

CHURCH AND KING

Joint Presidents
Rev'd E.R.C. Thompson
Rev'd Barrie Williams
Ph.D.

Vice President:
Mrs Irene Sillitoe

Chairman and Hon.
Treasurer
Robin Davies (and to
whom literary contri-
butions should be sent)
22, Tyning Road
Winsley, Bradford-on-
Avon BA15 2JJ

The Chaplain
Rev'd Barrie Williams

The Magazine of the Society
of King Charles the Martyr
Christmas 1999



London Secretary:
Peter Maplestone
St. Mary-le-Strand

American
Representative:
Mark Wuonola
291 Bacon Street,
Piety Corner
Waltham
MA 02451

Australia
Hon. Secretary
Rev'd R.E.Mills
1/54 Sarawak Avenue
Palm Beach
Queensland 4221

'Remember'

Commemoration of the King's Martyrdom —AD 2000

As January 30th is a Sunday in the millennial year it is assumed there will be no special services apart from those listed below:-

Friday January 28th

1.0pm St. Michael's Cornhill, City of London, Holy Communion (BCP)

Saturday January 29th

11.30am St. Mary-le-Strand, The Strand, London WC2 (opposite King's College) Sung Eucharist (1637). Royal Martyr Church Union. Followed by lunch & A.G.M. Lunch at the Strand Palace Hotel is £25 and must be ordered and paid for at least one week in advance.¹

Sunday January 30th

11am Laying of wreath and short act of devotion at the statue of Charles I, junction of Whitehall & Trafalgar Square.
(Royal Stuart Society)

The annual march-past by the King's Army (Re-enactment society) will begin from the Banqueting House at about 11.30.

530pm Evensong at St. George's Chapel, Windsor including laying of wreath on Charles I's tomb by the Chairman of the Royal Stuart Society.

Monday January 31st

11.40 Devotions and laying of wreath at the bust outside the Banqueting House, Whitehall followed at 12 noon by the Eucharist (PB. rite). The preacher will be the Rt. Rev'd Michael Houghton, Bishop of Ebbsfleet and the celebrant our chaplain. Informal lunch afterwards for those who wish.

Thursday February 3rd

¹ Contact the Secretary of the RMCU at The Priory, Pittenweem, Fife.

11.30am St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh. Scottish Liturgy. Full choir & sermon followed by lunch.¹ (Royal Martyr Church Union)
The Traditional Church of England parish of King Charles the Martyr, Brighton will hold its patronal festival on Sunday January 30th at Middle Street School. Sung Mattins 9.45 followed by Sung Eucharist at 10.30— Preacher: Professor the Rev'd Raymond Chapman.

Other Forthcoming Events

The Annual Restorationtide Festival will be on June 3~ at St. Andrew-by-the-Wardrobe, Queen Victoria Street, City of London (Nearest tube: Blackfriars) – Mass (1662) at 11am followed by A.G.M. and lunch together for those who wish.

News from Australia

For next year's diary. The year 2000 has an added significance for us in that it will be the 400th anniversary of St. Charles' birthday. We place more importance on 30th January, the day of his martyrdom, because this is his heavenly birthday. That day, in the year 2000, falls on a Sunday, so at least in Brisbane, our commemoration will take a rather different form. Instead of the usual evening Mass, we shall gather at All Saints' Church, Wickham Terrace, Brisbane, at 6.30 p.m. for Evensong, Procession and Benediction. I'm delighted to advise you that Professor David Flint, Chairman of the Australian Broadcasting Authority, will be coming to Brisbane to be the speaker, The Archbishop has been invited to preside. There will be supper in the church hall after the Service, and it looks like being a good and interesting night. Please note it in your diaries. Details of celebrations in other places are not yet finalised although in Sydney they will centre on St. John's Church, Gordon, with a Choral Eucharist at 11 am, on Saturday, 29th January.

A special commemoration. Our Society was represented at a dinner in Parliament House, Sydney, on 29th July, when some 340 people heard the Hon. Justice Michael Kirby speak on "The Trial and Execution of King Charles I". The dinner was arranged by the Anglo—Australian Lawyers' Society and the N.S.W. branch of the Australia-Britain Society to commemorate the 350th anniversary of King Charles's execution. A second speaker was Geoffrey Robertson QC (well-known for his "Hypothetical" TV series) whose recent book "Crimes Against Humanity" makes reference to our patron's trial and execution.

