

*Dedication: The Anglican Calendar.*

a) *Preliminary Qualifications & Remarks.* b) *William Laud.* c) i) *Charles the First's Day (30 Jan), Charles the Second's Day (or Royal Oak Day) (29 May), & Papists' Conspiracy Day (5 Nov).* c) ii) *Removal of these three holy days from the BCP (1662) in 1859.* d) *Defending King James the First.* e) *Charles I's Day sometimes kept on Monday 31 January.* f) *King Charles the First's Day: with Dedication of Volume 1 in 2008.* g) *King Charles the First's Day: with Dedication of Revised Volume 1 in 2010.*

a) *Preliminary Qualifications & Remarks.*

This first volume of my textual commentary (Matt. 1-14) was dedicated to Almighty God on *Charles I's Day*, 2008; and the revised Volume 1 is dedicated to Almighty God on *Charles I's Day* 2010. This is an Anglican holy day remembering King Charles the Martyr, who gave us a good example by standing steadfast in Christian faith when he was martyred in 1649. Volume 1 was dedicated in the 30th anniversary year of the revival of *Charles I's Day* on the Anglican Calendar in 1978 in Australia; and the revised Volume 1 is dedicated in the 30th anniversary year of the revival of *Charles I's Day* on the Anglican Calendar in 1980 in England. This followed its removal from the Calendar about 120 years before in the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* in 1859. As seen by the 1662 prayer book Office of *King Charles the Martyr's Day*, some secondary remembrance of such events as Charles II hiding in the royal oak in 1651, the tyranny of the interregnum, and Restoration under Charles II in 1660, also historically forms part of *Charles I's Day*. Thus it is also appropriate to remember in the Dedication of this Revised Volume 1 that the year 2010 is the 350th anniversary of the Restoration.

In the 1662 prayer book this was a red-letter day with its own office. Its revival in Australia (1978), like its earlier revival in Canada (1962), was as a black letter day; but since an Anglican clergyman can conduct a service on any day, it is possible to have a service on the day making reference to Charles I, although no specific red-letter day Collect and readings are provided. By contrast, though its revival in England (1980) was as a black letter day, a specific *option* was allowed for it to be kept as a red-letter day with a general Collect and readings usable for any martyr (in which the name of the specific martyr being remembered is inserted). Some consider *Charles I's Day* is best left as a black letter day, (in which case reference can still be made to it in e.g., a church sermon, on a Sunday if it falls on a Sunday in a given year, or the Sunday before or after it falls if in a given year it falls on a week day,) whereas others think a specific service remembering Charles I should be held on 30 January. In general, non-Anglicans do not recognize this day.

I more generally remember *Charles I's Day* as a black letter day. But as the year 2008 approached, a strange thing happened to me as I was working on these textual

commentaries. Although it had not been my original internet to Dedicate Volume 1 on *Charles I's Day*, I was repeatedly impressed by the Holy Ghost that I really should do something to mark the 30th anniversary of the revival of this day, and the matter took on a growing significance in my mind. As I thought and prayed about the matter further, the realization came to me that I should unite these two matters by Dedicating Volume 1 on what to my mind was a black letter day, albeit one that I attach a greater significance to than I would attach to most black letter days. Of course, this is understandable given its historical importance as seen in the fact that it formerly had an Anglican Office. Indeed, in a book I acquired in the early 1980s when the day had only been fairly recently revived in 1978, we read, at "January" "30. Charles, King of England (1600-1649)" (this is its terminology on the Australian Calendar). "The 1662 BCP provided a special service for this day (removed in 1859) . . . . As King, Charles was . . . a staunch defender of the Church of England. His high sense of religious principle and unfeigned faith in God were seen most clearly in the quiet dignity with which he faced death<sup>1</sup>."

Though I never thought this would be the case when I Dedicated the original Volume 1 on *Charles I's Day* in 2008, I ended up remembering the two subsequent *King Charles I's Day* in 2009 and 2010 as red-letter days. My expectation is that from 2011 onwards I shall go back to more normatively remembering it as a black letter day. *But whether remembered as a black letter day, a red letter day, or red letter day with its own Office, the big thing surely is that the day is in some way remembered!*

The matters dealing with the martyrdom of Charles I are complex and not easily unravelled. Sometimes things can be looked at quite briefly, but to understand the issues at stake for *Charles I's Day* this is not possible. In broad-brush terms, Protestantism historically divided between one group more like Luther and the other more like Calvin on a key issue. One group, more like Luther, considered that a church tradition may be retained if it was found to be useful and good, and not contrary to the Word of God. Such are the Lutherans and Reformed Anglicans. The other group, more like Calvin, looked for specific Biblical commands to do certain things. Such was Carlstadt and the Puritans. The matter is complicated by the fact that these are tendencies rather than absolute rules, but this led to disagreements over things like holy days (Rom. 14:5,6), and sometimes moderate consumption of alcohol (Lutherans and Anglicans) as opposed to alcohol prohibition (a tendency, though not an absolute one, among Puritans) (Rom. 14:21).

This replicated the type of thing that sometimes divided New Testament Christians (Col. 2:16-23). E.g., as part of the cultural heritage, Jewish Christians chose to always abstain from food offered to idols, and keep OT dietary laws on "things strangled, and blood," and Gentile Christians were commanded to do likewise when in

---

<sup>1</sup> Sinden, G., *Times and Seasons*, Ambassador Press, Sydney, 1980, Distributed by the AIO (Anglican Information Office) Press, St. Andrew's House, Sydney Square, p. 61 (Collect for Charles I). This Collect is not endorsed by the Anglican Church of Australia, and was produced privately by Sinden. Thus *Charles I's Day* is regarded simply as a black letter day on the Australian Calendar (1978).

fellowship meals with them (Acts 15:20,29; 21:25). But Jewish Christians were prohibited from more generally trying to impose these type of Jewish cultural rules on Gentile Christians (Rom. 14; I Cor. 8; Col. 2:16). Or whereas Jewish Christians seemingly had some form of liturgical worship, whether connected with the Jewish temple (Acts 21) or impliedly evident in the name of Jewish Christian churches as “synagogues” (Jas. 2:1<sup>2</sup>) i.e., a more Lutheran or Anglican type of worship; Gentile Christians seemingly had a more Puritan type of worship. The NT religious cultural divide between Jewish and Gentile Christians thus *in some ways* replicates the Protestant religious cultural divide between Reformed Anglicans and Puritans. It meant that e.g., Anglicans were happy to use a cross as a Christian symbol, whereas Puritans regarded it as an “idol,” seen e.g., in their pulverising destruction of Banbury Cross, *infra*, much to the chagrin of Anglicans who sometimes teach children the nursery rhyme, “Ride a cock horse to Banbury Cross, To see a fine lady upon a white horse; With rings on her fingers and bells on her toes, She shall have music wherever she goes.”

These issues are further complicated by the fact that Reformed Anglicans regard themselves as “Calvinists,” meaning they support *the doctrines of grace* as set forth in Scripture and the 39 Articles, most succinctly stated by John Calvin. But whereas for Reformed Anglican the three great men of the Reformation are Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer; for the Puritans, they would not so qualify Calvin with Cranmer. Rather, they would see Calvin as a progression out of Luther, rather than primarily a succinct articulation of the doctrines of grace. Traditional Reformed Anglicans would thus be more reserved on some elements of Calvin’s teachings, for instance, regarding Calvin’s Geneva as “too strict,” e.g., an over-use of the death penalty, and so there is a higher level of criticism and ambivalence towards Calvin, while still regarding themselves as “Calvinists” with reference to e.g., Articles 10 & 17 of the 39 Articles. But because the Puritans tended to think of being a “Calvinist” as more than this doctrines of grace definition, they tended to think of Reformed Anglicans as anti-Calvinist, and since “the opposite” to Calvinism is Arminianism, they bandied the word “Arminian” about in an inaccurate way. E.g., at Laud’s trial, *infra*, they went so far as to brand Lutheranism as Arminian. Laud thus found himself defending “Lutheran Protestants” whom his Puritan accusers said “are of the very same opinion, or with very little difference from those ... [in] Arminianism.” It thus became clear that if Luther had been Archbishop of Canterbury, he would have been put on trial for being an “Arminian.” Thus one must exercise great caution with the inaccurate way the Puritan Revolutionaries sometimes used the word, “Arminian.”

A further complication of the Puritan Revolution is that contrary to the normative position of Puritans looking for a specific injunction to do something (“The regulatory principle”), the English (and Irish) Puritans of the Revolutionary republic of 1642-1660 employed a form of “natural law” based on Rutherford’s *Lex Rex* which actually set aside clear Biblical injunctions against e.g., “seditions” and “murder” (Gal. 5:20,21). Thus Reformed Anglicans found themselves in the position of essentially, saying, “the natural

---

<sup>2</sup> Greek, “*sunagogen* (‘assembly’ AV, or ‘synagogue,’ feminine singular nominative noun, from *sunagoge*).”

law we use *is never contrary to Scripture*, whereas the natural law you revolutionary Puritans use *is repugnant to Scripture*.” Given that Puritans here went over a demarcation line that Bible believing Anglicans (and in general Scottish Presbyterians) were not prepared to cross, this is more than a simple reversal of the normative position, in which Reformed Anglicans are defending a form of natural law that is *not contrary to Scripture*, whereas the Puritans are saying, “Where is a specific Biblical command to do this or that?”

In broad terms, there are five views on Oliver Cromwell’s republic.

*View 1: The traditional Reformed Anglican view.* Charles I is regarded as a Solomonic type figure, making some mistakes e.g., marrying a Roman Catholic wife, but like King Solomon, King Charles is still remembered as a saint (Neh. 13:26). We should “Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17), and oppose “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:20,21) such as those of Cromwell and the Puritan republican revolutionaries of 1640-60; and also “liars” (Rev. 21:8) such as Rutherford, who falsely claimed that Anglican kneeling to receive Communion constituted intrinsic idolatry. E.g., when in 1637 Lord Craighall said he had no such intention to idolatrously adore the Communion bread, Rutherford said to His Lordship, “Your intention to honour Christ is nothing, seeing that religious kneeling ... doth necessarily import religious and divine adoration.” (Rutherford’s Letter 174 / 86). The Final Rubric of the Communion Service in the 1662 prayer book condemns Puritans like Rutherford as operating “out of malice and obstinacy.”

In his death, as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland*, Charles I gave a Christian witness. He received Communion at St. James’ Palace on 30 Jan 1649, before going to the execution block to be beheaded; where he again gave a Christian testimony, in Christ-like manner forgiving his enemies, and dying with steadfast Christian faith at the hands of virulently anti-Anglican Puritan revolutionaries, who e.g., made the prayer book “illegal” from 1645 to 1660<sup>3</sup>. He is thus known as “King Charles the Martyr.” The 1662 Caroline prayer book is a Restoration prayer book, and its associated Preface in the 1662 Act of Uniformity (which was originally printed with the prayer book), refers to “the great and scandalous neglect of Ministers in using the said Order of Liturgy” as “great mischiefs” that had arisen “during the time of the late unhappy troubles” of the 1642-60 republic. And from 1662 to 1859, the prayer book included the red letter day Office of “King Charles the Martyr.” Happily, *Charles I’s Day* has been now revived on Anglican Calendars in Canada since 1962, in Australia since 1978, and England since 1980.

*View 2: A Scottish Presbyterian view (not held by all Scottish Presbyterians; and*

---

<sup>3</sup> “An Ordinance for taking away the Book of Common Prayer, and for establishing and putting in execution of the Directory ...” (4 Jan. 1645), in: Firth, C.H. & Rait, R.S. (Editors), *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum 1642-1660*, Wyman & Sons, London, UK, 1911, Vol. 1, pp. 582-609. Cf. Ordinance 14 March 1646 (*Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 835), “That the Chappels or places in the Houses of the King and his Children, shall ... for ... Divine Duties ... be performed according to the Directory ...”.

*in more recent centuries adopted by some Anglicans*). Scottish Presbyterian Puritans of this type consider we should “Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17), and oppose “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:20,21) such as those of Cromwell and the Puritan republican revolutionaries of 1640-60, most of whom were English Puritans. They do not claim that Anglicans kneeling to take Communion thereby commit intrinsic idolatry. Thus Acts of the Scottish Parliament continued to be reckoned in the regnal years of Charles I, e.g., “Acta (Latin, ‘Acts’) Parliamentorum (of Parliament) Caroli (of Charles) I (the First)” in “Januarij (January) 1649;” after the 1642 republic had been formed in England (and Ireland). Then following the murder of Charles I on 30 Jan. 1649, the Scottish Parliament proclaimed his heir and son, Charles II, “King of Scotland” *et al* on 5 Feb. 1649. (The actual proclamation was broader and extended to the King’s right to be monarch of the three kingdoms. This was thus a clear repudiation of Cromwell’s republican claims.) Likewise, Acts of the Scottish Parliament were then reckoned under Charles II’s regnal years e.g., “Acta (Acts) Parliamentorum (of Parliament) Caroli (of Charles) II (the Second)” on “V (5) Februarii (February) MDCXLIX (1649).”<sup>4</sup>

With the support of the Scottish Parliament, Charles II was later crowned as King at Scone on 1 Jan. 1650. Scone was the traditional place for the coronation of Scottish kings from the 9th to 15th centuries. This was thus a very traditional Scottish coronation of Charles II. The Scottish Parliament also supplied King Charles II with troops to fight against Cromwell. Charles II was later defeated by Cromwell’s republican army at Dunbar (1650) and Worcester (1651); and he went into interregnum on the Continent till 1660. This Puritan view considers Charles I was a king unjustly murdered; but it does not specifically recognize Charles I as a Christian martyr. Under this view, it should be noted that e.g., the *Battle of Worcester* was a battle between a largely English Puritan republican army under Cromwell, against a largely Scottish Puritan royalist army under Charles II.

Elements of this anti-Cromwell sentiment were to some extent present in the usage of the *Church of Scotland* 1650 Caroline Psalter (the *Scots Metrical Psalter*). This was the source for songs sung in the *Church of Scotland* for the first 300 years, and is still used in parts of the Scottish Highlands, and by various Free Presbyterian and Reformed Presbyterian Churches<sup>5</sup> e.g., the *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia*. Thus e.g., a Free Presbyterian Minister in the *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia*, Denis Muldoon, says, “The 1650 Psalter was published without any tunes and it was not until 1666 that twelve tunes ... were made available ... . This was more the result of troubled political times than ... a deliberate policy. Charles II was proclaimed king in the same year as the Psalter was published. However, Cromwell’s army marched into Scotland

---

<sup>4</sup> *The Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland and the Government during the Commonwealth*, Printed by Authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty’s Treasury, 1872, Vol. VI, pp. 124, 150-151 (Charles I, Jan. 1649), 157 (Proclamation of Charles II as King, Feb. 1649) (British Library SPR Mic. A150, Volumes VI to VII).

<sup>5</sup> “Hymnbooks of the Church of Scotland,” *Wikipedia* (30 Sept. 2009) ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hymnbooks\\_of\\_the\\_Church\\_of\\_Scotland](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hymnbooks_of_the_Church_of_Scotland)).

and occupied it for nine years. Church worship was greatly disrupted. Singing of Psalms ceased in many places. Millar ... describes the decline in music which followed this 'invasion from the south of the border by a pestilent type of Puritanism, inconceivably arrogant and intolerant, which in the name of a supposedly superior piety sought to cast discredit on every form of art used in association with worship'<sup>6</sup>."

*View 3: An English Puritan view (not held by all English Puritans).* This view (also historically followed by many Irish Puritans,) considers that if a ruler is a "tyrant," then Biblical injunctions against "seditions" and "murderers" (Gal. 5:20; Rev. 21:8) may be set aside. This view claims Charles I was such a "tyrant," and usually falsely claims that he was trying to reconcile the Anglican Church with the Roman Church. The Puritan revolutionary republic is usually further justified on the basis that men like Cromwell and Rutherford were "great" "Christian" men, whereas "Charles I was not." There is an overlap between Views 3 & 5; and such thinking has also been present among some North American Puritans, it being *one* factor present in the American War of Independence forming the USA.

On the one hand, by the King's order, Restoration Anglicans placed Cromwell's head on a public gazing pole at Westminster Hall next to Westminster Parliament from 1661 throughout Charles II's reign, and hung the rest of Cromwell's body in chains at Tyburn in London's Hyde Park. Rutherford was also wanted by the government on charges of high treason, but he died in 1661 before he could be prosecuted. Restoration Anglicans enacted the Clarendon Code and Tests Acts, which barred English (and Irish) Puritans from various positions; for "seditions" and "murders" (Gal. 5:20,21) evident in Cromwell's glorification as found in View 3 is a serious matter. But on the other hand, from 1689, Reformed Anglicans holding View 1 and Presbyterians in Scotland holding View 2, worked together in close alliance as fellow Protestant Christians.

*View 4: The Puseyite View.* Unlike View 1 which is pro-Charles, *anti-Laud*, and anti-Cromwell (and also anti-Jacobite and hence pro-Williamite), View 4 is pro-Charles, *pro-Laud*, and anti-Cromwell (and frequently pro-Jacobite and anti-Williamite). It shares in common with View 3 the idea that not just Laud, but also Charles I, sought to Romanize the Anglican Church. This view fails to do justice to the fact that Charles I who appointed Laud Primate of the *Church of England*, also appointed Ussher Primate of the *Church of Ireland* i.e., the evidence is that Charles largely acted in a traditional patron-type way to his two Primates, giving them a good deal of autonomy. *While Charles may be fairly criticized for not restraining Laud more*, it is clear from his

---

<sup>6</sup> Muldoon, D.K., "Psalm Singing in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland and Australia," p. 2, quoting Millar, P., *Four Centuries of Scottish Psalmody*, Oxford University Press, England, UK, 1947, p. 110 ([http://www.pceasydney.org.au/Sermons/Psalm\\_Singing.pdf](http://www.pceasydney.org.au/Sermons/Psalm_Singing.pdf)) Patrick Millar (d. 1951) says in his Preface that he had been "appointed" by the "General Assembly of the *Church of Scotland* ... to prepare a historical survey of Scottish Psalmody, with special reference to the 1650 Psalter."

conduct with Ussher that he was not the instigator of Laud's innovations. View 4 seeks to misuse Charles I's Day to promote Puseyism<sup>7</sup>.

*View 5: The secular "democratic" view.* This 19th century view sees Cromwell's republic as "a milestone" in "the growth of parliamentary democracy." Like Cromwell, it seeks e.g., to place all power in the House of Commons, but whereas the Puritan republican revolutionaries sought to abolish the House of Lords and monarchy, this view, at least in the UK, seeks to retain both as rubber stamps.

The *Lex Rex* English Puritan view that such "natural law" means one can set aside the Bible's Divine Law (View 3) is pure religious liberalism. It was understandably rejected by most Scottish Puritans whose Parliament continued to recognize Charles I's regnal years from 1642 to 1649, and then Charles II's regnal years till Scotland was occupied by Cromwell's General, Monck. Hence George Ella notes the glorification of Rutherford and his *Lex Rex* by "antinomian politico-religious extremists"<sup>8</sup>. This also relates to the removal of *Charles I's Day* from the Anglican Calendar in 1859, and associated glorification of Cromwell in the secular "democratic view" (View 5). I.e., the secularists want a historically known "hero" figure who considers "natural law" may override and take the place of Biblical Divine Law (though their anti-Divine Law "hit-list" is much longer than was Cromwell's). To understand this, is also to better understand why Charles I is indeed a Christian martyr (View 1). I.e., with steadfast Christian faith, he died upholding the Biblical teaching of e.g., Matt. 19:18; 22:21; Rom. 13:1-9.

Opposition to View 1 has also existed from those with republican sentiments. E.g., in a 1716 *King Charles the Martyr's Day* sermon at Christchurch Church of Ireland Cathedral, Dublin, Bishop Ashe says, "I know there is a set of loose antimonarchal men, who would quite abrogate the observation of this day, and by virulent pamphlets either justify this murder, or extenuate the guilt thereof. But those very attempts do effectually demonstrate the necessity of continuing" it. Bishop Ashe does not thereby seek to white-wash Charles I, saying of "this good prince, as he had many great and eminent virtues," he "had also some" "imperfections, and might thereby be misled" on occasions "into mistakes in government, which the ... parliament ... might have reformed by moderate and peaceful counsels<sup>9</sup>."

---

<sup>7</sup> I am advised that the *Church of England* revival of *Charles I's Day* in 1980 owed a lot to Puseyite influence (View 4). To this I can but point out that like Popery, Puseyism is a mix of truth and error. Thus to the extent that these Puseyites support *King Charles the Martyr's Day* they hold to an element of truth, although to this it must be added, that they are known to greatly abuse the day by using it to promote their errors.

<sup>8</sup> Ella, G., *English Churchman* 13 & 20 Feb. 2009, EC 7760, p. 2.

<sup>9</sup> Ashe, St. George, A sermon preached at Christchurch in Dublin, January 30th, 1716 [literally, "1715/16" i.e., if using the New Year's Day 1 Jan. Calendar, 1716, but if using the New Year's Day 25 March Calendar, 1715], before their Excellencies the Lord Justices, and the House of Lords, by St. George, Lord Bishop of Clogher, Published by

Likewise, the issue of whether or not Charles is truly “a martyr” is an old debating point between traditional Anglican Protestants and Puritan Protestants. E.g., in his 1713 *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* sermon preached at Christchurch Church of Ireland Cathedral, Dublin, the Reverend Mr. John Echlin refers to Puritans who would not use “the name of ‘Martyr,’ which our [Anglican] Church bestows on” Charles, thereby adding insult to injury, for “as they robbed him of the Imperial Crown of these Kingdoms” of England, Ireland, and Scotland, so likewise “they would spoil him too of that martyrdom.” With regard to *King Charles the Martyr’s Day*, such persons did not acknowledge “the institution of this Anniversary day,” nor “the continuance of its observation<sup>10</sup>.”

Some conflict may occur e.g., between View 3 and 5, or within Views 3 & 5, as to what is “tyrannical.” E.g., such thinking has been developed with notions of “human rights,” and while those following View 3 would generally be anti-homosexual, those of View 5 may claim it would be “tyrannical” to discriminate against homosexuals. Those following View 5 have, to the applause of those following View 3, erected a disgraceful statue of Oliver Cromwell at Westminster Parliament<sup>11</sup>.

---

the House of Lords, Printed for W. Taylor at the Ship in Paternoster Row, London, 1716 [literally “1715/16”], pp. 7,14. (Electronic copy held in “Eighteenth Century Collections Online” at Fisher Library, Sydney University.)

<sup>10</sup> “The Royal Martyr,” A Sermon preached before Their Excellencies the Lord Justices of Ireland in Christchurch Dublin, on the 30th of January, 1712/13 [i.e., 1712 on an *Annunciation Day* New Year’s Day Calendar of 25 March, or 1713 on a New Year’s Day Calendar of 1 January], by John Echlin, Master of Arts, Published by Their Excellencies Command, 2nd edition, Printed by H. Clements, London, 1713, p. 2. *King Charles I’s Day* was instituted in Ireland by Proclamation of the Lords Justices and Privy Council on 21 January 1661, which required e.g., that shops be closed and Ministers preached to their congregations in denunciation of “this barbarous murder.” The English Act of 1661 (12 Charles II, chapter 30) for keeping 30 January was extended to Ireland and other English Dominions. Then the *Church of Ireland’s* Book of Common Prayer of 1666 contained the Office of King Charles the Martyr’s Day. (Connolly, S.J., “The Church of Ireland and the Royal Martyr: Regicide and Revolution in Anglican Political Thought c. 1660-c.1745,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Cambridge University Press, Vol. 54, No. 3, July 2003, pp. 484-506, at pp. 486-487.)

<sup>11</sup> See McGrath, G.B. (myself), “How We Should Regard Cromwell and Charles I,” *English Churchman* (EC) 7757, 2 & 9 January, 2009, p. 2; “Samuel Rutherford” (pro-Rutherford, by M. Johnson), EC 7759, 30 Jan. & 6 Feb. 2009, p. 2; and EC 7760, 13 & 20 Feb. 2009, p. 2 (anti-Rutherford by G. Ella); McGrath, G.B. (myself), EC 7772, 31 July & 7 Aug. 2009, p. 2 & EC 7774, 28 Aug & 4 Sept. 2009, pp. 2-3; McGrath, G.B. (myself), “Calvin and Charles I,” *British Church Newspaper*, No. 169, 25 Sept. 2009, p. 10.

View 1 is the type of view held by Bishop Donald Robinson, formerly Archbishop of Sydney (1982-1993). *Wikipedia* says that Archbishop Robinson was a “notable” “Archbishop” who “was highly regarded in Sydney for his Evangelical teaching<sup>12</sup>.” I was Confirmed by Bishop Robinson in 1980 when he was Bishop of Parramatta (Western Sydney, 1973-1982). I have spoken to Bishop Robinson on a number of occasions in recent years after the 1662 prayer book service of Evensong at St. Swithun’s Pymble. E.g., Bishop Robinson said to me that as one who had taught prayer book at Moore College (Vice Principal at Moore Theological College, 1959-1972), he was familiar with, and agreed with the theology in, all three Offices removed in 1859. He tells me he now stays away from St. Andrew’s Cathedral as much as he reasonably can as a consequence of the semi-Puritan Dean Phillip Jensen’s de-Anglicanizing and Puritanizing of it; a sentiment which the Bishop and I concur on. E.g., on one occasion in October 2007 (20th Sunday after Trinity), Bishop Robinson told me he was against what Dean Jensen had done in the Cathedral by removing the Choir from various services and elevated Communion Table with associated step for visibility and kneeling.

Archbishop Robinson and I used to also sometimes talk together in 1987/8 after a Chapel service at St. Paul’s College, Sydney University, when I was a student there, and he as Archbishop of Sydney was the College Visitor and as such he used to sometimes attend a Chapel Service. With some contextual reference to this St. Paul’s (Anglican) College backdrop, on one occasion in August 2008 (11th Sunday after Trinity), he told me when he was Bishop of Parramatta, he was on a prayer book Committee in which he was one of those who decided to give a delegated power to revise the Calendar to a former Warden of St. Paul’s College (1946-1963), Felix Arnott (after whom the “Arnott Building” is named that I had an upper room in during 1987, and who died while I was at College in July 1988). As in 1978, so now, Bishop Robinson approves of the decision to revive *King Charles I’s Day* as a black letter day on the Australian Calendar, with which I too am in agreement<sup>13</sup>.

As one who supports View 1, I nevertheless note that the historically Scottish Presbyterian View 2 has in more historically recent times come to be adopted by some Anglicans. For instance, it is the type of view held by Bishop Edward Malcolm, the Presiding Bishop of the *Church of England (Continuing)* since 2001<sup>14</sup>. *Wikipedia* says

---

<sup>12</sup> “Anglican Diocese of Sydney,” *Wikipedia* (16 Nov. 2009), “Notable former Archbishops,” ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anglican\\_Diocese\\_of\\_Sydney](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anglican_Diocese_of_Sydney)).

<sup>13</sup> More generally, I would disagree with most of the changes to the 1662 Calendar in 1978, and I consider reviving *Charles I’s Day* was not a change to the 1662 Calendar, but a return to it after the day was removed in 1859. Bishop Robinson tells me all the Calendar changes were put through by a delegated power given to Felix Arnott. Arnott’s work is of a very uneven standard, and I regret to say that amidst the time the Committee spent on other things, Arnott’s work was not always carefully scrutinized. See my footnote comments at Preface “f) King Charles the First’s Day: with Dedication of Volume 1 in 2008,” at “The BCP Calendar has ten broad divisions.”

<sup>14</sup> Letter of Bishop Malcolm to myself, 1 June 2009; in reply to my letter of 11

that as “Presiding Bishop of the *Church of England (Continuing)*” he presides over “an independent Anglican church body in the Evangelical or Low Church tradition,” and he was “previously a missionary ... of the *Church of England*<sup>15</sup>.” Anglicans holding *View 2* may be happy for 30 January to be a black letter day on the Anglican Calendar, and referred to under names such as *Charles I’s Day* or *King Charles’ Day* or *King Charles the First’s Day*. But they do not support references to Charles I as a “martyr.” The revival of *Charles I’s Day* on the Anglican Calendar of Canada in 1962 as a black-letter day entitled, “Charles Stuart, King, beheaded 1649;” and on the Anglican Calendar of Australia in 1978 as a black-letter day entitled, “Charles, King of England (1600-1649),” to some extent reflects this *View 2*<sup>16</sup>. I.e., this terminology in the Canadian and Australian Calendars allows for *View 1*, but does not go beyond *View 2*. Thus like the memory of the day from 1661 to 1662 under Act of Westminster Parliament<sup>17</sup>, the earlier revival of *King Charles I’s Day* on the Anglican Calendars of Canada and Australia avoided the word, “martyr” i.e., thus allowing for either the view that he was a martyr (traditional Anglican view) or not a martyr (traditional Scottish Presbyterian view, adopted by some Anglicans after 1859).

---

May 2009, which included an attachment of my *English Churchman* letter 2 & 9 Jan. 09 (with corrections of following edition) referring to these five views. E.g., he says, “I agree with you in the main [i.e., *View 1*], but not entirely. I have always been against the execution of King Charles by Cromwell and the Regicides, and admired the way he met his end. I temper it with the fact that I do not think King Charles acted altogether aright.” He makes the qualification that he does not regard Charles as a “martyr” because the political situation meant he did not die for Christ’s “sake *only*,” but a combination of “Christ *and*” something else (i.e., *View 2*).

<sup>15</sup> “Edward Malcolm,” *Wikipedia* (29 June 2009), ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edward\\_Malcolm](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edward_Malcolm)).

<sup>16</sup> Gilbert Sinden’s “Times & Seasons” (1980), *op. cit.*, has optional collects with introductory comments for use with the 1978 Calendar (much of which I disagree with as indeed I disagree with most of the changes in the 1978 Calendar). These were not approved by the Anglican Church of Australia, but are a private production. Sinden writes as a Puseyite. At p. 61, in the introductory comments Sinden makes certain criticisms of Charles I e.g., “Charles was frequently ... unwise,” and takes *View 2*. More positively, Sinden also says, “The 1662 BCP provided a special service for this day (removed in 1859) which was ordered to be kept as a day of ... fasting and humiliation. As King, Charles was ... a staunch defender of the Church of England. His high sense of religious principle and unfeigned faith in God were seen most clearly in the quiet dignity with which he faced death.” Sinden’s Collect for *King Charles I’s Day* makes no reference to “martyrdom.” It reflects *View 2*, while allowing for someone to hold *View 1*; “Father, we give thanks for the memory of King Charles who died in steadfast faith. Give us the courage to follow his good example and to be loyal and faithful to you to the end. We ask this through our Lord Jesus Christ” etc. .

<sup>17</sup> 12 Car. II, chapter 30 (passed in January 1661). This Act was extended to Ireland and England’s Dominions e.g., Wales.

By contrast, the 1662-1859 prayer book Office was entitled, “King Charles the Martyr,” and the revival of *Charles I’s Day* on the Church of England Calendar in 1980 as a black-letter day with a general collect of a martyr if it is optionally kept as a red-letter day<sup>18</sup>, is entitled, “Charles I, King, Martyr, 1649.” Thus like the memory of the day from 1662 to 1859 on the *Church of England’s* prayer book Calendar, or 1666 to 1859 on the *Church of Ireland’s* prayer book Calendar, the later revival of *King Charles I’s Day* on the Anglican Calendar of England uses the word, “martyr” i.e., thus clearly endorsing the view that he was a martyr (traditional Anglican view).

Hence in a terminology somewhat reminiscent of the 1662’s black letter day for “Beheading of St. John Baptist” (29 Aug.), which though not specifically using the word “martyr,” refers to an undisputable martyr; but in a terminology which also might be interpreted for a murdered, but not martyred king, like “Edward, King of the West Saxons,” *infra*, the Anglican Calendar of Canada in 1962 revived *King Charles I’s Day* as the black-letter day, “Charles Stuart, King, beheaded 1649”<sup>19</sup>. And in a terminology somewhat reminiscent of either the 1662’s black letter day for “Edmund, King” (20 Nov.), a recognized martyr who as King of East Anglia died in 869/870 at the hands of the Danes after refusing the choice of life if he renounced his Christian faith, (and who is buried at Bury St. Edmunds, West Suffolk, England<sup>20</sup>); or “Edward, King of the West

---

<sup>18</sup> The connected *Church of England* general Collect of a martyr, i.e., one which may be used for any martyr and whose name is inserted at “N” for name, reads, “Almighty God, by whose grace and power your holy martyr N [on 30 Jan. one would insert, ‘King Charles I’] triumphed over suffering and was faithful unto death: strengthen us with your grace, that we may endure reproach and persecution, and faithfully bear witness to the name of Jesus Christ our Lord; who is alive and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, one God, now and for ever.” As noted in the Dedication Sermon of this revised Volume 1 (Appendix 5), this 1980 Collect for use with the 1662 prayer book may have the language modified to “thee” and “thou” etc., which is what I do at the beginning of this Dedication Sermon on *Charles I’s Day* 2010.

<sup>19</sup> Compare the *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* sermon (1669) of Canon Thomas Lambert (1616-1694) of Salisbury Cathedral, who with respect to “those bloody and barbarous regicides,” draws an analogy with “John the Baptist” who also “dyed [died] for righteousness’ sake.” *Sad Memorials of the Royal Martyr*, being a Sermon preached on the Solemnity of His Majesty’s Martyrdom in the Cathedral Church of Salisbury, 1669, by Thomas Lambert, Prebend of the Cathedral, Printed by Thomas Milbourn for Robert Clavel, London, 1670, pp. 6,15. (Copy from Union Theological Seminary Library, New York, USA; in Early English Books online, British Library, London, UK.)

<sup>20</sup> The story of King Edmund’s death at the hands of heathen Danes in 869 A.D. (on a diverse calendar 870), is not disputed, but there are two broad accounts that give rise to three possible views that in some way regard him as a “martyr.” The first account of Edmund’s death is that he was slain on the battlefield, which gives rise to two possible views. The first possible view is that since he died defending a kingdom professing Christianity against heathens, on a broad definition of the term “martyr,” together with all

Saxons” (18 March), who is not regarded as a martyr, but was murdered in 978 at the age of 16 by his wicked step-mother, Elfrida, while drinking the stirrup cup at Corfe Castle; we find that the Anglican Calendar of Australia in 1978 revived *King Charles I’s Day* as the black-letter day, “Charles, King of England (1600-1649).” With regard to the

---

those who died on the battlefield on his side, he may in some broad sense be regarded as a “martyr,” however, this a permissible but non-preferable usage of the term “martyr,” and so in general the term “martyr” should not be used for him. The second possible view differs from the first in that reference to Edmund as a “martyr” is permissible and a preferable usage of the term. On these first two possible views, one may specifically remember King Edmund on 20 November in his role as commander-in-chief of the armed forces, and so there is a secondary memory on this day for all who fought and either lived or were slain in the battle with the heathens, but we especially remember Edmund because he was a king, in harmony with the words of our Lord, “Render . . . unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s” (Matthew 22:21); and those of St. Peter, “Fear God. Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17), as it is especially appropriate that the memory of such kings be honoured. And the second account of Edmund’s death is that he was taken prisoner by the heathen Danes and killed by being shot with arrows and beheaded by the heathens, in connection with his profession of Christian faith and refusal to accept vassalage status to the Danes. This gives rise to the third possible view, that on a narrow definition of the term “martyr,” he may be regarded as a “martyr,” being one who chose to die for his profession of Christian faith, rather than renounce his profession of faith. See *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, (thought to be written c. 890 A.D. written while witnesses still alive says, says “King Edmund fought with them; but the Danes gained the victory, and slew the king,”) translated by the Reverend James Henry Ingram (1774-1850), President of Trinity College, Oxford (Longman, London, UK, 1823), with additional readings from the translation of John Allen Giles (Bohn’s Antiquarian Library, London, UK, 1847), Produced by Douglas B. Killings, 1996, 2008, Project Gutenberg (<https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/657>, at <https://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/657/pg657.txt>); John Allen Giles (1808-1884) Bishop John Asser (d. 909) *Life of King Alfred*, A.D. 893 (Views 1 & 2, written while witnesses still alive says, he says, “Edmund was slain in the battle” (London, 1847, in Henry G. Bohn’s Antiquarian Library), Online Medieval and Classical Library, prepared for internet by Douglas B. Killings, 1997 (<http://mellibrary.org/KingAlfred/alfred.html>); & Lord Hervey (Editor) “The Passion of Saint Eadmund by Abbo [d. 1004] of Fluery,” *Corolla Sancti Eadmundi: The Garland of Saint Eadmund [/ Edmund] King and Martyr*, E.P. Dutton and Company, New York, USA, 1907, at pp. 7-59, sections IX & X (<https://torrencia.org/edmund/lattrans.html>) (View 2, “martyr” in narrow sense of word, written about 120 years after Edmund’s death, says he was taken prisoner by the heathen Danes and killed by being shot with arrows by the heathens and then beheaded, in connection with his profession of Christian faith and refusal to accept vassalage status to the Danes). *Update 2021*: After careful consideration of the facts in connection with two sermons on King Edmund’s Day 2021, while I allow I could be wrong, of these three possible views, on the presently available data I would favour the first view; and in doing so I would say, that having examined the source documents for the two accounts of his death, Abbo’s claims strike me as typical mediaeval Romish embellishment.

Canadian terminology, “Charles Stuart, King, beheaded 1649,” was King Charles simply murdered like King Edward (View 2), or martyred like St. John Baptist (View 1)? With regard to the Australian terminology, “Charles, King of England (1600-1649),” was King Charles simply murdered like King Edward (View 2), or martyred like King Edmund (View 1)? Though these two Anglican Calendars allow either interpretation for this black-letter day on 30 January, I for one do not doubt that he was a Christian martyr.

Significantly, the revival of *Charles I’s Day* on the *Church of England* Calendar in 1980 is unambiguous. It unapologetically embraces the correct and traditional Anglican teaching that Charles is a martyr. This Calendar reads, “Charles I, King, Martyr, 1649.” Thus this must surely go down as one the *Church of England’s* more positive accomplishments of recent times<sup>21</sup>.

On the one hand, I regard *View 2* as a *weak* view, which fails to do justice to the fact that if a *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* dies standing on such clear Biblical teachings as those opposing “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:20,21) and requiring that men, “Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17), then he has died for Christ and the Christian faith as set forth in the Bible. But on the other hand, I can accept that those holding *View 2* (the weak view) are clearly inside those broad Biblical requirements that we oppose “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:20,21) and “Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17); even though they are generally more critical of Charles I than those of *View 1* (the strong view), and specifically do not consider he can be fairly called a Christian “martyr.” Since the issue of whether Charles died as simply the victim of a murder (View 2) or as a martyr (View 1) involves some level of interpretation of the facts, I can accept the reality of such disagreements, even though I do not doubt he was a martyr. Thus I consider tolerance towards *View 2* in the context of an alliance between those holding to *the strong view* (View 1) and those holding to *the weak view* (View 2), is not too high a price to pay if that alliance defeats those holding *the wrong view* (View 3), even though it is a price I

---

<sup>21</sup> On the one hand, there is much that we Anglicans of the holy Reformed faith have been concerned about in the *Church of England*, evident in the rise of both Puseyism and religious liberalism. These concerns have grown more in recent times with e.g., the *Church of England’s* ordination of women priests and increasing tolerance of homosexuality. These types of things are shocking and disturbing developments, and reflect an indefensible increasing departure of the *Church of England* from the Bible, whereas she should, as in her better days, have her anchor ropes to the Bible. Nevertheless, it would be folly to suggest that everything the *Church of England* has done in recent times is wrong e.g., it continues to do some good charity work. Certainly their revival of *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* in 1980 must go down as one of their positive accomplishments, albeit amidst a series of negative developments in that Church, and it is in this highly qualified context that I selectively refer to it favorably in these textual commentaries. Thus I look for the good amidst the bad, but I do not deny, nor excuse, nor condone, the bad. I pray God, that in his infinite mercy, he might yet work a revival in the *Church of England*, that she might once again be the flag ship of the Bible based and Bible believing, Protestant fleet. “Nevertheless not my will, but thine be done,” Heavenly “Father,” through Jesus Christ my Lord. Amen. (Luke 22:42).

do not like having to pay, would prefer not to have to pay, and would not pay if I did not have to.

Historically, those holding *the weak view* (View 2) as Scots Presbyterians, worked in alliance with those holding *the strong view* (View 1) as Anglicans (in England & Ireland), against those holding *the wrong view* (View 3) as English (and Irish) Puritans. And so likewise in contemporary times, we find that those holding *the weak view* (View 2) as Anglicans, may work in alliance with those holding *the strong view* (View 1) as Anglicans, in order to put *King Charles I' Day* back on the Calendar as a black letter day at 30 January. And so it is that we find *history repeats itself*, for as in older times, so in newer times, *the weak* of View 2 join up with *the strong* of View 1, in order to defeat *the wrong* of View 3. As far as I am concerned, *the big thing* is to get King Charles I back on the Calendar such as one finds in Australia since 1978 with the black-letter day, "Charles, King of England (1600-1649)." *Anything more than this, such as we find in the English Calendar from 1980, is just icing on the cake!*

With regard to the revolutionary English Puritan's claims that Biblical injunctions against seditions and murders can be set aside for a so called "tyrant," it is notable that New Testament injunctions such as Matthew 22:21; Romans 13:7, I Peter 2:17; were said in a context where many of the Roman emperors were tyrants, and all of them forbade Christians freedom of worship. In fact, while we do not know why e.g., God permitted a tyrant like Nero, I think that one of the reasons was to make the very point that even if we are faced with a tyrant, we are not allowed to engage in sedition or try to kill him. Why? The answer to that is necessarily speculative. My own view on this could well be wrong. But I sometimes think about how when we are heaven, and have been there for even a long time, says 100s or 1000s of years, because we will still have limited minds relative to the infinite mind of God, then due to these limitations we may simply not be able to understand some of the things God says or does. If so, because we do not believe in sedition or murder, even against a tyrant; and because we know that God is perfect, we will accept whatever things God says or does that we cannot understand.

But if, in theory, God were to set aside his own infallible statements in Galatians 5:20,21, that those involved in "seditions" and "murders" "shall not inherit the kingdom of God;" and if, in theory, God were to admit into heaven a man like Oliver Cromwell or Samuel Rutherford; then what would happen when, as well it might, a point came where due to the limited nature of their brains, they wrongly considered God was some kind of bad "tyrant" on the basis of what he said or did? Then, good Christian reader, we would have a rebellion such as we now have under Lucifer! But what saith the Word of God? It says in Nahum 1:9 that God's character is such that under him, "affliction shall not rise up the second time." And so he tells us in Galatians 5:20,21 that he will by no means admit into heaven persons such as Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford in the first place!

Do we Reformed Anglicans thereby deny that Laud caused a lot of trouble, that he should have been disciplined, and it was a weakness of Charles that he failed to more actively restrain him? Absolutely not! *We do not white-wash Charles I, any more than*

*we white-wash such Biblical kings as Solomon and David!* The Final Rubric of the Communion Service in the 1662 prayer book recognizes guilt on both the Anglican side (Laud) and Puritan side (Rutherford), and unites Anglican and Puritan Protestants against transubstantiation idolatry. It says, “Communicants should receive the same kneeling ... for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ ..., and for the avoiding of ... profanation and disorder ... ” (Matt. 15:27,28; 23:12; I Cor. 14:40). But “lest” “kneeling” “either out of ignorance and infirmity,” e.g., some of those under Rutherford’s spell; “or out of malice and obstinacy,” such as is the case with Rutherford himself, “be misconstrued and depraved: it is hereby declared, that thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any corporeal presence of Christ’s natural flesh and body.”

Cranmer (1552) followed Zwingli’s symbolic view of the Lord’s Supper, given “in remembrance,” so the Communicant “feed on” Christ “in thy heart by faith” (Communion Service, 1662). But the 1662 final rubric changed the 1552 rubric rejecting the “real and essential presence ... of Christ’s natural flesh and blood” (transubstantiation), to rejecting “any corporeal presence of Christ’s natural flesh and blood” (transubstantiation or consubstantiation). Before 1662 some Anglicans argued that there was no *transubstantiation* i.e., *no change of the bread and wine into Christ’s body and blood*, but there was a *consubstantiation* type *corporeal presence* of Christ’s body and blood which were *in, under, around*, and so *united with* the bread and wine. Following the Laudians usage of Lutheran consubstantiation, from 1662 Anglicans here specifically prohibited it, and thus put a clear distance between themselves and Laud<sup>22</sup>.

The rubric says “adoration” is “idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians.” Then contextually rejecting both transubstantiation and consubstantiation, “the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here: it being against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one.” This Anglican Protestant language in conjunction with I John 4:2,3; Articles 19, 28, & 31, and the Homilies (Article 35), identifies the Roman Pope as the Antichrist via transubstantiation.

As noted above, unlike the Puseyites of View 4, we Reformed Anglicans of View 1 are anti-Laud (though not as strongly so as the Puritans who condemned Laud for his Anglicanism and Laudianism alike). Connected with consubstantiation, a small circle of Laudians became over-focused on the Communion Table, calling it a Lutheran type “altar,” and unlike Lutherans also bowing to it whether or not the consecrated sacrament was there. This acted as a backdrop that allowed the Puritan propagandist, Rutherford, to then try and claim a universal idolatrous adoration of the Communion elements by all Anglicans i.e., both Reformed Anglicans and Laudian Anglicans. His deceitful mechanism for this was Anglican kneeling at Communion.

---

<sup>22</sup> Written in the same general era, compare the Puritan, Francis Turretin (1623-1687), in his 28<sup>th</sup> Question on *The Corporeal Presence of Christ in the [Lord’s] Supper* (Part1). Here Turretin says, “We deny against the Romanists and Lutherans,” the proposition that “Christ [is] corporeally present in the eucharist ...” (“A Puritan’s Mind,” [www.apuritansmind.com/FrancisTurretin/francisturretinconsubstantiation.htm](http://www.apuritansmind.com/FrancisTurretin/francisturretinconsubstantiation.htm)).

Whereas Anglican and Lutheran Protestants maintain that a practice which the church has found useful and good may be maintained providing it “be not repugnant to the Word of God” (Anglican Article 34), Puritan Protestants look for a specific “regulatory” principle of finding a set command in Scripture. E.g., because only Sunday worship is specifically commanded (Exod. 20:8-11; John 20:1,19,26; Acts 20:7; I Cor. 16:2); Puritans historically opposed Anglican and Lutheran practices which “esteemeth one day above another” (Rom. 14:5) with e.g., Christmas, Good Friday at Easter, or All Saints’ Day (1 Nov.)<sup>23</sup>. Or with regard to remembering *Charles I’s Day*, the rule for Anglicans that I adhere to is: “Some Do. Some Don’t. ALL SHOULD!”

If Rutherford stopped where more reasonable Puritans stopped, and simply said he considered one should receive Communion sitting, then I could accept that “it is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly alike” (Article 34), and that legitimate Protestant diversity exists on the matter. Sitting is not contrary to the Bible, and indeed I have sometimes taken Communion in a sound Puritan Church sitting, even though my preference is to do so kneeling in a sound Anglican Church.

But in e.g., the 1637 quote I refer to above, Rutherford also added the element of pseudo-historicism, claiming those who knelt to receive the Lord’s Supper i.e., all Anglicans, were in “communion with great Babel, the mother of fornications. ... Will ye, then, go with them, and set your lips to the whore’s golden cup, and drink of the wine of the wrath of God Almighty with them? ... Oh cursed pleasure!” (Rev. 14:8-10; 17:4,5) (Rutherford’s Letter 174 / 86).

Then after the formation of the 1642 republic, with the making of Anglicanism “illegal” from 1645 to 1660, the pestering Puritan, Rutherford, was persistent. In his *Divine Right of Church Government* (1646), Rutherford says, “Though therefore we receive the Supper of the Lord [with heads] uncovered [from any head dress], no man can conclude from thence adoration of the elements, as we do from kneeling conclude the same ... .” This is typical of the insistence by pesky Puritans, contrary to all denials and attempts at clarification by Anglicans, that because they knelt to receive the Communion, Anglicans therefore engaged in “adoration” of the consecrated Communion elements.

Rutherford had the intelligence and Biblical knowledge to know that what he was saying could not possibly be correct. For if “intention” “is nothing” (Rutherford), and kneeling necessarily imports adoration of all that is in front of one, then e.g., “when Daniel” “kneeled upon his knees, three times a day” “toward Jerusalem” (Dan. 6:10), he was idolatrously worshipping Jerusalem in general and the temple site in particular. Or when St. Paul and those who were with him, “kneeled down on the shore, and prayed”

---

<sup>23</sup> “An Ordinance for Abolishing of Festivals” (8 June 1647), in: Firth, C.H. & Rait, R.S. (Editors), *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum 1642-1660, op. cit.*, Vol. 1, pp. 954. This specifically forbade the keeping of “the Nativity of Christ [Christmas], Easter ..., and other Festivals commonly called Holy-Dayes.” But paradoxically, some days of public fasting or Thanksgiving were still permitted (*Ibid.*, Vol. 1, pp. 606-7, 830).

(Acts 21:5), they thus idolatrously adored the sea, or “anything that is” “in the water,” since they certainly did “bow down” before “them” (Exod. 20:4,5). Cf. I Kgs 8:54.

Rutherford’s 1646 claims were part of a programme to bolster the “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:20,21) against the Crown, by the English Puritan’s revolutionary republic (cf. Rutherford’s *Lex Rex*). In thrice describing the damned, St. John the Divine (Theologian) mentions one sin thrice (Rev. 21:8,27; 22:15), saying wilfully unrepentant “liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone.” The cap fits Rutherford, who must wear it. Such is the clear teaching of Holy Scripture (Matt. 7:21-23; 15:18-20; 19:18; 22:21).

It should be noted, that while I endorse View 1, and in elucidation focus on this view, I nevertheless also make reference to these other views in order to give the reader a general overview. By contrast, especially those following Views 3, 4, and 5, tend to give their view as the only view. E.g., those following the English Puritan View 3, usually depict it falsely as “the Protestant view;” and those following the Puseyite View 4, generally depict it falsely as “the Anglican view.”

On the one hand, from the traditional Reformed Anglican Protestant perspective, King Charles I was something of a King Solomon figure, making some errors, including his entry into a religiously mixed marriage, and his most unfortunate war with Scotland in which he followed misadvice from e.g., Laud, with regard to an Anglican war on Puritan Scotland from 1637 to 1640. Of which it must be said the Scots forgave Charles I who agreed to stay out of religious matters in Scotland, though the English Puritan Revolutionaries tried to “flog this dead horse” for years, even though most of Presbyterian Scotland supported the King against the republic (although they disliked his Anglicanism). But on the other hand, like Solomon, Charles I still showed faith in God. Indeed, at the time of his execution on 30 Jan. 1649, he gave a Christian witness by taking Communion at St. James’ Palace (presently the residence of Charles, Prince of Wales, the heir to the throne,) and then giving a witness of Christian faith upon the gallows, e.g., in a Christ-like manner forgiving his enemies. Thus notwithstanding his undoubted blemishes, frailties, and imperfections, I consider Charles the First has historically been quite rightly regarded as a Christian martyr in Anglican hagiology i.e., *View 1, supra*.

Charles I’s is the closest thing we have to a uniquely Anglican martyr. Neither Papists nor Puritans so regard him, nor in general do any other non-Anglicans. Some Puritan Protestants following *View 2, supra*, have some similar views about him to Anglican Protestants, but they also have some differences. Significantly, they would not regard him as a specifically Christian “martyr.” The NT gives a liberty for Christians to either keep various holy days, “One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike” (Rom. 14:5), or fast days, “He that eateth, eateth to the Lord ...; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not”(Rom. 14:6). Anglicans like Charles I exercised this option on the Anglican principle that holy days and fast days are not prohibited by the Word of God, and had been found to be useful and good (see Article 34, Anglican *39 Articles*). E.g., Good Friday might be kept as a fast day

(including a partial fast or day of “abstinence,” for instance, abstaining from meat other than fish, or abstaining from some desert delicacy). Thus e.g., Charles I approved certain prayers to be used on *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* (5 Nov.); and both Anglicans and Puritans would agree that this day is not specifically commanded in the NT.

By contrast, the Puritan revolutionaries looking for a specific Biblical command to keep a certain day, found only Sunday in the New Testament; and so banned all holy days other than Sunday e.g., prohibiting the celebration of Christmas Day. (Although they allowed some Fast Days and Days of Thanksgiving, Cromwell relented and allowed Papists’ Conspiracy day from 1856.) To the extent that e.g., the observance of Christmas Day by Anglicans such as Charles was regarded as “Romish,” in my opinion these Puritan revolutionaries set aside the spirit of such NT passages as Rom. 14:5,6. And to the extent that Charles I gave Laud too much freedom, allowing an old statue to be used to fine English Puritans and others who did not attend Anglican Churches on Sunday, I consider the Anglicans set aside the spirit of such NT passages as Rom. 14:5,6. Certainly both Anglicans and Puritans would agree that the keeping of Christmas day is not specifically commanded in the NT. Thus among other things, King Charles the Martyr may be said to have died for the Biblical principle, “He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord”(Rom. 14:6) as e.g., applied to Christmas Day.

It should also be remembered that Charles I sometimes showed commendable Christian charity to his subjects. E.g., in June 1628, His Majesty King Charles accepted the Petition of Rights submitted by the House of Commons, so as to prevent arbitrary taxation or imprisonment. Or in 1635 he very generously opened up his *Royal Mail* service to the people. Thereafter, anyone could send a letter by the *Royal Mail*, and this great privilege has been extended throughout British Commonwealth or British Empire derived societies. Being able to post a letter is taken by most people for granted, but they would do well to remember that this was a privilege granted by the Crown, when King Charles the First extended access to his personal *Royal Mail* service to his subjects.

Under the English idea of a patron, a patron gave his financial and political support to certain persons who were given a great deal of autonomy under him. E.g., the Duke of Lancaster was a patron to both the poet, Geoffrey Chaucer (d. 1399), who in *The Pardoner’s Tale* upheld the Romish notion of “pardons;” and also to John Wycliffe (d. 1384), who as the *Morning Star of the Reformation*, rejected various Romish notions. Charles I likewise appears to have adopted the role of a patron over his Primate. Thus having appointed Laud as Primate of the *Church of England*, he then allowed him the freedom to act in a semi-Romanist manner, although Laud still supported the Lutheran or first stage of the Reformation. By contrast, having appointed James Ussher as Primate of the *Church of Ireland*, he then allowed him the freedom to uphold second stage Protestant reforms that had developed mainly under Elizabeth I.

On the one hand, Charles I sought to promote a general Protestant spirit in the Anglican Church by e.g., upholding *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* (5 Nov.). But on the other hand, by not actively restraining Laud’s innovations, his inaction allowed this same Protestant spirit to be undermined in some important ways. Charles I’s position was thus

somewhat duplicitous. Therefore, I would criticize Charles I for adopting this patron-type approach to Laud and Ussher. I think that as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland*, he should have actively restrained Laud from his innovations. But while Charles I may be fairly criticized for his patron-like approach, rather than a Supreme Governor approach to his Primates, it is clear from the contrast between Laud and Ussher, that the real instigator of the undesirable innovations was Archbishop Laud, not Charles I, since he made no attempts to have Ussher go this way.

It should also be said that there were two important areas of Protestant doctrine where King Charles I was prepared to flex his muscle as Supreme Governor. Firstly, in broad terms he required that his Primates and fellow Anglicans were Protestant to the point that they embraced the Lutheran Reformation. Secondly, they and fellow Anglicans were required to subscribe to the Calvinism of the 39 Articles. *Luther and Calvin were to be recognized as great Reforming saints of God, as was Cranmer via the usage of the prayer book.*

With respect to Charles I's first requirement, we see that Laud sought to roll back the second stage Protestant reforms brought about largely under Elizabeth. He sought to go back to the Lutheran Reformation, and then reinvent Anglicanism in a more anti-Puritan form. In doing so he lost an important element in the *sentiment* of Protestantism. Nevertheless, even on the scaffold, Laud said, "I have always lived in the Protestant religion established in England, and in that I come now to die." Had Laud not been prepared to so endorse the first stage of the Protestant Reformation, he would certainly have lost Charles I's tolerance.

With respect to Charles I's second requirement, it should be remembered that Arminians had come into existence in larger numbers in England as a consequence of the Puritan movement. The Puritans had split between a Reformed or Calvinistic group which in time became the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Particular Baptists; and an Arminian group which in time became the General Baptists. In 1618, in Holland the Dutch Reformed Church had condemned the teachings of Arminianism in the justly celebrated *Synod of Dort*.

Largely responding to concerns about Arminians, in 1626 Charles I made a royal proclamation to suppress any "new inventions, or opinions concerning religion, then [being found which] are such as are clearly grounded, and warranted by the doctrine and discipline of the *Church of England*." Then in 1628, "His Majesty's Declaration" was made by Charles I, and thereafter affixed to the *Thirty-Nine Articles*, which in order to alleviate "curious and unhappy differences," states, in part, "that no man" "shall print, or preach, to draw the Article aside, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof: and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense." In 1629, King Charles issued a further royal decree, warning that if "Men begin anew to dispute" "by reading, preaching, or making books" "concerning these differences," then "we shall take order with them, and those books, that they shall wish they had never thought upon these needless controversies." Indeed, we know that Caroline Bishops interpreted and used the 1626

Proclamation and 1628 Declaration as bulwarks against Arminianism<sup>24</sup>.

It is clear from the trial of Archbishop Laud, that despite repeated claims by Puritan propagandists (and in more recent centuries some secularists,) with regard to what has been called, “Laud’s Arminianism,” that in fact Laud very specifically repudiated Arminianism. Like King Charles I, he upheld the Reformed (Calvinist) doctrine of predestination found in Article 17 of the 39 Articles. Charles I had contextually made it clear from his 1628 “Declaration,” that Arminianism would not be tolerated in the Anglican Church of which he was Supreme Governor, and it is clear that Laud was not prepared to move away from the Calvinism of Article 17.

*Thus in fairness to King Charles the First, though he more generally adopted a patron-like approach to his two Primates of Laud in England and Ussher in Ireland, he was prepared to more actively seek the maintenance of a broad Protestant support for the Lutheran Reformation, as well as an active support for the Reformed doctrine of election and associated teachings of grace in the Anglican Church. If any during this time moved away from such teachings in the Anglican Church, they would have had to do so covertly, since if it was overtly known that they were not Calvinist Protestants, but Arminians, Charles the First made it clear that he would take action to discipline them. While in my opinion Laud’s innovations undermined the spirit of Protestantism, by rolling back second stage reforms; and by adding in elements that no Protestants had ever wanted or accepted, and which had a semi-Romanist sentiment to them whether they were practiced by the Romanists themselves or not, such as nodding at the name of Jesus (not done by Romanists), or the reintroduction of voluntary auricular confession (semi-Romanist as Romanists have a compulsory auricular confession); nevertheless, in fairness to Laud, though it was in what I consider a most inconsistent manner, Laud did continue to support the Lutheran Reformation, and accordingly regarded himself as a Protestant.*

Reformed Anglicans thus part company with Puseyites and semi-Puseyites, in that they do not support Archbishop Laud’s innovations. But Reformed Anglicans also historically part company with those Puritan Protestants who glorify men like Oliver Cromwell and Rutherford. Significantly though, a group of Scottish Puritan Presbyterians did not support Cromwell’s execution of Charles I. Up until the time of his death, Acts of the Scottish Parliament always refer to the reign of King Charles I, and upon his death, the Scottish Parliament proclaimed Charles II King and refer to his reign in their Acts until Scotland was occupied by Cromwell’s republican army under General Monck. Charles II held this position in the Scottish Parliament till Scotland was occupied following Charles II’s defeat by Cromwell’s army in the Battles of Dunbar (1650) and Worcester (1651).

On the one hand, Reformed Anglicans worked with these Scottish Presbyterian

---

<sup>24</sup> Davies, J., *The Caroline Captivity of the Church*, Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1992, p. 265.

Puritans from 1689. Both Anglicans and Scottish Presbyterians agreed that the Puritan revolutionary republican's "seditions" and "murders" (Gal. 5:21) were reprehensible, and that the Bible requires Christians to "Honour the king" (I Peter 2:17), and not be as the "murderers" (Rev. 21:8) who killed the king. But there was this difference. Anglicans regarded Charles I as a Christian martyr (*View 1*), whereas Scottish Presbyterians regarded him simply as a king unjustly killed (*View 2*).

But on the other hand, the Test Acts flowing from the *Clarendon Code* of 1661-5, inhibited English (and Irish) Puritans from holding various governmental positions till their repeal in the 19th century. But it was known that 1689 some of the more moderate Puritans were prepared to meet the requirement of the sacramental Test Acts by occasionally taking Communion in an Anglican Church, whereas no Papists were; so that at the time of their repeal they were more anti-Papist than anti-Puritan, although they inhibited the more extremist Puritans like Rutherford who claimed kneeling to receive Communion was intrinsic idolatry.

The fact that English (and Irish) Puritans generally glorified Cromwell was at the heart of the problem. This problem could also raise its ugly head among Puritans in Scotland, where the more responsible Presbyterians in the Established *Church of Scotland* were meant to keep the lid on such persons. But in England (and Ireland) the message was simply this. "Seditions" and "murders" have a serious consequence in the next life, namely, such persons "shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. 5:21); and also a serious consequence in this life. To the extent that there were Puritans in England (and Ireland), who like the Scottish Puritans, did not support the seditions and murders of Cromwell, *the innocent were made to suffer with, and because of, the guilty*. But the problem remained the glorification of the English Puritan revolutionaries such as Cromwell and Rutherford as "great" men.

The English Puritans had the powerful lever of the House of Commons in their control. Instead of using it to try and take all power to themselves, abolishing the House of Lords and killing the King, the English Puritans should have acted in keeping with constitutional law. This would have been a much slower, much harder process, but it is what they should have done. Instead of trying to make England Puritan, they should have recognized the fundamental Anglicanism of England, and the legitimacy of having the *Church of England* established under an Anglican Protestant King. They should have worked with Reformed Anglicans like James Ussher, and not against both Laudian Anglicans and orthodox Reformed Anglicans alike. They should in a long, patient manner, have worked with King Charles to bring about the type of religious freedoms procured in 1689. And if they had done that, the Tests Acts against English (and Irish) Puritans which continued after 1689 would not have been necessary because the Puritans would not have been glorifying a seditious murderer like Oliver Cromwell. Hence the type of historical Protestant alliance that existed between Reformed Anglicans and Scottish Presbyterians could have been extended to English Puritans. The problem with the megalomaniacal English Puritans was that they wanted all power in their hands, and they wanted the forced conversion of a most unwilling England to Puritanism.

But in the 19th century, the repeal of the Test Acts and removal of *Charles I's Day* from the Calendar in 1859, was meant to be part of a process that sought to usher in a secular society. In such a secular society, there could no longer be a place for such religiously motivated laws as those based in Gal. 5:21 and Rev. 21:8. Nevertheless, in Anglican hagiology, Charles I is, and remains, a Christian martyr.

WARNING: *Having now given this very general summary and introduction*, it must be said that AMONG PROTESTANT CHRISTIANS, THE 17TH CENTURY ERAS OF CHARLES I AND CHARLES II REMAIN CONTROVERSIAL. THIS ERA OF THE PURITAN REVOLUTION OF 1640 TO 1660 (with its Commonwealth dating from 1642) IS IMPORTANT TO THE RELIGIOUS TRADITIONS OF BOTH REFORMED ANGLICAN PROTESTANTS AND PURITAN DERIVED PROTESTANTS. (By direct Puritan derivation are Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and both Arminian and Reformed Baptists; and by indirect means, some other churches, whether Arminian or Reformed which have later adopted various Puritan values and forms of worship.) THIS DISCUSSION OF CHARLES I'S DAY AND CHARLES II'S DAY IS WRITTEN *FROM A REFORMED ANGLICAN PERSPECTIVE*. IT IS THUS PRO-ANGLICAN AND ANTI-ENGLISH PURITAN REVOLUTIONARY. HENCE IT DOES NOT ACCORD WITH THE ANTI-ANGLICAN AND PRO-ENGLISH PURITAN REVOLUTION VIEWS ASSOCIATED WITH SOME PURITANS AND THEIR DERIVATIVES, WHO MAY FIND SECTIONS a) TO c) INCLUSIVE ON THE ANGLICAN CALENDAR'S HAGIOLOGY, DISTURBING TO THEIR BELIEFS ABOUT THE HISTORY OF THE CAROLINE BRITISH ISLES.

THOSE RAISED AND REARED IN SUCH A PRO-CROMWELL PURITAN DERIVED OR INFLUENCED BACKGROUND, MAY HAVE NEVER HEARD A HISTORY OF THE PURITAN REVOLUTION OF 1640-60 FROM AN ANGLICAN PROTESTANT PERSPECTIVE (View 1, *supra*), OR THE ANTI-CROMWELL SCOTTISH PRESBYTERIAN PERSPECTIVE (View 2, *supra*), AND THEY MAY DISLIKE SUCH A VIEW WHEN EXPOSED TO IT. What I have said of the five views of Cromwell, *supra*, in which I favour View 1, is enough for someone to get the big picture. Hence IF AN ENGLISH PURITAN SYMPATHIZER DOES NOT WISH TO FURTHER KNOW OF VIEW 1, *supra*, WHICH IT MUST BE SAID HE MAY WELL FIND DISTURBING, AND IN SOME INSTANCES, MAY EVEN FIND DEEPLY DISTURBING, THEN HE MAY SIMPLY PREFER TO GO STRAIGHT FROM THE END OF THIS PARAGRAPH TO SECTION d). AND ANY PURITAN WHO MIGHT LIKE TO TALK ABOUT, (and I hesitate to state this, for I have no sympathy with it,) "THAT ANGLICAN BASTARD, QUEEN ELIZABETH I" (i.e., falsely claiming she was illegitimate because such Puritans condone certain forms of incest; a view allowed, though not required, under the Congregationalist *Savoy Declaration* and *Baptist / London Confession*, and in historically modern times, some modified Presbyterian *Westminster Confessions*), WILL NOT MUCH LIKE SECTION d), AND MIGHT PREFER TO GO STRAIGHT FROM THIS POINT TO f) *King Charles the First's Day: with Dedication of Volume 1 in 2008* and g) *King Charles the First's Day: with Dedication of Revised Volume 1 in 2010* (which they may not like either, but which is nevertheless an important part of understanding this commentary).

The Anglican doctrine of the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* and *39 Articles* has been increasingly trimmed down in historically modern times. E.g., in 1859, three important holy days which each had their own office were removed from the prayer book, namely, King Charles the Martyr's Day (30 Jan.); the natural corollary to this, Charles II Day or Royal Oak Day (29 May, remembering the Restoration in 1660, though not thereby necessarily endorsing any of his later actions); and Papists' Conspiracy Day (5 Nov; remembering the Papists' Conspiracy of gunpowder treason against King James I on 5 Nov. 1605; and the coming of King William III of Orange on 5 Nov. 1688 against the Papists' conspiracy to put a Papist, James II, on the throne).

These holy days showed that Anglicanism was neither Puritan (Charles I & Charles II Day<sup>25</sup>), nor Papist (Papists' Conspiracy Day), but Reformed and Protestant (Papists' Conspiracy Day) in e.g., her 39 Articles. Indeed, a wonderful resurgence of Protestantism within Anglicanism followed the events of 5 Nov. 1688. Its fruits included e.g., religious liberty granted to Protestant Puritans in the Toleration Act (1689); and support for the Scottish heart's desire for a Puritan Presbyterian Church to be established there as the *Church of Scotland* in 1690. After all, do we Protestants not all share in the same gospel truths of Christianity recovered by Luther at the Reformation, to wit, *grace alone, faith alone, Scripture alone*?

But in this Reformed Anglican Protestant embrace of our much beloved Reformed Puritan Protestant brethren in Christ, I think it is important to ensure that it is Anglican doctrine we Anglicans uphold. King Charles the Martyr's Day still reminds us Anglicans that we are not Puritans. Charles I was beheaded in 1649 by Cromwell's Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60, during the GREAT REBELLION. Charles I is historically regarded by Anglicans as a Christian martyr; and thus Cromwell the leader of bad and murderous forces. The *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* Office for "King Charles the Martyr," refers to Cromwell and his republican forces as "cruel men, sons of Belial" (cf. I Sam. 2:12; II Cor. 6:15). Cromwell's republic is described as a "tyranny." Those who committed regicide against Charles are said to have perpetrated a "foul" "act," in "the martyrdom of the Blessed King Charles the First."

This Office was also found in the Church of Ireland's *Book of Common Prayer (1666)*. In a 1716 *King Charles the Martyr's Day* sermon at Christchurch Church of Ireland Cathedral, Dublin, Bishop Ashe refers to "the inordinate ambition ... of some of the leaders" of the Puritan "rebellion," who "destroyed many thousands of their fellow

---

<sup>25</sup> While there was some involvement of Jesuitry in supporting Cromwell against Charles I, this was secondary to the fact that at its heart the republican revolutionaries were primarily English Puritans. For the Popish connection, see "Dedication: The Anglican Calendar," section "c) i) Charles the First's Day (30 Jan.), Charles the Second's Day (or Royal Oak Day) (29 May), & Papists' Conspiracy Day (5 Nov.)," subsection "Popish Jesuit involvement in Charles I's martyrdom;" and also my Dedication Sermon in Appendix 5.

subjects, and brought at last their own Sovereign to lose his head on a scaffold, under a pretended form of ... High Court of Justice.” He describes these as “barbarous and bloody transactions<sup>26</sup>.” Indeed, the continued Puritan glorification of Cromwell’s sedition and murder necessitated the Test Acts against Puritans (although their scope was wider than Puritans) in England and Ireland. Many English and Irish Puritans were simply not prepared to take seriously the words of Rom 13:2 that “whosoever ... resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and ... shall receive to themselves damnation” (Rom. 13:2), if that meant supporting an Anglican king (Charles) against a group of Puritan revolutionaries; even though when these words were originally written in New Testament times, they required that Christians not engage in sedition against a pagan government which persecuted Christians. Many Puritans stubbornly harboured the spirit of sedition and murder in their breasts, until it eventually oozed out again, this time in the unpretty spectacle of the American Revolution of 1775/6, in which it was once again claimed that the king, this time George III (Regnal Years: 1760-1820), was “a tyrant.”

As one who has moved to and fro between Sydney and London, I am conscious of the fact that Caucasian Christians of both lands give thanks to God for the valour and sacrifice of those who served in World War One and Two, without any hatred of contemporary fellow Caucasian Christians of Germany. In a similar way, I think we Anglicans should thank God for the Christian witness unto martyrdom by the *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland*, Charles I, but without any hatred of contemporary Puritan derived Protestants. But we would never dream of raising a monument in honour of the WWI, Kaiser Wilhelm II, or the WWII, Adolf Hitler; and nor do I think should we raise a monument in honour of Oliver Cromwell, which thing has been done outside the Westminster Parliament, much to my horror.

If we take seriously the words of Scripture, “Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17); “Thou shalt not kill” (Exod. 20:13); and “no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him” (I John 3:15); then we cannot deny that Cromwell was one of those “sons of Belial” who “knew not the Lord” (I Sam 2:12). Thus our Lord says to religious apostates of his day, “Ye are of your father the Devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth” (John 8:44). This is the teaching of Scripture. This is the teaching of the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662). I consider we ought not to stray from it!

Thus I look with regret on departures from Reformed Anglicanism whether by Puseyism in a Papist direction since the 19th century, or an ever increasing number of Evangelical *Diocese of Sydney* Anglicans since around the 1970s in a Puritan direction. With the demise of the Book of Common Prayer (1662) and Authorized Version (1611) in Diocese of Sydney Churches from around the 1970s in the name of “modernization,” the anchor ropes with Reformed Anglicanism have been more generally cut by an ever increasing number of Sydney Diocese Anglicans. The wonderful religiously

---

<sup>26</sup> Ashe, St. George, A sermon preached at Christchurch in Dublin, January 30th, 1716, *op. cit.*, pp. 7,8.

conservative neo-Byzantine tradition of the *Textus Receptus* and AV has been increasingly replaced by the religiously liberal neo-Alexandrian tradition of “modern versions.” In the name of so called, “contemporary worship services” or “churches,” they have introduced semi-Puritanism by stealth. In saying this, I do not wish to indicate or imply any sympathy for Puseyism, but rather to argue for the more traditional form of “Low Church” Reformed Anglicanism, found generally in the Diocese of Sydney up till about the 1960s as common. This was the type of Anglicanism I knew as a boy, but it has gradually declined in ever more Anglican churches of the Diocese since the 1970s.

E.g., I could still find *a pointer in the right general direction* with *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* and *Authorized Version (1611)* Reformed Anglican services at St. Philip’s Church Hill, (inner city of Sydney, near the Harbour Bridge) in the late 1990s under Reverend John Jones. (I do not say all was perfect at St. Philip’s. E.g., against justifiable opposition, the Rector sadly introduced the NIV as the pew Bible, while still mercifully keeping the AV for the readings in the church services of Matins, Evensong, or Communion. I was also concerned with issues of religious separation, since the Rector spoke in favour of the Billy Graham Crusades, even though Graham is an apostate who gives converts to e.g., Papists, Puseyites, and religious liberals.) But by that time in the late 1990s, such traditional Reformed Anglican services were becoming all too rare. Hence when living in London on and off for about 3½ years at various times between 2001 and 2009, I have been pleased to find the 1662 prayer book and AV used in *Church of England (Continuing) Services*.

Some years ago, I attended an Evening Service at St. Matthias’ Church, Paddington (Sydney), in which Anglican Minister, Philip Jensen, conducted what looked like a Puritan Service. It certainly was nothing like the very beautiful Anglican service of Evensong in the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)*. More recently, I was told by an old member of the Manly congregation (who in October 2007 had similar concerns about what is happening at that church<sup>27</sup>), that when Jensen had been a Curate many years before at St. Matthew’s Manly (1970-1973), he made his dislike of the stained glass windows at that church known to those there. This is reminiscent of the Puritan objections to stained-glass windows depicting e.g., scenes for the OT and NT, and the Kings of England, at Peterborough Cathedral, which windows they smashed to pieces in 1643. As one who has inspected these beautiful windows at St. Matthew’s Manly (and also Peterborough Cathedral), I find his objections quite absurd. Jensen evidently continued on this type of Puritan path over the years. I regret to say, that like *some* though *not all* Puritan Churches, the so called, “contemporary worship service,”

---

<sup>27</sup> This includes undesirable plans to demolish the chancel and rood-screens. See *Hierurgia Anglicana*, or Documents & extracts illustrative of the ritual of the church in England after the Reformation, Edited by Members of the Ecclesiological Late Cambridge Camden Society, J.G.F. & J. Rivington, J. Masters, London; Deightons Macmillan, & Co., Cambridge; J.H. Parker, Oxford; 1848 (hereafter called *Hierurgia Anglicana*), pp. 66-72. Between the time of Volume 1 (2008) and the Revised Volume 1 (2010), these unwarranted, undesirable, and unAnglican changes have been sadly implemented.

conducted by Jensen reminded me of what, as further discussed below, is a church service that was a great *misery*, and quite irreverent, being like unto when *a tinker and his bitch come into an ale-house*.

Naturally then, I am horrified to learn that Philip Jensen has become the Dean of St. Andrew's Cathedral, where this neo-Alexandrian now promotes the ESV. I think him very ill-suited and unworthy of such an honourable and noble position as Dean of the Cathedral. I think he should be stripped of his standing as an Anglican clergyman, and ejected like those ejected in 1662, on the basis that he is simply not Anglican<sup>28</sup>.

In saying this, I do not thereby wish to cast doubt upon the fact that Dean Jensen has made some valuable expositions of Scripture, and done some good work as well. But I do not think such an argument could be fairly used to prevent the ejection of men in 1662 far greater than Dean Jensen, such as Richard Baxter and Matthew Poole, two men whom I respect, and I do not think such an argument should be used to fairly prevent the ejection of men like Dean Jensen today. On the one hand, Dean Jensen needs to repent of certain worldliness, and learn that a faithful Minister is judged by how faithfully he proclaims the Biblical gospel, not how successfully his message appeals to unsaved persons, *for the work of salvation is by grace alone*. But on the other hand, if he were to humbly learn these lessons, then Dean Jensen has some spiritual gifts and qualities that may be put to good use in a Reformed Puritan Church of his choice.

Indeed, the reader should be aware that I have a great deal of respect for my Puritan Protestant brethren in Christ. I have known a number of godly Presbyterians and Baptists, and I have Presbyterian relatives (from both the Presbyterian Church and Free Presbyterian Church<sup>29</sup>), as well as Baptist relatives. E.g., my patrilineal grandfather was

---

<sup>28</sup> In the terminology of, "High Church" for Puseyites, "Broadchurch" for semi-Puseyites, or "Low Church" for Reformed (Evangelical) Anglicans, I would be "Low Church." I.e., I have a "low" view of excessive ritual; a "low" view" of sacramentalist ideas that deny the symbolic nature of the sacraments of Baptism and Communion; and a "low" view" of notions of so called, "apostolic succession," which I do not regard as an intrinsic part of Episcopal church government, considering rather than *spiritual* apostolic succession goes to any Protestant church irrespective of its church government form, if it is faithful to the Word of God as the Infallible Book. When I refer to a traditional Reformed Anglican service, I mean the type of thing that historically existed with the 1662 prayer book in the Australian Diocese of Sydney, or the type of thing I have seen at St. Mary's *Church of England (Continuing)*, Reading, (just outside of London), in England. It is "Low Church," Reformed, Protestant, *and Anglican*. Alas, this is nothing like what Dean Jensen does, since he lacks *the Anglican element*.

<sup>29</sup> "Free Presbyterian Church" describes a broad religious tradition (like "Baptist" or "Anglican"). Thus there are a number of different Free Presbyterian churches, and in varying degrees, these may disagree with each other. For instance, the *Free Church of Scotland*, *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland*, *Free Church of Scotland (Continuing)*, *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia* (PCEA), and *Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster*. My Free Presbyterian Church relatives come from the

a Presbyterian (although he moved between Presbyterian and Anglican Churches, and had some of his children, including my father, baptized as an Anglican, and others as Presbyterians), and his wife, my patrilineal grandmother, was a Baptist. Though I have known, and know of, a number of godly Presbyterian Puritans, and other Puritans (by which I mean Protestants in a Puritan derived tradition), I think it is one thing for a man to leave a Reformed Anglican Church and be a Puritan, something I can still respect him for, and another thing for men like Jensen who are sadly all too common in the Diocese of Sydney in increasing numbers from the 1970s, to stay in the Anglican Church and try to make it Puritan by stealth under such names as a “contemporary worship service.” Many beautiful Anglican Churches of the Diocese have been gutted and ruined because of this policy. *WHAT STUPIDITY!* Indeed some have had a new second Puritan type church constructed on the grounds of the older Anglican Church e.g., at West Ryde, Wilberforce, and recently Mittagong. This result is “Low Church” traditional Reformed Anglican opposition to what has been happening on the basis that this is *unAnglican*. For while we are Protestants of the Bible first and foremost, we express that Protestantism in a particular Anglican tradition that has sadly been very Puritanized in many churches in about the last three or so decades.

Nevertheless, one good thing I can say about them is that at least they have sought to retain some elements of their Protestantism, and for that, I am grateful. For I think the Puritans much better than the Puseyites, Papists, or others. Moreover, I have on a number of occasions worshipped in Puritan churches, especially, although not exclusively, Presbyterian Puritan Churches. Though we disagree on some matters, we embrace one another as brethren in Christ and fellow Protestants in the gospel. *As I have said before, so I say again, I think it one thing for a man to leave a Reformed Anglican Church and be a Puritan, something I can still respect him for, and another thing for a man to stay in the Anglican Church and try to make it Puritan or semi-Puritan.*

One qualification I make with respect to my treatment of the era of the 1640-1660 and republic of 1642-60, is that there were literally hundreds of executions for “treason” under the Puritan Revolutionaries. From an Anglican perspective, this is reminiscent of the Popish killings of Protestants under Bloody Mary. Indeed the 1559 and 1604 prayer books were regarded as *Protestant* symbols because of the reintroduction of the 1559 prayer book under Elizabeth following Bloody Mary’s Papist rule, and this is reflected in the *Primo Elizabethae Act* of the 1559 prayer book which is also printed near the start of the 1662 prayer book. Among other things, it says the Protestant prayer book “was ... taken away by ... Queen Mary [the First], to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ’s religion.” Thus to make this prayer book “illegal,” as occurred under the Puritan republic, was to attack an important symbol of English Protestantism; and thus act in a manner in some ways analogous to that of Bloody Mary. While the abuses and innovations of Laudians needed to be stopped, it was clear that the Puritan Revolutionaries were simply using these admittedly bad developments not in some desire to return the *Church of England* to the second stage of the Reformation, but rather, as a pretext, to turn it into a Puritan Church. They were

thus destructive of Anglican Protestantism, and so the Protestant prayer book was “illegal” under the Puritans of 1645-1660 just like it had been under the Papists of 1553-1558.

These killings were an important political device used by the Puritans, who were mainly English Puritans, during the interregnum, in order to establish their power and remove their political enemies. On the one hand, I shall only be considering in detail the case of Archbishop Laud, killed by the Puritan Revolutionaries in 1645, and King Charles I, killed by the Puritan Revolutionaries in 1649. But on the other hand, it should therefore be understood that in fact this era *in general* is historically regarded by Anglicans as a period of what the 1662 prayer book calls a “tyranny” (Office of King Charles the Martyr), in which hundreds of good people were killed on Puritan charges of so called, “treason.” These killings, especially, although not exclusively, that of King Charles the Martyr, were the source of some heightened level of historic anti-Puritan sentiment by Anglicans, particularly in the era just after the Restoration of the monarchy in 1660.

Let the reader consider e.g., these selections from an Anglican poem describing the Interregnum:

Churchmen are chained and schismatics are freed,  
 Mechanics preach and holy fathers bleed;  
 The Crown is crucified with the Creed, ...  
 The [Puritan English Presbyterian] presbyter  
     and [Puritan Congregationalist] independent seed,  
 Spring with broad blades to make religion bleed;  
 Herod and Pontius Pilate are agreed. ...  
 Great Britain’s heir is forced into France,  
 Whilst on his father’s head his foes advance ...<sup>30</sup>.

In this context, some reference should be made to both the *Greater Ejection* from 1643 and the *Lesser Ejection* of 1662. In the *Lesser Ejection* of 1662, Restoration Anglicans ejected from Anglican Churches, schools, and the public service, between 800 and 2,000 Puritans or semi-Puritans; but this number is dwarfed by the Puritan ejection of Anglicans before this time in the events of the *Greater Ejection* from 1643. Between 1642 and 1660, under the *Greater Ejection*, the Puritan regime ejected between 7,000 and 10,000 Anglican Ministers, school teachers, and public servants; and prohibited usage of the Anglican prayer book<sup>31</sup>. While Puritan historians sympathetic to Cromwell’s

---

<sup>30</sup> Quoted in: Connolly, S.J., “The Church of Ireland and the Royal Martyr: Regicide and Revolution in Anglican Political Thought c. 1660-c.1745,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 2003, *op. cit.*, p. 499.

<sup>31</sup> Ella, G.M., “Ejection & Rejection,” *English Churchman*, (EC 7766), 8 & 15 May 2009, p. 2. Precise figures are difficult to determine. E.g., compare Ella’s figures of 800-2,000 Puritan ejections with those of Wroughton who says in 1660, 695 Puritan

revolutionary regime like to refer to the events of the *Lesser Ejection* with the Act of Uniformity prohibiting Puritan worship services, and this ejection of between 800 and 2,000 Puritans or semi-Puritans in 1662; they do not generally refer to the preceding events of the *Greater Ejection* with the Puritan regime ejecting five to ten times as many Anglicans before this time, nor to the associated fact that the Puritan regime had prohibited Anglican worship services before this time.

