made almost entirely of glass. Centaurs, sirens, and serving maids adorned the gardens at Hampton Court, while in the park topiary hounds chased lifelike hares. Animated statues powered by hydraulics had been a feature of Italianate garden design in the Tudor and early Stuart eras. Following the Restoration, however, were developed gardens with long clean lines and unified designs.

Edmund Spenser celebrated Elizabeth in *Shepherd's Calendar* and later in *The Faerie Queene*. Spenser was one of Dudley's poet-writers. Spenser celebrated Dudley as King Arthur in his great poem, which was dedicated to Elizabeth.

Queen Elizabeth in the Garden is a detailed and delightful study in what the author calls "horticultural rivalry". Exoticism and allegory are expressed in the fountains, mazes, masques, plays, and jousts which took place in the constructs of what were the gardens of the Tudors and the Stuarts and reflected the glory and folly of the dominion and statecraft of the times. There is much to be gained from every page and chapter of this extraordinary work. The author, Trea Martyn, holds a Ph.D. in XVIII-Century literature from University College London, and has taught garden history at the Centre for Environmental Studies at Birkbeck in London.

Queen Elizabeth in the Garden is a work of thorough scholarship in what literally has been until recently an off-the-beaten-path direction in historical research. It does however require some background in commensurate study. There is a sound select bibliography for those interested in the best recent and nearly so source material.

In our own time one recalls Count Lennart Bernadotte, the Count of Wisborg, whose gardens on Mainau, the island in Lake Constance, which is also known as the Bodensee, were an internationally recognized treasure and a credit to the art of gardening. [Mainau had been in and out of the possession of the Swedish crown since the end of the Thirty Years' War in the XVII Century. Count Lennart Bernadotte gave up his royal Swedish title to marry a commoner. Born Gustaf Lennart Nicolaus Paul in Stockholm on 8 May 1909, he was the only child of Prince Wilhelm of Sweden and Grand Duchess Marie Pavlovna of Russia. After his parents' divorce, his upbringing was entrusted to his uncle and aunt, King Gustaf V and Queen Victoria of Sweden. His family gave its property on Mainau to his care in 1932. The 208-square-mile lake, also known as the Bodensee, is both fed and drained by the Rhine and borders on Germany, Switzerland, and Austria. The Count had already studied horticulture and later pursued ecology, filmmaking, and photography; most of the picture postcards on Mainau came from his camera. He married Karin Nissvandt, an industrialist's daughter,

in 1932 over his parents' objections. They had four children and divorced in 1970; she died in 1991. He spent WW II in Sweden, and then returned to Mainau, transforming the island into a tourist destination. In 1951 he was given the title Count of Wisborg from the Grand Duchess of Luxembourg. He married his assistant, Sonja Haunz, in 1972; with her he had five more children. They entrusted the 96-acre island and everything on it to the Lennart Bernadotte Foundation, which they formed in 1974. He died on 21 Dec. 2004. *—from an obituary by Wolfgang Saxon in The New York Times, Sunday 9 Jan. 2005.*

[JOHN ARTHUR EDWARD WINDSOR, BENEFACTOR, was born in April, 1941, two months before Operation Barbarossa. He was received into the Russian Church by Bishop Seraphim, Eparch of Berlin; his encrismal sponsor was the Grand Duchess (Grand Princess) Olga Alexandrovna, the Tsar's sister. Mr. Windsor was created Count of Constantine by Admiral Jean Francois Darlan, head of the North African Department of the French state. The death of Admiral Darlan changed the course of the war and the destinies of nations.

[As the Soviet armies swept through Eastern Europe in the closing days of the war, the Count of Constantine, for the sake of expediency and security, was placed under the protection and wardship of the Hungarian supremo, Admiral Miklos Horthy, and was then in exile with the same. He was recognized by anti-Soviet parties as Count of Jassy (Jasi).

[From Alsace the Count of Jassy was received by the consort of the French Consul Chevalier Louis Aubert—Chevalia Madam Marion Bragg Aubert of Scottsdale AZ and Daytona Beach FL.

[The Count of Jassy observed the Nurnberg trial process and the outcome and executions which followed, the youngest person so present, all of which was a sobering lesson in the consequences of war—its ravages and the fruits of international disparities in mercy and justice.

[Over the years Mr. Windsor has served as a patron of charitable organizations and pious societies alike.

[The accompanying sketch of Mr. Windsor is by Mona Zamder (1974).]





Queen of Scots: The True Life of Mary Stuart **by John Guy**

reviewed by John Arthur Edward Windsor

Queen of Scots: The True Life of Mary Stuart by John Guy. Boston, New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2004. 581 pp, hardcover, \$28.00. ISBN-131 089-0-618-25411-8; ISBN-1010-618-25411-0.

John Guy's *Queen of Scots: The True Life of Mary Stuart* is a new dispassionate and critically detailed view of Mary Queen of Scots in her times and context. It is an adroitly researched study in the copious events of a dynasty and in the intimacies of court life and its inevitable elements for the times, of murder, intrigue, betrayal, pride, capture, and remorseless dissemblance that composed the remonstrations of an age in some ways hardly comprehensible in the long reigns of Elizabeth of England and in that of Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, Elizabeth's first cousin once removed. Mary's father, James V of Scotland was the first cousin of Elizabeth, the Queen of England.

Mary Queen of Scots was the only daughter and third and youngest child of James V, King of Scots and his second wife, Mary of Guise. Mary, Queen of Scots, had a betrothal agreement by which she was to be married to the future King of England Edward VI. This arrangement had been made with King Henry VIII, Edward's father and Mary's grand-uncle, when Mary was in her infancy.

At only nine months of age on 9 September 1543, Mary was crowned Queen of Scots; James V her father had expired in December 1542. Mary was James's only surviving legitimate child. James left natural children—at least nine sons and two daughters. The most famous of the sons was James Stuart, 1st Earl of Moray and later Regent of Scotland; others were Robert Stuart, 1st East of Orkney, and John Stuart, Lord Darnley (not to be confused with Henry Stuart, Lord Darnley 1543-67, who was a second cousin of Mary; her grandfather James IV and Henry Stuart's grandmother Margaret Tudor, were brother and sister). It was this latter Lord Darnley, Mary's second cousin, who became Mary's second husband.

It was Henry Stewart, Lord Darnley, who was the son of Matthew Stewart, 4th Earl of Lennox and his wife Margaret, daughter of Archibald Douglas, 6th Earl of Angus. This Lord Darnley's matrilineal grandmother was the Earl of Angus's spouse, the very Margaret Tudor 1489-1541, sister of Henry VIII of England and daughter of Henry VII. Margaret Tudor's first husband had been James IV, King of Scots, who died at Flodden Field in 1513.

The Earl of Lennox and the Earl of Arran were rival claimants to the throne of Scotland. A pro-French policy had been followed by Mary of Guise, the dowager Queen (Mary Queen of

Scots's mother), after her husband James V's death in battle. In the name of the infant Mary Queen of Scots, James IV's grand-daughter, the alliance between France and Scotland was renewed at the expense of England in that the Treaty of Greenwich between Scotland and England was largely and significantly abrogated. This left King Henry VIII threatening revenge. The result of the realignment stemming from the Franco-Scottish alliance was Henry's futile invasion of Scotland over issues of the borders, and there followed an attempt to reinstate at least the dynastic and marriage clauses of the Treaty.