Home News

On July 3rd I was privileged to be able to carry the Society's banner in the procession at the Glastonbury Pilgrimage.

In September I was delighted to have the opportunity to address the Devizes branch of the Constitutional Monarchy Association on "the cult of Charles I and the Stuarts"

RD.

A Sermon preached for the Feast of the Nativity of King Charles the Martyr at St. Katharine Cree, Saturday November 19th 1995

By Prof. the Rev'd Roy Porter

I exhort, therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions and giving of thanks be made for all men;

for Kings and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. I Tim. II 1-2.

One of the most interesting chapters in the Eikōn Basilike, the work containing King Charles's reflections and prayers, is that entitled "Upon the Ordinance against the Common Prayer Book." In this, the king vigorously defends the use of a formal liturgy against the Puritans who wanted to abolish it and instead have only extempore prayer. Some of his language suggests a worshipper's bitter experience: he writes of 'the effectations, emptiness, impotency, rudeness, confusions, flatness, levity, obscurity, vain and ridiculous repetitions, the senseless and oftentimes blasphemous expressions, all then burdened with a most tedious and intolerable length which so sufficiently convince all men but those who glory in that Pharisaic way.'

But, towards the end, the royal author remarks that one of the greatest faults some men found with the Common Prayer Book, I believe, was this, that it taught them to pray so oft for Me.' Now it cannot be denied that the Book of Common Prayer does contain a large number of petitions for the sovereign: if you were to follow the Prayer Book pattern for Sunday Morning, Mattins, Litany and Ante-Communion, you would pray for the monarch no less than six times, beating by a short head the number of times the Lord's Prayer is recited. The prominence given to the king was further emphasized in the 1637 liturgy for Scotland which we are celebrating tonight; for there, for the first time and perhaps not surprisingly, the collect for the king is directed to be said before the collect for the day in the Communion service, something which only came into the English prayer book in 1662.

Nor can it be denied that many people have seen all this as a great fault in the Prayer Book. It was one of the things which decided Cardinal Newman to go over to the Church of Rome. At the other end of the ecclesiastical spectrum, Prince Albert, when, shortly after his marriage to Queen Victoria, someone said to him "Surely the Queen cannot be too much prayed for" is alleged to have remarked "not too much, but too often." And, of course, the various revisions of the Prayer Book from the 19th century onwards, not to mention the Alternative Services, have greatly reduced the number of occasions on which the sovereign is ordered to be prayed for in public worship.

It was one of these attempted revisions, the Shortened Services Act of 1872, which produced from the great liturgiologist Wiekham Legg a spirited defence of what he called the "Regalism of the Prayer Book." In his essay, he points out that the frequent petitions for the sovereign were seen by Newman, and many after him, as evidence of what is

called Erastianism, that is the theory of Church government, developed by the 16th century Swiss theologian Erastus, which subjects the Church, bound hand and foot, to an external force, the State, a minister or the House of Commons.

But as the Prayer Book views the monarch, he or she is not the State as a political institution, which is why Wickham Legg objected very strongly to the common term State prayers, because it seemed to make the sovereign just that. Nor is the king outside the Church: rather he is an individual member of it, but called to a special office in it when he is anointed and consecrated by the Church itself in the coronation service to the office of supporting and defending the Church. His responsibility is to create an environment where the Church can do its proper work, so that, in the words of my text, men and women can live together in all godliness.

Such an ideal was always very much before king Charles's eyes and throughout his life he did his best to make it a reality. The distinctive nature of his sanctity is that he is a saint on the throne. As we all know, he lost his crown and his head because he would not compromise over episcopacy. Even what we might nowadays call his fudges — his acquiescence to the removal of the bishops from the House of Lords or his agreeing that the Scots should be presbyterians as long as the English remained Episcopalians — even these were all designed to preserve Church government by bishops as much as possible.

What it is important to understand is that his passionate adherence to episcopacy rested on deep theological knowledge and conviction — as he himself put it, “I write rather like a Divine than a Prince that Posterity may see that I had fair grounds both from the canon of Scripture and ecclesiastical examples whereon my judgment was stated for episcopal government.” And what he meant by episcopal government was Apostolic Succession and what he says about this is exactly the same as the Tractarians were to say much later. Now what the doctrine of Apostolic Succession does is to guarantee the freedom and independence of the Church, for the Church rests on bishops who derive their authority, not from State or parliament or even king, but from the apostles and through them from Christ Himself. As Charles wrote “Their power and office was indeed distinct from, and above, all other in the Church as succeeding the Apostles in the ordinary and constant power of governing the Churches . . . the chief grounds and limits of all episcopal claim, as from divine right” It was the true nature and the true freedom of the Church which Charles saw himself called to preserve.