Personally, I consider that blame existed on both sides i.e., both sides had lost sight of the Biblical teaching of Christian love and tolerance on many of the issues that divided them (Rom. 14:1-15:4; Col. 2:16); and the era of tolerance from 1689 which recognized that the Kingdom of England was basically Anglican Protestant and the Kingdom of Scotland was basically Puritan Presbyterian Protestant, ought to have been reached some 50 years or more earlier than it actually was. *Had both sides been prepared to “walk in” Christian “love” (Eph. 5:2), agreeing to “judge” “no man” “in respect of an holyday” (Col. 2:16), and seeking “not to please ourselves,” but rather to “please his neighbor for his good to edification” (Rom. 15:1,2), then the civil war could, and indeed should have been, avoided.*

Between 2001 and 2009 I lived in London, England, several times totally about three and a half years. In October 2003 I visited Coventry in the English Midlands, with its many English country gardens. I inspected and passed through the two city gates that remain from the original twelve city gates, Cook Street Gate (completed c. 1385) and Swansell Gate (completed c. 1440). I saw the old Grammar School which had formerly been a monastic Chapel (built c. 1340), but following King Henry VIII's wise closure of the monasteries it was converted into a school (c. 1550), known as the *King Henry VIII School* (although the school moved in 1885 to Warwick Rd).

But this happy picture of Coventry's gardens and a monastic building made into a schoolhouse after the wise abolition of Romish monasticism under Henry VIII, is not the only side to the history of Coventry. This sunny side of Coventry is complemented by a bleak and dark side to its history. For Coventry suffered under two wars, one in the mid 17th century and one in the mid 20th century. For there at Coventry, I also beheld the Anglican Church of St. John the Baptist. A sign on this church, reads (in part), "...Saint John the Baptist in the Diocese of Coventry ... . During the Commonwealth (1642-1660) it was used as a prison where Royalist soldiers were 'sent to Coventry'."

While there, I also inspected old Coventry Cathedral. Founded in the 14th century, this beautiful sandstone Cathedral was bombed to form an incomplete stone-shell during World War Two (WWII) (1939-45) by the German Luftwaffe. Once the Nazi bombers were finished with it, only the west lower section and spire built 1374-

---

Ministers were ejected in order to restore earlier ejected Anglican Ministers into churches the Puritans had intruded into; or in 1662, 900 Puritan or semi-Puritan clergy were ejected for non-compliance with the Act of Uniformity (Wroughton, J., *The Routledge Companion to the Stuart Age 1603-1714*, Routledge, Abingdon, Oxford, England, 2006, pp. 34-35).

1459 A.D. remained. It was left in this state with a new (controversial) Cathedral built next to it. Walking around the old Cathedral now is like walking round some of the old Castles of the British Isles. The walls are there, with no windows or roof, although a stone floor is present, and wooden chairs have been placed inside the open air old Cathedral. As I walked around I saw St. Mary's Hall, which is the guildhall opposite the old Cathedral, built in 1360 for the local trade guilds. Inside the old Cathedral, I had a photograph taken of myself standing next to the Communion Table which has a large semi-burnt cross behind it. Engraved on the wall behind the Communion Table in gold letters are these words from Luke 23:34, "FATHER FORGIVE." (This photo, with others, is on the internet website homepage for these commentaries.)

It seems to me that this captures the correct spirit of Christian forgiveness and charity. It reminds us how we should deal with contemporary Germans, descended from those involved in WWII. We do not forget the destruction of Coventry Cathedral by the German Luftwaffe in the mid 20th century, but nor do we now hold grudges against biological descendants of these German people. So too, we do not now forget that St. John the Baptist Church at Coventry was turned into a royalist prison by the (mainly English) Puritan Revolutionaries in the mid 17th century, but nor do we now hold grudges against biological or Puritan spiritual descendants of these people.

Thus as stated above, I consider Anglicans should now remember *Charles I Day* without any hostility to later or contemporary Puritans. E.g., I recall when going to Sunday School as a five year old boy, attending a good Evangelical Anglican Sunday School at St. Columb's *Church of England*, West Ryde (Sydney), how on Palm Sunday (the Sunday before Easter), we were each given a small hand sized palm leaf to take home. *This type of thing is not Puseyism, it is simply Anglicanism.* We do such things with no hostility in our hearts to our beloved brethren in Puritan Protestantism, for whom the notion of a liturgical calendar with "Palm Sunday" on it, is not followed.

But while traditional Reformed Anglicans would agree with me, Puseyite Anglicans may seek to misuse *Charles I Day* as a way of generating an unwarranted anti-Puritan sentiment. I WISH TO HEREBY DISTANCE MYSELF FROM ANY SUCH PUSEYITES, both with respect to their pro-Laudian and Puseyite theology, which I unreservedly reject; and also with respect to their unwarranted and unChristian references of scorn concerning "Protestants," meaning both Puritan Protestants and Evangelical Anglicans (many of such derisions I heard from Puseyite lips when I was at St. John's College, Morpeth<sup>32</sup>). While it must be admitted that *Charles I's Day* does involve some element of anti-Puritanism, e.g., an anti-Puritan joke might be told, I do not think that this warrants a more general hostility towards contemporary Puritans, even if it does remind us Anglicans that we are not Puritans. As a Reformed (Evangelical) Anglican, I keep Christmas and Easter, even though others who keep these festivals may abuse them with e.g., drunkenness and gluttony by worldly people at Christmas time, or the celebration of

---

<sup>32</sup> See Preface, "Background Story to Commentary," "Return to Anglicanism (at 20 years old and later)," *supra*.

the idolatrous Roman Mass with a Popish “Midnight Mass.” So too, I remember *Charles I’s Day*, usually as a black letter day, even though some who remember it may abuse it with e.g., an unwarranted and excessive anti-Puritan spirit by Puseyites, or the celebration of an idolatrous Puseyite “Eucharist” or “Mass” involving adoration of the consecrated elements by those taking Communion.

In this context, I note that while I find *Hierurgia Anglicana* (1848) a useful source book, it should be remembered that it is a Puseyite production which generally uses its sources uncritically, and frequently distorts matters. E.g., its authors try to justify the practice of some Puseyites who use a thurible to incense a church as part of their ritualism e.g., they walk around the Communion Table directing the thurible at it at given points, as in a Roman Church. Hence they refer to e.g., “a ship or ark” in Queen’s Chapel in 1565 which the “Editors” say was “a vessel for holding incense,” although this is very interpretive. It may e.g., have been purely ornamental, or it may have been used for holding something else e.g., a candle used for lighting. Though they think they have a good reference with statements in Prynne’s *Canterbury Doom*, or Neale’s *Puritans*, it must be said that Prynne was a convicted libeller, and this work by Neal (Neil) is much later (1732-8), and had been greatly criticized for its inaccuracies (Neil’s work is discussed at *Libel 13* in *Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn, infra*). Certainly one would be ill-advised to base anything on the claims of these Puritan propagandists, unless one could clearly corroborate their claim from a more reliable source.

They also refer to some more reliable documents, such as the *Transactions of the Cambridge Camden Society* which records a 1562 reference to “Frankincense to perfume the church” of St. Mary the Virgin, Cambridge; a 1588 reference to “gum” “paid for” by All Hallows’s Steyning, London, “to burn in the church;” and also in 1588, “Juniper to air the chapel on S. Mark’s day” at Jesus Chapel, Cambridge. Yet it is greatly decontextualized by the authors of *Hierurgia Anglicana*. At that time, incense was sometimes used in a church like a modern aero-spray air freshener would be used. I.e., *not in a church service*, incense would be burnt to get rid of the stench. This is clearly the meaning of e.g., “Frankincense to perfume the church, or “Juniper to air the chapel<sup>33</sup>.” (Private persons I have known in modern times, likewise sometimes burn incense sticks in their homes, not for any religious significance, but because they like the odour and so perfume their home with it.) These references are most assuredly not to Puseyite practices of using a thurible to incense a church as part of their church service ritualism. Such are the type of distortions of fact that characterize *Hierurgia Anglicana*. Only a most careful reader with knowledge of church history should look at it, lest he be led astray by its many false and inaccurate interpretations of this kind.

The authors of *Hierurgia Anglicana* cannot deny on even their own evidence, that from the time of William of Orange in 1689, the Anglican Church experienced a

---

<sup>33</sup> *Hierurgia Anglicana*, pp. 4-5, 181-2 (citing *Canterbury Doom*, pp. 74, 123 & Neale’s / Neil’s *Puritans*, Vol. 2, p. 224), 365 (citing *Transactions of the Cambridge Camden Society*, Part 3, p. 271).

widespread revival of Protestant worship practices, and its Protestantism was clearly anti-Laudian, and so anti-Puseyite. Thus they refer with disdain to “the advocates of that slovenly and sordid mode of performing the Divine Offices” i.e., what would now be termed Evangelical or Reformed Anglicans, “which accompanied the ascendancy of Presbyterian principles at the *usurpation of William of Orange*<sup>34</sup>.”

Thus one should distinguish between a traditional Reformed Anglican view, upheld in the 1662 prayer book as amended in 1689, which is pro-Charles though not uncritical of him; anti-Laud – although not as strongly so as the Puritans who criticized him for his Laudiansim and Anglicanism alike, anti-Cromwell, and anti-Jacobite; and a Puseyite view which is less critically pro-Charles, pro-Laud, anti-Cromwell, and pro-Jacobite. Thus the Puseyite authors of *Hierurgia Anglicana* failed to realize that because James II would not give his allegiance to the 39 Articles and other Anglican doctrine, he could not fulfil the role of *Supreme Governor*, and hence his voidable office of king was declared void. I.e., Unlike Charles I, James II’s removal was in accordance with law<sup>35</sup>.

In this context, one should from the traditional Reformed Anglican view upheld in the Offices of *King Charles Martyr’s Day*, *Royal Oak Day*, and *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* which remembered both 5 November 1605 and 1688, distinguish between the fact that unlike Charles I who was unlawfully removed and succeeded by a so called “Lord Protector;” by contrast, James II, known as “the Popish Duke,” was lawfully removed. In English law if something is voidable, it is lawful till declared void. Among other things, a monarch is required to be Supreme Governor of the *Church of England*, and in James II’s day, also Supreme Governor of the *Church of Ireland*. James II was an open Roman Catholic, who refused to even attend Anglican Church services because they were Protestant. Yet his duties of office required that he be Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church, and so even before the Act of Settlement had come in under William III, it is clear that James II failed to meet his legal requirements of office. I.e., by law the throne was a Protestant throne.

By his Popish actions, in substance, though not in specific form, James II *de jure* (or *at law*) had abdicated the throne. This consisted of e.g., his acts of omission in not stating his allegiance to the Protestant 39 Articles as Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church, and so not fulfilling his legal requirements of office; and his acts of commission in attending and promoting Popish services. It was further aggravated by his unconstitutional “Declaration of Indulgence” in April 1688 illegally repealing or suspending laws against Papists and English Puritans. William III and Mary II were accordingly invited over by some Members of Parliament. In English Law, a Convention Parliament may meet when impossibility means a Parliament cannot be

---

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 354.

<sup>35</sup> McGrath, G.B. (myself), “Charles I, ...” *British Church Newspaper*, 23 October 2009 (Irish Massacre Day), p. 10; replying to Westfold, H., “Charles ...,” *British Church Newspaper*, 8 October 2009, p. 11; replying to McGrath, G.B., (myself), “Calvin and Charles I,” *British Church Newspaper*, 25 Sept., 2009, p. 10.

summoned in the normal manner by the King. A Convention Parliament of February 1689 (summoned by William III in January 1689,) met on the established precedent of the Convention Parliament of 1660 which had met without being summoned by the King in order to facilitate the Restoration under Charles II, and used its exact same words in declaring its validity. Consistent with James II's earlier conduct which had led to William III's arrival on 5 November 1688; the *Convention Parliament* of 1689 recognized that James II had *de facto* abdicated i.e., by his conduct for all practical purposes he had abdicated by deserting his post when fleeing the capital of London and discarding the Great Seal of the Realm into the River Thames. *The proof of the pudding was in the eating*, since the very fact that a Convention Parliament was necessary, that is to say, one not summoned by the king (James II), bespoke the fact that for all practical purposes, he was not the legally functioning king in the land, and that William III was now king. It was the same type of situation that had existed just 29 years earlier with the Convention Parliament of 1660. One cannot consistently uphold the principle of a Convention Parliament for Charles II, while denying it for William III. (Both of which had an earlier established precedent with the Convention Parliament of 1399 summoned after the deposition of King Richard II and accession of King Henry IV of England.)

The Convention Parliament of 1689 held that *the next in line was to succeed*, not some "Lord Protector" as under Cromwell's republic. This clearly had to be a Protestant in order for the monarch to fulfill the legal requirements as Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church; and so James Edward, born in June 1688 to both a Popish father, James II, and a Popish mother, Mary of Modena, whom James II married in 1673, meant the baby James Edward who was clearly under the custody of James II and being raised as a Papist, could not inherit the throne. Thus the next in line to succeed was James II's Protestant daughter, Mary II, born in 1662; who had become the Princess of Orange when she married Prince William of Orange in 1677. Hence the Parliament then recognized William III of Orange and Mary II as the successors to the throne. They were cousins, commonly descended from King Charles the Martyr, i.e., Mary II was a granddaughter of Charles I via James II, and William III was a grandson of Charles I via Charles' daughter, Mary<sup>36</sup>. They then ruled jointly as William III and Mary II from 1689 to 1694, and following the death of Mary II, William III of Orange had a sole reign till 1702. Thus this was not an illegal action such as occurred from 1642 to 1660, or was attempted in 1605. This was a legal succession of the next in line to the legally Protestant throne.

Hence the fact that because Mary II was the granddaughter of Charles I she was

---

<sup>36</sup> Let the reader be warned. Some confusion may occur between the names of both "Mary" and "William of Orange." This is because Charles I's eldest daughter, Mary (b. 1631), married William II, Prince of Orange in 1641, and so this couple may be sometimes referred to as "William of Orange and Mary," possibly with some additional reference to Mary's descent from Charles I. They begat William III, Prince of Orange in 1650. James II's daughter (and granddaughter of Charles I), Mary (b. 1662), married William III, Prince of Orange in 1677, and so this couple may also be sometimes referred to as "William of Orange and Mary," possibly with some additional reference to Mary's descent from Charles I. Hence one must be careful to distinguish these two couples.

next in line to succeed, and the fact that her consort, William III, was also a grandson of Charles I, acted to reinforce the fact that Charles I had been the lawful king, since if Charles I had not been the lawful king, nor could Mary II and William III be his lawful successors. This stood in stark contrast to the republican years when a so called “Lord Protector” in Oliver Cromwell, who in no sense was an heir to the throne, usurped the office of Head of State, violating the 8th commandment, “Thou shalt not steal,” by first stealing the office of Head of State from Charles I, and then after violating the 6th commandment, “Thou shalt not kill,” by partaking in the murder of King Charles I, further violated the 8th commandment, “Thou shalt not steal,” by further stealing the office of Head of State from the lawful successor of Charles I, which was Charles II.

Thus while the events of 1688 and 1689 are sometimes called, “The Glorious Revolution,” in such instances, the word “Revolution” should be understood to mean “a drastic change” or “great reversal of conditions” such as in the terminology of “The Industrial Revolution;” and should NOT be taken to mean, “the political overthrow of a government by sedition.” Thus any warfare that occurred between them, such as the *Battle of the Boyne* (1690), was the warfare between a lawful king in *William of Orange* i.e., William III, and a pretender to the throne in *James the Dunghill* i.e., James II<sup>37</sup>.

To avoid these types of problems arising in the future, the Parliament later in 1689 passed the *Bill of Rights* (1689) which then received Royal Assent. This stated that it was “inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant Kingdom to be governed by a Popish Prince [such as James II],” so “that all and every person or persons that is” such as James II, “or shall profess the Popish religion,” “shall be excluded, and be ever incapable to inherit, possess or enjoy the Crown.” This Act was merely putting into black-letter law, what had been the type of law formerly found at Common Law, in which the voidable office of a monarch could be declared void, if a monarch failed to meet his legal requirements as Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church. But whereas before this Act such a monarchs office was voidable, i.e., valid till declared void by lawful authority; after this Act, such a monarch’s office was void *ab initio* i.e., void from the outset.

This therefore means that the Puseyite authors of *Hierurgia Anglicana* support the Jacobite claims of James the Pretender, means they support sedition against the Protestant

---

<sup>37</sup> Concerning the name, “James the Dunghill,” see my book, *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist* (2006), With a Foreword by the Reverend Sam McKay, Secretary of the Protestant Truth Society (1996-2004), Sydney, Australia, 2006, Part 3, “Convicted Nazi War Criminal, ‘Blessed’ Stepinatz: A special case study of the Antichrist’s *sin* (II Thess. 2:3): Papal Support and Beatification in 1998 of the Convicted Nazi War Criminal, ‘Blessed’ Cardinal Stepinatz’,” Chapter 9: “Connections between Stepinatz’s Cult and Irish Roman Catholic terrorism against British Protestants,” section, “A Brief Protestant Hagiology about the Irish before 1922.” This book is available on the internet via Yahoo or Google under “Gavin McGrath Books” or direct at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.

Crown, as established by law. We thus here find in their Puseyite work, the type of hatred for the Protestant Crown of United Kingdom, associated with e.g., the Papist attempt to Romanize the British Isles under Jacobite forces, ended with the *Battle of Culloden* (1746). Thus is their Puseyite hatred of Protestantism, and the true doctrine of the Anglican Church's prayer book of 1662 and 39 Articles, clearly evident in this wicked statement about the alleged "usurpation of William of Orange" in 1689. I think these Jacobite Puseyites should have been closed down like the Jacobite Episcopal Church of Scotland was closed down following the *Battle of Culloden*. For James II, who would not so much as take Communion in an Anglican Church because he was a Papist, clearly failed to meet the legal requirements of a monarch as Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church, and thus his voidable tenure was declared void. This was ratified by Parliament in February 1689.

In this context, it should also be noted that the fourth and final Jacobite Pretender was Enrico (Henry) Stuart (1725-1807). Enrico was born in Rome, and baptized on the day of his birth by Pope Benedict XIII (Pope: 1724-1730). His father, *the old Pretender*, James Stuart, named Enrico, "Duca Di York" (Italian, "Duke of York") in the Jacobite system of peerages, and in 1745 Enrico went to France to help his brother, *the young Pretender*, Charles Stuart, prepare the Jacobite campaign that ended in the 1746 *Battle of Culloden*. Pope Benedict XIV (Pope: 1740-1758) made Enrico "Cardinal of York" in 1747. Spending most of his life living in what were then the Papal States of Italy, Enrico exuded a very "Italiano" persona. This Papist Cardinal rose to become Dean of the College of Cardinals, and Cardinal Bishop of Ostia and Velletri, which is one of the seven Romish Dioceses in the vicinity of Rome. When *the young Pretender*, Charles Stuart, died in 1788, Cardinal Enrico, proclaimed himself King of England. Nobody took this claim by the Jacobite peerage system's "Duca Di York" seriously, for he had a villa outside of Rome, which bears a plaque saying that it formerly belonged to "Enrico Stuart, Duca Di York." Upon his death, this loyal son of Rome, Cardinal Enrico Stuart was buried in St. Peter's Basilica in the Vatican City.

We thus see that the last of the Jacobites was very deeply part of the Roman Church. Thus the support of the Puseyite authors of *Hierurgia Anglicana* for the Jacobite claims, is a support that points them homeward and Romeward from "Go" with the Popish Duke, James II, "to Woe," with the Popish "Duca Di York," Cardinal Enrico.

Another qualification I would make is that the reader should understand that while I distinguish between the publicly declared doctrine of a church, and the private views of those in that church, I am not thereby opposed to persons holding private views, tolerated by their confession. E.g., my own views on the regional earth gap school, held in different forms by Puritans such as John Lightfoot (a Westminster Divine), or the Congregationalist Pye Smith (sometime Principal of Homerton College, London, now a College of Cambridge University), as well as the Anglican (white missionary to black Africa), Henry Alcock (sometime Principal of the *Church Missionary Society's* Theological Institute, Fourah Bay College, Freetown, Sierra Leone, West Africa), *supra* and *infra*; or some of my views on William Laud, e.g., my views on the undesirability of the heraldic mitre, *infra*; or my views on the desirability of a Protestant Week of

hagiology (the 6 days of 31 Oct. to 5 Nov.); are all private views.

My objection to Laud with regard to his failure to make such distinctions ought not to be read as meaning I am opposed to Christians holding private views. But I would isolate a broad issue such as *creation not macroevolution*, on which to take my final stand, and embrace all Bible believing creationists within this as orthodox on the issue. I.e., I would not use terms like “orthodox” and “unorthodox” over issues of which specific creationist model a person follows, whether old earth gap creationist school (either local or global creation of Gen. 1:2b-2:3), old earth day-age creationist school; or young earth 144 hour creationist school. Or I would isolate a broad issue such as, *No Anglican Bishop ought to wear a mitre*, and *the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction over us*, on which to take a stand, not my private views on the undesirability of the heraldic mitre. By contrast, it seems to me that Laud was not making these kind of necessary distinctions, which for someone in his position is particularly concerning, since he was Lord Primate of the Church of England.

Some Puritan derived Protestants glorify men like Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford, regarding them as “great” men. For instance, Rousas Rushdoony is the Presbyterian leader of group called “Christian Reconstructionists,<sup>38</sup>” which seeks to “reconstruct” a society on such models as Calvin’s sixteenth century Geneva (Switzerland), the Puritan John Cotton’s seventeenth century New England (Massachusetts, USA), or the Puritan’s seventeenth century New Haven (Connecticut, USA)<sup>39</sup>. (In doing so, he and his followers do what neither Calvin nor these Puritans

---

<sup>38</sup> Together with Otto Scott, he was one of the *Editors* of *The Journal of Christian Reconstruction* in 1984.

<sup>39</sup> Rushdoony is to be commended for realizing the self-evident truth that the secular state has failed and needs to be replaced by a Protestant Christian State. What is commonly called “modern history,” but which might be better called, “secular history,” and divided into “Type 1 Secular History” from the American and French Revolutions to the end of World War II (total freedom of religious belief, but imposition of Christian morals, justified on the basis of natural law in the courts and legislatures, and often on the basis of the Bible to the electorate), and “Type 2 Secular History” from about this time on (removal of Protestant Christian morals and in their place the development of “human rights” ideology, antecedent to, but clearly evident in the USA from the time of, Brown’s case in 1954), needs to be swept aside and replaced with a Protestant Christian State. But the model for such a state needs to be based on a modernized form of the more reasonable Anglican Protestant State of e.g., the 17th century (although it was in need of certain improvements, e.g., a wider distribution of wealth with larger middle class); or in a federation like Australia or the USA, possibly some States on the Presbyterian Scottish model and others on the Reformed Anglican model of England. But neither the models Rushdoony isolates, nor his added element of Judaizing, act to produce viable models; even though they should remind the reader that the secular history of the USA is an unwelcome imposition on top of its earlier Christian State history which it enjoyed under the white supremacist Protestant British Empire. Moreover, Rushdoony’s Cromwell glorifying model would incur the wrath of God and not his blessing (Rom. 13:2; Gal.

ever did, and claim that Jewish civil laws are *binding of necessity* in the Christian era. This Judaizing view is not only contrary to Article 7 of the Anglican 39 Articles, but also contrary to his own Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* chapter 19, which Rushdoony thus rejects)<sup>40</sup>. On the one hand, he has produced inaccurate anti-Caroline propaganda against both Charles I and Charles II, *infra*; but on the other hand, he speaks favorably of Cromwell, claiming the “collapse of Cromwell’s regime meant ... repression for the common people,” and “the development of a savage law code.” Certainly this sentiment is not in harmony my view of the Caroline and Cromwellian eras.

Indeed, by contrast, from a Reformed Anglican perspective, Cromwell was a cruel, brutal, and seditious murderer, who unrepentantly set aside the sixth commandment, “Thou shalt not kill” (Rom. 13:9); and Rutherford was a provocative, persistent, and unrelenting liar, who lived in violation of the ninth commandment, “Thou shalt not bear false witness” (Rom. 13:9); and a party to sedition and murder via his abominable book, *Lex Rex*. After the Restoration, Rutherford was wanted by the government on charges of high treason, but he died in 1661 before he could be prosecuted. In the same year of 1661, King Charles II ordered that Cromwell’s body be exhumed, and his skull placed on a public gazing pole at Westminster Hall, next to the Westminster Parliament, where Cromwell’s skull remained throughout the further 24 year duration of this Caroline reign.

Though there were a number of issues, e.g., the form of church government as either episcopal / prelacy (Anglican) or presbyterian (some Puritans), in my discussion, *infra*, two issues particularly isolated by a number of 17th century anti-Anglican Puritans, were the Anglican practice of kneeling to receive Communion (retained in the *Book of Common Prayer, 1662*), and the Anglican usage of crosses as a Christian symbol (retained in the *Book of Common Prayer, 1662*, with e.g., the *sign of the cross* at baptism, and *Holy Cross Day* on the Calendar for 14 September). My objection is not to Puritans who do not wish to follow Anglican practice on these matters, my objection is to the

---

5:20,21), “For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft” (I Sam. 15:23).

<sup>40</sup> Rushdoony, R.J., *The Institutes of Biblical Law*, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, USA, 1973, Vol. 1, pp. 1-2,195,256,517 (Puritan’s New England & New Haven), 9-10 (Calvin’s Geneva), 790-1 (Puritan’s New England & New Haven, also referring to “English Puritans” in this same era of “1641”), 349-350 (anti-William Blackstone and anti-Edward Coke, Chief Justice, the latter described as “a calculating opportunist,” this is part of an anti-Anglican Christian State view), pp. 550-1 (“the Westminster Confession” at “chapter XIX” contains “errors,” and “is guilty of nonsense”); Rushdoony, R.J., *The Institutes of Biblical Law*, Ross House Books, Vallecito, California, USA, 1978, Vol. 2, pp. 276 (pro-Cromwell), 420 (anti-Caroline propaganda, discussed *infra*), 329 (Western and American Puritanism equated with Protestantism, cf. my comments on Puritan propaganda’s unqualified equation of Puritanism with Protestantism, rather than identifying Puritan Protestantism as one form of Protestantism, which is distinctive from Anglican Protestantism or Lutheran Protestantism).

misrepresentation of Anglicans on these issues, and associated false depictions of Anglicans as “idolaters.”

E.g., Reformed Anglicans kneel at Communion in order to humbly receive the elements, and absolutely reject any form of adoration of the consecrated elements as idolatry. While I support the Anglican practice of kneeling to receive Communion, I do so on the basis that it is a tradition of humility and godly order that the church has found useful and good, and which is not contrary to Scripture. But nor do I think that sitting to receive Communion is contrary to Scripture, and so in harmony with Article 34 of the 39 Articles, I consider other churches have authority to make the rule of their church that of sitting to receive Communion. Thus while I support Anglican ecclesiastical law which requires kneeling at Communion, such ecclesiastical law requiring kneeling to receive Communion (other than due to necessity<sup>41</sup>), is *malum prohibitum* (Legal Latin, meaning “wrong due to being prohibited”), not *malum in se* (Legal Latin, meaning “wrong in itself” i.e., intrinsically wrong). *Indeed, I have sometimes received Communion at Puritan derived churches while sitting in the pew*<sup>42</sup>.

Hence lest my comments on Puritans be misunderstood, let me say that my objection to men like Rutherford on this issue is *not* that they believed in sitting to receive Communion rather than kneeling; *nor* that they did not want an Anglican form of worship in Scotland. (But I object to any illegal acts of sedition to attain this, and consider the English Puritans should have more profitably used their numbers in the House of Commons to peacefully negotiate greater religious tolerance for English Puritans). My objection to Rutherford’s type of views on Communion is their flagrant and persistent misrepresentation of the reason why Anglicans receive the Lord’s Supper

---

<sup>41</sup> In practice, this is usually due to illness or disability. Thus persons with e.g., leg or back troubles may stand at the Communion rails; or the Minister may take the Lord’s Supper down to disabled persons in e.g., a wheelchair, or e.g., to old or ill people sitting in the pew. Communion may also be administered to a sick person while e.g., lying in a bed, or sitting up in a bed, or sitting in an armchair near his bed. If e.g., an Anglican Minister was in a rocky boat during a storm, with e.g., people holding onto fixtures screwed into the walls, only a fool would suggest that “they had to kneel” to take the Communion.

<sup>42</sup> E.g., the *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia*. This is an autonomous Australian Church constituted in 1846, historically derived from the *Free Church of Scotland*, (which broke from the established *Church of Scotland* in 1843,) and whose first Moderator was Thomas Chalmers (Moderator 1843-7). Or the *Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster*, (Martyrs’ Memorial Church) Belfast, Northern Ireland, where I took Communion at a night-time Sunday Service in October 2001 with the Moderator, Ian Paisley, presiding (whom I spoke with both then and at the earlier morning service). While both of these churches are Puritan derived, certainly none of those whom I have spoken to in them, would make crazy claims to the effect that I was “an idolater” who “adored” the communion elements because I have taken Anglican Communion kneeling at e.g., St. Mary’s *Church of England (Continuing)*, Reading (near London).

from the Communion *Table* kneeling, and their associated lies about Anglicans engaging in “adoration” of the consecrated Communion elements at “an altar.” Contextually, such lies by figures like the Scotsman Rutherford were indissolubly interconnected with the English Puritan’s sedition against the Crown, and murder of King Charles the First. As King Solomon said, “The bloodthirsty hate the upright,” and “If a ruler” like Oliver Cromwell “hearken to lies, all his servants are wicked” (Prov. 29:10,12).

On the one hand, I am critical of both George Gillespie and Samuel Rutherford, who were two of the Commissioners connected with the Westminster Divines, who wrote the *Westminster Confession* of the Presbyterian Church. Moreover, since this was composed by the Westminster Divines meeting from 1643 to 1652, called together by the Puritans then at war with the King, and since King Charles I commanded Anglicans not to attend these meetings, I would certainly not have wanted to attend these meetings myself. But on the other hand, such reservations aside, let me say that I have a higher regard for a number of other Presbyterians involved in this process, which first issued this document in 1647, than I do for the likes of Gillespie and Rutherford; even though I certainly would not want to, and most assuredly do not, subscribe to this document as my confessional standard. For while on the one hand I have known good and godly Presbyterian brethren in Christ who have subscribed to this as their confessional standard; personally, I think the Anglican Church’s *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* and *Thirty-Nine Articles* to be a much better confessional standard.

For instance, I regard John Lightfoot (1602-1675), who was one of the Presbyterian’s Westminster Divines, as a much more reasonably minded man. He had a particular interest in Old Testament and Jewish studies. The son of an Anglican clergyman, (his father was the *Church of England* Vicar of Uttoxeter, Staffordshire, in northern England), John Lightfoot was educated as an Anglican at Christ’s College, Cambridge, and became an Anglican clergyman. He was Minister of St. John the Baptist’s *Church of England*, Ashley, Staffordshire, in the English midlands (1630-42). But he moved to London in 1642. He then became a Presbyterian Puritan, and was one of the Westminster Divines, referred to as “John Lightfoot of Ashley” in the official “List of the Divines who met in the Assembly at Westminster” (and, he was also author of the *Journal of the Proceedings of the Assembly of Divines*, 1 Jan 1643-31 Dec. 1644). In 1654, he was made Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University under Cromwell’s republic, though he lived at Munden Rectory. After the Restoration in 1660, he was confirmed in both i.e., it was required that all incumbents and teachers give their “unfeigned assent and consent” by St. Bartholomew’s Day (24 August), 1662, and since Oxford and Cambridge were Anglican Universities, as Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University, Lightfoot assented to the Anglican *Act of Uniformity 1662*. Thus Lightfoot moved from Anglicanism to Presbyterianism, and then back to Anglicanism.

Did Lightfoot’s final return to Anglicanism under the Restoration, stem from a view that having carefully considered Puritanism in general, and Presbyterian Puritanism in particular under Cromwell’s Puritan republic, he now wanted to cut his links with Presbyterianism, and re-embrace Anglicanism as preferable? Or was Lightfoot’s final return to Anglicanism under the Restoration a political expedient i.e., he *preferred*

Presbyterianism, but was not so radically opposed to Anglicanism that he was not prepared to live under it, and be ejected for not agreeing with the 1662 *Act of Uniformity*? Either way, in his movements from Anglicanism to Presbyterianism and then back to Anglicanism, Lightfoot was a Westminster Divine who clearly lacked the fanatical anti-Anglican Puritan virulence of men like Gillespie and Rutherford.

For instance, in understanding *Westminster Confession* 4:1, which refers to when “God” did “create, or make” “the world, and all things therein” “in the space of six days,” Lightfoot took the view that this was a local “world,” not the globe; and was happy to consult church fathers (in a way Puritans generally would not). His usage of the church fathers and natural law *that is not contrary to the Divine revelation*, is more akin to a Reformed Anglican methodology, than the type of think one would usually associate with Puritans.

On the one hand, with regard to one of the great issues of our times, *creation verses macroevolution*, I would consider the orthodox should unite on the twin issues of *creation not macroevolution* and *the authority of the Bible*. Thus they should also hold to those elements of Gen. 1-3 that are perfectly clear, such as the fact that Genesis 1:1, “In the beginning God created the heaven” (AV) or “heavens” (ASV) “and the earth” (AV & ASV) requires creation, not macroevolution; and creation of the entire universe with the planet earth (Pss. 115:15,16; 121:2; 124:8; 134:3), and all that is on it i.e., “the earth ... and the fullness thereof” (Ps. 24:1), for “the Lord ... made heaven, and earth, the sea, and all that therein is” (Ps. 146:5,6). Likewise Gen. 1-3 requires a belief in man’s common descent from Adam and Eve (Gen 3:20; I Cor. 15:49), man’s creation in a state of original righteousness with conditional bodily immortality (Gen. 2:16,17; 3:1-21; Ps. 51:5; Eccl. 7:29, ASV), and man’s fall into sin and death due to a historical fall by Adam (Rom. 5-8; I Cor. 15:22). Thus orthodoxy upholds original sin and rejects Pelagianism (e.g., Articles 2, 9, & 10, Anglican *39 Articles*).

But on the other hand, I would maintain that the issue of what broad model of creation one adopts for Gen. 1 & 2 is a matter of private judgement. I.e., whether one considers there is an old earth (millions or billions of years old) or a young earth (6,000-10,000 years old). And if an old earth, if one adopts The Gap School, whether this is with a global pre-Adamite Flood and global creation in Gen. 1:2b-2:3, or (like myself) a local pre-Adamite Flood and local creation of Eden in Gen. 1:2b-2:3; and whether one considers the pre-Adamite Flood of Gen. 1:2a is connected with the fall of angels, or (like myself) one considers it is not connected with the fall of angels. Or if an old earth, one adopts the Day-Age School. All these types of issues I regard as private judgments, and the type of thing it is best to allow freedom of opinion and diversity on.

Commenting on Genesis 1:1, Lightfoot refers to, “How Basil the Great, Saint Ambrose, and” “others interpret this<sup>43</sup>.” John Sailhamer says, “According to John

---

<sup>43</sup> Lightfoot, J., *Miscellanies Christian and Judaical*, London, 1682, chapter 46, “The time and manner of the creation,” in *The Works of John Lightfoot*, late Master of Katherine Kall Hall in Cambridge and Prebend of Ely, in two volumes, Printed by W.R.

Lightfoote ... the Genesis account of creation describes God's preparation of a specific area of land which he identified as the garden of Eden. Lightfoot held that Gen. 1:1 states that God created the universe, but from Gen. 1:2 through [to] the end of the chapter, the passage focuses on God's preparation of the land that was to be the Garden of Eden. Lightfoote's view was developed further by later Christian scholars," such as "John Pye Smith" in "*On the Relation Between the Holy Scriptures and some Parts of Geological Science*" in "1840<sup>44</sup>."

In his commentary on *The Book of Genesis*, Lightfoot says, "The earth newly created, lay covered all over with water, and there was darkness through the world, ... and the clouds ... of heaven ... . Twelve hours was there *universal darkness* through all the world, and then light was created in this upper horizon<sup>45</sup>" This is a picture of a dark-flooded earth, which included clouds, made in Gen. 1:1, existing for twelve hours in the time gap between Gen. 1:1 and Gen. 1:2. Lightfoot repeats his description of a dark-flooded earth with clouds, in his *A Few, and New Observations upon the Book of Genesis*. But here he makes a transition from this global earth in Gen. 1:1,2 to a regional earth in Genesis 1:3. He says, "The" global "earth lay covered with waters," "clouds," and "a" "great darkness." The "Spirit of God moved the heavens from the first moment of their creation in a circular motion." "Twelve hours did the heavens thus move in darkness, and then God commanded and there appeared light to this upper horizon, namely to that where *Eden* should be planted (for, for that place especially is the story calculated) and there did it shine other twelve hours, declining by degrees with the motion of the heavens to the other hemisphere, where it inlighted other twelve hours also, and so the first natural day to that part of the world was six and thirty hours long, so long was Joshua's day, Josh. 10. And so long was our Saviour clouded under death<sup>46</sup>."

Lightfoot's belief in a 36 hour "first natural day" is significant. He considered there was first twelve hours of light and then twelve hours of darkness for the first day, being, "the evening and the morning" of "the first day" (Gen. 1:5) (i.e., not the evening first and then the morning, but *vice versa*). Therefore, he understood Gen. 1:1,2 to refer to a distinctive prior creation of the global earth with "waters," and "clouds," covered in "darkness." The gap in time before the first 24 hour creation day of Gen. 1:2b-5 is specified by Lightfoot to have been 12 hours. He calculated the duration of the gap on

---

for Robert Scott in Little-Britain, Thomas Basset in Fleet St., Richard Chiswell in St. Paul's Churchyard, and John Wright on Ludgate Hill, London, 1684, at p. 1020.

<sup>44</sup> Sailhamer, J.H., *Genesis Unbound*, *op. cit.*, pp. 216,257; citing Lightfoote, J., *A Few, and New Observations, Upon the Booke of Genesis*, T. Badger, London, UK, 1642, p. 2.

<sup>45</sup> Lightfoot, J., *The Book of Genesis*, in *The Works of John Lightfoot*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 1.

<sup>46</sup> Lightfoot, J., *A Few and New Observations upon the Book of Genesis*, in *The Works of John Lightfoot*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 691.

the basis of analogy i.e., the darkness of the first day was 12 hours on analogy with Joshua 10:13; Matt. 27:46,50; 28:1. While I think one cannot sustain Lightfoot's 36 hour precision calculation of a 12 hour gap on the basis of analogy with these other passages, this is nevertheless an attempt to calculate a gap in time between an earlier and distinctive creation in Gen. 1:1,2 and a later creation in Gen. 1:2-2:3. *Lightfoot was thus a gap man, although unlike the later Free Church of Scotland Moderator, Thomas Chalmers, who calculated the gap at millions or billions of years, Lightfoot calculated the gap between the first two verses of Genesis at 12 hours.*

Furthermore, Lightfoot isolates a local earth, located "where Eden should be planted," since "for that place especially is the story calculated." Hence in discussing the third day, he says, "now was Eden planted with the bodies of all trees fit for meat and delight." His "Eden" is the location where the "light" of the first day "did" "shine" for "twelve hours," before "declining by degrees," it went to the other side of the planet where "it inlighted other twelve hours" while there were twelve hours of evening over Eden, and so "the evening and the morning were" over Eden on "the first day" (Gen. 1:5). That is, Lightfoot's description of the sun going to "the other hemisphere" on the other side of the globe so it would be dark over Eden, but light on the other side of the planet during this time, means he saw "the evening and the morning" of "the first day" (Gen. 1:5) as referring to that "hemisphere" where Eden was. Thus because he considered Eden was in one of two hemispheres on the globe, this means that he isolated a regional earth for the first creation day that approximated half the globe i.e., the "hemisphere" of Eden. The size of this "hemisphere" of "Eden" thus appears to approximate that portion of the earth known as *the Old World* i.e., Europe, Asia, and Africa, to the exclusion of *the New World* i.e., the Americas, which would be in "the other hemisphere" that was "inlighted" for "twelve hours" during which an Eden covering *the Old World* experienced the "evening" of the first 24 hour day. (I.e., then later peopled by Adamite Red Indians migrating into the Americas.) Lightfoot thus sees a later expansion out from Eden, i.e., (presumably) into *the New World*, for he says of the "beasts" God "created" in Gen. 1:25, that "the world" (seemingly with reference to the globe,) was "furnished with them from about Eden as well as with men"<sup>47</sup>.

To some extent, Lightfoot's belief that the America's were made outside the six creation days as a further distinctive creation or creations by God reflects the wonder and puzzlement 17th century men then had of the New World. They could accept the discovery of further parts of the Old World of Europe, Africa, and Asia, because they had known that these Continents must extended further. And did not the ancient Greco-Roman world's trade routes extend to the "cinnamon" "merchants" of southern India and Ceylon (Sri Lanka), and the "silk" "merchants" of China (Rev. 18:12,13)? They could accept the discovery of some small new islands because they were relatively insignificant. They could even accept the discovery of Australia ("New Holland") since in ancient times the Greek mathematician and philosopher, Pythagoras (c. 580 to c. 500 B.C.), had theorized the existence of a great south land, *terra australis incognita* (Latin, "unknown Southern Land"), which was an idea not only accepted by ancient Greek and

---

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 691,692.

Romans, but also e.g., mediaeval map makers who from the 12th century and later who so refer to a *terra (land) australis (southern) incognita (unknown)* which ultimately gave its name to “Australia (Latin adjective from *australis* meaning, ‘southern’).”<sup>48</sup>.

When European explorers from the old world found the Central Asia of “India” (Esther 1:1; 8:9) and the “cinnamon” “merchants” of Ceylon (Rev. 18:11,13), ... they found what they were looking for. Hear them say, “I told you so!” When European explorers from the old world found the East Asia of “silk” “merchants” in China (Rev. 18:11,12) where Marco Polo (c. 1254-1324) had been in mediaeval times, ... they found what they were looking for. Hear them say, “I told you so!” When European explorers from the old world found the “Great South Land” of Pythagoras and mediaeval maps extrapolating the existence of “australis” or “Australia,” ... they found what they were looking for. Hear them say, “I told you so!” But when European explorers from the old world found the Americas ... they were flabbergasted! Hear them say, “It’s a whole new world we never even dreamt about! ... It’s mind boggling! ... Are you sure it’s not somewhere in East Asia?”

*The Americas were different! Nobody had ever theorized their existence. “That’s why Columbus thought he’d landed in East Asia!” This was not like the discovery of some small little new islands, since the Americas were truly massive lands, with the South American Continent being something like Africa in size, and the North American Continent something like Europe and part of Asia in size. Moreover, their flora and fauna were very different. Can you hear men asking, “Where does the Bible or any ancient or mediaeval literature refer to the American bison called the ‘buffalo’? ... What about the American bald eagle?” Something this big, something this different, could be nothing less than “a new world!” We have lost the impact on men’s minds of wonder, puzzlement, excitement, and sometimes fear of the unknown, that the discovery of the New World had. But to some extent Lightfoot here reflects it.*

In December 2008 I stood at Land’s End in Cornwall (near Penzance where my Hotel was), which is the most south-west sea port in England. Land’s End is about 290 miles or 500 kilometres by road to London, and until explorers went out from the 1400s on, it was *the end of the known world*. As I looked out to sea, I knew the Americas were “out there,” and that, God willing, I would be visiting North America the following March. But I also pondered how for centuries men had stood here looking out from Land’s End, and wondered, “What was out there?” “Would one fall off the flat earth if one went out 100 miles? ... What about 200 miles?” Like the imaginations in Jonathon Swift’s (d. 1745) much later novel, *Gulliver’s Travels* (1726), which I studied as a boy in English in Senior High School at Cumberland High School (Sydney), and which was written at a time when large parts of the earth were still unexplored and men still wondered just “What was out there?,” men had stood for centuries at Land’s End, and just wondered things like: “If one goes out from Land’s End, are there strange worlds with 6 inch tall Tom-thumbs (of Lilliput) or giants (of Brobdingnag), out there?”

---

<sup>48</sup> Clark, C.M.H., *A History of Australia*, Melbourne University Press, 1962, 1979, Vol. 1, pp. 10-11.

“In 1492, Columbus sailed the ocean blue,” and discovered the Americas. Between 1519 and 1522, the expedition of the Portuguese navigator and explorer, Ferdinand Magellan (c. 1480-1521) who sailed for the authorities in both Portugal (1501-12) and Spain (1519-21), first circumnavigated the globe, though Magellan himself died on route. Thus it was generally recognized that the earth was a globe. Writing more than a hundred years later in the seventeenth century, John Lightfoot showed remarkable insight as to the ramifications of this fact for “the earth” of Gen. 1:2-31. *These significant ramifications of the earth as a globe for Genesis 1 and 2 are still not generally known or appreciated more than three and half centuries later!*

Lightfoot recognized that the formulae of words, “the evening and the morning” for the Genesis 1 days require 24 hour days. This is clear in his “Sermon preached upon Exodus 20:11,” which says, “For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.” Lightfoot asks why God “needed to take six days,” to do “that” which he “could have done all in a moment?” The answer, he says, is to give man an example of work and rest. “He had” “seven natural days to make a week, six days of labour, the seventh for rest, six for man, the seventh for God.” Lightfoot here refers to “twelve hours” of “darkness” in Gen. 1:1,2 as an “evening,” the “light” of the first day for another “twelve hours” “over the hemisphere” as the “morning” of the first “day,” and says “the first natural day” consisted of “twelve hours darkness, and twelve hours light<sup>49</sup>.” Though the matter is not clear from these comments, when taken with his clearly stated opinion in *A Few, and New Observations upon the Book of Genesis*, that “the first natural day” “of the world was six and thirty hours long<sup>50</sup>” i.e., 12 hours of an “evening” darkness (Gen. 1:1,2) followed by 12 hours “morning” light and 12 hours “evening” darkness (Gen. 1:3-5), this means that Lightfoot must have held a local creation gap school type view of Exod. 20:11, in which the later creation of Gen. 1:3-2:3 over six 24 hour days and a 24 hour sabbath is isolated as that which “the Lord made.” Therefore Lightfoot excluded from Exod. 20:11 what he regarded as the “twelve hours” of Gen 1:1,2, and so that which God “created” in Gen. 1:1 and which then existed in the time gap between Gen. 1:1 and Gen. 1:2, was considered by him to be prior to this creation week of seven 24 hour days.

That Lightfoot clearly understood the creation days of Gen. 1:3-2:3 as 24 hour days, cannot be reasonably doubted. Lightfoot then made a brilliant deduction based on the fact that men now knew from the Book of Nature that they lived on a global earth or planet. That is, *the only way that there could be six 24 hour day evenings and mornings for a universal creation, would be if there was a flat earth. But because the earth was a globe, for the description of “evening” and “morning” in Genesis 1 over a 24 hour*

---

<sup>49</sup> In *The Works of John Lightfoot*, Volume 2, Printed for William Rawlins, and Richard Chiswell at the Rose & Crown in St. Paul’s Church-yard, London, 1884, pp. 1320-30 at p. 1322.

<sup>50</sup> In *The Works of John Lightfoot*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 691.

*period (Exod. 20:11) to be valid, requires the conclusion that a portion of the globe is isolated, with a point on the globe marking a sunrise and a point on the globe marking sunset, followed by a night till the following sunrise reaches that same original point on the globe!*

From the time of Lightfoot's seventeenth century insight onwards, it would thus be fair to characterize the belief that Gen. 1:2b-2:3 refers to a global creation over seven 24 hour days, as "the flat earth theory." Lightfoot wrote when knowledge of time zones over the globe were not generally as well understood as later. Thinking that the globe had two hemispheres, and that a sunrise and sunset would encompass one of two hemispheres, he therefore thought that about half the globe was in light when the other half was in darkness, and so concluded that the local creation of Eden in Genesis 1 was therefore the size of half the globe. Though he does not specify the *Old World* (Europe, Africa, and Asia) and *New World* (Americas) dichotomy, in the cultural context of his times, this would be the most natural dichotomy of the globe for one of Lightfoot's readers to make in understanding Lightfoot's two hemispheres. However, if we follow the methodology of Lightfoot's brilliant deduction on the globe as we now know it, in order to get a sunrise and sunset "morning," followed by an "evening" totally 24 hours, the size of the local creation must have been vastly smaller. For example, we can immediately rule out the Arctic and Antarctic regions as being part of the Gen. 1:2b-2:3 creation, since there an evening and a morning can take about six months each, and so the requirement of Exod. 31:12-17 that these be six 24 hour days means that the regional earth of Gen. 1:2b-2:3 necessarily excludes those areas.

The regional earth of Genesis 1 cannot have been larger than what today would approximate one time zone, since if it was, one would end up with an "evening and morning" longer than 24 hours. But Exod. 20:8-11 precludes this possibility. This requirement means that the local earth of Genesis 1:3-2:3 must have been on a region no greater than about 1,000 miles or 1,600 kilometers from east to west, and possibly far less<sup>51</sup>. Furthermore, since the Genesis account clearly isolates the boundaries of Eden in Gen. 1 and 2 as being near the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers in Gen. 2:14, the relevant 24 hour time-zone must have been in West Asia. The combination of these two requirements, means that the regional earth of Genesis 1:2-2:3 (as opposed to the distinctive prior creations of Gen. 1:1; 2:4; Heb. 1:2; 11:3,) must have been in the northern hemisphere, no more than about 1,000 miles or 1,600 kilometers wide from east

---

<sup>51</sup> The earth has an equatorial circumference of about 25,000 miles or about 40,000 kilometres. The modern standard time system uses 24 meridians of longitude 15 degrees apart starting from Greenwich in England, UK. This concept of standard time only dates back to the 1870s when the Canadian Sandford Fleming outlined a global standard time plan, and the 1880s when 27 nations meeting in Washington, D.C., USA agreed on the basic system now used. But to the extent that this system reflects the reality of different time-zones on the planet, based on the definition of a 24 hour evening and morning (Exod. 20:8-11), one can still say that the focus in Genesis 1 must have been on a region no greater than about 1,000 miles or 1,600 kilometres from east to west, and possibly much smaller than this.

to west, and possibly much smaller than this, and located in a region of West Asia that includes the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers.

Lightfoot's conclusion that following a gap in time between the first two verses of Genesis, the six creation days of Gen. 1 & 2 refers to the creation of a local world, not a global world, was premised on his rejection of *the flat earth theory*. It was based on natural law (or reason), with regard to the fact that the earth was then known to be a globe. Although he wrongly thought that the globe was sufficiently small for one 24 hour sunrise and sunset to cover about half the globe, his methodology is clearly quite brilliant, and shows a broad and reasonable Biblical mind. His usage of the church fathers, and both natural law (cf. *Westminster Confession* 1:1; 10:4; 21:1,7) and divine revelation (cf. *Westminster Confession* 1:4,5,10), is much more akin to that which is generally associated with Reformed Anglicans than with Puritans.

Lightfoot was first an Anglican, then a Presbyterian and Westminster Divine, and then an Anglican again under the Restoration of Charles II's and the 1662 *Act of Uniformity*. *But throughout his movements from Anglicanism to Presbyterianism and then back to Anglicanism, he remained a Protestant Christian of the holy Reformed faith.* Any attempt to try and claim a broad-minded Westminster Divine like John Lightfoot should be put in the same category as a narrow-minded bigot like Samuel Rutherford, is simply unsustainable. How the two men ever tolerated each other is surely difficult to fathom. Thus the reader should not think that I am tarring all Westminster Divines, or those associated with them, with the same tar-brush as bigots like Gillespie and Rutherford. Nevertheless, men like Gillespie and Rutherford, and others holding their narrow views were very influential in the 17th century Puritan Roundhead camp, and I am not prepared to white-wash the facts of history in order to produce a revisionist history that is anti-Anglican and anti-Cavalier, or pro-Puritan and pro-Roundhead, in my discussion of the sad and lamentable events of the 17th century.

A final qualification I would make, is that historically from around the time of William of Orange, Anglican Protestants have worked with more moderate Puritan Protestants, especially, though by no means exclusively, Presbyterian Protestants from Scotland, in the common defense of the truthfulness of Protestant Christianity. Thus the Reformed Anglican's "bulldog bark" against Puritans, has over time, largely become "a warning off" to extremist Puritans, such as Rutherford and Cromwell; or anti-Anglican contemporary Puritan derivatives who e.g., like (the Free Presbyterian), Alexander Hislop, claim that "the sign of the cross" administered at baptism is a "pagan" rite, and the Christian cross is really a "pagan" symbol<sup>52</sup>; or deny the validity of Anglican baptism

---

<sup>52</sup> Hislop's *The Two Babylons* (1858, 4th edition 1929, reprint 1965, S.W. Partridge, London, Great Britain, chapter 5, Section 4, "The sign of the cross," pp. 197-205). Hislop (1807-65), was a former school teacher at Wick, Caithness, who joined the *Free Church of Scotland* at the time of its formation in 1843, and was ordained a Minister in 1844 at East *Free Church* (*Free Church* = *Free Church of Scotland*), Arbroath, where he later became the Senior Minister in 1864. Though there have been many good and godly people in this church, such as its first Moderator, Thomas Chalmers, many of

because it uses *the sign of the cross* (Presbyterian Reformed Church of Australia<sup>53</sup>); or

---

Hislop's *private views*, which should be distinguished from the publicly professed doctrine of the *Free C. of S.*, are quite outrageous. He falsely claims that the Christian cross is a "pagan" symbol representing the "t" of "Tammuz" in the Hebrew and Aramaic; and further claims, "There is hardly a pagan tribe where the cross has not been found" (*Ibid.*, pp. 197-9). But even if *some* pagan cultures did have a cross symbol e.g., certain "Egyptian monuments" (*Ibid.*, p. 198) with the hieroglyphic ankh which is a cross with a ring at the top representing "life" or the "soul," this is most assuredly *not* where the symbolism of the Christian cross is derived from, nor stands for, and it is folly to claim that this Christian symbol actually represents some kind of "pagan" religious allegiance. Other similarly ridiculous anti-Anglican claims include his reference to the initials "I.H.S." (Latin, *Iesus Hominum Salvator* = Jesus' Humanity's Saviour). These are found in Anglican Churches e.g., these initials (generally written on top of one another) are on the wooden paneling over the Communion Table at St. John's (Regional) Cathedral, Parramatta, Sydney (and the absence of any nearby cross, whether on the Communion Table or elsewhere, is the indicator that this is the full contextual meaning of "I.H.S." in this instance). They are also commonly found on Anglican bookmarks, where there is I.H.S. at one end and a cross at the other end. (And this matching and associated cross, is the contextual indicator that in this instance, "I.H.S." also means, Latin, "*In Hac [cruce] Salus*," that is, "In this [cross] is salvation," and Latin, "*In Hoc Signo [vinces]*," that is, "In this sign [thou shalt conquer].") But Hislop, referring to its usage in Roman Catholicism (but obviously cross-applicable to Anglicanism), claims that it really refers to the ancient "Egyptian" "system of idolatry," with its three pagan gods, "Isis, Horus [Hor / Har], Seb [Seth]." He blasphemously refers to this as "the Egyptian Trinity" (*Ibid.*, p. 164). These three pagan deities were certainly not a "Trinity," and this shows serious Trinitarian error by Hislop who (contrary to his own *Westminster Confession* 2:3) clearly did not understand basic Trinitarian concepts of "one" being with three Divine Persons (John 10:30; I John 5:7). Under the circumstances, I think Hislop should have been defrocked as a Minister, and excommunicated as a Trinitarian heretic, blasphemer, and liar.

<sup>53</sup> To be sure, there are some good men in the PRC. Nevertheless, PRC amended *Westminster Confession* 28:2 (PRC 1973 amendment), so as to invalidate any baptism that uses the sign of the cross, stating (in part) "whosoever presumes in baptism to use" "crossing, accuses the perfect institution of Christ Jesus of imperfection and causes it to be no sacrament" (28:2) (*Westminster Confession of Faith, With Amendments* by the Presbyterian Reformed Church of Australia, second PRC edition 1999, Covenanter Press, Lithgow, N.S.W., Australia). By contrast I maintain the view of Art. 20 of the Anglican *39 Articles*, that practices such as using *the sign of the cross* are not contrary to Scripture and so valid, if a church finds them good and useful (cf. this symbolism in Rom. 6:3-11). Worse than even the PRC view, is the blasphemous claim of some Puritans that *the sign of the cross* at baptism is "the mark of the beast" (Porcelli, B., *The Antichrist*, Protestant Truth Society, London, UK, 4th Edition Revised, 1929, pp. 102-4; Windburn, R., Appendix 3 in *Francis Turretin's Seventh Disputation: Whether it can be proven the Pope of Rome is the Antichrist*, c. 1661, 1848 Edinburgh edition

denies Anglicans entrance to its Communion Table because they are “unbaptized” (Strict Baptists<sup>54</sup>); or because they do not generally keep the Puritan Sabbath (although historically some Anglicans like Bishop Ryle would agree with FPCS Sabbatarianism as a *private view* allowed by Anglicans) (Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland<sup>55</sup>). Thus it

---

translation, reprinted: Protestant Reformation Publication, Forestville, California, USA, 1999, pp. 122-4). Since *the sign of the cross* is administered at both Roman and Anglican baptisms, it follows on this type of highly erroneous thinking, that Anglicans are “Romish” to the point of receiving “the mark of the beast” (Rev. 13).

<sup>54</sup> Certainly, there are some good people among the Strict Baptists. Nevertheless, sometime in the 1990s, I visited Ebenezer *Strict and Particular Baptist Church*, Top Ryde, Sydney, where the Minister, Lew Layton, claimed that I was “unbaptized.” Admittedly, this is not as bad as the Strict Baptist, Ian Sadler, who blasphemously claims that the *sign of the cross* administered at baptism is *the mark of the beast* (Sadler, I.A., *Mystery, Babylon the Great*, Cromwell Press, Wiltshire, U.K., 1999, p. 283. Sadler, who like Origen or Hislop, is a mixture of orthodoxy and heresy, also endorses Hislop’s blasphemous claims on the initials “I.H.S.,” *supra*, in *Ibid.*, p. 65; citing Hislop, p. 164). At Ebenezer Strict Baptist Church I sat through the main church service, but after it, the Minister said I could not remain for the closed Communion Service which followed. This church is typical of Puritan derived churches where the people sit or stand to pray, but never kneel. Strict Baptists historically originate from England, under the influence of such 19th century Puritan types as e.g., William Gadsby (d. 1844) of Manchester, or John Warburton (d. 1857) of Trowbridge, Wiltshire. I shall also make some further general comments about Strict Baptists in a future Volume. (I shall make some less favorable reference to elements of this type of Puritan thinking found among *some* Strict Baptists like Sadler, *some* Free Presbyterians like Hislop, *et al*, in a story about an English Puritan at “e) Charles I’s Day sometimes kept on Monday 31 January” in “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” *infra*; and also in some later volumes of this commentary, in some stories about an Englishman, an Irishman, and a Scotsmen. Such comments should *not be misconstrued* as hostility to Free Presbyterians or Baptists or other Puritans *per se*, but hostility to *those extremist elements of their teachings* which target for their attack Reformed Evangelical Anglicans such as myself).

<sup>55</sup> On the upside, there are a number of good and godly Protestant brethren in this Church. I have also seen some very good articles in their publication, *The Free Presbyterian Magazine*. But on the downside, this denomination is so strongly Puritan and so anti-Anglican, that they will not allow to their Communion Table those who do not keep the Puritan Sabbath, and so use public transport on Sundays. This position is a throw-back to the 17th century Anglican-Puritan conflicts, and while these Free Presbyterians are within their rights to impose this rule on members of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland if they so wish; to ban visitors who are fellow Protestants such as Reformed Anglicans from their Communion Table on this basis is clearly against the Protestant spirit of Anglican-Presbyterian relations following 1689. This fact excludes me from their Communion Table since like e.g., William of Orange whose Sunday trading laws allowed a reduced Sunday public transport service of

only becomes the Anglican “bulldog’s bite” when confronting extremist anti-Anglican Puritans or their modern day Protestant derivatives. More commonly, Anglican Protestants are found in spiritual alliance with Puritan derived Protestants, uniting together in defense of broad gospel Christian truths recovered at the time of the Protestant Reformation. By contrast, the Reformed Anglican’s “bulldog bark” against Papists, or since the nineteenth century, Puseyites (by which I mean both Puseyites Proper i.e., those who call themselves, “Anglo-Catholics” or “High Church” and semi-Puseyites i.e., those who call themselves “Broadchurchmen”), is always followed by a deep, penetrating “bulldog bite” against their anti-Protestant errors and heresies.

b) *William Laud.*

*Introduction; Some instances of “Laud’s Popery” as Puritan folly; Some instances of “Laud’s Popery” as fairly being characterized as Laud’s Innovations; “Laud’s Arminianism;” Laud’s role as Star Chamber Court judge in Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn (1637); Laud’s Execution & Legacy.*

*Introduction.* It is not possible to understand the issues of the Puritan Revolution of 1640 to 1660, and associated matters of King Charles I’s martyrdom, without some reference to William Laud (1573-1645), a graduate of St. John’s College, Oxford University, who was the Archbishop of Canterbury from 1633 to 1645. Whereas orthodox Anglican teaching in the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* requires recognition of King Charles I as a martyr (Office of King Charles the Martyr), the issue of what one thinks of Laud has historically been largely left as a matter of private judgment by Anglicans (although the altered Final Rubric of the Communion Service from 1662, *infra*, is an anti-Laud exception to this). Though Puseyites have sought to promote him as a “martyr” figure since the 19th century, Reformed Anglicans have been more circumspect and reserved about Laud. Nevertheless, I would accept that much, though not all of what the Puritans have claimed about him, is false. In considering the conflict between Laud and the Puritans, I am not entirely on one side or the other, and nor do I think, would any traditional Reformed Anglican be. For while the traditional Reformed Anglican view is anti-Laud, it is not as strongly so as the English Puritan view which condemned him for his Anglicanism and Laudianism alike.

In particular *two broad issues* are focused on by (the mainly English) Puritans. One is “Laud’s,” so called “Popery” of which a most significant example, some might say, *the most significant example*, is “Laud’s Arminianism.” The other issue relates to *Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn (1637)*. These matters in the first issue i.e., Laud’s so called “Popery” and “Arminianism,” are closely inter-related since it is argued that Arminianism is the roadway away from Reformed Protestantism and into Popery. *Prima*

---

watermen on the Thames, I maintain public transport is a necessity. McPherson, A. (Editor), *History of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, op. cit.*, Appendix II, “Synod’s Statement in Reference to Church-Going by Public Conveyances on the Sabbath,” pp. 359-64; cf. pp. 139-40, 278, 374, 379.

*facie* it might be said that even if Laud was an Arminian, he was e.g., trying “to usher in the General Baptists,” although nobody has ever suggested this; and it must be said that the General (Arminian) Baptists used Puritan forms of worship that Laud did not follow. However, those Puritans who say Laud was trying “to usher in Popery” are left with a similar problem in that there are forms of Roman Catholic worship, such as invocation of saints, that Laud did not follow either.

Nevertheless, at a fundamental level, if it were true as the Puritans claimed, that Laud was trying “to usher in Popery,” then it necessarily follows that they had to prove he was an Arminian. That is because the Roman Church is Arminian. Hence while on the one hand, to prove “Laud’s Arminianism” would not *ipso facto* prove “Laud’s Romanism;” on the other hand, to disprove the claims of “Laud’s Arminianism,” would *ipso facto* disprove the claims of “Laud’s Romanism,” at least in the terms put by the Puritan Revolutionaries i.e., a Laudian conspiracy to reconcile the *Church of England* with the *Church of Rome*. Thus for the English Puritan Revolutionaries, they could not afford to lose their case against Laud on this issue. It was essential to their case that they prove “Laud’s Arminianism” in order to maintain their wider claim that Laud was trying to reintroduce the Roman Catholic religion. In seeking to so prove their case, the Puritan Revolutionaries clearly also showed that their power structures were in the hands of the Reformed Puritans. I.e., Arminian Puritan General Baptists evidently formed no major part in the upper echelons of their revolutionary power structures (which in broad terms were Congregationalist on top, and after “Pride’s Purge” of 1648 exclusively so when Charles was martyred by them; but before and after this time with some Presbyterians coming in and out of power positions).

The importance of “Laud’s Arminianism” as what a number of anti-Laudians would see as the example *par excellence* of “Laud’s Popery,” means I shall pay particular attention to it. While I can accept Laud was a semi-Romanist, I do not consider he was a Romanist Proper; and in particular, I do not accept that he was an Arminian. But before discussing this matter in greater detail, I shall first consider a smaller sample from the larger “examples” used of “Laud’s” so called “Popery,” to introduce the reader to some of the type of things Laud had to deal with in his trial. After discussing this and Laud’s Arminianism, a further broad area of matters, which once again involves elements of “Laud’s” so called “Popery,” are matters that can be largely summed up and encapsulated through reference to his role as judge in the Star Chamber court case of *Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn (1637)*. My selections are intended to give a broad overview, nothing more, and nothing less.

Typical of Puritan propaganda against Laud, e.g., Albert Close says, “The greatest calamity of the reign of Charles I was the attempt of Archbishop Laud to reverse the Reformation ..., and Romanize the *Church of England*. Laud was a thorough-going Romish idolater ...” And “King Charles I,” claims Close, was “Laud’s partner in” such “crimes” as “introducing idolatry.” (Or the “Earl of Stafford” is described “as a tyrant.”)<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Close, A., *Jesuit Plots*, Protestant Truth Society, London, [1935,] pp. 149-

*Some instances of “Laud’s Popery” as Puritan folly.*

The English Puritan Revolutionaries are regarded by Anglicans as somewhat crude and uneducated vandals. They had a pre-history of this long before Cromwell’s time. E.g., in November 2008 I visited Banbury in Oxfordshire, England, and inspected the present Banbury Cross erected for the marriage of Queen Victoria’s eldest daughter in 1859, and completed in 1911. It replaced the earlier Banbury Cross destroyed by Puritan vandals in 1602. The present Banbury Cross includes a statue of Queen Victoria (Regnal Years: 1837-1901) and King George V (Regnal Years: 1910-1936). Diagonally opposite it is another statue, with a woman sitting on a horse in the lady-like side-saddle position; around which are the words of the associated nursery rhyme: “Ride a cock horse to Banbury Cross, To see a fine lady upon a white horse; With rings on her fingers and bells on her toes, She shall have music wherever she goes.”

Who but crude fools would willfully destroy such a symbol of English cultural history as the Banbury Cross of this rhyme? This vandalism of Banbury Cross by Puritans in 1602, is exactly the type of thing that all Anglicans, and the better Puritans, have greatly disliked about the more extremist Puritans. But it was this extremist type of English Puritan that was behind the Puritan revolutionary republic of 1642-60.

Thus e.g., in 1643 at the Cathedral Church of Peterborough, Cromwell’s forces smashed and brake into pieces a large brass eagle lectern holding the Bible, and a number of chairs that each had a Latin distich (a couple of lines of Latin poetry) on them, which referred to Bible stories. They then turned their republican muskets towards a picture on the ceiling of our Lord and Saviour seated on a throne, surrounded by the four Evangelists and saints each holding crowns in their hands. They called this picture an “idol,” and then blasted it to pieces with round upon round of musket fire. They then smashed to pieces various stained glass windows. They then broke into the Chapter House and finding their some documents with Great Seals and Latin writing, they denounced them as Popish and started to destroy them. For these English Puritans, anything in Latin was necessarily some kind of “Pope’s Bull.” Over time, the greatly alarmed Anglicans finally dissuaded the Puritans from continuing their Latin destroying frenzy, on the basis that these were important legal property deeds, and that English Law sometimes used Latin<sup>57</sup>.

I shall not consider all of the many instances of “Laud’s” so called “Popery” raised at this trial. What some seem to consider is the most important single instance of this shall be considered separately, namely, “Laud’s” so called “Arminianism.” Some other matters of “Laud’s” so called “Popery” will emerge both in *Rex v. Bastwick, et al, infra*, and in discussion of Charles I, *infra*. But the small selection of wider samples I

---

156 at pp. 149 (Laud), 153 (Charles I), 155-6 (Earl of Stafford).

<sup>57</sup> *Hierurgia Anglicana* (1848), pp. 275-81.

now make shall help the reader to understand the types of issues that were unfairly raised at Laud's trial, and the type of thing that ultimately, by *Bill of Attainder*, led to his execution by decapitation in 1645 at the hands of the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60. The death of the Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury at the blade of Cromwell's Puritan axe-man, threw fat on the flames of the fight between Cromwell's English Puritan republican revolutionaries and the Royalist Anglican forces of King Charles the First.

One issue to be raised in Laud's trial, is the distinction between the Anglican view that a religious picture is not intrinsically or necessarily an idol, forbidden by the second commandment, but only becomes one if veneration or adoration is done to it; as opposed to the Puritan view, that the mere making of such an image, is a violation of the second commandment. For Reformed Anglicans, the words, "Thou shalt not make unto the any graven image" etc., must *be read conjunctively* with, "Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them" (Exod. 20:4,5); whereas for Puritans, these words should *be read disjunctively*, so that the first part, "Thou shalt not make unto the any graven image" etc., is itself a specific commandment. E.g., in St. Andrew's Cathedral, Sydney, the stained-glass windows would on this Puritan view, be "idols." This historical difference of interpretation with respect to the Second Commandment, led to some very Puritan type of allegations of Popish idolatry against Laud by the Puritan prosecution.

I shall now consider three Puritan charges that arose at Laud's trial of *Cromwell's Revolutionary Regime v. Archbishop of Canterbury (Laud) (1644)*. One charge was against a picture Laud had of the God the Holy Ghost, and two charges were against two pictures Laud had of God the Son.

On 20 May 1644 (10th day of trial), Laud was "charged with three pictures." "The first of them was a fair picture of the four fathers [*sic.* doctors] of the Western Church: St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, and St. Gregory." And "there was a Dove pictured over them, and that stood for the Holy Ghost." "The second was, 'The *Ecce Homo* [Latin, 'Behold the man,' John 19:5] as Pilate brought forth and showed him to the Jews." "The third picture ... relates that of our Saviour," "where he says, 'that the shepherd enters into the sheepfold by the door, but they which climb up to enter another way are thieves and robbers'" (John 10:1,2)<sup>58</sup>.

Laud defends these through reference to Calvin's teaching that one may depict anything which may be seen in Scripture. Though a different view to the Puritans, it is clearly a Reformed view. Concerning the second picture, Laud says, "it be not worshipped," "I" "have written as much against it," i.e., adoration, "as any Protestant hath;" and some of Laud's writings were then read. Concerning the third picture, Laud says, "in that picture the Pope and the friars are climbing upon to get in at the windows"

---

<sup>58</sup> *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Laud*, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury, John Henry Parker, Oxford, England, UK, 1854 (hereafter referred to as "Laud's Works,") Vol. 4, History of Troubles and trial, & c., pp. 204-5. Laud refers to Calvin's Lib. I, Inst. Cap. 11, s. 12; Op. tom. ix. p. 22. I shall modernize some English spellings from this work without specifically saying so at the time.

i.e., these are depicted as the *thieves and robbers*. “So,” says Laud, “’tis as directly against Popery as can be.”

Laud’s answers that these were not Popish idols, evidently did not satisfy the Puritans, since these pictures were subsequently defaced by the Puritans during the Great Rebellion of 1640-60. The Chapel they were in was converted by the English revolutionary Puritans into a secular hall; and to do so, the Puritans wickedly beat down Archbishop Matthew Parker’s tomb, and horribly desecrated his human remains. Now this Archbishop of Canterbury was famous for “Parker’s Table,” which was attached to the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* (till 1946 in England), and which forbade the same degrees of incest as the Presbyterian Westminster Confession, but which many of the Puritans of a Congregationalist or Baptist viewpoint did not agree with. Congregationalists (then known as “Independents,”) were more prominent under Cromwell, himself a Congregationalist, and following “Pride’s Purge” in 1648, they were put in control of the House of Commons for the tasks of “abolishing” the House of Lords and setting up a show trial as the preamble to murdering the king. Now the anti-Anglican profanities that these incest tolerant Puritans committed with the bones of His Grace, Archbishop Parker, are so gross, I do not wish to specify them; but that so the reader may have some idea of these Puritans’ evil, with difficulty, I advise that having taken his bones from the Chapel, they then profanely cast them into a dunghill.

Another “charge” brought against Laud at this same time (20 May 1644), was that he had in his “study, a [Roman Catholic] Missal, and diverse other books belonging to the Roman liturgy.” To which Laud replied, “’Tis true, I had many, but I had many more of the Greek [Orthodox] liturgies than the Roman. And I had as many of both as I could get. And I would know, *how we shall answer their errors*; if we may not have their books? I had Liturgies, all I could get, both ancient and modern. I had also the Alcoran [the *Koran*] in diverse copies. If this be an argument, why do they not accuse me to be a [Mohammedan] Turk?<sup>59</sup>”

It is clear that these crude Puritan Revolutionaries did not understand an academic or intellectual mind. They could not conceive that one would have a book and use it critically in some way. They could not allow that a man with copies of the Roman Missal was anything but a Papist. Laud shows that even on their own absurd logic this would also make him both Greek Orthodox and Mohammedan. Laud did not thank the Puritans for reminding him of the possible dangers of inadvertently picking up ideas from a Roman Missal, and the need to be diligent not to do this in one’s critical usage of such works; and the Puritans did not thank Laud for this clarification, but continued to depict him as Romish. Neither side were much interested in what the other side said, except only to reject it out of hand. Hence it was as though Laud had said nothing in reply to the Puritan charge, for the Puritans were not listening.

On Monday the 27th of May, 1644 (11th day of *Laud’s case*), one of the charges, was, “there were Latin prayer in Lent,” “in diverse” “university” “colleges.” Laud says,

---

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, p. 203 (emphasis mine).

they have” “had” “their morning prayers in Latin,” from “long before I knew the university.”

On the one hand, Article 24 of the 39 Articles, entitled, “Of speaking in the Congregation in such a tongue as the people understandeth,” prohibits through reference to “the Word of God,” either having “public prayer in the Church” or “minster[ing] the sacraments in a tongue” that “the people” do “not understand.” But on the other hand, Queen Elizabeth I had Letters Patent for translating the Prayer Book into Latin<sup>60</sup>. (Although it is true that Laud wanted a new Latin translation undertaken of the prayer book, which motion had been rejected by the Convocation in 1640<sup>61</sup>. And it is also the case that the *Church of England* extended throughout the Kingdom of England i.e., England and Wales, and Anglicans at one stage also had a Welsh copy made of the prayer book and Bible<sup>62</sup>.) Moreover, Canon 79 of the 1603 *Canons Ecclesiastical* says that, “All schoolmasters shall teach in English or Latin, as the children are able to bear, the larger or shorter Catechism” of the *Church of England*.

I Cor. 14 prohibits the usage of “an unknown tongue,” for which reason the Protestant Reformers all introduced church services in a language that the people could understand, and so too a translation of the Bible. The Anglican Protestants clearly were part of this broad Protestant belief. However, the NT does not prohibit the usage of a Latin Church Service. Indeed, Latin was a well known and accepted language in NT times, being the language of the Roman Empire (Luke 23:38; John 19:20). And St. Paul says in this same passage, “There are, it may be, so many kinds of voices” or languages “in the world, and none of them is without signification” or significance (I Cor. 14:10).

Anglicans historically taught Latin in Anglican Schools, hence canon 79 says “schoolmasters” (school teachers) “shall teach” “the” “Catechism” “in English or Latin,” providing the children can understand the latter. Likewise, Reformed Anglicans have no objections to a Latin Church Service, *providing*, and here is the point that the Puritans miss, *PROVIDING that all those present in the congregation understand Latin, and so it is not thereby an unknown tongue to them.* (And on this same basis, and with this same qualification, also a Welsh Service.) But for all that, Anglicans largely decided to discontinue this practice of such Latin services after the Restoration in 1660, and so the 1662 prayer book was never translated into Latin, at least *officially*. (Although some unofficial Latin translations of the 1662 prayer book have been made<sup>63</sup>.)

---

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, p. 221; Wilkins’ Conc. Tom. iv. p. 217.

<sup>61</sup> Davies, J., *The Caroline Captivity of the Church*, *op. cit.*, p. 266.

<sup>62</sup> Gibson, E., *Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani*, or the Statutes, Constitutions, Canons, Rubrics, & Articles of the Church of England, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2nd edition, 1761, (hereafter called Edmund Gibson’s or Gibson’s *Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani*), Vol. 1, pp. 289-90 (A.D. 1562, Statute 5 Eliz. Cap. 28).

<sup>63</sup> The Act of Uniformity (1662) says, “it shall and may be lawful to use the Morning and Evening Prayers and Services prescribed in” it, “in the Chapels or other

Anglicans historically made provision for school teachers or tertiary college teachers to use Latin in certain contexts; but they would only use Latin for the Catechism in schools, or religious services in a tertiary College Chapel, *providing* it was with those who understood a necessary level of Latin. If not, as was more commonly the case, both the Catechism and Church Services were in English. Thus Anglicans did not identify with the Latin-phobia of these Puritans, who it must be admitted, would never put a Catechism in Latin, or ever have a church service in Latin under any circumstances. In an over-reaction to the Latin Church, it seems that the Puritans regarded Latin as something akin to a forbidden tongue. However, Latin was historically the language of learning; and it was required knowledge of university students. Hence to have Latin prayers *at a university college*, using the Latin translation of the prayer book authorized by Queen Elizabeth I, was perfectly proper in such a context.

*I now wish to make a broad general comment* on these instances of Laud's so called "Popery." These Puritans were happy to cite the King James Version, or other translation whose New Testament was a translation of the Greek Received Text. Indeed, Puritans, like Anglicans and Lutherans, used no other than a Received Text based Bible. Yet these Puritans here attacked Laud, failing to understand that he had books such as "Greek [Orthodox] liturgies" which he used critically, "as many" he says, "as I could get." Now Greek liturgies (from e.g., both what is modern Greece and modern Turkey,) whether the Eastern Greek Church under the Patriarchate of Constantinople (this Patriarchate was established by Constantine the Great and remained independent of Rome till 607<sup>64</sup>), Roman Catholic Eastern Greek Church (607-1054, the Patriarchate of

---

publick places of the Universities" of Oxford and Cambridge, "in the Colleges of Westminster, Winchester, and Eton, and in the Convocations of the Clergies ... in Latin ... ." But I would not agree with the 1965 extension of this to "such other places of religious and sound learning as custom doth allow or the Ordinary may permit" by the Westminster Parliament's *Prayer Book (Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure* (1965); as this opens the door for the very type of thing the Reformation sought to halt with Cranmer's English liturgy, and at the Ordinary's discretion it is potentially contrary to Article 24 of the Anglican 39 Articles.

<sup>64</sup> In the 4th century, Constantine the Great established four patriarchates to govern the church, thus creating the Patriarch of Constantinople, Patriarch of Antioch, Patriarch of Alexandria, and Patriarch of the West in Rome, to which he added shortly later, a fifth, the Patriarch of Jerusalem. These were four, then five, autonomously governed church regions. Bishops of these five cities were made Patriarchs over the entire region of their Patriarchate. Thus it was that the Bishop of Rome who formerly had jurisdiction and power only in the City of Rome, being made the Patriarch of the West, for the first time came to exercise church power beyond Rome itself. But Rome wanted more. In time, her religio-political campaign for church primacy secured the voluntary submission of the Patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, who agreed to support, and submit to, Rome. But Constantinople did not agree with the new idea, and so by the time of the *Council of Chalcedon* (451) there was a bi-polar governed

Constantinople was made subject to the Bishop of Rome by Decree of the Byzantine Emperor Phocas, in 607), or Greek Orthodox Church (from 1054, the Patriarchate of Constantinople regained its pre-607 independence from Rome in the *Great Schism* of 1054, and then formed the Greek Orthodox Church), are an important element of the Greek Byzantine Text which is the starting point of the NT Received Text, from which one only moves away if there is a good textual reason to do so.

The detailed work on collating readings in just over 2,000 Byzantine Text manuscripts (out of about 2,450 Manuscripts), consisting of both Codices and Minuscules, has been largely done by von Soden (1913). This includes over 1900 manuscripts that are completely Byzantine text, and over 100 manuscripts that are Byzantine text only in specific parts. Von Soden's (1913) work covers almost every Codex and Minuscule we know of. Though detailed work has only been done on between 100 and 200 Greek Lectionaries, the general work done on the Greek Lectionaries shows they are Byzantine Text. The several thousand Greek manuscripts of the representative Byzantine Text include readings from Greek Church Lectionaries numbering over 2,300 lectionaries and dating from between the 4th and 16th centuries<sup>65</sup>; although only 100 to 200 have ever been looked at in greater detail. Are we to forsake the study of the many jewels of the Byzantine text as we find in the Greek Lectionaries for the sake of Puritan scruples against the critical usage of "Greek liturgies"? *Absolutely not! Indeed I would wish to encourage a greater study of these Lectionaries!*

---

state church, partly from Rome, and partly from Constantinople (as well as some outer lying independent churches, for instance, orthodox ones in the British Isles and unorthodox monophysitist ones in the Middle East). In 533, the Byzantine Emperor, Justinian, ascribed to Rome titular primacy over Constantinople, but this survived only till his death, and gave Rome no governing power over the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Then in 607, the Bishop of Rome got a decree from Phocas giving him governing primacy as "universal bishop" over Constantinople. Thus the first Roman Pope was Boniface III in 607. See Preface "Scripture Citations of Bishop Gregory the Great in Matt. 1-14."

<sup>65</sup> Aland, K., *Kurzgefasste Liste Der Griechishchen Handschriften Des Neuen Testaments*, *op. cit.*, pp. 219-370. The representative Byzantine Text is determined through reference to the Codices and Minuscules collated by von Soden (see Robinson & Pierpont's and Hodges & Farstad's majority texts). Aland lists just over 2,400 lectionaries, although the representative Byzantine text is determined from manuscripts up to the phasing out of handwritten manuscripts in a process starting about the mid 15th century marked by the invention of the printing press (Gutenberg d. 1468) and fall of the Byzantine Empire's capital, Constantinople (1453), till and finishing at the end of the 16th century. I thus exclude from the count later lectionaries from the 17th century on. The range includes Byzantine text Lectionaries from the 4th century (Lectionary 1604), 5th century (Lectionaries 1043 & 1601), 6th century (1347 & 1354), 6th / 7th centuries (2210), 7th century (1348), just over a dozen lectionaries from the 8th century, four from the 8th & 9th centuries, another dozen from the 9th century, with most from the 10th to 16th centuries.

*I am, by the grace of God, “doing my bit” to this end by making a special feature of these commentaries starting from Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20) on, and thus incorporated into the Revised Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), data from two Lectionaries which have never before been studied in greater detail, namely, Sydney University Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, selections from Gospels, Constantinople Lectionary from Bulgaria) and 1968 (1544 A.D., selections from Gospels & Acts to I John, from Cyprus).*

These Puritans also criticized the Anglican maintenance and selective usage of Latin, *among those for whom it was not an unknown tongue* in the university colleges. Yet both Latin and Greek writings had general accessibility over time and through time, and manuscripts written in both are inside the closed class of NT sources. When a textual problem arises in the representative Byzantine Greek Text, they are consulted, and sometimes followed if different to the representative Byzantine Text and so warranted by textual analysis. Thus some preservation of knowledge of the Latin tongue is desirable for this (and other reasons). Are we to exchange the preservation of Latin in colleges for the contemptuous Latin-phobic sentiments of these Puritans? *May it never be!*

These Puritans also greatly disliked, and ultimately foolishly defaced, a picture in Lambeth Palace Chapel of the four traditional ancient and early mediaeval church doctors of the Western Church, St. Ambrose (d. 397), St. Jerome (d. 420), St. Augustine (d. 430), and St. Gregory the Great (d. 604); over whom was beautifully depicted a Dove, representing the Holy Spirit of God (Matt. 3:16). Now the writings of the church fathers, together with other ancient church writers from the post NT times up to the 5th century, whether in Greek or in Latin, together with those of mediaeval times, especially early medieval times, such as those of St. Gregory, are important because they are inside the closed class sources. These may be consulted if there is a textual problem in the representative Byzantine text, and sometimes adopted if different to the representative Byzantine Text and so warranted by textual analysis. This includes e.g., St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate.

Now I do not say that any man, Christ except, was ever perfect, or that the works of the church fathers and other ancient or mediaeval church writers ought to be accepted uncritically. Nevertheless, are we to desecrate the names of such saintly church doctors as Ambrose, Jerome, Austin, and Gregory, and cast the proper respect we should have for them aside, going so far as to vandalise a picture of them depicting the Holy Ghost over them, in order to appease extremist Puritan views? I say the name of “God” reverently when I say, *“God forbid!”* *Indeed, I would wish to encourage a greater study of the citations in St. Gregory which are found in NO PRESENT TEXTAUL APPARATUSES.* *I am, by the grace of God, “doing my bit” to this end by making a special feature of these commentaries starting from Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20) on, and thus incorporated into the Revised Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), data from Migne on Scriptural citations of Gregory.*

One of Archbishop Laud’s collected manuscripts is now known as *Codex Laudianus* or *Oxonii Laudianus*. This is a 6th century Latin-Greek diglot of the Book of Acts, and now in the Bodleian Library of Oxford University in England. While the Greek of this bi-lingual manuscript is of a mixed text type and so outside the closed class

of sources (known as Greek Codex E 08); the Latin of this bi-lingual is part of the wider Latin textual tradition, and so inside the closed class of sources (known as Latin e, in e.g., Merk's *Novum Testamentum* for Acts, and not to be confused with the different Latin e for the Gospels). (In this respect, *Codex Laudianus* is something like the 5th century Greek-Latin diglot, *Codex Bezae*, formerly owned by Beza of Geneva, whose Greek Codex D 05 is also outside, but whose Latin d is also inside, the closed class of sources).