In the fateful year of 1565, Mary Queen of Scots married Henry Lord Darnley. Henry Stuart, Lord Darnley, had been mentioned as a possible candidate for marriage to Mary from 1560 following the death at Orleans of Francis II, King of France, Mary's first husband. Mary's first meeting with Darnley occurred at Wemyss on 17 February 1565. Elizabeth of England was opposed to the marriage; her object was to set Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, as Mary's husband. It was on the basis of Mary's agreement to marry Dudley that her (Mary's) succession to the throne of England would be secured, in Elizabeth's mind.

Factionalism over matters of estate in the Douglas clan and the threat to England's security in a possible foreign marriage of Mary to Don Carlos of Spain or to the Austrian Archduke Charles had led to a brief civil war in Scotland in 1559; there was the re-emergence of the religious issue in that Mary's Catholicism posed substantial barriers for Scottish protestants. In the Summer of 1559 John Knox's sermon in Perth had set off a popular revolt throughout the Scottish lowlands. Sir William Cecil (later Lord Burghley) sought to aid the Lords of the Congregation, as the protestant party was known.

There was a failed revolt of the protestants again in 1565; it was an attempt by the 4th Earl of Bothwell, James Hepburn, hereditary Lord Admiral and the Sheriff of Edinburgh, to prevent Queen Mary Stuart from marrying Lord Darnley, who was a Catholic. Bothwell, who later became Mary's third and last husband, was a deadly rival of Darnley as was Lord James Stuart, the Earl of Moray, Mary's illegitimate half-brother.

Darnley, Mary's second husband, was the father of the infant Prince James. It was Darnley to whom Mary was devoted despite his abrasive incongruities of behavior and style of living. Darnley was assassinated on 10 February 1567 following the destruction of his (temporary) house-residence by a gunpowder explosion.

Mary herself was suspected of involvement in a plot by the Italian banker Roberto Ridolfi to assassinate Elizabeth in May 1569. Pope Pius V published a decree *Regnans in Excelsis* depriving Elizabeth of her "pretended title" to the English throne and releasing her subjects from their allegiance. Catholics then became 'traitors' and when Parliament met in April 1571 Cecil, Lord Burghley, a vehement anti-Catholic, introduced an oath to ensure that all Catholic members were excluded. Another bill disqualified any candidate to the succession claiming the throne or usurping its insignia—principally Mary, whose arms in France had been quartered with the arms of England. ['Catholic' is used in this review in the vernacular sense of the times to mean 'Roman Catholic'. —*Ed.*]

There was to be the Northern Rising of the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, both Catholics, who were quickly abandoned by their allies. The revolt had erupted in

November, 1569, and was crushed by overwhelming southern forces in two weeks' time. Northumberland was executed by Elizabeth. Mary was not blamed by Elizabeth for the revolt though Mary had rewarded those who had fled after the revolt, and as dowager Queen of France she was appealing to the Pope for funds for the banished English and Scots who had been involved in the action.

The Northern Rising, which took place in the midst of the complexities resultant in the material stakes of that age, was more a separate movement on the part of northern Catholics than a revolt on behalf of Mary Queen of Scots. Mary's life involved a vast narrative of duress and competition for land and privileges of place amongst the clans and cousinate of Scotland and England in the four and a half decades of her life which happened to be inextricably linked to the unique and binding events in the historical process which led to the formation of early modern states in Northwestern Europe.

John Guy does not engage in the equitable though romanticized notion of rival queens; rather he emphasizes the role of William Cecil (Lord Burghley from 1571) in his scrupulous reading of the archival material, the calendars, letters, despatches, and state papers, as they have come down to us, and largely edited in the XIX to mid-XX Centuries. [These were mis-filed, miscatalogued, and carelessly placed out of order in bound volumes, and many of them contain crude forgeries and interpolations, all of which detective Guy has meticulously identified by careful examination of the paper on which they were written, the handwriting, and other details. In one case Cecil completely changed the sense of a document by replacing a word with its negative! —*Ed.*]

Cecil was at odds with Elizabeth over policy toward Scotland and the religious issues. These differences persisted throughout the reign and to the very end of Cecil's service to the Queen, that is until his death in 1598. Cecil apparently viewed Scotland very much as a "satellite", so Professor Guy tells us, and a feudality of the English crown, as it had been or was thought to have been under Edward I.

The protestant lords called themselves "States of Scotland" with a view to supplanting Mary. To Cecil, Mary was a biblical "Jezebel" [Guy's quotations—*JAEW*]. Cecil, according to Professor Guy, was a supporter of John Knox's theory of armed resistance to 'idolatry and tyranny' that was supposed to be characteristic of Catholic rule and rulers.

Mary Queen of Scots was forty-four years of age at the time of her death—execution by beheading—at Fotheringhay Castle, on 8 February 1587. That event followed by a year the Babington plot to kill Queen Elizabeth of England and Ireland. It was also the year prior to 1588 when Philip II of Spain unsuccessfully sent his Armada to topple Elizabeth.

The Babington plot was devised in Catholic France. The (flawed) internal logic of the cabal in Paris was to aim to combine a revolt by English Catholics, a Spanish invasion, and Elizabeth's assassination. The conspirators' goal was the liberation and triumph of Mary. Factionalism and self-delusion walked hand in hand with the thirteen conspirators of whom Anthony Babington, a former page of the Earl of Shrewsbury, was one, perhaps the controlling or at least the most involved member, by imprecation of Sir Francis Walsingham's spies' collected evidence which was more than suppositional or inferential

but probably not what modern courts of law would consider to be faultless. There were what could be alleged to be prosecutorial coercion and evidence- and witness-tampering. But this was a very politically sensitive trial event, and was being conducted under what we might call martial rule.

Mary's incriminating written reply, however spontaneous or planned, seems to have made it clear that she had been of the disposition to consent to, and had indeed consented to, the assassination of Elizabeth. In terms of the ongoing Catholic cause, one might say implicit in the ideology of that cause, was the set notion that Elizabeth was an usurper and was widely referred to as such among the Catholic leaders and that as such she (Elizabeth) was an excommunicate [as she literally was —*Ed.*]. Thus the bonds of obedience to Elizabeth were dissolved and the plotters consciences freed from such obedience. The written evidence of the letters in which Mary assented to these actions against the English sovereign and state were used to convict her at her trial, despite her argument that the evidence was circumstantial and that there was no consent or incitement to assassination, and that assassination and rebellion were two separate allegations not to be taken together.

In defense, the decipherer of the postscript to the incriminating letter was accused of "doctoring" [Guy's quote —JAEW] the main body of the letter, the very letter 'incriminating' Mary in the murder plot. However, according to Guy, there is no evidence to support the claim that the main text of the letter was altered; and the postscript which was indeed a forgery by one of Walsingham's intermediaries, Thomas Phelippes by name, was not used against Mary. [. . . technically speaking! These documents were shown to those who would sit in judgment, but most were not formally introduced into evidence, one of Cecil's devious ways of prejudicing the decision. —*Ed.*]

Anthony Babington was tried and executed. At her trial, Mary had denied that she ever knew Babington or received from or wrote letters to him, or that she had plotted the destruction of Elizabeth. Mary's replies to Babington had been sent in code by one of her secretaries and had not been written in her own hand.