If, then, the sovereign is not an unfettered dictator with respect to the Church, no more is he with respect to society generally. If he has to ensure that his subjects can live in all godliness, he also has to see that they live in all honesty. The New English Bible translates that word as “high standards of morality”, meaning not just sex, as, alas, is probably the first thing that comes to our minds nowadays, but the standards of righteousness and justice which should

govern all the dealings of human beings with one another. And as the monarch must respect and maintain the divinely given ordering in the Church so he must maintain that order in the world at large. The sovereign himself stands under the law of God, he is no more — though no less — than God's vice-regent who has the great and awesome responsibility for seeing that the divine law is made effective through the laws and institutions of his own particular kingdom; and if he fails to do so he will be accountable before God's judgment seat. We who live in a society where respect for the law is often pretty minimal may feel that the men of the seventeenth century were almost obsessed with law and its enforcement, but we must realise that this was not because they were concerned with the equivalent of Victorian values or anything like that but because they saw law as the active expression of God's purpose for the good order and welfare of mankind and the world.

The awareness of his responsibility for the dignity and liberty of his subjects under the Law was never far from Charles's mind. It was the real issue at his trial. The court claimed the authority of the House of Commons; the Commons could do whatever it wanted on a show of hands, a delusion to which parliamentarians are always prone, not to mention members of the General Synod. But this is the appeal to power, not law, and in response, the king said: “it is not my case alone, it is the freedom and liberty of the people of England, and do you pretend what you will, I stand more for their liberties, for if power without Law may make laws, I do not know what subject he is in England that can be sure of his life or anything that he calls his own.” How right he was subsequent history was to show.

Equally Charles was conscious of how often he had failed in his duty, for surely a saint is not someone who thinks himself perfect but rather one who sees his sins and errors more clearly than the rest of us do. Thomas Carlyle once wrote of the Eikōn Basilike:

“King Charles throughout as this poor Eikōn represents him has nothing to say except “Am I not the most faultiest of men and martyrs? Was there at any time in any case blame found in me? A good man surely — O Lord, didst thou ever chance to make one as good? Make me better — if possible” — though it's only fair to add that Carlyle uttered these strictures because he could not believe that the work was written by Charles himself But I do not think he had read the Eikōn very carefully, for in fact it is full of self-accusations, where the king acknowledges how he has gone against what his conscience told him was right, particularly in the moving chapter about his signing the Earl of Strafford's death warrant.

There is one final point I would make. Monarchs are individual persons, not committees or juntas, but those who by and in their persons uphold order. It might be said that frequent public prayer for the monarch made good sense when the sovereign exercised direct personal power in matters of Church and State, but it does not when, as now, this is no longer the case. Yet it can still be said that the sovereign's personal example is of great significance, when

he or she is known as a devout member of the Church and as a faithful witness to the standards of the gospel in personal and public life — not least, I think, at a time when media attention means that the Royal Family are more in the public eye than at any previous time. Here, again, King Charles points the way. We honour him not only as one who died for the faith but also as one who lived it: as the model of Christian monarchy, whose whole being was governed by his religious belief and his regular observance of the Church's worship, whose family life was a pattern of purity, affection and loyalty in an age when those things were no more to be taken for granted than they are today.

Perhaps we may agree with Prince Albert that it is the quality not the quantity of prayers for the sovereign which is important, though the way my text heaps up its words — “supplications, prayers, intercessions, giving of thanks” — suggests that in the view of scripture, they should be frequent and regular. What does matter is that we should pray with understanding and conviction. If we keep before our eyes the pattern of blessed Charles, we can understand what graces we are asking God to grant to our sovereigns and we can intercede with the conviction that they can indeed attain them.

TRANSCENDING TIME

A sermon preached for Restorationtide 1996 by the
Rev'd Paul Lansley

Contend earnestly for the faith which was
once for all delivered to the saints. Jude, 3

I take it as a considerable honour to have been asked to preach a sermon to the Society of King Charles the Martyr. I joined the Society while still at school; to the best of my recollection, as soon as I discovered its existence. In those distant days one occasionally encountered a fellow Church member who reacted with distaste. The accusation tended to be that we were ‘stirring up long-dead controversies’— and surely, being distinctly un-ecumenical. My response to this would be that the same could be said of any commemoration and honouring of any of God's Saints, and especially of His Martyrs. Which Saint was not attacked and criticised? Indeed, the nearer a Christian draws in discipleship to his Master, the fiercer become the assaults of the enemy.