It seems to me that rather than trying to use these types of things to claim Archbishop Laud was seeking to usher in Popery, and on this basis, convict him of treason (which ultimately happened by *Bill of Attainder*), and kill him; *the whole attitude of these revolutionary Puritans on these types of issues should have been far more circumspect*. I think they should have gone into their chambers, bowed their knees (or if they did not believe in kneeling, then stand), and put their hands together in prayer. In such prayer, they should have *thanked God* that Anglicans like Archbishop Laud were keeping copies of Greek liturgies *which they used critically*, and so fostering an interest in Greek lectionaries which are important to the NT Received Text; they should have *thanked God* that Anglicans like Archbishop Laud were keeping Latin manuscripts like *Codex Laudianus* and keeping alive Latin in the colleges, and so fostering an interest in Latin which thing is important to the NT *Textus Receptus*; and they should have *thanked God* that Anglicans like Archbishop Laud were holding in high regard the four traditional ancient and early mediaeval Western church doctors, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Austin, and St. Gregory, and so fostering an interest in ancient and early mediaeval church writers, which thing is important to the Received Text.

In humble prayer they should have thanked God that the Anglican Church had, by the grace of God, created an environment where these important elements of the Received Text were recognized, and thanked God that from such an environment came so many of the *King James Version* translators. They should have asked God for wisdom, as to how they might best act to protect, safeguard, and assist such Anglicans in these matters, bearing in mind, that should the *Textus Receptus* ever come under sustained and systematic attack, and the people prayed to God for relief, it may well be that His Divine Majesty, the Lord Jehovah, would call forth a textual analyst from an Anglican background to defend his holy text (I Peter 3:15). For there are different gifts, and different types of teachers (I Cor. 12:27-30; Eph. 4:11). "Are all teachers" of, for instance, the Received Text (I Cor. 12:29)? Nay, but only "some" are "teachers" *per se* (Eph. 4:11), and even fewer are teachers of the *Textus Receptus*, and not many at that. Now from where God calls a man is entirely his business, and not mine. Nevertheless, it would be surely inconceivable that the Lord would call a man to do such a work, if he was opposed to the critical usage of Greek lectionaries of the Byzantine Text, if he was Latin-phobic, or if he was opposed to the usage of ancient or early mediaeval church writers, and disrespectful to ancient and early mediaeval church doctors.

Now the fair flower of gratitude and thankfulness is a fruit of the Spirit, e.g., St. Paul says to the Colossians, "We give thanks to God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, praying always for you" (Col. 1:3). Yet one will not find such a fair flower of gratitude from these Puritans for anything done by Archbishop Laud and the Anglican

Church. Instead, one will find a good deal of foolish malice and slander uttered against him, and blasphemy against the means and methods that God has used to preserve our knowledge of the NT text, as found in the New Testament *Textus Receptus*. If they truly did believe in the NT Received Text, then these Puritans *cut off their nose in order to spite their face*; for how can there be a Received Text “if the foundations be destroyed?” (Ps. 11:3). These Puritans targeted the building blocks of the *Textus Receptus* as surely as any religious liberal, although their form was different to that of the religious liberals. Their attack of Laud on these types of issues was a disgrace and a dishonour to the name of Protestantism. They greatly shamed and degraded themselves on these points. I thank God that the better Puritan Protestants join with their Anglican Protestant brethren in Christ to denounce this type of nonsense!

*Some instances of “Laud’s Popery” as fairly being characterized as Laud’s Innovations.*

Does this mean that Laud escapes all criticism for “innovations?” The Reformed Anglican view (unlike the Puseyite view,) is generally cool towards, and critical of, Laud, although not as strongly so as the English revolutionary Puritan view which criticizes both Laud’s Anglicanism and Laudianism alike, making no distinction between them. As further discussed, *infra*, Laud was associated with some unwarranted innovations, even though he was falsely accused of many more than he actually was associated with. It seems to me that a number of areas arise which may be fairly said to be innovations that Laud was in some way involved in promoting. I shall here isolate nine or ten, but possibly there were more. The extent to which these were specifically Laud’s innovations, and the extent to which he was part of a wider Laudian circle are not always entirely clear e.g., innovation 4, genuflecting, appears to have originated with Bishop Andrewes, and then expanded by others such as Laud. But to the extent that they were connected with Laud, I refer to them as Laudianism, and distinct from Anglicanism. Thus while I would concur with criticisms of Laud’s Laudianism, unlike the Puritan revolutionaries, I would not concur with their criticisms of his Anglicanism. Before considering nine or ten further innovations of Laud, let us consider the Canons of 1640.

*The Canons of 1640.* Interpretations may vary as to what Charles I initially thought of the 1640 canons, and the extent to which he originally was familiar with them. But while he initially gave his assent to them, it is certainly clear that by the end of 1640 Charles was dissociating himself from the 1640 canons and other ecclesiastical policies of the 1630s. Those hostile to Charles see this as a “surreptitious<sup>66</sup>,” and even if in theory they were correct to see a change of Caroline policy, I would see this as indicating repentance from past sins, and I would not be critical of it. I.e., if for whatever reason

---

<sup>66</sup> *The Caroline Captivity of the Church, op. cit.*, pp. 270,287. There are diverse interpretations of this era, and while I do not share the categories of thought and paradigm through which Davies filters his perceptions, I nevertheless find some useful information in this work, even though I consider he looks at in an erroneous manner (and he would no doubt make a similar claim about my perceptions, categories of thought, and paradigm).

Charles had first “botched it” by giving his assent to these 1640 canons, the fact that upon matured consideration he realized he had made a mistake and then distanced himself from them is something he should be commended for, not condemned for. After all, none of us are “perfect,” “for in many things we offend” (James 3:2).

However, more generally, I consider that Charles essentially worked with his Primates, whether Laud in England or Ussher in Ireland, in a typical English patron-type way, allowing both a good deal of freedom, and in Laud’s case, far too much freedom. In this context, I think the fact that he originally gave his assent to them on this type of basis, i.e., he was misadvised, probably by Laud, to give his assent; and likewise had them enforced, for instance, he thought of the Etcetera Oath as a mechanism to counteract the *National Covenant (1640)* of Scotland. E.g., on 20 Aug 1640 Charles ordered Laud to direct bishops in the Southern Province to not impose the Etcetera Oath on any further clergy, although to still use it for Ordinands and those to be instituted<sup>67</sup>. But later, upon realizing what the 1640 canons were really all about, he then realized he had made a mistake in not carefully checking them out earlier, and so near the end of 1640 distanced himself from these 1640s canons.

*To the extent that Charles had not studied them with all due care before that time he may be criticized of negligence; and it must be said that to the extent that he originally gave his assent to them he was unwise.* In upholding the revival of *King Charles the First’s Day* in Australia from 1978, Sinden says that sometimes “Charles was ... unwise<sup>68</sup>,” and I would certainly consider that he was so to give his assent to these canons. But Sinden also says “Charles ... was a staunch defender of the Church of England” and had a “high sense of religious principle,” and we here also see this in the fact that by the end of the 1640s, Charles started to realize that he had given Laud and the Laudians too much free reign, and these 1640 canons were an example of that fact. Hence Charles then wisely distanced himself from their Laudian odium, e.g., formally renouncing the Etcetera Oath in late 1640s; or in August 1641, Charles very specifically distanced himself from both the 1640 canons *and Laud*<sup>69</sup>.

I certainly think some reference may first be profitably made to these Canons of 1640. That is because they illustrate a number of relevant factors. Specifically, in the first place, the way Laudians were semi-Romanists but not Romanists Proper. That is, Laudians were trying to go back to the early stages of the Reformation, and reinvent Anglicanism in a more semi-Romanist and anti-Puritan manner i.e., they were opposed to the second stage of the Reformation largely developed under Queen Elizabeth. In the second place, these 1640 Canons show how Laudians were trying to create ambiguous

---

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 275,277.

<sup>68</sup> Gilbert Sinden’s “Times & Seasons” (1980), *op. cit.*, p. 61 at “January” “30. Charles, King of England (1600-1649).”

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 295 (1640) & p. 274 (1641); citing BL Harl. MS 6424/88v; & Russell, C.S.R., *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, Vol. 411 (Nov. 1968), pp. 229-36.

terminology that they could then use to promote Laudianism i.e., a lawyer's type approach to change, in which a legal fiction was created that there was no change, when in fact there was. Thirdly, they show how Laudians was prepared to sometimes try to change the law while trying to give the impression he was not doing so, since these canons were illegal.

But before considering these three elements of the 1640 Canons, there is another fourth element they illustrate. Following these illegal 1640 canons<sup>70</sup>, in the same year, Laud was impeached by the Puritan Parliament on the charge of high treason in December 1640. Subsequently imprisoned from March 1640, he was not brought to trial till 3 years later in March 1644. He was later executed by beheading in January 1645. On the one hand, *to some extent* the Puritan controlled legislature would represent a Protestant spirit also endorsed by Reformed Anglicans both then and now, which would see in Laudianism an attempt to roll back the second stages of the Reformation, for which Laud should have been justly disciplined. Certainly these canons were illegal and undesirable. But on the other hand, the charge of "high treason" was clearly excessive and inaccurate, and he ought to have been disciplined and deprived of his Archbishopric on more sensible grounds, specifically aimed at his undermining of the 39 Articles and 1559 & 1604 prayer book e.g., his reintroduction of auricular confession, *infra*.

Thus the 1640 Canons illustrate both the fact that Laudians wanted to roll back the second stage advances of the Protestant Reformation that the *Church of England* had progressed to, largely from Elizabeth's time; and also the fact, that the Puritans simultaneously wanted to go in the very opposite direction. I.e., the English Puritans of Parliament wanted to go further than these second stage reforms, into what it would regard as "third stage" Puritan reforms. *This then focuses on an important complexity of the era.* Because the Puritans of Parliament wanted to take the *Church of England* from its second stage reforms to "third stage" Puritan reforms; and at the same time Laudians wanted to take the *Church of England* back from second stage reforms to the first stages of the Reformation, and then reinvent Anglicanism in a more semi-Romanist and anti-Puritan manner, *the Puritans of Parliament over-reacted to Laud, who should have been disciplined and deprived of his Archbishopric, but not charged with "high treason" and trying to reconcile the Church of England with the Church of Rome, and then executed on these types of grounds. Thus the Puritans of Parliament did not simply wish to correct Laudian abuses, in which instance they could have joined forces with Reformed Anglicans like James Ussher in stopping Laudianism and returning the Church of England to the second stage of the Reformation i.e., its pre-Laudian form. Rather, the Puritans of Parliament exploited the Laudians folly to try and make England Puritan. THUS BOTH LAUDIANS AND THE ENGLISH PURITANS OF PARLIAMENT WERE EXTREMIST GROUPS, MUTUALLY OPPOSED TO THE STATUS QUO OF A REFORMED ANGLICAN CHURCH WHICH HAD ADVANCED TO THE SECOND STAGE OF THE REFORMATION, AND BOTH GROUPS ACTED IN A PINCER*

---

<sup>70</sup> The Canons of 1640, in Bray, G. (Editor), *The Anglican Canons 1529-1947*, Church of England Record Society in association with The Ecclesiastical Law Society, The Boydell Press, Woodbridge, Suffolk, England, UK, 1998, pp. 553-578.

*MOVEMENT AGAINST REFORMED ANGLICANS, DEPICTING THEM “ON THE OTHER SIDE” OF A TWO-WAY BATTLE, THAT IN REALITY WAS A THREE-WAY BATTLE. This is illustrated in both the 1640 canons and the Puritans’ response.*

Let us now consider the other three issues evident in the 1640 Canons. Firstly, the fact that Laudians were semi-Romanist, and not as the Puritans claimed, Romanist Proper and seeking to reconcile the Church of England with the Church of Rome. Secondly, the Laudian *modus operandi* of creating ambiguous terminology and so deviously seeking to change the Church of England in such a way as to roll back second stage Reforms, and introduce innovations. And thirdly, the illegality of these 1640 canons.

The first two elements are simultaneously seen in some parts of the 1640 Canons. In broad terms, the Canons of 1640 may be criticized for introducing ambiguous statements, that Laudians could then exploit to promote Laudianism. It is clear that both Reformed Anglicans who had gone to the second stage of the Reformation, together with Puritans, were both criticizing Laudianism since these canons refer to “rites and ceremonies” that “began to fall into disuse” from the time of “Queen Elizabeth” the First onwards. There is then an associated denial of “intention of ... Popish innovation<sup>71</sup>.” Of course, some of these “rites and ceremonies” were Laudian inventions that were fantasized into existence by Laudians e.g., nodding at the name of Jesus, which they then anachronistically tried to claim had “fall[en] into disuse.” But this type of terminology of “rites and ceremonies” that “began to fall into disuse” is an example of open-ended terminology that could then be used by Laudians to introduce various innovations they anachronistically claimed existed. It took the focus of the Bible and advancing in the spirit of Biblical Protestantism, and acted to create more of a legal argument, attracting unBiblical Laudians to its cause.

That Laudians were not as the English Puritans claimed, seeking to reconcile the Church of England with the Church of Rome; but rather, seeking to go back to the time of the Reformation, and then reinvent Anglicanism in a more anti-Puritan manner, while still staying “Protestant,” i.e., in broad terms in a more Lutheran way, is also clear from these canons. E.g., statements criticizing “Popish superstitions;” and claiming support for the “Reformation under King Edward the Sixth,” for “which” Anglicans “suffered martyrdom in Queen Mary [the First]’s days, but also” were “again taken up by this whole church under Queen Elizabeth [the First].” And other such reference to “the Reformation.” These canons sought to “reduce all ... to the Church of England who are misled into Popish superstition,” i.e., conversion of Roman Catholics to the Anglicanism<sup>72</sup>. For the Laudians were semi-Romanists who wanted to undo the advances of the second stage of the Reformation wrought largely from the time of Queen Elizabeth; but were not, at least in broad general terms, like the 19th century Puseyites, seeking to also undo the first stage of the Reformation, the Lutheran Reformation.

---

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 554-5.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 554,556,561.

This reinvented Laudian Anglicanism had no place for tolerance, and sought to “punish those who willfully absent themselves from church on holy days<sup>73</sup>.” To this, the Puritans took justifiable offence, it being in contravention of their Christian liberties under e.g., Rom. 14:5,6 to so compel them. But the matter was important for Laudians, since as discussed in further detail, *infra*, Laud reactivated an old Elizabethan statute requiring Sunday observance under penalty of fine in court; and so Laudians then used this as a precedent to claim similar “disuse” of various things had wrongly occurred since Elizabethan times, when in fact they had not. Moreover even if in theory the Laudians were right about something falling into disuse, of which this old Elizabethan statute would be an example, the focus should not have been on such a legal argument, but on the Bible’s teachings, and the fact that per Rom. 14:5,6 *et al* Anglicans should be free to keep holy days, and Puritans free to not keep them, for in Scripture, only the holy day of the weekly Sunday is required.

Laud’s desire to create ambiguous terminology the Laudians could then exploit, is e.g., evident in the fact that section 6:2 required an oath, which said, “I ... do swear ... that I will not ... give my consent to alter the government of this church by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, *et cetera*, ...<sup>74</sup>.” Most of this oath is basically sound, and includes some desirable anti-Popish statements e.g., to not “bring in any Popish doctrine.” (This helps explain why without sufficient care and consideration, Charles I originally supported it, thinking of it as a counter-balance to the *National Covenant of 1640* of Scotland.) Nevertheless, to swear to something as vague as, “I will not ... give my consent to ... *et cetera*,” is an oath crying out for legal determination of what is meant by “*et cetera*.” The Latin, “*et* (and) *cetera* (otherwise),” frequently abbreviated as “etc.,” is as about open to legal interpretation as anything could be. Known in church tradition as *The Et Cetera Oath*, Laudians here sought to create an oath that they could then legally be interpreted in the ecclesiastical courts and elsewhere, injecting just about anything they wanted to into the open-ended “*et cetera*.” (This explains why upon matured reflection, Charles I renounced it.)

Similar vagueness attaches to the terminology of “the said gesture” at Communion, which could mean kneeling to receive Communion (Reformed Anglican view & traditional Anglican view), or possibly be interpreted as genuflecting at the consecrated elements<sup>75</sup>. Was it then intended to legally interpret this under *The Et Cetera Oath*?

Likewise, what is meant by the reintroduction of the term “altar” in the following statement, “the holy table ... ought not the be esteemed a true and proper altar whereon

---

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 560.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 568-9.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 571.

Christ is again really sacrificed, but it is and may be called an altar by us in that sense in which the primitive church called it an altar, and in no other<sup>76</sup>”? On the one hand, it appears to close off the door to transubstantiation (“not ... whereon Christ is again really sacrificed”), but on the other hand, it appears to open the door to a Lutheran consubstantiation usage of “altar.” Of course, one could still theoretically argue that the only true “sense in which the primitive church called it an altar,” was that the Offertory (money Collection) was placed on it with reference to I Cor. 9:13,14. But this type of thing was historically rejected by Reformed Anglicanism in the second stage of the Reformation, with the word “table” being exclusively used for the *Communion Table* or *Lord’s Table* or *Holy Table*. Anglicans had retained the term “priest” for a Minister (Rom. 15:16), but entirely broke the priest-altar nexus so that this would not be understood with reference to some kind of Romish “sacrifice of the mass” (Article 31, 39 Articles). But the combination of the two is *too open to misinterpretation and so too theologically dangerous*. We thus see that the Laudians here managed in these illegal 1640 canons to reintroduce the term “altar” and thus roll back a second stage Anglican reform, and also attach to it ambiguous terminology, “an altar by us in that sense in which the primitive church called it an altar, and in no other.” Was it then intended to legally interpret this under *The Et Cetera Oath*?

Laudians had a Lutheran consubstantiation view, and in this context it is notable that the 1640 canon twice used the term, “Eucharist<sup>77</sup>.” As seen by Anglican prayer books, Reformed Anglicans use the terms, “Communion,” “Holy Communion,” or “Lord’s Supper,” i.e., words cross-referable to the Biblical passages on “the communion” (I Cor. 10:16) and “the Lord’s Supper” (I Cor. 11:20). The English term, “Eucharist,” comes from the Ecclesiastical Greek word, *eucharistia*, meaning “Thanksgiving,” which in turn is from the Greek word, *eucharistos* (ευχαριστος), meaning “thankful” or “grateful.” The Greek *eucharisteo* is derived from *eucharistos*, and the Greek *eucharisteo* is found at the institution of the Lord’s Supper. For at the Last Supper, Christ “took bread, and gave thanks (*eucharistesas*, masculine singular nominative, active aorist participle, from *eucharisteo*), and brake it” (Luke 22:19); and likewise “he took the cup, and gave thanks (*eucharistesas*, from *eucharisteo*)” (Luke 22:17).

On the one hand, reference is made to this Ecclesiastical Greek in the Anglican 39 Articles, for we read in Article 35, Homily 15, Book 2, entitled, “Of the worthy receiving of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ” (second part), “the godly fathers named it *Eucharistia*, that is, ‘Thanksgiving’: as if they should have said, ‘Now above all other times ye ought to laud and praise God ...’.” But on the other hand, Reformed Anglicans use the terms, “Communion,” “Holy Communion,” or “Lord’s Supper,” *supra*.

This raises the question of “Why?” Reformed Anglicans upholding the 1662 prayer book do not want the term “Eucharist” used. The answer relates to the fact that in The Communion Service, the section starting with “Lift up your hearts. We lift them up

---

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 570.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 561 & 571.

unto the Lord,” is known as “The Thanksgiving,” and introduces the section that then leads to the consecration of the elements. *In practice*, those who believe in consubstantiation or transubstantiation have often used the term “Eucharist” in order to *put an emphasis on this section in connection with their consubstantiation or transubstantiation views*. On the one hand, a stronger brother in Christ who understands the Greek meaning and thinks in terms of Luke 22:17,19, may be able to use the term “Eucharist” without any problems. But on the other hand, when this type of thing is done at a church level, a weaker brother, perceiving the inordinate focus on this part of the Communion Service, may be lead more easily into the false belief of consubstantiation. We are commanded in Rom. 14 and I Cor. 8 not to do this type of thing, but rather, to “walk in love” (Eph. 5:2).

We cannot ignore the finding of church history that substantial numbers can be led astray into consubstantiation, or worse still, transubstantiation thinking. We must guard against this type of thing vigilantly. It is does not matter that this term was used in ancient times by e.g., Justin Martyr<sup>78</sup>; for while the usage of this term is not intrinsically contrary to Scripture, over time this tradition of using the term “Eucharist” *has not been found to be useful and good, but rather harmful to the spiritual life of many weaker brethren (I do not say it has had this effect on all who so use it,) and so IT SHOULD NOT BE RETAINED*. Thus *we should not now use this term, “Eucharist”<sup>79</sup>*. That is *because it easily creates a false focus easily leading people into error*.

Good Christian reader, if you do not agree with me on this, do not point me to the stronger brother who can use a term like “Eucharist” and still believe in a symbolic view of the sacrament, and not in any way believe in consubstantiation (or worse still, transubstantiation). Although even here, are you sure he has not fallen for the sin of pride as he smiles and talks about how, “Protestants have to get over things like not using the term, ‘Eucharist’?” But instead, good Christian reader, I ask you to look at the deluded masses in Popery who bow down and commit idolatry with the consecrated bread because of their belief in transubstantiation. I ask you to consider the horrible apostasy that has occurred within Anglicanism as Puseyites following Laudians in consubstantiation and using this term, “Eucharist,” have (unlike Luther himself,) then gone into idolatry. For it is well known that both Puseyites Proper (“Anglo-Catholics”) and Semi-Puseyites (“Broadchurchmen”), have set aside the words found in the Final Rubric of the Communion Service, “adoration ... unto the sacramental bread and wine ... were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;” as they genuflect (Puseyites) or nod (many, not all, semi-Puseyites) at the consecrated elements.

---

<sup>78</sup> Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 66-67 (Justin, I, lxxv-lxxvii).

<sup>79</sup> Cf. the same type of Anglican thinking for banning crucifixes in e.g., my comments in Volume 1 (Preface, “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” section c) i) “Charles the First’s Day ..., Charles the Second’s Day ... , & Papists’ Conspiracy Day ...,” subsection, “Puritan propagandists turn Puritanism and ‘Protestantism’ into synonyms”) and Volume 2 (Commentary at Matt. 19:29c and Matt. 20:21).

For there is nothing intrinsically wrong with the term, “Eucharist,” even as there is nothing intrinsically wrong with eating the meat offered to idols. *But many cannot make the disconnection between meat offered to idols and idolatry, so that if such a brother is around, one ought not to eat such meat* (Rom. 14 & I Cor. 8). So likewise, *many cannot make the disconnection between the term “Eucharist” and the idolatry connected with this term in Romanism and Puseyism* (i.e., both Puseyism Proper and Semi-Puseyism). *And the term itself, because it is not a term one would normally use, like “Supper,” potentially lends itself to misinterpretation; and then when it is explained to people that it refers to “The Thanksgiving,” this may then create an over-focus in their minds on “The Thanksgiving” part of the Communion Service. This in turn easily lends itself to the type of misunderstanding and misinterpretation that has led both Papists and Puseyites into idolatry.*

You say you know what the term “Eucharist” really means and so it does not affect you this way personally, and so you want to keep using it at church? “We know that we all have knowledge. Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth. And if any man think that he knoweth any thing, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know. But if any man love God, the same is known of him” (I Cor. 8:3). As concerning therefore the eating of those things” associated with “idols” (I Cor. 8:4) in the Roman Mass or Eucharist or Puseyites’ Eucharist. “We know that an idol is nothing” (I Cor. 8:4). But “there is not in every man that knowledge” (I Cor. 8:7). So “take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling block to them that are weak” (I Cor. 8:9). “And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?” (I Cor. 8:11). “Wherefore” if such things “make thy brother to offend, I will” not do them “while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend” (I Cor. 8:13).

“Be not high-minded, but fear” (Rom. 11:20). “*Get off your high horse!*” with all this foolish intellectual pride about how you can “use a term like ‘Eucharist’ which you say is alright because it is derived some Bible passages,” and start thinking about your Christian brethren whom you are hurting grievously without thinking about it. *Start walking in Christian love!* (Eph. 5:2). Start using simple Biblical terms like “Communion” and “Lord’s Supper” which people can understand in English, and which do not mislead them like the word, “Eucharist.” “It is good neither to” do “any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak” (Rom. 14:21).

As for the fact that these illegal canons of 1640 twice used the term, “Eucharist,” we may well ask, “Was the meaning of ‘Eucharist’ then intended to be legally interpreted by Laudians as ‘consubstantiation’ under *The Et Cetera Oath?*”

I shall now leave further analysis of these 1640 canons, other than to note the third of the four issues, *supra*, namely, the important fact of their illegality. On the one hand, those arguing for these 1640 canons legality, like to point to the fact that Parliament did not specifically sanction or ratify the Elizabethan injunctions of 1559 nor Jacobean canons of 1603<sup>80</sup>. However, I would consider this to be a so called, “half-

---

<sup>80</sup> Davies, J., *The Caroline Captivity of the Church*, *op. cit.*, pp. 252,273.

truth.” That is because neither the 1559 Injunction nor 1603 canons of Convocation were contrary to the established doctrine of the *Church of England* as stated by Acts of Parliament. *Therefore they were allowed by parliament to stand on the basis that Convocation had exercised delegated powers and not acted ultra vires*<sup>81</sup>. By contrast, the 1640 canons were introducing new doctrine, such as the Laudians usage of the terms “altar” and “eucharist,” which was clearly contrary to the established doctrine of the 1559 & 1604 prayer book and 39 Articles. Hence they were *ultra vires* the delegated powers of Convocation, and invalid. They would have as much legal force as if, e.g., contrary to Article 22 of the 39 Articles, the Convocation had (as it did not,) claimed Anglicans should start “invoking saints.” Therefore, the 1640 canons certainly would require ratification by Parliament since they constituted a fundamental change on elements of doctrine established by Act of Parliament. Hence the fact that these 1640 canons very justifiably did not get such parliamentary approval, means that they were properly *declared illegal and non-binding by the House of Commons in the same year, on the basis that they had not been ratified by Parliament.*

Thus we cannot doubt that the House of Commons was quite right to so act<sup>82</sup>. In doing so, it should also be remembered that they were to some extent also responding to justifiable complaints being received from all over England against innovations and abuses of power enshrined in these 1640 canons<sup>83</sup>.

Under the Laudians’ illegal canons, 13 Anglican bishops had been impeached before these canons were rightly declared illegal. In a move that at first would have been popular among both Reformed Anglicans and English Puritans, the House of Commons then impeached Laud. But unfortunately, the Puritan controlled Parliament was not so acting in order to help Reformed Anglican restore the Anglican Church to its pre-Laudian form (by which I also mean without anything adopted by the Laudians, including Andrewes’s earlier quirky innovation discussed at the fourth innovation, *infra*) i.e., one which had advanced to the second stage of the Reformation; and recognize that England was predominantly Anglican, and then seek religious tolerance for English Puritans under an Established Anglican Church. Rather, the English Puritan House of Commons was seeking to harness this wider anti-Laud and anti-Laudian sentiment into a programme that would move the Anglican Church beyond the second stage Reforms of the pre-Laudian Anglican Church, and take England to what they would see as “third stage” Puritan

<sup>81</sup> In law, if something is *ultra vires*, meaning “beyond (*ultra*) the power (*vires*),” it is beyond the lawful authority conferred by law and hence invalid.

<sup>82</sup> Concerning Laud’s preparedness to act illegally, compare “Libel 8” on Philp. 2:5-11, in “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” section “b) William Laud,” subsection, “Laud’s role as Star Chamber Court judge in *Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn* (1637),” *infra*.

<sup>83</sup> Davies, J., *The Caroline Captivity of the Church*, *op. cit.*, pp. 252,285-287

reforms. *This would prove every bit as unpopular as Laudianism, and would entail a direct attack on Reformed Anglicans as much as on Laudian Anglicans.*

Thus on the one hand, 13 Anglican bishops were impeached under these Laudian canons in 1640 before they were rightly declared illegal. But on the other hand, 12 Anglican bishops were impeached by the Puritans in 1641 for being Anglican<sup>84</sup>. The House of Commons had said in their The Grand Remonstrance that Anglican bishops should lose their temporal power and associated seats in the House of Lords. Then when a dozen bishops protested that an unruly mob had physically obstructed their entry to Parliament, and so decisions taken in their absence should be nullified, the English Puritans impeached the bishops. *Laudian propaganda liked to depict Reformed Anglicans as “Puritans” in the Anglican Church, and Puritan propaganda liked to depict Reformed Anglicans as the same as Laudian Anglicans. Their was a certain “honour among thieves” as both Laudians and English Revolutionary Puritans tried to depict a three-way fight as a two-way fight in which Reformed Anglicans simply did not exist.*

Thus we find that under the *Clerical Disabilities Bill*, Bishops were deprived of their temporal power to sit in the House of Lords. Followed by Ordinances in 1645 prohibiting the Anglican prayer book, and 1646 abolishing of bishops. The bishops would not be restored to the House of Lords till 1661.

Therefore, on the one hand, the 1640 canons show that Laud was prepared to act illegally, and so the House of Commons was perfectly within its rights, and indeed was fulfilling its duty when it declared that these canons of 1640 were illegal, as they had not passed the Parliament even though they were introducing doctrine contrary to the 1559 and 1604 prayer book and 39 Articles e.g., the usage of the terms “altar” and “Eucharist.” But on the other hand, the fact that the Puritan controlled House of Commons then tried to use the associated widespread anti-Laudian sentiment to illegally get rid of Bishops and the Anglican prayer book of 1559 & 1604, shows how the Puritans were also prepared to act illegally. In overview, the attack by both groups on Reformed Anglicans who supported the second stage of the Reformation, found in the pre-Laudian Church, is writ large in the cruel way 13 Anglican bishops were impeached under these Laudian canons in 1640 before the 1640 canons were rightly declared illegal; and the shocking way 12 Anglican bishops were then impeached by Puritans in 1641 until their illegal actions were corrected by the Restoration of 1660.

Let us now consider nine or ten further innovations of Laud.

The first *innovation* is not one that the Puritans would oppose, although I would. It relates to Laud’s quirky view that “the Ancient of Days” in Dan. 7:9,10,13,22 does not refer to God the Father. Now if it does not refer to God the Father, “Who?” I ask, “does it refer to?”

---

<sup>84</sup> See “Laudians,” *Wikipedia* (2009) (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Laudianism>); Morrill, J., *The Nature of the English Revolution*, J.S. Longman, London, England, & New York, USA, 1993; & Wroughton, J., *op. cit.*, pp. 32-35.

Daniel says, “I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool; his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgement was set, and the books were opened . . . . I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominions, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed” (Dan. 7:9,10,13,14).

It is clear that “the Ancient of Days” here is one of the three Divine Persons of the Holy Trinity, since he sits on a heavenly “throne,” is “ministered unto” by “thousand thousands” of heavenly beings, and has “judgement” power. Now this cannot be God the Holy Ghost, for he is Spirit, although he took the form of a Dove in the holy Gospels, and cloven tongues of fire on the Day of Pentecost in the Book of Acts. That this is in fact God the Father is evident from the fact that “the Son of man” i.e., God the Son, “came to the Ancient of days,” and in fulfilment of prophecies such as Ps. 2, “was given dominion, and glory, and a kingdom” on earth, “which shall not pass away,” and which is not completely fulfilled till after Christ’s second coming. The imagery is clearly that of a Father and a Son. Moreover, the usage of such imagery as “garment was white as snow” and “hair of his head like the pure wool” shows his spotless purity as a holy God (cf. Ps. 104:1,2; Isa. 1:18), and “hair of his head” being white “like the pure wool” additionally symbolizes great age (cf. Lev. 19:32; Prov. 16:31; Isa. 57:15). Hence similar imagery with the same meaning of sinlessness and great age i.e., from eternity (Ps. 90:2) as here used for the First Divine Person of the Trinity (Dan. 7:9), is used elsewhere of the Second Divine Person of the Trinity (Rev. 1:14). I say again, if “the Ancient of days” here in Dan. 7 does not refer to God the Father, then who does it refer to? It seems to me, it can refer to none other!

Furthermore, we read in Article 35 of the Anglican 39 Articles, Book 2, Homily 21, “Against Rebellion” (Part 1), with reference to a number of Scriptures, one of which is “Dan. . . . vii. 10,” that “... God the Creator and Lord of all things appointed his angels and heavenly creatures in all obedience to serve and . . . honour his Majesty . . . .” I.e., Dan. 7:10 is clearly applied to “angels” who “serve and” “honour” “God,” so that Dan. 7:9 is clearly understood to be a description of God. And this must contextually be God the Father, *supra*.

Nevertheless, in *Laud’s case* (1644) reference is made to Laud’s role in *Sherfield’s case*, with regard to Sherfield’s “sentence for defacing of a church window” at St. Edmond’s Church, Salisbury<sup>85</sup>. The image on the defaced window was of God the Father depicted as the Ancient of Days from Daniel chapter 7. On the one hand, Laud

---

<sup>85</sup> Laud’s *Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 169,237-8.

took the very private view, “I never justified the making or having of that picture,” and “I could not justify the having of” “a picture of God the Father” “out of Dan. 7:22,” considering such an interpretation of “the Ancient of Days” as “God the Father” to be “foolish.” This meant that Laud considered that on “Calvin’s rule, ‘that we may picture that which may be seen,’” but “that no picture may be made of that which was never” “seen,” that one ought not to have pictures of God the Father. I.e., having dismissed as “foolish” the view that “the Ancient of Days” in Dan. 7 is God the Father, Laud considered that since there were no depictions of God the Father in Scripture, one could not, on “Calvin’s rule,” therefore ever make a depiction of God the Father since he “was never” “seen” in Scripture. *Given that the Puritans were opposed to all pictures of God as “idols,” Laud’s view that one should never depict God the Father accorded with Puritan views.* However, Laud’s reasoning for opposing any depiction of God the Father was different to the reasoning of the Puritans, with the consequence that unlike the Puritans, Laud did consider one could depict God the Son and God the Holy Ghost.

The concern in *Laud’s case* was that Laud supported a punishment of Sherfield. Laud says he did so because Sherfield “ought not have done it, but by command of authority.” Thus the Puritans were unhappy with Laud, not because he thought no picture of God the Father should be made, but because he took the view that Sherfield ought not to have defaced this picture without lawful “command of authority.” By contrast, I think that St. Edmond’s *Church of England*, Salisbury, was perfectly entitled to have a stained glass window depicting God the Father as *the Ancient of Days* from Daniel chapter 7, and I do not think this picture should have been defaced at all i.e., there were no grounds for seeking Laud’s desired “command of authority” to deface it, and there were certainly no grounds for defacing it without lawful authority either.

*My own concern with Laud is quite different to the Puritans’ concern.* It is clear that the publicly declared doctrine of the *Church of England* did not prohibit the view that “the Ancient of Days” in Dan. 7 refers to God the Father, and so if a church had a stained glass window of God the Father so depicted, there was no objection to this on the basis of Anglican doctrine. (Although it must be admitted, that most stained glass windows of Divinity depict God the Son in a scene from the Gospels; and a lesser number God the Holy Ghost as either a Dove from Matt. 3:16, or Pentecostal cloven tongues of fire from Acts 2:3. Thus a depiction of God the Father as the Ancient of Days from Dan. 7:9,10, is relatively rare.) But Laud does not state both this, and his private opinion that “the Ancient of Days” in Dan. 7 is not God the Father, a view he evidently held quite strongly, so as to claim as “foolish” those who disagreed with him. *Thus we here see a problem with Laud that we shall see further, namely, that he did not distinguish his personal and private views from the publicly declared doctrine of the Anglican Church, but defended and treated both as one and the same thing. Moreover, Laud’s private view that “the Ancient of days” in Dan. 7 does not refer to God the Father, is contrary to the 39 Articles (Article 35, Book 2, Homily 21).*

A second issue of Laud’s private views, which I shall leave the greater discussion of till *Rex v. Bastwick, et al.*, is Laud’s reference to the Communion Table as an “altar.” As noted *infra*, the injunctions of Elizabeth the First refer to *replacing* the place of the

former *altar* with a *table*, and the prayer book refers only to a *table*. The idea that the Holy Table might be called “an Altar” was a private view of Laud’s (and Andrewes), connected in Laud’s instance, not to a Romanist view of transubstantiation, but to a privately held Lutheran view of consubstantiation (although the ignorant Puritan Revolutionaries showed themselves incapable of distinguishing between Romish transubstantiation and Lutheran consubstantiation). Nevertheless, as seen in *Rex v. Bastwick, et al, infra*, Laud failed to make any distinction between his *private view* that this was “an altar,” and the publicly declared doctrine of the Anglican Church repeatedly found in the prayer book that this was a “table.” Sadly, the Laudian circle was able to get an ambiguous statement to their effect on this into the Canons of 1640.

A third issue of Laud’s private views has to do with his interpretation of Canon 18 of the Anglican *Constitutions & Canons Ecclesiastical* (1603/4). The words of this canon were minimally modified when it was revived by Anglican Convocation in 1662 following the Restoration. The relevant section reads in the 1603 canon, with 1662 alterations in rounded brackets i.e., (), afterwards, “... No man shall cover his head in the church or chapel in the time of Divine Service, except he hath some infirmity, in which case let him wear a night cap ... . All ... persons ... shall reverently kneel upon their knees when the General Confession, Litany, and other prayers are read; and shall stand up at the saying of the Belief [found in the Three Creeds] ... . And likewise when in time of Divine Service the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned, due and lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present as it hath been accustomed, verifying (or ‘testifying’ 1662) by these outward ceremonies and gestures, their inward humility, Christian resolution, and due acknowledgment that the Lord Jesus Christ, the true (‘and’ added 1662) eternal Son of God, is the only Saviour of the world ... . None either man, woman, or child, ... shall be otherwise at such times busied in the church, than in quiet attendance to hear, mark, and understand that which is read, preached or ministered; saying in their due places audibly with the Minister the Confession, the Lord’s Prayer, and the [Apostles’, Athanasian, or Nicene] Creed, and making such other answer to the publick prayer as are appointed in the Book of Common Prayer ... .”

The 1559 and 1662 prayer books uphold the “ornaments” rubric of “the church and of the Ministers,” in the 1549 Edwardian prayer book. The rubric of that prayer book, not with respect to ornaments, but with respect to all worshippers, says, “kneeling, crossing, holding up of hands, knocking upon the breast, and other gestures, they may be used or left, as every man’s devotion serveth, without blame.” This rubric is not found in later prayer books, but in practice the Anglican Church appears to have maintained the spirit of this. E.g., if an Anglican worshipper engages in “holding up of hands” (cf. Ps. 134:2), that would not be prohibited (a practice reintroduced in historically modern times in some Puritan Churches, and regarded by them as a very “modern” and “non-conformist” type of thing to do), but if a Minister tried to impose this on a congregation he would be outside his lawful authority since others may choose not to do this.

Against this background of a historic Anglican tolerance towards various gestures, it would appear that in the 16th century, and on the available evidence, starting with Laud, an attempt was made to read canon 18 on View 2, *infra*.

*View 1.* It is possible to read “outward ceremonies and gestures” disjunctively in this canon i.e., “gestures” refers to “reverently kneel upon their knees when the General Confession, Litany, and other prayers are read; and shall stand up at the saying of the Belief,” and that included in “outward ceremonies,” is the fact that “due and lowly reverence shall be done” when “the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned.” I.e., that “reverence” is to be shown in a decent outward decorum when “the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned,” so that in *a Christ-centred service, which all services should be*, “due and lowly reverence” requires that there be “quiet attendance to hear, mark, and understand that which is read, preached or ministered,” other than when “saying” “audibly” those part of the Divine Service that the congregation join in at. On this view, *Canon 18 reinforces as part of canon law that which the prayer books says at these points* (Ussher).

*View 2.* It is possible to read “outward ceremonies and gestures” conjunctively in this canon i.e., “gestures” refers to both “reverently kneel upon their knees when the General Confession, Litany, and other prayers are read; and shall stand up at the saying of the Belief,” and also “due and lowly reverence shall be done” when “the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned.” On this view, *Canon 18 requires bowing at the name of Jesus* (Laud).

Laud’s interpretation of “when in time of Divine Service the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned, due and lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present,” was openly stated by Laud in *Laud’s case* (1644), to mean “bowing at the name of Jesus,” which he said, “there should” be, “and the canon,” *supra*, “of the Church requires it<sup>86</sup>.”

As Archbishop of Canterbury from 1633 to 1645, William Laud was Primate of the *Church of England*. But as Archbishop of Armagh from 1625 to 1656, his contemporary, James Ussher (1581-1656), was Primate of the *Church of Ireland* from 1634. Ussher was a royalist who was respected by both Anglicans and Puritans. He rejected a Puritan invitation to be one of the Presbyterian Westminster Divines, and indeed preached against the legality of the Westminster Divines’ assembly. It is clear that these two contemporary Anglican Primates held different views on the meaning of Canon 18.

His Grace, the Lord Archbishop of Armagh, James Ussher, first quotes the *Church of England* canon 18. Ussher then says, “The corresponding Irish canon, the seventh, omits all these particulars, and substitutes this general direction, ‘using all such reverent gestures and actions, as by the Book of Common Prayer are prescribed in that behalf, and the commendable use of this Church received<sup>87</sup>.’” Ussher’s reference to “the corresponding” *Church of Ireland* canon 7, clearly considers that “all such reverent

---

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, p. 221.

<sup>87</sup> *The Whole Works of the Most Reverend James Ussher*, Lord Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland, by Charles R. Elrington, in 16 volumes, Hodge & Smith, Dublin, Ireland, Whittaker & Co., London, England, 1847, Vol. 1, p. 181.

gestures and actions” as are found in the *Church of England* canon 18, are preserved in “the Book of Common Prayer” rubric. Importantly, *this is not a private interpretation* by Ussher since it had the backing of the Anglican canon law of the entire *Church of Ireland*. It is clear that “reverent gestures and actions” do not necessarily require genuflecting or nodding. In e.g., the 1662 prayer book, “Whilst” Scriptural “sentences are in reading,” the “Offertory” is collected, “and” “in a decent basin,” those collecting it “*reverently* bring it to the priest, who shall humbly present and place it upon the Holy Table.” Nothing is said here about “reverently” requiring any form of “bowing.”

Therefore, on this view 1, *Canon 18 reinforces as part of canon law that which the prayer books says at these points* (Ussher). By contrast, on view 2, *Canon 18 requires bowing at the name of Jesus* (Laud). The question that arises is this. Was this a matter of tolerated diversity of opinion, in which Ussher and Laud can be seen as representing two different permitted interpretations, or was Laud introducing a private view as an “innovation” with View 2?

Laud’s interpretation of Canon 18 evidently included an interpretation that Philp. 2:10, “That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow,” supported this practice, since as discussed at Libel 8 in *Rex v. Bastwick, et al, infra*, we learn that Laud illegally changed the 1559 & 1604 prayer book reading from “in the name of Jesus” to “at the name of Jesus” without parliamentary amendment to the prayer book Act. Although I have no objections to the translation, “at,” which as discussed at Libel 8, *infra*, I think is a better rendering than “in” here, I do have objections to *the interpretation* here placed on it by those favoring Laud’s view of canon 18. *The fact that Laud illegally changed the prayer book reading of Philp. 2:10 in order to provide a “justification” for this practice, strongly suggests that it was a private interpretation since he evidently did not think the Parliament would agree to such a change.* Given that this rendering had the support of the AV, it can only be assumed that he did want scrutiny of his action because he was using it to bolster a particular interpretation i.e., that canon 18 required “bowing at the name of Jesus.” (The AV’s reading was later adopted in the 1662 prayer book.)

A fundamental absurdity with Laud’s view (View 2), must surely be that if it were so, when “the Minister ... delivereth the cup to any one,” and “say,” “The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ” etc., he would have to genuflect each time (possible spilling the wine, and at the very least unnecessarily risking this each occasion as scores and scores of communicants came up); and the Communicant, already kneeling, would have to stand up, genuflect at “Jesus,” and then kneel back down again. Similar problems exist elsewhere. E.g., (as seen by reference to the similar 1662 prayer book) when “the priest” is “kneeling down at the Lord’s Table,” and prays the prayer of humble access, at the words, “so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ,” he would have to arise, genuflect, and then kneel back down. Yet the prayer book rubric is quite specific, he is to say this prayer “kneeling down,” *not* “kneeling down, arising midway to genuflect at the name of Jesus, and then kneeling back down again.”

So too canon 18 says, “All ... persons ... shall stand up at the saying of the Belief [found in the Three Creeds];” and e.g., the 1662 prayer book says at the *Nicene Creed* in

the *Communion Service*, then “shall be sung or said the Creed following, the people ... standing ... .” Nothing here is said about then genuflecting at the name of “Jesus” in these three creeds (and nor in the earlier prayer book, of which 1662 is very similar also being primarily the work of Cranmer from about 100 years earlier). By contrast, the traditional Roman Missal states that after “descendit de caelis” (Latin, “down from heaven”), that “Here all kneel,” and so stay till “et homo factus est” (Latin, “and was made man”)<sup>88</sup>. Similar rubric is found in the modern Roman Mass in English, which says, “All bow down at the following words<sup>89</sup>.” Thus (while this Roman rubric is not at the name of Jesus,) the absence of such rubric is noticeable in the Anglican prayer book and canons.

In a bid to try and overcome such evident absurdities, those holding to this view then modify their position from their original starting point of Philp. 2:10, and say that “only the head bows” i.e., nodding at the name of Jesus. *But what is their justifying verse?* Philp. 2:10 says, “At the name of Jesus *every knee* should bow,” not “*every head should nod*,” and so we find that those taking this view are undone, since taking this view requires either a fundamentally absurd interpretation of the Communion Service, or a fundamentally absurd interpretation of Philp. 2:10. Either way, it is a fundamentally absurd position to hold to. Thus e.g., in Australia, I know of no Evangelical Anglican Church in the Evangelical *Anglican Diocese of Sydney* (which extends from Sydney down to Mittagong and just south of Nowra); and in the UK, I know of no *Church of England (Continuing)* Church, where such nodding occurs. It certainly strikes me as unBiblical, unwarranted, and undesirable.

I consider that the belief adopted by Laud, that one should “nod at the name of Jesus,” fundamentally misfocuses people’s minds about what is meant by “the name of Jesus.” I think this is a bad practice, with an undesirable misdirection of worship forms. Wherever Laud got the idea from is speculative. Though Bray claims it comes from pre-Reformation times through reference to the 15th century Roman Catholic works of William Lyndwood (1375-1445), investigation of what Lyndwood actually says is inconclusive. Lyndwood simply refers to the practices of “kneelings, [and] inclinations,” but what he meant by this is not clearly stated<sup>90</sup>. The evidence seems to be that the fourth innovation, *infra*, bowing to the Communion Table started with Bishop Andrewes. It seems likely to me that Laud, like Andrewes, was looking to put a larger

---

<sup>88</sup> Lefebvre, G, *Saint Andrew Daily Missal, With Vespers for Sundays and Feasts*, Imprimatur: M. de Keyzer, Vicar General, Brugge, 26 Jan. 1962, Abbey of St. Andrew, Brugge, Biblica, Belgium, 1962, p. 805.

<sup>89</sup> *Sunday Missal & Lectionary, For all Sundays, Solemnities, & Certain Feasts*, in English by authority of Pope Paul VI, Imprimatur: James Cardinal Freeman, Archbishop of Sydney, 7 March, 1975, E.J. Dwyer, Sydney, Australia, 1975, p. 473.

<sup>90</sup> Bray, G (Ed.), *The Anglican Canons, op. cit.*, p. 286; Bullard, J.V. & Chalmer Bell, H. (Eds), *Lyndwood’s Provinciale*, Faith Press, London, 1929, pp. 128-9 (Provinciale 5:5:3).

gap between Anglicanism and Puritanism, and in developing Andrewes's innovation, found in this interpretation of canon 18 a legalistic based vehicle to achieve his ends. However, the evidence clearly is that under Charles I this was a private *view* of Laud's (and probably some others) as to the meaning of canon 18, and a Laudian innovation. *We see with this issue a recurring problem with Laud, namely, that he did not distinguish his personal and private views from the publicly declared doctrine of the Anglican Church, but integrated, defended, and treated both, as one and the same thing.*

Laud's influence on others at this time is not entirely clear. Certainly both the Anglican Primate of Ireland and wider *Church of Ireland* was not swayed by Laud's views on nodding. Edmund Hickerlingill (as cited by Spurgeon, *infra*) claims that in c. 1661 there was "nodding, at the name of Jesus," in St. Paul's *Church of England* Cathedral, London. However Hickerlingill's works from this are those of a highly unreliable and untrustworthy pro-Puritan propagandist. (Amidst many fluctuations of religious belief, Hickerlingill later became an Anglican clergyman after the Restoration, and was accepted by Restoration Anglicans seeking to integrate in former Puritan enemies. But in doing so, they showed themselves too accepting in the case of Hickerlingill, who by a number of accounts remained a shady character till his death. E.g., following convictions for slander against Bishop Compton of London, Hickerlingill was deprived of his vicarage from 1885-88.) One should never accept anything he says unless there is good corroborating evidence. But on this particular occasion, there is evidence that under Charles II, this Laudian innovation was adopted by some Anglicans, presumably for the same reason that Laud had originated it, i.e., as part of creating an increased distance between Anglicanism and Puritanism. That is because Gibson's *Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani* (1761), refers to an established view that "due and lowly reverence" in canon 18, may be taken to mean, "to bow at the name of Jesus"<sup>91</sup>.

When Hickerlingill says there was "nodding, at the name of Jesus," he therefore *possibly* did see this, but it is also possible that he simply saw one of them inadvertently move their head at the name of "Jesus," and knowing that this Laudian practice was continued under Charles II by *some* Anglicans, and looking for evidence that this type of view was now more widespread than it really was, then interpreted this as "nodding, at the name of Jesus." I.e., because Hickerlingill *was looking to find this type of thing, he may found it where it did not really exist.* Thus we cannot be sure as to whether or not this practice was occurring at St. Paul's Cathedral when Hickerlingill says it was, although *possibly* it was. The reality remains that one would be ill advised to base a case for anything that was really going on in any Anglican Churches, on the basis of what the pamphleteer Hickerlingill, a libeller (convicted of libel in 1682) and forger (convicted of forgery in 1707, one year before his death), claims was going on. Sadly, this type of scrutiny of sources is lacking in the classic Puseyite work on such matters, *Hierurgia Anglicana* (1848), which cites this passage and other Puritan writers uncritically.

Thus the evidence is that while this was a Laudian innovation, and declared to be such at the time, it was later followed by some Anglicans under Charles I and Charles II.

---

<sup>91</sup> Gibson's *Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani*, Vol. 1, p. 294.

But it is also clear from Ussher that this was not so sanctioned in the *Church of Ireland*. Therefore, it would appear that it was to some extent interpreted in the spirit of the 1549 Edwardian prayer book, *supra*, i.e., either view 1 or view 2 could be followed. But to this must be added the qualification that the Puseyites found it necessary to resuscitate the practice in the 19th century. E.g., in their *Hierurgia Anglicana* (1848) they cite a 1630 Puritan concern about a “change in the worship of God,” namely, “in bowing to the name of Jesus<sup>92</sup>,” which in this instance does indeed appear to have been this nodding innovation.

The implication is that the practice was largely limited to some, though not all, Caroline Anglicans. There is thus some truth in the Puseyite claim to be following “Caroline Anglicans,” although as we shall see, the Puseyites go well beyond the Caroline Anglicans. That the practice which was clearly never universal, would die out also leads us to ask the question, Why? It would seem that following the experience of Charles II refusing to give his assent to legislation to bypass the Papist, James II, *infra*, followed by the experience of the Papist king, James II, Anglicans started to question whether or not *some* of the Puritan concerns that they had formerly rejected had been more valid than they had realized. Whereas the former Anglican practice had been one of diversity of interpretation over canon 18, either allowing nodding, or not nodding, at the name of Jesus, it seems that Anglicans from the time of William III onwards essentially discarded this practice, since experience had shown that it did in fact tend towards superstitions that pandered and promoted Popish proclivities. (It was thus ultimately discarded for the same type of reasons as crucifixes and images of saints i.e., it was found that substantial numbers were thereby led into impure worship. Thus though the Anglican methodology was different to that of the Puritans, after 1689 Anglicans ultimately came to a general agreement with the Puritans on this issue; and this general agreement remained till the 19th century rise of the Puseyites; although some semi-Puseyites started to question the desirability of this practice in the later 20th century.)

*We shall find this to be a recurring theme with certain errors of the Caroline eras corrected from the time of William III on, when references to them seem to either greatly diminish or disappear altogether, only then to be revived and reverted to by Puseyites.* (Cf. similar reasoning against the usage of crucifixes in the Homilies of the 39 Articles.) This however was not accompanied by any official reinterpretations of canon 18, i.e., in theory both interpretations of canon 18 might still be followed. The unfortunate consequence of this was that Puseyites were able to resuscitate this proven undesirable practice of nodding at the name of Jesus in the 19th century. But in doing so, they clearly repeated not only the errors, but the consequences of those errors from the 19th century on, as Puseyites clearly went into more and more semi-Romanist practices, which then drew them away from the true spirit and letter of Protestantism as set forth in the 39 Articles. In short, they replicated the errors giving rise to the Popish Duke, James II, and like him, went homeward Romeward, although in the Puseyites instance, usually into semi-Romanism. And it must also be said that numerous Puseyites have then, like

---

<sup>92</sup> *Hierurgia Anglicana*, pp. 242-3; citing the Puritan work, *For God & the King & c.*, pp. 128,129.

Cardinal Newman, been sucked into the vortex of Romanism Proper.

Thus we find that Laud's private view of canon 18, as further cultivated by *some* Caroline Anglicans, was revived with great relish by the Puseyites in the 19th century. E.g., the Puseyite Bishop of Exeter gave a public reply in 1843 to "the congregation of the parish church of Falmouth." Their stated "grievances" included "repeated bowings to the altar," (see also innovation 4, *infra*,) and the Bishop said they complained that "with the last twelve months various alterations had been introduced" "which in their opinion, in a great measure destroy the beauty and simplicity and spiritual character of the Reformed religion, and assimilate the ceremonies of our [Anglican] Church to those of the Roman hierarchy"<sup>93</sup>.

The Bishop of Exeter cited in favour of such nodding, Canon 18 of the Ecclesiastical canons of 1603, *supra*, and the 52nd injunction of Queen Elizabeth I (later made an Act of Parliament), that says, "That whensoever the name of Jesus shall be in any lesson, sermon, or otherwise, in the church pronounced, due reverence be made of all persons, young and old, with lowliness of courtesy as thereunto doth necessarily belong, and hereunto hath been accustomed." He further quotes Canon 7 of the 1640 synod, which says, "we ... commend ... the ... doing reverence and obeisance, both at the coming in and going out of the said churches ... ." He further quotes Philp. 2:10, "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow."

I agree that the Elizabethan terminology, "lowliness of courtesy" was simply alternative terminology for "outward ceremonies" in Canon 18. Sometimes particular terminology, such as "lowliness of courtesy," has dropped out of common usage since the 16th century and so requires clarification; nevertheless, I consider this 52nd injunction refers to having a Christ-centred service, in which when Christ is "pronounced" as the focal point for the Christian, there shall be "lowliness of courtesy" (Elizabethan 52nd injunction) meaning, "quiet attendance to hear, mark, and understand that which is read, preached or ministered" (Jacobean Canon 18), *supra*.

I think the Bishop's citation of Canon 7 of the 1640 synod does not really help his claims, but actually hinders them. This was part of the illegal canons passed without the consent of Parliament. Furthermore, this clearly refers to "coming in and going out of the said churches," not what is happening during the church service i.e., when one enters or leaves the church one should pray. This Canon 7 of 1640 says both "reverence and obeisance." If "reverence" means bowing at the name of "Jesus" (Canon 18 of 1603), why then does Canon 7 of 1640 refer to both "reverence and obeisance"? The implication surely is that "reverence and obeisance" is something additional to just "reverence," i.e., the absence of the words "and obeisance" in canon 18 of 1603 shows, when contrasted with canon 7 of 1640, that "reverence" by itself does not include "obeisance" or bowing. As to the Bishop of Exeter's usage of Philp. 2:10, I have already

---

<sup>93</sup> "The Bishop of Exeter's Reply to ... the inhabitants of Falmouth, 30 June 1843," *The British Magazine & Monthly Register of Religious & Ecclesiastical Information*, (T. Clerk Smith, London), Vol. 24, 1843, pp. 208-211.

noted the absurdity of using this verse to try and justify nodding at the name of Jesus, *supra*.

I think it truly sad to hear the Bishop of Exeter's concluding remarks, that if "such be the 'bowings' at which the memorialists [i.e., symbolist view of bread and wine at Communion] complain, as destroying the beautiful simplicity and spiritual character of the Reformed religion, and assimilating our services to those of Rome," then "I, as" "bishop" will give them no relief. This, like so many churches subsequently, had Reformed or Evangelical Anglicans in it who resisted the Puseyite push, but had their beautiful Reformed Anglican Church ruined by a Puseyite priest who came in, with a Puseyite bishop's support, to wreck and ruin that once lovely Protestant Anglican Church. This horrible story has been repeated many, many, times, but it still repulses me. And we cannot doubt that in this Puseyite push, *one element* was Laud's view of nodding at the name of Jesus, although it must be said in fairness to Laud that the Puseyites went far further as semi-Romanists in the Romeward direction, than Laud or any of his Caroline followers ever dreamt of going.

A fourth innovation associated with Laud, that I shall leave the greater discussion of to *Libel 12*, in *Rex v. Bastwick, et al, infra*, is that of genuflecting to the Communion Table. A fifth innovation has to do with Laud's expanded interpretation of Article 20 of the Anglican *39 Articles*, so as to enhance his own powers. I will also leave the greater discussion of this to *Libel 14*, in *Rex v. Bastwick, et al, infra*.

A sixth innovation associated with Laud has to deal with the introduction of ceremonial copes. Puritan strutting and prancing and fantasizing in 1662 about the rubric on clerical dress just before the service of Morning Prayer is well known. This endorses the Edwardian prayer book clerical dress rubric in place under the prayer book of 1549. This reads, "In the saying or singing of Matins and Evensong, baptizing and burying, the minister ... shall use a surplice. And in all Cathedral churches and colleges, the Archdeacons, Deans, Provosts, Masters, Prebendaries, and Fellows, being graduates, may use in the quire [choir], besides their surplices, such hood as pertaineth to their ... degrees. But in all other places, every minster shall be at liberty to use any surplice or not. It is also seemly that graduates, when they do preach, shall use ... [the] hoods ... [of] their ... degrees." "And ... the bishop ... [in] public ministration, ... shall have upon him, besides his rochette, *a surplice or albe* [alb], and a cope or vestment, and also his pastoral staff in his hand, or else borne or holden by his chaplain." The 1662 rubric is simply a replication of the rubric found in the prayer book of 1559 & 1604, used before it was made "illegal" by Cromwell's Puritan Revolutionaries republic of 1642-60 in 1645. It is the same rubric used from the time of Elizabeth I and retained in the prayer book under James I in 1604 i.e., the 1559 & 1604 prayer book.

Those who understand church history should know that an "alb" (albe) can mean a specific longer white linen garment worn by priests reaching to the feet (meaning 1), or it can simply mean any long white garment (meaning 2). This second meaning comes from the Latin title, "*Dominica (Sunday) in (in) albis (whites)*" for "White Sunday" or what the Anglican prayer book of 1662 calls, "Whitsunday." This term derives from the

fact that newly baptized persons wore white from when they baptized on Easter Eve till the first Sunday after Easter; although in northern countries such as England, due to climate factors this was transferred to a later date, and so in the 1662 prayer book “Whitsuntide” is the Sunday after Ascension Day (which is the 40th day after Easter, Acts 1:3). If this is the meaning of “alb” here (meaning 2), then it is a general term, *prima facie* capable of referring to any appropriate white robe. Having now given this matter matured consideration and reflection, given that “cope or vestment” are used as synonyms, it seems to me that “a surplice or alb” must contextually also be understood as synonyms i.e., “alb” is being used in the general sense recognized in “Whitsuntide” from “*Dominica* (Sunday) *in* (in) *albis* (whites),” here qualified to mean the same thing as a surplice. I think this conclusion is also more consistent with the historical reality of e.g., the “surplice controversies” with the Puritans, where it is clear that a surplice, rather than an “alb” in the other meaning of the word (meaning 1), were being used.

Thus one might refer to “a surplice or alb” (synonyms contextually for “surplice”) as the white linen vestment of a clergyman; that the vestment used with this is a black robe or gown; and any associated bishop’s “cope or vestment” (synonyms) worn by a Bishop in the cold conditions of the British Isles is a matching thick black cope worn over this. E.g., on the 450th anniversary of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer’s martyrdom, who was killed for being a Protestant under the Papist Queen, Bloody Mary, I attended a memorial service held in March 2006 conducted by Bishop Samuel from the *Church of England (Continuing)*, at Oxford in England<sup>94</sup>. The service was outside in colder conditions, and Bishop Samuel wore a black cope (with a flat black triangular pointed cap<sup>95</sup>). The man is no Puseyite. He certainly would not wear a ceremonial cope.

Thus the rubric on Minister’s dress at the beginning of Matins in the 1662 prayer book, which is in fact simply repeating the rubric used in the 1559 and 1604 Elizabethan and Jacobean prayer book (I Eliz. I, chapter 2, section 25), simply means that an Anglican priest wears a white surplice (with a black gown, and optionally with a matching black cope in colder weather); and a bishop also wears a rochette, and optionally an additional black “cope or vestment” (synonyms), a fact specifically stated in the rubric, lest any think that the wearing of the rochet should preclude the wearing of such a black cope<sup>96</sup>. Indeed, lest Anglican Ministers shiver in the cold of the England’s

---

<sup>94</sup> McGrath, G.B. (Myself), “The Hypocritical Papacy,” *English Churchman*, No. 7701, 10 & 17 Nov. 2006, p. 2.

<sup>95</sup> Cf. the “square cap” of e.g., the “Minister” “Robert Cole” in 1564, *Hierurgia Anglicana*, pp. 131,151; and the black cap of Bishop Andrewes, discussed at innovation 6, *infra*.

<sup>96</sup> Between 1552 and 1559 there was a short lived experiment to use only the surplice, without the matching vestment of a black gown. The optional usage of the cope also went. This type of thing might have been workable in a warmer clime, (so that I have never known the black cope to be used in the Evangelical Anglican *Diocese of Sydney*, where it would generally not be needed due to the warmer weather). But in the

Cathedrals and University Chapels, canon 24 of the *Ecclesiastical Canons* (1603), wisely says that in an era before modern heaters, such “Copes” are “to be worn in Cathedral Churches by those that administer the Communion.”

Given that this rubric came from the Elizabethan prayer book of 1559; and we know they did not dress like Puseyites, further shows the lack of genuine ambiguity in these words. While I think one can reasonably argue that this is consistently worn with a stock and black preaching scarf (suchlike are traditionally used by clergymen in the Evangelical *Diocese of Sydney*<sup>97</sup>, and also by the *Church of England Continuing*; and the bishops of both carry a pastoral staff in their hand); it is quite another thing to start arguing for stoles, or ceremonial copes, or chasubles, or bishops’ mitres. To refer to a “surplice” i.e., a white surplice, is like talking about a “coat’n’tie.” If someone says a function requires they wear “a coat’n’tie,” a man who turned up naked other than these items would be justly ejected. There is a cultural understanding that one will wear with the “coat’n’tie” appropriate shoes, trousers, shirt, underclothes, and socks. So too, there is a cultural understanding that one will wear with a “surplice” an appropriate black preaching scarf, black shoes, etc. .

---

cooler conditions of merry old England both serve a very practical function. They were wisely restored in 1559, and thereafter retained. The 1552 rubric read, “that the minister at the time of the Communion and all other times in his ministration, shall use neither alb [contextually used as a synonym for “surplice” through reference to the looser Whitsunday meaning of “alb,” *supra*, here so qualified by the later reference to “surplice,” *infra*], vestment [black gown under surplice], nor cope [a black outer-garment over surplice in cold conditions]: but being Archbishop or Bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet; and being a priest or deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only.” (In more recent decades, some clergymen inside the Diocese of Sydney have gone back to this 1552-9 practice of wearing a surplice without the vestment of a black gown.)

<sup>97</sup> I have occasionally seen a Diocese of Sydney clergyman who has heraldic embroidery at the bottom of both ends of his black preaching scarf. E.g., a Minister who formerly had been a Chaplain in the Royal Australian Navy with a military Coat of Arms so embroidered. For instance, suchlike was sometimes, though not always worn, by John Jones when I used to attend St. Philip’s Church Hill and he was Rector (from memory, he only did so rarely when he wore his medals on his preaching scarf in some military associated church service). Such embroidery is both limited in number and limited to heraldry, i.e., the same *one* heraldic crest embroidered at the bottom of both ends of his black preaching scarf (*not* a series of two or more heraldic crests). Even with such limitations, it is not common in the Diocese (easily limited to well below 10% of Diocesan clergymen), though such heraldic embroidery is a permitted Diocesan variation. E.g., (when not overseas) I usually attend the 1662 Evensong services held at St. Swithun’s Pymble; and the Rector of this Church, Roger Chiltern, when present, has always worn a black preaching scarf on which are so embroidered heraldic symbols of Swithun. (Swithun was a 9th century English Bishop of Winchester who has a black letter day on the 1662 Calendar at 15 July).

But in typical Puseyite propaganda we find in *Hierurgia Anglicana* (1848), a section entitled, “Copes objected against by the Puritans.” This includes a citation of Puritan propaganda which in 1574 claimed, “It is to be lamented that” Anglican Ministers “wear” “Babylonish garments,” for they “do” “command a cope and surplice to be used in Divine Service, or a tippet [a black scarf, also known as a black preaching scarf], and a square cap to be worn daily ...<sup>98</sup>.” Manifesting the Queer Street quirks of Puritan phobias, another Puritan propagandist in 1604 refers to the “attire of a ... mass-priest,” which *Hierurgia Anglicana* tries to interpret in their Queer Street quirks of Puseyism, as referring to “chasubles<sup>99</sup>.” These ignorant Puritans were clearly referring to the surplice as a “mass” garment or “mass vestment,” and so we here see how the Puseyites seek to use Puritan propaganda to their own ends.

Thus the more extreme, irresponsible, and inaccurate the Puritan propaganda is, depicting Anglicans as “Romish,” the more Puseyites like to use it, first falsely claiming it is correct, and then secondly claiming it justifies them going deeply into the quick-mire of semi-Romanism in ways that no 16th or 17th century Anglicans in fact ever really did. *Such Puritan lies and distortions thus become the realities of the Puseyites with “honour among thieves.”* On the day of judgement these Puritans will be held responsible for their lies; and the records will then show a long line of Puseyite usage which has availed itself of these Puritans lies and turned their distortions into the realities of Puseyism. “O what a web we weave, when at first we try to deceive.”

Reference is made to the Puritan, Peter Smart. As further discussed below, Smart was a shady character, and like all Puritan propagandists who were no strangers to exaggeration and distortion as they sought to depict Anglicans as “Popish” or “Romish,” one should, unlike the Puseyites of *Hierurgia Anglicana*, be very wary about anything Smart *et al* says. Smart refers in 1628 to “our new fangled ceremony-mongers” at Durham Cathedral. He says of them, that while “A ‘decent cope’ is commanded in our canons ... only at the ‘Communion,’” that at Durham Cathedral there was being used, “a sumptuous cope, a cope embroidered with idols of silver, gold, and pearl, a mock cope, a scornful cope, used a long time at mass ...<sup>100</sup>.”

On the one hand, Smart’s claim that these ceremonial copes were “embroidered with idols,” sounds like a typical Puritan exaggeration. There is no evidence of adoration or worship of pictures on these copes that would justify such a claim. It thus either reflects a Puritan idea that any pictorial representation is an “idol,” or simply a fantasy detail added by Smart that may be a gross exaggeration of e.g., some design

---

<sup>98</sup> *Hierurgia Anglicana*, p. 151, citing *A Full & Plain Declaration*, p. 129.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 153.

<sup>100</sup> Canon 24, *Ecclesiastical Canons* of 1603, says, “In all Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, the Holy Communion shall be administered upon principal feast days, ... the principal Minister using a decent cope ... .” *Hierurgia Anglicana*, p. 158, citing *Sermon by Peter Smart*, pp. 18-25.

pattern that fell short of any pictorial depictions. In the absence of any clear evidence that pictorial depictions were used, the more likely possibility is thus some design pattern in the fabric which Smart has greatly exaggerated. Smart's associated claim that these copes were some kind of a "mass" vestment might also be reasonably doubted. The idea of a "mass" or a "high mass" is a Puseyite idea, not a Caroline Anglican one; albeit one they were able to develop on the basis of this type of irresponsible Puritan propaganda. But on the other hand, there is external evidence that Smart's basic concern appears to be sound i.e., that in 1628 a ceremonial cope had been introduced as an innovation, falsely trying to justify this on the basis of references to the black copes used as a coat for the cold referred to in the Anglican prayer book and canons.

E.g., references to the time of Charles I, in which Bishop Wren was in "rich copes" when Bishop of Ely in 1641 (see Wren when Bishop of Norwich in 1634, at innovation 7, *infra*), seem to refer to this same thing<sup>101</sup>.

At his trial Laud was asked about "copes," and simply said that "the use of copes is prescribed by the 24 the canon of our church, anno 1603 ... This therefore is no innovation ...<sup>102</sup>." This is classic Laudianism. As with e.g., nodding and bowing, Laud has given a wider interpretation to a pre-existing Anglican rule, but denies that his expansive interpretation is an "innovation." In vintage Laudianism he uses an economy of words, so that if a person did not know that the issue was over the introduction of ceremonial copes on the basis of canons and rubric referring to a black winter "cope," then he would not understand the issue. Thus vintage Laudians make the Puritans look sillier than what they actually were. Laud's deviousness here strongly indicates he is hiding something, and acts to point to ceremonial copes as one of Laud's innovations (or at least an innovation of these times that Laud picked up and promoted).

A picture of such copes under Charles II can be found in a procession on St. George's Day in *Ashmole's Order of the Garter*. He refers to the "canons and vicars of Windsor," who "appear" at "the sovereign's Chapel at Whitehall," with "rich copes of cloth of gold," "costly embroideries," and says "these kind of vestments have been at all times worn in the grand procession ... even to the beginning of the late wars" i.e., the Puritan Revolutionaries' wars of the 1640s, "in which the covetous barbarism of the then [Puritan] reformers sent most of them to the fire ...<sup>103</sup>."

On the one hand, the localization of these in a book on the "Order of the Garter," raises questions about how widespread this practice was more generally under Charles II. It also means that the reference to them being "worn" is to "the grand procession" of the Order of the Garter, rather than *Church of England* services more generally. After the Reformation St. George was used as a motif saint for this Order of Knights founded by

---

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 161; citing Leland's *Collectanea*, Vol. 5, p. 346.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 162.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, pp 156-7 (with picture), citing *Ashmole*, p. 574.

King Edward III in 1348; and so St. George's Day remained the Order's feast day. The Order's chapel is St. George's Chapel, Windsor Castle, where each knight has a stall containing his knight's helmet *et al.* CONSIDERING WHAT HAPPENS IN A MEETING OF THE ORDER OF THE GARTER IS NOT THE SAME THING AS EVIDENCE OF WHAT IS HAPPENING IN *CHURCH OF ENGLAND CHURCHES USING THE PRAYER BOOK.* (Cf. *Hierurgia Anglicana's* similar unsustainable usage of *Fanny's Diary* with respect to a 1787 Order of the Garter service, discussed at *Libel 12 of Rex v. Bastwick et al, infra*).

Nevertheless, it would appear that this innovation from the time of Charles I did survive in some form under Charles II. The Puseyites of *Hierurgia Anglicana* try to give it a wider support under Charles II than is warranted by referring to Hickeringill's *Ceremony Monger* (also cited by Spurgeon, *infra*), where he refers to simply the wearing of a "cope," which by no means proves this was a ceremonial cope<sup>104</sup>. In fact, its usage under Charles II may have been limited to the Order of the Garter and the coronation of Charles II, for we read that "many," not all of "the Bishops," wore "cloth of gold copes" at Charles II's coronation<sup>105</sup>.

Whatever the extent of the usage of ceremonial copes under Charles II, which appears to be far less than the Puseyites of *Hierurgia Anglicana* (1848) claim on the available evidence, it is quite clear, that as with other innovations of Laud, we find that references to the ceremonial copes disappear from the time of William III on, in this instance, with the lone exception of coronation copes. Thus reference is found to "rich copes" and "a rich cope of purple velvet" being worn by the Dean of Westminster, "in a surplice," at the coronation of George I in 1714. What is meant by "copes" at the coronation of George IV in 1821 or William IV in 1831 is not investigated or explained in *Hierurgia Anglicana*<sup>106</sup>.

On this basis it would appear that something of Laud's innovation, in which "copes" was read as "ceremonial copes," survived and was resuscitated after the Restoration. But it appears to have been initially limited to the Order of the Garter and coronations, and certainly in time, it was strictly limited to coronations. How widely the post Restoration practice of wearing coronation copes became is unclear. But what is clear is that more generally in Anglican Churches, this Laudian innovation was discontinued until revived by 19th century Puseyites.

Thus I think the type of interpretations used for these things by the Puseyites is

---

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 166-7; citing Hickeringill Works, Vol. 2, pp. 388-389. With "honour among thieves," a favourite of both Puritan and Puseyite propagandists, the highly untrustworthy and vacillating Hickeringill is further discussed, below.

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 168; citing *Memoirs of Samuel Pepys*, Vol. 1, p. 1120, 4 to 1825.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 169 (George I), citing *The manner of the grand proceedings etc.*, p. 33, 4 to 1761; & p. 172 (George IV & William IV).

grossly dishonest, even if they like to refer to Puritan remonstrances and propaganda about Anglican clerical dress, and what this all meant when it was reintroduced in 1662. Such Puritan remonstrance about Anglican clerical dress is coming from an unreliable source, regarded as “Romish” not because it actually is, and wrongly characterizes the black gown and white surplice as a “mass vestment.” To Reformed Anglicans the surplice and associated vestment of a black gown are a simple clerical uniform; carrying none of the connotations of Romish chasubles (“real presence”) etc., and clerical uniforms are not contrary to, or forbidden by the Word of God for clergymen; any more than are uniforms or traditional dress of e.g., policemen, military personnel, judges, or nurses.

If some Puritans regarded the Anglican surplice as “a mass vestment,” it was not because it actually was. Rather, it would be because they were making a *derivative conclusion* based on the inaccurate fact that they considered all Anglicans had “altars,” *because they knelt to receive Communion*, and were thus “idolaters.” Puseyites trying to develop this type of Puritan propaganda with crazy claims about a “vestment” referring to a “chasuble”<sup>107</sup>; or a general usage of ceremonial copes in Anglican Churches being the meaning of something like Hickingill references to “copes,” cannot withstand strict scrutiny. *They belong in the realm of propaganda, not historical reports; they are the Puseyites’ stories of fiction, not fact, in which the Puseyite conveniently finds common ground with the Puritan propagandist’s lies about Anglican worship, and turns the Puritan propagandist’s lies and falsehoods into the fact and reality of Puseyism.*

A seventh matter has to do with the mitre. E.g., the Puritan, Peter Smart says of Archbishop Laud, “I appear’d before the Archbishop, and the High Commission, I gave him no grace, but told him to his face; that he favoured superstition. Boldly I preach, *hate a cross, hate a surplice, mitres, copes, and rochets*”<sup>108</sup>.

A claim by Milner that “the mitre, which at the present day is barely seen on the carriages of English and Irish Bishops, is actually worn of them in the ceremony of coronation,” from which the Puseyite writers of *Hierurgia Anglicana* conclude there were “Mitre worn at the coronation of George III”<sup>109</sup>, is unsubstantiated. In the first place, Milner may simply have been wrong. In the second place, it is not clear what is meant by “mitre,” *in the coronation context*. The word “mitre” is used in the King James Version for the head-dress of the Jewish high priest (Exod. 28:4,37,39; 29:6; 39:28,31; Lev. 8:9; 16:4; Zech. 3:5). Its Biblical description is very different to the two-horned bishop’s mitre that these Puseyites have in mind, but this fact goes to show that the term “mitre” was sometimes used more generally to describe the head-dress of a clergyman.

---

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 111,129-73.

<sup>108</sup> “Peter Smart – Puritan Divine” ([www.lighthorneonline.com/PHsmart.htm](http://www.lighthorneonline.com/PHsmart.htm)).

<sup>109</sup> *Hierurgia Anglicana*, p. 89; citing Milner’s *Description of the Limerick Mitre & Cross*, p. 39.

E.g., preaching on *Papists' Conspiracy Day*, 1765, the Anglican Bishop of Clonfert and Kilmacduagh, Dennison Cumberland, used the term “mitre” in his sermon to the House of Lords of the Irish Parliament in Christchurch *Church of Ireland* Cathedral, Dublin. He said, “The Saviour of mankind, in establishing his kingdom, did not seek to *pluck the mitre from the head of a Jewish high priest*, nor to wrest the sceptre out of the hand of a Roman emperor, though a heathen.” “Surely then we may ask, where is the meekness of those instructors” “of Popery,” “who employ fire and faggot, the knife and the dagger to make converts? Can gentleness and patience establish Inquisitions, or make use of racks and tortures, ... [or] dictate persecutions and massacres?<sup>110</sup>”

Under these circumstances, one must be careful that e.g., Smart’s references to “mitres” does not in fact mean what are more commonly called, “square caps,” or some other head-dress used by a given bishop. As noted above, Puritan propaganda called the Elizabethan “square cap” which was part of Anglican Ministers dress, “Babylonish garments<sup>111</sup>,” and one could certainly not put it past Puritan propagandists to use a word like “mitre” in a broader sense, in order to try and make the square cap or another head-dress sound more Romish.

When I have visited Southwark *Church of England* Cathedral, London (near London Bridge), at various times over the years between 2001 and 2009, I have there inspected the tomb of Bishop Lancelot Andrewes (1555-1626), which I took some photographs of in April 2002. His tomb has a realistic wooden etching of him in bishop’s clerical dress, and because of its evident realism *genre*, he is not wearing a two-horned bishop’s mitre, for the obvious reason that such bishops did not wear mitres. But his black cap, which clings close to his head something like a modern swimming cap, could be called a “mitre” on the type of precedent one finds for the expansive usage of “mitre” in e.g., the King James Version, especially notable since Bishop Andrewes was one of the King James Version translators. Indeed, on one occasion when I visited Southwark Cathedral, there was a moveable sign placed in front of his tomb referring among other things to the fact that he was one of the AV translators.

A similar realistic wooden etching is also found of the Archbishop of Canterbury (1583-1604), Archbishop Whitgift (c. 1530-1604), at St. John the Baptist *Church of England*, Croyden. I inspected this monument, and that of Archbishop Sheldon, *infra*, in June 2001<sup>112</sup>. Once again, the bishop, this time Archbishop Whitgift, is in clerical dress,

---

<sup>110</sup> “A sermon preached before the House of Lords, in Christ-Church, Dublin; on Tuesday, November 5, 1765, ... by the Right Rev. Dennison Cumberland, D.D., Lord Bishop of Clonfert and Kilmacduagh.” Printed for Samuel Price, Bookseller, in Dame Street, Dublin, pp. 11,14,16,17 (emphasis mine) (British Library copy).

<sup>111</sup> *Hierurgia Anglicana*, p. 151, citing *A Full & Plain Declaration*, p. 129.

<sup>112</sup> This is actually a replica of the original tomb of Whitgift made after a fire destroyed much of the church in 1867. (The Archbishops of Canterbury and Bishops of London formerly came to nearby Croydon Palace. The old Croydon Palace is referred to in more detail with reference to “Laud’s Communion rail,” *infra*.)

and because of its evident realism *genre*, the bishop is wearing the same type of close fitting black cap as Bishop Andrewes, *supra*.

I find that while there are some uncertain, unreliable, and disputable indications that some 17th bishops and one early 18th century bishop *might* have worn the two-horned mitre, there is no clear and unambiguous evidence that bishops ever wore bishop's mitres at any time from the mid 16th century, till they were introduced by Puseyites in the 19th century.

The Puseyite writers of *Hierurgia Anglicana* (1848), refer the fact that the mitre was carried before the coffins of a relatively small minority of dead bishops under Charles II, and also in Ireland in 1724 for Archbishop Lindsay of Armagh<sup>113</sup>. But were the "mitres" carried before the bishop's coffins the two-horned bishop's mitres, or the Elizabethan square caps, or the close clinging type black Jacobean caps worn by Archbishop Whitgift and Bishop Andrewes, or another type of cap again? We simply do not know. But this issue is not raised or discussed in *Hierurgia Anglicana*.

The Puseyite writers of *Hierurgia Anglicana* (1848), also refer to some 17th century artistic depictions of bishop's mitres, such as those in a stone sculpture at Croydon Church, *infra*, or other pictorial artwork, including a heraldic usage on the tomb of the Bishop of London, Bishop Porteus, at Sundridge Churchyard near Seven Oaks<sup>114</sup>.

On my fifth trip to London, (Sept. 08 to March 09), in October 2008 I inspected St. Mary's Church of England, Sundridge, not far from Sevenoaks (Seven Oaks), near London. (I shall refer in more detail to this church and Sevenoaks *on some quite different matters* in a future volume.) A framed picture of Bishop Beilby Porteus (d. 1809, aged 78), wearing a pointed black hat, appears inside the church. Some local ladies arranging church flowers were just leaving, and one of them kindly pointed out to me the location of Bishop Porteus's tomb. I inspected his tomb at the back of the churchyard (a task made more difficult by a fence surrounding it). The heraldic mitre clearly appears on the top part of the Bishop's tomb. *But there is no evidence that the Bishop ever wore such a mitre.* As to what the Bishop of London would have thought about this heraldic symbol being placed on his tomb we do not know because he was dead when it was done. Would he have approved or disapproved of this heraldic usage?

On the one hand, it is true that these are artistic depictions of the two-horned bishop's mitre. E.g., when I inspected Croydon Church in 2001, I there also saw the stone monument of Archbishop Gilbert Sheldon, who was Archbishop of Canterbury from 1663 to 1677. In this monument, Sheldon lies on a couch with a surplice, bishop's staff, and two-horned bishop's mitre, and is on top of a coffin that is marked with symbols of mortality carved into it such as winged hour glasses, fragments of coffins,

---

<sup>113</sup> *Hierurgia Anglicana*, pp. 84-7.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 82,87-9.

skulls, bones, and worms.

But on the other hand, at this point the writers of *Hierurgia Anglicana* once again show themselves to be falling over each other in the rush to “prove the Puseyite case,” without careful investigation and consideration of all the facts. The two-horned bishop’s mitre is, in one artistic *genre*, used so the person looking at the artwork is aware that this is a bishop, even though all agree that the bishop in question never actually wore a mitre.

An obvious precedent and example for this type of thing is the usage of the Papal mitre (or more commonly Papal tiara), to signify a person the Church of Rome claims is a “Pope.” While we Protestants would date the first Pope as Boniface III in 607, *supra*, the Church of Rome falsely depicts earlier Bishops of Rome as “Popes.” In this context, the two-horned Papal mitre, (or more commonly Papal tiara), is used to show “Popes” from earlier eras, even though the Church of Rome herself would acknowledge that the Papal mitre (and tiara) were actually of much later origins.