Cecil, however, had the copy of the English text of Mary's letter authenticated by Babington himself, that is information as it was deemed not obtained under torture. The evidentiary material, the original coded letter, Babington had burned. A facsimile of the lost original was reconstituted by Walsingham's spy, Phelippes. The facsimile was what stood in for evidence of the original coded letter that Babington had burned. Mary's secretaries confessed to the evidentiary truth of the facsimile. Their statements were regarded as corroboration of the reconstituted ciphers. The contents of the facsimile matched the English transcript. This was Walsingham's method or sleight of hand to convince the commissioners of the truth of the charge—that the case against Mary was proof solid—or to say, invincible.

Despite the drama of the recorded trial in which Mary was forced to defend herself without being allowed to subject any of the documents exhibited against her to legal or forensic scrutiny, there could have been no other conclusion, according to the practice of the law as it was then constituted and established, than what was called for, in the verdict to

be proclaimed from the Act for the Queen's Safety (passed in March 1585) which meant that the warrant for Mary's execution could be issued and the sentence carried out.

At Elizabeth's insistence the Bond of Association had been passed in Parliament in November 1584. It was precursory to the Act for the Queen's Safety; according to it, if anyone threatened Elizabeth's life in the interest of the Stuart succession both Mary and James would be executed, whether privy to the attempt or not. When the Bond had been made sure in the parliamentary petition, Elizabeth was equivocal in her answer to it. She called the Bond of Assurance "an answer answerless".

The verdict of Mary's guilt was publicly proclaimed on 4 December 1586. Are we to determine that one false agent in a chain of correspondence could be responsible for an entire misapplication and misdirection of justice in the case? The preliminaries of the Babington plot involved a double agent of Walsingham's, Gilbert Gifford, who was in on the innermost workings of the conspiracy and it can be adduced that much of the plot took place amidst a sort of political frenzy of convoluted secrecy, class, and national interests and a peculiar sense of combativeness one sees in our own times amongst the elites of emerging regions. The object it seems of this eventful activity was the incrimination of the Scottish Queen.

Professor Guy's work is meticulous in its wealth of scholarly apparatus and includes a discussion of Cecil's drafts of the Act for the Queen's Safety. The author gives us a sense of the extraordinary context in which the Act was passed; the Act was almost certainly part of Cecil's legislative plans for a quasi-republican regency council to exclude Mary from the (English) succession. Cecil proposed that such a Grand Council would choose a Protestant successor whose authority would be confirmed by statute. Elizabeth's view on such further legislation was that it was a subversion of the principles of monarchy and hereditary right.

In October 1612 Mary's body was exhumed from Peterborough, where it had been interred, and reinterred in Westminster Abbey. King James I of England (and VI of Scots), her son and heir, moved his mother's body, reburying it in the South aisle with the bodies of Margaret Beaufort, Henry VII's mother, and with James's paternal grandmother, Margaret Douglas, Countess of Lennox.

In choosing the phoenix as her last emblem, Mary wrote her own epitaph:

"In my end is my beginning."

Monarchy and the Chase **by “Sabretache” (Albert Stewart Barrows)**

reviewed by Sarah Gilmer Payne

Monarchy and the Chase by “Sabretache” (Albert Stewart Barrows). London, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1948. Hardbound, illustrated. [This book was donated to the Society by J. A. E. Windsor, Ben. —Ed.]

This little gem, an account of the connection of the English monarchy to horses and hunting as seen through the eyes of a prominent foxhunting man of the 1940s, is every bit as interesting for the picture it paints of the England that existed in its author’s time, and his views on horses and history, as it is for the many historical events he describes.

Monarchy has always been closely linked to hunting, the horse has played a central role in history and warfare, and the cruelties of sport have always hardened and prepared men’s hearts for the cruelties of the battlefield—although our author would not, I think, have seen it quite in those terms.

To understand the book’s perspective properly, it is important to note that riding and jumping were revolutionized in the early XX Century by the brilliant Italian cavalry officer Federico Caprilli, who developed the forward seat, and that the English countryside in previous centuries was less enclosed, making jumping a less vital part of hunting than it had become by the author’s day. When reading his discussion of the slower pace and overflexed horses of King James’s time, it is also important to remember that this was prior to the development of the Thoroughbred, and that the horses of those times would have been of a heavier and “colder” type than a modern hunter.

The author’s first-hand knowledge of the English countryside, and his perceptive statement that really to understand a battle, one must actually see the land it was fought on, fleshes out the reader’s understanding of the printed page.

After a brief outline of pre-Norman times, the book gets down to business with William the Conqueror, “the father of modern English hunting”—his love of the chase, and his draconian forest laws.

His son, William Rufus, the victim of a hunting “accident” of the type which is probably still not terribly uncommon in the supposedly advanced XXI Century, is a sad example of ways that field sports have been creatively exploited to alter the course of history.

The Stuart era will of course be of greatest interest to us. Both Charles I and Charles II are described here as excellent horsemen: “Both . . . rode very well, especially Charles II, who is the only king to have ridden a winner at Newmarket. Both were much criticized for being out hunting when they should have been attending to affairs of state.”

Most of the credit for the riding abilities of both monarchs is attributed to the Duke of Newcastle. While that nobleman was indeed one of the finest horsemen of his day, and hugely influential, especially as teacher to Charles II, he cannot be said to be the only influence on Charles I: the author, for example, totally fails to mention M. de St Antoine.

It is always a pleasure to read Newcastle in his own words. His common sense and kindness shine through, for example, in his memorable remark that when a man rides a horse there should be a man and a beast, not two beasts—advice many should take today, even if my experience has been that human beings are far more beastly than the most difficult horse could ever be.

His comments regarding the silliness of relying on the almanacs of the day as a guide to horse care demonstrate that there have always been acute as well as credulous minds.

Both King Charles I and Prince Rupert are presented here in quite a favorable light, as fine horsemen and courageous characters. However, Rupert was much more than “a beau sabreur to the life . . . very tall, lean, and handsome”; on the contrary, his military acumen was quite a match for his high abilities and personal courage. He as well as King Charles were of far greater depth than the cardboard caricatures with which we are so often presented.

It is difficult to find something complimentary to say about the Hanoverian monarchs, and the author missed a rare opportunity to do so by failing to mention the magnificent Hanoverian Creams. There is an interesting sideline on these horses in Christian Freiherr von Stenglin’s *The Hanoverian*:

The Herrenhausen court stud deserves a mention here for the impetus it gave to Hanoverian horse breeding. It was founded in 1844 and situated in the lime-rich Leine marshes west of Hanover. Its main purpose up until 1866 was to supply horses for the royal stables. This stud was also the last place where the Hanoverian Creams, the ceremonial coach horses of the Hanoverian monarchs, were bred. [These creams (in fact cremellos) were of necessity very inbred and their consequent tendencies to being short-lived and needing false tails for parade purposes caused them to die out before the end of the XIX Century; . . . —*pub. note.*]

All in all, this book is a treat, a pleasure both for its topic and for its picture of a genteel bygone era.

[SARAH GILMER PAYNE, BENEFACTRESS, OL, of Martin GA has been a contributor to these pages for twenty-six years. Chief among her interests are the Royal Martyr, his life and times, and diverse aspects of his reign, as well as her many animals, feline, canine, and equine. Sarah must have read, and for a that matter, must own, nearly every book about King Charles. She is an extraordinary resource, for whom we give thanks, and a much valued supporter, extraordinaire.]

***The Treatment of Head Injuries in the Thirty Years War:
Joannis Scultetus and his Age (1618-1648)***
by Louis Bakay, M.D., F.A.C.S.

reviewed by Sarah Gilmer Payne

The Treatment of Head Injuries in the Thirty Years War: Joannis Scultetus and his Age (1618-1648) by Louis Bakay, M.D., F.A.C.S. Charles C Thomas, Publisher, Springfield IL (1971).