But are we caught up, in S.K.C.M., in a 17th-century time-warp? No, we have carefully avoided entanglement with the ‘Sealed Knot’ Society, not out of any disrespect for those worthy people, but precisely to uphold our central contention that St Charles, by his witness to the timeless truths of God's Church, is translated to God's Kingdom, and speaks “to the end of time”.

The Saints — Charles the Martyr of course among them — are not mere figures of the past. They are our contemporaries. They are in Christ. We are in Christ. And Christ lives and reigns. And the Church is the living Body of the living Christ. That is why the Church is in its essence unchanging and unchangeable. In Vladimir Lossky's phrase, Page 4

“The Church is the living image of eternity within time.” So long as the Church is true to itself it will appear from outside, from the world's perspective, to be old-fashioned and ‘behind the times’ . But the reality is that it is ‘before the times’, or rather, ‘beyond the times’. For the Church is living in the Kingdom of God, which has been brought into the world in the Person of Jesus. Not surprisingly, those who have been made partakers in the Kingdom find themselves at odds with this world, as St Charles did; as all the Saints and Martyrs did, and do still. We are nailed to the Cross with Christ, and “God forbid that we should glory, save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by Whom the world is crucified to us, and we to the world”.

So, while we are trying hard not to be trapped in the 17th or any other century of the past, some of us cannot help noticing that many of our contemporary fellow-churchmen are trapped firmly in the 20th — or perhaps in the nineteen-sixties or seventies. And the great difference between the late 20th century and all other Christian centuries is the modern belief in progress' and change for change's sake. Is the 17th and all those other centuries all sides in any Christian argument would agree on the principle of submitting the Church to the Word of God, and not adapting to current fashions. Each side would accuse the other of innovating, and each claimed to be loyal to, or to be returning to, the original revelation.

Perhaps because we have been living through all this ‘development’, we may not have noticed how far it has gone. So it can be salutary to listen to someone from a Church which lays great emphasis on remaining consistent. Here is the late Prof. Alexander Schememann, of St Vladimir's Seminary, New York:

“Western Christians, Catholics or Protestants, when faced with what they consider as ‘impossible’ would rather change religion itself, ‘adjust’ it to new conditions and thus make it ‘practicable’. Quite recently, for example, we have seen the Roman Church first reduce fasting to a bare minimum and then to dispose of it completely. With just and righteous indignation, we denounce such an ‘adjustment’ as betrayal of Christian tradition and as minimising Christian faith. And indeed, it is the truth and the glory of Orthodoxy that it does not ‘adjust’ itself to and compromise with the lower standards, that it does not make Christianity ‘easy’.”²

² Alexander Schememann, Great Lent St Vladimir's Seminary Press 1969, p.⁹⁸. This book has given me a deeper understanding of Lent than any other I have read so far.

Perhaps I should hasten to add that Schememann is using us westerners only as a solemn warning. He goes on, "It is the glory of Orthodoxy, but certainly not of us Orthodox people . . . and then for two and a half pages tells his readers to "take Lent seriously" in spirit, not just in traditional customs.

An interesting example of this slide into modernism is provided by the last and the present Archbishops of Canterbury. On 23 October 1987, the 12th centenary of the 7th Ecumenical Council, a delegation of four from the Anglo-Orthodox Society was received at Lambeth Palace to present our 'Pledge of Fidelity to the Historic Faith...'. In the conversation which followed, Archbishop Robert assured us that the "ordination" of women could only be justified if it could be shown "to be within the tradition; not as a mere response to secular pressure". On 11 November 1992, Archbishop George Carey persuaded the majority of the General Synod that we have to do this "in order to be credible to the modern world"!

The setting up of a General Synod was intended to give the Church greater independence from State interference. Ironically it has ended up, through claiming an authority far exceeding any claimed by Pope or Monarch, overriding Tradition and 'reinterpret' Scripture, in abject surrender to secular pressure. "Letting the world write the agenda" was the slogan. On 11 November 1994 Mr Justice Lightman ruled that "an established religion is subject to state control as regards doctrine, government and discipline. Against this proclamation of Erastianism in its most virulent form there seems to have been no protest from General Synod, nor from any Bishops, whether 'flying' or sedentary — not even a mention of Article XXXVII, "We give not to our Princes the ministering either of God's Word, or of the Sacraments." The learned Judge's attention seems not to have been drawn to this. But then he seems to believe that Parliament, not General Synod, has now set aside Magna Carta, the Acts of Supremacy of Henry VIII and Elizabeth I and the Acts of Union of Queen Anne. Perhaps he is right, but it must surely be a surprise to most members of both assemblies, and not quite what they had intended, or supposed they were doing.