Certainly, the two-horned Papal mitre is not to be confused with the two-horned bishop’s mitre, for even though the two are quite similar, they are not identical. The Papal mitre (and Papal tiara), was historically said to come from grants in the *Donation of Constantine*, which was a fraudulent document actually originating in the 8th century, but falsely trying to date “Papal grants” to the 4th century Constantine the Great. By contrast, the bishop’s mitre came from later Papal grants. The Papal mitre is distinguishable from a bishop’s mitre in artwork because it is a larger shape with a bigger curve than a bishop’s mitre, and frequently, though not always, golden. E.g., when in Rome in August 2001, inside the Vatican Museum I saw a picture of Pope Pius IX (Pope 1846-1878) standing in a golden Papal mitre; and when I was in the museum of the Lateran Palace which adjoins St. John Lateran’s Basilica, I there saw a picture of what was then the incumbent Pope, John-Paul II (Pope 1978-2005), standing with a white and gold Papal mitre. In both instances, the size and golden coloration of the mitre showed that this was a Pope.

Between the time of the “eighth ecumenical” Council of *Constantinople IV* (869-70), and “ninth ecumenical” Council of *Lateran I* (1123), the Pope gave Papal grants to his bishops to wear the mitre as a symbol of his authority. Starting from about the time of the *First Lateran Council*, the mitre developed into the two-horned mitre used thereafter to this day<sup>115</sup>. But historically, Protestants do not much like either the Papal mitre, or the similar bishop’s mitre. They regard putting some kind of upside down cone on a person’s head as acting to put too great a distance between a bishop and the people (natural law); consider it is against the teaching of Christ (Matt. 23:5); and some, though by no means all Protestant historicists, like myself hold as a *private view* the belief that the second beast of Rev. 13 is the Roman Catholic ecumenical councils, and that the “two horns” (Rev. 13:11) depict the Pope in his two-horned mitre, as head of the Romanist

---

<sup>115</sup> *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1913), Vol. 10, “Mitre” pp. 404-6; *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (1967), Vol. O, “Miter” pp. 981-2.

bishops in their two-horned mitres<sup>116</sup>.

When I was in Rome, I there saw the Papal tiara and Papal mitre, usually the former, used as a symbol for bishops of Rome, back to, as it is falsely claimed, “St. Peter.” Yet the Romanists themselves would admit that these symbols were of a much later derivation. Nevertheless they use them in an artistic tradition to identify in a picture one whom they claim is a “Pope.” E.g., when one enters St. Peter’s Basilica in Rome, there are on the ceiling over the door next to the main door, a series of golden Papal mitres. These mitres at St. Peter’s Basilica are making the claim that the Papacy dates from St. Peter; and outside the Basilica there is a statue of St. Peter, and on St. Peter’s day, a Papal tiara is placed on it (which tiara I saw displayed in the Basilica’s smaller internal museum). Though nobody in the Roman Church claims that St. Peter ever wore such a mitre or tiara, these are nevertheless used as symbols of the Papal office (which contrary to Romish claims, was in fact not formed till 607 i.e., more than half a millennia after St. Peter’s death).

This type of artistic tradition may also be found in certain chess sets, where the piece known as “the bishop” may be so depicted. E.g., when I was a schoolboy, in 1974/5 I won a year-long chess knock-out tournament. As my prize, at a school assembly in the hall of Belconnen High School in Canberra, I was presented by the Headmaster, Mr. Frank McKenzie, with a book entitled, *1001 Brilliant Ways to Checkmate* (1973)<sup>117</sup>. This book contains 1,001 depictions of chess pieces in different positions on a chess board, and whenever a bishop is signified, the symbol of a two-horned mitre is used. The game of chess may be played by many Protestants who would not under normal circumstances be prepared to use any such symbol for a bishop, but they are not concerned about it in such an artistic context.

On the one hand, it is certainly within the bounds of reasonableness to argue as do those in *Hierurgia Anglicana*, that the bishops in question wore mitres. But on the other hand, against the background of this type of artistic usage of a mitre to symbolize a

---

<sup>116</sup> With some varying interpretations as to the exact specifics, a number of Protestant historicists have applied the “two hornes” in some way to mitres. E.g., the footnote at “two hornes” (Rev. 13:11) in the *Geneva Bible* (1560) sees a fulfillment in “Boniface the eight[h]” (Pope: 1294-1303) “and the two hornes in the bishops mitre.”

<sup>117</sup> Reinfeld, F., *1001 Brilliant Ways to Checkmate*, Wilshire Book Co., California, USA, 1955, 1973 edition. I was at Belconnen High School from the end of First Form (now called Year 7) in 1972, to the end of Form 4 (now called Year 10) in 1975. Though this is in the Australia capital Territory (ACT), the whole ACT is sometimes called “Canberra” since it is part of Greater Canberra, much like the Cumberland Plain is sometimes called “Sydney” since it is part of Greater Sydney. Similar practices occurred in ancient times with what was meant by “Babylon” or “Nineveh” including such outerlying “suburbs” of Greater Babylon or Greater Nineveh e.g., the Birs Nimrud (Borsippa) site of the Tower of Babel (Gen. 10:9,10; 11:9) is in Greater Babylon, or the “three days’ journey” of Jonah 3:3 refers to Greater Nineveh.

bishop, it is also within the bounds of reasonableness to conclude that the bishops pictured in two-horned mitres referred to by *Hierurgia Anglicana*, never actually wore such mitres, but were so artistically depicted for the purposes of identification. E.g., looking at Bishop Sheldon's monument, no-one would suggest that its winged hour glasses or skulls are meant to depict the presence of real skulls (plural) or winged hour glasses in his coffin. This is a monument rich in symbolism, and the two-horned bishop's mitre on Sheldon may well be part of this rich symbolism here used to show he was a bishop, but not one who ever actually wore such a two-horned mitre.

Which of these two views is correct? It seems to me that the jury is still out on this issue. If on the one hand, evidence better than that found in *Hierurgia Anglicana* was to be produced that at least some bishops under Charles II wore mitres, then I would accept it, and then see this as an undesirable practice phased out from the time of William III on. If on the other hand, no such fresh evidence is forthcoming, then it seems to me that the evidence is at best ambiguous and uncertain. E.g., unlike copies we have of liturgical instructions by Bishop Andrewes, *supra*, we have no comparable instructions referring to a bishop wearing a two-horned mitre.

But in the context of an artistic usage of the mitre, I now make particular reference to the artistic usage of the mitre in heraldry where we have some interesting evidence indeed. *Hierurgia Anglicana* refers to a heraldic usage of the two-horned mitre on the Bishop of London, Bishop Sundridge's tomb in the Churchyard near Seven Oaks, *supra*. On *Hierurgia Anglicana's* argument, this might *prima facie* appear to give support to some remarks on "mitres" by the Puritan, Peter Smart. A contemporary of Laud's, Smart says, "I appear'd before ... Archbishop [Laud], and ... told him to his face ... Boldly I preach, *hate* a cross, *hate* a surplice, *mitres*, *copes*, and *rochets*," *supra*.

Thus one of Smart's objections to Laud was against "mitres." But Smart's reference to "mitres" requires qualification. Though Laud says during the time he was Chancellor of Oxford, there was an "inn" called, "The Mitre" "Inn<sup>118</sup>," no-where in his trial is the allegation made that he wore a "mitre," which given the dissertation on "copes" and other elements of clerical dress would make no sense if he really did. There is absolutely no evidence that Laud ever wore a bishop's mitre. However, in the 1895 Archbishop Laud 250th anniversary commemoration, the catalogue of Laudian exhibition states that artefacts included were, "bookcase doors, formerly belonging to Archbishop Laud, of oak and gilded metal, carved in handsome open-work panels containing Laud's Arms, the same impaled with the Arms of Canterbury, his crest, *the episcopal mitre*, & c. Formerly in the possession of St. John's College, Oxford<sup>119</sup>." It is evidently therefore to this heraldic usage of a mitre that Smart refers.

---

<sup>118</sup> Laud's *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 269.

<sup>119</sup> These were lent to the exhibition by the Reverend T. Arthur Curties. "Archbishop Laud's Commemoration, 1895, Lectures on Archbishop Laud, Catalogue, pp. 279-88, at p. 288 (books.google.com/books?isbn=0833706284).

On the one hand, Laud did not always use the mitre on his coat of arms, since on the carved Coat of Arms of Archbishop Laud that I inspected at old Croydon Palace, *infra*, there was no such mitre. But that he sometimes did was not unique to himself. When in October 2001 I inspected St. Patrick's *Church of Ireland* Cathedral in Armagh, Northern Ireland, I there saw Archbishop John Bramhall's chair. After James Usher's Archbishopric (1625-56), due to the troubles of the republican commonwealth, the Archbishopric was vacant until John Bramhall was appointed by Charles II in 1661. The chair in which he was enthroned, "Bramhall's Chair," is on permanent display in the Cathedral. This wooden chair has carved on it the year, "1661," and a heraldic mitre is also carved on it, (underneath three crosses,) symbolizing it is a bishop's chair. (Bramhall had been earlier consecrated as a Bishop by Archbishop Ussher in 1634, assisted by others including e.g., John Echlin of Down and Connor<sup>120</sup>.)

Two views exist on the usage of the mitre as a heraldic symbol among Reformed Anglicans. This has led to debate in the Diocese of Sydney's Synod, an Evangelical Diocese where no bishop wears a two-horned mitre. The Diocese of Sydney debate made reference to the usage of the heraldic two-horned mitres in St. Andrew's Cathedral, where e.g., it is used on the Archbishop's chair to designate a bishop (like at St. Patrick's Cathedral, Armagh, *supra*), and on various wall plaques it is placed to symbolize a bishop, including coats of arms (like Archbishop Laud's Coat of Arms, *supra*). This debate resulted in a majority view in favour of retaining the traditional usage of the bishop's mitre *in heraldry only*; and a minority view which thinks its usage in such heraldry should be phased out (so argued unsuccessfully by Bruce Ballantine-Jones, a now retired Minister of the Diocese<sup>121</sup>). But it should be stressed that both groups are absolutely opposed to a bishop actually wearing a two-horned mitre.

In favour of the traditional view, three points that may be made are these. Firstly, the mitre is a recognizable established symbol of a bishop. This is seen in e.g., Laud's reference to "The Mitre Inn" at Oxford. Secondly, the objection to the mitre as a symbol of Romanism is safeguarded against since no Bishop is actually wearing a mitre himself, and the teaching of Article 37 of the 39 Articles, "The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England," becomes in practice, "the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction *in this Anglican Diocese*" and "Anglican Church." Thirdly, outmoded symbols are sometimes used in heraldry, e.g., my father is a retired army officer from the *Royal Australian Corps of Signals*. The insignia of this corps is the jimmy badge, which is a picture of a runner carrying a container under his arm. The days are long gone when signals are sent this way over long distances, but this runner remains as a heraldic

---

<sup>120</sup> McCafferty, J., *The Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland*, Cambridge University Press, England, 2007, pp. 31,264.

<sup>121</sup> I spoke to Canon Ballantine-Jones about this matter on 15 Jan 2008. He said his recollection was that he *probably* first articulated this as a public argument in Synod when he was Canon of St. Andrew's Cathedral from 1995 to 2002. (He is now a Canon Emeritus of the Cathedral, and an Honorary Assistant Minister at St. Philip's Caringbah.) He confirmed to me that this was still his view.

symbol. So too, for those who accept the Reformation teachings, the days are long gone when a bishop wears a mitre, but the mitre might still serve as a heraldic symbol.

In favour of the minority view, three points that may be made are these. Firstly, the mitre was historically a symbol of the allegiance of a bishop to the Roman Pope. It developed after the Great Schism of 1054 with the Archbishop of Constantinople (producing first the Greek Orthodox, and then the other Eastern Orthodox Churches), for which reason it is not found in Eastern Orthodoxy. This nexus means it should be jettisoned *per se*, and so phased out of its heraldic usage. Secondly, the mitre is an ostentatious head-covering, and Christ spoke against this sort of thing in Matt. 23:5. (To which it might be replied that Matt. 23:5 is applicable only to the wearing of suchlike, not to its heraldic usage. To which it might be replied that one cannot safely make such a distinction. And so the argument may go back'n'forth *ad infinitum*.) Thirdly, while there is a sense in which the mitre is an outmoded symbol, its retention in Anglican heraldry cannot be justified since it still has an ongoing meaning in Roman Catholicism as a symbol of Papal allegiance. It thus has Romish overtones even if the bishop is not wearing a mitre, but only using it for heraldic purposes. And in this context it is surely worthy of note that Puseyite (by which I also mean semi-Puseyite) Bishops, have sadly reintroduced the wearing of mitres.

Now of these two views, there is no agreement. On the one hand, I personally support the minority view put forth by Canon Ballantine-Jones, and think the mitre as a heraldic symbol should be phased out. In its place, I think a bishop's staff could be used, perhaps featuring mainly the top part of the staff with the handle curling around. But on the other hand, at least to date, this minority view has never gained a wide general support among Reformed Anglicans. In my opinion, those Reformed Anglicans using it, such as occurs at St. Andrew's Cathedral, are *skating on thin ice*. Nevertheless, in view of their qualifications, *most importantly its strict limitation to heraldry, and their absolute rejection of any claims of Papal authority*, it is a tolerated difference of opinion, *much as I lack sympathy for the majority and traditional view that the mitre can be safely used as a bishop's heraldic symbol*.

And so it is that when we come to Smart's statement "before the Archbishop" Laud, "Boldly I preach, hate ... mitres," on the one hand, I admit I have some sympathy for it. But on the other hand, I do not think that this is a difference of opinion that we cannot live with, in the same way that Smart and the Puritans did. Though I would like to see even the heraldic usage of the mitre phased out, I do not think that one can claim that on the basis of a heraldic usage of the mitre that a bishop is thereby *necessarily* "seeking to usher in Popery." *Rather, I rejoice that we Reformed Anglicans are firm in our agreement that no bishop should now wear a mitre, and that the Pope of Rome hath no jurisdiction over us. This to be sure is the biggest and most important thing!*

Moreover, much as I greatly dislike the mitre even as a heraldic symbol, I find that Smart's statement here, (like the Puritan statements on "crucifixes,") is put in confusing terminology and seems intended to allow his Puritan readers to wrongly think that Laud was actually wearing a mitre. But if he was challenged on the matter, Smart

could then turn around and say in his smart-alec way, “Oh, I was referring to the heraldic mitre on the Archbishop’s Coat of Arms.” This type of misleading approach, evidently a hallmark of Smart’s Puritan propaganda (see Smart on “crucifixes,” *infra*), here designed to allow his Puritan readers to wrongly conclude that Laud was wearing a mitre, also facilitates abuse by the Puseyites, *whose bishops really did reintroduce the wearing of mitres*. Truly was I saddened to see this type of thing in the pictures of Archbishops of Canterbury from around the mid-nineteenth century on, that I saw hanging on a wall at Lambeth Palace when I inspected it in February 2003.

Therefore I find that Laud’s 6th innovation was the promotion of the two-horned mitre as a heraldic symbol, and more generally, those following this thinking used the two-horned mitre as an artistic symbol. It is possible though not certain, that some Restoration bishops then developed this thinking to the point where they actually wore a mitre. Whatever the full usage of the mitre, to the extent that Laud promoted its heraldic usage, I think he did a disservice. But in saying this, the reader should bear in mind that historically, many Reformed Anglicans do not share my private view that the two-horned mitre should not be used even in heraldry, although such a view clearly exists and has in contemporary times been so argued in the Diocese of Sydney by Canon Ballantine-Jones, *supra*.

An eighth innovation of Laud’s was the reintroduction of auricular confession. And this too has been readily adopted by Puseyites from the 19th century.

In his *Babylonian Captivity* (1520), Luther argued for “three” “sacraments,” namely, baptism, communion, and confession (penance). However he qualified the Romish sacramental teaching with its “three parts: contrition, confession, and satisfaction.” He rejected the Romish teaching that regarded “contrition” as a good work of “merit.” He rejected the Romish claim that the core element of “secret confession” to a Minister was ordained by God in Scripture, arguing rather, that though private auricular “confession of sins” in the “sacrament” of “penance” is “not” specifically “commended in Scripture,” that is, it is not of Divine law origin but human origin, he “nevertheless” thought it to be “highly useful and necessary,” and so ought to be retained. He further repudiated the Romish “doctrine of satisfaction,” which he said had become “so perverted that people do not realize that satisfaction is simply amendment of life, not” some penance of good works like “pilgrimages, flagellations, mortifications,” and so on. Concerning his designation of confession as a “sacrament,” Luther said that the term “sacraments” might include other things such as “prayer, the Word, and the cross, whereas strictly the term is used of promises with signs annexed and in this sense there are really but two, baptism and the bread.” By contrast, the “sacrament of penance lacks the visible and divinely instituted sign, and” “is only a return to baptism.” Hence he qualified his usage of “sacrament” for his third “sacrament” of confession by saying that when he referred to the “sacrament of penance,” he was using the term “sacrament” differently to when he referred to the “sacraments” of Baptism and Communion. Thus Luther considered that in the narrow sense of the word “sacrament” there are “two,” Baptism and Communion, but in the broad sense of the word “sacrament” there are three, with confession being the third “sacrament.”

The Lutheran *Augsburg Confession* (1530) likewise discusses: Baptism (Article 1:9), Communion (Article 1:10), and Confession (Article 1:11) as “sacraments” (Article 1:13). But it rejects Romish notions of righteousness by works for these “sacraments,” declaring that Lutherans “condemn those that teach that the sacraments do justify by the work done” (Latin, “*ex opere operato*” i.e., the Romish view), “and do not teach that faith which believes the remission of sins is requisite in the use of the sacraments” (Article 1:13). They also abolished the need to enumerate all offenses, for “Who can understand his errors?” (Ps. 19:12), and made the usage of private auricular confession to a Minister *voluntary* (Article 1:11). Like Luther, the *Augsburg Confession* does not claim auricular confession is ordained or commanded in Scripture, but says, “Confession is of human right only” (Article 2:4)<sup>122</sup>. In time, the *optional* and *voluntary* elements of Lutheran auricular confession meant that it could be left behind as in general Lutherans progressed to the second stage of the Reformation in which auricular confession was generally abolished *in practice*.

Reformed Anglicans went through a three step process in proceeding to the second stage of the Reformation and generally abolishing voluntary auricular confession to a Minister. The first step of this process consisted in Reformation Anglicanism basically adopting Lutheran private voluntary confession (“commonly called” “penance,” Article 25, *39 Articles*), but unlike Lutherans, not regarding it as a “sacrament.” This meant ridding it of those Romanist elements connected with a doctrine of justification by works, and making it purely voluntary. The *First Exhortation* in the *Communion Service* from the *Book of Common Prayer, 1662* (though changing location in the Edwardian Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552, Elizabethan Prayer Book of 1559, and Caroline Prayer Book of 1662,) is found in an earlier form in the 1549 Prayer Book. But the 1549 form states if a man’s “conscience is troubled” then for “the quietness of” his “own conscience” before Communion, if he requires further “comfort or counsel” about God’s forgiveness of his sins, he should “confess and open his sin and grief secretly” to that or another Minister in order to “receive comfort and absolution” after he has made “auricular and secret confession to the priest.” But the voluntary nature of this is stressed with tolerance urged to both those using “auricular and secret confession to the priest,” and those who are “satisfied with a general confession” in the main Church Service. The fact that this is for “a man” who “cannot quiet his own conscience,” means that like the Lutheran form it is both for specific sins and voluntary. At the *Visitation of the Sick Service* (1549) provision is also made allowing “the sick person” to “make a special confession, if he feels his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession, the priest shall absolve him after” the “form” provided (which is the Absolution found in the old *Sarum Manuel*), and the rubric also states “the same form of absolution shall be used in all private confessions,” that is, those referred to in the Exhortation at the Communion Service.

---

<sup>122</sup> Bainton, R.H., *The Age of the Reformation*, D. Van Nostrand, New Jersey, USA, 1956, pp. 106,109-111; Schaff, P., *Creeds of Christendom, op. cit.*, pp. 13-15,41; Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, p. 655.

The second step of this process consisted in strictly limiting the use of auricular confession to use with a sick person. In the first instance, this *Exhortation* was changed in the Communion Service in the 1552, 1559, and 1662 Prayer Books. While I think there are evangelistic and pastoral contexts where a Gospel Minister may discuss a person's sins with him, I do not think that this should ever take the form of auricular confession and absolution in which the sins are confessed to the Minister who then "absolves the penitent." Rather, I consider that at the end of such a context, the individual, if repentant, privately confesses his sins in prayer to God, and seeks pardon from God through the blood of Christ (I John 1:7,9; 2:1,2). This is the type of thing referred to in the revised *Exhortation* found in the Anglican *Books of Common Prayer* (1552, 1559, & 1662), "When the Minister giveth warning for the celebration of the holy Communion" (1662). He addresses the congregation and says, "if there be any of you" who "cannot quiet his own conscience" before he "come to holy Communion," "but requireth further comfort or counsel," then "let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned Minister of God's Word, and open his grief;" in order "that by the ministry of God's Word, he may receive comfort and the benefit of absolution" as well as "ghostly counsel, advise, and comfort, as his conscience may be relieved" (1552 & 1559), or "that by the ministry of God's holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience" (1662) (The Communion Service, *Books of Common Prayer*, 1552, 1559, & 1662).

Thus unlike the 1549 form of "absolution" after "auricular and secret confession to the priest," we find that from 1552 "the benefit of absolution" is obtained "by the ministry of God's Word" (1552 & 1559) or "by the ministry of God's holy Word" (1662), that is, the Minister goes over Scriptures dealing with God's forgiveness of repentant sinners in conjunction with other "ghostly" or spiritual "counsel." The matter is then left to the man to later confess his sin in private prayer to God, and to take comfort in these Scriptures dealing with forgiveness that have been brought to his attention by the Minister in pastoral counseling. That is, the Minister does not actually listen to an auricular confession followed by an absolution (as in the 1549 Prayer Book). This is also highlighted by the fact that at the *Visitation of the Sick Service* (1552 & 1559), there is a complete removal of the 1549 rubric stating "the same form of absolution shall be used in all private confessions," since private auricular confessions *were strictly limited to the sick* from 1552.

Nevertheless, this second step in the Anglican process of abolishing voluntary auricular confession to a Minister, still allowed it in one situation, namely, as the "special confession" of a sick person. The *Visitation of the Sick Service* of 1549 was largely retained in 1552, 1559, and 1662 (though the 1552, 1559, and 1662 Prayer Books abolished the revised and non-sacramental form of voluntary anointing of the sick found in the 1549 Prayer Book). Though strictly limiting its use to a sick person from 1552, Reformation Anglicanism retained the basic Lutheran idea of voluntary auricular confession to a Minister when a "sick person" wanted to "make a special confession," "if he feels his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession the priest shall absolve him" (1552, 1559, & 1662), with the same Absolution found in the 1549 Prayer Book. In the 1552 Prayer Book, the sick person therefore had three options,

*Option 1:* not “to make a special confession of his sins.” *Option 2:* “to make a special confession of his sins” in private prayer to God, after which the Minister absolves him, i.e., this is like the silent confession of sins before the “General Confession” followed by the “Absolution” pronounced by the Minister at Morning and Evening Prayer or The Communion Service in the *Book of Common Prayer*. *Option 3:* “to make a special confession” of his sins in voluntary auricular confession to the Minister.

Because the rubric refers to “a special confession of sins” but *does not specify* “to God” or “to the priest,” this allowed, but did not require, movement by the clergy and people to the second stage of the Reformation. Thus if a Minister did not believe in auricular confession, he could even direct the use of *Option 2*, saying to the sick man something like, “Make your confession in silent prayer to God, and when you’re finished open your eyes and look at me; or if you want to keep your eyes closed, just say ‘Amen’ audibly;” at which point he would absolve him. Or he could say something like, “Make your confession in silent prayer to God, and then say audibly the General Confession at The Communion Service changing ‘we’ to ‘I,’” after which point he would absolve him. But it was also true that a sick man could here make an auricular confession to the priest after which the priest would absolve him.

Berkhof says the “Church of Rome” “seeks the Scriptural ground for penance in Jas. 5:16,” “Confess your faults” (AV) or “trespasses” (NKJV) “one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed” (AV). For example, the Anglican Canon Blakeney (1820-1884), a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, quotes the Roman Catholic *Grounds of Catholic Doctrine* (a nineteenth century Irish catechism published in Dublin, that he says was “much used among Romanists” at the time,) which says, “the [Roman] Catholic doctrine and practice of confession” “is prescribed in the New Testament (James 5:16), - ‘Confess therefore your sins, one to another;’ that is, to the priests or elders of the church whom the Apostles ordered to be called for (v. 14)<sup>123</sup>.”

In the first place, I note that the picture in James 5:16 is of people confessing their “sins one to another,” not a picture of people confessing their sins in auricular confession to a Minister. This is doubly significant since contextually such “elders of the church” are present (James 5:14), but they are not availed upon for this purpose. Furthermore, if one is going to claim “Confess” “your sins, one to another” is limited to the Minister, then logically the rest of the verse put in the same words, “and pray one for another” must also be limited to the Minister. But this is so absurd that no-one claims Christians ought not to pray for the sick, but leave such prayer to the Minister. In the second place, I note that we must *rightly divide the Word of God* (II Tim. 2:15), and that one should not expound one place of Scripture in a way that makes it to be repugnant to another place (Matt. 4:5-7). Since the Scriptures teach elsewhere that we should confess our sins to God (I John 1:7,9,10; 2:1,2), James 5:16 cannot mean auricular confession to a Minister. The Scriptures teach that we should seek reconciliation with Christian brethren when one

---

<sup>123</sup> Blakeney R.P., [*Church of England*] Canon of York [1882-4], *Manuel of Romish Controversy*, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK [1883 +/- 1 year], pp. 83-4; Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, p. 620.

sins against the other (Matt. 5:23,24), and if a Christian brother asks our forgiveness for some sin he has committed against us, we should, for our part, forgive him (Matt. 18:23-35). Hence we pray in the *Lord's Prayer*, "forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors" (AV) or "forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us" (*The Lord's Prayer*, 1662 prayer book) (Matt. 6:12). Therefore this is surely what James 5:16 is referring to. Of course, in conjunction with such reconciliation among brethren, one must then seek God's forgiveness for the sin in private prayer (Matt. 5:24).

That the Church of Rome would use James 5:13-16 to justify auricular confession is not surprising given her frequent cursory usage of Scripture, and her reading of it through the filter of Romish Tradition. But Reformation Anglicans hastened slowly out of this type of thinking. While the Prayer Books of 1549, 1552, and 1559 did not specifically state that James 5:13-16 was being used to justify the option of voluntary auricular confession (1549), or voluntary auricular confession of a sick person (1552 & 1559), the *unqualified* contextualization of voluntary auricular confession in the *Books of Common Prayer's* Visitation of the Sick Service (1549, 1552, & 1559) *allowed, though did not require*, this view. (The *qualification* made in the third step, *infra*, meant that no alteration was regarded as necessary in the 1662 Prayer Book). This means that unlike Luther who considered auricular confession was "not" specifically "commended in Scripture," but might "nevertheless" be "highly useful and necessary" and so ought to be retained; in 1549, 1552, and 1559 Reformation Anglicans allowed *either* the view that James 5:16 refers to auricular confession (Roman Church view), or the view that James 5:16 does not refer to auricular confession (Lutheran Church view). But if the former, unlike the Roman Church, they additionally *limited its usage to sick persons only*.

The third step of this process in proceeding to the second stage of the Reformation and abolishing voluntary auricular confession to a Minister consisted in definitively striking down the view that James 5:16 refers to auricular confession, and removing *Option 3* from the "special confession" in the *Visitation of the Sick Service* (1552 & 1559). This was done in 1562, through the Homilies referred to in Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*. In Homily 19, Book 2, "Of Repentance," the auricular confession view of James 5:16 is rejected, and those who consider James 5:16 refers to "auricular confession" are said to be "the adversaries" who "go about to wrest" or twist this Scripture. For those maintaining this view are said to have "greatly deceived themselves, and" to "shamefully deceive others." For "What need we" "to tell forth our sins into the ear of the priest," since "they be already taken away?" And so "Ambrose" (c. 337-397) "in his second sermon upon the hundred and nineteenth psalm" "doth understand that, *both the priesthood and the law being changed* (Heb. 7), we ought to acknowledge none other priest for deliverance from our sins but our Saviour Jesus Christ." The fact that this Homily then first says, "It is most evident and plain that this auricular confession hath not" the "warrant of God's Word," and then gives a clear injunction to "use that kind of confession that God doth command in his Word," means that auricular confession was abolished and so *Option 3* in the *Visitation of the Sick Service* (1559) was not to be used. But this Homily retained the usage of pastoral counseling, so that a person "troubled in conscience" could "receive at" a Minister's "hand the comfortable salve of God's Word" as Bible verses on sin, repentance, and the

assurance of God's forgiveness were read to him, and so the Exhortation of the 1559 Prayer Book was (with minor changes) retained in the later 1662 Prayer Book.

The nineteenth century *Church of England* Canon of York (1882-4), Richard Blakeney, is a good example of Anglicans who, *for some three hundred years* had completed this three step process and had completely abolished auricular confession to a Minister. Canon Blakeney declared, "We are opposed to auricular confession" "because it is an infringement upon the prerogatives of God," since "we should confess our sins to God" "Psalm 51:1; 32:5; 130:4; Dan. 9:3-9". He also opposed "the power which it gives to the priesthood," and considered "it is immoral in its character and results" as "the priest hears a recital of sins, and asks questions of a corrupting character." Similar statements can be found in the Anglican *Thirty-Five Articles* (1875) of the *Reformed Episcopal Church* in America, which in 1873 had withdrawn as a group of Evangelical Anglicans from the *Protestant Episcopal Church* in America on the basis of its Puseyism. Article 35 of these says, "Private confession of sins to a priest commonly known as auricular confession, has no foundation in the Word of God, and is a human invention. It makes the professed penitent a slave to mere human authority," "and opens the way to many immoralities." Rather, "in any and every case confession is" "to be made to God." "Priestly absolution is a" "usurpation of the sole prerogative of God<sup>124</sup>." The Protestant confessions of the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Baptists, outrightly adopted the second stage of the Reformation on this matter, at no time ever having auricular confession to a Minister.

Contrary to these advances to the second stage of the Reformation with the abolition of auricular confession by Anglicans in a three step process from 1549 to 1562, auricular confession was revived in the nineteenth century by the inroads of the retrograde Puseyites. This was accomplished by a triple Puseyite deception. In the first place, they ignored the words of Homily 19, Book 2, Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*, and thus would not give heed to the third step which completely abolished auricular confession in 1562. Then they stopped up their ears to the plain meaning of the Exhortation at the Communion Service (1662, basically retained from 1552), as they misread the statement that "the benefit of absolution" is obtained "by the ministry of God's holy Word," and perverted it to mean "by the ministry of" *the Minister absolving a penitent after auricular confession*, thus refusing to listen to the second step which limited auricular confession to the sick in 1552. Then they closed their eyes to the fact that from 1552 there is a complete removal of the 1549 rubric in the *Visitation of the Sick Service* stating, "the same form of absolution shall be used in all private confessions," since private auricular confessions *were strictly limited to the sick* from 1552. Hence the spiritually ignorant, deaf, and blind Puseyites (and semi-Puseyite Broadchurchmen) had to decontextualize the Absolution in the *Visitation of the Sick Service* (1662), in order to dishonestly find a form of Absolution to use in such contexts since the *Books of Common Prayer* (1552, 1559, & 1662) made *no provision* for a general usage of voluntary auricular confession to a Minister. Thus "it happened unto" those in Puseyism and the

---

<sup>124</sup> Blakeney's *Manuel of Romish Controversy*, *op. cit.*, pp. 85,87,89; Schaff, P., *op. cit.*, pp. 825-6.

semi-Puseyite Broadchurch “according to the true proverb, The dog is turned to his own vomit again; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire” (II Peter 2:22).

In this context, the Puseyite authors of *Hierurgia Anglicana* (1848) also make reference to Canon 113 of the *Canons Ecclesiastical* (1603), which refers to a situation in which a “man confess his secret and hidden sins to the Minister for the unburdening of his conscience, and to receive spiritual consolation and ease of mind from him<sup>125</sup>.” But let the reader note, this is *not in order to received absolution from him*. I.e., this is referring to a pastoral situation in which a person has confessed some secret sin to the Minister who has pastorally counselled him. In this situation the Minister is required to keep his confidence. This is certainly not referring to an auricular confession and absolution such as occurred from 1552-1562 for sick persons, or 1549-1552 for sick or whole persons.

But the Puseyite authors of *Hierurgia Anglicana* (1848) also refer to an entry in Laud’s diary of 15 June, 1622, in which he says, “I became confessor to my Lord of Buckingham<sup>126</sup>.” Here we have the first known instance of the reintroduction of auricular confession and absolution (as opposed to a non-auricular confession in quiet prayer to God in a priest’s presence), since the abolition of auricular confession in 1562. Showing the influence of the Laudian circle, such an interpretation with the words, “if any man confess his secret sins to the Minister,” also occurred in the Diocese of Peterborough in 1634. In the Diocese of Norwich under Bishop Matthew Wren in 1634 (see Wren when Bishop of Ely in 1641, at innovation 5, *supra*), we read the words, “if any man confess his secret and hidden sins, being *sick or whole* to the Minister<sup>127</sup>; so that Bishop Wren clearly revived the pre-1552 position, found between 1549 and 1552, when auricular confession was to either the sick or whole.

After the Restoration, under Charles II the view appears to have been modified by some bishops from the 1549-1552 view under Charles I (auricular confession for whole or sick person), back to the 1552-1562 (auricular confession only for sick person). Hence in 1686, the Bishop of Ely, Bishop Turner says, “Doth he [the Minister] visit the sick? Doth he, upon their confession, repentance, and faith ... absolve them? Doth he keep secret such confession?” And in 1687, this innovation is maintained later by the Archbishop of Canterbury (1715-1737), William Wake, who says, “When we visit our sick, we never fail to exhort them to make a special confession of their sins to him that ministers to them; and when they have done it, the absolution is ... full ...<sup>128</sup>.”

---

<sup>125</sup> *Hierurgia Anglicana*, p 271.

<sup>126</sup> *Ibid.*, p 271.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 271-3.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 273-4; citing Visitation Articles of F. Turner, Bishop of Ely, 1686; and Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England by Dr. Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, pp. 42,43.

Once again, this innovation seems to have largely disappeared from the time of William III on, with the 1552-1562 position given some support later by bishops Turner and Wake; and then the 1562 position largely re-adopted by Puseyites of the 19th century who more comprehensively revived this Laudian innovation. To the extent that elements of this Laudian innovation survived with the resuscitation of the 1552-1562 position, this is most regrettable; but it must be said that the evidence for such usage is very sparse till the 19th century Puseyite movement.

It should also be borne in mind that we Reformed Anglicans do not regard bishops as infallible. Our standard is Holy Scripture, and Holy Scripture is infallible. We maintain the third step in the second stage Anglican reforms of abolishing auricular confession outright in Article 35 because we uphold the authority of Scripture, not *vice versa*. Therefore, if a bishop departs from this, and reverts back to teaching auricular confession, whether Laud, or Turner, or Wake, we denounce this as an unwarranted departure from the teaching of Scripture, and the Protestant doctrine of Anglicanism. We do not, like the Puseyites, seek to first condone their error, and then copy it. For we are subject to God and his holy Word, and we judge all things, bishops included, by that standard, the Lord being our helper.

For in the words of Homily 19, Book, 2, Article 35 of the 39 Articles, “confession” “is made unto God,” and those who “wrest” different places of Scripture, “to maintain their auricular confession,” “are greatly deceived themselves, and do shamefully deceive others.” For “it is most evident and plain that this auricular confession hath not his [God’s] warrant of God’s Word; else it had not been lawful for Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, upon a just occasion to have put it down.”

For, continues the Homily, which changed “sith that” to “sith” in 1623, as I now change this to “since,” (but thereby showing that the official doctrine of the Anglican Church still opposed auricular confession in 1623, a year after Laud started to illegally act as a confessor); “these are St. Augustine’s words, ‘What have I to do with men, that they should hear my confession, as though they were able to heal my diseases? A curious sort of men to know another man’s life, and slothful to correct or amend their own. Why do they seek to hear of me what I am, which will not hear of thee what they are? And how can they tell, when they hear of myself, whether I tell the truth or not, since ‘no mortal man knoweth what is in man, but the spirit of man which is in him’ (I Cor. 2:11).” “Augustine would not have written thus, if auricular confession had been used in his time.” “Therefore,” “let us” not engage in “the numbering of ... sins” in “auricular confession,” but rather, “use that kind of confession that God doth command in his word; and then doubtless, as ‘he is faithful and righteous, he will forgive us our sins, and make us clean from all wickedness’ (I John 1:9).”

If bishops such as Laud, Turner, or Wake, taught auricular confession, as they appear to have done, *then they were wrong to do so, and they should not have done so, since the teaching of auricular confession is contrary to the Biblical teaching of the 39 Articles.* Unlike the Roman Church where the priest *gives* absolution, the Reformed

Anglican teaching is that a priest *pronounces* an absolution. Thus an Anglican clergyman *absolves a person or congregation only in the sense that he pronounces an absolution*. This is based on the Biblical teaching of forgiveness of sins (John 20:23), and thus following the absolution at *The Communion Service*, Scriptures are read from Matt. 11:28; John 3:16; I Tim. 1:5; I John 2:1. Whether in the general confession at Communion, before which the people in their minds remember their sins and seek God's forgiveness, or whether in the *Visitation of the Sick Service* a person makes a special confession of his sins *quietly to God*, and then after he has stopped praying, the priest pronounces the absolution, *either way, the Minister never hears what those sins are in any kind of auricular confession*.

The private auricular confession was limited to the sick from 1552-1562, and abolished in 1562. *Why? Because the Lutheran Reformation started a process. This was followed by later reforms in the same spirit that Luther himself coming out of medieval Romanism had not embraced. One such reform was the abolition of auricular confession. Thus in seeking to go back to the pre-1562 position (auricular confession for the sick) or pre-1552 position (auricular confession for the whole or sick), Laud and others were attacking the spirit of the Reformation in general, and the second stage of the Reformation as developed by Reformed Anglicanism after Luther's time in particular. This issue thus brings us to Laud's ninth innovation.*

A ninth innovation of Laud's, evident from the former eight, was his suppression of the spirit of Protestantism, with respect to later stage reforms. I.e., the Lutheran Reformation was the first stage of the Reformation. But a second stage of the Reformation then occurred in the Anglican Church. (The Puritans regarded themselves as a third stage of the Reformation. But they split among themselves with e.g., Arminian Baptists, known as General Baptists, claiming that the Anglican Church had to be "purified" of its Reformed teaching on election; and Reformed Baptists, known as Particular Baptists, claiming that the Anglican Church only had to be "purified" of its Reformed teaching of Rom. 9:11-13, by introducing a strange teaching of universal infant salvation, whilst simultaneously claiming to believe in election. Moreover, among the Reformed Puritans, there were further divisions, and ultimately, Reformed Puritans produced rival third stage Reformation confessions with the Presbyterian's *Westminster Confession*, the Congregationalist's *Savoy Declaration*, and the Baptist's *London Confession*).

Hence Laudians considered the second stage reforms of the Anglican Church had gone too far in the Protestant direction. They wanted to go back to the point of the Lutheran Reformation i.e., the first stage of the Reformation, and then from that point to reinvent Anglicanism in a more semi-Romanist and more anti-Puritan way. By contrast, the Puritans considered the second stage reforms of the Anglican Church had not gone far enough; whereas the Reformed Anglicans considered they had the right kind of balance. *There was thus a three-way split, in which the two major opponents were Laud and the Puritan Revolutionaries, and in which no serious coverage was given to the Reformed Anglican view which wanted neither Laud's innovations rolling back the second stages of the Reformation and reinventing Anglicanism in a more semi-Romanist way, nor the*

*Puritans' "third stage" reforms.* It suited the political propagandist purposes of both Laud and the Puritans to present themselves as a simple two-way split, rather than a three-way split i.e., *honour among thieves*. This same type of misrepresentation is taken up by later Puseyite propagandists, and some later Puritan propagandists who also like to present the matter as a two-way split, rather than a three-way split.

Thus on issues such as auricular confession *et al*, Laudians sought to take the *Church of England* back to where it was before the second stage reforms in the later stages of the Reformation under King Edward VI (Regnal Years: 1547-1553) and the more developed views of Archbishop Cranmer; all of which were revived, and built upon under Queen Elizabeth I (Regnal Years: 1558-1603). In a conceptually confusing way, certain 17th century Anglicans, of which Laud was one, then sought to develop some additional practices, such as nodding, genuflecting, and ceremonial copes, designed to make the Anglican Church even more distinct from the Puritans, by being more in a semi-Romanist direction, but with some notions such as "nodding" that the Romanists themselves did not follow. This was clearly against the spirit of the second stage of the Reformation which the Laudians wanted to roll back and remove.

As Laudians were trying to roll back second stage reforms of the Anglican Reformation, such as the Laudians' reintroduction of auricular confession, and develop some new semi-Romanist ideas, the Puritans wanted to go from the second stage reforms of the Anglican Church under Edward VI and Elizabeth I, to what they regarded as third stage reforms. Because both were seeking to go in the opposite direction at the same time, the Puritans made a number of excessive criticisms of Laud, and Laud also showed what from the perspective of a Reformed Anglican, was an excessive anti-Puritanism. Nevertheless, to the extent that Laud was seeking to undo second stage reforms of the Anglican Church, he was clearly going against the spirit of Protestant reform that had developed and nurtured the teachings of the first stage of the Reformation, the Lutheran Reformation, in the bosom of the Anglican Church, which Protestant spirit had then, by the grace of God, produced the second stage reforms under Edward VI and Elizabeth I.

This ninth innovation was contrary to the spirit of Anglican Protestantism as seen e.g., in the 39 Articles. Book 2 Homily 21, Article 35 of the 39 Articles, is "one of the six Homilies against rebellion" i.e., Homily 21 has six parts, that may be read "after the Creed, if there be no sermon" in the Office of *Papists' Conspiracy Day*; and Parts 1 & 2 of this Homily may read in the Office of *King Charles the Martyr's Day* if there is no sermon. Parts 1 & 2 of this Homily compares "King Edward" the Sixth, to the reforming king of Israel, "good Josias" or Josiah (Matt. 1:11; II Kgs 22:2). And other parts of this Homily refer favourably to Queen Elizabeth as e.g., a "most peaceful and merciful Queen." And Part 6 of this Homily, refers to both "King Edward the Sixth" and Elizabeth" with respect to "the Pope's curses" against them, and then says "the Bishop of Rome" is "the Babylonical beast of Rome" (Rev. 17).

But this type of Protestant spirit manifested in the Supreme Governors of the Anglican Church, Edward VI and Elizabeth I, was to a large extent replaced by Laudians with an anti-Puritan spirit which was then developed into a wider anti-Protestant later

stage reforms spirit, opposing the later reforms under Edward VI and Elizabeth I that the Anglican Church enjoyed. Thus e.g., Elizabeth got rid of all altars, and yet Laudians resuscitated the usage of the word, “altar” for the Communion Table. This more robust spirit of Protestantism survived with men like Archbishop Ussher of Ireland, but was not again captured in the upper echelons of the *Church of England* till the time of the Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church, William III, from 1689. From that point on there was a glorious resurgence of Protestantism within Anglicanism, as these second stage reforms again came to be more generally embraced, and the Laudian innovations cast out.

Thus when the Puseyites went looking for a figure to help roll back the Protestant spirit of Anglicanism, they looked to Laud. Even though they went further than Laud did or would, they had a point in that Laud’s innovations had rolled back the later stage Protestant reforms that started under Edward VI and the more matured Archbishop Cranmer, and had been nurtured and developed under the Protestantism of Elizabeth I. Laud’s innovations were pointers back to forms of semi-Romanism that had been first jettisoned, which reforms had then been successfully defended against the Romish Queen, Bloody Mary. The later loss of these reforms had helped create a civil war in the 1640s and 1650s. (Not that I would thereby justify the Roundheads sedition and murders i.e., *two wrongs do not make a right*.) This loss as maintained by a number of key Restoration Anglicans had helped facilitate the rise of the Romish king, James II. The later removal of these semi-Romanist ideas with the rejuvenation of the second stage reform Anglican Protestant spirit, meant these innovations had then been either jettisoned, or severely restricted (coronation copes), from the time of William III after 1689. The revival of this tried and failed anti-Protestant Anglican spirit Laudian type idea under the Puseyites from the 19th century would once again greatly damage the Anglican Church, and tragically send her back into forms of semi-Romanism that had caused so many problems in the past, and would now create more problems for her again.

While in addition to the illegal 1640s canons and the innovations in them, I have isolated a further nine clear innovations of Laud, some might argue for even more. E.g., some might claim that as a tenth innovation, Laudians introduced the crucifix, meaning a cross with an image of Christ on it. I shall leave the greater discussion of this issue to section *c) i) Charles the First’s Day (30 Jan.), Charles the Second’s Day (or Royal Oak Day) (29 May), & Papists’ Conspiracy Day (5 Nov.)*, *infra*, subsection “*Five illustrative issues: kneeling at Communion, ‘crucifixes,’ ‘altars,’ candles, & clerical dress.*” I state there that I think references to “crucifixes” are in fact references to crosses.

But some ambiguous and uncorroborated Puritan claims would have us believe that Laudians used crucifixes in the sense of a cross with an image on it. It is *just possible* that this happened, in part because Laudians were going back to the point of the Lutheran Reformation in order to reinvent Anglicanism as Laudianism, and Lutherans used crucifixes; and in part because Laudians were sometimes prepared to set aside the Homilies in the 39 Articles, as seen by their revival of auricular confession. Hence while on the one hand, I take the view that in the absence of unambiguous evidence to the contrary, we should work on the presumption that they were maintaining the publicly

declared doctrine of the Anglican Church, which in the Homilies is opposed to such crucifixes; on the other hand, it must be admitted, that I *might* here be being overly generous to Laudians, who *just possibly* did use such crucifixes.

Therefore, I further say in section c), *infra*, that if some additional evidence should prove me wrong, “my response would be threefold. 1) The evidence still indicates that *many* references to the ‘crucifix’ were in fact to a cross; 2) that those using such a crucifix with an image on it would have used it in a Lutheran way, rather than a Romish way; and 3) those that so used such a crucifix did so illegally and improperly, this being contrary to the publicly declared teaching of Article 35 of the 39 Articles.” I.e., if I am proved wrong on this difficult matter, then this would be a tenth Laudian innovation.

Whatever the truth of such matters, it is clear from these nine innovations, *supra*, that Laud and his 17th century Laudians were involved in illegal, unwarranted, and undesirable innovations, that sought to move the Anglican Church in an undesirable semi-Romanist direction. Laudians sought to go back to the point of the Lutheran Reformation, and then redesign and reinvent Anglicanism as a more semi-Romanist and anti-Puritan Church. Their hostility to e.g., much that is in the Homilies of Article 35 of the 39 Articles was thus taken over and continued by the Puseyites.

*“Laud’s Arminianism.”*

Notwithstanding my criticisms of Laud’s nine or ten innovations, *supra*, it is also clear that the Puritan Revolutionaries were extremists who wanted to “purify” the Anglican Church of much more than Laud’s unwarranted innovations. Laud’s innovations created an environment in which Reformed Anglicans who embraced the second stages of the English and Irish Reformation, did not look with favour on the Laudians, and nor did other Protestants i.e., the Puritans look with favour on the Laudians either. The Puritan revolutionaries opportunistically exploited this situation to try and first argue against Laudian attempts to roll back second stage Anglican Reforms, and then additionally take the Reformed Anglican Church to their desired “third stage” reforms by turning it into a Puritan Church. Reformed Anglicans were unwilling to support this either. This creates the difficult situation that Laud is sometimes nobly defending Anglicanism against the Puritans, and sometimes ignobly defending his innovations against the Puritans. Part of the difficulty is that amidst a number of true Puritan charges against Laud (Laud’s innovations), the Puritans also created a number of false charges against Laud. Thus truth and falsehood are intermingled together in their charges, as Laud is made by the Puritans to look far worse than he actually was. I shall now pay some special attention to one issue that seems to be mentioned more than most others, to wit, “Laud’s Arminianism”<sup>129</sup>.

---

<sup>129</sup> See McGrath, G.B (myself), “Calvin and Charles I,” *British Church Newspaper*, No. 169, 25 Sept., 2009, p. 10; Westfold, H., “Charles, Neither Martyr nor Calvinist!” *British Church Newspaper*, No. 170, 8 Oct., 2009, p. 11 (attacking what I say on 25 Sept. 2009); McGrath, G.B (myself), “Charles I ...,” *British Church Newspaper*,

Barrels and barrels of ink have been expended on the claim of “Laud’s Arminianism.” The claim, first made by Puritan propagandists and acted upon by the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1642-60 in Laud’s trial of *Cromwell’s Revolutionary Regime v. Archbishop of Canterbury (Laud) (1644)*, *infra*, in which Laud entirely repudiated the claim; was later taken up in historically modern times by both a number of secularist historians as well as Puseyites, who exploited this “established fact” to then justify their own embrace of Arminianism. To this day, pro-Cromwellian and anti-Caroline Puritans like to use this issue to typecast Caroline Anglicans as “Arminian<sup>130</sup>,” an infectious propaganda claim that has even spread to some semi-Puritans such as Bishop Barry Shucksmith in the *Free Church of England* in England<sup>131</sup>.

---

No. 171, 23 Oct., 2009, p. 11 (defending what I say on 25 Sept. 2009); Westfold, H., “Charles I ...” *British Church Newspaper*, No. 172, 6 Nov., 2009, p. 11 (attacking what I say on 23 Oct. 2009); & McGrath, G.B (myself), “Charles I ...,” *British Church Newspaper*, No. 173, 20 Nov., 2009, p. 11 (defending what I say on 23 Oct. 2009). Cf. Evans, H., on “Charles I,” & Bartley, A., on “Civil War,” *British Church Newspaper*, No. 174, 4 Dec. 09, p. 10 (pro-Cromwell) & McGrath, G.B (myself), “Cavaliers & Roundheads,” *British Church Newspaper*, No. 176, 15 Jan. 2010, p. 10 (“a modern-time Cavalier” in “fight” “with the pen and not the sword against modern day Roundheads”).

<sup>130</sup> The Presbyterian, John S. MacKenzie (d. 2009), in an article entitled, “Samuel Rutherford writes on Arminianism,” first quotes Rutherford who “In a letter dated 1637 ... encouraged resistance to English Popish ceremonies, ‘... the accursed and wretched prelates [Anglican bishops], the Antichrist’s first born and the first fruits of his foul womb’.” He then discusses an “extract on Arminianism,” in which Rutherford’s opposition to this is discussed e.g., “Rutherford, preaching before the House of Common in 1644” (*Faith & Freedom*, formerly Para Hills, South Australia, 5096; now P.O. Box 1117, Innaloo City, W.A., 6918, Australia), January 2005, p. 5. For my views on this Puritan Presbyterian publication which is a mix of good (Protestant) and bad (pro-Cromwell Puritan) material, see my footnote comments on “Khoo’s *simple solution* belief that Burgon’s Majority Text equates the Received Text,” in *Textual Commentary* Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, section, “\*Determining the representative Byzantine Text.” E.g., the December 2009 issue of *Faith & Freedom* under the new Editor, Errol Stone, contains a flyer telling of MacKenzie’s death in Dec. 09; contains some good Protestant material in an Editorial on e.g., Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer (p. 2); and some bad Puritan material entitled, “10 Reasons Why Christmas is Unscriptural,” claiming “Christmas is of heathen origin,” and urging people not to keep this “heathen” or “pagan” day (pp. 13-14).

<sup>131</sup> *English Churchman*, No.7764, April 2009. As I note in *English Churchman*, “Shucksmith would have been defrocked and ejected by historic Protestant Anglicanism in her better Bible based day,” e.g., he does not “accept the teachings in the 1662-1859 Office for ‘King Charles the Martyr,’ that Cromwell and his cohorts were ‘cruel men, sons of Belial’ (I Sam. 2:12; II Cor. 6:15),” *English Churchman*, No 7772, July & Aug. 2009, & No. 7774, Aug & Sept 2009.

Before examining these claims further, let me state that my own position is that I entirely reject Arminianism (by which I mean both Arminianism Proper and semi-Arminianism). (Though to my shame, I once adhered to the error of Wesleyan Arminianism,) I regard Arminianism, whether Arminianism Proper (Jacob Arminius, rightly condemned by the Dutch Reformed *Synod of Dort*, 1618), or semi-Arminianism, e.g., Wesleyan Arminianism (John Wesley, founder of Methodism), as highly erroneous. I maintain that “the gospel of” “grace” (Gal. 1:6,7) teaches that “by” “works” “shall no flesh be justified” (Gal. 2:16), and hence the so called “good work” of faith that Arminians boast of (if they think about it carefully), as something that they have done, is not admissible. Rather, men are given the gift of “faith” by which they are justified (Gal. 3:11), i.e., they are enabled (Titus 3:4-7; I Peter 1:2), since it is Christ that doth “draw all” types of “men,” both Jews and Gentiles (John 12:32). For we are not, as the Arminians claim, very, very, sick in our sins, but rather, “dead in trespasses and sin” (Eph. 2:1); so that we must be “quickenened” or made alive by God, “by grace ye are saved” (Eph. 2:5). Therefore I hold with all orthodox brethren of the holy Reformed faith, i.e., Calvinists, that “by grace are ye saved through faith: and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast” (Eph. 2:8,9). As a Calvinist, I also uphold a particular or limited atonement (Matt. 1:21; 26:28; John 10:11,15), as opposed to the general or universal atonement of Arminians and Amyraldians.

Among the Reformed, there is sometimes an overly simplistic approach which basically considers that if a man is Reformed, and so believes in election, then his general theology must also be sound. By contrast, if a man is bad, he “just must” be an Arminian. Thus because the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60 were Reformed, they “must be” “the good guys,” and because Laud is the known “bad guy” or “villain,” they “just know” that he must have been “an Arminian.” *The truth is that one can have heretics inside the Reformed tradition.* The truth that so many Reformed Puritans find hard to accept, is that the battle of *Laud verses Cromwell’s Puritans* was a battle of *Reformed verses Reformed*. It was also, I hasten to add, a battle of *heretic verses heretic*; for whereas Laudians set aside the wonderful advances of the English and Irish Reformation in the second stage Anglican reforms largely under Queen Elizabeth; Cromwell’s Puritans set aside broad Biblical teachings about law and order (Matt. 22:20,21; Rom. 13:1-7), in order to allegedly justify “seditions” (Gal. 5:20) against the Crown, and associated “murders” (Gal. 5:21) ultimately even murder of the king himself. But what saith the Apostle? “They which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (Gal. 5:21). And what saith Christ? “Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s” (Mark 12:17).

I consider the claim that Archbishop Laud was “an Arminian” to be a *paper-tiger*. It has no serious basis in fact and was a libel first put out by the Puritan Revolutionaries to try and discredit him and help “justify” the Puritan’s Revolutionary republic of 1642-60. It is particularly connected to their false claim that Laud was seeking to reconcile the *Church of England* with the *Church of Rome*, since if Laud was not an Arminian, he certainly could not be the clandestine Papist they falsely depicted him as. *Laud was a semi-Romanist, and that was bad; but the Puritans made him out to be a Romanist*

*Proper and thus an Arminian, and this was false.* The charge of Arminianism formed an important part of Laud's trial, although in *Cromwell's Revolutionary Regime v. Archbishop of Canterbury (Laud) (1644)* Laud entirely rejected it, upheld the Reformed teaching of predestination, and showed that the "evidence" adduced against him to make this claim was entirely false. Nevertheless, this false claim has thereafter been repeated by many *ad nauseam*.

A further complicating problem is that Puritan Revolutionary propagandists were clearly looking for ambiguous words that made Anglicanism sound "more Romish." E.g., like Rutherford they claimed that when Anglicans knelt to receive Communion they were really idolatrously adoring the consecrated elements, or claimed that because Anglican Communion Tables were elevated so as to be both more visible to the congregation and also to create a step on which to kneel, that they were "*high altars*." In this context, while Reformed Anglicans are "Calvinists," i.e., they support *the doctrines of grace* as set forth in Scripture and the 39 Articles, most succinctly stated by John Calvin; with regard to other matters, they have historically followed Luther's type of view that if a practice has been found to be useful and good it may be retained in a church e.g., stained glass windows or prayer book liturgy (Article 34, 39 Articles), rather than Calvin's type of view that one should look for a specific injunction to do such things, which is the thinking found in Puritanism (sometimes called, "the regulatory principle").

Thus for Reformed Anglicans there are three great doctors of the Protestant Reformation, Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer; whereas for these Puritans, they would only count two, Luther and Calvin, and qualify Luther far more as a kind of "transitional" figure before Calvin, on whom they put their main emphasis. It seems that some of the Puritan propagandists were misusing the word "Arminian," or from their twisted perspective, "giving it an expansive meaning," to mean "the opposite of Calvinism, *not only with respect to the doctrines of grace, but also with respect to the regulatory principle issue on which Luther and Calvin divided.*" Thus at Laud's trial, with respect to those Laud rightly called "Lutheran Protestants," the Puritans claimed they "are of the very same opinion, or with very little difference from those ... [in] Arminianism," *infra*. On this supercilious meaning of "Arminian," Martin Luther and Lutherans are thus "Arminians," and so the Puritan Revolutionary claim that Laud was an "Arminian" becomes part of a wider claim that Anglicans and Lutherans are "Arminian." *Thus this Puritan propagandist misuse of the term "Arminian" is behind some of the confusion.*

The truth is that in post-Reformation times Arminianism as it is properly defined in theology, came to the British Isles in a big way as one element of Puritanism, since the Puritans split into a Reformed group (majority) and an Arminian group (minority). The larger and more dominant Reformed group of Puritans gave rise to the Presbyterian, Congregationalist (formerly called Independent), and Reformed Baptist (formerly called Particular Baptist) Churches; and the minority Arminian group of Puritans gave rise to the Arminian Baptists (formerly called General Baptists, who much later rejected Arminianism Proper in favour of Wesley's semi-Arminianism). A number of Reformed Puritans like to down-play the fact that the Puritan movement had both a Reformed wing and an Arminian wing; though it must be admitted that the Reformed Puritans

understandably distanced themselves from the Arminian Puritans.

In this context, I think we should first consider the clear words of Article 17 of the Anglican 39 Articles, entitled, “Of predestination and election.” This says (in part), “Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, where (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed [not ‘foreseen’] by his command secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind [‘those’ = a portion only], and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. Wherefore, they [these ‘vessels’ of ‘predestination and election’] which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God be called according to God’s purpose by his Spirit working in due season; they [these elect vessels] through grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: ... they attain to everlasting felicity ... .”

The question is, *Did Archbishop Laud believe the clear and natural Reformed meaning of this Article or not?* The evidence is that he did. I shall not specifically consider the many unsubstantiated claims of many writers that all refer, without any specific justification, to what has come to be called, “Laud’s Arminianism.” Most Puritan propagandists simply assert “Laud’s Arminianism” by bigoted habit. Some conceal or hint at this (and who knows what else,) behind such vague terminology as that found in Laud’s *Bill of Attainder*. Close claims this showed Laud had been “undermining and subverting religion by cherishing and defending Popery,” i.e., (among other things) conceptualizing Arminianism as Popish, which on one level it is, although Arminians also exist outside of Romanism; and “with power and violence severely punishing those who opposed his Popish doctrine and opinions” (presumably Close is here referring to *Rex v. Bastwick, et al*, as well as the “Popish doctrine” of Arminianism); and that he “cruelly persecuted ... orthodox Minister’s of God’s Word<sup>132</sup>.” Close is probably writing for both an Arminian and Reformed readership, and so he uses this type of vague terminology to allow his Reformed readers to think of “Laud’s Arminianism,” while simultaneously allowing his Arminian readers to think of some other “diabolic thing” that they think or imagine Laud did.

But I shall pay some particular attention to two attempts to claim “Laud’s Arminianism.” Firstly, a recent article by David Como of Stanford University, USA, entitled, “Predestination and Political Conflict in Laud’s London” (2003)<sup>133</sup>. This allows a more detailed examination of the type of things covered by Close’s vague claims that Laud was e.g., “introducing arbitrary power ... without any limitation of law;” and “cruelly persecuted ... orthodox Minister’s of God’s Word.” Once again the complexity of disentangling Puritan and Laudian propaganda emerges at this point, since while in these instances of “Laud’s Arminianism” the claim that Laud was “introducing arbitrary power ... without any limitation of law” is a Puritan distortion; it is simultaneously true, that as discussed in *Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn, infra*, at times Laud was guilty of “introducing arbitrary power ... without any limitation of law.”

---

<sup>132</sup> Close, A., *op. cit.*, p. 154.

<sup>133</sup> *The Historical Journal*, Vol 46, No 2, 2003, pp. 263-94. (Journal produced by Cambridge University, England, UK.)

Secondly, I shall then consider the charges of Arminianism made against Laud in *Cromwell's Revolutionary Regime v. Archbishop of Canterbury (Laud) (1644)*. Though Laud repudiated these claims, by means of *Bill of Attainder* he was ultimately sent to the executioner's chopping block to be decapitated, in part, on the basis of these false claims of "Laud's Arminianism." Though Laud insisted he was Reformed and believed in Article 17 of the Anglican 39 Articles, the life of Laud, was required of him by the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60, in part, because of his alleged Arminianism. The gravity of this sentence, namely, to kill an Archbishop of Canterbury, is of such magnitude; and the importance of "Laud's Arminianism" both to those killing him and later generations of historians is so significant, that it necessitates that I make some reference to these outlandish charges in *Laud's case (1644)*.

In considering Como's article, I am walking the second mile in the moccasins of the Puritans *et al* who make these claims, since Como is one of the best and most talented defenders of this proposition, even though the weakness of the basic case means he must ultimately fail in seeking to show this impossible claim. Como admits the obvious truth that "Laud and his associates" "found" "it" "impossible to" "suppress predestination discourse" "in an overt and frank manner"<sup>134</sup>. He must admit this, since try as the Puritans *et al* might, they have never been able to produce one authentic statement of Laud in favour of Arminianism (although some have fabricated unsourced statements).

Como then, and here is his brilliant cunning, tries to put together a case on the basis of *inference, innuendo, and distorted interpretations* of Laud's role in enforcing the King's three decrees on Anglican doctrine<sup>135</sup>. The three relevant decrees, *and these it must be stressed lie at the very heart of, and their enforcement by Laud constitutes the very "proof" of, and indeed the only "proof" of, "Laud's Arminianism,"* are as follows (modernizing the English spellings). In 1626 there was a Royal Caroline proclamation to suppress any "new inventions, or opinions concerning religion, then [being found against that which] are such as are clearly grounded, and warranted by the doctrine and discipline of the *Church of England*." In 1628, "His Majesty's Declaration" was made and thereafter affixed to the *Thirty-Nine Articles*, which in order to alleviate "curious and unhappy differences," states, in part, "that no man" "shall print, or preach, to draw the Article aside, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof: and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense." This Declaration was e.g., "printed and published" by "Royal Warrant" of 26 "July 1658," by "Elizabeth R[egina, = Latin, "Queen"], so that the 1662 prayer book I use still reads at the front of the 39 Articles, "by command of His Majesty Charles I," "his royal declaration prefixed thereunto." I maintain that this "Declaration" clearly shows that Charles I was Reformed<sup>136</sup>. Then in 1629, King Charles issued a

---

<sup>134</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, p. 278.

<sup>135</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, p. 264.

<sup>136</sup> See McGrath, G.B (myself), "Calvin and Charles I," *British Church Newspaper*, 25 Sept., 2009, p. 10; and (in reply to Westfold of 8 Oct. 09, p. 11), *British Church Newspaper*, 23 Oct. (Irish Massacre Day), 2009, p. 10; and (in reply to Westfold

further royal decree, warning that if “Men begin anew to dispute” “by reading, preaching, or making books” “concerning these differences,” then “we shall take order with them, and those books, [so] that they shall wish they had never thought upon these needless controversies.”

Indeed, in the background discussions to the illegal 1640 canons, when the issue of new canons against Arminianism were discussed, it was specifically said by the bishops that any such canons were not necessary because the 1626 Proclamation and 1628 Declaration were sufficient safeguards against Arminianism<sup>137</sup>. We thus see that they were historically used for this very purpose.

The basic claim of Como is that “Laud enforced Charles I’s decrees in an unbalanced manner, attacking Calvinists while apparently leaving their anti-Calvinist opponents untouched.” But realizing the absence of evidence for such a claim, Como then tries to cover himself by saying, “this strategy was accomplished not by a policy of overt judicial persecution,” *for there is no such evidence*, “but through a more subtle regime of quiet threat and harassment<sup>138</sup>.” Thus at the beginning of Como’s argument we have an admission that the whole case for “Laud’s Arminianism,” is based on an alleged “unbalanced” enforcement of the King’s three decrees, for which there is no direct evidence of any “overt judicial persecution” of the Reformed in favour of Arminians, so that the whole case turns on proving the existence of “a more subtle regime of quiet threat and harassment.” *This is thus an admission at the outset that the proposition that “Laud was an Arminian,” is at best a derivative inference* (“quiet threat and harassment”), *based upon an antecedent inference* (covert “judicial persecution” of the Reformed), *and that there is no direct, clear, or unambiguous evidence, to prove these highly inferential claims!*

Como’s attempt to keep alive *that old Puritan chestnut* of “Laud’s Arminianism<sup>139</sup>,” means that he necessarily fails to mention that “His Majesty’s Declaration” of 1628 was drawn up by Laud, and was contextually a response to concerns raised in parliament about Arminianism. (The Arminian Puritans forming the General Baptists had been made so unwelcome by Reformed Anglicans, that some of them had gone from Lincolnshire, England, to Holland 20 years before in 1608; and this was now only 10 years after the *Synod of Dort* condemned Arminius in Holland in 1618). Put simply, the “Declaration” of 1628 was an attempt by King Charles and Archbishop Laud, first and foremost to defend the doctrine of predestination as found in e.g., Articles

---

of 6 Nov. 09, p. 11), *British Church Newspaper*, 20 Nov., 2009, p. 11.

<sup>137</sup> Davies, J., *The Caroline Captivity of the Church*, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

<sup>138</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, p. 263.

<sup>139</sup> “Chestnut” is an Australian colloquialism (usually said with a smile), referring to either an old / stale joke, or (as here) an old anecdote.

9 (total depravity), 10 (enabling), & 17 (election) of the 39 Articles, although the breadth of its scope meant that the “Declaration” also acted to cover any other departures from established Anglican doctrine. *On this point, Como, like others arguing his position, are silent.*

Instead Como says that in 1629, “Sir John Eliot rammed through the House three resolutions,” one of which was “denouncing Arminianism<sup>140</sup>.” His failure to mention that the 1628 “Declaration” was essentially an Anglican response under Laud and Charles I to these same concerns, thus creates the false impression that the Puritans in the House of Commons were worried about Arminianism, but Laud and Charles I were not. Such internal inconsistencies in Como’s views aside, let us consider some of these ten cases that Como himself isolates for his purported proof of “Laud’s Arminianism;” together with the eleventh case mentioned by Como, concerning Brooke (a legal opinion by Laud only). Despite claims that this shows a Laudian bias of 10 (Reformed cases) to 1 (Arminian case), I think the 10:1 ratio more likely simply reflects the fact that there were at least ten times more Reformed than Arminians in London, when Laud was Bishop of London. Thus investigations and /or prosecution and/ or legal opinions in these eleven cases (I use the term “case” loosely for any of these), most probably reflected the fact that with Arminians being no more than 10 per cent, and I would think in all likelihood far less than 10 per cent overall, a 10:1 Reformed:Arminian case ratio emerged.

Como likes to refer to “the 1629 royal proclamation against the discussion of predestination<sup>141</sup>” as a foundation plank of his case. But in fact, as we shall further see, *infra*, these decrees were not against “the discussion of predestination” *per se*, e.g., one could still publicly read Article 17 in a sermon, but rather against creating public divisions over certain “curious and unhappy differences.” Though on the one hand, I would agree that it was undesirable that such public discussion was curtailed; on the other hand, it must be said that *its operational orbit was far more limited in scope than Como claims.*

Como admits that the evidence that he basis his claims on is only able to find “ten Calvinist preachers or publicists” who “were brought before the authorities between 1629 and 1634<sup>142</sup>.” If this is his proof of “Laud’s Arminianism,” it must be said that *there were not very many Reformed preachers and teachers in the realm, if only 10 cases can be found.* Perhaps the Puritans should change their claim from, “Laud was attempting to usher in Popery,” to “Laud succeeded in ushering in Popery, for which reason, he could only find ten preachers and teachers in the entire realm who were Reformed”?

In most of these cases, Como without any real evidence, asserts that the person in question was being persecuted for their Reformed (Calvinist) doctrine. This is because

---

<sup>140</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, p. 267.

<sup>141</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, p. 264.

<sup>142</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, p. 289.

most of the records are very incomplete, the people concerned were known to be Reformed, and the evidence is that their trial had something to do with issues of predestination and election. E.g., in this context, reference is made to “the Calvinist Bishop John Davenant” who “tried to preach a predestination sermon at court in March 1630” and was “reprimanded<sup>143</sup>.” We do not know the details of this case, but if, as Como claims, it was fundamentally because he was Reformed, then why was he not defrocked as a Bishop?

*Unlike Como, I maintain on the basis of those cases that we do have more evidence for, that these people were not on trial for believing in predestination per se, but some connected esoterical question.* While I would agree with the Puritans that they should have been allowed to discuss these esoterical issues, it is nevertheless one thing to say that they were put on trial *for discussing* “curious and unhappy differences” among the Reformed (my view), and saying they were put on trial *for being Reformed* (Como’s view).

Como also refers to Salisbury’s case. On the one hand, he refers to some Reformed statements in Salisbury’s sermon e.g., “All Christ’s abundance is for Christ’s little flock, and for them alone, he prays not for the world.” But on the other hand, Como fails to show that it was for these statements of Reformed orthodoxy that Salisbury was being investigated by Laud. Indeed, he admits the presence of other material in the sermon, which in my opinion are the more likely reasons why he was investigated. Specifically, Salisbury said that certain unnamed figures had turned “against reason in the state,” and “our pure ... religion,” and this had “distracted, then divided, and now at last ... dissolved our house of counsel.” For this reason Salisbury considered God was angry with England, and so God had ensured “the King hearkened not to the people.” In this connection Salisbury referred to I Kgs 11:9, “And the Lord was angry with Solomon, because his heart was turned from the Lord God of Israel, which had appeared unto him twice,” and II Chron 10:15, “So the king hearkened not unto the people: for the cause was of God, that the Lord might perform his word, which he spake by the hand of Ahijah the Shilonite to Jeroboam the son of Nebat<sup>144</sup>.”

What Salisbury meant is unclear. Como exploits this ambiguity by claiming that he is referring to Laud’s Arminianism. He also likens elements of Salisbury’s rhetoric to that used by the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60, saying that it “anticipated” what the Puritan John Pym said eleven years later in the Short Parliament<sup>145</sup>. Unlike Como, I think whether or not there is any reasonable connection between Salisbury’s comment here, and Pym’s comments later, is an open question. However, it seems to me that Salisbury criticism of King Charles is *more probably* referring to the fact that the King is anti-Puritan. I.e., it is *more probably* a broad criticism of the King’s anti-Puritanism,

---

<sup>143</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, p. 268.

<sup>144</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, pp. 270-1.

<sup>145</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, p. 271.

lacking the detailed specifics that Como and others might try to attach to it. Other speculations are also possible. Really, we do not know. But whatever Salisbury was driving at, he was clearly claiming God had in some sense hardened the heart of the king, and so he was at least potentially stirring some kind of anti-royalist sentiment against the Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church. Under the circumstances, it was surely reasonable that Laud investigate Salisbury and this matter further.

It must be candidly stated that we do not have enough information to know the detailed substance of the specifics in *Salisbury's case*. But it is certainly possible to link this to a scenario in which His Grace, the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud, was concerned with certain “curious and unhappy differences” with regard to the doctrine of predestination, which appears to have been the primary, although not exclusive focus, of the king’s three decrees. In orthodox Reformed thinking, all human beings are worthy of death, because when God made man he did so under the conditions of the Adamic Covenant (Hosea 6:7, ASV; Rom. 5), so that “by one man, sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned” (Rom. 5:12). Indeed, before the giving of the law at Sinai, men were subject to death exclusively for Adam’s primal sin (Rom. 5:12-14), although with the coming of the law at Sinai, men’s actual sins as violations of the Decalogue were also included (Rom. 5:20), and Gentiles without the law may also be judged from the principles of the Decalogue evident through godly reason via God’s common grace (which is not unto salvation) (Rom. 1 & 2).

The fact that God is just to deny all men access to heaven, and not obligated to save any, is then relevant to election. Because God is an absolute monarch, a sovereign king, he is perfectly entitled to select any he wishes to save, and not others. For those living in a society with an absolute monarch, or at least a powerful monarch, like King Charles I, this type of thing would seem to be normative. “After all,” they might say, “Does not the King have the right to summon any from the realm he so wishes, to come and dine with him at his Palace? And is not this something like God’s special grace unto salvation? Now the King also considers and rules the whole realm, and is not this something like God’s common grace? Does any subject have the right to say, ‘It’s unfair that such and such were invited to the King’s Table, and I was not?’? Absolutely not! For the King is obligated to invite none to sup at his table, and if by royal decree he summon some, and not others, then that is his royal prerogative and his royal business.” Thus the fact that His Divine Majesty, the Lord Jehovah, should elect some vessels to salvation and others not, would not represent the same conceptual difficulty for those who accepted the legitimacy of a powerful king like Charles I, even though he ruled in conjunction with a parliament, which thing God does not.

But let the Puritan notion of a republican commonwealth be developed, and a King like Charles I be described as “arbitrary” or “unfair” or “tyrannical” for exercising his royal prerogatives; or possibly in Salisbury’s terms, *supra*, such as occurred under the Puritan republican Revolutionaries of 1640-60; or under the American republican revolutionaries from 1775 & 1776; or to a lesser extent, but still some extent, the movement to an essentially titular monarch such as occurred in the UK from the 19th century; and the people take on board such “democratic” values, then a problem may

emerge. The people, and I hesitate to utter this blasphemy, but I do so, not because I agree with it, but because it must in these sad and lamentable circumstances be said, the people, I say, may cross-apply this thinking to God's royal prerogatives. Now I do not say that they would probably do so consciously, (for most of them are not deep thinkers, nor anything like it,) but subconsciously, they may cross-apply these republican categories of thought, and may claim, "God is unfair to elect some and not others." This in turn gives rise to a much stronger Arminianism (and we cannot doubt the rise of Arminian thinking in historically modern times), and / or much greater tolerance by the Reformed to the Arminians (and we also cannot doubt that this is a feature of historically modern times e.g., in the 19th century, many of the Arminian / General Baptists and many of the Reformed / Particular Baptists of Great Britain, united together in the Baptist Union).

Thus it was *possible*, though *by no means certain*, that Archbishop Laud had an eye open to these type of concerns, when he moved to investigate Salisbury for his statements against the king, and may have seen this as relating to an issue at stake between the Reformed and the Arminians. Though we cannot be sure of this, it is a *possible* and *plausible* scenario.

Como then refers to a statement that the judges decided that they "dare not advise, that he [Salisbury] should be proceeded against by course of the common laws, where much must be referred to the jurors." Como interprets this as reflecting "the judges attitude" which was "authoritarian and only tenuously bound by the tether of the common law – that had pushed an indignant House of Common to insert the issue of trial by jury ... into the Petition of Right," because the "judges did not think they could find a jury to convict him<sup>146</sup>." Other speculations are also possible. E.g., possibly Laud *et al* were worried that a public trial on the issues would give them a publicity that they did not want i.e., they did not want to put in the public forum the idea that rebellion against a king was being contemplated.

Furthermore, this would have involved technical matters of law as to what constitute sedition. What if e.g., the jury found that to apply the words, "the king hearkened not unto the people: for the cause was of God" (II Chron 10:15) to Charles I, did not constitute heresy or sedition, but it was nevertheless factually wrong? The fact that the jury might not find Salisbury guilty, could be misinterpreted by some to mean that the court therefore considered Salisbury was right. *Although these are two different issues*. Arguably then, there may be a number of reasons why the judges did not want to proceed with this case. *Really we do not know what their concerns with a jury were*. Thus once again, Como exploits an ambiguity i.e., we do not know why the judges did not want to put the evidence before a jury; and then claims that this proves his assertions about Laud's purported Arminianism, which at best, are only one possible interpretation of highly ambiguous and open-ended factual data.

Moreover, without any clear evidence that Laud and the other judges were secret

---

<sup>146</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, pp. 268-9.

Arminians, I think Como's conjecture here is quite wild. On this basis, one might as well argue that Laud and the judges were really secret Jews or Mohammedans, and that this was their "secret" reason "for persecuting Christian Ministers." There is as much factual evidence that the judges were secret Jews or Mohammedans, as there is that they were secret Arminians. In short, there is none. But when the type of nonsense here argued by Como *et al* is advanced, then *the sky is the limit* for such wild and crazy claims! E.g., taking Como's selected quote, *supra*, one might, on this type of basis, argue that the judges really objected to the words, "he prays," because they were "secret atheists." But how absurd is that? Just about as absurd as claiming that the judges were really concerned about it because they were "secret Arminians"! *Were is the evidence for any of these wild assertions!*

Como refers to death threats made against Laud<sup>147</sup> and various libels, claiming that the Anglican Bishops were in a secret alliance with "confederate Popish kings," and seeking "to have the English Protestants more and more impoverished and disabled" so as "to be overrun and destroyed by the Popish infidels." *Como makes this candid admission, "the author may have had a number of things in mind."* But Como then speculates that "it seems most likely that he was referring to" "curtailing predestination debate<sup>148</sup>." This is pure supposition. As seen by 14 libels in the case of *Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn (1637)*, *infra*, there were many claims by libelers that Laud was trying to "usher in Popery" that had nothing to do with Laud's so called "Arminianism."

Developing this type of groundless claim, Como then refers to another libel, which was pinned up as a paper at St. Paul's Cross. Once again, Como admits, "This libel contained no explicit reference to the doctrine of predestination," but once again he tries to link this to Laud's purported "Arminianism<sup>149</sup>." Given that this was an anonymous scrape of paper hung up in a public place, why would the author have been afraid to mention predestination if this was really his concern? Would one treat a bit of anonymous graffiti with such seriousness? I for one would not. Yet looking for graffiti in a public toilet as "evidence" is about as silly as looking to an anonymous bit of paper stuck up at St. Paul's Cross. This type of wild speculation by Como, which forms "the evidence" for Puritan propaganda claims by Puritans that Laud was an Arminian, when looked at in the plain light of day, are really very silly indeed!

It is on the basis of the above "evidence" that Como concludes the second part of his dissertation by saying, "For Laud and like minded figures within the [Royalist Anglican] establishment, by 1629, the solution to" various "troubles lay in part in the suppression of Calvinistic ideas, a policy that was seen as absolutely necessary<sup>150</sup>." *I let*

---

<sup>147</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, p. 275.

<sup>148</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, p. 276.

<sup>149</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, p. 277.

<sup>150</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, p. 278.

*the reader judge just how silly this “conclusion” sounds.*

Como starts the third part of his dissertation with the statement that “Laud and his associates” now considered it “absolutely necessary to suppress predestination discourse,” but “as the Salisbury case suggests,” *supra*, they found “it was very difficult, perhaps even impossible, to do so in an overt and frank manner<sup>151</sup>.” Thus we now have a development of this Arminian conspiracy theory, for which it is said that the Arminian conspirators never attacked Reformed doctrine “in an overt and frank manner.” *They certainly were unusual “heretics,” since on this logic they evidently assumed that once ten Reformed Ministers were dealt with, the established Anglican Church would automatically repudiate the Thirty-Nine Articles and turn Arminian, without them ever “in an overt and frank manner,” seeking to inculcate the heretical doctrines of Arminianism!*

What is Como’s basis for this astounding claim about “Laud’s Arminianism”? Como now admits that “there is no surviving evidence that Salisbury was actually formally charged in the High Commission or in any other court,” and it must be added, we do not know specifically for what part of his sermon he was investigated in the first place. Como now develops a theory, for which there is no direct evidence. It is this. “If indeed Salisbury did escape prosecution, it was only after a presumably nail-baiting period of harassment and official scrutiny<sup>152</sup>.” I.e., this is the theory that Laud was using “harassment” of Reformed Ministers in order to promote Arminianism. As already discussed, there is no evidence that this is why Salisbury was investigated; and whether or not he was charged, the claim that there was “presumably” “harassment” is once again pure supposition. But even if, in a theoretic sense, it is a correct presumption, *and I am not saying that it is a correct presumption*, there is still nothing here to really claim this proves “Laud’s Arminianism,” since such *presumed* “harassment” may be aimed at other elements in Salisbury’s sermon than his embrace of predestination.

Next Como makes a beat-up of *Milbourne’s case* (1629), in which Milbourne who was a publisher of Reformed material was charged. But at the end of it Como makes this admission, “the articles that the court produced against Milbourne” “accused him ‘only with publishing or printing it unlicensed’.” Despite Como’s claim that this proves “judicial attack on Milbourne’s Calvinism<sup>153</sup>,” I think it really proves that one had to have a license to print material. *Yet once again, it must be said that this is the type of thing that Puritans use as the “evidence” for “Laud’s Arminianism.”*

If Como *et al* really wants to develop this type of argument, why do they not also claim that the Puritan revolutionaries of 1640-60 were “really Arminians, because under the 1642-60 republic in 1645 they make the Anglican Prayer Book with any attachment

---

<sup>151</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, p. 278.

<sup>152</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, p. 279.

<sup>153</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, pp. 279-80.

such as the 39 Articles ‘illegal,’ and that the real reason for this was the Reformed doctrine contained in e.g., Articles 9, 10, & 17”? “An absurd and preposterous claim” they would say. And they would be right. *But they are the ones running this same type of logic against Laud, not I!*

Now Como comes to his evidence for a “flurry of attacks on London Calvinists” in the 1630s, with *Archer’s case*. He refers to Archer’s catechism, which had many Reformed statements in it. This included the following words, either underlined by Archer or underlined by Laud. “God ... decrees sin ..., and that by a powerful and effectual decree<sup>154</sup>.” Now the claim that “God ... decrees sin” is certainly unorthodox. Man in his unfallen state was not like man after Adam’s fall. In his unfallen state, Adam had original righteousness, and under a covenant of works was able to please God. I consider that God *foresaw* the fall, but *did not decree* the fall, in his absolute sovereignty choosing to allow it under his *permissive will* as opposed to directing it under his *directive will*, and on that basis, predestined some to salvation and eternal life through the redemption of his Son. I consider those who would limit God by insisting “he cannot have a permissive will and be absolutely sovereign,” are seeking to deny the sovereignty of God which allows him to have such a will *if he so chooses to*, and he evidently has. To suchlike I say, “Let God be God.” Whatever the reader thinks of my views on this matter, *absolutely no orthodox Reformed believer would claim that “God decrees sin,” or that “God is the author of sin.”* “Far be it from God, that he should do wickedness; and from the Almighty, that he should commit iniquity” (Job 34:10)<sup>155</sup>.

Far from proving Como’s point, I think the fact that these words are underlined shows that these were in all probability the words and issue at the heart of *Archer’s case*. What I consider they show is that Laud’s usage of the King’s three decrees, was being applied not against the discussion of predestination *per se*, but rather against creating public divisions over certain “curious and unhappy differences.” Specifically, it was not considered that one should publicly air or teach a view that predestination means “God decrees sin.” While one might argue that the discussion should have been allowed (a view I would agree with), and that Archer might then have been the subject of a heresy trial, and if he did not recant, defrocked (also a view I would agree with), the reality is that this is anything but the proof that its proponents claim it is, i.e., it is not a proof of “Laud’s Arminianism.” Archer was suspended for three months. This, upon investigation, is the type of thing that emerges as the substance behind Close’s and the Puritan Revolutionaries vague claims in Laud’s *Bill of Attainder* (1645), i.e., that Laud was “introducing arbitrary power .. without any limitation of law,” and “cruelly persecuted and suspended orthodox Minister’s of God’s Word<sup>156</sup>.”

---

<sup>154</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, pp. 280-1.

<sup>155</sup> Cf. Louis Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, 1958, reprint 1976, p. 220.

<sup>156</sup> Close, A., *op. cit.*, p. 154.