The author of this fascinating study modestly states, “I thought it would be interesting to approach neurosurgery through the eyes and minds of men of the seventeenth century” and he was uniquely qualified to achieve this goal: Professor of Neurosurgery at the State University of New York at Buffalo, with a knowledge of history and languages as well, it is an enlightening experience to be guided by him through some actual case histories of the Thirty Years War—he understood exactly what was being described, the probable outcome, the comparison of XVII Century instruments and techniques to those of our own times, and so much more than a less expert writer would ever be able to explain to the reader. I would hasten to add that it is not necessary to have great medical knowledge to appreciate and enjoy this book—I certainly do not, but I learned so much from reading it!

The primary surgical source of the book is the work of Joannis Scultetus, “a remarkable physician and scientific writer, one of the great surgeons of all ages....Some of the surgical principles he developed are still practiced.” His “*Armamentarium Chirurgicum*” describes surgical instruments and techniques, detailed case histories including very precise descriptions of the treatment of head trauma. The remarkable illustrations are accurate and beautifully executed.

For the background, the times in which these events unfolded, our guides are the writer Hans von Grimmelshausen and the artist Jacques Callot, eyewitnesses to the cruel and turbulent events of the war.

Dr. Bakay discusses the various types of XVII Century weapons—pole arms such as halberds and pikes, as well as swords, axes, and maces, and the prevalence of depressed fractures caused by these weapons. Also mentioned is the quaint belief in those days that bullets were poisonous:

“Firearms were frequently referred to as diabolical. This epithet had considerable meaning: Since gunpowder was made of the devil’s stuff, sulphur, saltpeter, and charcoal, the resulting explosion could only be diabolical. It was also thought that devils rode on the bullets, which explains why bullet wounds were believed to be poisonous.”

As for the surgeons, there were the learned and highly trained doctors and physicians such as Scultetus, who received his training in Padua and spoke Greek and Latin, in strong contrast to the “ignorant barbers” with no training, as well as barber surgeons who did have some formal education, including university courses.

The drawings of the surgical instruments are interesting, to say the least. To my untrained eye, a few of them would not appear out of place in a farrier’s or carpenter’s tool

box. The trephines and similar implements which figure so prominently in Scultetus's descriptions are depicted and compared to their counterparts in the late XX Century. (the book was published in 1971.)

Some of the forceps and rongeurs used by Scultetus were apparently not unlike their modern counterparts; he also mentions the use of hammer and chisel:

“More prudent and experienced surgeons use forceps for the removal of protruding bones, instead of chisel and mallet, with better results.”

It is also interesting to note that the operations were done without any kind of anesthesia, and Scultetus did not permit his patients to consume liquor, as illustrated by his observation “A case of head injury with opening of the skull that became lethal because the patient drank forbidden wine.” Wine was, however, commonly used to irrigate wounds, and opium or laudanum were often used to relieve pain.

The mysterious concoction known as “theriac” was considered to be a panacea. There were various, often secret, recipes for its making; alas, the author informs us that it was “the forerunner of all patent snake-oil medicines to come.”

The case histories give the reader a vivid picture of life in the XVII Century, the suffering and hardship endured by the protagonists of the Thirty Years War, and a true appreciation for the compassion and ingenuity of the surgeons who did their utmost to help and to heal.

‘The Uncommon Prayer Book’ by M. R. James

Commentary by Sarah Gilmer Payne

Imagine an old English estate with all the expected genteel charm, whose prior owner, a fiercely Royalist lady, had commissioned a painted ceiling depicting the regicides receiving their just rewards in the afterlife.

Now imagine a perfectly preserved chapel standing close by the house, unchanged since the seventeenth century.

Inside this chapel are eight folio prayer books, all of which have a mysterious, unauthorized addition to the lesson for the 25th day of April: Psalm 109, and on this day each year, the books are found to be carefully laid out, and open to this page.

The room is locked, and no one can explain how this could happen, who could have done it, or why.

Mr. Davidson, the protagonist of our story, discovers the chapel and its mystery by chance, when he finds himself alone in a country town and begins to explore the place and its landmarks.

Quite by chance, he falls into conversation with the father of the woman who acts as caretaker to the old house at Brockstone Court; its owners, descendants of the fierce and devoted Royalist, Lady Sadleir, were now all deceased, the house closed up, and its

furnishings stored away. The chapel, however, remained exactly as it had been in Lady Sadleir's day.

The caretaker, Mrs. Porter, was perplexed and somewhat disturbed to find the eight unique prayer books lying open once more after she had put them up. She had the only key to the chapel's door, and all the windows were barred.

Intrigued by this strange occurrence, Mr. Davidson, who has already discerned that the unauthorized lesson was a celebration of Cromwell's death, and the prayer books specially printed for Lady Sadleir, returns to the chapel on the following 25th of April—only to find that the prayer books have not been opened and arranged as usual. But wait!

Upon examining the prayer books, he discovers that they are not the same ones—Lady Sadleir's books have been stolen, and replaced. Could the suspicious man who had asked Mr. Davidson for directions last year be responsible?

I was expecting a "locked room" mystery with a perfectly rational explanation—but I had forgotten that this was a ghost story! It would be a shame to give away the surprising finale, so I will only say that this short story is well worth the reader's time, and were I Mrs Porter, I would be anticipating the 25th day of April each year.

Passive Obedience and Caroline Politics: III

(concluded; Parts I & II appeared in our June & December, 2011, issues, respectively.)

by The Most Rev'd Mark Haverland, Ph.D.

Metropolitan of The Original Province, The Anglican Catholic Church

D. NATURAL LAW ARGUMENTS

Hammond's tract, *To the Right Honourable the Lord Fairfax and His Council of War, The Humble Address of Henry Hammond*, dated 15 January 1648 (Old Style), was written to the Army's leaders after the military defeat of the Royalists and two weeks before the King's execution on 30 January 1648/9. Like the other political tracts, the *Address* to Fairfax considers resort to arms by the subject against the supreme magistrate. Near the conclusion of the *Address* Hammond also takes up a newly relevant topic: the question of a victor's right to shed the blood of others in satisfaction for past injuries.

In this *Address* and its subsequent *Vindication*, Hammond reveals his view of the origin of government, though in a brief way that leaves many unanswered questions. The *Address* is written

. . . to review some of the Principles by which you [that is, Fairfax and his Council] seem to be acted, and whereon to ground the high enterprises which you have now in hand. ^{<45>}

These principles, which Hammond not surprisingly intends to cast in doubt and overthrow, are, he reckons, four in number. The first three of these four are relevant to the present subject and deserve separate consideration.

i) The first principle is the claim of the rebels to have acted and to act still in the name of God. Hammond repeats the charge made in his other political tracts that the rebels are reduced to justifying their acts by reference to the motions of the Spirit. To this justification Hammond answers again that there are seducing spirits as well as the Holy Spirit and that violation of the laws and of oaths of allegiance requires more support than such a bare, subjective claim to inspiration^{<46>}. This point adds little to Hammond's consistent rejection of claims to private inspiration and revelation.

ii) The second principle that Hammond rejects is *'that the KING by taking up Arms made His appeal to Heaven'* and that the King's defeat therefore proves God's rejection of his appeal and cause. This argument, which would rebound against the anti-Royalists with some effect after the Restoration, does not impress Hammond. First, Hammond denies that Charles ever made an appeal to heaven to be judged by arms: Charles simply defended his rights with the means at hand. Secondly, it would be immoral to refer the justice of a cause to trial by arms, as Charles well knew. And finally, the righteous often suffer in this world. If this principle were to stand, then it follows that the Turks have a just cause, given 'that unreturn'd Captivity' suffered by the Greek Church^{<47>}. So, too, many just men in Scripture would be condemned by this principle, because they suffered misfortune.

iii) The third, and for present purposes most important, principle rejected by Hammond is that

. . . the community of the People is the supreme power, and the KING is inferiour...and accountable for his breach of Trust. . . .^{<48>}

This principle actually contains two significant points: it implies denial both of the traditional English fiction that the prince can do no wrong and also of the theory that he is the source of all law, honors, and authority in the state. Hammond responds by denying in turn that supreme power was ever given by God to the whole community in Scripture, reason, or historical example.