It has been suggested that the Western Church — or Churches — perhaps as a consequence of having adopted the Creed of Toledo instead of that of NicaeaConstantinople, have fallen into the error of thinking of Christ, as an absentee Landlord. While He Himself stays remotely away at the Right Hand of the Father, He has sent the Holy Spirit to help keep the machinery going, and supervise the replacement of worn-out parts, or to facilitate the judicious demolition and reconstruction of the premises. Meanwhile the Managing Director is designated the "Head" of the Church. As the Patriarch of Constantinople complained to King James I in 1615, "The wretched Jesuits would deprive us of Christ Himself, making another to be the head and foundation of the Church". Even the King of England could be described as the

"Head" on earth of the Church in his realm — an error corrected under Elizabeth I, but not yet by the British Press. And now, with a 'General Synod', the true Head of the Church has been so far lost sight of that the Church is seen as a democracy; no longer a theocratic monarchy.

Today is the Vigil of Pentecost. We think of the descent of the Spirit. The late Fr Derwas Chitty, who lived and died an Anglican, but already in 1929 was also an Orthodox, wrote this:

"The Spirit's work in creation is always the framing and hallowing of the Incarnation . . . When the Spirit descended upon the Apostles, the Spirit was not merely sent by a Christ remaining aloof. The descent of the Spirit brought Christ again to the Apostles by forming Him in them and making them His body.

"So always in Christ's life, which we share in the Church, we know the Holy Spirit descending, not from an aloof Christ upon us, but from the Father upon Christ being made incarnate in us."³

The Church, the Spirit-filled Body of Christ, transcends time; but to the extent that the earthly part of it lives in time, and passes through time, yes, some 'change' is inevitable. We cannot stay in our 17th century time-warp. But it is the 'change' that happens to a tree, gentle and gradual growth; not reformation and reconstruction. The Church is an organism, the Living Body of Christ; not a mere organisation.

What I am arguing for is that we believe in the Real Presence. But we do . . . yes, in the Eucharist — but not in the Church! What we forget is that the Presence of our Lord, effected by the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist, actually constitutes the Church; that is what the Church is. This is the primary reality of the Church, not something extra, over and above. Synods and hierarchies are merely structures deriving from the Eucharist, and facilitating it. But the Eucharist itself is the Church, the Presence of Christ in His people, one at all times and places, One in heaven and earth. That is why the Eucharist is in principle unchanging: it is the heavenly marriage-supper of the Lamb, the Messianic Banquet. That is why the priesthood is one and unchanging; it is the Apostolic Ministry, the gift of Christ to His Church.⁴

Members of S.K.C.M. are bound to be labelled as traditionalists. But I hope that our traditionalism is not something dry and dead. Tradition as the Church understands

³ Derwas J Chitty; The Spirit of Orthodox Christianity. A paper read before the Egyptian Fellowship of Unity. Cairo, 8 Nov. 929. Reprinted 1987 by the Russian Orthodox Cathedral, Ennismore Gardens, London SW7 INH.

⁴ ARCIC: The Windsor Report. II,3: "(The ordained) ministry is not an extension of the common Christian priesthood but belongs to another realm of the gifts of the Spirit" This agreed statement is of course contradicted by the 'Porvoo Declaration'. duly endorsed by General Synod.

it is living in Christ. It is the consistent voice of the Holy Spirit in the living Body of Christ. And by being members of the Church we are participating in the Kingdom of Heaven. This is the present reality — and it is newer than the newest fashion, as well as older than life on earth. This world is passing away; its fashions are old almost as soon as they are new. The Church must not be subject to fashions. “Our citizenship is in heaven” We are strangers and pilgrims here on earth — and we insist on sticking to the ways we have inherited from our true homeland.

Many of us grieve to see the Church of England, for which our Royal Saint gave his life, floundering in a mire of liberalism. “The prince of this world comes, and has nothing in Me.” But the news has been bad before: “the world groaned to find itself Arian”. To the extent that the ‘official’ Church is now hitched firmly to the world which passes away, it can only wither and die; as the Arians did, and the Gnostics, and the Docetics, and the Eutychians, and the Patrippassians...