Como then turns to *Madey's case* (1631). Meredith Madey preached a sermon at Christchurch *Church of England*, London, in which he stated elements of Reformed orthodoxy, such as, "election is not universal, and common, but special and peculiar belonging to some." This is harmonious with Article 17 of the *Church of England* 39 Articles, and once again, there is *no evidence* that Madey was brought before Laud for these comments. Indeed, we know that Laud specifically was concerned with that section of the sermon where Madey asks, "Whether the Son doth elect or no?" To which he answers, "Yes, the whole Trinity." Laud was concerned that by this Maday was suggesting that the works of the Trinity "are all one." While Como calls this "a willful misinterpretation," the reality is that it is possible to read them as meaning, what "the Son doth," "the whole Trinity" doth, and if so, there is a denial of the three Persons in the Trinity. Alternatively, Madey may have simply meant that "the whole Trinity" is involved in predestination, and "the Son" is part of the Trinity.

*But is it clear that Madey was here getting himself into an area that might be classified as creating public divisions on "curious and unhappy differences" as to the precise role of different Persons of the Trinity in election.* Laud formed the view, that Madey was in "desperate heresy" in his claim that the works of the Trinity "are all one" i.e., Modalism / Sabellianism (in which the three Divine Persons are wrongly said to be "three modes" / "manifestations" of "the one Divine Person"). While I do not have access to enough of this case to judge the accuracy or otherwise of Laud's conclusion, *prima facie*, Laud appears to be correct. But either way, once again it is clear that far from proving Como's claim, it actually shows the opposite. I.e., Laud was not here seeking to prevent the Reformed teaching of predestination *per se*, but rather seeking to prevent Trinitarian heresy in connection with it. Specifically, he was concerned that Madey had gone into some Trinitarian heresy in his desire to determine specific roles of the three Divine Persons in election, in which he drew the conclusion that Madey considered whatever "the Son doth," "the whole Trinity" doth<sup>157</sup>. (E.g., if this were so, it would mean e.g., that the Father also suffered on the cross, i.e., the Patripassian heresy, which is part of the wider modalist or Sabellian heresy.)

Now if the criticism of Como *et al* about *Madey's case* (1631) are taken seriously, then I fear that the Puritans will start claiming that I too am some kind of Arminian, because I condemn Hislop as a Trinitarian heretic, a blasphemer, and a liar, *supra*<sup>158</sup>; and

---

<sup>157</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, pp. 283-4.

<sup>158</sup> Alexander Hislop was a Free Presbyterian (and a disgrace to the name of "Free Presbyterian," many of whom I have found to be good and godly people). His pseudo-historicism in Hislop's *The Two Babylons* (1858, 4th edition 1929) theoretically focuses on Roman Catholicism, although he sometimes selects examples where there is an Anglican-Roman Catholic overlap, so as to indicate the Anglican Church, as constituted in the prayer book of 1662 and 39 Articles, is really "Romish." E.g., he attacks Christmas and Easter as "pagan." Although he does so through reference to a Roman Catholic example, he refers to letters I.H.S., frequently also found in Reformed Anglican Churches e.g., lectern bookmarks which have I.H.S. on one side, and a cross on the other side, clearly visible to the congregation as e.g., they come up to receive

yet simultaneously Hislop was (to the admitted deep regret of we Reformed), also a believer in predestination. If this is taken to its logical conclusion, and Como and those like him are not game to so take it, then the Puritan usage of *Archer's case* and *Madey's case*, means that there should be immunity for any heretic just so long as he says he believes in predestination!

Thus once again, while one might argue that the discussion should have been allowed, and that Madey might then have been the subject of a heresy trial if he really unrepentantly claimed “God decrees sin,” the reality is that this is not the proof that its proponents claim it is, i.e., it is not a proof of “Laud’s Arminianism.” Madey was found to be a *Trinitarian heretic* and banned from preaching. This, upon investigation, is the type of thing that emerges as the substance behind Close’s and the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60’s vague claims in Laud’s *Bill of Attainder* (1645), i.e., that Laud was “introducing arbitrary power .. without any limitation of law,” and “cruelly persecuted and suspended orthodox Minister’s of God’s Word<sup>159</sup>.”

Como then makes the claim that on the basis of the above cases, “a clear pattern” is “apparent. Laud and his associates were hardly ignoring the question of predestination; but they were dealing with it in a manner that was not entirely straightforward.” They “sought,” Como claims, “to use” “behind-the scene methods to quietly bully London’s Calvinist spokesmen [all ten of them!] into compliance<sup>160</sup>.” If Como is a sincere man, and he appears to be, then he is also a theological ignoramus. He clearly does not understand the theological issues at stake in these cases, and simply perceiving that they were connected to issues of predestination, wrongly assumes, and wrongly concludes, that this must be because of “Laud’s Arminianism” against the Reformed.

---

Communion. They appear on the eastern wall over the Communion Table at e.g., St. Matthew’s Windsor, Sydney. These letters are Latin, standing for *Iesus Hominum Salvator* i.e., “Jesus’ Humanity’s Saviour,” although if the “I” is crossed at the top it doubles as a Christian cross, and some further Latin meanings also apply. But Hislop claims that I.H.S. really refers to the ancient “Egyptian” “system of idolatry,” with its three pagan gods, “Isis, Horus, Seb,” and blasphemously refers to this as “the Egyptian Trinity” (p. 164). This shows he follows a Tri-unity understanding of the Trinity, rather than recognizing that the three person are *one substance / being* (Greek *homoousion*) (John 10:30; I John 5:7). There is absolutely no sense in which these three heathen gods of Egypt were a “Trinity,” and it is a great blasphemy to so misuse the word, “Trinity.” Nor does I.H.S. refer to these pagan gods. *Hislop’s claims here expose him as a Trinitarian heretic, a blasphemer, and a liar.* Like the heretic Origen, his works contain a mix of truth and error. But if a reader is not strong and knowledgeable in the faith, I recommend that he ought not to read this pseudo-historicist’s works, for they contain dangerous errors and heresies, carefully interwoven with some truth.

<sup>159</sup> Close, A., *op. cit.*, p. 154.

<sup>160</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, p. 283.

Como now turns to *Crabtree's case (1631)*<sup>161</sup>. The case is said to show “Laud’s Arminianism” because Crabtree, together with Thatch and Freeman, were found to have conspired to smuggle 2,000 copies of a prohibited anti-Arminian publication into England, entitled, *The spy: discovering the danger of Arminian heresy and Spanish treachery*. But the facts of *Crabtree's case* do not support these claims by Como *et al*. This book was prohibited, not because it was anti-Arminian, but for other reasons. Specifically, it alleged that Arminius had a number of English followers who were in a conspiracy that was about to deliver the realm into “Spanish thralldom” or bondage (cf. Libels 3 & 10 in *Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn, infra*). Whatever one thinks of suppressing such a publication, it is clear that it was not done so because it was anti-Arminian *per se*.

Moreover, Crabtree had formerly been disciplined for being an unlicensed preacher, and seeking to entice his parishioners into Puritan Non-Conformity. Specifically, now in *Crabtree's case (1631)*, it was found that “Mr. Crabtree” had “within these five years ... past, ministered the Holy Communion to diverse parties ... standing or sitting and not kneeling,” had “Christened some children without using the sign of the cross,” and “neither” had he “used the ring in marriage.” Crabtree thus had Puritan views against a woman wearing a marriage ring, against kneeling to receive Holy Communion, and against using *the sign of the cross* at Holy Baptism.

If Archbishop Laud had wanted to, he could have penalized Crabtree quite severely for both these things and his smuggling conspiracy. Instead, he showed mercy, compassion, and an overwhelmingly strong spiritual fatherly desire to bring Crabtree back to the right path. Crabtree was not sentenced as he promised to comply in the future with the laws of the realm and the house rules of the Anglican Church. As best we know, Crabtree complied, and Archbishop Laud, held no grudges. This, upon investigation, is the type of thing that emerges as the substance behind Close’s and the Puritan Revolutionaries vague claims in Laud’s *Bill of Attainder (1645)*, i.e., that Laud was “introducing arbitrary power .. without any limitation of law,” and “cruelly persecuted and suspended orthodox Minister’s of God’s Word<sup>162</sup>.”

Next Como turns to *Votier's case (1633)*<sup>163</sup>. Como *et al* seeking to show “Laud’s Arminianism,” may much like to cite the account that Voiter gives. Voiter, who is certainly not an impartial witness to his own summonsing, says that he was called to the hearing, where he claims Laud “threatened to suspend him for preaching these doctrines ... 1. That some are elect some reprobate. 2. That Christ died only for the elect.” Here then may seem to *prima facie* be the “evidence” that the Puritans want. *But*, and here is the salient point, *when Laud learnt that this is what Voiter believed, he dismissed the*

---

<sup>161</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, pp. 284-5.

<sup>162</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 154.

<sup>163</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, p. 285.

*case, and allowed Votier to go free.* I.e., Laud determined that Votier had no case to answer for.

But Votier, being clearly very anti-Laud, seeks to put this in terms that “saves the day” for the Puritans. First, he says that Laud “threatened to suspend him.” If so, why then did Laud not suspend him? Votier, realizing the weakness of his position, then *conjectures* that the reason was that Laud was “fearing the clamor of the world.” At this point, we find an internal contradiction in Puritan propaganda. On the one hand, the Puritan propagandists like to say that “Laud became dictator of England,” and in Close’s and the Puritan Revolutionaries vague claims in Laud’s *Bill of Attainder* (1645), that Laud was “introducing arbitrary power . . . without any limitation of law,” and that Laud “cruelly persecuted and suspended orthodox Minister’s of God’s Word<sup>164</sup>.” But on the other hand, they like to use *Votier’s case* (1633) to claim, with Votier, that Laud did not persecute the Reformed because, in Votier’s words, he was “fearing the clamor of the world.”

The reality of course, is that the evidence indicates that Laud believed Votier needed to be investigated. But when it was clear to him that he was orthodox on the points in question, he was released. But Votier’s subsequent actions vindicated Laud’s earlier suspicions about him. Votier later emerged as an outright Puritan, and he was later suspended for having Puritan views against Anglican conformity. He had refused to support the *ex officio* oath<sup>165</sup>, fled to the Low Countries, and returned under the Puritan Revolution of 1640-60 to denounce Laud in 1640.

Sometimes a person shows sufficient dispassion in their analysis to be regarded as a generally credible witness, even of something bad that happened to him. But in Votier’s instance, this does not seem to be so. He was in the apparent safety of the Low Countries for some years, and yet never made any such allegations against Laud in e.g., pamphlets (although if he had, this would not have been conclusive evidence either). Then suddenly, when the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60 started coming to power in 1640, Votier reappears with *just the type of “evidence against Laud”* that they are looking for. It seems to me Votier is an unreliable witness, and Votier was an anti-Laud Puritan who was rounding some kind of revenge against Laud.

We cannot now be sure of the details of *Votier’s case*. But on balance, it seems likely to me that this case had some similarities with *Crabtree’s case, supra*, in that Laud

---

<sup>164</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 150,154.

<sup>165</sup> The *ex officio* oath required a man to tell the truth in the Star Chamber even at the risk of self-incrimination as a witness against himself. Compare the case of the Puritan, Alexander Leighton, arrested 1630, imprisoned for life, released September 1640 by the Long Parliament. He denounced the *ex officio* oath; and his anti-Anglican rhetoric was critical of the English Reformation from the time of Henry VIII, calling the Anglican bishops, “wens” (skin tumours) “and” “Popish flesh.” (*Anti-Prelatical Tracts*: Alexander Leighton, <http://www.brysons.net/miltonweb/antiprelatical.html> ).

was investigating departures from Anglican practices in a Puritan direction, and “curious and unhappy differences” on predestination. Laud’s probe on predestination was probably in order to see if Votier was orthodox in this area, and when it emerged that he was, Laud took no further action on this matter. But he may well have *cautioned*, not “threatened,” Votier about not creating public divisions over certain “curious and unhappy differences” on the doctrine of predestination and / or over alleged Puritan tendencies that Votier had. Votier then later made this a beat-up into claims that Laud “threatened to suspend him” for his predestination teachings, and as one lie leads to another, he then tried to claim Laud did not precede against him because he was “fearing” the “clamor of the world.” When word was brought to Votier that Puritan sedition was rife, he virtually fell over himself in the rush to get back to London, and cash in on the Puritan Revolution of 1640-60 in order to attack Laud.

Such unsubstantiated claims as those of Votier, made by a man who states that he declared himself to be Reformed to Laud, and *against whom Laud then clearly imposed no penalty in Votier’s case (1633)*, is thus upon investigation, the type of thing that emerges as the substance behind Close’s and the Puritan Revolutionaries vague claims in Laud’s *Bill of Attainder (1645)*, i.e., that Laud was “introducing arbitrary power .. without any limitation of law” and “cruelly persecuted and suspended orthodox Minister’s of God’s Word<sup>166</sup>.” Once again, whatever one thinks of Laud’s actions, under strict scrutiny they do not support the claim of demonstrating “Laud’s Arminianism.”

Next Como refers to *Prynne’s case (1633)*<sup>167</sup>, who is the same Prynne (Prinn) as discussed in the case of *Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn (1637)*, *infra*. Though no records of this earlier case remain, Como refers to the High Commissioners deliberations in *Bridges, Fermin & Mudd’s case (1632)* against three Puritans charged with antinomianism. The charges include the charge that these men claimed that “justified persons cannot displease God,” and the “the moral law doth not bind the conscience nor accuse the believer.” When sentencing these three heretics, Laud further directed, “And let Mr. Prynne be articed against for the same; we must not sit here to punish poor snakes, and let him go scot-free.”

Some years later, Laud said in reply to Lord Saye and Sele’s speech, “Mr. Prynne ... says expressly, ‘let any true saint of God be taken away in the very act of any known sin, before it is possible for him to repent: I make no doubt or scruple of it, but he shall as surely be saved as if he had lived to have repented of it.’ ... So according to this divinity [/ theology], the true saints of God may commit horrible and crying sins, die without repentance and yet be sure of salvation; which teareth up the very foundation or religion, induceth all manner of profaneness into the world and is expressly contrary to the whole current of Scripture.”

On the one hand, we of the holy Reformed Christian faith, whether Anglican or

---

<sup>166</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, p. 154.

<sup>167</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 286-7.

Puritan, cannot doubt, that *justification by confession* is the very thing Luther broke from when after years of long hours in the confessional trying to remember all his sins lest failing to confess one he should not go to heaven, he then discovered the Biblical doctrine of justification by faith and the gates of heaven swung open to him. He realized that in receiving the gift of salvation all his sins, past, present, and future, had been forgiven, and so he could not be barred entrance into heaven if he had forgotten to confess a sin (Ps. 103:12; Isa. 44:22; Rom. 5:21; 8:1,32-34; Heb. 10:14)<sup>168</sup>.

This realization is the death-knell to the Arminianism in the Roman Catholic system of religion. That is, believers confess their sins after salvation not in order to be saved, but because they are saved, so if they should forget to confess some sin this does not affect their salvation. Hence, e.g., the usage in the Lutheran *Augsburg Confession* (1530) of Ps. 19:12, “Who can understand his errors?” Believers do not, as the Roman Church and other Arminians claim, fall in and out of salvation, depending on whether or not they have any unconfessed sins. Indeed, this is why for those in Romanism, the so called, “Last Confession” is regarded as so important.

But on the other hand, the true believer does not use this to justify antinomianism (lawlessness). E.g., referring to the Holy Decalogue, St. Paul says of the tenth commandment (Exod. 20:17), “I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet” (Rom. 7:7). And he also says, “What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?” (Rom. 6:1,2).

For it is also true, that in Luther’s day the Roman Church had been selling indulgences, and Wittenbergers had thought that by purchasing a pardon for some sin e.g., drunkenness, they could then go ahead and commit the sin of drunkenness with impunity (I Cor. 6:9,10; Gal. 5:19,21). This is not the response of a true believer per e.g., Rom. 6:1,2. Luther of Wittenberg also attacked this type of thing in his *95 Theses*, saying in e.g., *Thesis 32*, “Those who think themselves sure of salvation through their letters of pardon will be damned for ever along with their teachers;” or *Thesis 35*, “Those who teach that contrition is not needed to procure redemption or indulgence are preaching doctrines inconsistent with Christianity;” or *Thesis 39*, “It is very difficult, even for the most learned theologians, to emphasize in their public preaching, the bounty of indulgences and at the same time, the need for true contrition;” or *Thesis 40*, “... the bounty of indulgences relaxes the penalty and induces hatred of it. Such ... is its tendency<sup>169</sup>.”

It would be possibly to cite these statements of Luther in isolation, and create the false impression that he was an Arminian, who believed one could move in and out of salvation, depending on whether or not one had repented from all of one’s sins. But this would be at variance with Luther’s clear teachings elsewhere, evident at a confessional

---

<sup>168</sup> Cf. Louis Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, pp. 514-5.

<sup>169</sup> Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 185-191 (Luther’s 95 Theses) at 187-8.

level in the Lutheran *Augsburg Confession* of Ps. 19:12, *supra*. So too, it is possible to take Laud's above statement in isolation, and create the false impression that he was an Arminian, who believed one could move in and out of salvation, depending on whether or not one had repented from all of one's sins. But this would be at variance with Laud's clear teachings elsewhere, evident at a confessional level in Article 17 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*.

Importantly, this Article 17 on predestination ends with the statement, "Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in holy Scripture: and, in our doings, that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God." Laud's usage of this qualification to the Article on predestination is well known, being so used by him at both the Hampton Court Conference and his trial of *Cromwell's Revolutionary Regime v. Archbishop of Canterbury (Laud) (1644)*, *infra*<sup>170</sup>.

Moreover Laud refers to "horrible and crying sins" and we know of some sins so terrible, that if a person is willfully and unrepentantly in egregious breach of them, then they exhibit a bad fruit showing they are not genuinely saved (I Cor. 6:9,10; Gal. 5:19-22; Col. 3:5,6; I John 3:15; Rev. 21:8,27; 22:15). In the context of discussing Prynne, it is important to remember Laud's words are based in *Bridges, Fermin & Mudd's case* against three Puritans charged with antinomianism. This qualifies his later words, concerning Prynne, who he evidently considered was abusing the predestination teaching, and presuming upon his salvation notwithstanding his unrepented of sins. In short, he was saying that "we" should "continue in sin, that grace may abound" (Rom. 6:1). Como is quite dogmatic in saying "Prynne ... was most certainly not an antinomian"<sup>171</sup>.

But it is possible that a genuine misunderstanding emerged between Prynne attacking justification by confession, and Laud attacking antinomianism. It must be remembered that both Laudian Anglicans and Reformed Anglicans considered the Puritans were liars (Rev. 21:8,27; 22:15), violating the ninth commandment (Exod. 20:16; Matt. 19:18; Rom. 13:9); although these same Puritans would deny that their propagandas violated the ninth commandment. Thus whether or not one might think of such Puritans as antinomian, or at least be concerned that they were Decalogue-breakers, may relate to these other issues, and so potentially be looked at differently by Anglicans and Puritans. In his *Epistle to the Romans*, St. Paul also refers to the 9th commandment (Exod. 20:16), namely, "Thou shalt not bear false witness" (Rom. 13:9), and Prynne was later found to be a willfully unrepentant libeler, as demonstrated in *Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn (1637)*, *infra*.

Under the circumstances, it is certainly reasonable to allow that Laud was concerned with this sin of deceit. I.e., Laud may have wondered if Prynne was taking the view that he or some other Puritan could tell any libel against Laud, and "be taken

---

<sup>170</sup> Laud's *Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 268,453.

<sup>171</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, p. 286.

away in the very act of” this “known sin” of violating the 9th commandment, being an egregious liar; and if Prynne then considered it did not matter since, “he shall as surely be saved as if he had lived to have repented of it.” No true Christian would ever make such a claim as “we continue in sin, that grace may abound” (Rom. 6:1). And St. John the Divine thrice says that willfully unrepentant liars are outside the kingdom of God (Rev. 21:8; 27; 22:15). “But ... all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone” (Rev. 21:8). Was this type of thing Laud’s concern? Or perhaps incest? (Anglicans also had incest concerns about *some* Puritans who e.g., considered a man could marry his deceased brother’s wife.)

Como contorts and twists Laud’s quote on the habitual liar, Prynne, claiming from it that “for Laud, predestination doctrine led necessarily to moral chaos<sup>172</sup>.” Laud never said this nor anything like it. Como concludes that “Once again, a very-well known and outspoken defender of Calvinist orthodoxy had apparently been harassed by the bishop.” In fact, once again, Laud had defended the doctrine of predestination, this time against a concern of libertine antinomians, and his balance is found in both St. Paul’s *magnum opus*, the Book of Romans, as well as Martin Luther’s concerns with indulgences that sparked the Protestant Reformation, based as it was on the true and Reformed teaching of justification by faith (which being also taught by Calvin later came to be called “Calvinism,” but which is certainly antecedent to Calvin, so that in such terminology, Luther was a “Calvinist”).

Nevertheless, in *Prynne’s case (1633)*, Laud showed a reluctance to convict, a desire to give the benefit of the doubt to the accused, and thus an allowance for the accused to go free under the circumstances. I.e., after initial investigations, Laud appears to have been satisfied that in fact Prynne was not misusing an attack on justification by confession to justify antinomianism. *Thus once again, Como treats an acquittal by Laud, as though it were a conviction by Laud, to try and claim “Laud’s Arminianism.”* I leave the reader to decide how silly Como’s claims sound, i.e., that *because Laud acquitted two men of charges, Laud should be treated as though he convicted these two men of the said charges.*

The case against Prynne in 1633 was not proceeded with, although as with *Votier’s case, supra*, so with *Prynne’s case* i.e., the accused having been released became emboldened and went on to commit later iniquity. Thus upon investigation, the type of thing that emerges in *Prynne’s case (1633)* in which Prynne was released and not sentenced, turns out to be the substance behind Close’s and the Puritan Revolutionaries vague claims in Laud’s *Bill of Attainder (1645)*, i.e., that Laud was “introducing arbitrary power .. without any limitation of law” and “cruelly persecuted and suspended orthodox Minister’s of God’s Word<sup>173</sup>.” Once again, whatever one thinks of Laud’s actions, it is clear that this case does not support the claim of demonstrating “Laud’s Arminianism.”

---

<sup>172</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, p. 287.

<sup>173</sup> Close, A., *op. cit.*, p. 154.

Next Como refers to *Davenport's (Dampart's) case (1633)*<sup>174</sup>. The recorder in the *Court of King's Bench*, wrote, "that Mr. Dampart, a preacher in London hath not been seen this month," but that the court wanted to see "him *viz*, for preaching against some points of Arminianism against His Majesty's Prohibition. One point was, Whether a child of God could totally and finally fall from grace? He held [in the] negative." Davenport, also known as Dampart, fled the country rather than appear before the court, going first to Holland, and then to the Puritan stronghold of New England, America.

Como makes this a beat-up into Laud's "method of informal intimidation." But importantly, Como once again fails to distinguish between an investigation and a conviction. It seems that some of the content of Davenport's statements had raised questions warranting further investigation. But as seen by *Votier's case* and *Prynne's case, supra*, Davenport may well have been released without being sentenced. We do not know the details of *Davenport's (Dampart's) case*, but on the basis of the precedent of *Bridges, Fermin & Mudd's case* and *Prynne's case, supra*, it is certainly *possible* that the concern was antinomianism. I.e., was Dampart saying that "a child of God could totally and finally fall from grace, and so he might freely break the Ten Commandments," or were Laud *et al* concerned that *he might* be saying this and the matter warranted further investigation to determine whether or not he was saying this?

The penultimate case Como puts up for his straw-man of "Laud's Arminianism," is *Roborough's case (1634)*, which was brought before the High Commissioners shortly before Bishop Laud was elevated from being Bishop of London, to become Archbishop of Canterbury<sup>175</sup>. Roborough was investigated for a number of matters, including: allowing a schismatic Minister named Richard Walker to preach from his pulpit; saying that "the persecution of the saints in these times and in this kingdom or *Church of England* was great;" denouncing the Book of Sports from the pulpit; "that you have wholly omitted to preach ... Christ crucified, faith, repentance, and good works, but digressing from your texts ... spend most of your time in bitter invectives against the Church and State Ecclesiastical, and the doctrine and Discipline of the *Church of England* ... ." Moreover, in violation "of His Majesty's ... Edict and Proclamation," he had "cried out much against the false lying doctrine, and sundry other points of like nature of falling from grace, whereas His Majesty hath graciously signified his pleasure that he would have these points handled in the universities and not elsewhere."

Como claims Roborough "thus allegedly affirmed the central Calvinist doctrine of the perseverance of the saints." This is not clear from the quote, since when it says, he "cried out much against that false lying doctrine, and sundry other points of like nature of falling from grace," it might mean the opposite i.e., he "cried out" "against" the predestination doctrine "of falling from grace," so making him an Arminian. However, it seems likely that in fact what was meant was he was being investigated on some unspecified matter to do with "falling from grace," which on the basis of the precedent in

---

<sup>174</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, pp. 287-8.

<sup>175</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, pp. 288-9.

*Prynne's case, supra*, probably had to do with antinomianism. He was evidently raising questions that Laud considered under the King's decree should have been left to academic theologians (a Laudian policy I would certainly not share).

This interpretation also dovetails into the fact that he was being questioned over what he meant by saying, "that Christ's intercession saves us from condemnation, so as no sins be they ever so heinous shall be laid to charge of the elect, for that Christ had or hath already acquitted them from the bar of God's justice. So then, let every child of God say there be ten thousand sins that assault me, yet I will never faint or doubt, or once stagger in the matter of salvation." Such an interpretation would be consistent with "the persecution of the saints in these times and in this kingdom or *Church of England*," as this may well mean not "persecution" of Puritans or the Reformed, as Como presumes, but rather "persecution" of libertines or antinomians who were excommunicated for egregious breaches of the Moral Law found in the Ten Commandments e.g., fornicators and adulterers (I Cor. 6:9,10). Hence the criticism, "you have wholly omitted to preach ... Christ crucified faith, repentance, and good works."

Importantly, Como once again fails to distinguish between a probe *to find out if the man was an antinomian*, and his claim that he was being "persecuted" because he was Reformed. It is also clear that other issues were raised, such as having a heretic in the pulpit, denouncing the Book of Sports, and generally being critical of the *Church of England*. Thus it is once again clear, that there is nothing here to support the claim of "Laud's Arminianism."

The final case Como considers is *Brooke's case*. However, this is not so much a case, as a legal opinion that Laud gave over the inadvisability of publishing a certain book. Samuel Brooke, the Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, sent Laud a manuscript copy of a treatise on predestination. In it, he claimed that the "doctrine of predestination is the root of Puritanism, and Puritanism the root of all rebellious and disobedient intractableness in Parliaments etc., and all schism." But when Laud read it, he would have none of it, saying e.g., "I do much doubt whether the King will take any man's judgment so far as to have these controversies any further stirred." He cautioned Brooke, "take heed that none [of the manuscript copies] be stolen out privately to the press, which should it happen might breed a great deal of trouble to yourself and the church." Laud thus advises against publishing these views, which he clearly regards as being against the King's three decrees. and warns that if it is so published, Brooke "might breed a great deal of trouble to" himself.

Como now criticizes this on the basis that Laud here used "gentle and deferential words" to Brooke, as opposed to those in the other cases, *supra*, and says "Brook was not summoned before Laud ... to answer for his opinions<sup>176</sup>." But Como's basic criticism is wrong in a number of particulars. In the first place, Laud's actions were always taken after violations of the King's three decrees in which certain matters were raised *in public*. Brooke had here not done this. Moreover, Laud makes it clear, that if Brooke should

---

<sup>176</sup> Como, D., *op. cit.*, p. 290.

raise these matters in public, he “might breed a great deal of trouble to” himself. Thus Laud indicates that an official probe in a case may well ensue if these views were made public. The reality is that Como here, as elsewhere, is struggling against the natural interpretation of the evidence to argue for “Laud’s Arminianism.”

We have thus considered the views of one of the most talented and crafty anti-Laud writers of contemporary times. Como tries, without success, to prove “Laud’s Arminianism” in modern times, by putting together an argument of inference and innuendo based on Laud’s actions in about a dozen cases (I use the word “case” somewhat loosely to also include investigations and legal opinions). Como thus labors with the energy and noise of an elephant about to give birth to this long expected baby elephant “evidence,” but we find in the end, that after its long groanings, this elephant does not so much as bring forth an ant of evidence. It brings forth naught. For this is a phantom pregnancy.

I shall now briefly consider the charges of “Laud’s Arminianism” brought against him by the Puritan Revolutionaries of the 1642-60 republic, in *Cromwell’s Revolutionary Regime v. Archbishop of Canterbury (Laud) (1644)*. The issue of “Laud’s Arminianism” was raised on two days of *Laud’s case* under Prynne’s management. It was first raised on Monday 17 June 1644 (14th day of Laud’s hearing), and again on Friday 5 July 1644 (17th day of Laud’s trial).

Reference was made to the *Hampton Court Conference* attended by William Laud. Laud became Bishop of London in 1628. In that capacity, the records of that Conference record that, “the Bishop of London,” Bishop Laud, discussing “fall from grace,” “took occasion to signify to His Majesty [King Charles I], how very much in these days, neglecting of holiness of life, presumed too much of persisting in grace, laying all their religion upon predestination. ‘If I shall be saved, I shall be saved,’ he termed a desperate doctrine, showing it to be contrary to true divinity [theology], and *the true doctrine of predestination* ..., that I live in obedience to God, in love with my neighbor, ... because *I trust that God hath elected me, and predestined me to salvation*; not, thus which the usual course of argument, God hath predestined and chosen me to life, therefore though I sin ... grievously, yet I shall not be damned ... . Whereupon he showed His Majesty out of the ... Article [of the 39 Articles] what the doctrine of the *Church of England* [is] touching predestination, [Article 17] in the very last paragraph ... . [This reads,] ‘We must receive God’s promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture: and, in our doings, that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God.’ Which part of the Article His Majesty very well approved. ... [Bishop Laud] wished that the doctrine of predestination might be very tenderly handled, and with great discretion; lest on the one side, God’s omnipotence might be called in question, by impeaching the doctrine of his eternal predestination; or on the other side, [there be] a desperate presumption ... inferring the necessary certainty of standing and persisting in grace<sup>177.</sup>”

---

<sup>177</sup> Laud’s *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 453.

It is clear from this that Laud believed in predestination as found in Article 17 of the Anglican 39 Articles. On the one hand, he was concerned “lest ..., God’s omnipotence might be called in question, by impeaching the doctrine of his eternal predestination,” i.e., Arminians such as the General Baptist Puritans (with whom the Reformed Puritans disagreed), or those more recently influenced by the teachings of Arminius condemned by the Dutch Reformed *Synod of Dort (1618)*. But on the other hand, he was concerned that an antinomian or libertine group were using predestination to create “a desperate presumption” that they could live an ungodly life, on the basis, “If I shall be saved, I shall be saved.”

Bishop (later Archbishop) Laud’s comments at the *Hampton Court Conference* are relevant to the proceedings of *Laud’s case* on 17 June 1644. At that time, Laud was charged with, “stopping of books from the press, both old and new, and expunging some things out of them.” In this context, Laud records that one alleged “instance was about Arminianism, ‘as maintained by me against the Declaration of both Houses of Parliament [House of Commons, 11 June 1628].’” Laud said, “First, *I have nothing to do with defending Arminianism, no man having yet charged me with the abetting any point of it.*” This is an unequivocal rejection of Arminianism, and “charged me” here means *successfully* so charged him, since they have never been able to show he believed in “any point of it.”

Laud continues, “Secondly, ... with the Article [17] of the *Church of England ... I ever consented.*” And the passage in the conference at Hampton Court was read [*supra*] ... . [Now] for the peace of Christendom, and *the strengthening of the Reformed religion*, I do heartily wish these differences were not pursued with such animosity, in regard [to the claim] that ... the Lutheran Protestants are of the very same opinion, or with very little difference from those which are now called Arminianism.” Laud here identifies himself with “the Reformed religion,” and the doctrine of Article 17, entitled, “Of predestination and election.” He further defends “Lutheran Protestants” whom his Puritan accusers evidently also considered “are of the very same opinion, or with very little difference from those ... [in] Arminianism.” The passage is interesting here, since while Puritans were both anti-Lutheran and anti-Anglican, most of their rhetoric was anti-Anglican. But it is clear from this testimony, that the same Puritan Revolutionaries accusing Laud of being an Arminian, were also claiming that Lutherans were Arminians, or something very close to Arminians, and Laud’s usage here of “Lutheran Protestants” is presumably meant to make the point, that Puritans seemingly found hard to accept, that Lutherans and Anglicans are also Protestants, as distinct from Puritan Protestants.

If this absurd Puritan Revolutionaries’ claim were accepted, it would mean that not only Laud was an Arminian, but also Luther. If any deny that Martin Luther understood justification by faith, then I for one, deny that they understand justification by faith, and denounce them as preaching “another gospel” (Gal. 1:6; 3:11). It seems clear that if Martin Luther had been Archbishop of Canterbury at this time, these same Puritan Revolutionaries would have had Luther on trial rather than Laud. By contrast, I note that the Lutheran *Augsburg Confession* says such things as e.g., “... They condemn Pelagians ... who say that ... man can be justified in God’s sight by his own strength of reason, so

as to lessen the glory of the merit and the benefits of Christ” (1:2) (for a man must be enabled, Ezek. 16:4-6; 37:1-14; John 6:44,65; Eph. 2:1,5,8; 1 Cor. 2:14); “They teach that men cannot be justified in the sight of God *by their own strength*, merits or works, by that they are justified freely on account of Christ through faith, when they believe that they are received into grace and that their sins are remitted on account of Christ who made satisfaction for sins on our behalf by his death. God imputes this faith for righteousness in his own sight (Roman 3 & 4)” (1:4, emphasis mine) “They teach that human will ... without the Holy Spirit ... has no power of accomplishing the righteousness of God, or spiritual righteousness ... ” (1:18, entitled, “Of Free Choice”).

It seems clear then, that something like in post World War Two 1940s and 1950s Yugoslavia, Tito’s Nazi-phobia saw “a Nazi under every bed of those of Germanic descent,” resulting in the genocide of about 150,000 persons of German descent in two concentration camps in the northern Voivodina region of Serbia, which decimated the Lutheran population of Croatia from about 70,000 in 1945 to less than 20,000 in 1991<sup>178</sup>; so likewise the Puritan Revolutionaries had an Arminian-phobia. These Puritan Revolutionaries saw “an Arminian under every bed,” and found “Arminians” in such bizarrely improbable places as Lutheranism, and indeed in the Anglican Archbishopric of Canterbury under Laud.

Moreover, reference was then made at Laud’s trial to *Spark’s case*. (The case is not referred to by Como, *supra*.) Michael Sparks said “he was called into the High Commissioners about a book of Bishop Charlton’s.” Sparks had been one of the English Divines who attended the Synod of Dort. The book by George Charlton, Bishop of Llandaff, was entitled, *An Examination of those things wherein the Author of the late Appeal holdeth the Doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians to be the Doctrine of the Church of England* (London, 1626). This book, says Laud, had been found to be “expressly against the King’s Declaration.” Laud says this man “was eleven years in [the investigation of] the High Commission and never sentenced.” This once again touches on the issue of investigation and sentencing. Any one promoting a book claiming “the Doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians to be the Doctrine of the Church of England” might reasonably be expected to be investigated. But even though Laud describes him as “a bitter” “enemy” of “the Church,” he also notes the decision was made not to sentence him. How then can he claim Laud and the other High Commissioners were using their powers to promote Arminianism?

Sparks was the prosecution case’s *star witness* for “Laud’s Arminianism.” Sparks testimony against Laud was premised around personal knowledge of Laud. Sparks says, Laud “was a Dean then, ... of Hereford.” But says Laud in answer to this claim of intimate knowledge of himself, “I was never Dean of Hereford.” And then in a

---

<sup>178</sup> Greater Croatia and Greater Serbia overlap with Croatia and Serbia historically claiming Bosnia-Herzegovina, Belgrade, and part of the area between Belgrade and Croatia. Under the six state federation of the first Yugoslavia (1921-1941) and the second Yugoslavia (1946-1991/2), these rival claims were resolved by including all disputed areas inside the Yugoslav federation.

colourful, dramatic, and spectacular piece of court theatrics, Laud exposes Sparks, and pulls the rug out from under Spark's charade of claiming to know Laud so well. "He was," in fact says Laud, "Mr. Pryn's printer!" This is the Pryn (Prinn) of *Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn, infra*.

Finally, "they say, 'some passages against Arminianism were left out of two letters, one of Bishop Davenant's and the others of Bishop Hall's, sent to be printed' by Laud. Investigation shows that part of the passage that Prynne (Pryn / Prinn) claimed was omitted from Bishop Hall's letter, in fact was not; and Bishop Davenant's letter was left very anti-Romanist. Laud replied, "First, here is no proof at all offered that I differed in anything from the doctrine [of predestination] expressed in those letters. And secondly for the leaving out of those passages, it was (it seems) done to avoid kindling of new flames in the *Church of England* ..., that *these passages were left out by the express order from the Bishops themselves.*" Thus Laud did not make these changes, but the authors themselves did<sup>179</sup>.

Thus at the end of this day's hearing, the allegations of "Laud's Arminianism" had been shown to be bogus. Laud had said, "*I have nothing to do with defending Arminianism,*" that "with the Article [17] of the *Church of England* ... *I ever consented*;" and that *he supported "strengthening of the Reformed religion."* These are clear Reformed statements that he also makes in terms of *his support for Article 17 of the Anglican 39 Articles*, to which he says, "I ever consented." The so called "evidence" against him by the prosecution case's *star witness*, Sparks, was shown to consist of nothing more than the claims of a false witness who had floundered badly, and whose intimate knowledge of Laud as "Dean of Hereford" was clearly a manufacturing of evidence, since Laud had never held such a position. And in fact, far from being a star witness, Sparks, was unmasked as the murky "printer" of "Mr. Pryn's" libels against Laud. In short, Sparks was not a credible witness. The Puritan prosecution team under Prynne (Pryne), "had egg on their faces."

Following Laud's statement, "no man having yet charged me with the abetting any point of" "Arminianism," the Puritan prosecutors were evidently thrown into a rage of desire to make further attempts to find "evidence" of "Laud's Arminianism." After further investigations and a clear desire to make the charge of "Laud's Arminianism" stick, the proceedings in *Laud's case* returned to this claim with "fresh evidence" on Friday 5 July 1644. On this day of Laud's trial, a "charge" was brought, that Laud "preferred none to bishoprics, deaneries, prebends, and benefices, but men Popishly affected, or otherwise unworthy." Some of whom they then named, *infra*.

Firstly, reference is made to Bishop Lind. "Him they charged with Arminians." The prosecution's first witness to allege that Bishop Lind was an Arminian was Peter Smart. Originally an Anglican clergyman, he proved to be a shady character which had been deprived of his Prebendary in Durham, after he preached a seditious sermon in

---

<sup>179</sup> Laud's *Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 267-70 (emphasis mine), 453 (citing Hampton Court Conference, pp, 29,30, emphasis mine).

Durham Cathedral. He was questioned for this in the High Commission. At the beginning of the Long Parliament, the Puritan Revolutionaries restored him to his preferments, and he presented articles against the Anglican Bishop John Cosin (1594-1672), who was exiled to the Continent<sup>180</sup>. Laud refers to the fact that both Lind and Smart were prebendaries at Durham, and in a reference to what would certainly include Smart's seditious sermon, he says "there was animosity between them." I.e., Smart is a highly prejudiced witness.

Laud also says, "Smart" is "not able to judge" "Arminianism." This is a claim to Smart's fundamental competence to even know what "Arminianism" is. It seems to me that Laud is absolutely correct here, not only in Laud's limited sense of a comment on Smart, but also more generally as a comment on the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60. These Puritans were wildly claiming Lutherans and Laud were "Arminians," and they seemingly had no real theological understanding of what an Arminian is. There is no reference here to basic issues e.g., Arminian teachings of conditional salvation (Arminian) rather than predestination (Reformed); special grace unto salvation, as opposed to common grace not unto salvation available to all men to live godly lives (Reformed), in contrast with a common grace for anyone unto salvation (Arminian); or issues of God's irresistible grace and enabling of the elect (Reformed), as opposed to claims of God's resistible grace and man's own free will, which by its own strength is said to be able to exercise the good work of "faith" in accomplishing salvation (Arminian). Despite the Puritan's excessively rigid Sabbatarianism (4th commandment), there is no developed theology of how the true Reformed teaching upholds the Moral Law found in the Decalogue, as opposed to antinomianism; and there is a good deal of evidence that much of Laud's disputes with Puritans over predestination revolved around this very issue, *supra*. Instead, there is a loose bandying about of the word "Arminian," and it is used to describe any action of Laud against any Puritan who says he believes in predestination (Reformed), as "the real reason" why this Puritan was in some way criticized or disciplined. Under the circumstances, Laud is surely within his rights to say that a fool like "Smart," is simply "not able to judge" what "Arminianism" is.

The prosecution's second witness to allege that Bishop Lind was an Arminian, was Mr. Walker. Walker's evidence consisted solely in this. That "he heard so from some Ministers and Dr. Bastwick." This is the Bastwick of *Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn, infra*. Thus concludes Laud, the whole case against him for appointing the allegedly "Arminian" bishop Lind, was founded on claims of Lind's "Arminianism," which were based on "ignorance" (Smart) "and hearsay" (Walker)<sup>181</sup>. Moreover, these

---

<sup>180</sup> Peter Smart, presumably the libeller Puritan Smart, *infra*. Some of his testimony was recorded in Prynne's *Cant. Doom*, p. 360 (Laud's *Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 40,293). Cosin was a Chaplain at Durham Cathedral from 1619, and a liturgist. After being exiled by the Puritan Revolutionaries, he was made Bishop of Durham after the Restoration.

<sup>181</sup> In law, *hearsay evidence* refers to what someone else has been heard to say, i.e., it is second-hand (or third-hand etc.), in contrast to *direct evidence* from a witness himself. In general, *hearsay evidence* is not admissible in a court of law, since it is the

claims, notes Laud, are made “when the man is gone to that which should be his quiet, the grave.”

The next example put forward by the prosecution of Laud’s so called “Arminian” appointment, was “Dr. Potter, a known Arminian, to the deanery of Worcester” in 1635. (Christopher Potter was formerly Provost of Queen’s College, Oxford, and Chaplain to the King. He died in 1645.) Laud asks, “What proof” is there “of this” Arminianism? “Nothing,” says Laud, “but Dr. Featley’s testimony, who said no more but this; that ‘Dr. Potter was at first against Arminianism,’ that’s absolute; ‘but afterwards he defended it,’ as he ‘hath heard’” it so claimed; to which Laud says, “there’s a hearsay!” I.e., the third witness produced only *hearsay evidence* which is not reliable.

The next example put forward by the prosecution was Pryne’s claim about an “Arminian sermon at St. Paul’s Cross” by “Dr. Martin.” Here Laud referred to his earlier answer on this. Pryne claimed that “Dr. Martin,” who was “then” Laud’s “Chaplain in London House,” had supported a “book” in his sermon, that “set out to countenance Arminianism.” Laud said, “If Dr. Martin did this, ‘tis more than I remember . . . . But Dr. Martin is living, and in town, and I humbly desire he might be called to answer.” Martin was summoned and appeared the next day. Martin rejected all claims of having ever supported or preached in favour of Arminianism. Martin said, “Pryn says further, ‘that after this he preached Arminianism at St. Paul’s Cross.’ Why did not Mr. Pryn come then to me, and acquaint me with it, which neither he nor any man else did’.”

Still desirous to support Pryn’s basic claim, the prosecution case now moved to produce their fourth witness, a *star witness*. The arrival of the star witness necessarily came with great fan-fare. After all, this was a *surprise star witness*, which the prosecution case had been secreting in anticipation of a possible denial of the preaching of Arminianism by Martin at St. Paul’s Cross *Church of England*. The mystery witness was summoned to appear the next day. This star witness came to prove the basic claim, that Martin had “preached at the Cross [i.e., St. Paul’s Cross Church,] universal redemption.” With this star witness, the prosecution case hoped to show that Martin was lying, and Pryne was telling the truth. His appearance was meant to stand out as an evident instance of the prosecution’s *tactical brilliance*.

But once again, the prosecution case’s star witness floundered. He was unable to identify Martin. He had no idea who Martin was. He “gave testimony” that in fact, he “knew not him,” at all. He confessed in court that his belief about this alleged Arminian sermon was based entirely and exclusively on the fact that “one” unnamed third party, had “told him ‘twas Dr. Martin” who had said these things. With the prosecution case’s *star witness* once again proving to be a *sinking star*, whose self-destructive testimony crashed and burnt out badly in court, the prosecution team once again “had egg on their faces.”

---

same as a rumour.

Fumbling under the frustration of their second star witness failing them just as badly as their first star witness had, the prosecution team under Prynne, now recalled their second witness, Mr. Walker back for the second time. Admittedly, Walker had let them down the first time, when his evidence proved to be nothing but hearsay, but perhaps he would prove more damaging to Laud the second time round? He was evidently eager to get back into the fight, and help make the charge of “Laud’s Arminianism” stick. This evidently willing witness, now came with his *knock-down evidence*. “Walker ... said, ‘he [Laud] proposed Arminian questions to diverse Ministers’.” But what was his basis for this claim? Walker said, “these Ministers told him.” To which Laud rightly replied, “So it is but hearsay!”

Perhaps worried that this type of repeated slippage in the prosecution witnesses was making the prosecution case look rather silly, the prosecution case now hunted around for the testimony of a witness that Laud could not refute. They pinned their increasingly desperate hopes on their third witness, Featley, who was now recalled. Featley had *fumbled the ball* badly the first time, by producing hearsay. The question was this, *could he now produce something that Laud simply could not refute?* The prosecution case did not want their fingers burnt a third time, by witnesses like their two star witnesses, who had failed to come through with the goods. But how could they ensure that their witness would not fall through like their two star witnesses had? The prosecution team under Prynne believed that Featley had *the bombshell* they needed to demolish Laud. *It was a witness who they were sure would not appear in court and contradict their claims, the way their two star witnesses had.*

Prynne’s prosecution team now moved in for the kill. “Dr. Featley ... said, ‘Dr. Jackson was a known Arminian’.” For these unsubstantiated allegations, Featley had a *knockdown punch*, “the man is dead” and so *could not refute the claims*. But the prosecution team’s glee was short-lived. For, in response noted Laud, he “cannot answer of himself” either. The evidence thus rested on the flimsy basis that *dead men tell no tales*. Once again Prynne’s prosecution team was looking silly in court.

The prosecution team now moved to wind up their case for “Laud’s Arminianism.” They now advanced as their fifth witness their *big gun* as their penultimate argument. Once they had *smashed Laud with this*, they would *then follow through with one further witness*, who would then *finish Laud’s broken pieces off*. All of their previous prosecution witnesses had proven to be flat-footed and failed. The final piece of evidence could not be trusted to just any member of the prosecution team, but only to the leader himself. It was their *big gun*. It was Prynne himself! Prynne would advance this penultimate argument to allegedly prove “Laud’s Arminianism.” And presumably Prynne thought, he would thereby achieve great fame and applause for himself as *the big gun* who came through when all others had failed, in proving the case of “Laud’s Arminianism.”

From the prosecution case’s perspective, proving “Laud’s Arminianism” had proven to be *a very slippery proposition*, and the harder they grabbed hold of it, like a hand grabbing a slippery object, the harder they inadvertently projected it out of their

hands. There had been too much incompetence and too many failures already. It was time to bring in *the big gun*. Prynne himself would come in as *the big gun*, and prove once and for all the case of “Laud’s Arminianism!”

“Mr. Prynne,” that is, the Prynne (Prinn) of *Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn, infra*, a proven unrepentant liar and libeler, now “testified very boldly,” that Laud “gave benefices which were in the gift of the Master of the Ward, and all preferments, only to such men as were for ... Popery and Arminianism.” But to this, Laud very satisfactorily and very tellingly replied, “I never gave one of those benefices in my life! And that this story is of truth, the Lord Cottington is yet living and can witness it.” *The claim had thus proven false. The prosecution case’s big gun, Prynne, was shown to be firing blanks!*

The prosecution case now advanced their *piece de resistance*. They had left this till the very end, perhaps, so that if everything else failed, as indeed it had, they could still prove their case for “Laud’s Arminianism” through their great iconic *piece de resistance*. This great icon of the Puritan Revolutionaries case, was presumably intended to stand as a representation of their whole case for “Laud’s Arminianism.” *The best was kept till the last*, for it encapsulated and represented everything they had been trying, *admittedly without success*, to prove in their charge of “Laud’s Arminianism.”

The great and final *piece de resistance* was focused on their sixth witness, Dr. Hoyle, a Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. Hoyle testified against Dr. Chappell, saying that the “doctor did maintain in that college,” which was an Anglican College in the *Church of Ireland*, “justification by works, and in the Christian Church, Arminianism.” Laud asked, “If it be true, why did not the Lord Primate in Armagh,” the primatial see for the *Church of Ireland*, “punish him?” Laud, who as Archbishop of Canterbury was Lord Primate for the *Church of England*, said, “I am a stranger to all this.” “And no man ever complained to me that he favoured Arminianism.” Thus Laud not only said he had no knowledge of the matter, he further indicated, that if it were true, then the Anglican Archbishop of Armagh should have taken appropriate action.

This great piece of prosecution evidence, this great *piece de resistance* of the prosecution’s case, now rested on showing a link to Laud. They now set about to prove that Laud was intimately connected with Chappell, and that on Hoyle’s testimony. What was it that Hoyle had said that was so damning of Laud’s case? It was these words, and these words alone. Hoyle had said in evidence, “that they which did this,” i.e., preached “justification by works, and” “Arminianism” in Dublin, “*were supposed to have some friends in England.*” And so the link the prosecution case advanced was that because Laud was clearly “in England,” and it was “supposed” that Chappell had “some friends in England,” *therefore they deduced that Laud was one of those “friends.” Now this really is very silly!* Laud, showing his good sense of humour amidst such adversities replied, “And surely they must have had some bad manners and walked funny, if they had no friends [in England]!”<sup>182</sup>

---

<sup>182</sup> Laud’s *Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 290,292-300 (emphasis mine). The final quote is literally, “And surely their carriage was very ill, if they had none;” “carriage” here means

And thus the prosecution rested their case for “Laud’s Arminianism.”

The prosecution case had returned on this fifth day of July 1644, following their trouncing on the earlier seventeenth day of June, 1644, when allegations of “Laud’s Arminianism” had been shown to be false. On the one hand, Laud had said, “*I have nothing to do with defending Arminianism,*” that “with the Article [17] of the *Church of England ... I ever consented*”; and that *he supported “strengthening of the Reformed religion.”* He clearly and unequivocally stated his consent to Article 17 of the Anglican 39 Articles, which upholds the Reformed teaching on “predestination and election.” He rejected all claims to supporting, believing, or defending Arminianism.

On the other hand, the prosecution case had consisted of their first star witness, who proved to be a false witness, and whose claims to intimate knowledge of Laud as “Dean of Hereford” exposed him, since this was not a position Laud had ever held. Indeed, Laud exposed this rascal as the figure who lurked in the shadows behind Pryne, being none other than “Mr. Pryn’s printer!” This was then followed by further later hearings, in an attempt by the prosecution to prove “Laud’s Arminianism,” and to this end they made claims that Laud appointed Arminians to key positions.

Specifically, Bishop Lind, although this claim was shown to be based on “ignorance” (Smart) “and hearsay” (Walker), against a dead man (Lind) unable to defend himself. The appointment of Dean Potter as an alleged Arminian, although this was simply more “hearsay” (Featley). Chaplain Martin, although this was shown to be a case of mistaken identity, by someone who had been “told” by an unknown third party, “’twas Dr. Martin” who had said these things (the second star witness). This was followed by more hearsay (Walker recalled); and unsubstantiated allegations about a dead man (Featley recalled). Then came false allegations about giving “benefices ... in the gift of the Master of the Ward, and all preferments, only to such men as were for ... Popery and Arminianism” (Pryne), but Laud never gave any such benefices, and he named a witness that could be summoned to corroborate this (Cottington). Finally, it was said that because an alleged Arminian heretic in Ireland, was “supposed to have some friends in England,” and because among multiplied hundreds of thousands of other people, Laud was “in England,” therefore he was one of these “supposed” “friends” (Hoyle).

On the one hand, I do not usually show such empathy to Laud in defending him against the Puritans. But on the other hand, it must be understood that I am prepared to defend Laud where he was orthodox. The truth is that while Laud was bad, so were the Puritan Revolutionaries. The case of Laud verses the Puritans was not, as both Puritans and Puseyites lie to claim, a simple case of “a white hat” verses “a black hat.”

It seems to me that at this point in the case against Laud, with its allegations of

---

“carriage of oneself” i.e., “the way one carries oneself,” one’s “deportment” or “manners.”

“Laud’s Arminianism,” like so much else in Laud’s trial, (I do not say all that was in Laud’s trial,) really reads like a comic book story written for university law students on *when not to bring a prosecution case and how to not run a prosecution case*. It seems that at the end the second hearing of those bringing these allegations about “Laud’s Arminianism,” these Puritan prosecutors were left, like the black-coated sinister figures in some of the old-time black’n’white movies to exclaim, “Drats! Foiled again!”

*It should also be remembered that there was a very serious side to this case. The prosecution case was playing with a man’s life. Laud’s life was on the line, for charges of sedition, in connection with promoting Arminianism and so in the Puritan Revolutionaries’ minds, therefore by extension promoting Popery, since Papists are Arminians. IF LAUD WAS, AS THE PURITANS MAINTAINED, A SECRET PAPIST, HE THEREFORE HAD TO BE AN ARMINIAN; AND CONVESLEY, IF LAUD COULD SHOW THAT HE WAS NOT AN ARMINIAN, IT FOLLOWED THAT HE COULD NOT POSSIBLY BE A PAPIST.* Therefore, this was an important plank in the case to convict Laud of treason and execute him as one who was trying to reintroduce the Roman Catholic’s Arminian religion. Though the allegations made against Laud, and the claims of his sedition were certainly false, we can never forget this somber fact, *the prosecution case and the court, were playing with a man’s life. And when a man’s life is on the line, there should be somberness, circumspection, and reflection.* Sadly, those who wanted Laud dead were not interested in a serious trial, but a show trial, and they would ultimately achieve their ends by *Bill of Attainder, infra*.

Nevertheless, having fairly considered the case put forth by the types of people responsible for both generating and sustaining down to our own day, the claims of “Laud’s Arminianism,” I can only describe such persons as slanderers and liars. They violate the 9th commandment, “Thou shalt not bear false witness” (Exod. 20:16), generally, though not always, in order that they might seek to justify, or at the very least create a sympathy towards, the violation of the 6th commandment, “Thou shalt not kill” (Exod. 20:13), in the subsequent unwarranted execution of Laud at the hands of the Puritan Revolutionaries. Their lies have been taken up since the 19th century by Puseyites, who now do what Laud would never have done, and embrace Arminianism.

The claim of “Laud’s Arminianism,” like the claim of “Laud’s Popery,” comes to us in the context of a furor of Puritan propaganda. The two claims are indissolubly interconnected, since Romanism is a form of Arminianism, and so while to prove “Laud’s Arminianism” does not *ipso facto* prove “Laud’s Romanism;” nevertheless, to disprove the claims of “Laud’s Arminianism,” does *ipso facto* disprove claims of “Laud’s Romanism,” if by that is meant a Laudian conspiracy to reconcile the *Church of England* with the *Church of Rome*. Thus for the Puritan Revolutionaries, maintaining “Laud’s Arminianism” was an essential component of their case against Laud i.e., the claim that Laud was trying to reintroduce the Roman Catholic religion. This drove them to insist upon this claim finally in Laud’s Bill of Attainder, and it made it an irremovable plank of the Roundhead propaganda machine down to our own day.

The propaganda was a complex mix of *fact* (Laud’s innovations, *supra*, e.g.,

private Lutheran consubstantiation beliefs resulted in him calling the Communion Table an “altar,” or his private views on episcopal government being “divine law” were integral to his fanatical desire of 1637-40 to extend Anglicanism into a very unwilling Scotland; and his private views on nodding at the name of Jesus were Romish), *unfair attack* (many of the criticisms made against Laud were really an attack on Anglican doctrine, viewed from the skewed perspective of Puritans wanting to “purify” Anglican worship, and so unfairly claimed Anglican practices were evidence that Laud was “Romish”), and *fraud* (e.g., a pack of lies about “Laud’s Arminianism”).

Amidst this Puritan propaganda farrago of *fact, unfair attack, and fraud*, this claim of “Laud’s Arminianism,” was thus connected with a political movement in the Puritan Revolution of 1640-60 and associated republic of 1642-60; and has been repeated through bigoted habit by some of those derived from Puritan Protestantism as part of their ongoing justification for Cromwell *et al.* Some are more talented in this repetition (e.g., Como), and some less talented (Close). But either way, it is a claim spun on the loom of deceit. Said our Lord Christ of such, “Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it” (John 8:44).

Good reader, do you think my judgment unduly harsh? I think anyone who justifies killing an Archbishop of Canterbury on this sort of grounds deserves to be so described. After all, outside of rejection of Christ’s holy gospel, is not murder one of the most serious, and arguably *the* most serious moral crime that a person can commit? To disagree with some of Laud’s views is one thing (and indeed I certainly do), to argue that Laud should have been disciplined for his innovations and deprived of the Archbishopric of Canterbury is also one thing (and once again I would agree that he should have been so deprived, for I am no fan of Laud’s), but to deliberately set about to kill the man, and to accomplish these ends to propagate a series of lies, is surely quite another thing.

Laud and Laudians were semi-Romanists and bad men; but they were not Romanists Proper, and they did not seek to try and reconcile the *Church of England* with the *Church of Rome* as claimed. They certainly should have been disciplined for their semi-Romanism and illegal acts against the doctrine of the Anglican Church as found in e.g., her 39 Articles. But it is quite another thing to claim that they were Romanists Proper, guilty of sedition, and part of a conspiracy to bring the Roman Church back in; and then on this basis to execute them for such treason. The Laudians were bad; but not that bad. The reason why some people think they were so bad, is that they are looking at the matter through the eyes of some other bad men, to wit, the Puritan revolutionaries and their associated propagandists. Let us be careful to in all things follow him who is “the way, *the truth*, and the life” (John 14:6). He who from Mount Sinai thundered these words, “Thou shalt not bear false witness” (Exod. 20:16).

*Laud’s role as Star Chamber Court judge in Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn (1637).*

Against the backdrop of considering the Puritan's first great anti-Laudian argument of the Caroline era, namely, "Laud's Popery," of which a most significant example is "Laud's Arminianism," I have stated my finding that Laud introduced at least nine (and possibly ten) unwarranted innovations. Eight of these made him a semi-Romanist going back to before the later stage reforms under Edward VI and Elizabeth I, so that he should have been disciplined for these eight innovations as a semi-Romanist; and one of these innovations, for which he also should have been disciplined, involved distortions of Article 20 of the 39 Articles, *infra*. This highlights the complexities of assessing Laud in the context of the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-1660. I.e., it is clear that in the Laud-Puritan disputations, *neither side* came to court *with clean hands*. Both sides sadly chose *to get some dirt on their hands*.

Thus I have found that Laud was subjected to a raft of unfair charges, most notably, "Laud's Arminianism." Against this backdrop, let us now consider a matter that is also repeatedly referred to, to wit, Laud's role in the case of *Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn*. *Once again, it is not a simple matter that can be dealt with quickly*. To do so, greatly distorts it, which is why Puritan propagandists like to deal with it quickly. They hope their readers are slothful, and will not look into the matter in any depth. *The reality is that this court case does not resolve into a simple dichotomy of "a white hat wearing good guy" and "a black hat wearing villain."*

Specifically then, let us consider Laud's Star Chamber role in the 1637 trials of the Puritans, Henry Burton (1578-1648), who was charged with sedition in 1636, imprisoned and punished for writing inaccurate pamphlets; John Bastwick (1593-1654), imprisoned and punished in 1637 for the claims he made in his pamphlets, and who after his release in 1640 served in the Puritan's republican army during the civil war; and William Prynne (Pryn / Prinn) (1600-69), who was convicted as a "seditious libeller" in 1637, and following his release in 1640 supported Cromwell's republican forces, and was later put in charge of managing Laud's trial.

Puritan historians look with great favour on these three men, and claim that they were essentially the victims of trumped-up charges. This claim necessitates that I consider in some detail *Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn's case*. E.g., typical of such Puritan propagandists, Albert Close says, "With the connivance of King Charles I, Laud became dictator of England. He then became a most savage persecutor of those who openly opposed his illegal acts." "In 1634, William Prynne, ... published a book attacking Laud's 'cringings and duckings at the altar [i.e., *kneeling to receive Communion*, which was part of the publicly declared doctrine of the Anglicans Church; and also *nodding at the name of Jesus* and genuflecting at the Communion Table, which were both private view of Laud's and innovations], and his bellowing chants in the Church [i.e., such sung prayer book services as Matins and Evensong, which was part of the publicly declared doctrine of the Anglican Church]." Laud prosecuted him in the Star Chamber. ... In 1637 Prynne was again put in the pillory for writing pamphlets from prison. ... Bastwick, ... and ... Burton, ... for denouncing Laud's Service Books and acts, were also sentenced ... and ... imprisoned ... . After seven years under this tyrant's heel, [the Puritan]

Parliament met ...[in] 1640, and decided to impeach Laud. Oliver Cromwell at this point first appears on the stage of English history, as one of its greatest figures. He was a member of the Parliament which impeached Laud.” And other such references are made to “Laud’s victims of the Star Chamber sentences, Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton<sup>183</sup>.”

The *Court of the Star Chamber*, commonly called, *The Star (Starr) Chamber*, was a court based on the King’s power and privileges, rather than the parliament’s power and privileges. It was so named because of stars painted on the roof of the court-room where it met at Westminster Palace in London. It was not bound by rules of common law e.g., it had no jury system, was frequently characterized by secrecy rather than common law court openness, and followed an inquisitorial rather than adversarial approach in its judicial procedures. King Henry VIII used it to enforce laws when corrupt courts otherwise would not, and through it provided more suitable remedies when the other courts remedies were inadequate. In particular, (though not exclusively,) I shall consider its usage under Laud for the prosecution of Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton which was disliked by Puritans. It was finally abolished by the Puritan Long Parliament of 1641, in general because it was considered to be too open to abuse on the basis that it lacked the system of justice found in other Courts, and in particular because it was regarded as an essentially anti-Puritan and pro-Anglican pro-monarch court. But after the Restoration in 1660, the anti-Puritan and royalist Anglicans wanted nothing to do with it either. It was regarded as too open to abuse. *The Star Chamber had gone for good. And both Anglicans and Puritans were glad it had gone. Neither wanted it.*

I have had the opportunity to read in full the Judgment of His Grace, the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud, spoken from the bench of the court. His Grace’s judgment in the case of *Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn* was given in the Star Chamber on Wednesday the 14th of June, 1637, upon the joint conviction of the three accused of libel<sup>184</sup>. Bastwick, Burton, and Prynne, had produced pamphlets claiming that the Archbishop had introduced a series of “innovations” into the Anglican Church, designed “to advance or usher in Popery.” I find the seventy-seven page judgment of His Grace, Lord Archbishop Laud, is frequently, though not always, moderate in tone. Its focuses on fourteen specific charges of libel. *After considering the evidence, I do not doubt that the three defendants were guilty as charged on most counts; but, nor do I doubt, that on some counts it was Laud who was guilty, and the accused were unfairly dealt with. I also find that the penalty imposed on them by Laud was excessive.*

In considering this case, I would note: “Libel” refers to some permanent form,

---

<sup>183</sup> Close, A., *op. cit.*, pp. 150-151.

<sup>184</sup> His Grace, William Laud, A speech Delivered in the Starr Camber, on Wednesday the 14th of June, 1637, at the censure of John Bastwick, Henry Burton, and William Prinn, concerning pretended “Innovations” in the Church, Printed by Richard Badger, London, 1637 (microfilm copy, NSW State Library, Sydney, Australia). I shall modernize the spellings where I think it appropriate, without specifically stating so.

usually written, of false defamatory words. “Defamation” refers to the publication of false and derogatory statements about a person that lacks lawful justification. The added element of “sedition” was relevant because of Laud’s position as Archbishop of Canterbury, and the claims that in the Church-State of his day he was seeking to “usher in Popery.” If the case were run at all today, it would most likely simply be a libel case, in which Laud (Plaintiff) against Bastwick, Burton, and Prynne (Defendants) would be sued in a civil law suit for libel (perhaps individually rather than as co-defendants). But in the context of these Church-State times, it was held in the *Star Chamber Court* whose authority was the King (Latin, *Rex*).

The judgment makes reference in the prefatory remarks to “S. Ambrose, who was a stout and a worthy prelate” (p. 3), ends with reference to “S. Cyprian [who] when he” was “Bishop of Carthage, was bitterly railed upon by a pack of schismatics,” in the same way that His Grace considers Bastwick, Burton, and Prynne have “railed both bitterly and falsely upon me” (p. 75). The judgment was given on 14 June, and though this holy day was not on the prayer book Calendar (a matter of no absolute consequence, since liturgical calendars are a selection and so names come and go on them from time to time), it was notable that this is the holy day of St. Basil the Great (who is so remembered on this day in the Calendar of the Anglican Church of Australia’s *An Australian Prayer Book, 1978*, and Church of England *Alternative Service Book 1980*<sup>185</sup>). This would have been known, and so the broad general usage of three bishops, St. Cyprian (d. 258), St. Basil the Great (d. 379), and St. Ambrose (d. 397), contextually acts to reinforce Archbishop Laud’s belief in episcopal church government, and so contextually his own authority, in opposition to these three Puritans who did not believe in episcopal church government.

In this context, it is notable that Laud says the “calling of bishops” is “by Divine right,” and “in all places, the Church of Christ was governed by bishops; and lay-elders never heard of, till Calvin’s new-fangled device at Geneva” (pp. 6-7). As more fully discussed, *infra*, Reformed Anglicanism retained the three-fold ministry of bishop, priest, and deacon, finding it not contrary to the Word of God, and also finding value in it. On the one hand, Reformed Anglicans *allowed* someone to believe that episcopal government was Divine Law derived from apostolic times, if having investigated the matter this was their conclusion; but on the other hand, *this was certainly not a required belief* from the doctrinal standards of the Anglican Church. Laud’s belief in the value of

---

<sup>185</sup> As more fully stated, *infra*, I generally do not support these two modern prayer books, but agree with a small amount of the changes in them. Their inclusion of St. Basil on the Calendar is certainly appropriate and understandable, although the earlier absence of his name from the BCP (1662) Calendar is also appropriate and understandable. That is because there are always far more worthy saints than days in a not too cluttered calendar, so that before this time, St. Basil, like so many others, had to be principally remembered on All Saints’ Day. (Although an Anglican Church Dedicated to God in memory of St. Basil might always have held 14 June in greater significance, or possibly the Sunday before or after 14 June if it fell on a weekday in a given year.)

episcopal government in the Anglican Church was a broad Anglican belief; but his belief that this was “by Divine right” “from the apostolic times” was a personal belief, allowed, but not required, in the confessional standards of the Anglican prayer book and 39 Articles. Laud fails to make this distinction clear, and thus shows an element of personal bias, in my opinion due to a fundamental *conflict of interest* in him hearing this case.

On the one hand, I think that it was undesirable for the Archbishop to hear this case since the charges of libel were essentially against himself, and so I think there was a *conflict of interest* in a mere mortal and fallen man essentially passing judgment on his own accusers. Certainly as the law evolved, this problem was recognized and so came to be changed. I would have preferred an adversarial court where an impartial judge could hear Laud’s lawyer advance the charges of libel, and Bastwick, Burton, and Prynne’s lawyer(s) seek to defend their clients. *I shall return to this criticism especially, although not exclusively, when considering the penalty imposed upon these three, infra.* Nevertheless, I think that even if an adversarial system had been used, a conviction against these three men would have been found and recorded in most, though not all, instances.

I shall first pass briefly over most of these 14 libels, and then selectively focus more on *Libels 9 (Papists’ Conspiracy Day)*, *11 (Anglican Minister standing at the Communion Table)*, *12 (kneeling / bowing in churches)*, and *13 (placing the Communion Table where the Altar formerly stood)*, since these four libels touch on the matters further discussed in connection with the martyrdom of King Charles I, *infra*, and so Burton here isolated some much broader issues in the wider anti-Anglican English Puritan revolutionaries’ views. *Libel 1-7* deal with all three men as co-defendants; whereas *Libel 8* is jointly against Burton and Prynne as co-defendants; and *Libels 9-14* are against Burton alone as defendant.

*Libel 1* of “innovations” in not having “sermons in London” on “fast” days is fairly answered by Laud through reference to exigencies that arose due to disease “infected places” (pp. 16-18). Whether or not one agrees with this policy, it was certainly not designed “to advance or usher in Popery” (p. 54). *Libel 2* of a “Wednesday” “fast-day” being “without preaching” “lectures in London,” is fairly answered by Laud. He says that having “Wednesday for the fast-day was no innovation” for it long predated his incumbency as Archbishop, and further says he “had no aim to bring in Popery; nor to suppress all, or any” “Wednesday lectures in London.” The basic claims are thus false.

*Libel 3* of “the prayer for seasonable weather” being “purged out of” the “last Fast Book,” “which was,” “say they” three, i.e., Bastwick, Burton, and Prynne, was “one cause of shipwrecks and tempestuous weather,” is thus answered by Laud. He says that the “bishops” have “power” “to put in, or leave out, whatsoever they think fit for the present occasion: as their predecessors have done before them. Provided,” that is, “that nothing be in” the Fast Book that is “contrary to the Doctrine or Discipline of the Church of England.” Since they were presently enjoying “seasonable weather,” the prayer was not included. However, “any Minister” who “found it necessary,” “might with ease, and

without danger, have supplied” any “want” on this matter, “by using that prayer to the same purpose which is in the ordinary liturgy” i.e., the prayer book of 1559 & 1604 (pp. 10-12)<sup>186</sup>.

I do not find *some elements* of his response to be *wise theology*, since I do not think we should wait for a disaster to first strike, before praying for God’s help; but think that we should pray God that we avoid such disasters. In arguing that one should first wait for a disaster before praying about it, Laud spoke too strongly in his own defence, and should have been more circumspect. E.g., the Litany prayer, now found in the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)*, but before this time in Crammer’s earlier prayer books, includes the petition, “From lightning and tempest; from plague, pestilence, and famine; from battle and murder, and from sudden death, *Good Lord, deliver us.*” Laud would surely not disagree with this, and if this petition from the Litany were specifically pointed out to him, he would surely accept it as good theology. Why then does Laud not refer to this? *Once again, the answer seems to be the fact that Laud was so engrossed in judging his own case, his powers of reason were biased towards himself, and he was not sufficiently circumspect in his thinking.*

Nevertheless, Laud is right to point to the theology of the prayer book’s prayer, “For Fair Weather,” now found in the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)*, but originally coming from Cranmer’s 1549 prayer book (and having some resemblance to an older Collect in the Sarum Missal). “O Almighty Lord God, who for the sin of man didst once drown all the world, except eight persons, and afterward of thy great mercy didst promise to never again destroy it so again; we humbly beseech thee, that although we for our iniquities have worthily deserved a plague of rain and waters, yet upon our true repentance thou wilt send us such weather, as that we may receive the fruits of the earth in due season; and learn both by the punishment to amend our lives, and for thy clemency to give thee praise and glory; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*”

Therefore I think it too much to say, as the three Puritans did, that Laud and the bishops omitted this prayer from the fast book as part of a design “to advance or usher in Popery” (p. 54). I.e., presumably the Puritan logic here was that by the destruction of British ships, the bishops were hoping to weaken the realm and so make it more susceptible to Papist attack (see *Libel 10, infra*). In saying that any Minister was still left with the prayer in the prayer book for seasonable weather, *supra*, Laud must surely demolish the basic supercilious claim of the three Puritans that the bishops were desirous of facilitating poor weather and shipwrecks.

*Libel 4* that “a very useful Collect” is “left out, and a clause omitted in another” in the Fast Book, *supra*, is fairly answered by Laud. He says, “Though God did deliver our forefathers out of Romish superstition, yet (God be blessed for it) we were never in” it; and the Bishops “thought fit” “to alter” this Collect, per *supra*. Personally, I would have

---

<sup>186</sup> The Elizabethan prayer book of 1559, it was minimally modified in Jacobean times in 1604, most particularly when the section on the sacraments was added in the *Catechism*, according to (uncertain) tradition, by Bishop Overall.

modified the old Collect to one thanking God that in our forefather's day God delivered us from Romanism, and ensured a stronger anti-Romanist spirit remained than that which Laud wanted. But this is not what the libelers were saying, even though I think they were right to detect that Laud lacked the stronger anti-Romanist spirit of traditional Reformed Anglicans. *Libel 5* that "in the" "Fast" Book, "there is a passage left out concerning the abuse of fasting in relation to merit." Laud says this was done, "Because in this age and kingdom there is little opinion of meriting by fasting." As with *Libel 4 et al*, one may agree or disagree with the usage of Laud's discretion here in the facts of *Libel 5*, and different men may use their discretions differently on such matters. Nevertheless, once again this is a reasonable response to show that Laud was not, in the terms claimed by the libelers, by this means seeking "to advance or usher in Popery" (p. 54).

*Libel 6* that Lady Elizabeth and her royal children "are 'dashed' (that's their terminology) out of the new Collect, whereas they were in the Collect of the former Book" of Common Prayer. Laud reasonably replies that this "was done according to the" "ordinary" "course of the Church, which" "names none in the prayer, but the right line descending." Moreover, "this was not done till the King himself commanded it."

Laud's reply to this libel is also significant in dealing with Puritan claims that the King was seeking to bring in Popery. Laud asks "what must be the consequence here? The Queen of Bohemia and her children are left out of the Collect; therefore the prelates intend to bring in Popery. For that ... they say is the end of all these 'innovations.' Now if this be the end and the consequence, truly the *libelers ... poison" the King's "people with this conceit. That the Lady Elizabeth and her children would keep Popery out of this kingdom, but the King and his children will not. ...* For my part, I honour the Queen of Bohemia, and her line ..., and shall be as ready to serve them, but I know not how to depart from my allegiance" i.e., the royal line has now descended to Charles I (pp. 25-27, emphasis mine).

*Libel 7* that the words, "who are the Father of thine elect and of their seed" are changed in the Collect for the son of King Charles I, namely, Prince Charles (later King Charles II), and "with a most spiteful inference, that this was done by the prelates to exclude the King's children out of the number of God's elect" i.e., "elect" in the royal line of being kings and princes of the realm. "And they call it 'an intolerable impiety and horrid treason'," that is here committed by the Anglican Bishops. Prince Charles was born in 1630, and so was seven years old at the time of this trial in 1637. Laud reasonably replies that due to the prince's young age, "it was done by" the "special direction" of "His Majesty" King Charles I, "as" the Prince "having then no children to pray for" (pp. 27-29).

Here ends the joint charges of *Libels 1-7* against Bastwick, Burton, and Prynne as triple co-defendants. I think on all these libels the three co-defendants should stand guilty as charged. Elements of *Libel 8* are jointly against Burton and Prynne as co-defendants, though it is primarily focused on Burton; and *Libels 9-14* are against Burton.

Now “rebellion,” saith the Word of the Lord, “is as the sin of witchcraft” (I Sam. 15:23). *Libels 9, 11, 12, & 13* shall be dealt with at the end after *Libel 14*, since these libels deal with broader issues in the wider anti-Anglican Puritan views. These anti-Anglican views would ultimately result in the (mainly English) Puritan’s GREAT REBELLION (or English Civil Wars) of 1642 to 1651 under Oliver Cromwell against both Charles I and Charles II. In turn this would result in the republic under Oliver Cromwell which upon its collapse ended with the Restoration of Charles II in 1660. These libels lay behind actions that would ultimately see bloodthirsty Puritans first killing Archbishop Laud in 1645; then killing King Charles I in 1649, an event later to be annually remembered on *King Charles I’s Day* every 30 January; and then establishing Cromwell’s drag-net of death, in which republican forces were ordered to frantically run to and fro from one end of England to the other, in an abortive bid to capture and kill the young Charles II in 1651, an event later to be annually remembered in lesser form on *King Charles I’s Day* (30 Jan.) and in greater form on *Royal Oak Day* (29 May).

*Libel 8*, that in the Epistle reading from Philp. 2:5-11 for the *Sunday Next Before Easter*, the Anglican bishops “have put out ‘in,’ and made it ‘at,’” i.e., “That *at* the name of Jesus every knee should bow” (Philp. 2:10), and this “is directly against the Act of Parliament” establishing the prayer book in 1559. (This same reading may now be found in the *Book of Common Prayer, 1662.*)

In the Greek, Philp. 2:10 reads “*en* (in / at) *to* (‘the,’ dative singular neuter definite article, from *o*) *onomati* (‘name,’ dative singular neuter noun, from *onoma*)” i.e., *en* + a dative = “in” or “at” depending on context. Though it would be theoretically possible to render this as either, “at (*en*) the name of Jesus” (AV) or “in (*en*) the name of Jesus” (ASV), since those who “bow” the “knee” include those “under the earth,” i.e., in hell, this would require a universalist connotation that everyone is “in ... Jesus.” This being repugnant to both the immediate context of this epistle (Philp. 1:28; 3:18,19), and elsewhere in the writings of this same apostle (e.g., Eph. 2:12), and also in other portions of Holy Scripture (e.g., Matt. 25:31-46), the earlier rendering, “in” was an inadvertent mistake, being not thought through with sufficient care, and being better rendered as “at.” (That the ASV translators would return to this mistake, is a sad comment on their shallowness here.)

Laud first admits that the earlier rendering, “in” was one of those “slips” of human error than can occur. He defends the reading, “at,” as consonant with Greek “grammar.” He says “at” is found “in the” “learned translation made in” the “time” of “King James” i.e., the King James Version (1611), and says this is also the translation found in “the Geneva Translation” (Geneva Bible) of “1557.” As to this being a change to the Act of Parliament of 1559, Laud says that while “the *Common Prayer Book* was confirmed by Act of Parliament,” that “if anything were falsely printed then, the parliament did not intend to pass those slips for current” usage; and further says that “one word” may “be put in for another” as “they both bear the same *sense*” (pp. 29-31).

Certainly I agree with Laud that the rendering of Philp 2:10 as, “At the name of Jesus” is to be preferred, and that this is not *necessarily* an “innovation” of the bishops

since it is consonant with the Greek, and is found long before Laud's time in the Geneva Bible of 1557 and King James Version of 1611.

However, I find that under strict scrutiny there is a fundamental contradiction between Laud's claim that on the one hand, "if anything were falsely printed then, the parliament did not intend to pass those slips for current" usage; and on the other hand, Laud's claim that "one word" may "be put in for another" as "they both bear the same *sense*." How can something be one of "those slips" Laud refers to, and simultaneously really "bear the same *sense*?" Was this earlier rendering right or wrong? I think it was wrong, and so did Laud. Moreover, Burton was absolutely correct here in saying that no such change should be made without the consent of parliament. The proper procedure would have been for Archbishop Laud, who by virtue of his office was a Member of the House of Lords, to seek to pass an amendment to the 1559 & 1604 prayer book. He failed to do this, and was fairly criticized for this. (This same proclivity of Laud emerged in the illegal canon of 1640, *supra*.)

Moreover, as to the claim that Laud and the bishops were here making "an innovation" of theology, this should also be joined with the statement of *Laud's case* (1644, House of Lords) *supra*, where on 27 May, 1644 (11th day of hearing), a witness "says, 'there was bowing at the name of Jesus'," and Laud does not dispute this, but says, so "there should" be, "and the canon of the Church requires it"<sup>187</sup>. I.e., there is a contextual connection between this correct rendering of Philp. 2:10, and a practice under Laud of "bowing at the name of Jesus" in church. Thus it is clear that contextually this Scripture was being misused with reference to canon 18 of the Ecclesiastical Canons of 1603, *supra*, to first try and justify the misguided theoretical concept of "bowing the knee" at the name of Jesus in church services; and then, because this is not practical, the modification of this to "bowing the neck" i.e., "nodding at the name of Jesus." As already observed, *supra*, this turns the verse that is meant to justify the practice on its head.

Furthermore, this is not what Philp. 2:10 is referring to in the first place anyway. The meaning of this verse is that "God" requires that "every" person will on bended "knee," "confess" in the sense of *acknowledge*, that "Jesus Christ is Lord." They will do so whether they acknowledge the Lordship of Christ as a saved person "in heaven," or "in earth," or as an unsaved person "under the earth" in hell (Philp. 2:9-11). As to the unsaved, "The Lord [God the Father] said unto my Lord [God the Son], Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool" (Ps. 110:1); and "the Lord" who is God the Father, says of God the "Son," "I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance," "Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." Those who do not acknowledge the Lordship of Christ in this life, will certainly do so in hell, when the Lord "shalt break them" (Ps. 2:9). For he who is Lord of heaven and earth, is also Lord of hell (for God, not as some claim, the Devil, is in charge of hell). *Any claim that this verse in Philp. 2:10 refers to the idea of Christian believers' genuflecting or nodding at the name of Jesus in a church service is contextual*

---

<sup>187</sup> Laud's *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 221.

*nonsense!*

In the liturgical context of the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), this reading from Philp. 2:5-11, together with the Gospel reading of Matt. 27:1-54 is on *The Sunday Next Before Easter* (Palm Sunday). The theme of these Communion readings includes the idea of *Christ the King* (Matt. 27:11,37), and confession of Christ as Lord (Matt. 27:54); hence the appropriateness of Philp. 2:10. (Cf. the Matins reading of Isa. 9, which includes description of Christ as, “The mighty God,” and “The Prince of Peace,” Isa. 9:6; and the Evensong reading of Luke 19:28-48; 20:9-20, which in this Palm Sunday context includes Luke 19:38, “Blessed be the King that cometh in the name of the Lord”). *Any attempt to claim that the Anglican usage of Philp. 2:10 for Palm Sunday was meant to promote “nodding at the name of Jesus,” is an innovation and distortion as to the proper and appropriate usage of this reading on the Sunday Next Before Easter.*

We are not sure exactly how Laud got the idea of “nodding” at the name of Jesus from “bowing at the name of Jesus.” We simply do not know. But we do know that Laudians were looking to put a greater distance between Anglican worship and Puritan worship, and evidently someone in the Laudian circle “had a great brain-wave” that they could, in a very legalistic way, exploit the language of the Ecclesiastical Canons to this end. It looks very much like a lawyer’s trick. Certainly in terms of clear time verification, “bowing at the name of Jesus” seems to have been a Laudian innovation.

We have no evidence that will stand up for this practice in the earlier Elizabethan times that it is meant to have come from, where it referred to a general due and lowly reverence in the heart and mind of listeners when in broad terms Christ was focused on. Indeed, given the nexus between this practice and the purported meaning of Philp. 2:10; the fact that no change was made to the readings of the prayer book in 1604, indicates that idea was still not around at that time either. Thus there are good reasons to conclude that this illegal innovation was put through by Laud, *on the sly*. I.e., if the Parliament was presented with the proposition that a verse being misused to argue for “nodding at the name of Jesus” in church services was now specifically being put into the prayer book at the behest of an Archbishop seeking to use it to promote the practice of nodding at the name of Jesus in church services, they may well have wanted to investigate this matter further, and Laud was anxious to avoid any such scrutiny or objections.

The connection with Philp. 2:10 and nodding is somewhat speculative. We are reconstructing discussions and the origins of practices inside the Laudian circle by guessing, and perhaps guessing wrongly. But possibly, first came “the great brain-wave” of someone in the Laudian circle which was adopted when it was decided to so read the thing into the Ecclesiastical Canons, and for the purposes of justification, harness the idea to Philp. 2:10. Perhaps they then tried it out, but e.g., when they genuflected at “Jesus” with a chalice in their murky hands at the Communion rail, much to their chagrin, they then spilt Communion wine all over themselves, as one of them cried out something like, “Blast it!”, as he raced out of the church to try and wash the staining red wine off his surplice. Frustrated and fuming, perhaps with some unholy and profane language coming from their lips, they may then have walked off in anger at the failing of their

“great brain-wave.” Later, more calmed and settled down, either Laud by himself, or those in the Laudian circle, may then have then sat down to think the thing through further. At that point, someone in the Laudian circle might have had the second “great brain-wave” i.e., modify the thing by making it “nodding at the name of Jesus.” “Brilliant idea” one of them might have said; as another added, “We’ll yet make the Anglican Church more anti-Puritan than those virulently *Protestant* Anglicans want!” Though this is conjectural, such an evolution by trial and error may help to explain how a verse on *bowing at the name of Jesus* came to be used as the “proof text” for *nodding at the name of Jesus*.