Most of Hammond's Scriptural arguments for obedience have already been explained. However, Hammond does refute one additional Scriptural argument from his opponents in the *Address*. That argument is that I Peter ii.13-4 implies a subordination of kings. The verse in the Authorized Version reads:

Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it beto the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers. . . .

Hammond points out that these verses say nothing about a king's subordination to anyone, though they do speak of the subordination of lesser magistrates. The real meaning of these verses in Hammond's view is that Christian Jews are to obey all governors, including pagans, and above all the king or emperor^{<49>}. In fact the entire epistle is opposed to 'the vile Sect' of self-proclaimed 'Gnosticks,' who assert freedom for themselves in their new faith from all obedience^{<50>}. Hammond similarly implies in other works that the gnostics in Scripture were similar to the enthusiasts and rebels of his own day^{<51>}.

Next Hammond argues that reason also is opposed to the principles of royal inferiority and accountability. Hammond agrees with the Thomistic tradition against the Augustinian in seeing dominion and the state as natural and not as effects of the fall. There would be superiority and inferiority, not equality, even if Adam had never fallen, as can be seen from the hierarchy of the orders of angels^{<52>}. The duty of obedience to superiors is 'founded in the Law of the first Creation,' although it also is precisely commanded in the Mosaic law and is confirmed by Christ^{<53>}.

In any case, Hammond continues, God did in fact give authority to some men over others originally, which overthrows the idea of an original liberty. Both Scripture (Genesis iii:16 and iv:7) and reason support this divine donation to some. To show the reasonable basis for this assertion, Hammond begins with what he considers two unquestioned points: first, no one has a right to kill himself; secondly, the state now does have the right to execute malefactors. A community is

. . . many particular men together, indowed with that power (and no more) which every man hath singly over himself. . . .^{<54>}

But singly men have no power over life and death. Since the state does have this power, it must come from some other source than donation by the individuals who form the community. In Hammond's opinion the source of this power is God, who gives power over life and death directly to the chief magistrate. Since the power of life and death is necessary for civil order, it is given directly by God to the one who must bear it.

Nevertheless, Hammond does not hold to an extreme view of divine right, in which all power is seen as coming directly from God to the king, with the king in turn responsible to God alone for his exercise of that power. Hammond is willing at least to consider that civil society and the individuals who compose it may be the fountain of the magistrate's power over property and liberty. If the state dissolves, these powers may revert to their source. The only power made explicitly by divine gift is that over life. If government dissolves, then this power reverts to its source, God, not to the community which never held it^{<55>}. Among other things this argument means that the current government, addressed by Hammond through Fairfax and his Council, has no right to execute Charles or anyone else, even if the former government could be proven to have dissolved *de facto* and *de jure*. However, Hammond does not explicitly make this last point.

One might argue that Hammond's argument does not support all of the conclusions outlined here. The problematical premise of the argument is that men have no power in a group which is not in origin a power over self; or, positively put, that human rights are only rights over one's own person and property and life. Hobbes and Locke will argue for a natural right to life which implies a right to defend life when attacked, even by killing the aggressor. Hammond admits this right to self-defence. Why then does he not conclude that the state has a power over life and death derived, not from direct divine donation to the chief magistrate, but rather from the right to self-defence? Hammond might, of course, argue that the Christian obligation to bear the cross abrogates such a natural right. But that

argument is different from denying altogether the existence of such a natural right discernible by reason.

Hammond would not have to anticipate Locke or even his own contemporaries to confront this objection, since it and similar arguments are present in the Thomistic tradition. Saint Thomas argues that when the magistrate acts in violation of divine or natural law, his action lacks part of the formal character of law, and therefore is null and void. If such action amounts to tyranny, if the magistrate habitually consults his own and not the common good, then he may be resisted^{<56>}. On this point Hammond does not seem to do full justice to his opposition. In his *Vindication of the Address* Hammond is even less persuasive when he argues that acceptance of oppression is always better than loss of life^{<57>}. It may be true, as Hammond claims, that government is the only security from slavery and chaos, the state of 'common hostility (the unhappiest lot in nature).'^{<58>} But Hammond's conclusions do not necessarily follow from this observation. There may well be cases in which loss of life seems better than oppression and in which the hazards of civil war and chaos seem better than the alternative.

The final section of this chapter will return to Hammond's disagreement with the Thomistic tradition and will argue that Hammond's conclusions ultimately rest on distinctively Christian principles that are in tension with the natural law arguments of Thomas and others. Before proceeding to that final section, however, this section must complete Hammond's argument against the principles of his opponents.

Hammond rejects the principles of royal inferiority and of royal accountability on the basis of historical example as well as on the bases of Scripture and reason. Hammond doubts that supreme power ever was originally vested in the whole community. And if in some case supreme power were vested in the whole community, then such a popular system soon was abandoned in favor of rule by kings or judges. In any case Hammond doubts that England was ever anything but a monarchy. In this matter Hammond represents the opinion of his party and king. John Bradshaw, Lord President of the court that tried Charles, in the course of the trial claimed to the King that the court spoke 'in the name of the people of England, of which you are elected king.' Charles replied, truly enough, that

England was never an elective kingdom, but a hereditary kingdom for these thousand years.^{<59>}

In the *Practical Catechism* Hammond calls paternal dominion,

. . . that eminent natural right that belongs to all fathers...the root of all power and government among men.^{<60>}

If royal authority has its root in paternal dominion, it comes from a natural, divinely established source. Paternal dominion does not flow from election or the consent of the governed, and few in the seventeenth century would question that even fathers who misuse their authority hold paternal dominion. The implication of this line of thought is that royal authority, which comes from a paternal root, also flows downward from God rather than upward from the governed and that it is not accountable except to God. In any case, even if

supreme power in England had first come to the king by popular donation, Hammond denies that rebellion can be justified, that the donation may be repealed, or that the kingdom should on any account be plunged into 'confusion...which is much worse than the hardest subjection.'⁶¹

Hammond next grants the point for the sake of argument: if one supposes that the whole might in some case licitly take back the power it supposedly first had, what group would be competent to represent the whole then and so to do? Hammond points out that the House of Commons of the Long Parliament, which claimed such competence, was not very representative to begin with. Many, Hammond says, are unrepresented in the Commons, and those who are chose their delegates for limited purposes, stated in their writs for election. In any case, Hammond continues, the House Commons in 1647-8 is only a small part of that elected. (One should note that Pride's Purge came on 6 December 1648, one month before the publication of the *Address* on 15 January 1649.) From this Hammond concludes that though the Army and the 'godly' are well-represented in the Commons, not a 'thousandth' part of the whole kingdom is. This number significantly understates the extent of the representativeness of the Commons. Nevertheless, Hammond certainly has a point when he notes with irony that if rebellion is justified as an act of the whole, then it is strange that the whole should be denied freedom to express any opinion contrary to the will of the powers that be. If the kingdom were thrown back into its first liberty (the justification for the rebellion), then all, including the supporters of the King, ought to retain their right to form a government to their liking⁶².