“See round Thine ark the hungry billows
curling;
See how Thy foes their banners are
unfurling; Lord, while their darts envenomed they
are hurling,
Thou canst preserve us.”⁵

The call to us is to remain faithful; faithful, not to an official structure, not to some past ideal, nor to some future dream; but to the present reality, but the reality of the Presence of Christ in His Kingdom; that Presence which is manifested by the overshadowing of the Spirit in the mystery of the Mass; in that Kingdom of tomorrow which is given to us today. In the perspective of that Kingdom we can see the world with its modernisms as hopelessly outmoded and outdated, passing away, dead and dying; while we are sharing the future with our Martyr from the 17th century, and with the Mother of God and all the Saints, in the fullness of the life and unity of the Body of Christ.

From some interesting papers recently
made available to the Society.

**THE EXECUTION OF CHARLES
TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.
10th MAY 1890**

Sir,—Mr. Ernest Croft’s interesting picture “Whitehall, 30th January, by the Royal Academy”, suggests an historical query, which perhaps, by your obliging help, I may put to your readers, even during this overburdened season.

Did King Charles at the last moment kneel down and bend his head over the block, retaining in other respects an upright position? On the contrary, I venture to assert, to receive the headsman’s blow, the King first knelt down, and

then stretched himself at full length upon the scaffold, and rested his neck across a bar of wood, in height about 6in.

No insult was intended by this mode of execution. It was the customary practice, and the scaffold was prepared to afford the sufferer some comfort in that wretched position. This is shown by the description of the death of the Duke of Somerset, January 22, 1552. He knelt down “in the straw”; then “he laid himself atone” and “looked for the stroke.” So again, I shrink from calling into publicity so pathetic a witness, Lady Jane Grey, when “the hangman” had “asked her forgiveness,” he “willed her to stand upon the straw,” and “she kneeled down, saying, ‘Will you take it off before I lay me down?’ and the hangman said, ‘No Madam’. Then tied she the handkerchief about her eyes, and, feeling, for the block, she said, ‘What shall I do? Where is it? Where is it?’ One of the standers-by guiding her therunto, she laid her head down upon the block, and then stretched forth her body, and said, ‘Lord, into Thy hands I commend my spirit,’ and so finished her life.” State Trials I, 526-726.

An endeavour shall now be made to show that the execution of Charles I was carried out in conformity with what I may term the Tudor method, which, compelled the sufferer to lie at full length upon the scaffold. And at the outset of this task I must admit that in this contention I can derive no help from any contemporary account of the King’s demeanour on the occasion; all that we are told is that “stooping down, he laid his neck upon the block.”

Nor does any recorded statement directly contradict the traditional idea of the scene, reflected from the contemporary prints of the event, which places Charles upon his knees, bending over a block fitted for the purpose—i.e., in height between 2ft. and 3ft., and in breadth about a foot and a half.

Those prints, made mostly in Holland, are, I venture to assert, in this respect misleading, because such a block, consisting of a solid, conspicuous mass of wood, in height much exceeding the breadth, differs wholly from the block which, according to the following evidence, stood upon the scaffold of January 30, 1649. The Moderate Intelligencer, dated January 25-February 1, 1648-9, describes the execution scene, on the information presumably of an eye-witness; and these are his words—“The scaffold was laid with black bays, also the rail about it; the block a little piece of wood flat at bottom, about a foot and a half long.”

Had the pictorial block stood before our eyewitness, he must have noted its height and bulk. On the contrary, the height of the block did not come within his observation; it was the length which caught his attention. Nor would he have described the pictorial block as “a little piece of wood.”

Thus it seems certain that the block placed before King Charles was a bar of wood and that to place the neck across such a bar of wood, retaining a kneeling posture, was physically impossible. Assuredly, also, had the block differed in any way from the customary shape, or had the King’s attitude when he received the death-blow been in any way unusual, such circumstances would have been recorded. The

⁵ English Hymnal 435. P. Pusey, 1799-1855.
Page 6

uniform brevity in the accounts given of his death proves that the beheading was according to the wonted fashion.