*Though we cannot be sure as to how this practice originated in the Laudian circle, we have both a bad motive for Laud in wanting this correct rendering of Philp. 2:10 put in the prayer book i.e., purportedly to justify nodding in church services; and also a clearly illegal act by Laud i.e., changing the prayer book of 1559 & 1604 without a change to the Act of Parliament<sup>188</sup>. This means that when Laud (and his Laudians) later sought to get the illegal 1640 canons through without the consent of Parliament, he was “up to his old tricks.” Therefore on this occasion with respect to Libel 8, Laud must stand guilty of introducing an innovation. But it should be added that there is no evidence that Laud was trying to accomplish by this the ushering in of Popery as alleged. Rather, it would be more accurate to say that Laud had a semi-Romanist penchant, here manifested in this “nodding” nonsense, and that like others following this practice, he wrongly claimed this was taught in Philp. 2:10. It also seems quite likely that Laud was trying to establish a further demarcation line between Anglicans and Puritans. I.e., because the Laudians were seeking to roll back the second stage Reforms of the Anglican Church accomplished under Queen Elizabeth and found e.g., in the Homilies of Article 35 of the 39 Articles, Laud’s anti-Puritanism was excessive relative to the normative and more moderate anti-Puritanism more generally characterizing Reformed Anglicans. Laud was also looking for legalistic levers whereby he could cajole Anglicans into his Laudianism; a tendency seem later in the disgraceful dismissal of 13 bishops who refused to submit to the illegal canons of 1640, before they were declared illegal by Parliament.*

*Once again then, the fact that here in Libel 8 Laud both did not clearly distinguish between his private opinions and the publicly declared doctrine of the Anglican Church, and also the fact that Laud was judging his own case, shows itself as a conflict of interest between litigant and judge that blurred his capacity to make a fair and impartial finding.*

On the one hand, it is true that Puritan propagandists sometimes exaggerated what Laud was doing here. E.g., in 1640, Laud was asked, “And when you so devoutly kneel before your altar at the receiving of the sacrament ... what is it a sign of? ... Of your

---

<sup>188</sup> Concerning Laud’s preparedness to act illegally, compare the same issue in the 1640 canons i.e., their illegality, in “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” section “b) William Laud,” subsection, “Some instances of ‘Laud’s Popery’ as fairly being characterized as Laud’s Innovations,” *supra*.

adoring the crucifix (cross) upon or over your altar?<sup>189</sup>” The implication that because Laud and other Anglicans knelt to receive Communion, they did thereby *adore the crucifix* (cross), is the type of Puritan propaganda that may be selectively cited by some Puseyites seeking to justify the idolatrous practice of kissing and adoring crucifixes from the time of the 19th century on.

But on the other hand, putting aside such complexities which can blur some of the actual issues, as to the substance of Burton’s *Libel 8* claim, namely, that Laud and the bishops were here making “an innovation” of theology, I find for Burton and against Laud, since it is clear that by this correct rendering of Philp. 2:10; Laud was seeking to promote the incorrect practice of nodding at the name of Jesus in church services. As to Burton’s claim that Laud was here making an unauthorized change to the 1559 Act of Parliament establishing the 1559 & 1604 prayer book, I find for Burton and against Laud; since if Laud wanted to make this amendment, he should have first sought and succeeded in putting an amendment to the 1559 Act through the parliament. But it seems that Laud, who as Archbishop of Canterbury was a Member of the House of Lords, did not want this done, lest this admittedly more accurate and justifiable rendering of Philp. 2:10, should result in an investigation of his unwarranted and unjustifiable practice of “bowing [i.e., nodding] at the name of Jesus” in church services.

*Libel 10* that “the prayer for the navy is left out of the late Book for the Fast” (see *Libel 3, supra*), is reasonably answered by Laud that “the King had no declared enemy then nor (God be thanked) hath he now. Nor had he then any navy at sea.” On the one hand, Laud thus fairly rejects the Puritan Burton’s ridiculous claim that this “were a piece of the prelate plots to bring in Popery from beyond the sea,” and so “they left out the prayer for the Navy.”

But on the other hand, *the conflict of interest in Laud judging his own case once again emerges in his rhetoric*. Laud says, “perhaps Mr. Burton intended to befriend Dr. Bastwick, and in the navy bring hither the *Whore of Babylon* [i.e., Popery, Rev. 17] to be ready for his Christening” (pp. 39-41). This type of nonsense, in which Laud indulges in some personal invective against Burton and Bastwick, evidently regarding them as intending to be re-baptized as Roman Catholics, (presumably meant in a jocular or sarcastic rather than a serious way,) and pretending that perhaps it is they who wish to bring in Popery in order that the Roman Church might baptize them, is absolutely beyond the pale of what is acceptable or what an impartial judge would ever think or say. Thus *the finding here of Libel 10 though a fair one, is nevertheless blurred by a conflict of interest in which Laud is judge of his own case against the accused, and uses the opportunity for some personal invective and ridicule of the accused*.

*Libel 14* is that the Anglican “prelates, to justify their proceedings, have forged a new Article of Religion” in the *Thirty-Nine Articles*, “brought from Rome (which gives them full power to alter the Doctrine and Discipline of” the Anglican “Church...) and

---

<sup>189</sup> *Hierurgia Anglicana*, p. 359; citing a Puritan “witness,” in *A Reply to the Relation of the conference between William Laud and Mr. Fisher the Jesuit*, p. 106.

have foisted it (such is their language) into the beginning of the Twentieth Article ... in the last edition of the Articles, Anno 1628” as an “affront of His Majesty’s Declaration before them.” “The clause (which they say is forged by us) is this: ‘The Church,’ that is, *the Bishops*, as they expound it, ‘hath power to decree rites and [or ‘or,’ Latin, *et*] ceremonies, and authority in matters of faith. (The words are ‘controversies of faith,’ by their leave). This clause (say they) is a forgery ... . For ‘tis not to be found in the Latin or English Articles of Edward ... or Elizabeth, ratified by Parliament.”

Laud cites a copy of “the Articles” from “1571” “printed both in Latin and English,” that contain this clause, and some later printings as well. The Articles were produced in both English and Latin first in 1563, and then after a final revision by convocation, in 1571. Hence Laud refers to the “Convocation” “of” “1571,” and says in the non-adversarial and inquisitorial form of the Star Chamber court, “I do here openly in [the] Star Chamber charge upon that ... sect” of Puritans like Burton *et al*, “this” “corruption of falsifying the Articles of the *Church of England*” (pp. 64-73).

Though I dislike this inquisitorial Star Chamber approach, where a fallen and frail human being such as Laud, can as a judge both “charge” and try an accused, a fact here greatly aggravated by the fact that Laud is also judge of his own libel case; I would nevertheless accept that *the basic element* of the claim made by Burton *et al*, namely, that Laud has introduced this clause into Article 20 as his own “innovation” is not entirely correct *in the form they presented it*.

Specifically, assuming that these pre-1628 copies of the Articles from 1593, 1605, 1612 cited by Laud are genuine (and I have not checked them), which Laud says are accurate based on his inspection of the Articles in the “Latin of the year 1563,” then there would appear to be an established precedent for printing the Article as “matters of faith” rather than “controversies of faith.” However, there is certainly also a precedent for the printing of Article 20 as “controversies of faith.” Thus Burton failed to make a clear distinction between black letter law which Laud did not make with respect to Article 20, and Laud’s discretion, both in selecting from these two possibilities, the reading, “matters of faith” in the 1628 printing of the Articles, and *then* by judicial interpretation of black letter law, Laud clearly giving an expanded legal meaning to Article 20. The complexities of this confusing situation in which Burton oversimplified the facts of his essentially correct case against Laud, nevertheless, by such oversimplification, muddied the waters, and allowed Laud to evade the basic issue.

Nevertheless, the important basic element of substance in Burton’s claim is correct I.e., by selecting these earlier printings as a precedent for the printing of the 1628 Articles with the words, “matters of faith;” and also by subsequent judicial interpretation, Laud undoubtedly expanded “controversies of faith” in Article 20 to mean “matters of faith.” With this expanded meaning he was then able to corrupt the Star Chamber Court so as to use it to more easily bring people under his control. The substance of Burton’s claim is therefore correct, even though the basic form that he put it in is incorrect.

Thus to Burton's claim I make *two important qualifications* that Laud does not. Firstly, this disputed clause was in fact added in before Laud, and was the source of some controversy. Secondly, Burton's view that Article 20 refers to "controversies of faith" (Burton) rather than "matters of faith" (Laud), is quite reasonable. Laud's claim that the "Latin of the year 1563," supports him is simply not correct. The Latin is "*fidei* (of faith) *controversiis* (controversies)," i.e., "controversies of faith" (Burton). This is a much better translation than "matters of faith" (Laud), and is generally so rendered in the English. The Latin noun used here is *controversia*, and is the origins of our English word, "controversy." Therefore the most natural rendering of it is as "controversies of faith," and Laud's claim that the Latin supports "matters of faith" is not correct. If this was the meaning, a more natural Latin word would e.g., be the noun, *propositio*, from which we get our English word, "proposition" i.e., "propositions" of faith.

Given that Laud was rendering this as "matters of faith" rather than "controversies of faith," by promoting as Archbishop that line of printings of the Articles that apparently had done this previously, and then judicially giving this *an expansive interpretation* that would allow him to more easily bring a matter to the Star Chamber; the substance in Burton's claim that Laud was trying to expand his powers through a combination of the Star Chamber and his interpretation of Article 20 is correct. Thus *Laud's finding here on Libel 14, though containing some elements of truth with respect to Burton's overly simplistic method of explaining this reading, is more a factor that appears to have been used by Laud as a cloak to dodge the real issue. Thus Laud did in fact give an expansive interpretation of Article 20 as "matters of faith," which allowed him to more easily bring to court, and adjudicate, a matter (or incident) in the Star Chamber. Once again this appears to have been influenced by a conflict of interest in which Laud was judge, prosecutor, and jury in his own case against the accused; and a further conflict of interest in which Laud is defending his own inquisitorial powers in the increasingly corrupt Star Chamber, being used in this very case, and at least in part being based on this unlikely rendering of Article 20 as "matters" (Laud) rather than "controversies" (Burton).*

Therefore, as to the form of Burton's argument, I find for Laud, since he was not the innovator of the incorrect terminology of the black letter law of this clause in Article 20. But as to the substance of Burton's argument, I find for Burton, since Laud not only selected this incorrect pre-existing terminology on the inaccurate basis that it is supported by the "Latin of the year 1563," but also then gave Article 20 an expanded judicial interpretation, thus moving from the reading "controversies of faith" to "matters of faith," in order to expand his powers. Burton was quite right to say that Laud's expansive interpretation was an "affront of His Majesty's Declaration before them," since this requires "that no man" "put his own sense or comment to the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense." But it also highlights a great weakness of "His Majesty's Declaration," namely that the matters ultimately revolve around judicial interpretation, and if "the law is slacked," "judgment doth never go forth: for the wicked doth compass about the righteous; therefore wrong judgment proceedeth" (Hab. 1:4). (This same problem is well known in modern times, with the very wicked judicial interpretations that have characterized the US Supreme Court since about the time of

*Brown's case*, 1954, on.)

I shall now consider *Libels 9, 11, 12, & 13*.

*Libel 9* refers to “the prayers set forth for the fifth of November” i.e., *Papists' Conspiracy Day*. The prayers were changed in two places. “The first place is changed thus, from, ‘Root out that Babylonish and Antichristian sect [i.e., Roman Catholicism], which say of Jerusalem,’ etc., into this form of words, ‘Root out that Babylonish and Antichristian sect of *them* [Roman Catholics] which say’ etc.,” i.e., the words, “of them” are added. “The second place went thus in the old [prayer], ‘Cut off these workers of iniquity, whose [Roman Catholic] religion is rebellion.’ But in the book printed 1625 ‘tis thus altered, ‘Cut off those workers of iniquity, who turn [Christian] religion into [Roman Catholic] rebellion,’ etc. .”

*This Libel 9 is more widely important since it very specifically touches on the broad Puritan claim that Laud and Charles I were anti-Protestant and pro-Papist.* The evidence such as we have it, is more that Laud was anti-later second stage reforms of the English Reformation i.e., he was more towards the first or Lutheran stage of the Reformation. But to make the picture more complex, he then added certain new Laudian practices not found in Lutheranism, such as nodding, which gave Laudianism a stronger semi-Romish character and feel to it than one finds in Lutheranism; but which was nevertheless seen by him as still Protestant in terms of its endorsement of the Lutheran Reformation. This continued support for the Lutheran Reformation makes the semi-Romanism of Laudianism fundamentally different to the semi-Romanism of Puseyism. The Puseyites seek to capture the semi-Romanist sentiment of Laudianism, but then to detach it from the pro-Lutheran Reformation sentiment of Laudianism.

These prayers mentioned in *Libel 9* were for use in conjunction with the Office of *Papists' Conspiracy Day*, and so did not require the consent of Parliament to change them. Laud's reply includes the view that there were “but three religions to have been of old in the world, Paganism [i.e., all heathen religion is essentially the same], Judaism, and Christianity. And now they have added a fourth, which is Turkism [i.e., Mohammedanism], and [Islam] is an absurd mixture of the other three<sup>190</sup>.” Since Roman Catholicism is Christianity perverted, it “teaches rebellion” and so *turns religion into rebellion* (pp. 32-39).

Without considering Laud's full reply, it seems to me that Burton and those Puritans taking his type of view, *failed to see the wood from the trees*. Like the later Puseyites who love to cite these Puritan's propaganda as fact, these Puritans wanted to develop Laud's semi-Romanist views in such a way as to make Laudianism look more Romish, and less attached to certain elements of the Lutheran Reformation, than in fact it really was. The reality is that both Laud and Charles I supported *Papists' Conspiracy Day*, e.g., Laud says of these changes in the prayers for 5 November that, “His Majesty

---

<sup>190</sup> Some prefer a threefold break-up of Christians, infidels (Jews, Mohammedans, or other non-Christians still believing in one God), and pagans.

expressly commanded me to make the alterations” (pp. 33-34), an important fact showing that Charles I supported the keeping of this holy day.

Moreover, this prayer clearly endorsed by both the King and Archbishop, describes Roman Catholicism as “Babylonish and Antichristian.” This is historicist terminology, considering that first Imperial Rome, and then Papal Rome, is the Babylon of the Book of Revelation, and the Pope is the Antichrist. I.e., “Antichristian” used in this context, is a declension of “Antichrist.” *The fact that both Charles I and Laud endorsed Protestant historicism in this prayer is surely significant.*

Whatever one thinks of these two changes to these prayers, *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* was, and remains, a strongly pro-Protestant and anti-Papist holy day. No-one who fairly recognizes both this and the support for this holy day given to it by both King Charles I and Archbishop Laud, could possibly claim that either man had any desire “to advance or usher in Popery” (p. 54). Burton here is like the Jews who quibbled over eating the unclean OT Jewish food of a “gnat,” but would then “swallow” the unclean OT Jewish food of “a camel” (Matt. 23:24).

The reality is that *Papists’ Conspiracy Day*, whether in its pre-1689 form that did not include William of Orange’s coming on 5 November 1688, or its post 1689 form, is in its sentiment a Protestant holy day *par excellence*. With church bells tolling all day, canons firing, and Anglican Churches the length and breadth of England, Ireland, and Wales, all celebrating the Office of *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* (before 1859), and bonfires lit at night in connection with clear Protestant imagery, *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* or *Gunpowder Treason Day*, is the most rousing celebration of Protestantism that any Protestant Church has ever come up with. The fireworks of the day were more than the equal of the Chinaman’s pagan new year festivity fireworks. *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* historically stood with Christmas and Easter as one of the three most popular days in the Anglican Church’s calendar. Even when the secular state tried to close it down from 1859, it stuck around as *Bonfire Night* or *Guy Fawkes’ Day*, even though in some ways *Bonfire Night* was but a pale reflection of its former glory.

Therefore, if someone wanted to argue that the removal of *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* from the Anglican Calendar, and the removal of its Office in 1859, constituted a secularist sentiment that was pro-Papist in tolerance and anti-Protestant in that it ceased to uphold the unique truthfulness of Protestantism, and thank God for its protection in 1605 and 1688, then I would think that fair comment. But neither King Charles I nor Archbishop Laud would tolerate such a thing. How absurd then it really is to suggest that by these two changes to two prayers, that Laud was seeking to “to advance or usher in Popery;” and how absurd are comparable claims found more generally in Puritan (or Puritan derived) propaganda! The Puseyites hate the rousing Protestant sentiment of *Papists’ Conspiracy Day*. Though the Puseyites say they are the devotees of Laud and Charles, they would not have been well received by either of them on this issue of celebrating the very anti-Romanist and pro-Protestant, *Papists’ Conspiracy Day*<sup>191</sup>.

---

<sup>191</sup> See e.g., the anti-Papists’ Conspiracy Day Sermon of the Puseyite

Before considering *Libel's 11, 12, & 13* individually, it is necessary to first consider a common element in them, namely, Laud's belief in Lutheran consubstantiation. The stated and public doctrine of the Anglican prayer book and 39 Articles specifically rejected "transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lord," as that which "cannot be proved by holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture" (Article 28, *39 Articles*). This was reinforced by the rubric on kneeling at Communion in the 1552 prayer book, which specifically rejected the "real and essential presence ... of Christ's natural flesh and blood." A strong bias was given to Cranmer's symbolistic view in that it was in the prayer book's Communion Service words, "...Take and eat this in *remembrance* that Christ died for thee, and feed on him *in thy heart by faith* with thanksgiving," and "... Drink this *in remembrance* that Christ's blood was shed for thee ... ."

Nevertheless, *as a private opinion*, and from the evidence such as we have it, a *minority private opinion*, one could still believe in a *corporeal presence* of Christ via Luther's consubstantiation, providing one did not thereby seek to idolatrously adore the consecrated elements. I.e., one could argue with Luther that there was no *transubstantiation* i.e., *no change of the bread and wine into Christ's body and blood* (per Anglican Article 28, *supra*), but that there was a *corporeal presence* of Christ body and blood which were *in, under, around,* and so *united with* the bread and wine. Reformed Anglicans allowed this view up till 1662, when the 1552 rubric was changed from rejecting the "real and essential presence ... of Christ's natural flesh and blood" (transubstantiation), to rejecting "any corporeal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood" (transubstantiation or consubstantiation).

Laud held this minority view of Lutheran consubstantiation at a time before 1662, when Reformed Anglicans were prepared to *tolerate* it in their midst. But Laud does not

---

Archdeacon Denison in 1854 referred to in Commentary Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface section "(6) Broad Protestant support for Gunpowder Treason Day." subsection, "(a) Anglican Protestantism." Or the Puseyite Alfred Bird falsely claims, "Charles the First" "laid" "the foundations of Anglicanism" as "non-Roman but not anti-Roman." In this inaccurate context he further refers to the "service – with the title 'Gunpowder Plot' or 'Papists Conspiracy' being a thanksgiving for deliverance from the plot to blow up the Houses of Parliament on 5 November 1605." He then falsely claims that "in 1859 the Gunpowder Plot commemoration was regarded as being unnecessarily offensive to Roman Catholics, but to abolish this service and retain that for Charles the Martyr would have seemed an arbitrary decision, and so all three services were abolished. *It was more or less accidental that with the abolition of the services the commemoration of Charles disappeared*" (Bird, A., 1978 Sermon, *infra*, pp. 1 & 8, emphasis mine). The fact that Puseyites like Bird support the abolition of Papists' Conspiracy Day, but not the abolition of Charles I's Day, claiming it was the "accidental" bi-product of getting rid of Papists' Conspiracy Day which was "unnecessarily offensive to Roman Catholics," shows the extent to which Puseyites both pervert the remembrance of Charles I's Day and the Protestant history of Anglicanism.

make a clear distinction between the *public* doctrine of the Anglican Church which at that time allowed, but did not endorse Lutheran consubstantiation, and his own personal and private belief in *the corporeal presence* of Christ through consubstantiation over the Communion Table. I shall return to this matter in discussing *Libel 12, infra*.

Those who like Laud adhere to Lutheran consubstantiation sometimes, also like Lutherans, refer to the Communion Table as “an altar.” Once again, this was a *private opinion* of Laud’s (and Laudians), since the prayer book always refers to a “table” alone. (Although in the illegal canons of 1640, Laudians sought to formally reintroduce the usage of the term, “altar.”) But it should be understood that those following this view did not mean “altar” in the Roman Catholic sense, for Article 31 of the Anglican *39 Articles* says, “the sacrifices of masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.”

Rather, this is the idea that the unconsecrated bread and wine are “offered” to God when placed on the Communion Table, (or in an Anglican Church the “Offertory” or money collection is so placed on the Lord’s Table,) and so there is a sense in which it is “an altar.” This is a *private interpretation*. It does not represent the doctrine and discipline of the Anglican Church which *acknowledges only a Table*. Laud admits as much when he refers to Elizabethan injunctions stating that, “The Holy Table in every Church ... shall be decently made and set in the place where the altar stood” (p. 56, *Libel 13, infra*) i.e., the Anglican Church now has a “Holy Table” rather than an “Altar.” He thus says, “the Holy Table, or the Altar, (call it whether you will),” (p. 43, *Libel 12, infra*). But once again, Laud does not make a clear and concise distinction between the doctrine and discipline of the Anglican Church, which recognized a Communion Table and *only* a “Table” under the names of “Holy Table” or “Lord’s Table,” and *his own private view* that the Communion Table may also be called “an altar.”

On the one hand, it must be admitted that the combination of Laud’s private views on *Lutheran* consubstantiation with a corporeal presence of Christ’s body and blood on “an altar;” and his private views on the threefold episcopal ministry being divine law (rather than something found to be useful and good and so retained by Reformation Anglicans); when coupled with his failure to make a clear and concise distinction between publicly declared and required Anglican doctrine and discipline in the prayer book and articles, as opposed to his permitted private views; helped to facilitate a situation where a Puritan might, *prima facie*, wrongly think Laud was seeking to “to advance or usher in Popery” (p. 54) i.e., Romanism Proper; even though Laud was certainly a semi-Romanist. And of course, this was then aggravated by the Laudians illegal canons of 1640 which reintroduced the words “altar” and “Eucharist,” before being justly declared illegal later in the same year after they had been already used to impeach thirteen Anglican Bishops (and no doubt many more bishops would have been later so impeached had they not been declared illegal)<sup>192</sup>. *Once again, a conflict of*

---

<sup>192</sup> See these elements in Bray, G (Ed.), *The Anglican Canons, op. cit.*, pp. 561 & 571 (“Eucharist”) and 570 (“altar”); referred to in “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,”

*interest in which Laud is judge of his own case against the accused meant that he did not recognize this issue, and lacked appropriate reflection on how some of his actions might be genuinely misunderstood or misinterpreted.*

But on the other hand, such a persistent view of Laud as maintained by the three Puritans in this court case was very selective of the evidence, and failed to consider the general support given to a Laudian modified Lutheran-Anglican type of Protestantism by Laud. If the Puritans wanted to argue that e.g., they considered Luther had not purged all the old leaven of Rome out of the lump of Reformed doctrine as seen by his sacramentalism (a view that most Reformed Anglicans would agree with any such Puritans on), that would be a reasonable comment. If they then developed this, and said that Lutheran consubstantiation was therefore semi-Romanist and they did not agree with it, and that Laud's support for Lutheran consubstantiation (i.e., before 1662), and associated view that the Communion Table was an "altar," were *private views* then allowed Anglicans, but not held by most Reformed Anglicans, so that Laudianism had a semi-Romanist sentiment contrary to the second stage of the English Reformation then that would also have been a fair comment. But instead, they libelously claimed Laud was seeking to "to advance or usher in Popery" (p. 54). There was an element of truth in the claim since Laudianism is semi-Romanist; but there is also a fundamental error in the claim since Laudianism still looks with favor on the basic elements of the Lutheran Reformation i.e., Laudianism was semi-Romanist but not Romanist Proper, and still sought to maintain some kind of theological linkage with the Lutheran Reformation as opposed to Popery, which it was not seeking to "usher in."

Let us now consider *Libel's 11, 12, & 13*. *Libels 11 & 13* have a close connection with each other, and so will be considered first.

*Libel 11* was "the reading of the" Communion "Service at the Communion Table or the Altar." On the one hand, Laud fairly says that this is no "innovation" designed "to advance or usher in Popery" (p. 54), but is supported in the Communion Service rubric of the 1559 & 1604 prayer book, "the priest standing at the north side of the Holy Table shall say the Lord's Prayer" etc. (pp. 41-42). This is simply a practice of Anglican Protestantism. (This rubric is retained in the 1662 prayer book, which reads, "Table" rather than "Holy Table," here, although uses the terms "Lord's Table" and "holy Table" elsewhere in the Communion Service for the Communion Table).

But on the other hand, Laud fails to state that his terminology "at the Communion Table" is the official teaching of the Anglican Church in her prayer book of 1559 & 1604 (and later 1662), whereas his view that this "Table" might also be called. "the Altar," was a *private view* that he held; and that the publicly declared doctrine of the Anglican Church always referred to this as a "table," never an "altar," and that indeed Reformed Anglicans would strongly oppose any suggestion that the Communion Table is an "altar."

---

section "b) William Laud," subsection, "Some instances of 'Laud's Popery' as fairly being characterized as Laud's Innovations," *supra*.

*This lack of qualification once again highlights the conflict of interest that existed with Laud being Crown Prosecutor, judge and jury in his own case, and wanting by inference to give his own private Laudian views a greater import than was warranted. It shows how the Puritans were simultaneously attacking both orthodox Anglicanism and Laudian Anglicanism, and how Laud was happy to accept this false paradigm and defend the two simultaneously, even as Puseyites are happy to accept this false Puritan paradigm.*

*Libel 13:* “The placing of the holy Table altar-wise, at the upper end of the Chancel, that is, the setting of it north and south, and placing a rail before it, ... Mr. Burton says, ‘is done to advance and usher in Popery’” (pp. 52-64).

Laud fairly refers to Elizabethan injunctions of Queen Elizabeth I, such as Canon 82, or Jacobean injunctions of King James I, that “the Communion Table should ordinarily be set and stand with the side to the east wall of the Chancel’.” E.g., one Elizabethan injunction said, “that when the altar is taken down, the Holy Table shall be set in .. the place where the altar stood’.” This is also required from the prayer book rubric mentioned in *Libel 11, supra*, since for a priest to stand “at the north side of the Table,” requires that the Communion Table is at the east end of the Church, i.e., in the language of the Elizabethan injunction, “at the place where the altar stood” in earlier times.

Laud does not expand much on the issue of a Communion rail. Despite the attention often given this matter by writers, this was something neither required nor prohibited in Anglican Churches before Laud’s time. It was an option before Laud, but made compulsory after Laud, and traditional Reformed (Evangelical) Anglicans have historically been happy with it. Its promotion by Laud and subsequent widespread adoption, reminds us that while traditional Reformed Anglicans are anti-Laud, they are not as strongly so as the Puritans, who opposed both Laud’s Anglicanism and his Laudianism alike, making no clear distinction between them. In broad terms, the Communion rail was a good idea that served a practical function since kneeling to receive Communion is made easier with it. I.e., kneeling to receive Communion (discussed in *Libel 12, infra*) with a Communion rail, is useful in this context since in kneeling a communicant can lean and balance on the rail.

In July 2001, I was privileged to inspect old Croydon Palace in London which was then (as it only occasionally is,) open for public inspection. On this site, there has been something belonging to Archbishops of Canterbury since 809 A.D., and Croydon Palace was the summer home of Archbishops of Canterbury for centuries till 1780 (when the Archbishops sold this palace and went to Addington Palace), but now it is an Anglican Girls’ School and part of the Whitgift Foundation (Archbishop Whitgift is buried in the nearby Anglican Church, and like Laud, Whitgift was the son of a merchant). This is the oldest part of Croydon, and now forms part of Greater London, which is about 12 miles (or about 19 kilometers) from inner London. Its beauties include a mid 15th century Great Hall doorway, original 15th century oak ceiling beams, with chestnut crossbeams added by Archbishop Herring in 1748, a courtyard not changed since the Tudor times of the 16th century, the Queen Elizabeth room of Elizabeth I, and

Cranmer's Library room where Archbishop Thomas Cranmer composed part of the Book of Common Prayer.

In the Chapel, the entrance pews are carved with the Coat of Arms of Archbishop Laud. Though all the Chapel ornaments are of recent origin, being added by the school since 1887, the Communion rail in front of the Communion Table was put in by Archbishop Laud. It is commonly known as "Laud's Communion Rail." This Communion rail is not discernibly different in *broad general style* to many Anglican Communion rails I have seen in Reformed Anglican Churches e.g., in the (Evangelical) Diocese of Sydney at St. John's Parramatta, or St. Matthew's Windsor, or St. Stephen's Mittagong, mentioned in more detail, *infra*. It is very similar to, though not precisely identical with, the Communion rail at St. Matthew's Anglican Church, Windsor. "Laud's Communion Rail" at Croydon is made of stained polished wood, with stylishly rounded support beams running straight up and down it. It is dignified, but not particularly ornate. Having seen "Laud's Communion Rail" at old Croydon Palace, I think one would be drawing a very long bow indeed to try and suggest that by this type of "innovation," Archbishop Laud was seeking "to advance or usher in Popery" (p. 54). Especially so since the Papists generally stand to receive their Romish Mass wafer.

Nevertheless, Laud here fails to develop an important element of these Elizabethan injunctions, namely, that these require that any "altar" had been "taken down," and now under Protestantism, there was a "Holy Table ... set in .. the place where the altar stood'." Thus there is now a "Holy Table" not an "Altar." This is also consistent with the Prayer Book which refers to a "Table" not an "Altar." *Once again, it can only be concluded that a conflict of interest existed with Laud being both prosecutor, judge, and jury, in his own case, since he here wanted by inference to give his own private views about an "altar" relevant to his other private views about Lutheran consubstantiation a greater importance than was warranted. He failed to make it clear that the terminology of "altar-wise" was a private interpretation of his, whereas the practice of placing the Holy Table at the east end in the Chancel was part of the publicly proclaimed doctrine of the Anglican Church.*

*Libel 12* was that "bowing or doing reverence at our first coming into the Church, or at our nearer approaches to the Holy Table, or the Altar, (call it whether you will)," is "one thing" that "sticks much in their stomachs, and they call it an 'innovation'" (pp. 43-52).

Both Laud and the Puritans used a confusing terminology; *and possibly it suited both propagandist sides to do this, and possibly it suited one side to do this and the other side simply missed the ambiguity*, which allows for one of two interpretations. There is both a necessary interpretation which accords with the publicly declared Anglican doctrine, and an added possible interpretation that does not. The first part, "bowing, or doing reverence [of, and to God] at ... first coming into the Church," refers to the Anglican practice of kneeling in prayer inside the church before a church service. (This is also done at the end of a church service, and is *one* of the reasons why kneelers are provided in Anglican Church pews.) And by the words, "bowing or doing reverence

[of, and to God] ...at our nearer approaches to the Holy Table,” it is *possible to read as the exhaustive meaning of this* kneeling to receive Holy Communion at the Communion rail in front of the Communion Table.

However, the second part, namely, “bowing or doing reverence ... at our nearer approaches to the Holy Table, or the Altar, (call it whether you will),” *allows, but does not require, an additional meaning* of genuflecting at “the Holy Table, or the Altar,” something like the way one acknowledges the bench in a court of common law. A further question arises as to whether or not this was a deliberate or accidental ambiguity.

A similar claim was made against Laud on 20 May 1644, i.e., in the Chapel at Lambeth Palace, Featley said there was “bowing at the coming into the Chapel [i.e., bowing down in prayer when first entering], and going up to the Communion Table.” Laud then says this “was usual in Queen Elizabeth’s time” i.e., not an “innovation” of his as Featley claimed<sup>193</sup>. Laud follows a terminology of, “going up to the Communion Table,” which could be interpreted to mean either *kneeling to receive Communion*, which accords with the publicly professed doctrine of the Anglican Church; but which could also allow, though this is not a required view, *genuflecting at the Communion Table*, which if what Laud was doing, was a private view of Laud’s.

*Prima facie*, it is possible (*Possibility 1*) that *the Puritans may have been using a deliberately ambiguous terminology* of “bowing at ... going up to the Communion Table” to mean kneeling to receive Communion, but then *allowing their Puritan followers to wrongly interpret this as genuflecting at the Communion Table* (as with their “crucifix” terminology). If so, this may have been to confuse publicly declared Anglican doctrine (kneeling to receive Communion) with Laudianism (genuflecting), and if so, it is possible that Laud did not pick up this ambiguity.

Alternatively (*Possibility 2*), *Laud may have been using deliberately ambiguous terminology both in Libel 12 of Rex v. Bastwick et al (1637) and also in Laud’s case (1644)*. If so, Laud’s reference to *kneeling to receive Communion* in Elizabethan times was an attempt to try and justify *both* the Anglican practice of *kneeling to receive Communion* (publicly declared Anglican doctrine) and his private belief in *genuflecting at the Communion Table*. If this was Laud’s meaning there appears to be a deliberate element of concealment in his comments, so that if one was looking only for the Anglican practice of *kneeling to receive Communion*, one might wrongly think this was all that he was talking about. On this possibility, the Puritans in Laud’s case possibly did not realize the ambiguity, and thought e.g., that Laud was simply admitting to genuflecting at the Communion Table.

*It is also possible that both Laud and the Puritans wanted this ambiguity (Possibility 3)*. If so, Laud wanted it to try and protect himself by falsely claiming the practice of genuflecting at the Communion Table was referred to in references to kneeling to receive Communion in Elizabethan times; and the Puritans were happy to run

---

<sup>193</sup> Laud’s *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 201.

with this, because it suited their propaganda purposes to try and make Laud's private practice of genuflecting at the Communion Table appear to be something that he had more widely spread around the Anglican Church than he had; and also to confuse in their Puritan supporter's minds the publicly declared Anglican doctrine (kneeling to receive Communion) with Laudianism (genuflecting). I.e., *honour among thieves* against "the common enemy" of "those Reformed Anglicans who want to keep the Anglican Church at the second stage of the Reformation."

An example of a later Puritan writer taking this view is Edwin Hill's *The Puritans and their Principles* (1846)<sup>194</sup>. He makes the claim that Laud "approached the altar, ... made five or six low bows, and coming to the side of it where the bread and wine were covered, he bowed seven times." His source for this bizarre claim is David Neil's *History of the Puritans* (4 volumes, 1732-8). Neil's work has been strongly criticized, e.g., in 1733, Dean Isaac Maddox (Dean of Wells, 1733-6), later Bishop Maddox (Bishop of St. Asaph, then Bishop of Worcester from 1743), criticized it as an unfair and inaccurate work<sup>195</sup>. At best, this appears to have been a speculation based on the description on Andrewes *Notes in Nicholl's Commentary, infra*.

Hill makes other questionable claims. E.g., he says that Laud put "on the window" "in the Cathedral of Canterbury," "images of the Virgin Mary, inscribed, 'Hail Mary, Spouse of God'. Besides these, there were pictures of God the Father, and of God the Holy Ghost." In fact, there is no evidence that Laud ever supported or encouraged invocation of Mary or any other saint, and since he was strongly opposed to pictures of God the Father, this claim about "pictures of God the Father" is also ridiculous. Hill further claims that in *Sherfield's case, supra*, Laud supported the idolatrous adoration of a picture of God the Father, which once again is certainly not correct, and not the substance of this case which was about the illegal defacing of a stained-glass window in an Anglican Church. His claim that "Laud" wanted "to exhibit his hatred of Protestantism," while having some elements of truth in that Laud opposed the second stage of the Reformation and was in some areas a semi-Romanist innovator, in the form

---

<sup>194</sup> Baker & Scribner, New York, USA, pp. 205-7,209. This book came from lectures given to the First Congregational Society in Norwalk, Connecticut, USA in 1843 & 1844 (p. v). The Congregational Church is a Reformed Puritan derived Church. For a typical example of a secular writer uncritically excepting these type of Puritan claims about Laud genuflecting at the Communion Table, see Fincham, K., "Oxford & the Early Stuart Polity," pp. 179-209 at p. 206, in Tyacke, N (Ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1997, Volume 4: 17th century Oxford.

<sup>195</sup> Neil's volume 1 is critiqued in Dean (later Bishop) Maddox's *A Vindication of the Government, Doctrine, & Worship of the Church of England*, As established in the reign of Queen Elizabeth against the injurious reflections of Mr Neil & etc., (1733); and Neil's volumes 2-4 are critiqued in Zachary Grey's *Impartial Examination of the 2d, 3d, & 4th volumes of Mr. Daniel Neal's History of the Puritans* (London, 1736-9). Neil replied to Maddox in Neil's *A Review of the principal facts objected to [by Dean Maddox] in the first volume of the History of the Puritans* (1734).

here stated by Hill, is nevertheless a typical example of Puritan propaganda equating Puritan Protestantism with Protestantism *per se*.

A final possibility (*Possibility 4*), is that both Laud and the Puritans meant by this, *kneeling to receive Communion, and nothing more*. Certainly this is a theoretical possibility given that we know that e.g., Rutherford was claiming that the mere act of kneeling to receive Communion was idolatrous. If so, the possible ambiguity of these words was unintentional, and later exploited by both subsequent Puritan propagandists and also from the 19th century by Puseyites seeking to justify genuflecting at the Communion Table.

Of these four views, it seems to me that the external evidence supports *Possibility 3*. I.e., an ambiguous terminology was used by Laud, in order to anachronistically claim that his practice of genuflecting at the Communion Table came from Elizabethan times, but that the Puritans propagandists were happy to run with this, because it meant that what was a relatively limited Laudian innovation could be depicted by them as a much more widely used Anglican practice than it actually was. Thus we are brought face to face with the difficulties of two groups, Laudian and Puritan propagandists, both of whose honesty leaves something to be desired; and both of whom wanted to conceal the existence of their “common enemy,” the Reformed Anglicans upholding the second stage reforms of the pre-Laudian *Church of England*. To this is added the further complication, that 19th century Puseyites were happy to endorse both the claims of Laudian and Puritan propagandists, so as to also try and depict this type of thing as representing a wider group of “Caroline Anglicans,” that they then mimic like monkeys, rather than a smaller group of Laudians in Caroline times. In the words of the wise proverb, *O what a web we weave, when at first we try to deceive*.

In the first place, it must be said that genuflecting at the Communion Table is not a specifically Roman Catholic practice in those terms. In some forms of Puseyism, as always in Popery, genuflecting “at the altar” is understood as genuflecting or bowing at the so called “real presence” of the consecrated Communion elements. Hence this is done either at a Communion Service *after* the consecrated elements are placed on “the altar,” or more generally if there is “a tabernacle” placed over “the altar” containing “the reserved sacrament.” Hence such persons *do not genuflect* “at the altar” (or more precisely the reserved sacrament,) on Good Friday because “the host” is then removed from “the tabernacle” or “aumbrey” and Communion is not celebrated<sup>196</sup>.

---

<sup>196</sup> The Puseyites, like the Papists, frequently have a strange and indeed superstitious view that Communion ought not to be celebrated on Good Friday. Now the Jewish day began at evening, and so when Christ instituted this sacrament on the Thursday night before Easter, this was conceptualized not as “Maundy Thursday,” but as Good Friday; a point that appears to be somehow lost on the Puseyites and Papists, who will celebrate their “Mass” or “Eucharist” on the night of “Maundy Thursday,” “but,” they say, “*never* on Good Friday.” In Popery the “aumbry” (ambry) is a box-like device with a lockable “door” that is placed in the sanctuary wall and oils are placed in it. But in Puseyism, the “aumbry” is often used like the Popish “tabernacle” for “the reserved

But this was not the practice of genuflecting that in the context of this *Libel 12* Laud was involved in. Rather, this innovation appears to have been related in its underpinning theoretics to the same types of ideas that one finds in the court-room practice notion of “acknowledging the bench.” Put simply, this was a *Laudian Anglican innovation not a Popish innovation*. Of course, it was still a bad and undesirable innovation, since one only acknowledges the bench in a court if the Judge is present; and so the idea presumably was that God was in some sense “at the table,” whether there were consecrated Communion elements there, *or not*. But God is omnipresent, and so while certainly at the table, he is not at the table to the exclusion of being elsewhere; and so this Laudian innovation tends to get people thinking the wrong way about God’s presence. It tends to put too great a focus on the Communion Table, which in turn then acts to heighten the likelihood of other erroneous notions about the Lord’s Supper, since the question must necessarily be posed, “Why does one say God is in some special sense present at the Communion Table, whether or not the consecrated elements are there?” This is really a hopeless and silly position to hold to. It understandably leads some Puseyites to then put a “tabernacle” with “the reserved sacrament” over their “altar,” or more commonly, an “aumbrey” near their “altar.” Either way, unlike Lutherans, the Puseyites use consubstantiation as the mechanism to develop such Romish type transubstantiation practices.

This theologically unsound and silly innovation of genuflecting at the Communion Table most assuredly did not, as Laud claimed, come from Elizabethan Anglican times. Where then, and why then, did this undesirable innovation come from? With deep regret, we must say that it appears to have originated as a private view of Bishop Lancelot Andrewes (1555-1626), Bishop of Chichester from 1605, then Bishop of Ely from 1609, and finally Bishop of Winchester from 1619. It is, I repeat, with *deep regret*, that this matter can be traced to Bishop Andrewes, for he was a mix of good and bad, but had many good and positive qualities. Most notably, he was one of the King James Version translators. But while I think highly of Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, I do not thereby agree with everything Jerome ever said or did; and so likewise, though I think highly of the King James Version, I do not thereby agree with everything that all of its forty-seven translators (drawn from fifty-four potential translators approved for this task by King James,) ever said or did. *We must distinguish the wood from the trees!*

Andrewes *Notes in Nicholl’s Commentary*, written in Jacobean times, say this of the Communion Service. E.g., “The priest after the Collect, descends to the door of the Septum, *makes a low adoration towards the altar*, then turns to the people, and standing in the door readeth the Ten Commandments.” Then “after the Creed,” “the priest *adores*,” and later the “Bishop [i.e., Bishop Andrewes] ascends *with treble adoration*, and lastly kneels down at the altar.” Then after “the Prayer of Consecration,” “the priest, *having made adoration*,” continues. “Then” after “be said or sung, Glory to God on

---

sacrament” i.e., consecrated Communion wafers which via transubstantiation (Popery) or consubstantiation (Puseyism) are said to have “the real presence,” and so a “sanctuary lamp” is sometimes placed near them, and people idolatrously genuflect at or near it.

high” (The Gloria), “the congregation ariseth, and *having made their adoration*, they go towards their seats to a little private devotion ...<sup>197</sup>.”

Andrewes had been in some conflict with Queen Elizabeth over his desire for a more independent Anglican Church, and his peculiar innovation of genuflecting at the Communion Table would not have been tolerated by her. To some extent, he took advantage of, and misused, the greater leniency and freedoms given to him under King James I, who as far as we know, was unaware of Andrewes’s genuflecting innovation.

It is with sadness that we read in the testimony of Bishop Wren, that he was first led into this error, “by the example of ... Bishop Andrewes.” By 1640, Wren was a man who was greatly deceived on this issue. In his 1640 answer to the articles of impeachment against him it is recorded that at his trial, “the defendant answereth and denieth that the bowings and adoration which he used were superstitious gestures, or that they were dangerous examples to draw others to the like. ... But this he ... acknowledgeth, that when he entereth into any church or chapel ..., or departeth from it, as also when he approacheth to the Lord’s Table, or receedeth from it, and when in the time of Divine Service the Lord Jesus is mentioned, he performeth an adoration by lowly ... bowing *of his body*; the reason of all which he ... offereth,” thus. “He began so to do by the example of ... [the late] Bishop Andrewes ... . As his own years and studies increased he found ... the bowing before the Holy Table had been ... used in the Church of England ... in the rule ... the ... lords of the Garter did set ... under Henry V [Regnal Years: 1413-1422] ... neither was it forbidden by the injunctions of King Edward or Queen Elizabeth, in both of which other gestures are prohibited. ... And as for any fear of Popish superstition, Bishop Moron, in his defence of the gesture, shows that cannot be, for that the Papists do only use it for their opinion of transubstantiation, and would deride us for doing it in any other respect ...<sup>198</sup>.”

In the first place, I would observe that the reason why it is not prohibited in the Edwardian and Elizabethan injunctions, is that it was not generally practiced or known about. *For exactly the same reason they did not prohibit “bringing elephants into a church service”!!! To them, this type of thing i.e., bringing elephants into a church service, or genuflecting at the Communion Table, would be so unknown and such a crazy’n’bizarre idea as to not require any specific prohibition.* Notably though, this claim that Elizabethan injunction did not prohibit such genuflecting is a different argument to Laud’s anachronistic attempt to claim the practice from reference to kneeling in Elizabethan times, *supra*, and shows different attempts by different bishops, to somehow try and predate this 17th century innovation to earlier times after the Reformation. The internal contradiction between Wren’s statement that “Papists” “only use it for” the idea of the *real presence* in “their opinion of transubstantiation,” with the fact that it was apparently used by the Order of the Garter in the early 15th century, is

---

<sup>197</sup> *Hierurgia Anglicana*, pp. 236-7.

<sup>198</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 246-8; citing *Book of Sacram*, p. 463 & *Bishop Wren’s Answer to the Articles of Impeachment*, pp. 80-2.

resolvable by the fact that the practice was evidently never used in the Church *per se*, but only specifically in rituals connected with the Order of the Garter; and even here, realistically speaking it would have been done in pre-Reformation times because a Romish “tabernacle” stood over a Popish “altar.”

It would seem that Andrewes, Laud, Wren, and some other bishops, were looking to put a greater distance between the *Church of England* and the Puritans. This led to some 17th century Anglican innovations in the *Church of England*, seemingly not found in the *Church of Ireland*. This indicates that their spread was limited to the *Church of England*, and seemingly only to *some* inside the *Church of England*. (Though some similar claims are in less frequency made by Puritan propagandists about the *Church of Ireland*, there is not the same corroborating evidence; and no competent persons seriously doubt that e.g., Archbishop Ussher would be opposed to suchlike, if he knew about it.)

They were evidently looking around for things, like genuflecting at the Lord’s Table, that they could either say were “not prohibited” under Edward and Elizabeth (Wren), or could be “justified” under an expanded reading of something in the Edwardian or Elizabethan rules (Laud), that moved the *Church of England* more in a semi-Romanist type ritualistic direction *away from both the second stages of the English Anglican Reformation and also away from Puritanism*, but which simultaneously was not actually Romanist in the sense that it was not something normatively done in Roman Churches. References to some obscure Order of the Garter services in pre-Reformation times i.e., Romanist times, were thus well received by Bishop Wren for these purposes. Yet even here, it must be asked how accurately Bishop Wren understood these references? I.e., if those in the Order of the Garter genuflected at an “altar” in Romanist times, *it was probably* because there was a “tabernacle” over “the altar,” *even if the description of them doing so does not specifically refer to the “tabernacle.”* This idea of genuflecting obviously appealed to the Laudians since they could point to some purported history of it in the Order of the Garter; but it was something the Roman Church did not commonly do in this form, (and given Papists do this in connection with the “real presence” of transubstantiation when there is a “tabernacle” with “the reserved sacrament” over “an altar,” probably they never did it in the way the Laudians claimed,) and so they could say, “It is neither Roman nor Puritan,” even though it looked more Romish than Puritan.

The practice appears to have disappeared in the *Church of England* after Caroline times. There is a reference to it in 1787 in *Hierurgia Anglicana*, which in the first instance may be inaccurate, since the description “bowed to the altar” may refer to an act of stopping, and kneeling to pray. But in the second place, it is once again stated to be in the context of the Order “of the Garter,” and so even if this is what happened, it is not a description of what was happening during normal prayer book regulated Anglican Services<sup>199</sup>. Given the ambiguity of the statement in *Fanny’s Diary* which might well

---

<sup>199</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 269-70; citing *Madame D’Arblay’s Diary*, 1842, Vol. 3, pp. 269,270. This was written by Fanny / Francis D’Arblay nee Burney (1752-1840). *Fanny’s Diary* was published posthumously, and should not be regarded as necessarily accurate in all particulars. The possibility that the author of *Fanny’s Diary* actually saw

mean *bowing down in prayer on their knees*, I take the opposite view to the Puseyite writers of *Hierurgia Anglicana*, and think this orthodox interpretation should apply in the absence of any clear evidence to the contrary.

This practice of Laudians genuflecting thus fits one of our recurring themes. I.e., *certain errors of the Caroline eras corrected from the time of William III on, when references to them seem to either greatly diminish or disappear altogether, were then to be revived by Puseyites.* The evidence thus indicates that this was an innovation in which Laud was part of a small circle, influenced directly or indirectly by Bishop Andrewes, who sought to make the *Church of England* less in the direction of the Puritans, and in some sense, more in the direction of Rome, by mimicking what 15th century persons in the Order of the Garter were said to be doing. (Even though in my opinion, in the absence of clear evidence to the contrary, I think one should stipulate that those in the 15th century Order of the Garter were *in all likelihood* genuflecting to “the real presence” in a tabernacle over the “altar,” even though this is apparently not specifically mentioned in the 15th century description of them genuflecting read by Bishop Wren.) But in adopting this innovation of genuflecting to the Communion Table, the Laudians subtly here of an innovation that was *more Romish looking, but not actually Roman*, and so neither Romanist nor Puritan, was a subtlety too great for the Puritans to grasp. But in fairness to the simple Puritans, as with other innovations, this one seems to have helped to foster an undesirable spirit of semi-Romanism in the *Church of England*. Recognizing this, the practice was wisely discontinued by Anglicans later in the 17th century.

Nevertheless, my criticism of Laud here in *Libel 12* must be muted by the fact that the Puritans were not simply against genuflecting at the Communion Table (or nodding at the name of Jesus), which thing I would also see as undesirable, and certainly as innovations, later rightly discontinued. *But as part of the complexities of these allegations*, the Puritans, influenced by fools like Rutherford, were also opposing things such as kneeling in prayer or kneeling to take Communion. These were most assuredly *not* innovations but longstanding Anglican practices. *But both Laud and the Puritans wanted to link these two issues, in Laud’s case to falsely try and claim his innovations were from older Reformed times, and in the Puritan’s case so they could falsely claim these practises were more widespread than they were, and also link their attack on Laudianism to a more general attack on Anglicanism, and the Anglican practice of kneeling at the Communion, and kneeling in prayer before and after a Church service.*

Certainly then, here in *Libel 12*, Laud fairly demonstrates that the publicly professed doctrine of the Anglican Church endorses this first form of kneeling when entering a church. He refers e.g., to the *Venite* (Psalm 95) used at Anglican Matins. (It was found in the Sarum rite, retained in Cranmer’s prayer books, and retained after Laud’s time in the 1662 prayer book.) Laud refers to the key words of Ps. 95:6, “O come, *let us worship*, and *fall down*: and *kneel* before the Lord our Maker,” to show that

---

a person *bowing down in prayer on their knees*, and called this, “bowed low to the altar,” is not even discussed by the Puseyite propagandists of *Hierurgia Anglicana*.

Anglican worship contains an invitation to kneel and worship God. He rightly notes that the “Venite” “was retained at the Reformation,” “in the daily prayers of the *Church of England*.” Laud finds further Biblical warrant for this Anglican practice in Num. 20:6; Gen. 28:17; and defines “reverence” as being “of, and to God.” Certainly this practice is no “innovation” of Laud’s.

Laud makes some general Anglican type of comments at *Libel 12*, that all decent Anglicans would agree with. He fairly says, with classic Anglican anti-Puritan humor, that the failure to show proper reverence to God in a church is a great “misery,” and reminds him of when “a tinker and his bitch come into an ale-house.”

Certainly I have been in some Puritan derived Churches where this is the case. Though not the only Puritan Churches I have ever been in, the two main types of Puritan Churches that I, as a Reformed (Evangelical) Anglican sometimes *visit*, are Presbyterian Churches in a Free Presbyterian tradition, and Baptist Churches in an independent Baptist tradition.

I have been in e.g., a Free Presbyterian church in NSW where there is much talking in the pews right up till when the Minister arrives, and I can scarce sit quietly to pray and read God’s Word before the church service. In NSW I have been in an independent Baptist Church where there was a great hubbub, and as I tried to read God’s Word after bowing down to pray in the seat (for there were no kneelers in this church), one of the two Ministers’ wives came up to me, interrupting my reading of God’s Word (in an admittedly noisy environment), and profanely said, “Are you doing a crossword?,” for she could not conceive that any who were focused on something before a church service, could be focused on God. The Minister of this Baptist Church had to stand before his congregation and quieten them down before he started the service. To be sure, such Puritan Churches where the people do not bow in reverent worship of God when entering and sitting down in their pews, and irreverently fail “to *sanctify*” their “day” (Deut. 5:12) of public “worship” (I Cor. 14:25), violates the apostolic injunctions, to distinguish between the holy and profane (I Tim. 1:9), and “Let all thing be done *decently* and in order” (I Cor. 14:40).

Indeed, in this context I also note, that when I was in London for six months on fourth trip there (Oct. 2005-April 2006), I visited an independent (Reformed) Baptist church in London on the Lord’s Day. After the service in this Puritan derived Church, a man started to walk his dog around inside the church as I spoke to members of the congregation. I was filled with a holy anger at the profaneness of this practice. The man then came up to me, holding his dog on a leash inside the church building (this was not even the church’s hall, but the actual church building used for the worship service, where in this Puritan tradition people talk in, rather than outside of, the Church after the service). Now I do not believe that there are any “new revelations of the Spirit” now possible, nor that the gift of prophecy exists outside of Bible times. But *the Spirit of the Most High God took hold of me, and the Spirit I say, not I, spoke to this man condemning his wickedness*, not in terms of any new revelations of the Spirit, but in terms of that which may already be plainly known through godly reason and the Scriptures.

Now it is most unusual for the Spirit of the Most High God to so take hold of me. And I count it a great privilege that I was found to be of use in the Lord's service. To the question, "If this was no new revelation of the Spirit, but merely stating that which godly reason and Scripture already tell us, why then did you or another not speak to him on this basis?" I reply simply, "The decision was not mine, but the Lord's." But when the Baptist Minister of that Church learnt of what was said, he was not happy with me. So I said to him that what had been said to the man "was from God," not I, and he, knowing me over some years, and knowing me to be a saved Christian, regenerated by the power of the Holy Ghost, and subject to the Word of God as his completed revelation to man, accepted my testimony, albeit with some reluctance and unease<sup>200</sup>.

*Such are the profanities* than occur in some Puritan Churches. For after this, I also went to an independent (Arminian) Baptist Church in Sydney where a special guest preacher who was an Ashkenazi Jewish Christian was discussing evangelization of Jews of Israel; a matter that I as a Gentile Christian have some interest in. But a member of the Congregation brought her dog into this Puritan derived Church, much to my Anglican horror<sup>201</sup>. To be sure, some of them remind not just Archbishop Laud, but also myself,

---

<sup>200</sup> The Minister told me the man was unsaved, and they desired him there to hear the Gospel, but whenever he came to the church (this was not his first time,) he always brought his dog with him. While I share my Puritan Protestant brethren's desire to bring the unsaved under the sound of Christian Gospel preaching, I also maintain that there are limits to proper evangelistic techniques of how this is done. I think that even the unsaved and unchurched can, and should, be made subject to basic rules of church sanctity, such as not bringing a pet dog into the church with them. Those at the door of such a church should be as polite as is reasonably possible with such a man, perhaps offering to tie it up for him somewhere around the church, but they ought not to allow it in. Certainly this type of thing did not occur in the London Anglican Church that I worshipped in during this time, to wit, St. John's *Church of England (Continuing)*, South Wimbledon; nor I hasten to add, any other Puritan derived London Church, whether independent Baptist or Free Presbyterian, that I sometimes visited during this time.

<sup>201</sup> In between the time of Vol. 1 & the revised Vol. 1, I visited an independent (Arminian) Baptist Church at Penrith (western Sydney), and was horrified to see a girl taking a pet dog into the church and sitting down with it. I left a message for the Minister on the church card with respect to the matter, citing, Ps. 96:9, "O worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness." The Baptist Minister, (Pastor David Hill,) wrote back to me defending this practice, saying that he had no objections to the girl's pet dog in the church, and that he did not consider there was anything in Ps. 96:9 that would prohibit this practice. By contrast, I would entirely agree with the traditional Anglican view that it is not inappropriate to bring a pet dog into a Church Service, and in general I have found that the Puritans agree with me. We read in Deut. 23:17,18 that "the price of a dog," i.e., money from "sodomite" prostitution, was not to be brought "into the house of the Lord." While "a dog" here means "a sodomite," the propriety of the imagery surely presupposes that one would not bring a canine into the worshipful "house of the Lord" (other than for reasons of necessity such as a guide dog for a blind person.)

of when *a tinker and his bitch come into an ale-house*.

But on the other hand, in both New South Wales, Australia, and London, England, I have also been in *some* better Puritan Churches where greater reverence is shown in public worship. Notably, these better Free Presbyterian and independent Baptist Churches known to me, all use the *King James Version*. E.g., *some* Free Presbyterian churches. They do not bow when entering a pew, nor kneel to receive the Communion, and stand to pray during the church service. Yet notwithstanding some very obvious differences between us, I have found that in *some* Free Presbyterian Churches there is a reverential silence when entering the church. Even though those in this church allow no musical instruments, and sing only psalms and never hymns, I find that some of these Puritan Protestant brethren in Christ maintain a basic dignity and decency in their Church Service.

I have also been in *some* independent Baptist Churches, where e.g., music is played about 5 or so minutes before the service, and the people do not chatter *from this point on*. *Some* of the Baptists might even, like myself, read a portion of Holy Scripture. Though their Puritan church has no kneelers, and though they pray during the church service either standing or sitting in their pews, when I bow forward in the pew to pray before and after the church service, none interrupt me, nor say anything negative to me about this Anglican practice.

Therefore, taking these factors into account, on the one hand, (as one who might tell the occasional anti-Puritan joke against the more extremist anti-Anglican Puritans, especially in some connection with *Charles I's Day*), in some contexts I greatly enjoy the Anglican anti-Puritan humor of Laud. Describing a Puritan Church as like when *a tinker and his bitch come into an ale-house*, is the type of thing that a conservative Anglican such as myself might especially say in some connection with *King Charles the Martyr*, about this or that Puritan Church where e.g., they sell books promoting Cromwell as a “great” man; or wear jeans, with some of them possibly going barefoot, and so on in their “contemporary worship service.”

But on the other hand, in fairness to the Puritans it must be said that their practices *sometimes*, but *not always*, lead to a situation of such irreverence in which they fail “to *sanctify*” their “day” (Deut. 5:12) of public “worship” (Isa. 66:23; I Cor. 14:25). It is also sadly the case, that in more recent years the Anglican Dean Jensen type “contemporary worship services” in Sydney are every bit as bad as the Puritan ones. Laud fails to properly state this more balanced view, i.e., there are also Puritan Churches where there is a reverential spirit of worship, decorum, and decency; and there are Anglican Churches lacking these qualities. Thus in my opinion, Laud here shows his anti-Puritanism to be excessive. Nevertheless, I sincerely believe that such Puritans can learn a great deal from the traditional Anglican practice of kneeling to pray before and after a church service, and entering into a reverential worshipful spirit before the public worship of God; and like Archbishop Laud, I am baffled by the fact that for any Puritans

---

such a practice, in Laud's words, "sticks much in their stomachs."

For what saith the Word of God? "My house shall be called the house of prayer." But how can it be so when both some Anglican and some Puritan Churches make as much noise and unholy babbling, commonly, though not always, about worldly matters, immediately before and after the Church service, as much as ever did the Jews that Jesus drove out, saying, "My house shall be called the house of prayer" (Matt. 21:12,13)? "O worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness" (Ps. 96:9), "bow down" and "kneel before" him (Ps. 95:6), "his glory" "declare" (Ps. 96:3); "bow" thy "knees unto the Father" (Eph. 3:14), and "bow" thy "knee" to "Jesus" (Philp. 2:11), for the "Lord" is his "name" (Ps. 96:2,8; re: singular usage of "his," see John 10:30; I John 5:7).

Thus on the one hand, I find that here in *Libel 12*, Laud fairly demonstrates that the publicly professed doctrine of the Anglican Church endorses this first form of kneeling when entering a church. It is certainly no "innovation" designed "to advance or usher in Popery" (p. 54). But on the other hand, when dealing with kneeling at the Communion Table, I have some criticisms to make of Laud. Specifically, he does not state the publicly professed doctrine of the Anglican Church on this matter, but instead advances a private opinion, to wit, Lutheran consubstantiation, which was a view allowed Anglicans before, but not after, 1662.

The relevant publicly professed Anglican doctrine, not referred to by Laud, is found in e.g., Cranmer's prayer of humble access (composed in 1549, and retained in the 1662 prayer book). I.e., "We do not presume to come to this thy Table [NOT 'altar'], O merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in thy manifold and great mercies. We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under thy Table [i.e., we come kneeling in humility]. But thou art the same Lord, whose property is always to have mercy ... ." This too is e.g., found in the Communion rubric on kneeling dating from the 1552 prayer book (and found with some modification in the 1662 prayer book), which in part says, "the Communicants should receive the same kneeling" and this "order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgement of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy receivers" (Matt. 15:27; Mark 7:28), "and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the Holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue" (I Cor. 14:40).

But instead of referring to this, Laud gives his own *private view* which is connected to his Lutheran view of consubstantiation, and associated *corporeal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood*. Laud says, "I doubt not, but ... towards his altar, [stands] as the greatest place of God's residence upon earth. I say the greatest, yea greater than the pulpit. For there [in Latin] is *Hos (This) est (is) corpus (body) meum (my)*, 'This is my body.' But in the pulpit 'tis at most but, *Hos (This) est (is) verbum (Word) meum (my)*, 'This is my Word.' And a greater reverence, no doubt, is due to the body, than the Word of our Lord. And so, in relation, answerably to the throne where his body is usually present, than to the seat, where his Word ... be proclaimed." "His altar, for there is a reverence due to that too, though such as comes far short of Divine worship." "I say, adoring [of God] at the sacrament, not adoring the sacrament." For

we “apply” “all commendable gestures” “unto God,” “to God, and to none but God.”

In the first place, it must be said that Laud’s reference to “reverence due to” the “altar,” as being “far short of Divine worship,” is in some ways reminiscent of the Roman Catholic distinction between “Latria” worship (i.e., worship of God) and “Dulia” worship (i.e., worship of angels and Saints); and in some ways, reminiscent of the type of thing that one finds with acknowledging the bench in a court of common law, *supra*. However, neither I nor any Reformed Anglican I know of would agree that this should be done to the Lord’s Table. As regards the issue of adoration, Laud makes it clear that he does not believe in “adoring the sacrament,” but rather, in giving adoration “to none but God.” But he understands there to be a corporeal presence of Christ at Communion, and so supports “adoring [of God] at the sacrament.”

This distinction between “adoring *at*,” but not “adoring” *of* “the sacrament,” is confusing terminology, and understandably some of the Puritans may have misunderstood it. It is a manifestation of a Laudian innovation based on Lutheran consubstantiation, which no Lutheran would agree with, since Lutheran theology does not support sacramental adoration. But in a Lutheran consubstantiation way, Laud sees the “altar, as the greatest place of God’s residence upon earth,” because of the words at Communion, “This is my body.” *This is certainly not the publicly proclaimed doctrine of the Anglican Church in the Prayer Book of 1559 & 1604 and 39 Articles for kneeling at Communion, but rather Laud’s private view on kneeling at Communion. But Laud nowhere makes this distinction, as indeed he should.*

On the one hand, it must be said that this is a private opinion allowed Anglicans from the time of the Reformation till 1662. At that time, I believe the *Church of England* very wisely altered the rubric on kneeling in the 1552 prayer book from rejecting the “real and essential presence there being of Christ’s natural flesh and blood” (transubstantiation), to rejecting “any corporeal presence of Christ’s natural flesh and blood” (transubstantiation or consubstantiation). Laud’s views were disallowed from 1662 (a fact conveniently ignored by the Puseyites, who love to use this Laudian innovation based on Lutheran consubstantiation, to “justify” their idolatrous sacramental adoration). Thus it must be clearly understood that Laud not only fails to state that this is his private view on Lutheran consubstantiation occurring on a Lutheran type “altar,” but simultaneously fails to give the publicly stated Anglican doctrine on why kneeling occurs at the Communion.

But on the other hand, I do not think it fair to conclude from this that Laud was seeking to “to advance or usher in Popery” (p. 54). Nevertheless, in view of Laud’s confusing terminology about *adoring at*, meaning *adoring God at “the altar,”* but not *adoring of* the sacrament at “the altar;” and his other lack of qualifications, *supra*, I think that the Puritans may have had some genuine misunderstanding of Laud’s views here.

*Summarizing the case in these 14 libels*, having now considered these 14 libels, it seems to me that through reference to *Libels 8, 12, & 14*, we must conclude there is a some basic truth in the Puritan claim that, “Laud became dictator of England. He then

became a most savage persecutor of those who openly opposed his illegal acts.” “In 1634, William Prynne, ... published a book attacking Laud’s ‘cringings and duckings at the altar [i.e., *kneeling to receive Communion*, which was part of the publicly declared doctrine of the Anglicans Church; as well as *nodding at the name of Jesus* which was a private view of Laud’s and a Laudian innovation; and also genuflecting at the Communion Table, which was an Andrewes’ derived innovation followed and promoted by Laud], and his bellowing chants in the Church [i.e., such sung prayer book services as Matins and Evensong, which was part of the publicly declared doctrine of the Anglican Church].’ Laud prosecuted him in the Star Chamber. ... In 1637 Prynne ..., Bastwick, ... and ... Burton, ... for denouncing Laud’s Service Books and acts, were ... sentenced ... and ... imprisoned ...<sup>202</sup>.” Nevertheless, it seems to me that the case against Laud has been greatly exaggerated and overstated by such Puritan writers, who fail to deal with the fact that most of the 14 libels against Laud were truly dishonest, unfair, and libellous.

Therefore, Bastwick, Burton, and Prynne were clearly three dishonest Puritans who in broad terms deserved to be convicted for libel. Their basic claim which was ultimately interconnected with the Puritan Revolution of 1640-1660, associated English civil wars, and Puritan republic of 1642-60, namely, that Laud had introduced a series of “innovations,” designed “to advance or usher in Popery” (p. 54), was fundamentally false *in the terms it was put in*. I.e., while I am as opposed to Laud’s innovations as any man, they were not, as claimed, designed by Laudians as part of a conspiracy to bring about reconciliation between the *Church of England* and *Church of Rome* under Popery.

Nevertheless, it is true that Laud was involved in some innovations that acted to roll back the advance of the Anglican Church into the second stages of the Reformation, and promote semi-Romanism in the *Church of England*, as seen through reference to *Libels 8, 12, & 14*. This same factor is evident in Laud’s nine (or ten) innovations, *supra*, e.g., his desire to reintroduce auricular confession, abolished in 1562, but allowed in Lutheranism, shows this same type of methodology of going back to the first stage of the Reformation, and then seeking to create a Laudian Anglicanism from this point. Thus e.g., in this case, *supra*, Laud held some private views allowed by the Anglican Church, which gave him an essentially Lutheran sacramentalism on the Lord’s Supper (which views were no longer tolerated in the *Church of England* after 1662). But Laudian development of sacramental adoration from this point was harmonious with neither Lutheranism nor second stage Reforms of the English Anglican Reformation.

In this context, Laud also held a “Divine Law” view of Episcopal government that resulted in a failure to recognize other Protestant forms of government such as Lutheran or Presbyterian Church government, as also permitted in Scripture and manifested in Anglican doctrine through reference to Article 34 of the 39 Articles. This helped make him excessively anti-Puritan. For Reformation Anglicans, episcopal government had been found useful and good, and so on the one hand it was retained, but on the other hand, non-episcopal Protestant Churches on the Continent were also embraced.

---

<sup>202</sup> Close, A., *op. cit.*, pp. 150-151.

Thus e.g., the 1578 Notes on *The New Calendar* of the Elizabethan Prayer Book of 1559 makes reference to some proto-Protestant and Protestant saints, e.g., Luther (18 Feb., 22 Feb., 31 Oct., & 10 Nov), Calvin (27 Aug.), and Zwingli (11 Oct.). It clearly upholds Protestant saints as having valid ministries that are non-episcopal. E.g., (modernizing the spellings,) 16 February says, “The learned cleric, Philip Melancthon, . . . upon this day was born, *Anno* 1497;” 10 November says, “upon this day Martin Luther was born;” 22 February says, “Martin Luther his body, as upon this day, was translated to Wittenberg, and buried in the Chapel of the castle there;” 27 August on Calvin, says, “Religion, as on this day, was Reformed, according to God’s express truth, in the most renowned city of Geneva, 1535.”

This statement on the Anglican Calendar of 1578 with respect to Melancthon as a “learned” clergyman, or Calvin’s Geneva, is a very different sentiment to the words of Laud in *Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn*, that the “calling of bishops” is “by Divine right,” and “in all places, the Church of Christ was governed by bishops; and lay-elders never heard of, till Calvin’s new-fangled devices at Geneva” (pp. 6-7). This second stage Anglican Reformation Calendar of 1578, thus has a sentiment in favour of recognizing fellow Protestant Churches that are non-episcopal, a sentiment that is wholly at variance with Laudianism. This same type of thing is evident after 1662 with recognition of the Lutheran Church in London from the late 1660s, *infra*, or the establishment of the Puritan Presbyterian Church as the established *Church of Scotland* from 1690, both in harmony with Article 34 of the *Thirty-Nine Articles*.

But it should also be noted, that Puritans also often claimed that their form of church government, frequently, though not always, Presbyterian, was also divine law, and so on one level were as extreme as Laud. E.g., Puritan propaganda against “prelacy” is often as bad in the Puritan direction, as Laudian propaganda is in the Laudian episcopal Anglican direction. (My own view is that the NT makes no specific provision for church government once the apostolate died out, and so the matter is left to the godly reason of Christians, subject only to some broad principles. E.g., patriarchy is required, and so an adult male must be the minister-in-charge of a church congregation, an adult male must be the one who preaches the sermon, and women or children are not to publicly pray in the church service; and some form of bishop / overseer / presbyter, and deacon as required under different interpretations of church government from e.g., I Tim. 2:8-3:13. Historically, the NT ministry of apostle, bishop / presbyter, and deacon, evolved into bishop, presbyter / priest, and deacon, and was so retained by Anglicans after the Reformation. But if others want some other form of church government, e.g., Presbyterian, Congregationalist, or a council of Baptist elders, then I consider they are free to have it.)

Laud also failed to monitor what he was doing, and take into account the fact that both many Anglicans and also the Puritans were greatly agitated by this. The Puritans were seeking to go in the opposite direction to the Laudians at the same time. I.e., as Laudians sought to first move backwards from the second stages of the Reformation that the Anglican Church had advanced to after the initial Lutheran Reformation, and then reinvent Anglicanism at this point as Laudianism; the Puritans were wanting to go into

what they regarded as “the third stage” of the Reformation, ultimately producing four such rival “third stage” reforms in the General Baptists (Arminians), Particular Baptists (Reformed), Presbyterians (Reformed), and Congregationalists (Reformed). Thus a greater polarization ensued which both Laudians and Puritans are partly responsible for. Neither group wanted to acknowledge the Reformed Anglicans who wanted to simply hold the fort at the second stage of the English Reformation. Thus the three way split was generally presented by both Laudians and Puritans alike as a two-way split.

The Star Chamber court system that Bastwick, Burton, and Prynne were subjected to, had an inquisitorial rather than an adversarial common law system, and this acted to bias the proceedings against them in a grossly unfair manner. This was further aggravated by the fact that the same person was not only their prosecutor, judge, and jury, but also the complainant involved in the other side of the libel case. I.e., Laud was complainant, crown prosecutor, and judge in his own court case. This factor is also relevant to the issue of Laud’s sentencing of Bastwick, Burton, and Prynne<sup>203</sup>.

On the one hand I think these men were worthy of a fine and fixed prison sentence, since they were contextually part of an ever more dishonest and unreasonable Puritan movement, whose claims that Laud was seeking to introduce Popery were so erroneous, and so dangerous, as to reasonably constitute a threat to the security of the realm. But on the other hand, I consider that the sentence given to these three men was excessive. They were each fined 5,000 pounds, their ears were to be cut off, and they were to be put in perpetual prison in castles. Prynne was to be branded on his two cheeks with the initial’s “S.L.” meaning “seditious libeler.”

A complicating factor is that Laud was clearly guilty of some undesirable and unwarranted innovations as referred to in *Libels 8, 12, & 14*. These innovations were a serious threat to the spirit of Protestantism in the *Church of England* since they were semi-Romanist in sentiment, if not always in precise form, and Laudians were clearly rolling back second stage reforms of the English Reformation in order to try and reinvent Anglicanism at the point of the Lutheran Reformation, and then cast it into a more semi-Romanist and anti-Puritan mould. At times, Laud was also seeking to use this case as a smokescreen to cloak these innovations.

*Laud should have been disciplined for his guilt with respect to the accuracy in these three libels.* In my opinion, the failure of Charles I to appropriately punish Laud at this point, by depriving him of the Archbishopric of Canterbury was a failure of much needed leadership on his part. It was a kingly failure to ensure justice is administered fairly and impartially. It was a failure that made the Puritans more hostile to the king than they need have been. The reason for the King’s failure to discipline Laud is speculative. In my opinion, Charles I appears to have made an initial error in placing his trust in Laud; and thereafter dispassionate review by him of the situation with Laud was blurred by the extremeness and seriousness of the Puritan threat against Anglicanism *per*

---

<sup>203</sup> For the sentence on Prynne *et al*, see John Rushworth’s *Historical Collections* (1706 abridged edition), Vol. 2, p. 293.

*se.* While this does not justify the King's inaction, it does help to explain it. It also helps to explain why the king was still prepared to listen to Laud's misadvice with regard to an Anglican war on Puritan Scotland from 1637 to 1640.

The fact that the Puritans libelers were rightly punished for their wrongdoing, while Laud was not, acted to create an erroneous impression among some that the guilt was all on the Puritan propagandist's side. It also helped create an erroneous impression on the Puritan side that the guilt was all on Laud's side and the whole trial was nothing but a sham. In fact, *both parties, Laud and the Puritan propagandists, were guilty of matters for which they should have been punished.*

Prynne responded by saying that the Star Chamber had given the Archbishop greater protections than the monarch had. *The sentence for libel against the monarch under Queen Elizabeth I and King Charles I, was six month in ordinary prison, no fine, a capacity for the convicted person to redeem his ears for 200 pounds, and two months to make payment. Therefore the fine here was excessive, the loss of ears without redemption was excessive, the perpetual imprisonment was excessive, and the branding of "S.L." was excessive. I am in agreement with these comments of Prynne.*

The legal maxim developed since those times, *nemo judex in sua causa* (Latin, *No-one shall be judge in his own cause*), would later preclude Laud sitting as judge in *Rex v. Bastwick et al.* It seems to me that Laud found it impossible to separate in his own mind some elements of personal vengeance from this sentence, even as he had found it impossible to separate in his own mind some elements of personal defensiveness in *Libels 8, 12, & 14.* Being given the type of powers that e.g., Laud had as a Star Chamber judge, *he found a fundamental conflict of interest between his roles as complainant, prosecutor, judge, and jury,* that most men put in this position would.

Laud found a fundamental conflict of interest in his partly just and partly unjust grievances against the libelers, and his powers as a Star Chamber judge to bring his own case to court, and be its complainant, prosecutor, judge, and jury. Laud thus found himself in a fundamental conflict. Laud wanted to promote a particular religio-political agenda and saw that he might use his powers as a judge to advance this agenda. But it should also be said that legal abuse can occur in any supreme court, not just an inquisitorial one. (This is evident in modern times with e.g., the US Supreme Court with their evil libertine and "human rights" legal decisions in Brown's case, 1954, and later<sup>204</sup>).

---

<sup>204</sup> In the *Bob Jones University case* (US Sup. Ct., 1983), Bob Jones University (BJU) quite rightly took a stand in which it prohibited inter-racial dating or inter-racial marriage among students, on the basis of Biblical teaching opposed to racially mixed marriages (e.g., Gen. 6:1-4; Dan. 2:43,44; Matt. 24:38,39). The Inland Revenue Service (IRS) attempted legal action to remove BJU's tax exempt status, unless it agreed to allow racially mixed marriages. An initial court decision in 1976 found for BJU, then on appeal, the IRS went to the US Supreme Court, which decided in 1981 to hear the case in January 1982. But *the US Justice Department* under the new administration of President

*We cannot ignore the fact that the inquisitorial powers of the corrupted Star Chamber were a factor in the later civil war.* I think the decision to abolish the Star Chamber in 1641, in part based on this case of *Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn (1637)*, was a reasonable one in the context of the times by the Republican Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60, and I think the decision not to reintroduce it after the Royalist Anglican Restoration of 1660 was also a reasonable one in the context of the times. I for one, would be very reluctant to support any form of reintroduction of any court system with inquisitorial type powers or procedures, since I do not think that fallen human beings are generally very good at administering justice by such a system, although it must be paradoxically admitted that they were quite good at it under Henry VIII. Those who controlled it under Henry VIII were unusually good, talented, intellectually gifted, and dispassionate men, but alas, such men are truly hard to find in positions of power! But if they could be found, and if they were not judging their own cases, there may be some circumstances in which I would support such a court. If so, it would still need to be monitored by an independent body, and need to be accountable to some independent body, to ensure there was no abuse of the type that clearly occurred under Laud. Creating such a structure, while maintaining judicial independence, would at best be very difficult, and quite possibly, impossible. It has only ever been done historically when a strong king, like Henry VIII, was actively watching matters as the independent monitoring body; but when Charles I allowed the Star Chamber greater judicial autonomy, it quickly became corrupt.

Neither Laudians nor the Puritan Revolutionaries had a strong and sincere commitment to the Biblical teaching, “Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!” (Ps. 133:1). Both had lost sight of the big picture of the glorious truthfulness of the gospel of Christ rightly recovered at the time of the Christian Reformation, as embraced by all good Protestants. Both had lost sight of the spectacular truths found in the Reformation Motto, “*sola fide, sola gratia, sola Scriptura*” (Latin, “faith alone, grace alone, Scripture alone”). Both were “not holding the head,”

---

Ronald Reagan (President 1981-1989), *decided to drop the charges*, and so *withdrew the IRS appeal*. The Reagan Administration made it clear that it did want this appeal to continue, or to take any legal action against BJU. *But the US Supreme Court then allowed a third body*, the NAACP (a wicked organization known as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, who oppose the spirit of Christ in such passages as Matt. 15:22,26,27 cf. Gen. 9:25,26), *to be joined to the case*, and the US Supreme Court then *appointed a well known negro “civil rights” activist as prosecutor*, and had the case brought before them. *The US Supreme Court thus first appointed a complainant whose views they liked, then appointed a prosecutor whose views they liked, in both instances, CONTRARY TO THE WISHES OF THE PRESIDENT’S ADMINISTRATION AND JUSTICE DEPARTMENT’S DIRECTIONS.* It then naturally enough found against BJU. *If this is not a reintroduction of Star Chamber like powers by the US Supreme Court, then what, I ask, is?* (Wright, M., *Fortress of Faith*, 3rd ed., BJU, South Carolina, 1984, pp. 377-89).

who is “Christ,” and focusing on “him” “in” whom “dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily” (Col. 2:8,9,19). For had their focus been on *Christ alone* (Philp. 3:8,9), there would have been a great underpinning Protestant unity amidst the Anglican-Puritan diversity. The Puritans were right to oppose Laud’s innovations referred to in e.g., *Libels 8, 12, & 14*, but in fact the Puritan Revolutionaries wanted to use these to justify a much wider attack on Anglicanism. The charge that I would have brought against both Laudians and the Puritans, though not in a formal worldly court of law (I Cor. 6:1), would be the charge that for both, Christ was not “all in all” (Eph. 1:23).

The two-way pull between the Laudians and the Puritans meant that both sides wanted to move the middle Reformed Anglicans in their direction, and both saw the other side as more extreme than this middle Reformed Anglican ground. E.g., both sides wanted Scotland, although the evidence is that Scotland wanted Puritanism. The more general result was explosive passions on both sides (Jas. 4:1-7). On the one hand, it is true that the situation would not have been as volatile if a normative Reformed Anglican, rather than Laud, had been Archbishop of Canterbury. But on the other hand, it is also true that the situation would not have been as volatile if the Puritan leadership had sought to restrain, or at the very least condemn, Puritans like these three libelers *in those areas where they were dishonest*, or the dishonest Rutherford’s jurisprudence of seditions and murders found in his vile *Lex Rex*, rather than turning all of them into “heroes.”

There also needed to be the type of candid recognition of 1689, that England was fundamentally Anglican and Scotland was fundamentally Presbyterian, and if Protestantism was to flourish in these lands it needed to be first and foremost though the Establishment of these churches in their respective countries, with tolerance to other Protestants as minorities in these countries. I.e., trying to “Anglicanize” Scotland or trying to “Puritanize” England were lost causes. The emphasis needed to be on *a Biblically sound Protestant Established Anglican Church in England*, and *a Biblically sound Protestant Established Presbyterian Church in Scotland*, with tolerance and religious freedom to other Protestants outside these established churches. It is also true that the Puritan leadership moved to exploit the situation of Laud’s Archbishopric in a way that would “justify” the Puritan Revolution of 1640-60. As further discussed, *infra*, at this point I lose any sympathy for the Puritans, since I maintain that this was contrary to e.g., Rom. 13, and that like the NT Christians, they should have waited on the Lord and learnt patience, NOT political revolution.

In this context of Laud and the Puritans simultaneously going in opposite directions away from the middle ground of the publicly declared *Church of England* doctrines of Reformed Anglicanism, we cannot doubt that the case of *Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn (1637, Star Chamber)* acted to galvanize the two groups into a most undesirable situation of heightened rivalry for the one to control the other. A huge crowd gathered to see Prynne placed in the pillory, the stubs of his ears removed, and his cheeks branded. And when Prynne was released in 1640, a huge crowd numbering some thousands carried him into the city of London as some great hero, with Puritan supporters

throwing flowers in front of him, and shouting against the Anglican bishops<sup>205</sup>. In 1640, the Puritan revolutionaries of 1640-60 showed themselves to be a powerful political force, both by releasing these three libelers, and also by accusing the King's "evil councilors" such as the Earl of Stratford and Archbishop of Canterbury, Laud, of treason. They claimed that they were subverting true religion by Popish superstitions.

I now pass over many details of the GREAT REBELLION. Whatever criticisms I make of Laud and the sentencing of these three men in the Star Chamber Court in *Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn (1637, Star Chamber)*, must pale into *relative* insignificance with the criticisms that I would make of the Puritan trial of *Cromwell's Republic v. Archbishop of Canterbury (Laud) (1644)* (H.LL.), in which the Puritans put Prynne, justly convicted of libel by Laud in 1637, in charge of managing the trial. The legal maxim developed since those times, *nemo iudex in sua causa* (Latin, *No-one shall be judge in his own cause*), would preclude either Laud sitting as judge in *Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn*, or Prynne managing the case of *Cromwell's Revolutionary Regime v. Archbishop of Canterbury*. But such principles of justice were not then established and operating.

Prynne's face still bore the sentence of branding with the initial's "S.L." meaning "seditious libeler" that Laud had ordered as part of his sentence. He came with no ears, since what had been left of them in 1637, had been removed as part of Laud's Star Chamber sentence. I think that Prynne came to manage the trial, clearly rounding some kind of personal revenge against Laud, and that he was appointed by Cromwell's Puritans specifically because he was not impartial, and would not assist in giving Laud a fair trial. I.e., this was to be a show-trial.

If the Puritans had wanted a man with a known capacity for independent, broadminded, and dispassionate godly thinking, capable of withstanding the pressure of bigots, (both of which qualities are evident in Lightfoot's dissertation on the spherical nature of the planet earth, and his derivative conclusion on the need for a local earth in Gen. 1:2b-2:3, and need for a prior creation before the six creation days in Gen. 1:1,2, *supra*.) then they should have selected John Lightfoot of Ashley & London. Instead, they chose Prynne. The evidence is that Prynne managed the trial in the House of Lords with great anti-Laud bias, inappropriate for a person in his position. (E.g., see "Laud's Arminianism," *supra*.)