Hammond is satisfied that these arguments undermine the foundation of the Council's actions and that the superstructure built on that foundation must therefore fall. The *Address* concludes with a prayer that the Council will have its heart mollified towards Charles, or, failing that, that God may 'interpose his hand, to rescue his Royal Person out of your power. . . .'⁶³

E. CONCLUSIONS

The position Hammond takes in his political writings as a whole is that of all the Laudians: resistance to the supreme magistrate is illegitimate, or at least active resistance harmful to the stability of the state is always illegitimate. The arguments Hammond gives for this position may be summarized in two points. The first is the Biblical example of Christ and the theological and ascetical principle of 'bearing the Cross' in imitation of Christ. The second is an argument from reason, which holds that an essential part of supreme power, namely power over life and death, is not conveyed through a social contract, but by divine gift, and that the royal authority is therefore in part beyond popular origin and control.

Unlike Hobbes, however, Hammond does not argue for the absolute power of a magistrate holding *de facto* power. Although Hammond claims that God always gives the power over life when he gives supreme power, as a necessary instrument for the maintenance of law and order, it does not follow that everyone holding power *de facto* has

been given that or any other power or right by God. On the contrary, although Hammond does not explicitly state this position in his political tracts, he is a legitimist monarchist at least insofar as the English polity is concerned. That is, Hammond believes that Charles's royal authority is indefeasible: that Charles, even in defeat, remains England's monarch *de jure* and is the only rightful holder of power over life and death, and that his lawful heirs alone can succeed to that authority.

This legitimism is made explicit in the *Practical Catechism*. There Hammond briefly states his political theory for his catechetical scholar. This statement begins as an elaboration of the Fifth Commandment, which teaches that 'Christ meddles not with dominion among men.'⁶⁴ Hammond then rejects two 'doctrines of sedition' that threaten this teaching: the doctrines that the pope holds both the temporal and the spiritual swords⁶⁵ and that all dominion is founded on grace and so may only be exercised by the godly⁶⁶. Hammond's arguments against these two doctrines for the most part simply repeat the political teaching already presented in these articles. Then, however, the scholar raises a question from Roman history: Christ counsels obedience to Tiberius, who gained power in succession from Julius Caesar, who himself seized it from the Senate 'violently.' Does this justify rebellion? Hammond concedes the fact of Caesar's revolution, but distinguishes it from contemporary events. By Tiberius's day the emperors 'reigned unquestioned without any competition of the senate.'⁶⁷ Does this mean that the consent of the governed brings legitimacy? No. It was not the governed who consented to imperial rule, but the former governors who effectively accepted the new order:

Which case how distant it is from other forcible usurpations, where the legal sovereign doth still claim his right to his kingdoms, and to the allegiance of his subjects, no way acquitting them from their oaths, or laying down his pretensions, though for the present he be overpowered. . . .⁶⁸

The use of the plural in 'kingdoms' plainly refers to Charles I and Charles II, the kings of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Hammond accepts the possibility of abdication (as when the Roman senate abdicated in favor of Caesar and the emperors). However, a legitimate king and his heirs retain their full rights until and unless they abdicate. It is unclear from this passage whether Hammond concedes the possibility of a legitimate king in an hereditary monarchy such as England abdicating the rights of his heirs as well as his own. On the one hand, in the case of the Romans' acquisition of power over Palestine, Hammond appears to allow the abdication of dynastic rights. Hyrcanus, the heir of the Maccabees, appealed to the Romans to regain the high priesthood (and so also, under the circumstances, 'the Kingdome') from his younger brother. Thereby Hyrcanus and his party came 'to hold (as he obtained)' the kingdom, by Roman leave. The Romans, it follows, gained their authority in Palestine 'by consent, not by force...by way of dedition. . . .'⁶⁹ On the other hand, Hammond's reference to loyal royalists as those that 'still cleav[e] to the house of David' suggests a somewhat more indefeasible view of hereditary authority⁷⁰. In a manuscript work titled *A brief Resolution of th[sic] Grand Case of Conscience concerning the Allegiance due to a Prince ejected by forces out of his Kingdom*, Hammond explicitly asserts that in an

elective kingdom abdication must involve the joint consent of the king and people, and that in an hereditary kingdom the king may only abdicate to his rightful heir^{<71>}. In any case, Hammond certainly never conceded for a moment that the Stuarts were anything other than the lawful kings of England. The Stuarts did not abdicate voluntarily to anyone, and the war against them was, in Hammond's view, manifestly unjust.

Nevertheless, Hammond's conduct in the years of the Interregnum proves that he was willing to suffer the actual state of affairs and to accept it as condign punishment for the laxity and sin of churchmen in the days of their prosperity. Hammond never conceded the legitimacy of the Interregnum governments and felt free to engage in royalist activities, yet he accepted the inconveniences of the *de facto* situation as part of his own bearing of the cross. It is ironic and yet fitting that the relative passivity of the Laudians in the face of the Interregnum authorities perhaps proved to be one historical case in which quiet suffering moved posterity by its example, just as Hammond argued it would. Whether or not Hammond's politics comprehended a realistic system for the governance of England, the moral power of that politics in defeat should not be ignored.

Since there are some superficial similarities between the politics of Hammond and of Hobbes, one must add that Hammond does not draw from his views on the illegitimacy of rebellion the Hobbesian conclusion that the will of the magistrate is the formal determinant of right and law. Rebellion is unreasonable in Hammond's view because it tends towards tumult and chaos, which are worse than any subjection. On this point Hammond and Hobbes agree. But this view of rebellion does not make the will of the magistrate reasonable or just. The subject may not actively resist the magistrate, but that does not make the will of the magistrate the measure of the good. On the contrary, Hammond argues that

. . . those Magistrates are to remain rational creatures, and to continue under the Sovereignty of Reason, and all the branches of that, as far as their particulars are concerned in it, *i.e.* to be ruled by the Universal Laws of Justice and Equity, by the Civil Sanctions which tend to preserving of the Societies, and consequently by the particular Local, or municipal Laws of any Country, which are supposed to have a particular propriety toward the preserving and regulating of that People.^{<72>}

The moral limits on the rights of the magistrate remain what they are in the Thomistic and Hookerian theory of law, which Hammond accepts. The positive laws that a magistrate makes or enforces are properly limited by the higher levels of law, including the nation's existing body of law and custom. But Hammond leaves any worldly enforcement of the proper limits on the magistrate to God. Yet Hammond would never consent, for instance, to Hobbes's notion that the religion of the supreme magistrate is *ipso facto* the 'true' religion^{<73>}. Agreement with Hobbes on the narrow, if practically important, question of rebellion should not obscure other major disagreements.

The traditional name for the Caroline position, passive obedience, therefore is somewhat misleading. Hammond requires active obedience to the just commands of the magistrate. The magistrate may well, in Hammond's view, command one to do something

wrong and in violation of higher levels of law. In that case one may, indeed should, disobey the magistrate, but only passively:

. . . our meekness consists in obedience, active or passive, acting all their legal commands, and submitting, so far at least, as not to make violent resistance, to the punishments which they shall inflict upon us, when we disobey their illegal. . . .^{<74>}

This position might better be called a theory of passive disobedience or of non-resistance than a theory of passive obedience.