That being the case, the King must have yielded himself to the executioner by extending himself at full length upon the scaffold. Two men who shared his fate, tried by the tribunal which had condemned him, were beheaded within six weeks after January 30, 1649, the Duke of Hamilton and Lord Capel, and the duke, having "observed how he should lay his body, ... stretched himself upon the ground" to receive the axe-blow, and Lord Capel, for the same object, "laid himself down." And on the title-page of a "broad side," published within a fortnight of the event, an "Obsequies on that perfect pattern of true prowess, Arthur, Lord Capel," is a print representing the headsman, axe in hand, and below him lies a man stretched out, with his neck barely raised above the planking of the scaffold "by a little piece of wood." *State Trials IV., 1,194-1,220. King's Pamphlets, 669, f. 14-92.*

Surely the King and his followers, in like manner, met death upon the scaffold.

Yours faithfully,
REGINALD P. D. PALGRAVE.

REVIEWS

Dorian Gerhold: Westminster Hall (James & James) £25.00 (hardback) £9.95 (softback)

William Rufus is not usually accounted one of our great kings, but he left the nation at least one priceless legacy: Westminster Hall. To commemorate its nine hundred years history, Dorian Gerhold, a House of Commons clerk, has written an account of the Hall in all its aspects — its architecture and spectacular angel roof (perhaps the most magnificent in England); its diverse usage as banqueting house, court of law and modern venue for state occasions. Outsized, cold and uncomfortable, it has also served as a shopping mart and drill-hall, but not (contrary to legend) as Henry VIII's tennis court.

Our own members will be particularly interested in how the building itself was used in the trial of King Charles. The quotations of the King's words will be familiar, less so those of his 'judge', Bradshaw. It may give cause for reflection that the Hall had already been the scene of the condemnation, with questionable justice, of William Wallace, Sir Thomas More and Edmund Campion. Faith in British justice is at least partly restored by the acquittal there of Lord Dacre, the Seven Bishops and Warren Hastings.

The Hall has witnessed monarchy in all its aspects :- the lavish hospitality of the Normans, the Divine Right of Kings, coronation feasts, commonwealth gatherings, royal lyings-in-state; it has also seen the forced abdication of Richard II (who did so much to beautify it), the assumption of the throne by Edward IV and Richard III and the usurpation of Oliver Cromwell. But it has been, rather, the place of interaction between monarch, parliament and people, so that 'The history of the Hall is...almost a history of

England' (p.8). It is fitting that two great commoners have been honoured by a lying-in-state in the Hall — Gladstone and Churchill. The quiet dignity shown by those who paid homage to them and to the departed royals is a reflection of the best of English character.

A building which 'has been so closely involved in the life of a nation for such a long period' will not easily perish, though it has been in greater danger from Victorian 'restorers' and death-watch beetle than from fire and incendiary bombs. Scientists, architects and fire-fighters receive due mention in this book, along with more celebrated heroes.

It is amazing how much material Gerhold comprehends in under a hundred pages of very readable text. But it has two bonuses. Nearly every chapter concludes with an original text, of interest to the scholar but useful also to the intelligent history teacher. And not least, nearly every page carries a beautiful illustration which adds to the text. Only one of these disappoints me:— the photograph of Parliament Square. Westminster Hall is, appropriately, at the centre, but is overshadowed by its neighbours, Big Ben, the Houses of Parliament, St. Margaret's and the Abbey. Perhaps this picture tells its own story that these more popular tourist attractions have obscured a building in their midst which rivals them in beauty, interest and importance.

If I had not received a review copy, this is the sort of book I should like for a Christmas or birthday present. I think many will feel the same.

Barrie Williams.

The Paintings and Drawings of Sir Anthony Van Dyck at the Royal Academy, British Museum and Wallace Collection.

" 'Camp' is not a young man in a big hat and
feather boa pretending to be Marlene Dietrich."

The words are not mine but Christopher Isherwood's and they are not idle words at that. He goes on to explain what the word means with illustrations. 'Camp' is in aesthetic philosophy a term to describe not a style in great art but ambience. Isherwood's illustrations are. For music, Beethoven wasn't — Mozart was. In literature Tolstoi wasn't — Dostoevski was. I would add, Rubens wasn't — Van Dyck was.

With this in mind the first thing this reviewer should attempt is to give his reader a view of his subject and by so doing allow the reader to experience the whole without dulling his senses to the particular.