Prynne said in his *History of the Trial* that Laud made "a pithy defence of" "a bad cause," and "spake" "with much ... sophistry" and "audacity," "without the least blush or acknowledgment of guilt in anything." Yet for all this, *Prynne proved unpredictable*. He admits that the law could not be stretched to convict Laud of treason, since the evidence for this charge was simply not there. This shows a sense of justice in Prynne, and coming as it does from a clearly very hostile source, must act to show that the evidence for Laud's innocence *on the charge of sedition* was overwhelmingly strong.

---

<sup>205</sup> Close, A., *op. cit.*, pp. 150-151; Isani, M.A., "Hawthorne & the branding of William Prynne," *New England Quarterly*, Vol. 45 (1972), pp. 182-95 at 182.

The Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60 were evidently livid with rage at Prynne's finding. As always, *Prynne had proven to be unpredictable*. He was appointed to help reach a set decision, and he had surprisingly failed to reach it. To the chagrin of the Puritan Revolutionaries, he had thus proved to be an unpredictable trial-manager<sup>206</sup>. The Puritan parliamentarians then moved in the House of Commons to pass a *Bill of Attainder*. This is an Act of Parliament declaring the accused to be guilty of a crime without the need for a trial or any further legal proceedings. Whatever criticisms one may validly make of Laud as a Star Chamber judge, it must be said that he did not judicially impose the death sentence on his political enemies. By contrast, the Puritan Revolutionaries applied no such restraints. This *Bill of Attainder* required Laud's execution for sedition, though the court under Prynne had failed to find him guilty of this.

Close refers approvingly to various charges that the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60's made and based Laud's *Bill of Attainder* (1645) on. These included e.g., charges that that Laud had been: "introducing arbitrary power ... without any limitation of law;" "perverting the truth of God to defend lawless men" (of which I think there is some basis in fact as seen by e.g., *Libels 8 & 12, supra*); "making the King's Throne but a footstool for his own pride;" "advised His Majesty to use violence in introducing ecclesiastical innovations in Scotland tending to Popery" (I have sympathy with the Puritans on this charge<sup>207</sup>); "undermining and subverting religion by cherishing and

---

<sup>206</sup> Following his release in 1640, Prynne supported Cromwell's republican forces. But later as a member of the Puritan parliament, the unpredictable Prynne fell out of favour with Cromwell and was expelled in Pride's Purge of 1648 when Colonel Pride forcibly removed from the House of Commons political dissidents in what was effectively a *coup d'etat*. (Charles I was imprisoned at this time, though later escaped, and was then imprisoned again.) Now disliked by Cromwell, Prynne was imprisoned 1650-3 for his opposition to the Puritan's military government. Finally the unpredictable Prynne, decided to change his allegiances. Paradoxically, he supported the Restoration in 1660, being rewarded for this by being made *Keeper of Records* in the Tower of London. He thus died in 1669, aged 68/9, in the service of King Charles II.

<sup>207</sup> Though both Laud and Charles I may certainly be criticized for this policy from 1637 to 1640, it must be said that they did accept from 1640 that Scotland would basically determine its own religious matters, and this point seems lost on those who liked to criticize Laud some five years later in his trial of 1645. I consider they would have done better to acknowledge that there had been a change of policy since 1640, let bygones be bygones, and worked co-operatively with that new Caroline-Laudian policy, seeking for Scotland, *but not England or Ireland*, to have an established Puritan (Presbyterian) Church such as occurred in 1689. The Puritan's desire to hammer Laud over the older 1637-40 Caroline-Laudian failed policy which from 1640 both accepted was a failed policy, I think was one factor that retarded the earlier movement to an established Presbyterian *Church of Scotland* in 1689. These Puritans were not desirous of Anglican-Puritan reconciliation and *reasonable* movement forward on this issue. *They wanted not just Scotland, but also England and Ireland to be established as Puritan, although only Scotland had a broad support base in favour of this.* I.e., they wanted to

defending Popery;” “with power and violence severely punishing those who opposed his Popish doctrine and opinions” (presumably here referring to *Rex v. Bastwick, et al*); giving “promotion to those favouring Popery;” “appointing Chaplains grossly addicted to Popery” (the matters raised with respect to “Laud’s Arminianism,” *supra*); “by the abuse of the spiritual keys, he shut up the doors of heaven, and opened the gates of hell, and let in ignorance and superstition” (I regard this as anti-Protestant theology, since Christ has the spiritual keys, and no mortal man here on earth is able to “shut up” “heaven,” nor “open” “the gates of hell,” Rev. 3:7); and “cruelly persecuted and suspended orthodox Minister’s of God’s Word.”

But while these charges of subverting the law of the realm are important, and I think Laud was certainly to *some* extent guilty of this, such charges would not of themselves be likely to bring the death penalty. Therefore of special importance was the charge of being a traitor i.e., that Laud “traitorously endeavored to reconcile the *Church of England* with the *Church of Rome*,” and to this end, was “confederates with ... Jesuits.” This charge of seeking to overthrow Protestantism and reintroduce Roman Catholicism thus *lies at the heart of the charge of sedition and so the death penalty*. However, *Laud was certainly not involved in some “Jesuit plot” to so seditiously Romanize England* (even though his theology was in places semi-Romanist)<sup>208</sup>. E.g., contrary to the claims of Puritan revolutionary propaganda, the theme of Laud’s conference with the Jesuit, Fisher, was that he wanted to show that the Church of England was a better expression of Christianity than the Church of Rome<sup>209</sup>.

In the same way that in post World War Two 1940s and 1950s USA, a communist-phobia (McCarthyism) thought of “a red under every bed;” so likewise the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60 had a Papist-phobia (and an Arminian-phobia). They found “a Papist under the bed” (when not finding “an Arminian under the bed”). Upon investigation, these “Popish” (and “Arminian”) persons might sometimes be Anglicans of the Reformed faith who were not truly guilty of any charges, and sometimes semi-Romanists whose evils were greatly exaggerated, such as Archbishop Laud. As discussed in *Rex v. Bastwick, et al, supra*, Laud describes the Roman Catholic Church as the “*Whore of Babylon*” (Rev. 17) (*Libel 10*); and both Laud and Charles I approved of prayers for *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* praying that God, “Root out that Babylonish and Antichristian sect” i.e., Roman Catholicism (*Libel 9, supra*). Thus both King and Archbishop were in some sense Protestant historicists, who considered that the Pope is the Antichrist (as maintained in Article 35 of the 39 Articles), and the Roman Church is “Babylon” in the Book of Revelation. I allow the reader to draw his own conclusions, as to just how silly this makes sound, Close’s and the *Bill of Attainder’s* claims, which reiterate that old Puritan chestnut that Laud was seeking to usher in Popery, and on that

---

Puritanize England, Wales, and Ireland, the way Laud had wanted to Anglicize Scotland 1637-40.

<sup>208</sup> Close, A., *op. cit.*, pp. 153-5.

<sup>209</sup> Davies, J., *The Caroline Captivity of the Church, op. cit.*, p. 257.

basis condemn Laud to death for treason.

On 3 January 1645, the same day the parliament passed Laud's attainder bill, the Long Parliament made an Ordinance declaring the *Church of England's* Elizabethan and Jacobean *Book of Common Prayer* (1559 & 1604) *illegal*, and establishing "the Directory," a manual of Puritan worship. Gone, was the 1559 prayer book of *that Anglican Queen*, Elizabeth I, as minimally modified in 1604 by *that Anglican King*, James I. (A further Ordinance of 23 Aug 1645 would enact penalties of five pounds for a first offence, ten pounds for a second offence, and one year's imprisonment for a third offence, for anyone using the prayer book in any "public place of worship or in any private place or family.") *The Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, His Grace William Laud in 1645, like his Anglican King, His Majesty Charles I in 1649, was to be denied an Anglican burial by the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-1660.*

With respect to Laud's *Bill of Attainder*, I note that in the first instance it did not receive Royal Assent from the King. Thus I regard this as an illegal Ordinance. In the second place, aware that the Puritan Revolutionaries were seeking to charge and execute Laud with treason, in 1643 the King had preemptively granted him a Royal Pardon. *A King's Pardon is absolute.* Laud tendered the Royal Pardon in response to the *Bill of Attainder*, but it was ignored by the Puritan Revolutionaries.

There are thus three relevant facts. Firstly, the court (House of Lords) under the highly hostile prosecution team management of Prynne, admitted that the law could not be stretched to convict Laud of treason. Secondly, the *Bill of Attainder* had not received Royal Assent, and so was not law, it was a *Bill* but not an *Act* of Parliament, and so it was illegal to claim it was the law. Thirdly, a Royal Pardon had been granted to Laud, and so even if the *Bill of Attainder* had become law, it would be invalidated by the King's Pardon. *There was thus no lawful grounds to execute Laud for treason.*

Laud was now taken to Tower Hill, in London. On 10 January 1645, he was taken to the execution block. In his final speech<sup>210</sup>, he says among other matters the following notable things. "I have upon this sad occasion, ransacked every corner of my heart, and yet I thank God, I have not found any of my sins that are there, any sins now deserving of death by any known law of this kingdom." "And I thank God, though the weight of the sentence lie very heavy upon me, yet I am as quiet within as, I thank Christ for it, I ever was in my life. And ... I am not the first Archbishop ... that died in this way ..., [for] long before, Saint John Baptist had his head danced off by a lewd woman, and Saint Cyprian, Archbishop of Carthage [is also found] submitting his head to a persecuting sword." Now "that Church which all the Jesuits' machinations in these parts of Christendom could not ruin, is now fallen into a great deal of danger." "I was born

---

<sup>210</sup> Laud, W., *The Arch-bishop of Centerburie his speech or his funeral sermon: preached by himself on the scaffold of Tower Hill, on Friday 10th January, 1645 upon Hebrews 12:1,2.* Printed with Licence, London, 1645 (microfilm copy, NSW State Library, Sydney, Australia). I shall modernize the spellings where I think it appropriate, without specifically stating so when this is done.

and baptized in the bosom of the *Church of England*, as it stands established by law, in that profession I have ever since lived, and in that profession of the Protestant religion ... I come now to die.” “I have always lived in the Protestant religion established in England, and in that I come now to die.”

“Now at last I am accused of high treason in Parliament, a crime which my soul ever abhorred. This treason was charged upon me to consist of two parts. An endeavor to subvert the law of the realm, and a like to overthrow the true Protestant religion established by those laws. ... I protested my innocence.” “I never endeavored the subversion of the laws of the realm, nor ever any change in the Protestant religion into Popish superstitions, and I desire you to remember this protest of mine, for my innocence.”

On the one hand, these words of Laud upon the scaffold are the words of a man who to the end took a lawyer’s type approach of trying to claim semi-Romanist innovations introduced were really much older “discoveries of the law.” This was dishonest and wrong. But on the other hand, these words of Laud upon the scaffold are not the words of a man seeking reconciliation with the Roman Church, which is the charge that lies at the heart of his death sentence for sedition. They are not the words of a man seeking to usher in Popery in the way claimed by the Puritan Revolutionaries, even though it is clear that the Puritans did have a valid point in that Laud held some semi-Romanist views with his belief in the Communion Table as an “altar” (Lutheran view), his genuflecting at the Communion Table, and his nodding or bowing at the name of Jesus. These are not the words of a Puseyite who generally uses with disdain the word “Protestant,” and wants no connection with the *Protestant* Reformation of Christianity. Laudianism sought to go back to the Lutheran Reformation, and from that point to then reinvent Anglicanism in a more semi-Romanist and anti-Puritan way than the Anglicanism of the second stage of the *Church of England* and *Church of Ireland* Reformation was; whereas Puseyism generally lacks any such connectedness with supporting the Lutheran Reformation. Laud was semi-Romanist and posed a serious threat to the Protestant integrity of the *Church of England* that needed to be addressed. He certainly needed to be deprived of the Archbishopric of Canterbury, and punished for his violations of law. But for all that, Laudianism still wanted the first stage of the Reformation, i.e., the Lutheran Reformation (even though I consider his semi-Romanist views on e.g., sacramental adoration, to be contrary to even that first stage of the Reformation), and so Laud was nowhere near as extreme in this direction as the anti-Protestant Reformation Puseyites who dote over him.

After offering a prayer to God, he closed his eyes kneeling in prayer for the last time in this life, saying, “Lord, receive my soul.” These words were the appointed signal to the axe-man that his speech and prayer was now ended. And the sharp, shocking, glistening blade of the executioner fell hard upon his neck, and his blood spurted forth, and the voice of Archbishop Laud was heard no more upon this earth. And his “blood” cried up “from the ground” (Gen. 4:10). And the question was asked, “Where is ... thy brother?” (Gen. 4:9). And those who sought to find him, could not, for he was no more. And upon learning of this murder, King Charles declared of the English Puritan

Revolutionaries who were “guilty; ... this ... crying blood” is “totally theirs<sup>211</sup>.” For his “blood crieth ... from the ground” (Gen. 4:10). *Laud was no martyr. But he was the victim of an unwarranted murder by the Puritan revolutionaries.*

*What of Laud’s legacy?* It reminds us that, *Neither kings nor archbishops are infallible.* Even as Abraham had Ishmael who was not the son of promise, and Isaac who was the son of promise, so King Charles I had two primatial archbishops, William Laud of Canterbury who was not a son of promise, and James Ussher of Armagh who was a son of promise. In a curious way, both Laud and the Puritan Revolutionaries benefited from each other. When the Puritans justly complained about Laud, he could with some justification, turn to the King and say something like, “Your Majesty, these Puritans are well known extremists. They claim that the Anglican Church under Queen Elizabeth, and your father, King James, did not go *far enough* in the Puritan direction. They want my head; but Your Majesty, they want your head also.” *I think the effect of having extremist Puritans made Charles I over-reluctant to take much needed disciplinary action against Laud, lest he be seen to be encouraging Puritanism.*

The Puritans also benefited from having Laud, since they could with some justification say something like, “Laud is a well known extremist. He claims the reforms in the second stages of the English Reformation *should not* have occurred. He is trying to roll back the Protestant Reforms made under Queen Elizabeth and upheld by King James. He and his cronies have introduced a number of innovations which move the *Church of England* backwards from these Protestant advances.” *The reality is, that Charles the First needed to get rid of both Laud and the Puritan Revolutionaries, and he made a serious tactical mistake in keeping hold of Laud and not disciplining him. Though Charles’ mistake is understandable given the climate of Puritan hostility and sedition against the Crown, it was nevertheless a mistake that he would pay for greatly.*

Anglicans do not believe bishops are infallible. If they did, they would never have broken from the Bishop of Rome under Henry VIII. E.g., I know of no Reformed (Evangelical) Anglican who thinks favourably of the incumbent Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams. Williams is a man who e.g., is a religious liberal that does not recognize the Bible as God’s infallible Word (II Tim. 3:16), supports sex role perversion in the form of women priests (I Tim. 2:8-3:13), and supports sexual perversion in the form of “them that defile themselves with mankind” (I Tim. 1:10; cf. Lev. 18:22,24). He is clearly a very bad Archbishop of Canterbury. So too, I know of no Reformed (Evangelical) Anglican who thinks favourably of the former Archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud. Laud was clearly a very bad Archbishop of Canterbury.

---

<sup>211</sup> “*He being dead yet speaketh*”: *A sermon preached in the Church of S. Thomas, Oxford, on the anniversary of the death of King Charles*, by the Rev. H. Maynard Smith, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Malvern, Published for the Royal Martyr Church Union by B.H. Blackwell, Oxford, England, UK, 1918, p. 15. Though this sermon is sadly marred by Puseyism (*Ibid.*, p. 16), it nevertheless contains some useful information. (Copy held at the British Library, London.)

To the extent that from 1662 the Final Rubric at the Communion Service of the Anglican prayer book replaced the words of 1552 rejecting the “real and essential presence ... of Christ’s natural flesh and blood” (transubstantiation), to rejecting “any corporeal presence of Christ’s natural flesh and blood” (transubstantiation or consubstantiation); it may be reasonably concluded that Reformed Anglicans decided that after the experience of having an Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury who believed in the corporeal presence of Christ via consubstantiation, that they no longer wanted to leave this open as an option of *private interpretation*.

This means that after the Restoration, the same Reformed Anglicans that moved to recognize King Charles as a martyr, also moved to put some distance between themselves and Laud. Anglicans could accept that Laud’s killing was an example of what the Office for King Charles the Martyr calls the Puritan Revolutionaries’ “tyranny,” but they did not want to itemize Laud specifically as a “martyr.” This distance resulting from some level of ambivalence toward Laud, was more comprehensively made after the events of 1685 to 1688. Laud was not remembered as a martyr, and his memory was not generally honoured among Anglicans.

The Final Rubric of the Communion Service in the 1662 prayer book recognizes guilt on both the Anglican side (Laud) and Puritan side (Rutherford), and unites Anglican and Puritan Protestants against idolatrous adoration of the elements, such as occurs in Romanism with transubstantiation teachings. It says, “Communicants should receive the same kneeling ... for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ ..., and for the avoiding of ... profanation and disorder ... ” (Matt. 15:27,28; 23:12; I Cor. 14:40). But “lest” “kneeling” “either out of ignorance and infirmity,” e.g., some of those under Rutherford’s spell; “or out of malice and obstinacy,” such as is the case with Rutherford himself, “be misconstrued and depraved: it is hereby declared, that thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any corporeal presence of Christ’s natural flesh and body.”

Cranmer (1552) followed Zwingli’s symbolic view of the Lord’s Supper, given “in remembrance,” so the Communicant “feed on” Christ “in thy heart by faith” (Communion Service, 1662). But the 1662 final rubric changed the 1552 rubric rejecting the “real and essential presence ... of Christ’s natural flesh and blood” (transubstantiation), to rejecting “any corporeal presence of Christ’s natural flesh and blood” (transubstantiation or consubstantiation). Before 1662 some Anglicans argued that there was no *transubstantiation* i.e., *no change of the bread and wine into Christ’s body and blood*, but there was a *consubstantiation* type *corporeal presence* of Christ’s body and blood which were *in, under, around*, and so *united with* the bread and wine. Following the Laudians usage of Lutheran consubstantiation, from 1662 Anglicans here specifically prohibited it, and thus put a clear distance between themselves and Laud.

The rubric says “adoration” is “idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians.” Then contextually rejecting both transubstantiation and consubstantiation, “the natural

body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here: it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one." This Anglican Protestant language in conjunction with I John 4:2,3; Articles 19, 28, & 31, and the Homilies (Article 35), identifies the Roman Pope as the Antichrist via transubstantiation.

Thus Reformed Anglicans are anti-Laud, though not as strongly so as the Puritans who condemned Laud for his Anglicanism and Laudianism alike. Connected with consubstantiation, a small circle of Laudians became over-focused on the Communion Table, calling it a Lutheran type "altar," and unlike Lutherans also bowing to it whether or not the consecrated sacrament was there. This acted as a backdrop that allowed the Puritan propagandist, Rutherford, to then try and claim a universal idolatrous adoration of the Communion elements by all Anglicans i.e., both Reformed Anglicans and Laudian Anglicans. His deceitful mechanism for this was Anglican kneeling at Communion.

Whereas Anglican and Lutheran Protestants maintain that a practice which the church has found useful and good may be maintained providing it "be not repugnant to the Word of God" (Anglican Article 34), Puritan Protestants look for a specific "regulatory" principle of finding a set command in Scripture. E.g., because only Sunday worship is specifically commanded (Exod. 20:8-11; John 20:1,19,26; Acts 20:7; I Cor. 16:2); Puritans historically opposed Anglican and Lutheran practices which "esteemeth one day above another" (Rom. 14:5) with e.g., Christmas, Good Friday at Easter, or All Saints' Day (1 Nov.). Or whereas Anglicans having an element of ambivalence towards Laud and being not as anti-Laud as the English revolutionary Puritans, generally adopted "Laud's Communion rail" policy, Puritans continued to sit to receive Communion (although kneeling to take Anglican Communion predates Laud). *Thus while traditional Reformed Anglicans are anti-Laud, they are not as strongly so as the English Puritans who condemned him for his Anglicanism and Laudianism alike.*

If Rutherford stopped where more reasonable Puritans stopped, and simply said he considered one should receive Communion sitting, then I could accept that "it is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly alike" (Article 34), and that legitimate Protestant diversity exists on the matter. Sitting is not contrary to the Bible, and indeed I have sometimes taken Communion in a sound Puritan Church sitting, even though my preference is to do so kneeling in a sound Anglican Church.

*This Final rubric in the 1662 Anglican prayer book Communion Service which is both anti-Laud and anti-Rutherford, is thus a recognition that to some extent, the problems of the civil war era were connected to the high profile of both trouble-makers on the Anglican side (Laud) and trouble-makers on the Puritan side (Rutherford). The Anglicans from King Charles down were wrong not to restrain Laud and deprive him of his Archbishopric, and the Puritans were wrong not to restrain Rutherford and excommunicate him. In this, both sides failed to recognize the teachings of Christian love and legitimate diversity found in such passages of Scripture as Rom. 14 & Col. 2:16.*

As further discussed, *infra*, Reformed Anglicans gave the Lutheran Church exemptions from the *Act of Uniformity 1662* in the late 1660s, long before the Toleration

Act of 1689, and Reformed Anglicans were quite happy for Princess (later Queen) Anne to marry the Lutheran, Prince George, in 1683, and he had two Lutheran Chaplains. Thus on the one hand, Reformed Anglicans from 1662 required the general Reformed Anglican view of symbolism at the Communion, with absolutely no *corporeal presence*, and in this sense held the same basic symbolistic view as Puritans. But on the other hand, Anglicans retained a greater tolerance to embracing Lutherans as fellow Protestant brethren in Christ, and did not, like the Puritans, cut themselves off from Lutheran Protestants in the same way as Puritans did on this type of ground. In granting Lutherans religious liberty in the 1660s, they also clearly distanced themselves from Laud's view that episcopal government was divine law, since Lutherans were not episcopalians<sup>212</sup>.

To the extent that Caroline Anglicans after the Restoration clearly recognized as valid the church government of the Lutheran Church in London, and from 1690 supported the establishment of Presbyterian Puritanism in Scotland, it is clear that they gave an interpretation to Article 34 of the 39 Articles that militated against the severity and fanaticism of Laud's view that Episcopal government was divine law in the 1660s, and then further strengthened their position on this from 1689. This militated against the type of fanaticism that had led to the attempt to Anglicanize Scotland against its Puritan will from 1637-40. This was clearly a return to the pre-Laudian era view. E.g., under Queen Elizabeth a statute was passed (5 Eliz. Cap. 26) to help Protestants on the Continent. Among other things, this recognized that "within the realm of France," there was "hostility and persecution" "against the professors of God's holy gospel and true religion," even though these Huguenots were certainly not episcopalians.

The decision to grant Lutheran religious liberty in the 1660s also meant that the Anglicans were putting a small distance between themselves and Laud's policy of compulsory Sunday worship in Anglican Churches, a policy they more comprehensively repudiated in 1689. Thus the *Toleration Act* of 1689 would have been understood by the people as a complete repudiation of Laud's policy that had produced persecution of non-Anglicans attending Puritan Churches in Caroline times under Charles I, and after the Restoration seen the imprisonment of such persecuted Puritans as the saintly Baptist, John Bunyan of Bedford. The *Toleration Act* thus contained a very obvious anti-Laudian sentiment, and signaled that Anglicans had now put a large gap between themselves and Laud who had revived Elizabethan statute law to ensure a legal fine applied to those not attending an Anglican Church on Sunday.

Other Anglican actions also compatible with this post 1689 more strident anti-Laudian policy evidently included the termination of any surviving Laudian innovations of the type and kind most disliked by both second stage Reformation Anglicans and also Puritans, such as nodding, genuflecting, and ceremonial copes (other than for coronations). References to these would now disappear from the history of Anglicanism, or be severely modified (ceremonial copes were later used as coronation copes).

---

<sup>212</sup> Gibson's *Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani*, Vol. 1, pp. 635-6 (Title XXXVII, cap 5).

However, these had only been practiced by some Anglicans, and a number of Laud's innovations had already gone. The type of pro-Laudian bishops of the immediate Restoration era would no longer be appointed. But Anglicans would stand firm on kneeling to receive Communion, and hence Laud's expanded practice of a Communion rail was retained. For though Anglicans were not happy with Laudianism, nor did they want the Puritan's anti-Anglicanism.

But with the clear jettisoning of remaining elements of Laudians' anti-Protestant spirit innovations, the Anglican Church experienced a resurgence in Protestantism. The Anglican Church from the Williamite era on, like the Anglican Church under Edward VI, Elizabeth I, and James I, was much more clearly a *Protestant* Church in her sentiment, outlook, and appointment of Bishops. The *Act of Settlement* stated the monarch was to be Protestant, and only marry a Protestant. And that great Protestant holy day, *Papists' Conspiracy Day* (5 Nov.), recalling God's protection of Protestantism in 1605, was now to be expanded to also include reference to the coming of William of Orange on 5 November 1688, so that even more than before, the *Church of England* was to celebrate far and wide the fact that she was Protestant. Under God, Reformed Anglicans in England (and Ireland), now worked in alliance with Presbyterians in Scotland, *for the Protestant cause*. *'Twas a glorious celebration of Protestant Christian truths!*

The smile of heaven, and peace in the realm among Protestants now returned to the British Isles, as God's people, the Protestants, now stood united in a way that they had not done since Edwardian, Elizabethan, and Jacobean times. That smile and peace of heaven would remain till the 19th century. Under that smile of heaven, the British Empire would be built up in order to protect white Protestantism in the British Isles from any attack by the mixed race southern European Papists of Spain, or any other Papists in Europe. Under that smile of heaven, the prophecy of Gen. 9:27, "God shall enlarge Japheth," would be largely fulfilled by the white British Protestants of the three kingdoms of England (England & Wales), Ireland, and Scotland, then from 1707 to 1800 of the Kingdom of Great Britain (England & Scotland) with the ongoing Kingdom of Ireland, and from 1801 of the United Kingdom, as they went forth to North America, Australia, and elsewhere.

*Anglican orthodoxy from 1662 required that King Charles the First be regarded as a martyr. But the issue of how one assesses Laud was left to private opinion among Anglicans. Anglicans in general wanted little to do with Laud from 1662, and Anglicans in general wanted nothing to do with Laud from 1689.*

E.g., in his *King Charles Martyr's Day* sermon at St. Patrick's Church of Ireland Cathedral, Dublin, in 1726, Dean Jonathon Swift, the author of the novel, *Gulliver's Travels* (1726), celebrated the memory of King Charles I. But Dean Swift also recognized that there had been mistakes and abuses under Charles I, even though he maintained that these did not thereby justify sedition and murder. This included corruption in the "court called the Star Chamber" i.e., under Laud<sup>213</sup>. Similar sentiments

---

<sup>213</sup> Connolly, S.J., "The Church of Ireland and the Royal Martyr: Regicide and

might also be inferred from the 1738 *King Charles Martyr's Day* sermon of Patrick Delany, who criticized both Charles I's bad advisors as well as "a most seditious Puritan faction." Dean Swift described this as "an excellent loyal sermon on the martyrdom day," showing that this type of balance i.e., criticism of both Charles I's bad advisors (e.g., Laud), as well as the Puritan's revolution, had a broader support base among Anglicans<sup>214</sup>.

Laud himself was unnecessarily unpopular with a lot of good Anglicans, not just Puritans. E.g., in a well known story, oft repeated, as a Chaplain, Laud drew up a list of clergymen for the purposes of considering promotions, given to Charles I in 1625. He put next to their names either an "O" or "P" for "orthodox" or "Puritan" respectively. Those whom he deemed "P" were thus black-listed<sup>215</sup>. Laud's concept of who was "orthodox" clearly excluded a large number of Anglican clergymen, who were clearly not "Puritan" in the normal sense of the word, but were Anglican *not Puritan*. This is seen in e.g., the dismissal of 13 bishops in 1640 opposed to the illegal canons of 1640. But this is typical of how Laud would use a word like "orthodox." I.e., he did not distinguish between his private opinions and the publicly declared doctrine of the Anglican Church. Thus he did not use "O" to mean those who followed the publicly professed doctrine of the Anglican Church in her prayer book and Articles, but those who were "orthodox" in the discretionary opinion of his personal idiosyncrasies, quirks, and Laudian heresies.

Laud remains a controversial figure. To the Puritans he was a sinister Romish figure entangled in a clandestine Jesuit plot, seeking to usher in Popery. Many secular historians have produced a secularized form of this image. But it tends to strip the anti-Laudian sentiment of references to Laud's unpopular belief in compulsory Sunday worship in Anglican Churches, and other spiritual matters of importance. But for all that, there is a secular view regarding Laud as a villain. And what is their basic concern? This varies. But surprise, surprise! One increasingly popular secular view (how long it remains popular one can only surmise,) seeks to raise that old Puritan chestnut of "Laud's Arminianism," which they now claim was responsible for all the troubles of this era!<sup>216</sup> (I think I smell a Puritan rat in this secularized history! Albeit one that gives the Puseyites something, namely, the claim that "Caroline Anglicans" were "Arminians.")

At the other extreme, Laud is regarded as a "martyr." One finds some early

---

Revolution in Anglican Political Thought c. 1660-c.1745," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 2003, *op. cit.*, p. 501.

<sup>214</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 503.

<sup>215</sup> E.g., Solt, L.F., *Church & State in Early Modern England 1509-1640*, Oxford University Press, New York, USA, 1990, p. 178.

<sup>216</sup> Hoyles, D., "A common investigation of Arminianism and Popery in Cambridge on the eve of the civil war," *Historical Journal*, Vol. 27, No. 2, 1986, pp. 419-25 at p. 419.

support for this view in e.g., the publication of Henry Wharton's *History of the Troubles and Trial of the ... blessed martyr, William Laud, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury* (1695), and *The Second Volume of the Remains of the ... Blessed Martyr, William Laud, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury* (1700)<sup>217</sup>, where Laud was clearly regarded as a Christian "martyr." But this appears to have been very much of a minority view, and those following this view do not appear to have been very vocal till the Puseyites of the 19th century started to pick up Puritan propaganda against Laud with great relish. With it, they argued for various forms of semi-Romanism that Laud himself would have wanted nothing to do with, and which went well beyond repealing the 1662 rubric on adoration prohibiting Laud's consubstantiation views, and went well beyond e.g., Laud's semi-Romanist innovations on nodding or genuflecting.

The 1979 prayer book of the Episcopal Church of the USA (ECUSA), includes on its calendar for 10 January, William Laud; and for 18 September, Edward Bouverie Pusey. ECUSA is a religiously liberal Puseyite Anglican Church. The proposition that religiously conservative Reformed Evangelical Anglicans such as myself, should back the Puseyite claim that Laud was a "martyr" is entirely out of the question. Nevertheless, Puseyite influence is clearly apparent in the fact that some Anglican Churches have made 10 January a black letter day for Laud. I think Laud is most unworthy of such an honour. I for one want nothing to do with Laud's semi-Romanism.

Laud's desire to increase the level of ceremonial and ritual in the *Church of England*, and thus place a greater gap between the *Church of England* and Puritan Churches, failed to recognize that the Anglican Church was already more ceremonial than Puritanism, and for Protestants, *it was ceremonial enough!* The type of clerical dress worn by Reformed Anglican clergyman with the surplice, captured an element of the ceremonial, but like all Protestant clergyman's dress, was still simple enough not to unnecessarily isolate people. This is a principle of Reformed (Evangelical) Anglicanism, that Laudians (and later Puseyites) never seem to grasp; and in more recent times, Puseyites bringing their views to churches have driven people out into other churches, not that this ever seems to worry them. *Laud failed to realize that for many people things like ceremonial copes put too great a distance between the clergy and people, and isolates them from the people who want to get away from them. Laud failed to realize that God has put a conscience in man that tells him idolatry is wrong (Rom. 1 & 2), and many, including many Anglicans, testified that their conscience was troubled at practices such as genuflecting to Communion Tables; to which may also be reasonably added concerns from the Divine revelation of Scripture.* The numbers of people exiting, and clearly wanting something even more simple than traditional Protestant Anglicanism,

---

<sup>217</sup> Laud, W., *The History of the Troubles and Tryal of the Most Reverend Father in God, and Blessed Martyr, William Laud, Lord Arch-Bishop of Canterbury*, Wrote by himself during his imprisonment in the Tower, Published by Mr. H. Wharton, London, 1695; Laud, W., *The Second Volume of the Remains of the Most Reverend Father in God, and Blessed Martyr, William Laud, Lord Arch-Bishop of Canterbury*, Written by himself, collected by Mr. Henry Wharton, London, 1700 (both as microfilm copies, NSW State Library, Australia).

should have given Laud pause for thought, that his policy was not a good one. Laud was isolating both Protestant Anglicans and Puritans from the *Church of England*, and he clearly did not care about this effect. *He was too anti-Puritan.*

Moreover, as Sir Winston Churchill observes, in addition to Laud's "new emphasis on ceremony," he found a new revenue source by having enforced old Elizabethan statutes that had fallen into disuse, fining people one shilling for not attending an Anglican Church on Sunday. "Now," says Churchill, "all over England men and women found themselves haled before the Justice for not attending church, and fined one shilling a time. Here indeed was something that ordinary men and women could understand ... it was something new and something teasing. The Puritan, ... regarded it as persecution ...<sup>218</sup>." Thus Laud was a somewhat unpopular figure among many in England, both Anglican and Puritan, and those in Scotland were not very happy with him either. *Few would have shed a tear at his death.*

Though my negativity towards Laud is less than that traditionally found among Puritans, at the end of the day, I nevertheless agree with e.g., modern Christians derived from a Puritan tradition, that *Laud was a bad egg*. On a chess board, a King has two bishops. So too, King Charles had two primatial bishops, the Lord Archbishop and Primate over the *Church of England*, William Laud; and the Lord Archbishop and Primate over the *Church of Ireland*, James Ussher. I do not doubt that Ussher was the King's good bishop, whereas Laud was the King's bad bishop.

E.g., with respect to his quirky views, Laud's claim that to consider "the Ancient of Days" in Dan. 7 is God the Father is "foolish." Or his claim that no stained-glass windows depicting God the Father should be made. Or his claim that the Ecclesiastical Canons supported a wrong type of devotion in the form of nodding at the name of Jesus. Thus when the question is asked, *Who held quirky private views that he failed to distinguish from official Anglican teaching?* The answer comes back, *Laud, Laud, Laud.*

Or with respect to Laud's innovations. E.g., from 1622 his at first secretive reintroduction of auricular confession (as opposed to a non-auricular confession in silent prayer to God in a priest's presence), after its abolition 60 years before in 1562, with Book 2, Homily 19, Article 35, of the 39 Articles. Indeed, going backwards even beyond the 1552-1562 view (auricular confession only for a sick person), to the earlier 1549-1552 view (auricular confession for a whole or sick person). Or his unauthorized changing of Philp. 2:10 in the prayer book of 1559 & 1604 without Parliamentary approval. Or his expansive interpretation of Article 20 in the 39 Articles in which "controversies of faith" became "matters of faith" in order for him to enhance his own judicial powers. Thus when the question is asked, *Who introduced unauthorized innovations into the Church of England?* The answer comes back, *Laud, Laud, Laud.*

Or Laud's immorality in setting aside the *Ten Commandments*. For instance,

---

<sup>218</sup> Churchill, W., *A History of the English-Speaking Peoples*, Cassell & Co., London, UK, 1956, 2nd ed. 1957, Vol. 2, p. 159.

contrary to the Second Commandment (Exod. 20:4-6), his idolatrous adoration of a corporeal presence of Christ's natural body and blood in the consecrated sacramental bread and wine of the Lord's Supper. (Though Lutherans also believe in consubstantiation, they do not thereby use it to justify such idolatrous adoration.) Or his setting aside of the Tenth Commandment (Exod. 20:17), which prohibits "lust" (Rom. 7:7), which sin precedes the commissioning of other sins (James 4:1). This lust is clearly evident in Laud's ungodly and unBiblical lust towards semi-Romanism and his self-aggrandizement, which gave rise to the nine (or ten) innovations formerly itemized. Or his setting aside of the ninth commandment (Exod. 20:16), in his many lies in which he denied he was introducing innovations, but deviously tried to claim that Laudianism was the established form of Anglicanism. Thus when the question is asked, *Who set aside the Holy Decalogue?* The answer comes back, *Laud, Laud, Laud.*

Or with respect to Laud's advising of the King on various matters, e.g., his 1625 promotions black-listing of various clergy who did not agree with him. Or his legal usage of a dead-letter statute to fine Englishmen one shilling if they did not attend an Anglican Church on Sunday. Or his misadvised in favor of an Anglican war on Puritan Scotland between 1637 and 1640. Thus when the question is asked, *Who misadvised the King?* The answer comes back, *Laud, Laud, Laud.*

I think a suitable punishment for Laud would have involved depriving him of the Archbishopric of Canterbury, and a fine that he could afford to pay. I think a prison sentence up to, but not exceeding *five* years, should also have been imposed. Personally, I do think he should have been given an excessively high fine that he could not reasonably afford to pay, or been jailed (gaoled) longer than five years, or been mutilated or flogged, or been charged with treason, or executed. But that is my personal opinion<sup>219</sup>. Ultimately, the matter should have been determined by judges who were Reformed Anglicans, and who supported the spirit and teachings of the second stage of the English Reformation. Laud should have been tried by good and sound Reformed Protestant Anglicans, not by bigoted Puritans who had an anti-Anglican agenda as well as an anti-Laudian agenda. E.g., a man like James Ussher could have been put in charge of the trial, or at least been one of the judges. I consider that the charge of treason against Laud was excessive, and the punishment of execution dangerously severe. It reflected the fact that the Puritan Revolutionaries were opportunistically exploiting the presence of a prize fool like Laud, in order to unjustifiably try and justify their bloodthirsty and tyrannical regime. *Laud had thought himself a great Puritan opponent, but his stupidity and folly had helped facilitate the political rise of extremist Puritans, much as he and Laudians would no doubt deny that his actions helped to have this effect.*

In my opinion, Laud was an Anglican first, and his profession of Protestant Christianity, imperfect as it was, came second; in the same way that the Puritan

---

<sup>219</sup> I am of course here dealing in terms of a man giving out human judgments. By contrast, if "God" who has "purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity" (Hab. 1:12,13) puts e.g., both Laud and the Puritan revolutionaries into the pits of hell, then I do not doubt that whatever God does is entirely right.

Revolutionaries of 1640-60 were Puritans first, and their profession of Protestant Christianity, imperfect as it was, came second. *The great heart cry and need of the age, was for broad-minded and enlightened men, who were born again and regenerated Protestant Christians washed in the blood of the Lamb* first, and followers of their denomination or sect second. The cry of God's saints in both the Anglican camp and the Puritan camp was the same. It was not the cry to be Anglican or Puritan. It was the cry to be *Christian* as understood in the glorious truths of Biblical Protestantism. It was the cry for more men like the Anglican Lord Primate of Ireland, His Grace James Ussher; or the Presbyterian Puritan Westminster Divine, John Lightfoot.

Alas, Laud, like the Puritan Revolutionaries, failed to meet this important test. Neither of them have my support or endorsement. I serve God, not man. They both failed to show an appropriate Christian love for the brethren (I John 4:10,11,19-21). "Vanity of vanities, saith the Preacher, vanity of vanities; all is vanity" (Eccl. 1:2).

c) i) *Charles the First's Day (30 Jan.), Charles the Second's Day (or Royal Oak Day) (29 May), & Papists' Conspiracy Day (5 Nov.).*

*General; The secular society seeks the abolition of these holy days; Puritan propagandists turn Puritanism and "Protestantism" into synonyms; Puseyite distortions on Charles I; Five illustrative issues: kneeling at Communion, "crucifixes," "altars," candles, & clerical dress. A modern Puritan: Charles Spurgeon; Charles the First; Charles I and Anglican hagiology recognizing him as a Christian martyr; Popish Jesuit involvement in Charles I's martyrdom; The immediate events of Charles I's martyrdom; The second feast ... the restoration of the monarchy, under ... King Charles II; The removal of religious liberty to Puritans from 1662 to 1689; Church building and the Great Fire of London; religious tolerance ... for Lutheran ... Protestants from 1668; Charles II's final years and death; Papists' Conspiracy Day.*

*General.* The 1578 Notes on *The New Calendar* of the Elizabethan Prayer Book, refers to such notable proto-Protestant and Protestant saints as Melancthon (16 Feb.), Luther (18 Feb., 22 Feb., 31 Oct., & 10 Nov), Huss (8 July), Calvin (27 Aug.), and Zwingli (11 Oct.)<sup>220</sup>. E.g., a note at 8 July says, "John Huss was burnt as on this day, at the Council held at Constance, for professing the Gospel of our Lord Jesus, Anno 1415." Or a note at 31 October says, in "1517," "101 years after the death of John Huss, Martin Luther gave his propositions in the University of Wittenberg, against the Pope's pardon." Or a note on 18 February says, "Martin Luther, the servant of God, died ... upon this day. Anno 1546."

But except occasionally, e.g., this *New Calendar* of 1578, until historically modern times, Anglican prayer book hagiology for the 16th and 17th centuries more

---

<sup>220</sup> *The Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth 1559, With an Historical Introduction* by Edward Benham, John Grant, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, 1909, pp. 194-205, *The New Calendar of 1578* (I have modernized spellings e.g., "ye" become "the").

usually had a strong focus on the monarch as Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church. Thus more commonly, Anglican hagiology used *All Saints' Day* (1 November) to remember saints such as e.g., Huss, Luther, and Calvin. Of course, one could mention in a sermon on All Saints' Day that in the Elizabethan *New Calendar* of 1578 these Protestants saints, especially Luther, were remembered. Nevertheless, in general Anglican hagiology was focused on the Supreme Governors of the *Church of England* and *Church of Ireland* for the 16th and 17th centuries. I.e., one would e.g., tell the story of Luther and Protestantism in conjunction with the story of the defence of Protestantism on *Papists' Conspiracy Day* by King James in 1605 and King William of Orange in 1688.

This more general focus on Supreme Governors of the Anglican Church, is seen in the focus on King James I and King William III in *Papists' Conspiracy Day*, or Charles I in *King Charles the Martyr's Day*. Likewise, there are favorable references to King Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Elizabeth I in the Homilies of Article 35 in the 39 Articles. Cranmer, as Archbishop of Canterbury composed the prayer books, most of whose work was retained in the 1662 prayer book, and so through reference to this Cranmer was remembered, and likewise he might be mentioned on All Saints' Day. Reference is also made to the Marian Confessors and Martyrs in the *Primo Elizabethae Act* of the 1559 prayer book which is also printed near the start of the 1662 prayer book. This says the Protestant prayer book "was ... taken away by ... Queen Mary [the First], to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ's religion." I.e., by publishing this Act in the front of the prayer book, a tradition continued in the 1662 prayer book, it was unmistakably stamped as *the Protestant* prayer book of Cranmer that *the Papist* Bloody Mary had sought to destroy, but which came back with Elizabeth I (notwithstanding some relatively minor modifications to Cranmer's prayer book in 1559, 1604, and 1662).

But in terms of hagiology on the Anglican Calendar or in the Anglican Homilies, it was thus Supreme Governors of the *Church of England* and *Church of Ireland* who were generally remembered. While the *Church of Ireland* Office of *Irish Massacre Day* (23 Oct.) was something of an exception to this general trend, even this had some lesser focus on the *Supreme Governor of the Church of Ireland*. E.g., the 15th regnal year of Charles (Latin, *Caroli* = "Car.") the Second was 1663 (Regnal Years: King *de jure* of the three kingdoms, 1649-1685; King *de facto* of Scotland, 1649-1650/1<sup>221</sup>; King *de facto* of England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1660-1685); and 14 & 15 Car. 2, Sess. (Session) 4, c. (chapter) 23 (Irish Parliament) which was not repealed till 1859 (22 Vic. c. 2, UK Parliament), required that "yearly, upon the twenty-third day of October," that people "diligently and faithfully resort to the parish church" for "morning prayer, preaching, or other service ... used," "and that after morning-prayer or preaching every such twenty-third of October they read publickly ... this ... Act." Among other things, this Act read every 23 October in *Church of Ireland* churches till 1859 reminded Anglicans that, "on

---

<sup>221</sup> As a consequence of the unwelcome encroachments into Scotland of the invading republican army of Cromwell, Charles II held *de facto* power only in parts of Scotland from the latter half of 1650 through to 1651.

the twenty-third of October, in the year of our Lord God one thousand six hundred and forty-one,” “malignant and rebellious Papists and Jesuits ... conspired ... [in] this Kingdom of Ireland,” intending that “... the Protestants ... that would not join with them should be cut off, and” intending “by a general rebellion to deprive ... King Charles the First of his ... rightful Crown ...;” and that “many thousand British ... Protestants” were then “massacred,” and “many thousands of other of them” were “afflicted and tormented.” Yet notwithstanding e.g., this reference to Charles I, in broad-brush terms both this Act and also the Office of *Irish Massacre Day* maintained such linkage to the *Supreme Governor of the Church of Ireland* as a secondary focus, but the primary focus was on the massacre of Protestants in Ireland by Papists in 1641.

These three days, *Charles the First's Day* (30 Jan.), *Charles the Second's Day* (or *Royal Oak Day*) (29 May), & *Papists' Conspiracy Day* (5 Nov.), each had an Office (Service), and were part of the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) till they were removed in 1859. (They were also part of the *Church of Ireland's* prayer book of 1666 till they united with the *Church of England* and from 1801 used the 1662 prayer book till after their lamentable Disestablishment from 1871<sup>222</sup>.) Protestants have historically disagreed in their views on Charles the First and Charles the Second. In broad terms, Reformed Anglicans have given *qualified support* to these two kings, regarding neither as perfect or beyond criticism. E.g., it must be admitted, that at times Charles II was too sympathetic to Roman Catholics, a fact clearly evident in his marriage to a Roman Catholic. In this, he was like King Solomon. But such Anglicans distance themselves from the exaggerated claims, distortions, and inaccuracies, made against these two kings by *some*, though *by no means all*, Puritan derived Non-Conformists who peddle propaganda in favour of the Puritan Revolution of 1640-60 with Oliver Cromwell and the Puritan republic of 1642-60. Support for the restoration of the monarchy in 1660 under Charles II, is the natural corollary to opposing the forces of Cromwell's republic and regarding Charles I as a Christian martyr in 1649.

Those executed under the Puritan Revolution of 1640 to 1660, generally for

---

<sup>222</sup> *Irish Massacre Day* (23 Oct.) was a red-letter day with its own *Church of Ireland* Office 1666-1800. As part of the 1801 Union the *Church of Ireland* lost its 1666 prayer book, and as the *United Church of England and Ireland* used the *Church of England's* 1662 prayer book. This was part of the wider union of the three kingdoms of England (and its Dominion of Wales), Ireland, and Scotland into first the Kingdom of Great Britain with the ongoing Kingdom of Ireland (1707-1800), and then (from 1801) the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. The union preserved the Act of the old Irish parliament, “An Act for keeping and celebrating the twenty-third of October as an Anniversary Thanksgiving in this Kingdom” (14 & 15 Car. 2, Sess. 4, c. 23); and so *Irish Massacre Day* continued as a red-letter day in the *Church of Ireland*, and beyond this a publicly recognized day in Ireland. But under the 1859 Act abolishing the three Offices of the *United Church of England and Ireland*, the *Irish Massacre Day* Act was also repealed under 22 Vic. c. 2 (1859). The events of *Irish Massacre Day* continue to be remembered to this day by some faithful Protestants in Ireland, particularly in Northern Ireland.

“sedition,” numbered in the hundreds. Those Christians persecuted for, or killed for their Anglicanism during this time, *which included their loyalty to the King as Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church*, are the closest thing we have to uniquely Anglican Christian confessors and martyrs respectively. In general, one will search Puritan hagiologies in vain for Anglican Christian saints from this era. In particular, one will find no reference to King Charles the Martyr. However, an interesting exception is the Anglican Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of Ireland, James Ussher. Ussher both then and later, has been generally respected by both Anglican and Puritan alike. I wonder if, instead of being Lord Primate of Ireland, he had been Lord Primate of England; and if the Puritans had looked more to the leadership of men like the Westminster Divine, John Lightfoot, and less to the leadership of men like Cromwell and Rutherford, if some more amicable accommodation between Anglicans and Puritans could not have been worked out earlier as fellow Protestants? The matter is admittedly speculative, and we must deal with reality, not theory. Nevertheless, in my experience, *even the most staunch Puritan is not bitter in his belly against the royalist Anglican Archbishop, James Ussher; and even the most staunch Reformed Anglican, is not bitter in his belly against the Westminster Divine, John Lightfoot.*

Nevertheless, in this general context, the *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and the Church of Ireland*, King Charles the First, is a particularly significant example of one such *uniquely Anglican* Christian martyr. This is reflected in the following ditty addressed to Protestants:

“Tell me, was King Charles a martyr?  
Or with Cromwell dost thou barter?  
And now I will tell thee,  
if thou be ‘O’ or ‘P’<sup>223</sup>.”

If one were to enter a room with e.g., Roman Catholics, Lutherans, Anglicans, (Puritan) Presbyterians, (Puritan) Congregationalists, (Puritan) Baptists, and others, and ask, “Who looks to the example of King Charles the First as a Christian martyr?,” then most, and probably all of those who raised their hands, would be Anglicans. There is a sense in which Anglicans think of Charles I as “our man” or “our martyr,” whereas most others think of him as, “not our man,” or “not our martyr.” Though a number of non-Anglican Christians would argue that he ought not to have been killed by Cromwell and his republican forces; and in particular, Presbyterians derived from the *Church of Scotland* may say he was a king unjustly killed and they oppose the republic’s sedition

---

<sup>223</sup> If the answer to Qu. 1 is “Yes,” & Qu. 2 is “No,” “O” = Orthodox Anglican; if the answer to both Qu. 1 & 2 is “No”, usually “O” = Orthodox Presbyterian derived from the *Church of Scotland*, but “O” might also refer to some other Orthodox Protestant; and if the answer to Qu. 1 is “No” and Qu. 2 is “Yes,” then “P” = Puritan of the English Revolutionary type. Cf. Laud’s list using “O” or “P” somewhat differently for “orthodox” or “Puritan” respectively, *supra*.

against the Crown; finding non-Anglican Christians who would recognize and remember him as a specifically Christian *martyr* is no easy thing. Thus *King Charles I's Day* (30 Jan) has historically tended to very largely become a demarcation line between Anglicans and non-Anglicans.

On the one hand, Reformed Anglicans would agree with Puritans that Charles I was at times too sympathetic to Roman Catholicism, as seen in his marriage to a Roman Catholic wife. Thus there is some truth in Puritan concerns, even though this has been grossly exaggerated by Puritans. But on the other hand, Charles I had the misfortune of having to deal with an increasingly English Puritan Parliament, which increasingly interpreted Anglicanism as semi-Romanism. This is the stock standard Puritan view, that they wanted to “purify” (hence the name, “Puritan,”) Anglicanism from its “Romanism.” Puritanism’s anti-Anglican virulence was matched by a similar, indeed greater, anti-Lutheran virulence, since e.g., Lutherans use crosses, crucifixes<sup>224</sup>, candles, and historically allowed voluntary auricular confession<sup>225</sup>.

*The secular society seeks the abolition of these holy days.* The reader should be aware that the religious disputes of the 17th century are interconnected with, and sometimes blurred by, struggles of power which a number of secular modern historians tend to view through a 19th century power struggle paradigm, and so put in terms of “the Parliament,” although really meaning “the House of Common” (the Puritans) “verses the King” (Anglicans). Thus religious and political struggles are *to some extent* intertwined, since the Puritans wanted more power for the Parliament, especially the House of Commons, in order to push for their Puritan’s religious agenda in the 17th century. Thus some 200 years later in the 19th century, non-Puritan politicians grasping for unbridled political power in order to implement a wicked secularization policy that was ultimately linked with French and American revolutions derived “rights of man” ideology, identified themselves with much, though not all, of the political element of the Puritans power

---

<sup>224</sup> Reformed Anglicans had adopted second stage reforms going beyond the Lutheran Reformation. E.g., in the Homilies of Article 35 of the 39 Articles, rejection of crucifixes, not because like the Puritans they considered they were forbidden by the Second Commandment; but rather, because on the basis of experience, they considered that there was *a historical tendency* for them to be made into idols, just like Moses’ brazen serpent was not forbidden by the second commandment, but had nevertheless later been made into an idol.

<sup>225</sup> Auricular confession persisted in large parts of the Lutheran Church during the 16th century; and was so urged by the Lutheran Church as a pre-condition for taking Communion. In Wittenberg from the 16th century, Saxony from 1657, and Brandenburg from 1678, a General Confession and Absolution was decreed for use at the Lord’s Supper which could serve as a substitute for auricular confession before receiving Communion. *This saw the happy decline and demise of Lutheran auricular confession;* but sadly there has been some revival of it among Lutherans since the 19th century.

struggle. I.e., like the Puritans, these secularist politicians wanted to sideline the monarch and House of Lords, and make the House of Commons the one and only political power. But unlike the Puritans they did not want to abolish them outright, but simply turn them into rubber stamps for approving whatever the House of Commons wanted. Thus part of the reason for removing the three holy days and their offices from the calendar in 1859, was connected with the fact that they did not like the image of decent and godly Christian kings such as Charles the First in particular, but also others like James I, Charles II, or William III. They did not want a Protestant Christian state, but rather, a secular state.

This movement to a titular monarchy also had important ramifications for the Anglican Church. From the time of Henry VIII the monarch had been Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church (although this exact title came from Elizabethan times). Dioceses were largely autonomous, so that if corruption occurred in one, it could be isolated and rooted out under the central control of the king. The republican revolution in America had deprived the Anglican Church there of its Supreme Governor. Although in 1629 King Charles the First granted a Royal Charter to the Massachusetts Bay Company in America which included the right to use its own seal, *Charles I's Day* was phased out in the United States of America following the American War of Independence in 1775-83. Doctrinal corruption quickly set in when in 1801 the *Protestant Episcopal Church in the USA* removed the *Athanasian Creed* from its revised Article 8, and also made other changes. A titular monarchy would result in the loss of the Anglican Church's Supreme Governor more universally. *In theory*, the monarch would keep the title, "Defender of the Faith," but *in practice* Anglicanism would become a confederal structure, essentially made up of confederal dioceses<sup>226</sup>.

---

<sup>226</sup> As a national church, the Anglican Church certainly had to recognize that the "field" contains both "wheat" and "tares" (Matt. 13:24-30,36-43). A strong central control through the Supreme Governor (supported by the Parliament), acts to seek out godly orthodox bishops who are regenerated by the power of the Holy Ghost, who in turn act to keep their Diocese pure with priests and deacons who are regenerated by the power of the Holy Ghost, who in turn are faithful shepherds to their flocks which contain both "wheat" and "tares." It must be so, for only a relatively small number are elect, and so others, through God's common grace find the church a place to express worship to God, even though they be strangers to God's special grace unto salvation; and they here learn good moral values, most especially from the Ten Commandments. (The failure to understand these dynamics, made the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60 bad governors. The American Revolutionaries in broad terms applied these principles from 1776, but without a State Church, till the post World War Two era. Till that time, they used the immigration policy to keep America broadly "Christian," and racial segregation to maintain the common grace and Divine Law requirements of raced based nationalism, Gen. 10.) But what happens when the central control of the Supreme Governor and associated backing of Parliament is removed, as occurred from the 19th century, and each Diocese is a law unto itself? Then it becomes much easier for the "tares" to start rising up in the system, and soon one has bishops, priests, and deacons, who are not "born again" (John 3:3) or "born of the Spirit" (John 3:8) i.e., unsaved men who are strangers to

It could now be only as good as individual bishops or an individual diocese, and so *in reality*, although not in theory, *it very largely became multiple Anglican Churches, each only as big as its own Diocese*. Thus in theory, there is an “Anglican Church of Australia,” but in practice there is an “Anglican Church of Sydney Diocese,” an “Anglican Church of Newcastle Diocese,” an “Anglican Church of Melbourne Diocese,” etc., and so too generally for other “national” Anglican Churches. Moreover, within a country there may be rival Anglican Churches e.g., the “Church of the Province of South Africa” is broadly a Puseyite Anglican Church, whereas the “Church of England in South African” (outside the Anglican Communion under the titular primacy of the Archbishop of Canterbury) is broadly an Evangelical Anglican Church. Or the “Church of England (Continuing)” (outside the Anglican Communion) is a Reformed Anglican Church that operates in England alongside the “Church of England.”

*I.e., with the loss of the Supreme Governor, there is really no longer a central administrative leader of the Anglican Church.* The error that e.g., Roman Catholics in ARCIC (Anglican Roman Catholic International Commission) made, was to not recognize this confederal structure. At best they could only make an agreement with an individual Anglican Diocese; but in turn, that Diocese would not consider itself bound by that agreement once the incumbent bishop(s) and others in power positions were in time replaced by others. Thus ARCIC could only ever make an agreement with an individual Anglican Diocese that would have an uncertain duration of validity, perhaps measured in decades, but perhaps measured only in several years, or possibly even less time than this.

By contrast, a powerful king had historically been important to both Church and State. E.g., under King James I, Bartholomew Legatt was executed for denying the Athanasian and Nicene Creeds. The *Athanasian Creed* was greatly hated by the 19th century and later secularists because of its Biblically sound damnatory clauses against heretics and unbelievers, and pressure was exerted on the increasingly apostate *Church of England* to drop it from use. After all, deist, agnostic, atheist, and heretical politicians, did not much like the damnatory clauses whose orbit included not only themselves, but also e.g., Jews, Mohammedan Turks, and Eastern Orthodox Greeks. King James the First believed so strongly in a Christian State that he was prepared to condone executing such heretics as Legatt, but the secular state did not want so much as this creed used in

---

special grace, but who nevertheless in varying degrees walk in common grace and so e.g., recognize and worship God. Such unsaved men came to take over Diocese after Diocese, and they found the jingle-jangle trinkets of the Puseyites appealing to themselves, which thing then led them into idolatry and spurning of much of even common grace (Rom. 1 & 2). Thus e.g., in 2003 the Episcopalian Church of the USA (ECUSA) made Gene Robinson the Diocesan bishop of New Hampshire. Now “it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done ... in secret” by those like Gene Robinson (Eph. 5:12); for he is one of those who “defile themselves with mankind” (I Tim. 1:10 cf. Lev. 18:22,24), though Scripture says, that “abusers of themselves with mankind” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (I Cor. 6:9; cf., Gen. 19; Lev. 20:13; Rom. 1:26,27,32).

Anglican Churches.

At his Puritan show “trial” (reminiscent of the mock trial which our Lord endured in the holy gospels, or his holy Apostle, St. Paul later endured), Charles repudiated the usurpation of power by the House of Commons, which had set up a court without the consent of either the House of Lords or the monarch. The King said, “How the House of Commons can erect a court ... which was never one ... as is well known to all lawyers, I leave to God and the world to judge. And it were full as strange, that they should pretend to make laws without [the] King or Lord’s House.” In contemporary terms, this would be like in the USA, if the House of Representatives “passed a statute” on its own authority abolishing the Senate, Presidency, and US Supreme Court, and then “passed” another “statute” to “set up a court” to execute the President. Clearly the action would be unconstitutional.

Notwithstanding his undoubted blemishes, imperfections, and certain errors of his reign, in broad-brush terms, the image of King Charles I, the *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland* who died as a Christian martyr, was the image of a good and great Christian King. Thus the secularizing politicians of the 19th century greatly feared the possibility of such a godly monarch on the throne. I.e., if a king like King Charles the Martyr was in town, he would not allow the House of Commons to side-line either the monarch or the House of Lords (which is also a court). He would rather die than allow this to happen. He would rule as a good Christian king ought to rule, in conjunction with, but not replaced by, one or both houses of the parliament.

The very memory of King Charles the First was an image that the secularists greatly feared. *Just think of it, a Christian King who would literally be prepared to die before he would allow the removal of the Anglican Christian State with e.g., the rise of a secular state, and who would literally die before he would allow the House of Commons to turn him into a rubber stamp!* Was this man one of the fulfilments of the prophecy that from “the Gentiles” God would raise up “kings” who would be “nursing fathers” of the church, or not? (Isa. 49:22,23). The secularists seemed confident he was some kind of “nursing father” to the church, even if we Reformed Anglicans admit he was not a perfect one.

By the grace of God, King Charles I had stood up to the power-grasping Puritans, and not buckled when many a weaker man would have done so in order to save his life. King Charles I’s Christian fortitude, as one who obviously would support neither the 19th century secularization of society, nor the side-lining of a monarch, was well known. Were he now on the throne, as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland*, King Charles would clearly not, like the 19th century secularists, allow the Anglican Church to either lose its privileged position as the established *Church of England* and established *Church of Ireland*, nor allow it to go to spiritual rack’n’ruin under religious liberals, Puseyite Arminians, Wesleyan Arminians, or others. *Though dead for some 200 years, King Charles I now sent shivers down the spines of the 19th century secularist politicians.* The Puritans had pioneered the concept of rule *exclusively* by the House of Commons, and the secularists would now take up that concept, and seek

to perfect it. Thus for the 19th century secularist politicians in the House of Commons, the powerful kingly image celebrated in the Office of *King Charles the Martyr*, was a kingly image that *just had to go!*

These politicians effectively turned the monarchy into what was largely, if not entirely, a symbolic and ceremonial office. As one element of this they wanted and attained the removal of these three offices, in part, because of the positive image of a powerful king they maintained with James I, Charles I, Charles II, and William III. For about the first 100 or so years in the UK and Commonwealth countries like Australia, (or 150 or so years in the USA,) the so called secular state allowed *freedom from Christian religious belief* in general (and freedom from the endorsement of Reformed Protestant Anglicanism in particular), but *not freedom from Christian morals*. Such a society was bearable to live in for Christians<sup>227</sup>. All seemed well. God's common grace upholding moral decency was still generally sought out, although his common grace teaching that idolatry was wrong was deemed optional. But Christians still chose to frown upon idolatry. This lulled a number of Christians into a false sense of security as to the seemingly benevolent nature of the new "secular society," a society in which it was entirely optional and "unimportant" as to whether one, "worshipped one god, worshipped six gods, or worshipped no god<sup>228</sup>."

---

<sup>227</sup> No church was usually Established e.g., the USA or Australia; or where it was e.g., England and Scotland, complete dissent from it was allowed, and religious tests for public offices generally removed although retained for the monarch as Supreme Governor of the C. of E. (and till recent times for the Lord Chancellor in England). Though outwardly secular, the State nevertheless regarded the Church as an "ally," and in its morals and cohesive sentiment was religiously "Christian" e.g., the phrase, "Christian name" was commonly used (though objected to by small numbers e.g., Jews), and racially Caucasian as a manifestation of Christian morals and values (Gen. 10 & 11), or segregationist and white supremacist in e.g., the USA (Gen. 9:27).

<sup>228</sup> Over time this created other problems. E.g., because men engaged in idolatry, God gave some of them over to homosexuality (I Kgs 15:12; II Kgs 23:7; Rom. 1:18-27). This was also related to the rise of idolatry in Puseyism, as e.g., the once Protestant Anglican State of England failed to check Puseyites (by which I also mean semi-Puseyites), and protect and safeguard the Reformed Evangelical (Low Church) as the true expression of the Christian State. In the case of lesbian sodomy, it was further related to the idolatrous lusts of sex role perversion (commonly called "feminism"). The secular society could not deal with the concept of *a Divine Judgement on the sin of idolatry*, for they had fashioned unto themselves idols of secularist intellectual pride and various forms of "covetousness, which is idolatry" (Col. 3:5). Thus they were in no spiritual condition to understand what was going on, being spiritually "blinded" by "the god of this world" (II Cor. 4:4), as "professing themselves to be wise, they became fools" (Rom. 1:22). The secularists realized that there was nothing they could do to alter the sexual orientation of more and more homosexuals, and so they then interpreted this as "a sexual orientation homosexuals were born with." While they were born with original sin the giving of them over to sodomy was only derivatively related to this as they angered a holy God with their idolatry. This ever increasing homosexual population, and blinded

*Then in the post World War Two Era, the trap having been carefully laid for over 100 years, was now sprung. Gone from prominence was any figure like King Charles the First who believed in a specifically Christian society. Their political “heroes” for a long time now were all secularists. They had disarmed for more than a 100 years. They were defenceless. They would be easy prey. As the trap closed tight, Christian morals were now removed from the fabric of society*<sup>229</sup>. “When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice: but when the wicked beareth rule, the people mourn” (Prov. 29:2).

Thus it would be about another 100 years from these developments in the 19th century, before the fuller ramifications of this tragedy became more glaring apparent. The spiritual and moral scum of society would float to the top, and become the lawmakers, judges, college / university teachers, entertainment industry controllers etc. of society, and this became more comprehensively apparent in the post World War Two era of the Western World. They would then move to the active persecution of those adhering to Christian morals, with e.g., “human rights” “anti-discrimination” legislation; and they would further move to a strip-down and rip-down of society by immigration policies designed to destroy both the white racial, and also Christian religious culture of these countries. These would be overlaid with increasingly negative images of e.g., white nationalists who accepted the Biblical teaching of race based nationalism (Gen. 10), not in positive terms as “patriots” and “nationalists,” but with a negative loading given to the word “racist,” as “racists.” The Devil would give directions that his Roman Church receive some publicity in the media as “the Christian view” so that e.g., amidst the libertine filth of Hollywood some Popish movies would still be made (“Black Robe,” or “Passion of Christ”<sup>230</sup>), but the true Protestant faith would receive no such favours.

Thus “*human rights*” notions would be used to persecute Christians in e.g., the work-place; and great misery would be inflicted on godly men by taking away from them a racial and cultural definition of a nation. The truth of Bible based Protestantism that had once been the glory of such lands as England, would be suppressed and unheard of as far as was possible. A block-buster axe would be put through basis societal unit man-woman relationships via anti-patriarchal feminism and easy divorce. Evil men in power would smile widely and proclaim “All is well.” But the reality would be very different.

Secular anti-discrimination legislation would effectively remove righteous men

---

secularist legislature, created a situation where e.g., in the UK *The Wolfenden Committee* sought increasing toleration “for buggery,” with Lord Devlin opposed to this and his initial starting point being that “the full offence of buggery should be retained” (Devlin’s *Enforcement of Morals*, Oxford University Press, UK, 1965 Reprint: 1970, p. vi).

<sup>229</sup> See Lord Patrick Devlin’s *Enforcement of Morals*, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

<sup>230</sup> “Black Robe” (1991), Directed by Bruce Beresford, seeks to glorify Jesuit missionaries operating in 17th century Quebec, Canada; “Passion of Christ” (2004), Directed by Mel Gibson, badly perverts the Biblical Christ and promotes Mariolatry.

from a raft of government positions on the basis of “inefficiency,” if they did not comply with wicked and evil laws; and they would also be locked out of key legal, political, academic, and media, positions. Thus these type of 19th century political considerations compliment the wider picture, *infra*, with respect to the tragic removal of these three holy days and their offices from the Anglican Church’s Calendar in 1859, *infra* as well as to anachronistic secular depictions of the struggle between the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60 and Charles I in terms of glorifying the Puritan Revolutionaries as “champions of parliamentary democracy” i.e., Puritan Revolutionaries ruling with just the House of Commons.

*Puritan propagandists turn Puritanism and “Protestantism” into synonyms.* Though the Anglican Church was more in the Puritan direction than Luther was in the Carlstadt direction, nevertheless, the 17th century Anglican-Puritan clash in the British Isles resulting in the Puritan Revolution of 1640-60, followed by Royalist Restoration of 1660, was in some ways a re-run of the 16th century Luther-Carlstadt clash in Germany. E.g., writing in 1525, Luther says, “Carlstadt” “calls us twice-Papists and cousins of Antichrist.” Luther rejected Carlstadt’s view that “images” such as “crucifixes” and “images of the saints,” were “idols.” He referred to the command, “Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image” (Exod. 20:4), and said, “The primary sense of the whole passage is that images of God are not to be worshipped, but these Carlstadters cry, ‘Hew, fight, smite, break, shove, knock, smash, and crash the idols. If you see a crucifix, spit in its face.’ The people are stirred up to violence whereas judgement has been committed to the civil magistrates. I had not said that Carlstadt is a murderous prophet, but I do say that he has a rebellious, murderous, and sectarian spirit which will break out, given the chance. We are under princes. . . . These image smashers read my German Bible which is full of pictures, and if they are not objectionable in the book, why should they be on a wall? When I think of the passion of Christ I have to picture it [in my mind,] and if I may do so without sin in my heart why not before the eye?<sup>231</sup>.”

---

<sup>231</sup> Bainton, R.H., *The Age of the Reformation*, D. Van Nostrand, New York, 1956, pp. 117-20. **IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER.** My generally favourable comments about Lutherans in this section should not be misconstrued as support for Lutheran sacramentalism, which as a symbolist I reject i.e., Luther’s consubstantiation, baptismal regeneration, or view that “the sacrament of (auricular) confession” should be established as “a sacrament” by extra-Biblical church ordinance since it is not found in the Bible; or Lutheran usage of the term “altar” for the Communion Table; or the usage in Lutheran churches of crucifixes i.e., crosses with an image of Christ on them. While I agree with Luther that the Second Commandment (Exod. 20:4-6) does not prohibit graven images (Num. 21:8,9), but rather, prohibits the idolatrous usage of graven images (II Kgs 18:4); nevertheless, it has been the consistent experience of the church that there is a strong tendency for a substantial number of people to be attracted to idolatry via a crucifix, and turn crucifixes into idols, for which reason I think they should be banned from churches *per se* (Rom. 14:13,14; I Cor. 8:4,7). While I can still accept as Protestant brethren in Christ my Lutheran brothers, since I do not think Scripture specifically forbids usage of the crucifix; I nevertheless think Lutherans are “skating on thin ice” by using crucifixes, and are unwise to do so. I consider they thus “put a stumbling-block” “in” a “weak”

The type of criticisms generally made by Puritans against Charles I, could also have been made against the Lutheran princes of Germany, who presumably would have fared no better than Charles I if the Puritans could have had their bloodthirsty way. Indeed, in their instance, the Puritan claims would have had more accuracy as to more of the basic facts, since e.g., Lutherans do in fact believe in an “altar” rather than a Communion Table, and so their publicly declared doctrine agrees with Archbishop Laud’s private views on a corporeal presence via consubstantiation on an “altar;” or Lutherans truly are anti-sabbatarian, rather than like Caroline Anglicans who simply followed a less strict form of sabbatarianism than Puritans. Nevertheless, even with Lutherans, the Puritan claims of being “Romish” would still fail to distinguish the wood from the trees, with the fundamental recognition that Lutherans are Protestant. But the general, though not absolute absence of Lutherans in the British Isles, *infra*, meant that much to the relief of Lutherans on the Continent, and much to the discomfort of Anglicans in the British Isles, in practice the Puritans focused most of their broadside attacks, both spiritual and political, on Anglicans rather than Lutherans.

This has led to a plethora of unbalanced and inaccurate Puritan, or Puritan influenced perspectives of the Caroline era of Charles the First, which depict Charles as anti-Protestant, rather than anti-Puritan. If the Puritans, or those using a Puritan-like perspective, simply argued that Charles, as an Anglican, held some views and allowed some practices more akin to Lutheranism than Puritanism, but that his maintenance of the 1559 & 1604 prayer book and the “Declaration” of 1628 shows he still wanted the Anglican Church to remain inside the broad parameters of Reformed Protestantism, then that would be one thing. If they wanted to say that “Charles I was misadvised by Archbishop Laud on a number of particulars, and the King put too much confidence and trust in Laud and some other bad advisors,” then that would be fair enough also. If they wanted to additionally argue that *in their opinion*, “he should have gone further in the direction of making the Anglican Church a Puritan Church,” i.e., turning it into something like the Puritan Presbyterian established *Church of Scotland* from 1690, then that would be their prerogative to argue, although no true Anglican could agree with them.

Although Charles’ support for Archbishop Laud was misplaced and misguided, it must also be remembered that Charles I was dealing with a difficult situation in which Puritans in the House of Commons were becoming increasingly hostile to the King, Anglicanism, and Laud. In this mix, Charles was no doubt reticent to cut ties with his allies, such as Laud, even though I think he should have done so, and it was a serious error of judgment on his part not to. It must also be remembered that Charles appointed Archbishop Ussher as Primate of Ireland, and none dispute Ussher’s Protestant credentials. The matter is further complicated by Puritan propaganda which depicts anyone who was as anti-Puritan as being anti-Protestant. But as previously discussed, in some ways Laud was anti-Protestant, but because Puritans would say this of any

---

“brother’s way” (Rom. 14:1,13), by which the “conscience” of their “weak” brother “is defiled” (I Cor. 8:7).

Anglican, the waters are muddied and blurred when one comes to Puritan propaganda on this issue. They thus tend to make “Puritan” and “Protestant” synonyms, when in fact, Puritanism is one species of Protestantism i.e., Puritan Protestantism, as opposed to Lutheran Protestantism or Anglican Protestantism. E.g., something of this type of this tomfoolery arose in Laud’s trial when the Puritans made it clear they were virulently anti-Lutheran. If one was to develop this type of nonsense to its logical conclusion, one would have to conclude that Martin Luther himself “was not a Protestant,” on the basis, that he certainly was not a Puritan. But how absurd would that claim be?<sup>232</sup>

Thus as one element of their narrowly defined Puritan paradigm, the Puritans or Puritan influenced perspectives, essentially depict Charles I as “Romish.” While from a narrow Puritan paradigm this is “correct,” since they consider they are “purifying” Anglican doctrine and worship from “Romish” elements; from a broader Protestant paradigm that recognizes both Lutherans and Reformed Anglicans are Protestants, this Puritan view of Charles I is a distortion. As an Anglican, in many ways, though not in all ways, Charles was more like Lutherans than Puritans, but he still remained Protestant and anti-Romanist. E.g., in 1633, Charles the First re-issued the *Book of Sports* first published under his father, James I in 1618. This rejected the Puritan concept of Sabbatarianism<sup>233</sup>, and allowed various recreations to be played after, but not before,

---

<sup>232</sup> This is a technique of resort propaganda used more widely by some Puritan derived Protestants. E.g., Anglican Protestantism allowed a reduced and limited Sunday public transport system in London from the 16th century. But when promoting a very strict Puritan Sabbatarianism, which unlike Anglican Sabbatarianism, disallows the usage of any public transport on Sundays, I have known of some Free Presbyterians to present the very unrepresentative views of the 19th century Anglican Bishop Ryle, and then try to claim that their Puritan Protestant views against public transport on Sundays are in fact the historic “Protestant” views (a claim that also ignores anti-Sabbatarian Protestants such as Lutherans). (These indefensible claims came to me from an Elder of the Free Presb. C. of S. .) So too, I have read some Presbyterian literature which goes on a questionable quest to find “Anglican support” for opposing the usage of the cross as a Christian symbol; which is then presented as “*the* Protestant” view, rather than “a Puritan Protestant view” of the second commandment. (These indefensible claims were repeatedly made by Editor John MacKenzie in *Australian Beacon*, later *Faith & Freedom*. He died in 2009 but was connected with an independent Presbyterian Church in Adelaide, South Australia.) Such a view ignores the fact that e.g., the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) Calendar includes Invention (Discovery) of the Cross Day (by Helena, the mother of Constantine the Great) (3 May) and Holy Cross Day (14 Sept.). These both celebrate the usage of the cross as a Christian symbol.

<sup>233</sup> Puritan sabbatarianism was notoriously extreme. E.g., in this same era, American Puritans in New England under John Cotton, had enacted laws which as at 1641, made their concept of “profaning the Lord’s day,” a capital offence, “to be punished with death” (“An Abstract of the Laws of New England, As they are now established,” London, 1641, chapter 7:11, Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 1798, reprinted 1835; reprinted in *The Journal of Christian Reconstruction*, Vol. 2, 1975-6, pp. 117-128, at p. 124). While Luther, Calvin, and James I were obviously no

Divine Service on Sunday. This book is critical of “two sorts of people, wherewith” parts of the “country is much infected, we mean Papists and Puritans<sup>234</sup>.” This type of language shows a like-father like-son theological relationship between James I (Regnal Years: 1603-1625) and Charles I (Regnal Years: 1625-1649).

But there was also a difference, for though in 1618 James ordered its declarations to be read from the pulpit by clergyman, when opposition came to it he withdrew the need for reading this in church; whereas when Charles I had it republished in 1633, he required that James I’s declaration be read by the clergy, and when this was protested by many clergy he had them punished. Thus while James I would not allow such strict Sabbatarianism to be more generally imposed by law, he allowed Anglican clergyman who wanted more strict Sabbatarianism to do so as a private interpretation; whereas Charles I lacked this more desirable tolerance of his father, James I. When one adds to this Laud’s reactivation of an old statute giving a one shilling fine for not attending Anglican Churches on Sunday, it means that under Charles I the Biblical requirements of tolerance and diversity on these types of things (Rom. 14; Col. 2:16) were sadly encroached upon (not that the subsequent English Puritan revolutionaries had any respect for such diversity either). In supporting the revival of *King Charles the First’s Day* in Australia from 1978, Sinden says that sometimes “Charles was ... unwise<sup>235</sup>,” and I would certainly consider that examples of such *lack of wisdom* are evident in both his diminution of tolerance to clergy with stricter Sabbatarian views, and failure to work with Parliament to repeal the statute reactivated by Laud fining Puritans and others for not attending Anglican Churches on Sunday. *Charles was wrong on these matters.*

On the one hand, like James, Charles was no Puritan; but on the other hand, like James, Charles was no Papist either. Charles I also continued the celebration of *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* (5 Nov), which focused on the triumph of Protestantism under his father, James I, against Roman Catholicism in 1605, and is a Protestant holy day *par excellence*.

On the day of his martyrdom, 30 January, 1649, Charles declared to the thousands

---

longer alive at this time, nevertheless, this would mean that if, theoretically, an anti-Sabbatarian like Martin Luther or John Calvin, or a more moderate Sabbatarian such as King James I (after whom the King James Bible is named), had gone to New England at this time, these American Puritans would have quite literally executed Luther, Calvin, and James I as sabbath-breakers. Such are the extremities of Puritan Sabbatarianism, which they based on OT Jewish laws no longer binding in the Christian era (Exod. 31:14; Num. 15:32-36; Col. 2:16,17). By contrast, these same Puritans cry out greatly against Laud for his one shilling fine on those not attending an Anglican Church on Sundays. They are right to protest Laud’s one shilling fine, yet in doing so they “strain at a gnat” while they “swallow a camel” whole (Matt. 23:24; cf. Lev. 11:4, 21-23).

<sup>234</sup> Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 284-6 at 285.

<sup>235</sup> Gilbert Sinden’s “Times & Seasons” (1980), *op. cit.*, p. 61 at “January” “30. Charles, King of England (1600-1649).”

watching his execution, “I die as a Christian according to the profession of the *Church of England*, as I found it left me by my father ... I have a good cause and I have a gracious God.” It is clear from this that Charles considered he made no significant changes to Anglicanism in his reign; although to this must be made some qualification, for instance, the diminution of tolerance to diversity on Sabbatarian views, *supra*. Moreover, changes were certainly made by Archbishop Laud, though perhaps Charles was not fully aware of all that the now dead Laud had done. But he *should* have known. He *should* have made it his business to find out about such things. *He was unwise not to both find out about such things and / or work to restrain Laudianism.* Charles should have taken decisive action to inhibit Laud’s innovations, and to the extent that he failed to do so, he was derelict in his duty as Supreme Governor. Nevertheless, the absence of such changes in the Church of Ireland shows that this Laudianism was a Primate of England push by Laud, not a Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland push by the King.

*Puseyite distortions on Charles I.* It is a sad fact that *Charles I’s Day* is abused and misused by Puseyite Anglicans to foster an anti-Protestant spirit. In this context, some of the Puritan distortions and contortions of history concerning Charles I, have paradoxically been picked up by the Puseyite Anglicans (by which, unless otherwise stated, I mean not only the Puseyites Proper or “Anglo-Catholics,” but also the semi-Puseyites or “Broadchurch” Anglicans). The Puseyites try to turn Charles I into some kind of Romish like “Saint.” Thus e.g., Bishop Grant, a bishop from Victoria, and Flint whose work is printed and distributed by the Puseyite *Society of King Charles the Martyr*, which in Flint’s work is said to be seeking “to encourage devotion to St. Charles,” both try to use Romish notions of a “Saint” being “canonized.” Grant claims the “Church of England” “and popular feeling combined to ‘canonise’” “Charles Stuart.” He also says, “I noted earlier that in the Roman Church a miracle was required as a guarantee of sanctity. Does Charles qualify in this regard?” He finds in “the Restoration” of 1660 such a “miracle.” He thus concludes “that the canonization of Charles signified by the insertion of his name in the Calendar and the provision of special liturgical services – clearly confirms to the normal criteria.” Flint also says, “The members of Convocation unanimously recognised his martyrdom and his canonisation on 26 April 1661. The Office for 30 January was then adopted and included in the Book of Common Prayer<sup>236</sup>.” Indeed, more widely, the anachronistic claim of Charles

---

<sup>236</sup> Grant, J. (bishop), “Sermon preached at Christ Church Brunswick Tuesday 30 January 1979 ... to commemorate the Feast of Charles King & Martyr,” Christ Church Press, Brunswick, Victoria, Australia, 1979, pp. 4-5,7-9; Flint, D., “King Charles I,” A sermon preached on Sunday 30 January 2000 at All Saint’ Wickham Terrace, Brisbane, using a text that forms the basis of address and sermons given on Friday 30 Jan 1998 at St. John’s Gordon, at Christ Church, Brunswick in 1999, and All Saints’ Brisbane in 2000, The Society of King Charles the Martyr, Palm Beach, Queensland, Australia (copy held at Fisher Library, Sydney University), p. 3. Notwithstanding their Puseyite defects, there are some useful references in these sermons that I have cited (such as Charles “trial” words, *supra*).

“canonization” is stock standard Puseyite propaganda and historical revisionism<sup>237</sup>.

This is absolute balderdash! The Anglican concept of a saint in the Protestant prayer books of 1559 & 1604 and 1662, is quite different. It is the Biblical notion of a *universal sainthood of all believers*, in which saints who have in some way been particularly prominent may be selected as examples of faith (e.g., Philp. 3:17; II Thess. 3:9). There is no sense in which the prayer book or Articles of Anglicanism have any notion of “canonizing” a saint, and as for Puseyite “devotion” to Charles, Article 22 says, “The Romish doctrine concerning ... worshipping and *adoration*, as well of images as of reliques, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrant of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.” Charles I who upheld these Articles would be horrified by this Puseyite “devotion,” as indeed am I and all good Protestant Christians.

In this semi-Romanist context of a Puseyite misuse of *Charles I Day*, it should not surprise us that when Flint looks for a reason to have such unBiblical and (if the prayer book of 1662 and 39 Articles are our confessional standard,) unAnglican “devotion” to Charles I, he finds it in the threefold Anglican order of bishop, priest, and deacon. Flint says, “Prelacy ... is the very concept, the truth of the one holy catholic and apostolic church.” This is a very Laudian view! On a perverse view of Anglicanism, Flint claims “catholic and apostolic, not merely Anglican, status for the three orders,” and adds, “The orders are in fact common to the Anglican, Roman [Catholic] and [Eastern] Orthodox communions.” He considers that if the Puritans had succeeded, “there would be no Church of England as we know it, as an integral part of the holy catholic and apostolic church,” because “that link, the apostle [*sic*. ‘apostolic’] succession,” “comes to us through Augustine That line from Augustine would have ended<sup>238</sup>.”

It is truly sad to think that an Anglican Church with such a Reformed confessional standard as the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* and *Thirty-Nine Articles*, would have these Puseyites in it who would think that the big thing to remember about Charles I is Anglican “apostolic succession” on the basis of the three-fold ministry of bishop, priest, and deacon. While the Anglican Church allowed the *private* belief that episcopal church government was divine law, (and indeed Archbishop Laud held this view), the publicly declared doctrine of the Anglican Church did not teach this.

---

<sup>237</sup> Similar false claims of Charles’ so called “canonization” can be found in other material I have seen produced by “The Society of King Charles the Martyr,” e.g., Sillitoe, H.J., “King Charles the Martyr,” Reprinted with some additions, from the quarterly “Church and King” of 29th November, 1948, the organ of The Society of King Charles the Martyr, [c. 1961], by the Rev. H. J. Sillitoe, Dunton Rectory, Winslow, Bletchley, Bucks (Buckinghamshire), England, UK, Wilfred Edmunds Printers, Chesterfield, England, UK, (copy held at Moore Theological College Library, Sydney, Shelf mark: Pamphlets P 941.062 SIL). Notwithstanding its Puseyite defects, this pamphlet nevertheless contains some useful information.