Hugh Trevor-Roper argues that the uniqueness of Laudianism lies in its particular synthesis of religion and politics, of 'Arminianism' in theology and of royal absolutism in political theory and practice^{<75>}. The theological element of this synthesis, a kind of 'post-Calvinism,' actually was, according to Trevor-Roper, a revival of English Erasmianism:

. . . tolerant, unsuperstitious, rational and politically uncommitted. It was an appeal to primitive Christianity, as interpreted by the exact scholarship of the Renaissance and by human reason; but it also accepted, in essentials, the continuing historical tradition of the Church. In doctrine it was liberal, professing free will and universal grace.^{<76>}

This basic theological position long antedated William Laud or Charles I. Dutch Arminianism was similar to this neo-Erasmianism, but in Holland Arminianism was republican. In England, according to Trevor-Roper, Hooker shows that the doctrinal heart of Arminianism could combine with a rejection of high clerical claims^{<77>}, and Overall and Andrewes show that it could be essentially apolitical^{<78>}. Likewise, the ceremonial and liturgical elements of Laudianism antedated Laud and roused no politically significant protest when their proponents were men such as Andrewes or John Williams^{<79>}. What was odious to the cultivated aristocrats and gentlemen who destroyed Charles and Laud was the powerful alliance of religious and political doctrines, which threatened to create in England 'a modern, "despotic" monarchy, on the European model.'^{<80>} The Laudians tied their fate to the monarchy: they flourished under that monarchy in the 1630s and again after the Restoration; they fell with it in the 1640s and again in 1688-9.

This study of Hammond runs slightly counter to Trevor-Roper's thesis in two main respects. First, the 'political' component of the Caroline or Laudian synthesis seems more central to Anglicanism than Trevor-Roper admits. Secondly, these articles argue that Hammond's political teaching, which is typically Laudian, also is intimately tied to his whole moral theology and theological method. Therefore, Hammond's doctrinal teaching cannot be 'apolitical,' as Trevor-Roper argues Arminianism could be. These two points deserve some elaboration.

First, Laudian politics is firmly rooted in earlier Anglican theologians and formularies. The Elizabethan *Homilies*, for instance, teach passive disobedience as plainly as do Laud or Taylor or Hammond: all men are obliged to obey the magistrate, even if he is evil^{<81>}; no one may obey an ungodly command, but such a command may only be resisted passively^{<82>}; to suffer patiently under an evil magistrate is only to follow David under Saul, Christ under Pilate, Saint Mary as she went to pay a tax, and the early Church under evil persecuting emperors^{<83>}. The supposedly 'apolitical' Andrewes nevertheless teaches non-

resistance and presents the monarch as exalted and inviolate. Likewise, Hooker argues that if the prince offends, then

. . .there is Heaven, a tribunal, before which they shall appear: on earth they are not accountable to any.^{<84>}

In fact Hooker and Hammond are equally 'neo-Erasmian' *and* equally committed to obedience and the monarchy. The difference between Hooker and Hammond lies elsewhere.

For one thing, Hammond holds to a higher view of episcopacy than Hooker. Furthermore, while Hooker concludes his great work with a book on the Royal Supremacy, the Supremacy hardly figures at all in Hammond's chief political writings. Hooker presents an idealized vision of the Tudor commonwealth, with the monarch at its head, the Church in its place, and all properly governed by tradition and consensus. Hookerian politics cannot much apply beyond its Tudor context. Hammond, in contrast, emphasizes a universally applicable political principle (non-resistance) and describes a Church of England that is defined more by its bishops and by its (Hookerian) theological method than by the Elizabethan settlement (including the Supremacy). In an obvious way the Laudians tied the fortunes of their Church to those of the Stuart dynasty and adopted a politics that served the apparent interests of the monarchy. In less obvious but deeper ways Hammond and the other Laudians began to develop a politics and an ecclesiology that could both survive the Interregnum or the *coup* of 1688 and also inspire later Anglican revivals. Trevor-Roper begins to argue along these lines when he notes Archbishop Bancroft's desire to elevate episcopacy, to restore the authority of the Church, and so to protect Anglicanism from the possibility of an unfriendly future monarch^{<85>}. Hammond's system fulfils these objectives.

Secondly, Hammond's politics are not accidental, but rather are intimately tied to his whole system. Respect for established, legitimate authority is central both to Hammond's theological method and also to his politics. Passive obedience to just and indifferent commands and non-resistance to wicked commands are key parts, perhaps the most important part, of 'bearing the cross,' which in turn is the essence of that Christian practice upon which salvation depends. Evidently Hammond is a legitimist, rather than a *Realpolitiker* who supports the *de facto* power of the day, because he thinks that rights and obligations transcend immediate interests and power relationships. In the context of Hammond's England his political principles imply royalism, but royalism does not follow from them necessarily. Non-resistance is Hammond's major political premise. Royalism follows from the addition of a minor premise, that the legitimate magistrate is in fact a king. The essence of Hammond's politics, however, non-resistance, is theoretically compatible with any regime type.

Hammond rejects the natural law argument for rebellion that Thomas Aquinas and others have articulated through the centuries. Hammond fails to answer the Thomistic argument adequately on its own grounds of natural law. But in the end this failure is beside the point. In the end Hammond argues for non-resistance as a distinctively Christian duty, as an acceptance of the cross of Christ for oneself. Or to put Hammond's position in natural law terms, he argues that the specifically Christian goods of obedience and patience under affliction take precedence over more general goods such as self-preservation and liberty. Hammond endeavors to answer

the natural law arguments and denies that there is any natural right to rebel. However, even if such a natural right to rebel could be established, Hammond would certainly argue that an obligation to obey is part of the Christian's *imitatio Christi*.

On this political issue two great traditions, the Thomistic and the Caroline, stand in plain and stark opposition. The Carolines take the higher, specifically Christian ground. It is true that Hammond also asserts the duty of 'passive disobedience' on the basis of reason. However, the natural law arguments for this duty are questionable. Hammond's strongest arguments rest on supernatural and religious grounds. By taking this position, then, Hammond in effect asserts the existence of a specifically Christian morality. This assertion is consistent with Hammond's denial elsewhere of the existence of 'counsels of perfection.' The duty of obedience, even to the point of martyrdom, is itself in the same category as the other 'counsels.' That is, it is a duty for Christians that flows from Christ's heightening of the moral demands of the natural and Mosaic laws. By denying that such duties are 'counsels' that only a few, extraordinary Christians can or will follow, Hammond demands from all Christians extraordinary moral seriousness and endeavor.

Hammond's position, and by extension that of virtually all of the Carolines, is not necessarily true because it is specifically Christian. However, the seriousness and Christian claims of Hammond's moral theology, including notably his politics, are not accorded the respect they deserve, if the debate is conceded from the outset in its central issues. And this is true whether the concession is made to earlier or to later political and moral systems. Hammond, and many others, assumed and argued that Anglicanism implies a politics that is neither that of the schoolmen nor of those who make liberty the primary political good. In Hammond's case this politics both fits well with his entire moral system and also illustrates that system in a number of important particulars. In the end Hammond's politics must stand or fall with his moral theology as a whole.

44. *Cross*, p. 323.

45. *Address*, p. 330.

46. *Ibid.*, pp. 330f.

47. *Ibid.* 331.