This I will attempt to do when covering these exhibitions. To begin I have to say that anyone who expects a sumptuous eye-dazzling show at the Royal Academy is in for a let-down, the only thing that is sumptuous is the catalogue, so take along your £21. No, this is not a eulogy of the Stuart reign or even of its court. It is a long walk with a great painter who reveals to us his gradual development from a worthy

assistant to Rubens to a master of the genre he decides to work within. From the start we have a clear view of the man for No. 1 in the exhibition is a small portrait.

From it we can distinctly see the man who is behind all these works — attractive, slightly sardonic, but who will succeed if only by his looks. With this in mind each picture has something to say not only about the sitter or subject, but about the man himself. A sitter would be entranced by the charm and, dare one say it, sex-appeal of this sensual creature. If you can't believe this wait for Room 7 and his 'Cupid and Psyche'; if it isn't a self portrait, then it's the idealised view of a man of forty years of himself.

The early work still shows the constraints of the upright code which prevailed at that time and in which he lived and moved. Decorous and stolid it may be but it also shows it owes much to the Italian influence, particularly that of the school of Veronese, and to Van Dyck's master, Rubens. As we progress through the rooms the conventional slowly drops away and we can relax with this free spirit as he does what all good artists do, beautify the world and in doing so his sitters. There has even been, from the start, a slight smile on all his sitters' faces and we can be in no doubt that they were in 'love' with the person who was to immortalise them.

In the early rooms are contained his religious paintings. These are formal and inclined to be in a traditional sense 'religious'; but even here the flamboyant painter is straining to get out from under the mantle of the accepted and to imbue his subject with a sensuality he himself feels. You could see it as the 'catholic butterfly' emerging from a 'puritan chrysalis'; in fact, you could almost see the whole exhibition as a 'religious' journey from Reformation Europe to Catholic England. Wonderful glimpses of this appear every now and then. A respectable husband and wife are in their Rembrandian blacks but their children glow in colour as though not yet touched by the heavy hand of Protestantism. As time goes on even these pillars of puritan society allow a little glamour to intrude, a column with flowing drapes or some other feature.

The main interest to us, as members of the Society, comes in the last room for here stands the King, surrounded by some of his subjects, all doomed, but here they glow forever like the last rays of a setting sun. That sunset is symbolised poignantly by the very last picture: Rachel de Ruvigny, duchess of Southampton portraying 'Fortune'.

On the other hand "Light of Nature" at [the British Museum](#) is an exhibition of Van Dyck's watercolours, which is a quite different matter altogether.

Here we have twenty four, out of twenty nine at his known water-colours in the first room, which are followed by a selection of works by his Continental contemporaries. This exhibition gives us a view of the times in which he lived and worked and through it a glimpse of that sunset period. Water-colour, I know, is not everyone's 'cup of tea'; but the serene beauty of these works, from plant studies for paintings to

views of towns and landscapes, though small and mainly pastoral, are a delight and well worth a visit.

For me, at least, [the Wallace Collection](#) exhibition is the real gem. Here are a few paintings hung in a tiny room which has all the glamour the R.A. lacks. Here the wall shimmers with the warm glow of beautiful pictures set in an intimate setting with a plethora of interesting notes and fascinating insights. None of this is done obviously, just presented with the panache that the Wallace Collection has always possessed. But to get the feel of the aura which this collection has, first pay the lavatories a visit (by the entrance): class will out!

Fees

R.A. Piccadilly. £8; B.M. Russell Square. £4; Wallace Collection. Hertford House, Manchester Square: Free.

Jeffrey Monk

THE SOCIETY'S PUBLICATIONS

A Liturgical Manual comprising material for the 3 commemorations, the Litany of St. Charles and all known hymns in his honour, 44 pages.

The White King, Vol. I — A selection of material from past issues of Church and King and from the Society's minute books covering 1894-1949, 32 pages.

The White King Vol. II — Covering 1950-1954, 40 pages.

The White King Vol. III — Covering 1954-1974, 40 pages.

The Sanctity of Charles I — the Rev'd. Fr. Charles Roux (republished)

Medals (members only)

Add 10% for postage.

These are available from the chairman at the address on the cover, or at our bookstall at the Banqueting House on January 31st.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Please note that subscriptions are due on or around January 30th and should be sent to: Chris Verity, Esq., The Turnpike, 83 West Town Road, Backwell, Bristol BS48 3BH. He will be available to receive these on January 31th at the back of the Banqueting House hall next to our bookstall. Those who have not paid by April 30th are liable to be deemed to have resigned.

Address changes should be advised to The Rev'd Alan Lee, Flat 1, 8 Chichester Terrace, Brighton BN2 1FO.