48. *Ibid.*

49. Cf. *Paraphrase & Annotations* on I Peter ii.12: "And so...he warns the Jewes Christians, that they meddle not with them that are given to changes, joyn not with the seditions, and that upon this

50. *Address*, p. 332.

51. See, e.g., in *P&A*, Hammond's paraphrase of Romans xiii.8f.: obedience, even to persecuting heathen emperors, is a natural duty that Christianity does not change. In fact this part of the duty of charity is heightened by the Gospel, let the Gnostick advocates, and patrons of liberty (or rather licentiousnesse) under that pretence, teach what they please to the contrary." The end of the

motive, that by so doing, by being found quiet, obedient subjects, when this vengeance comes upon the seditious, the heathens may observe the difference betwixt believing and unbelieving Jews...." The Tudor *Homilies* interpret I Peter ii the same way as Hammond (cf. pp. 114ff.).

paraphrase of Romans xiii: 8 refers reader to Matt. ix: 48 but there is no such verse. Cf. *P.C.*, p. 177.

52. *Address*, p. 332. On the significance of angelology for political theory in this period, see Michael Walzer's admirable book, *The Revolution of the Saints: A Study in the Origins of Radical Politics* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, p. 1966), pp. 160-6.

53. *Fund.*, p. 477.

54. *Address*, p. 333.

55. *Ibid.*, p. 334.
56. See note 12 above for references to Thomas.
57. *Vindication of the Address*, p. 337.
58. *Ibid.*, p. 339.
59. Quoted in Carlton, p. 350.
60. *P.C.*, p. 310. Cf. Carlton, p. 298: "I die, I take it, for maintaining the Fifth Commandment," said Lord Capel just before parliament executed him for being a royalist."
61. *Address*, p. 334.
62. *Ibid.*, p. 335.
63. *Ibid.*
64. *P.C.*, p. 173.
65. *Ibid.*, pp. 173f.
66. *Ibid.*, pp. 174-7.
67. *Ibid.*, p. 178.
68. *Ibid.*
69. *P&A*, annotation b. on Matthew xxii.
70. *Death-bed*, p. 35. Cf. Hobbes's similar position on this issue at the end of chapter 21 of *Leviathan* (pp. 166ff.). But note that for Hobbes the duty to obey only lasts so long as the sovereign is able to protect the subject (p. 166).
71. See the quotations and summary in John Packer's study of Hammond, p. 181. Note also Hammond's explicit assertion that conquest in an unjust war (which includes any war by subjects against their sovereign) gives no rights at all. Hammond's politics, as Packer notes here, have much of a "spirit of martyrdom." Hobbes gives not the slightest hint of such a spirit.
72. *Vindication of the Address*, p. 346.
73. "[S]eeing the examination of doctrines belongeth to the supreme pastor, the person, which all they that have no special revelation are to believe, is, in every commonwealth the supreme pastor, that is to say, the civil sovereign." (*Leviathan*, p. 427)
74. *P.C.*, pp. 87f.
75. Trevor-Roper, p. 114.
76. Trevor-Roper, p. 42.
77. *Ibid.*, p. 48.
78. *Ibid.*, p. 114.
79. *Ibid.*, p. 92.
80. *Ibid.*, p. 119.
81. *Homilies*, pp. 113ff. and 597f.
82. *Ibid.*, pp. 117f.
83. *Ibid.*: on David, pp. 601-6; on Christ, pp. 608f.; on Saint Mary, pp. 607f.; on the early Church, p. 597.
84. Keble-Hooker III, p. 446 (VIII.ix.2).
85. Trevor-Roper, p. 48

Editor's Miscellany

The Kalendar of Anniversaries does not appear in this issue of *SKCM News* as it usually does. For those important dates, we encourage our readers to refer to a back issue of *SKCM News*, or, better, to purchase a copy of the recently-published *Devotional Manual*, which includes the Kalendar for the entire year. It may be ordered using the Goods Order Form at www.skcm-usa.org or by sending \$7.50 to the Membership Secretary at the below address.

William Byrd and ***Sir Edward Elgar***, featured composers at the 2012 Annual Mass in Appleton WI, are the two best known Roman Catholic English church composers. **Byrd** (as his contemporary, William Shakespeare, is generally supposed to have been) was a recusant, tolerated by the Crown because of his prodigious musical talent. His recusancy is a matter of public record because of numerous court cases in which he was involved, because of his family and related property disputes.

We know that when a judge or attorney recuses himself from a case it means that he absents himself from participation due to an actual or perceived conflict of interest. The RC 'recusants' of the XVI Century and later chose to absent themselves from C of E services, and from the Holy Communion in particular, considering them heretical and invalid. (Latin *recusans*, past participle of *recusare*)

When anti-recusancy laws stiffened in 1593, Byrd enjoyed the patronage of Sir John Petre, whose Ingatestone Hall was a safe house for RCs. Byrd and his family joined a community centered at the Petre manors that worshiped together throughout the church year. When Byrd died he was described as "*Brittanicae Musicae Parens*"; he was a prime influence on Tomkins, Bull, and Weelkes.

During the XX Century, **Sir Edward Elgar**, who received the Order of Merit (wearing the medal of which, he is depicted here), was forthright about his faith. In fact, *The Dream of Gerontius*, to words by Cardinal Newman, which treats the subject of Purgatory, was written by him as an explicit statement to fly in the face of the many free-thinking intellectuals and skeptics who predominated in artistic, academic, and social circles at the time. Elgar's act almost of defiance created the oratorio's "terse, fervent, and individual" score, according to *The New Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (2001). Elgar's *Ave Verum* dates from 1886-7 (rev. 1902).

Samuel Seabury, the first bishop consecrated (by Scottish non-jurors in Aberdeen, 14 Nov. 1784) for the United States, had this to say about innovations:

"The faith and doctrine of the Church is tried and settled. We have a right to examine what it is, but we must take it as it is."

British & American Officers

British Headquarters

www.skcm.org

American Region

www.skcm-usa.org

Joint Presidents

The Rev'd Edward R. C. Thompson
The Rev'd Barrie Williams, Ph.D.

Robin J. B. Davies, *Chairman, Sec./Treas., & Editor*
22, Tynning Road
Winsley, Branford-on-Avon
Wilts., BA15 2JJ U.K.

Chaplains

The Rev'd Charles Card-Reynolds, London
The Rev'd Barrie Williams, Ph.D., North

Peter Maplestone, *London Secretary*
Saint Mary-le-Strand

President

The Rev'd Canon William H. Swatos, Jr., Ph.D.
william_swatos@baylor.edu

Treasurer/Membership Secretary

David Lewis, FAAO
1001 Wilson Blvd., Apt. 405
Arlington VA 22209
Ameraca453@aol.com

Mark A. Wuonola, Ph.D., Editor

13 Walnut St., Apt. 2
Waltham MA 02453
wuonola@yahoo.com



Sir Edward Elgar

A. Elgar wearing the insignia of the Order of Merit, 1911



**William Byrd portrait by
Gerard van der Gucht**



At the 2012 Annual Mass

Pictured are (left to right)

The Ven. Shawn W. Denney, J.D., Archdeacon of Springfield (IL), Select Preacher

The Rev'd John D. Alexander, SSC, Rector of S. Stephen's, Providence RI

The Rev'd Patrick Twomey, Rector of All Saints, Appleton WI

The Rt. Rev'd Russell E. Jacobus, D.D., Bishop of Fond du Lac

(photograph courtesy Mrs. Jacobus)