<sup>238</sup> Flint, D., *op. cit.*, pp. 10,12.

The proposition that because, as it is claimed, the apostles touched someone, who in turn touched someone else, etc., makes an order of ministry valid, so that Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox, and Anglicans have “valid orders” and no-one else does, is about as silly as it can get. The Jews of Jesus day had a similar, though not identical kind of concept based on their racial descent from Abraham. Jesus rejected their claims, saying, “I know that ye are Abraham’s seed, but ... if ye were Abraham’s children, ye would do the works of Abraham” (John 8:37,39). Reformed Anglicanism in Articles 8 & 19 of the 39 Articles condemns the Eastern Orthodox to hell via the Biblically sound damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed, since they are Trinitarian heretics who deny the double-procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father *and the Son* (e.g., John 14:26; 15:26; Gal. 4:6; 5:20,21). Or Roman Catholicism is condemned in e.g., Articles 19,22, & 35. E.g., Book 2, Homily 2, condemns Roman Catholic idolatry as the teaching of Antichrist; Book 1, Homily 10 says the “bishop of Rome” “ought” “to be called Antichrist” (II Thess. 2:1-12; I John 2:18); or Book Homily 21 (which is one of the Homilies that may be read on Papists’ Conspiracy Day), refers to the “bishop of Rome” as “the Babylonical beast of Rome” (Rev. 17). This is a very different sentiment to that which Flint is trying to promote!

Reformed Anglicanism, it is true, retained the three-fold ministry of bishop, priest, and deacon, finding it not contrary to the Word of God, and also finding value in it. Article 36 of the 39 Articles says “Of consecration of Bishops and Ministers,” that the threefold ministry forms of “consecration and ordering” are neither “superstitious” nor “ungodly,” i.e., *not contrary to the Word of God*, and that “whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to” these “rites” are “lawfully consecrated.” There is nothing here about Puseyite claims of “apostolic succession” by “a touch.” On the one hand, Reformed Anglicans *allowed* someone to believe, as a private view, that the governing of the church by bishops was Divine Law derived from apostolic times, if having investigated the matter they believed this e.g., Archbishop Laud, *supra*; but on the other hand, *this was certainly not a required belief* from the doctrinal standards of the Anglican Church. This balance militated against the type of emphasis placed on this issue by the Puseyites, who in this respect, are also Laudians.

Charles I was right to reject Puritan demands for the abolition of this threefold ministry in the *Church of England* and *Church of Ireland*. To the extent that this was one of the factors leading to his beheading, and the motive for this was a religious one, one may fairly argue that this is one of the factors making his killing a Christian martyrdom.

Charles was prepared to accept religious freedom of Presbyterians in Scotland, while still maintaining the Anglican Church in England. Clarendon records that a number of Presbyterians, including those in the republic’s legislature, said they would support Charles I if he would endorse Presbyterian Church government and seek to abolish Anglican Church government. And when he was a prisoner on the Isle of Wight (1647-8), Charles said the Solemn Covenant to this effect was unacceptable. Clarendon records, “This the King told them exceeded the Implicit Faith of the *Church of Rome*,

which rather obliges her proselytes to what she does hold.” Charles said he would accept the republic’s requirements that “the King was to invest the two houses [of Parliament] with a power of raising .., armies, and ... moneys ... for the space of twenty years,” and he would “expose to the mercy of the two houses, the lives and fortunes of all those who had served him” in “the affairs of Ireland.” But Clarendon records Charles said, “Necessity could never warrant him to deprive the Church ... of an order instituted for continual use, and for establishing a succession of lawful [Anglican] Ministers in the Church ... . That he would not force any man to take the Covenant [for the “extirpation of” “Prelacy” and establishment of Presbyterian Church government]; and would have the privilege of his own [Anglican] Chapel, to use the [Anglican] Common Prayer, and observe the same worship he had used to do: and, that all persons who desired it, might have the liberty to take the Covenant, and to use the [Puritan] Directory.”

On the one hand, I consider *Charles I was unwise* to “expose to the mercy of the two houses, the lives and fortunes of all those who had served him” in “the affairs of Ireland.” Loyalty cuts two ways between a monarch and their subjects. This same problem exists today when we see that *Elizabeth II is unwise* to not robustly support her loyal Protestant subjects. E.g., she welcomes the Pope<sup>239</sup>; and she has failed to exercise the royal prerogative during her reign to, for instance, keep the UK as a white Protestant land, choosing rather to be “a rubber stamp” to the wickedness of the politicians whose evil unBiblical laws she has repeatedly given her assent to. If e.g., her father, George VI (Regnal Years: 1936-1952) had said to his Prime Minister, Sir Winston Churchill in 1951 (UK Prime Minister: 1940-45; 1951-55), “I want you to get the niggers and all the other coloureds out of Britain,” and then publicly supported Churchill in such an action, he would have been “doing his bit” to uphold God’s laws on race based nationalism (Gen. 10); and he could at that time reasonably have expected the wider support of e.g., the Australian Prime Minister, Sir Robert Menzies (Australian Prime Minister: 1939-41; 1949-66). *Alas like these later monarchs, Charles I was sometimes unwise!*

But on the other hand, Charles I’s 1647-8 agreement meant he was prepared to accept religious freedom for Presbyterians, while still maintaining the Anglican Church in England and protecting freedom of worship to those within it. But this was deemed an unacceptable compromise by the English Puritan revolutionaries. Hence in referring to these matters in a *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* sermon, preached at Christchurch *Church of Ireland* Cathedral, Dublin, in 1713 before the Lord Justices of Ireland, John Echlin, refers to these matters. From them, he concludes that Charles “died in defence of the church government by Bishops,” therefore died for a Christian belief, and so “is truly a martyr<sup>240</sup>.” Yet this is quite a different claim to that of Flint, *supra*, since on Echlin’s

---

<sup>239</sup> Pope Benedict XVI (Pope since 2005) intends to visit the UK in 2010, and he declined an invitation to stay at Buckingham Palace, though he and the Queen are scheduled to meet at Balmoral. Though the Pope rebuffed the invitation to stay at the Palace, such an offer should never have been made in the first place.

<sup>240</sup> “The Royal Martyr,” A Sermon preached before Their Excellencies the Lord Justices of Ireland in Christchurch Dublin, on the 30th of January, 1713, by John Echlin, Master of Arts, *op. cit.*, pp. 2,8-11; citing Clarendon’s *History of the Rebellion & Civil*

view, Charles was prepared to accept the validity of Presbyterian church government for those who wanted it i.e., religious freedom, while still keeping Anglican Church government more generally in England, and also himself remaining Anglican. Charles says nothing here about episcopal church government being of “Divine Law,” but rather justified it as a system “establishing a succession of lawful [Anglican] Ministers in the Church,” which had worked well, and which he thinks should therefore be retained.

On the one hand, Charles suggested that a compromise would be that “he would suspend episcopacy for three years, and then, upon consultation with Divines, among whom he would nominate twenty to be present, and to consult with them such a government of the Church, as should be agreed should be established.<sup>241</sup>” But on the other hand, this was a condition he agreed to while imprisoned on the Isle of Wight, and none could seriously doubt that he would thereafter reestablish episcopacy for the *Church of England*.

But even though this was clearly a political suggestion designed to buy Charles a three years “breathing space.” after which Episcopal church government would be reintroduced, it nevertheless shows he did not regard it as Divine Law, since he could accept that it might be removed for a short time, and permanently not made obligatory for fellow Protestant Christians in Presbyterianism. Moreover, his wider proposals that he would remain Anglican, use “the Common Prayer” Book of 1559 & 1604 in his Royal “Chapel,” establish a Committee to advise him on church government after 3 years - which we cannot doubt would have resulted in the reestablishment of Anglicanism in England, not “force any man” to become a Presbyterian, but provide “liberty” for any man to become Presbyterian and “use the” Puritan “Directory,” *indicates that Charles I was seeking something akin to the 1689 settlement in which Anglicanism was Established in the Kingdom of England, with dissenter toleration to Puritans, and Presbyterianism was Established in the Kingdom of Scotland, with toleration to Anglicans. But unlike the 1689 settlement, there would have been no “Test Acts” for the Puritans of England (or Ireland).* Though 1689 was some 40 years off, these proposals show that Charles “was ahead of his times” in seeing the kind of settlement that would ultimately work, even though at this time he did not have the final solution crystallized in his thinking in the precise and succinct way that it was formulated in 1689. And of course, if the revolutionary Puritans had been prepared to be reasonable and work with Charles on this matter, the “Test Acts” for Puritans would never have been necessary.

*Yet because Charles would not agree to the Solemn League and Covenant, he was regarded as having met one of the three basic criteria allowing sedition and murder in Rutherford’s Lex Rex, namely, one has exhausted all lawful courses of action. He was further deemed to have met Rutherford’s Lex Rex criterion for sedition, “a tyrant is he*

---

*Wars in England*, by Edward Hyde (1609-1674), 1st Earl of Clarendon & Lord Chancellor, Vol. 2, pp. 91,446,579; Vol. 3, pp. 24,172.

<sup>241</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.

*who habitually sinneth against the catholic good of the subjects and state, and subverteth law;*” as well as Rutherford’s *Lex Rex* third criterion for sedition that the legislature make the decision to kill the “tyrant” king. (What may be regarded as either an implicit element of these three, or a fourth criterion of Rutherford’s *Lex Rex*, namely, that such revolutionaries must have a reasonable chance of success, was also here met<sup>242</sup>.) Thus King Charles was certainly killed in connection with his religious belief that refused to agree with the “extirpation of” “Prelacy;” but not in the terms that Flint claims. It should also be said that Charles’ claim to be martyr is based first and foremost on the fact that he died with steadfast Christian faith in Christ upholding the Biblical teachings of such passages as Rom. 13:1-9; Gal. 5:19-21; I Peter 2:17. Any other arguments are at best secondary to this one.

While it is true that Reformed Anglicanism retained bishops, it did not do so in Flint’s type of Puseyite sense of determining catholicity, but simply because it found it to be useful and good. It cared not for the notion of “orthodoxy” on the basis of a “touch,” for which reason it condemned as apostate the Church of Rome which had such so called “apostolic succession,” and also the Greek Orthodox Church (the 1054 A.D. founding Eastern Orthodox Church,) which also had such “apostolic succession,” saying of both in Article 19, that they had “erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.” In Article 34 the Anglican Church said, “It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like,” but only “that nothing be ordained against God’s Word.” Hence “every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man’s authority, so that all things be done to edifying.” That the orbit of Article 34 included the threefold order of ministry is seen in the fact that Reformation Anglicans recognized Lutheran and Calvinist ministries on the Continent; and from 1690 considered this Article applied to the Presbyterian *Church of Scotland* as the established “national church” of that country. It is thus a gross perversion for Puseyites to start claiming that this is how one determines the apostolic catholicity of a church.

In the NT Books of Romans and Galatians, the Biblical teaching puts the emphasis on matters of repentance, regeneration, salvation, in a word, justification by faith. So too does Article 35, for we read the Biblical position in Book 1, Homily 3, in the homily entitled, “Of the salvation of mankind by only Christ our Saviour from sin and death everlasting.” This Homily refers to the glorious doctrine of justification by faith, whereby “we be justified by faith only, freely, and without works,” and says that, “whosoever denieth” this “is not to be counted for a true Christian ..., but for an adversary of Christ and his Gospel.” This, together with other broad Biblical truths, evident in the Reformation Motto and the three creeds, together with the moral standards

---

<sup>242</sup> Rutherford’s three or four *Lex Rex* criteria for sedition and murder of a “tyrant” king are discussed in more detail at “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” section “c) i) Charles the First’s Day (30 Jan.), Charles the Second’s Day (or Royal Oak Day) (29 May), & Papists’ Conspiracy Day (5 Nov.),” subsection “Popish Jesuit involvement in Charles I’s martyrdom,” *infra*.

of the Ten Commandments, and prayer to God alone as found in the Lord's Prayer, are the types of areas we are to look to in determining a church's or individual's apostolic catholicity. How sad and tragic, that any would think that this type of Biblical emphasis, upheld in the Anglican prayer book of 1662, together with the 39 Articles, would be replaced by Puseyites with a fixation on the threefold order of ministry as some kind of test for apostolic catholicity. Such are the deviations of those who have lost sight of God's wonderful and precious special grace unto salvation, through the atoning blood of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

Against this type of backdrop, it then becomes intelligible as to why, since the nineteenth century, the Puseyites have grabbed hold of some of the irresponsible Puritan, or Puritan influenced, propaganda depicting Charles as "Romish," and claimed that this vast pre-existing pool of Puritan propaganda is "true," in order to try and falsely promote and "justify" their own anti-Protestant views inside of Anglicanism. I.e., unlike the Puritans who use such "Romish" images to "condemn the memory of Charles," the Puseyites use such "Romish" images to "celebrate the memory of Charles." Thus the Puseyites took hold of a well established Puritan type of rhetoric, and used it to help them convert a historical Anglican anti-Puritan rhetoric and theology, into a 19th century and following anti-Protestant rhetoric and theology. Thus the perpetrators of Puritan or Puritan influenced anti-Caroline propaganda, which it must be remembered is ultimately intended to either "justify" the murder most foul of a King, or to create sympathy among Puritan derived Protestants for the murder most foul of a King, in fact manifests a deeper layer in the proverb, *O what a web we weave, when at first we try to deceive!*

These type of distortions are a farrago of fact (e.g., Charles I married a Roman Catholic wife; retained a semi-Romanist Archbishop Laud, when he should have gotten rid of him; and opposed any attempt to make the Anglican Church a Puritan Church), confusing terminology (the meaning of "crucifix," *infra*), inflation of the importance of Laud's private views to the Anglican Church (Laud's Lutheran consubstantiation views acting to "confirm" claim about "altars," and then depicting this not as a Lutheran, but as a Roman Catholic view, and not held as a private view by Laud, but as a more general view of Caroline Anglicans), fantasy or fiction (e.g., the claim that Charles I and his son Charles II claimed "divinity")<sup>243</sup>, and falsehood (e.g., "altars" and "adoration" of the

---

<sup>243</sup> See the claim by the Presbyterian, Rushdoony, that one "aspect of the doctrine of the divine right of kings" with regard to both "Charles I," "and Charles II," was that the "king's person" "was a species of divinity" (Rushdoony, R.J., *The Institutes of Biblical Law, op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 420). This is entirely false. The Divine Right of Kings is a Biblical teaching (Rom. 13:1-7; I Peter 2:13-17). It does not mean the king is "a species of divinity," and neither Charles I nor Charles II made any such blasphemous claim to divinity. Does Rushdoony make this claim on a Rutherford like basis i.e., "that religious kneeling ... doth necessarily import religious and divine adoration"? If so, I note that to bow before an earthly king who was Supreme Governor of the C. of E. and C. of I., *did not mean* that Anglicans considered he was Divine (Gen. 37:10; 41:42,43; 49:8; Rev. 3:9). (By contrast, the French King Louis XIV did commit such blasphemy, claiming to be "the sun god." E.g., when I visited Lyons, France, in Aug 2001, the

Communion elements, *infra*).

*Five illustrative issues: kneeling at Communion, “crucifixes,” “altars,” candles, & clerical dress.* Though detailed examination of the many fictions and false stories created about Charles I is beyond the scope of this work, to demonstrate the point, let us reduce the field considerably, by first considering some background statements on the Anglican practice of kneeling to receive the Lord’s Supper, and then primarily considering in brief several issues that seem to receive a lot of mention from both Puritans and Puseyites, namely, “crucifixes,” Communion Tables or “altars” and “high altars” (and the associated issue of “adoration” to the consecrated elements), candles, and clerical dress; together with two issues that neither Puritans or Puseyites like to mention, namely, the plain and full meaning of the Anglican 39 Articles and Anglican Prayer Books of 1559 & 1604 (used under Charles I) and 1662 (used under Charles II).

From the time of the Reformation, all Protestants have rejected the Romish priest-altar nexus. Both Lutherans and Anglicans rejected the Romish idea of *the sacrifice of the mass*, in which it is said that the mass is a sacrifice by a *priest* on an *altar* to God. Lutherans broke the priest-altar linguistic nexus by calling their clergymen *pastors*, while retaining reference to the Communion Table as an “altar” (on which is brought the *offering* of bread and wine to be later used in Communion, and possibly the money *offertory* is placed on the Communion Table<sup>244</sup>). Anglicans broke the priest-altar linguistic nexus by calling the Communion Table a “table,” while either calling their clergymen *Ministers* or retaining reference to them as *Priests* (cf. Rom. 15:16). In practice, Reformed Anglicans generally came to limit the usage of “priest” to relatively rare, and mainly written contexts, connected to ordination, and referred to their clergymen as “Ministers” (until the usage of “priest” was greatly increased by Puseyites from the nineteenth century on). Thus for Reformed Anglicans, the fact that their Ministers are ordained as “priests” per Rom. 15:16, means that they regard it as important to maintain reference to a Communion “Table<sup>245</sup>.”

---

tourist guide pointed out to me a picture on the ceiling of the City Hall, depicting “the sun king” Louis XIV as the pagan sun god, Apollo.)

<sup>244</sup> While the money *offertory* is so placed on the Communion Table in the Anglican tradition, and verses such as I Cor. 9:13,14 may be read in the 1662 prayer book service of Communion, the rubric clearly says the Minister shall “place” “the Offertory” “upon the holy Table” i.e., unlike in Lutheranism, this is still a “table” not an “altar.”

<sup>245</sup> Some Protestants broke the priest-altar linguistic nexus by calling the Communion Table a “table,” and calling their clergymen *Pastors* or *Ministers* or *Elders*. But some of these Protestants then reintroduce the language of an “altar” in a *different* context with reference to a *metaphoric* prayer-altar at a *place of prayer*. Hence they make reference to, for example, an “altar call” in an evangelistic campaign, when a person comes to the front and *prays to God* at a metaphoric prayer-altar. Or they refer to getting “married at the altar,” since the couple stand in a church before God and at a metaphoric prayer-altar make their vows before God, whose blessing they pray for. Or they refer to the “family altar,” as the place where families meet for prayer in their homes

*The two main relevant background issues are that of the Protestant Anglican practice of kneeling to receive Communion, and the Anglican usage of crosses as a Christian symbol.* Reformed Anglicans kneel at Communion in order to humbly receive the elements, and absolutely reject any form of adoration of the consecrated elements as idolatry. Even Laud's minority *private view* was one of adoration *at* God in a corporeal presence via Lutheran consubstantiation, not *adoration of* the consecrated elements, although it must be admitted that his views here involved confusing terminology and bad theology, mercifully prohibited to Anglicans after 1662. But Puritans continued to insist that Anglicans were really adoring the sacramental bread and wine. From this came the associated Puritan "deduction," that what Anglicans called a Communion "Table" in their prayer book (Anglican view), was in fact "an altar" (Puritan claim), bolstered by reference to the minority *private view* of Laudians that the Lord's Table could be called a Lutheran "Altar," and because it was elevated both to be better seen and to create a step on which to kneel to receive the Communion (Anglican view), it was called by Puritans "a high altar" or "a high place," the latter terminology carrying the connotation of idolatry in Scripture.

Also connected to this first issue, Puritans tried to depict the Anglican usage of the surplice as some kind of a Romish Mass vestment. This was quite wrong, since the Romish Mass vestment is the chasuble. E.g., in the *Surplice Controversies*, Puritans at one point violated the 8th commandment, "Thou shalt not steal," by breaking into and stealing all the surplices from an Oxford University Chapel. They then failed to distinguish between *the holy and the profane*, which is a concept taught in the 4th commandment dealing with the sabbath day that the Puritans put great emphasis on, as they took *the holy*, to wit the surplices and irreverently cast them into *the profane*, namely, a toilet pit. The second issue was the Puritan view that the second commandment prohibits graven images *per se*, rather than the Anglican-Lutheran view that it does not prohibit graven images *per se*, but rather it prohibits a graven image specifically used for idolatry.

George Gillespie of Edinburgh and Samuel Rutherford of St. Andrews were two of the eleven Commissioners from the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, connected with the Westminster Divines who wrote the Presbyterian Westminster Confession. Typical of the type of claims made by Puritans, Gillespie (1613-48) wrote in *A Dispute Against the English Popish Ceremonies*, "kneeling before the consecrated bread [implying that Anglicans kneel *before* the bread in the sense of adoration, developed *infra*], the sign of the cross [used in Anglican baptism], surplice [used by Anglican Ministers], festival days [i.e., liturgical year, which included Papists' Conspiracy Day, although this anti-Papist element is not mentioned], bishopping, bowing down to the altar [typical example of confusing Puritan terminology, by this is meant Anglicans kneeling to receive Communion from the Communion Table], administration of the sacraments in private places etc., are the wares of Rome, the baggage of Babylon, the trinkets of the whore, the bridges of Popery, the ensigns of Christ's enemies, and the

---

at a metaphoric prayer-altar (cf. Rev. 8:3,4).

very trophies of Antichrist [Rev. 17]: we cannot conform [as do Anglicans], communicate and symbolize with the idolatrous Papists in the usage of the same, without making ourselves idolaters by participation” (3:3:1).

Also in this same work, Gillespie claims, “Our [Puritan] opposites [i.e., Anglicans] ... both in pulpits and private places ... plead for the ceremonies by this very argument, that we should not run so far away from Papists, but come as near them as we can ... .” This work is typical of Puritan propaganda, depicting Anglicans as Romish, being “idolatrous” in “bowing down to the altar,” and wanting to “come as near” “as” they “can” to the “Papists.” It seems the Puritans, like the later Puseyites, had a vested interest in trying to turn Laud’s private views into official Anglican views, and making Anglicanism, whether Laudian or orthodox, sound more like Rome than it really was.

Moreover, the claim of Gillespie, that Anglicans “plead for the ceremonies by this very argument, that we should not run so far away from Papists, but come as near them as we can,” is quite false. This is typical of the type of thing that the three nasty Puritans were rightly convicted of libel for in *Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn (1637, Star Chamber)*. The reality is that Anglicans retained church practices if they were found to be useful and good, and not contrary to Scripture. They did not, as Gillespie claims, do so on the basis of “this very argument,” we wish to “come as near” “as we can” to “Papists.” But this type of false sentiment is the type of thing that Puseyites take up and use, claiming, “we know that Anglicans under Charles I were seeking to ‘come as near’ ‘as’ possible to ‘Papists,’ because this is what so upset the Puritans, who refer to it.”

Rutherford (c. 1600-61) pushed remorselessly on this issue of Anglicans kneeling at Communion<sup>246</sup>. In 1637 he claimed, “As the religious homage done to an image, to even to elements, is itself an external act of idolatry, ... so the act of kneeling to a piece of bread ... is a relative act of worship and an adoration of the bread itself. ... Therefore, ... kneeling, when used as a religious service, is the external adoration of that bread” (Letter 91).

The claim that Anglicans were “kneeling to a piece of bread” is quite false. Even Laud in his *private views* of Lutheran consubstantiation distinguished between adoration of God at the Holy Table, not adoration of the elements at the Holy Table i.e., he claimed to be adoring a corporeal presence of Christ’s natural flesh and blood, which was in, under, and round the elements, not the actual elements themselves. (Although I admit it would be hard in practice to distinguish Laudian adoration of a corporeal presence from consubstantiation, from Romish adoration of the actual elements from transubstantiation). More generally, unlike Laud, Anglicans were kneeling in humility and decent order, so as to receive the Communion bread and wine. This is the official and publicly declared doctrine of Reformed Anglicanism, seen in Cranmer’s *prayer of humble access* (first composed in 1549), now found in the *Communion Service* of the *Book of Common*

---

<sup>246</sup> *Letters of Samuel Rutherford, With a sketch of his life, by Andrew Bonar, Oliphants, London & Edinburgh, UK, 1904, pp. 192-4 (Letter 91), 326-40 (Letter 174 / 86).*

*Prayer* (1662), which says, “We do not presume to come to this thy Table [NOT ‘altar’], O merciful Lord, not trusting in our own righteousness [rejection of justification by works], but in thy manifold and great mercies [salvation by grace]. We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under thy Table [i.e., we come kneeling in humility]. But thou art the same Lord, whose property is always to have mercy . . . .”

When e.g., Lord Craighall in 1637 said he had no such intention to idolatrously adore the Communion bread, Rutherford said to His Lordship, “Your intention to honour Christ is nothing, seeing that religious kneeling . . . doth necessarily import religious and divine adoration.” To this, Rutherford also added the element of pseudo-historicism, claiming those who knelt to receive the Lord’s Supper were in “communion with great Babel, the mother of fornications. . . . Will ye, then, go with them, and set your lips to the whore’s golden cup, and drink of the wine of the wrath of God Almighty with them? . . . Oh cursed pleasure!” (Rev. 17 & 18) (Letter 174 / 86).

This type of thinking historically underpins the lack of kneelers in Puritan pews. I.e., Puritan derived Churches sit and / or stand for prayer, since on this type of thinking, if they knelt, they would be worshipping anything in front of them e.g., people, chairs, tables. “My knee shall bend,” I once heard it reported of such a Puritan, “to God and God alone.” While I admit *I like the God-focused sentiment in the sound and sincere sentiment of this*, in practice I think this is misguided since it means such a person will only “bend the knee” when he is literally in the presence of God in heaven or after the Second Coming. A half-way house compromise has been to *bow the head* while seated or standing, to which I am left to ask, *Why is bowing the head not “adoration,” but bowing the knee is “adoration”?* Of course, in practice many of the Puritan derived Churches no longer believe this type of thing, and so they sit and / or stand for prayer, purely because it is part of their Puritan tradition to do so. For such persons, to bow the head is not regarded as “adoration” of anything in front of them, because they think Puritans like Rutherford were wrong to claim bowing the knee was “adoration” of anything in front of them.

In its most extreme form, some Puritans were not even prepared to close their eyes in prayer, i.e., the closure of the eyelid could be said to be an adoration or bowing of what was in front of one. This type of view may be bolstered by a misunderstanding of e.g., Ps. 121:1,2a, “I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help. My help cometh from the Lord.” I.e., while this is one acceptable way to pray, it is not the only acceptable way to pray to God. Thus e.g., we read the following account in 1640, “A Puritan is he who when he prays, his rolling eyes up to heaven doth raise<sup>247</sup>.”

Reformed Anglicans (like Lutherans), consider that if the church has found a practice to be useful and good, providing it is not contrary to the Word of God, it may be retained. Thus because closing one’s eyes in prayer has been found to be useful in

---

<sup>247</sup> *Hierurgia Anglicana*, p. 358; citing *The Character of a Puritan*, A Dialogue wherein is plainly laid open the tyrannical dealing of the [Anglican] Lord Bishops against God’s [Puritan] Children, 1640 reprint.

devotion, and is not contrary to anything in the Bible, it is a practice that may be retained. By contrast, Puritans say one must find a specific injunction in the Bible to do something (though they are inconsistent on this matter<sup>248</sup>). As a consequence of this, *some* Puritans took the view that due to the Scriptural injunctions to “lift up ... eyes” (Ps. 121:1) that prayer should be made looking up toward heaven.

Certainly not all Puritans either then or now are this extreme. Jesus commended “the publican,” who “would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven,” i.e., his head and body were *so bowed down in prayer* that he would not so much as try to look up, “but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner” (Luke 18:13). On the basis of this passage, one can also reasonably infer that later in Luke-Acts, when one reads that St. Paul and those who were with him, “kneeled down on the shore, and prayed” (Acts 21:5), that like the man in Luke 18:13, they too closed their eyes.

Nowadays, Puritan derived churches seem to find no difficulty in their members closing their eyes in prayer. E.g., a Baptist Minister known to me whose (independent Baptist) Church in Sydney I have occasionally attended, says to his congregation (with minor variations on a given occasion,) something like, “Let us pray, [pause,] with every head bowed, [pause,] and every eye closed [pause,] ... .” Or the Presbyterian Elder of a (Free Presbyterian) Church I know in Sydney, once said to me, “I taught my children to close their eyes in prayer to worship the invisible God.” But back then, at least *some* of the Puritans saw it differently. On Rutherford’s type of logic, a Puritan might consider that anyone who had not “lifted up his eyes” in prayer (John 17:1), was an idolater of that which was before him. For such roof gazing Puritans, to close the eyelids in prayer was part of the so called “Romish worship” of Anglicanism, that they were seeking to “purify” by Puritanism. For in 1640, they would say, “*A Puritan is he who when he prays, his rolling eyes up to heaven doth raise.*”

Rutherford’s claim that “intention” “is nothing,” is quite different to the sentiment found in the teaching of e.g., I Cor. 8, where a distinction is made between an intention to commit idolatry and an intention not to, with respect to food offered unto idols, and a general spirit of tolerance and consideration for the other person’s view is urged. Moreover, unlike Rutherford, Scripture clearly recognizes that there is a kneeling *which does not import religious and divine adoration*. This is clear from the first Book of the Bible (Gen. 37:7,10; 49:8) to the last Book of the Bible (Rev. 3:9). Thus e.g., under the English common law system, in a court of law, bowing to the bench does not denote religious or divine adoration, but the giving of due *recognition* or *worthiness* or *worship* or “worship” (Rev. 3:9). Laud believed in this type of thing to the Communion

---

<sup>248</sup> E.g., where in the Bible does it say to have pews, windows, doors, pulpits, and notice boards for hymns or psalms? Clearly these are based on natural law (reason) that is not inconsistent with the Divine revelation. Thus the divide between this and Reformed Anglicanism is really *an issue of line drawing*, i.e., what is or is not desirable based on godly reason? And as for those Puritans who support Cromwell, they go to the other extreme i.e., they set aside the Word of God by their so called “natural law” or “reason” in allowing Biblically prohibited “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:20,21).

Table as a *private view* as to why he was kneeling. Yet even this, *is not* what Anglicans in general were doing when they knelt at Communion, since in harmony with the publicly declared doctrine of the Anglican Church, they knelt to humbly receive the sacrament, *not* to give any recognition to the consecrated elements, which not even Laud was prepared to do.

But even limiting ourselves to Scriptures where *religious worship and divine adoration* are intended to God, does not support Rutherford's basic claim with regard to "intention." If Rutherford's claim that "intention" "is nothing" is accepted, then when "the people bowed the head and worshipped" at "the Lord's Passover" (Exod. 12:27), which was a type of the Lord's Supper (I Cor. 5:7-11), does this mean that they thereby did adoration unto the unleavened bread in violation of the second commandment? Does this mean, that "when Daniel" "kneeled upon his knees, three times a day" "toward Jerusalem" (Dan. 6:10), that in fact he was idolatrously worshipping Jerusalem in general and the temple site in particular? When the holy Apostle Paul and those who were with him, "kneeled down on the shore, and prayed" (Acts 21:5), did they thus idolatrously adore the sea, or "anything that is" "in the water," since they certainly did "bow down" before "them" (Exod. 20:4,5), seeing as on this Puritan argument, "intention" "is nothing"? And what of King Solomon? For we are told that after "praying" "unto the Lord, he arose from before the altar of the Lord, from kneeling on his knees" (I Kgs 8:54); so that if "intention" "is nothing," Solomon must have idolatrously worshipped this "altar" and anything on it. *Such is the absurdity of these Puritan claims!*

But the pestering Puritan, Rutherford, was persistent. In his *Divine Right of Church Government* (1646), Rutherford says, "Though therefore we receive the Supper of the Lord [with heads] uncovered [from any head dress], no man can conclude from thence adoration of the elements, as we do from kneeling conclude the same ... ." This is typical of the insistence by pesky Puritans, contrary to all denials and attempts at clarification by Anglicans, that because they knelt to receive the Communion, Anglicans therefore engaged in "adoration" of the consecrated Communion elements.

*Let us now consider the specific issues of "crucifixes," "altars" and "high altars," candles, and clerical dress; together with two issues that neither Puritans or Puseyites like to mention, namely, the plain and full meaning of the Anglican 39 Articles and Anglican Prayer Books of 1559 & 1604 (used under Charles I) and 1662 (used under Charles II).*

On the one hand, *Charles' I Day* is an important corrective to Anglicans against Puritan forms of Non-Conformist worship. For this reason, Puseyites have taken up this holy day and abused it greatly. But on the other hand, Charles I is not to be confused with Laud. Charles I made a mistake in appointing and retaining Laud as the Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of England; but he also appointed Ussher as Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland. Laud would never have appointed the very Protestant, James Ussher. Charles largely acted in a traditional English patron-type way to his two Primates, i.e., like a patron giving them a good deal of autonomy. Thus he allowed a certain amount of freedom to his Primates and Laud chose to abuse this

privilege. But *Charles was unwise* to treat his Primates in this patron type manner, since as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland* he needed to be more actively involved. He needed to rope in Laud and stamp out Laudianism, and *he was unwise and derelict in his duty* not to do so. To some extent, Laud also benefited from the religio-political climate of the time in which Puritans were virulently anti-Anglican, and Charles balked, albeit wrongly, to give something that the Puritans would have liked, i.e., to see Laud disciplined.

Nevertheless, King Charles sought to take some measures to prevent the corrosion of Protestantism. Specifically Charles I's "Declaration" of 1628 is an uncompromising theological commitment to the "plain and full meaning" of "the [39] Articles of the Church of England," which thing no Puseyite genuinely believes in. Charles also allowed no formal changes to the Elizabethan and Jacobean Prayer Book (1559 & 1604). This acted as some kind of brake on Laud, albeit one that Charles I failed to apply with sufficient force against Laud. Nevertheless, unlike Reformed Anglicans, neither Puritan nor Puseyite perspectives analyse claims made about Caroline Anglicans through these doctrinal standards. But my Reformed Anglican perspective of Charles I, which is not interested in Puritan or Puseyite historical revisionism, most assuredly does.

The Anglican doctrinal position on what is commonly called a crucifix i.e., an image of Christ hanging on a cross, is stated in Article 35 of the *Thirty-Nine Articles*, Book 2, Homily 2, "Against peril of idolatry" (Part 2). The homily is more moderate in tone towards the crucifix than are the Puritans, since it still regards St. Gregory the Great as a "learned bishop," even though he was "the first" "that did allow the open having of [such] images in churches." It refers to when "a godly and learned man," "Serenus, Bishop of Massile, the head town of Gallia Norbonensis," "seeing the people by occasion of images fall to most abominable idolatry, brake to pieces all the images of Christ [i.e., statues and crucifixes] and Saints which were in that city; and was therefore complained upon to Gregory." The homily quotes the view of Gregory, in "the Epistles of Gregory, or Register" (fourth epistle in the tenth part of the register or book of Epistles), "where he hath these words, 'That thou didst forbid images to be worshipped, we praise altogether; but that thou didst break them, we blame. For it is one thing to worship the picture, and other thing by the picture of the story to learn what is to be worshipped'." But of these two views, i.e., images such as crucifixes and statues may be used but not worshipped (Gregory), or that images such as crucifixes and statues should not be used in churches (Serenus), the latter is preferred. Thus the homily concludes at the end, "But whether Gregory's opinion or Serenus' judgement were better herein consider ye, I pray you; for experience by and by confuteth Gregory's opinion."

In reaching this conclusion that Serenus' view is the better view, the homily notes that "there is no ground for worshipping of images in Gregory's writing, but a plain condemnation thereof." Nevertheless, the homily is opposed to crucifixes as "proved" on the basis of *experience* as to what happens with them. "Wherefore, as soon as an image of Christ is made," and "set up in temples" it leads "to the great and unavoidable danger of idolatry." The Homily documents how, "First, ... that all images so set up publicly have been worshipped of the unlearned and simple sort shortly after they have

been publicly so set up, and, in conclusion, of the wise and learned also. Secondly, ... that they are worshipped in sundry places now in our time also. And thirdly, ... that it is impossible that images of ... Christ ... can be suffered, especially in temples and churches, any while or space without worshipping of them; and that idolatry, which is most abominable before God, cannot possibly be escaped and avoided without the abolishing and destruction of” suchlike. (Similar concerns are expressed about certain types of “pictures” designed to have a similar effect.) Thus the Reformed Anglican teaching of the 39 Articles, in what Charles I called, the “plain and full meaning” of Article 35, is clearly opposed to the usage of crucifixes in any Anglican Church.

Nevertheless, when one reads Puritan or Puritan derived propaganda, references are made to “crucifixes” in Caroline Anglican Churches. E.g., in the article of Spurgeon considered in greater detail, *infra*, under Charles I, the contemporary seventeenth century Puritan, Smart<sup>249</sup>, refers to “the bishops” who are “setting up” “crosses, crucifixes, ... etc.”. Likewise, the twentieth century Puritan derived Non-Conformist, Close, who most horribly seeks to justify the regicide of Charles I, claims that “during Charles I’s reign,” there was “restored ... the crucifix of the Church of Rome,” and that there was “set up the ... crucifix over the high altar<sup>250</sup>.”

How are such contradictory factors to be reconciled? If one could prove that crucifixes in the sense of a cross with an image of Christ on it were so used, then this would constitute another Laudian innovation, and another instance of illegal Laudian actions which violate the 39 Articles. But I know of no such evidence.

Therefore, the answer appears to lie in different meanings of the word “crucifix.” The complete *Oxford Dictionary* gives two meanings of “crucifix.” One meaning is the common one i.e., “an image or figure (formerly also a pictorial representation) of Christ upon the cross.” But the other meaning is “Christ on the cross” in a poetical sense. Most notably, reference is made to the Anglican clergyman, Jeremy Taylor (1613-1667). He was a supporter of Charles I and made a Doctor of Divinity by royal decree of Charles I. He was made *Church of Ireland* Bishop of Down and Connor after the Restoration in 1660 by the *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland*, King Charles II. Before he was made a bishop, Reverend Jeremy Taylor said in 1649, the year of Charles I’s martyrdom, “He that swears by the cross, swears by the holy crucifix, that is, Jesus crucified thereon” (*Gt. Exemp.* 2:9:118, *my emphasis*). This is the idea, that *one can never look at a cross without seeing a crucifix, because one can never think about the resurrection of Christ (symbolized by a cross) without thinking about the atoning passion of Christ (symbolized by a crucifix)* (I Cor. 1:13,17,18,23; Gal. 3:1; 5:11; 6:14).

The *Oxford Dictionary* says that “Todd,” commenting on “Jeremy Taylor’s usage of ‘holy crucifix,’” interpreted this in the “sense ‘The cross of Christ ...’.” The *Oxford Dictionary* takes the view that this is “an error” of interpretation, “repeated in the

---

<sup>249</sup> Peter Smart was a witness against Laud in the Archbishop’s trial, *supra*.

<sup>250</sup> Close, A., *op. cit.*, p. 149.

Dictionaries,” but says that what it regards as the “misuse of ‘crucifix’ for ‘cross, figure of the cross’ is frequent in writers of the 18-19th c[enturies].” By contrast, *Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary* (20th century, 2nd edition, 1979), gives as one meaning of “crucifix,” the common meaning of “a religious symbol consisting of a cross ... with the figure of Jesus crucified upon it,” and then as the second meaning, the less common usage, “the cross as a religious symbol.” On the one hand, I sympathize with the *Oxford’s* position since for the purposes of clarity, I prefer to reserve the term “crucifix” for a cross with an image of Christ upon it, and so distinguish it from a cross. But on the other hand, I do not doubt that the *Oxford* is wrong to criticize Todd’s commentary on Taylor’s comments. It is clear from Taylor’s comments that at the time of Charles I’s martyrdom, the term “crucifix” was used by some Anglicans for what is more commonly called the cross, on that basis that *one can never look at a cross without seeing a crucifix because one can never think about the resurrection of Christ (symbolized by a cross) without thinking about the atoning passion of Christ (symbolized by a crucifix)*. Therefore, *Webster’s* is correct in recognizing that one meaning for the term “crucifix” is that which is more commonly called a “cross.” This is quite possibly the meaning of “crucifix” in a number of Puritan descriptions.

Another type of usage of “crucifix” remains in contemporary usage with the term “crucifer” or “cruciferous,” for *one who carries a cross*. This however is very largely technical language not commonly used except among people who attend *some* churches e.g., Roman Catholic Churches, where the term “crucifer” is known in the sense of *one who carries a processional cross*. I.e., if any cross is in some way carried or supported by a person or thing, *who thus carries a cross*, it may be called a “crucifix,” since this is the purpose of a cross (Matt. 10:38; 16:24; 27:33,35; Rom. 6:6; Gal. 5:24). E.g., the *Oxford Dictionary* refers to a Roman Catholic usage of “crucifer” under Bloody Mary’s Archbishop Pole, with reference made in 1574 to “fees” that were “bestowed on his crucifer” (*Life 70th Abp Canterbury*, Pref. D. iij b) i.e., the “crucifer” was the person who carried the processional *cross*; or in 1656, Blount (*Glossogr.*, Cruciferous) uses “cruciferous” for “he that bears the cross.”

This type of technical language, *not commonly used by people*, is also found in the science of botany for a plant with four equal petals which is known as “cruciferous” e.g., the *cruciferae* family of mustard plants. I.e., the stem of these plants supports (or holds up) a cross shape of petals, and so it is “cruciferous” or in this sense, a “crucifix.” Hence the *Oxford Dictionary* records that in 1846 Linley’s *Vegetable Kingdom* 352, refers to such botanical “crucifers;” or in 1868 Duncan’s *Insect World* 3:91, refers to “The cabbage and most of the cruciferous plants.” So too a cross-shaped object, especially a church with transepts, is sometimes called, “cruciform” i.e., the *cross* shape of the church is *supported by* the structure of the building and so is *cruciform*. Or in the Caroline times of Charles II, Lovell refers in 1661 to, “the cruciforme bone of the head [of a pike]” (*Hist. Anim & Min.* 215), i.e., on a “pike,” a metal spearhead attached by a piece of cross “bone,” which in turn is *supported by* a long wooden pole. Or in 1794 Martyn says, “These corollas are called cruciform or cross shaped” (*Rousseau’s Bot.* 2:29) i.e., the inner leaves or petals of a flower are “cruciform” because they may be “cross shaped” and *supported by* the stem of the flower. On this type of thinking of “cruciferous” and

“cruciform,” a cross that is affixed to a wall with one or more support rods coming out of the wall, thus leaving a space between the cross and the wall, is *cruciferous* or *cruciform* i.e., a cross *supported by rods*. This is quite possibly the meaning of “crucifix” in some Puritan descriptions, e.g., Smart, *infra*.

These diverse possible meanings of “crucifix,” helps us better understand both Anglican and Puritan statements from this era. To demonstrate this point, let us first consider some usages of “crucifix” in Laud’s trial of *Cromwell’s Revolutionary Regime v. Archbishop of Canterbury*, and then some usages of “crucifix” in Puritan propaganda from this era.

On 20 May 1644 (10th day of hearing) in the case of *Cromwell’s Revolutionary Regime v. Archbishop of Canterbury (Laud) (1644)* (House of Lords), the Archbishop was “charged” that as Archbishop he introduced “innovation in ceremonies” at the “Chapel at Lambeth” Palace (the Archbishop of Canterbury’s Palace, located near the Westminster Parliament on the opposite side of the Thames, in London)<sup>251</sup>. The specifics of this “charge” included reference to a “crucifix.” In this charge, “Dr. Featley” “says, ‘there was a fair crucifix in ... a piece of the *hangings hung up* behind the altar,’” which Featley “thinks was not used before” Laud’s time;” although Laud replies, “the piece of *hangings which hung*” was there for “thirty years ... upon my knowledge” i.e., long before Laud became Archbishop, and Laud thought “somewhat” “long before” that, for which he “offered proof by the vestry men.”

Moreover, Laud says, “and for the crucifix,” a witness “confesses it was standing in my predecessors’ times, though a little broken, so I did but mend it. I did not set it up, as was urged against me.” The very words of the Article [35, “of Homilies,” 39 Articles], we subscribe, are, that ‘The’ ‘Homilies’ ‘do contain a godly and wholesome doctrine’ for *all* times, but ‘necessary for’ *those* [‘times’ in 1562 & 1570]<sup>252</sup>, *when people were newly weaned from the worship of images*. Afterwards, neither the danger [of idolatry], nor the scandal [of idolatry] alike [existed].”

Laud’s usage of Article 35 to allow for crosses would be acceptable, since these were clearly used by Anglicans e.g., *the sign of the cross* at baptism, or the Calendar in the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* includes “Invention [Recovery] of the Cross Day” (3 May), a day which traces the origins of the cross as a Christian symbol back to Constantine the Great’s time. But any attempt to use this argument on Article 35 to e.g., allow for a crucifix, meaning a cross with an image of Christ on it, would be

<sup>251</sup> Laud’s *Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 197-201 (emphasis mine).

<sup>252</sup> Article 35 says “The ... Homilies ... do contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, ... necessary for these times ... .” Laud’s view that “these times” means some things in the Homilies are no longer applicable, is a standard Anglican view; although Reformed Anglicans have a much narrower contextual understanding of what this means than the expansive interpretation of the Puseyites who essentially strike down the Article and render it meaningless.

unacceptable, since it would strike at the very substance of the Homily's argument that experience shows how *over time* there is a strong tendency for a substantial number of people to be so attracted to the image on a cross, that they start making it an idol, e.g., they might start kissing it, or bowing down to it, for which reason, such crucifixes should be banned. Thus an interpretation of Article 35 which allows for such a crucifix i.e. a cross with an image of Christ on it, so fundamentally undermines the meaning of Article 35, that it cannot be accepted by those who in the words of "His Majesty's Declaration" of 1628, "submit to" "the Articles" "in the plain and full meaning thereof."

The fact that this "crucifix" is said by Featley to be part of "the *hangings hung up behind the altar*," and said by Laud to be part of "the *piece of hangings which hung*," means that this may refer to a cruciferous cross. I.e., a cross *without an image of Christ on it*, which was *cruciferous* because it was affixed to something, so that the *support rod or attachment coming out from the back of the cross supported it*, and thus made it *cruciferous* or *cruciform* i.e., a "crucifix" is contextually a natural enough meaning here for a cross so *hung*.

Bishop Taylor's idea that a cross may be called a crucifix because *one can never look at a cross without seeing a crucifix*, seems relevant to this following matter in *Laud's case*. This included the following "charge," against Laud. On 27 May 1644 (11th day of hearing), a "charge" was brought "about the ceremonies at the coronation of His Majesty" Charles I in February 1625. At the time, Laud was the Sub-Dean (i.e., deputy) to the Dean of Westminster and the coronation was held at Westminster. As such, Sub-Dean Laud had no direct power over the coronation ceremonies but had to follow the instructions of the Dean and others. "They say, 'there was a crucifix among the regalia and that it stood upon the altar at the coronation, and' Laud "did not except" i.e., make exception, "against it." So too "Heylin affirmeth, that the old crucifix, being found among the regalia, was then placed on the altar." Such a "crucifix" is also "mentioned among the regalia" by Bishop Andrewes and the Dean of Westminster, Dr. Neule. Laud became Archbishop of Canterbury sometime later in 1633. He says that if any such "crucifix" had been there at the time of the coronation, then it would have been necessary for his "predecessor" Archbishop of Canterbury, to "connive at it," thereby indicating his disapproval of any such "crucifix." Nevertheless, he says, "I believe I would have excepted [i.e., taken exception] against the crucifix had it stood there. But I remember not any there<sup>253</sup>."

One way to resolve this apparent conflict of testimony is to conjecture that by "crucifix," Heylin, Andrewes, and Neule, meant *a cross* in this same sense as Taylor uses it. By contrast, one may speculate that in the claim put to Laud by the Puritans, both Laud and the Puritans wrongly understood "crucifix" to mean a cross with an image of Christ on it. (Though Laud sometimes used "crucifix" in the sense of a "cruciferous" cross, *supra*, this was clearly not the meaning here since "it stood upon" the Communion Table, rather than in some way being attached to the wall behind the Communion Table.) If so, this would account for why Laud says, he does "not" "remember" "any" such

---

<sup>253</sup> Laud's *Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 206,207,209,211.

“*crucifix*” being “there,” and that if it were, he would have taken exception “against it.” If so, this also acts to highlight how the double meaning of the word “*crucifix*” made for some confusing terminology, and was the source of some conflict due to some genuine misunderstandings of its meaning at this time. If so, aware of this, the Puritan propagandists may then have set out to deliberately exploit this ambiguity by calling certain crosses “*crucifixes*.”

Having thus considered the meaning of “*crucifix*” in Laud’s trial, let us now also consider the meaning of it in Puritan propaganda usage.

Taking into account the fact that Anglican doctrine in the *39 Articles* forbade the usage of the *crucifix* in its more common meaning of an image of Christ on a cross, it follows that unless one can produce good evidence to the contrary, and I know of none, then what the Puritans meant by a “*crucifix*” over “the altar,” was in fact a *cross* over the Communion Table. The Puritan critic, Smart, refers more generally to Cathedral “crosses, *crucifixes*.” Either he meant by this some distinction between different types of crosses, i.e., a *cruciferous* cross attached to a wall with *support rods*; or he was using the terms “crosses, *crucifixes*” conjunctively as synonyms, rather than disjunctively as distinct items i.e., on the basis that *one can never look at a cross without seeing in it a crucifixion scene of Christ*. Certainly his language lacks adequate clarity and is confusing, and I suspect, deliberately so. I.e., it suited the purposes of Puritan propagandists to use the term “*crucifix*” for a cross, since this allowed their Puritan listeners’ minds to imagine they meant “an image of Christ on a cross,” which is one meaning of “*crucifix*,” but if they were challenged by someone on the basis of “inaccuracy,” they could turn around and say they meant “*crucifix*” in the second sense of a “cross.” In doing this they could point to Roman Catholic usage of “*crucifer*” for one carrying a processional cross and / or Anglicans like Taylor who so used the term “*crucifix*” on the basis that one can never look at a cross without seeing in it a *crucifix* because Christ’s resurrection means nothing if it is not connected with his atonement. Thus Puritan propagandists can be seen to be here exploiting an ambiguity in the term “*crucifix*,” and *upping the anti*, to make Anglican Churches with a cross over the Communion Table sound as “Romish” as they could make them sound.

Communion Table designs vary in Anglican churches. In the Evangelical Anglican Diocese of Sydney, Australia, the Communion Table (also known as the Lord’s Table or the holy table) in some, though not all churches, looks very much like a table design that Puritans would probably not object to (except that it is elevated in the chancel and surrounded by communion rails). The more common tradition in the Diocese is not to have a cross put on, or over the middle of the Communion Table, so that more commonly, the cross as a Christian symbol is reserved for other contexts e.g., a large cross exists on the *outside* of the church, at the top of St. Anne’s, Top Ryde (where I went to pre-school); or long dangling book-marks used on the lectern (holding the church Bible read during services,) often have crosses embroidered on them (and are generally in that day’s liturgical colour of the calendar’s liturgical year). But a minority of traditional Diocesan churches have a cross in the middle of the Communion Table, or on the wall over the middle of the Communion Table.

In a number of traditional Evangelical Anglican church buildings in the Diocese of Sydney, such as St. Matthew's Windsor (the oldest complete Anglican church building in Australia), St. Philip's, Church Hill (near the Harbour Bridge) in the city (rebuilt in the mid 19th century when the original wooden church built by Arthur Phillip burnt down)<sup>254</sup>, St. John's Cathedral, Parramatta (named after the Presbyterian Governor of NSW, John Hunter, a pro-cathedral for the Bishop of Parramatta), or St. Swithun's Pymble, one finds the traditional looking Communion Tables that Puritans would object to, in the east end of the church (all these churches face east in the direction of the rising sun, Mal. 4:2). But a Communion Table looking very much like a table i.e., with distinct table legs with open spaces between them, which the Puritans would prefer, is found at St. Stephen's, Mittagong (in the southern part of the Diocese, which extends just south of Nowra, outside of the City of Sydney). However, they are all elevated in that the chancels of these churches are elevated. St. Philip's also has a smaller elevated Communion Table in the Richard Johnson Chapel<sup>255</sup>.

---

<sup>254</sup> As recently as the late 1990s, I was for some years stretching back into the 1980s, a regular worshipper at St. Philip's. It maintained a traditional Evangelical Anglican form of service, with the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* and AV; although sadly it introduced the NIV as the pew Bible under the last Rector before I left, John Jones, but the AV was still used for readings in the service although the NIV was sometimes quoted from in sermons. A plaque in the park on the opposite side of the road to St. Philip's (named after the Apostle Philip), known as *Richard Johnson Square*, marks where the original St. Phillip's (named after Arthur Phillip) stood. Thus memorials to Arthur Phillip and Richard Johnson (e.g., the Chapel of St. Philip's) are geographically close together in the heart of the City of Sydney. So too, in the heart of the City of London, memorials I have visited are geographically close together to Arthur Philip (in St. Mary-le-Bow, "the great bells of Bow" in the rhyme, "Oranges and Lemons"), and Richard Johnson (in the nearby St. Mary Aldermary's).

<sup>255</sup> Richard Johnson (1753-1827) was an Evangelical Anglican clergyman, who is deservedly remembered on 3 February in the Calendar of the Anglican Church of Australia (see *e) King Charles the First's Day* & my comments on *An Australian Prayer Book, 1978, infra*). The Calendar says, "First Christian service in Australia, conducted by Richard Johnson, Sydney, 1788." Nearby on the corner of Hunter & Bligh Streets, Sydney, a stone memorial of historical importance celebrates Chaplain Johnson's First Christian Service. In 2006 I also inspected a plaque to Richard Johnson at St. Mary Aldermary's, London (near St. Paul's Cathedral). On the outside of this church is a stone carving of St. Antholin's Church, formerly in nearby Budge Row, but demolished in 1874. St. Antholin's had been amalgamated with St. John the Baptist's Church following the Great Fire of London in 1666, and in turn, St. Antholin's was amalgamated with St. Mary Aldermary's in 1874. When he returned to England, Reverend Johnson was the Rector of St. Antholin's *Church of England*. Johnson's plaque was originally at St. Antholin's, but transferred to St. Mary Aldermary's after the amalgamation, as were a number of old Offertory plates which I also inspected.

These Communion Tables all have communion rails in front of them. Reflecting the more common tradition in the Diocese, there is no cross on, or over, the middle of the Communion Tables at St. Philip's, Church Hill, or St. John's Cathedral, Parramatta. However, there is a gold metal cross in the middle of the Communion Table at St. Matthew's Windsor and St. Swithun's Pymble, and there is a small wooden cross affixed to the wooden panel in the same colour wood, over the middle of the Communion Table in the Richard Johnson Chapel at St. Philip's, Church Hill<sup>256</sup>. There is also a gold metal cross attached to the wall by support rods, set above the middle of the Communion Table at St. Stephen's, Mittagong.

Yet nobody suggests that because they are "elevated," and "at the east end," and "have communion rails around them," that they are therefore "altars," *on the basis that communicants receive the Lord's Supper kneeling*, and hence are really engaging in "adoration" of the consecrated elements. Nobody is silly enough to suggest that because they are both elevated, and have crosses on, or over them, the main Communion Tables at St. Matthew's, Windsor and St. Swithun's, Pymble, or St. Stephen's, Mittagong, or the Chapel's Communion Table at St. Philip's, Church Hill, are "high altars" with "crucifixes on, or over, them." Nor should they, since they are certainly not regarded by anyone as anything but *very Anglican* Communion Tables, whether with or without a cross on, or over, them.

Under Charles I the prayer book used was the Elizabethan and Jacobean prayer book of 1559 as slightly modified in 1604. The rubric of that prayer book states at the beginning of the Communion Service that "the Table at the Communion time ... shall stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel, where Morning and Evening Prayer be appointed to be said. And the priest standing at the north side of the Table shall say the Lord's Prayer ..." etc. . . Up till Charles' time, many Anglican churches had placed the Lord's Table in the body of the church, which was certainly allowed in this rubric. In Charles time, *subject to this rubric*, the Communion Tables were moved to the Chancel i.e., the east end. This section of an Anglican Church is usually elevated *so the people can see the clergy and / or choir better*. *The step also* has cushions placed on it, and *acts as a kneeler* upon which communicants can kneel to receive the consecrated elements at Communion. Communion rails were also placed there. This is an established variant within Reformed Anglicanism.

But Puritan propaganda, both then and now, has made all sorts of outrageous

---

<sup>256</sup> When I was a parishioner at St. Philip's, Church Hill, I remember an Honorary Assistant Minister, (Reverend Norman Fox, a retired clergyman who used to help out in both weekday and Sunday services,) arguing that he thought this wooden cross in the Richard Johnson Chapel "should be painted gold," because it was too hard to see since it is the same colour as the wood panelling that it is affixed to. But neither the Rector nor others agreed with him. On the one hand, they did not object to the presence of a discreet wooden cross in the wall over the middle of the Chapel's Communion Table; but on the other hand, they did not regard the cross to be so important, or noteworthy, or necessary, as to be highlighted by painting it gold.

claims about this. E.g., Close, claims “Charles I’s reign” “restored High Altars” and “Romish Altars<sup>257</sup>.” Though Close does not say so, this was essentially a Puritan “deduction” based on the invalid presupposition that since communicants receive the Lord’s Supper kneeling, they were really “adoring” the consecrated elements which was *therefore* coming from “an altar” rather than a Communion “Table.” In the complexities of Puritan propaganda which does not clearly distinguish between Reformed Anglicanism and Laudian innovations, but attacks both, it was bolstered by reference to the *private view* of Laud whose views on Lutheran consubstantiation meant he considered the Lord’s Table was “an altar,” but like Laud, the Puritans (and later the Puseyites,) made no attempt to distinguish Laud’s *private views* from the more common and publicly professed doctrine of the Anglican Church that this was a Communion “Table.” Rather than exposing Laudian innovations such as the usage of the term “altar” in the 1640 canons as an example of the Laudians illegal attempts to subvert Reformed Anglicanism; Close seeks to more greatly generalize Laud’s actions as representing Anglicanism, much like Puseyites who wrongly like to refer to Laudianism under such names as “Caroline Anglicanism.” What about e.g., the 13 Anglican bishops impeached by the 1640 canons before they were declared illegal, and doubtless the many more that would have followed had the canons not been struck down that same year of 1640? The proposition that an Anglican Communion Table which is elevated because it is in the chancel is a “high altar” or a “Romish altar,” is absurd. No-one but a fool would make these type of claims about the Diocese of Sydney Communion Tables at e.g., St. Matthew’s, Windsor, St. John’s, Parramatta, St. Swithun’s, Pymble, or St. Stephen’s, Mittagong, which are both “elevated” in the chancel so as to be more visible to the congregation, and also surrounded by Communion rails. So why make these types of claims about Communion Tables in Charles I’s time?

Nevertheless from the perspective of Puritan propaganda, because the cross on the wall over the middle of the Communion Table at St. Stephen’s Anglican Church, Mittagong, is affixed to the wall by means of a *support* rod, it might be classified as “cruciferous.” Because there are Communion rails, and the area of the Communion Table is elevated, both in order to be more visible, and also to create a step *on which communicants can kneel to receive the Lord’s Supper*, the Puritans would falsely claim that “adoration” of the consecrated elements was occurring. On this basis, it follows on Puritan logic, that *therefore the Communion Table is really “an altar.”* Because this area is elevated, Puritan logic would also claim that this was “a high altar.” Thus what at St. Stephen’s, Mittagong, the Puritans would call “a high altar” with a “crucifix” over it, would in fact be nothing more than a very Protestant Communion Table, with a cross over it, where Anglicans who opposed adoration of the Communion elements as idolatry, may humbly kneel to receive the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper.

Hence, perhaps if Puritans were trying to “justify” a murder of the Anglican Archbishop of Sydney (which I thank God they most assuredly are not trying to do,) they might start claiming that these were “high altars,” and in the case of St. Matthew’s, Windsor, St. Swithun’s, Pymble, or the Chapel of St. Philip’s, Church Hill, with

---

<sup>257</sup> Close, A., *op. cit.*, p. 149.

“crucifixes” set up in the middle of them on the basis that *one can never look at a cross without seeing a crucifix*, and in the case of St. Stephen’s, Mittagong, on the basis that it is a *cruciferous* cross attached to a wall with *support rods*. They might go so far as to join the Puritan anti-Anglicanism of the Free Presbyterian pseudo-historicist, Alexander Hislop, and his wicked claims about the meaning of the letters, “I.H.S.,” and the cross as a “pagan” symbol. If so, they might claim that the “I.H.S.” over the middle of the Communion Table in either the wooden panelling of St. John’s Parramatta or the painted eastern wall of St. Matthew’s Windsor, does not stand for “*Iesus Hominum Salvator*” (Latin, “Jesus Humanity’s Saviour”), but rather, as Hislop blasphemously claims, the ancient “Egyptian” “system of idolatry,” with its three heathen gods, “Isis, Horus, Seb.” And they might add blasphemy to blasphemy, by further claiming that the Christian cross formed at the top of the “I.” of the “I.H.S.” at Windsor, like the golden cross in the middle of the Communion Table at that Church, stands for – and I hesitate to utter this shockingly wicked blasphemy, stands for, as Hislop claims, the first letter, “t” of the pagan god “Tammuz.”

If so, their claims would be a mix of fact (these Communion Tables are elevated and have Communion rails around them, so that communicants may receive the Lord’s Supper kneeling, and two of them do have “I.H.S.” written over them), confusing terminology (the meaning of “crucifix” is not the common one, albeit a *possible* uncommon meaning), fantasy (because a Communion Table is elevated so people can see it better, and a step is created that they can kneel on to receive Communion, that does not mean that they engage in “adoration,” and so this does not justify the “High” of “High Altar”), and falsehood (adoration is rejected as idolatry by such Anglicans, these are regarded as Communion Tables, not “altars;” and the “I.H.S.” does not refer to pagan deities, nor is the cross a “t” standing for a pagan deity). Thus such claims would be misleading and irresponsible. If, at some point in the future, Puseyites were then to take hold of such fanciful claims and say, (that other than the “I.H.S.” type of claims that these are symbols for heathen gods,) they were true, then they too would be misleading and irresponsible. Yet this is precisely what both Puritans and Puseyites have done with Puritan propaganda concerning e.g., the Caroline Communion Tables.

Limerick in Ireland is well known as the place from which originates the limerick style of poem. When visiting Limerick in October 2001, (including relevant sites on the Siege of Limerick, 1690, against the Jacobite forces; and *Treaty Stone* of Limerick used in 1691 by the victorious forces of William of Orange, which is on the other side of the river, and directly opposite to, King John’s Castle, the King who signed the Magna Carta and granted Limerick its Charter,) I inspected St. Mary’s *Church of Ireland* Cathedral. Among many interesting features of this Anglican Cathedral (including “seats of mercy” designed to allow clergy to rest while appearing to stand during services; and the “leper’s squint hole,” where a leper could stand outside to watch church services through a slit in the stone and receive Communion,) I inspected a stone Communion Table. This had been buried in the churchyard by Cromwell’s son-in-law under Cromwell’s republic, on the basis that it was “an altar.”

Laud had installed a number of stone Communion Tables in the place of wooden

Communion Tables, and the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60 claimed that if a Communion Table was made of stone, rather than wood, it was necessarily “an altar” rather than “a table.” Hence the Communion Table at Limerick was deemed by the Puritans to be one of these “stone altars.” Moreover, for the Puritans these were always thought of as an altar in *the Romish sense*, not *the Lutheran sense*, since they seemed incapable of accepting that Lutheran Protestants, or Laudians who followed their thinking and were thus Lutheran not Roman Catholic in elements of their Communion theology, also believed in an “altar.” (Although, like the Puritans, I confess I do not like such Lutheran sacramentalism of consubstantiation and “altars,” and I accept that it is semi-Romanist, I nevertheless do not thereby claim that those holding Lutheran views are thereby *ipso facto* excluded from being part of broad Protestantism.)

This basic Puritan claim that *an altar is stone* and *a table is wooden*, is a most unBiblical one since in Ezek. 40:39-43, we read of “tables ... of hewn stone” on which the OT priests “slew the sacrifice” and placed their instruments. The animals were killed here, *not offered here*, so it would be a great blasphemy to claim that because the “tables were of hewn stone” (Ezek. 40:42) they were therefore really the same thing as the “altar” (Ezek. 40:46,47). Worse still for the Puritans, reference is also made to an “altar of wood” (Ezek. 41:22; cf. Exod. 30:1; I Kgs 7:48; Rev. 8:3), although they might perhaps take some comfort in the fact that it is also referred to as a “table” (Ezek. 41:22).

The reality, of course, is that there can be both *stone altars* and *stone tables*, or both *wooden altars* of incense (Exod. 30:1; Rev. 8:3) and *wooden tables*. To claim, as the Puritans did, that simply because it is stone it is an altar, or simply because it is wooden it is a table, is both contrary to the Divine revelation (Ezek. 40:42,46,47; 41:22), and also contrary to plain reason. Thus I regard this basic Puritan claim as supercilious. I think it is just as well that the Puritans buried this stone Communion Table in the Anglican churchyard at Limerick, because if the reasonable minded people of Ireland had been able to see it, then they would have surely concluded that the fundamental Puritan claims that because it was made of stone it was intrinsically an “altar,” not a table, were absolutely ridiculous claims. To the extent that the Puritans had the sense to “hide the manufactured evidence,” by stashing it away underground, where it was unseen and unable to be inspected, they thus showed some level of animal, fox-like, cunning.

*This Puritan claim is ultimately premised on the antecedent Rutherford type of false Puritan claim that because Reformed Anglicans receive the Communion kneeling, they are really “adoring” the consecrated elements, and that “therefore the ‘table’ must be ‘an altar’.*” It is bolstered by reference to the private views of Laud and Laudians about Lutheran consubstantiation on a Lutheran type “altar,” which are not distinguished from official and publicly declared Reformed Anglican doctrine which never recognized any such thing. Thus *it is fundamentally based on deception*, in violation of the ninth commandment, “Thou shalt not bear false witness” (Exod. 20:16), since Reformed Anglicans humbly receive Communion kneeling. They do not thereby “adore” the Communion elements, and even Laud rejected adoration in such terms, although I would accept Laud engaged in sacramental adoration of a corporeal presence, prohibited from 1662. But there is no evidence that Laud’s private views here were very widespread.

Communion Table designs vary in Anglican churches. This Communion Table at St. Mary's Anglican Cathedral had been rediscovered after 300 years of burial, and restored to the church. What matters in interpreting suchlike in the Caroline era is the doctrinal interpretation of the Prayer Book (1559 & 1604) and 39 Articles. The Elizabethan and Jacobean prayer book used under Charles I very clearly states that the Communion Table is a "table." This issue reminds us that when those in a Non-Conformist Puritan tradition claim certain Anglican things are "Romish," they are viewing the matter through the eyes of Puritans who believe Anglican doctrine and worship had to be "purified" of Roman Catholic elements; rather than from a Reformed Anglican perspective, which like Lutherans, took the view that if something was not contrary to the Word of God, and had been found to be useful and good, it might be retained. They are also bringing to it a Rutherford type Puritan view that because Anglicans kneel to receive Communion they are necessarily "adoring" the elements. They are also universalizing Laud's and Laudians' private views on adoration of a corporeal presence, and giving it a wider support than the evidence indicates it had. Laud's view was prohibited from 1662, and it does not seem to have had much support before this time.

Thus this issue of Puritans calling Anglican Communion Tables "altars," was indissolubly intertwined with, and derived from, concomitant Puritan claims about "adoration" of the Communion elements. I note that this associated issue of "adoration" shows that this is the type of thing that reasonable minded Anglicans had to endure when dealing with some of these unreasonable minded Puritans. This issue of alleged "adoration" of the Communion elements by Anglicans kneeling to receive Communion is the underpinning Puritan "justification" and *raison d'être* for claiming that what the official Anglican theology of the prayer book calls a Communion "table" was actually "an altar." The troublesome covenanter, Samuel Rutherford *et al*, irritatingly continued to falsely claim that Anglicans who received Communion kneeling, were really doing so because they "adored" the consecrated elements, as in Roman Catholicism. *No Reformed Anglican denial was ever good enough to get Puritans like Rutherford to shut-up on this issue.* They thus continued to fuel false Puritan claims that Anglicans were "Romish idolaters" of the consecrated Communion elements, who had "altars," "high altars," and "high places," not Communion "tables."

The final rubric in the Communion Service of the 1662 prayer book reflects the difficulties Anglicans had with these type of pig-headed Puritans who continued to misrepresent Anglicans who very specifically denounced such adoration, and from that time prohibited it as even private view allowed among Anglicans, such as Laud. In part the rubric says, "Whereas it is ordained in this Office for the administration of the Lord's Supper, that the communicants should receive the same kneeling ... for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgement of the benefits of Christ ..., and ... avoiding ... disorder ..., lest the same kneeling should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved; it is hereby declared, That thereby no adoration in intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any corporeal presence of

Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances and therefore may not be adored; (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more place than one."

On the one hand, this rubric is anti-Papist in that it rejects Roman Catholic transubstantiation; and notably, its rejection of "any corporeal presence" and statement that "the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven," further acts to reject Lutheran consubstantiation. It is also anti-Laudian, since on this logic, Laud must have been guided in his views by "ignorance," "infirmity," or "obstinacy." It thus rules out the pre-1662 position in which Anglicans could, like Laud, hold to Lutheran consubstantiation as a private view, and so is an admission that Laud's views were unrepresentative of Reformed Anglican doctrine, and would no longer be tolerated within Anglicanism. Understandably, the Puseyites do not like the rubric for this reason. But on the other hand, this rubric is clearly anti-Puritan in that it maintains that the tradition of kneeling to receive Communion is to be retained as it is not contrary to God's Word, and has been found to be useful and good for the purposes of church order as "a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgement of the benefits of Christ" (cf. Matt. 15:27), and as a way Anglicans had found from experience was useful for "avoiding ... disorder" (cf. I Cor. 14:40). It also considers Puritans like Rutherford are guided by "ignorance," "infirmity," "malice," or "obstinacy." Understandably, the Puritans who insist on sitting to receive Communion did not like this rubric because it maintains kneeling at the Communion. Thus this rubric on the Lord's Supper is a classic example of Anglicanism as a Protestant *via media* (or "middle road") between the errors of Roman Catholicism and the extremes of Puritanism; as walking in between the Laudians wanting to go back from the second stage of the Reformation to the first stage of the Reformation, and Puritans wanting to go on to a "third stage" of the Reformation.

This 1662 Communion rubric was largely taken from the rubric in the 1552 prayer book which referred to those who "by ignorance and infirmity," or "by malice and obstinacy," held such views, saying that out of "brotherly charity" or love this explanation was given. But the removal of these words of "brotherly charity" to those making this claim, seems to reflect the loss of some good will that resulted from the long struggle with the remorseless claims of "adoration," both by Laudians on the one hand, and pesky Puritans on the other hand such as Rutherford, who had greatly angered Reformed Anglicans by these claims and who under the Act of Uniformity of 1662 were now going to lose their religious freedoms for about a quarter of a century, *infra*. By 1662, these type of false and inaccurate claims about Anglicans who allegedly "adored" the consecrated elements by kneeling to receive this sacrament at their "Romish altars," had moved beyond mere annoyance to Anglicans. Its promotion in the Puritan Revolution of 1640-1660 by Cromwellian Puritans had been an integral component in Puritan propaganda underpinning and "justifying" the martyrdom of the Supreme Governor of the *Church of England*, King Charles I. It was also one of the general underpinning reasons "justifying" Cromwell's 1651 drag-net of death, in which Cromwell's forces frantically combed England from north to south, and east to west, in a

close, but ultimately unsuccessful bid, to try and capture Charles II; who hid in the royal oak at Boscobel in England, but if he had been captured, the republicans would have surely done to him what they had done to his father, *infra*.

The removal of “brotherly charity” from this rubric in 1662, shows an increased level of distrust by Anglicans against both the Laudian innovation of adoration to a corporeal presence; and also the Puritans because of their continued claims of “adoration” in the face of absolute denials of this by main-line Anglicans. There was an absolute failure by more moderate Puritans to discipline those Puritans making these claims, and so there was a tendency to be suspicious of all Puritans. Although on one level this was unfair, on another level, the more moderate Puritan leadership were derelict in their duty by not denouncing and seeking to discipline trouble-maker Puritans like Rutherford, and so they were to some extent responsible for this unflattering Puritan stereotype. This Anglican rubric against adoration nevertheless retains an air of moderation since it puts a distance between Restoration Anglicanism and Laudians, thereby admitting that Laud’s private views on consubstantiation were undesirable and had caused unnecessary trouble; and characterizes those making this claim as doing so either from “ignorance and infirmity,” “or” from “malice and obstinacy.” Thus the door is left open for a reasonable minded former Laudian or Puritan to desist from making such claims, on the basis that Laud’s views on consubstantiation were now ruled out, and the more general Puritan claims of people like Rutherford were wrong, and they had agreed with either Laud or Rutherford in “ignorance” of the facts, for which they were now truly sorry.

For any reasonable minded person, these types of statements against “adoration” of the Communion elements by Anglicans kneeling to receive Communion would be enough to end the claims of “altars” and “high altars” and “idolatry” at them by Reformed Anglicans. Certainly, there were some more reasonably minded Puritans who accepted the statements of their Anglican Protestant brethren. They were happy to accept the Anglican *olive leaf of peace* that the former Anglican tolerance of a private view in favour of Lutheran consubstantiation on a Lutheran type “altar” which had been associated with Laud’s innovation of sacramental adoration would no longer be permitted; and that e.g., some Puritans had been in “ignorance” due to false Puritan propaganda put out by “obstinate” fellow Puritans like Rutherford whose conduct was an embarrassment to Puritanism. Alas, there were other unreasonably minded Puritans who did not accept this *olive leaf of peace*.

The Puritan propagandists wanted to falsely depict Anglicans as “Romish idolaters.” This made it difficult for Anglicans to assess the potential danger of this obstinate group of vocal less unreasonable Puritans *vis-à-vis* the more reasonable Puritans. With both Puritan groups still generally positive about unrepentant murderers like Oliver Cromwell (Exod. 20:13) and unrepentant liars like Samuel Rutherford (Exod. 20:16), Anglicans were still understandably concerned in the 1660s. Whereas Scripture says that unrepentant “murderers” and “liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone” (Rev. 21:8); by contrast, the Puritans glorified men like Cromwell and Rutherford, claiming they were “great” men; and holding the seditious and murderous writings of Rutherford’s *Lex Rex* in high regard. With the murder of Charles

I in 1649, and the attempted capture and (what must be assumed would have been the subsequent) attempted murder of Charles II in 1651, Anglican lawmakers were understandably still concerned in 1662. *After all, a king of England had been murdered!*

These obstinate and unreasonable Puritans will have to answer to God for their mischief. They inflamed Protestant Anglican passions against both themselves as well as innocent fellow Puritans at the time, since such “adoration” is “idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians,” and was clearly rejected in 1662. They also helped to create a pool of Puritan propaganda depicting the Anglican Church as essentially Romish on these type of issues; and in the 19th century the Puseyites were able to tap into this pool of many false Puritan depictions, claim they were true, and then really take the Anglican Church into semi-Romanism on some of these issues with e.g., adoration of the consecrated Communion elements in a monstrance.

When the link between Anglicans kneeling to receive Communion and alleged “adoration” of the Communion elements is understood, it makes contextual sense for these same type of Puritans to be also claiming that Anglican Communion Tables were “altars,” and then mischievously give Laud’s private views of a Lutheran type “altar” greater credence than they deserved. Even though there was a *prima facie* shred of truth in them through reference to Laud’s Lutheran consubstantiation views, fundamentally, these Puritan claims were based on lies, since not even Laud supported adoration of the Communion elements, but rather adoration of a corporeal presence in, under, and around the elements (admittedly a fine distinction based on Lutheran consubstantiation, rather than Romanist transubstantiation), although Laud and Laudians did sometimes refer to the Communion Table as a Lutheran type “altar,” as did the illegal canons of 1640. It is one thing for Puritans to say that they only receive the Communion sitting, and disagree with the Anglican practice of kneeling to receive Communion. It is quite another thing to falsely claim that Reformed Anglicans “adore” the Communion elements that they receive from “an altar” or “high altar” or “high place.” It seems *there are none so blind, as those who will not see.*

The historical presence of these type of Puritan distortions does not end there. The Puseyites, in looking for their unjustifiable justifications to de-Protestantize the Anglican Church, love to treat these Puritan claim about “altars” which universalized the “altar” view of the Laudian circle without subjecting it to e.g., the doctrine of the Prayer Book of 1559 & 1604 which clearly rejects this view, and so shows Laud *et al* were holding unAnglican views; and other similarly absurd Puritan claims about “altars,” as factually correct. They love to ignore the 1662 Communion Service rubric that ended the former allowance of a Laudian type private view in favour of a *corporeal presence* of Christ’s body and blood over the Lutheran type “altar” adhered to by Laud. It suits their purposes to do so.

In this context, I note that in 1978 the Anglican Church of Australia put *King Charles I Day* (30 Jan) back on the calendar as a black letter day. But since a Minister can hold a Church Service on any day he wishes, he can hold one on 30 January, and make reference to the fact that *King Charles I* is on the Calendar for that day, and then

preach a connected sermon. Thus something akin to a red-letter day may be followed by a local church<sup>258</sup>. But the more general practice has been to leave it as a simple black-letter day (and indeed I would normally remember it as a black letter day)<sup>259</sup>. On the one hand, it was a most welcome development to again have *Charles I's Day* on the Calendar. But on the other hand, the matter was soured by Puseyite abuse of it.

In both 1978 and 1979, a Puseyite church in Victoria abused this day and sent copies of special sermons preached on “The Feast of Charles King and Martyr” to the Evangelical Anglican Moore Theological College Library in Sydney (which is where I

---

<sup>258</sup> The matter was complicated by Sinden’s *Times and Seasons, infra*, which are a private work by him. It is not endorsed by the Anglican Church of Australia, but it was nevertheless Distributed by the AIO (Anglican Information Office) Press, St. Andrew’s House, Sydney Square, and it contains a red-letter day Collect for Charles I at p. 61.

<sup>259</sup> I would happy to have it made a red letter day, using the readings in the 1662 Office, and the Collect from the 1662 Office I use at the end of my *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* Sermon of 2010 in Appendix 5 of this Commentary, and also in section, “\*g) King Charles the First’s Day: with Dedication of Revised Volume 1 in 2010,” *infra* (starting “O Lord, our heavenly Father, who didst not punish us as our sins deserved, but hast in the midst of judgment remembered mercy”), which Collect acts to profitably combine the memory of the events of *Charles I’s Day* with those of the royal oak, tyranny of the interregnum, and Restoration in 1660. But on present trends I shall have to be content with having it as a black letter day. (The *Church of England* has it as a black letter day which is optionally a red letter day. While I admit the usage of a “common” Collect and readings for Charles I is desirable for the purposes of optionally making Charles I’s Day a red latter day, more generally I do not support the old Sarum rite idea of such “common” Collects and readings found in the 1980 C. of E. Alternative Service Book, and so I would want such a Collect to be specific to *Charles I’s Day*.) Beyond this, I think that without State support in making 30 January a public holiday, and transferring its remembrance to Monday 31 January when it falls on a Sunday, it is not viable to revive the 1662 Office and so revive it as a fast day. Even though I would personally welcome this, the sad advances of the secular state mean that such a possibility is not within the foreseeable future. Thus *Charles I’s Day* in its greater form with an Office is a manifestation of The Establishment Principle for the Anglican Church “in full flight.” Alas, the secular state which “grounded” all three Offices in 1859, still acts to “clip our wings” with respect to *Charles I’s Day*. But if at some future point before our Lord’s return the fortunes of the Protestant Christian State should again so create such a situation, I would stipulate that the revived 1662 Office should add some words in the rubric with respect to the fast, making it clear that in the application of the “Tables and Rules” of the 1662 prayer book for “fasting” and “abstinence,” that *as seemeth best to each individual*, by “fast” is meant either a full fast, *or a partial fast i.e., abstaining from red meat in favour of eating fish and / or milk’n’sugar in one’s tea or coffee and / or abstaining from delicacies such as lollies or deserts on the day.*

learned of them, about three decades after the event)<sup>260</sup>. These sermons contain many Puseyite errors, e.g., the 1978 one is said to have been in the context of a “High Mass”<sup>261</sup>. It also claims that under Charles I there was a change “regarding the Holy Table as an altar, placing it permanently at the east end of the chancel, railing it off and requiring communicants to come up to the rail.” Does this sound familiar? It sounds unmistakably like the type of false interpretation placed on this by the Puritans and Puritan derivatives such as e.g., Close, *supra*.

Like Puritans propagandists such as Close, these Puseyite propagandists fail to state that these Puritan “testimonies” of Anglican “altars,” were *deductions*, based on the premise that that because Anglicans kneel to receive Communion, they are necessarily “adoring” the elements, and that they are then “confirmed” through reference to the unrepresentative private views of Laud on Lutheran consubstantiation on a Lutheran type “altar.” Obviously it best suits the purposes of Puseyite propaganda to simply accept Puritans “descriptions” of Anglican “altars” as factually correct.

Connected claims by both Albert Close and Alfred Bird about what Close in a Puritan tradition calls “tapers,” and Bird in a Puseyite tradition calls “candles on the altar”<sup>262</sup>, are also highly interpretive. They both come from Puritan “testimonies.” But these are Puritan derivative conclusions based on the false premise that the Communion Table is an “altar,” and that *therefore* any candles on it are *ceremonial altar* candles. This is an example of one false premise and conclusion feeding into another false premise and conclusion.

It should be remembered that until relatively recent historical times, candles were used for lighting. Churches used candles like everyone else as the basic way to light up a church. Attaching the type of significance to candles on or around a Communion Table in the 17th century that Close and Bird wish to is without justification. If candles could be placed on and around a Dinner Table, why not a Communion Table? Continuing such practices in an era of first gas lighting and then electrical lighting, on the grounds that the Communion Table is “an altar,” is an entirely different thing. *There is*

---

<sup>260</sup> Bird, A. (clergyman, Assistant at Christ Church, Brunswick, Victoria, and Archivist at Trinity College, Melbourne), “Charles, King and Martyr,” A Sermon preached at Christ Church, Brunswick, Monday, 30 January, 1978, in a booklet entitled, “The Feast of Charles, King and Martyr,” Christ Church Press, 1978; and Grant, J. (bishop), “Sermon preached at Christ Church Brunswick Tuesday 30 January 1979 ... to commemorate the Feast of Charles King & Martyr,” *op. cit.* . Notwithstanding their defects, there are some useful references in these sermons that I have cited.

<sup>261</sup> Likewise, another pamphlet held at Moore Theological College Library, produced by the Puseyites’ “The Society of King Charles the Martyr,” (undated,) gives various liturgical information for a “Mass” on 30 January (“January 30th Saint Charles King and Martyr,” MTC Library shelf mark, Pamphlets, P 264 SOC).

<sup>262</sup> Close, A., *op. cit.*, p. 149; Bird, A., *op. cit.*, p. 4.

*no reason to believe that the candles used in Charles I's time (or Charles II's time) were for any reason other than lighting.*

This is evident in e.g., the fact that at Charles I's coronation, reference is made to "two wax candles, which were unlight (unlit)<sup>263</sup>." Why unlit? Because they were not needed in the daylight! It is also seen in the language used of candles, e.g., we read that "in the second year of Edward VI there were *two lights*" "to be set" on what later prayer books called the "Holy Table"<sup>264</sup>. But why refer to these as "lights"? The answer with regard to their function is surely obvious enough.

Thus e.g., the claim that as a general proposition, Caroline Anglican Communion Tables were actually "altars" (Puritan type claim adopted by Puseyites) is incorrect (although it must be admitted that this idea was found in the illegal canons of 1640 and was a minority private view of Laud connected with his Lutheran consubstantiation, prohibited after 1662); but we cannot doubt that Puseyites, purportedly following "Caroline" Anglicans, or more accurately, following Laudians, introduced "altars" into Anglican Churches from the 19th century. In doing so, the Puseyites showed reckless indifference to the Final Rubric of the 1662 prayer book ending the former tolerance of allowing Lutheran consubstantiation as a private view to Anglicans.

Likewise the deliberate ambiguity of Puritan statements about "crucifixes" in churches (Puritan type claim adopted by Puseyites), meaning crosses, but which they were happy to allow their Puritan readers to run wild with in their imaginings and think of as a cross with an image of Christ on it, (which they could then "correct" if challenged as to its accuracy,) appears on the presently available evidence to be incorrect if by that is meant that any crucifixes in the sense of a cross with an image of Christ on it were set up in any Caroline Churches, though we cannot doubt that these type of crucifixes have certainly been set up by Puseyites in Anglican Churches since the 19th century.

It is true that the Puseyites of *Hierurgia Anglicana* can find some quotes by the Puritan, William Prynne, who seems to refer to a crucifix with an image on it, saying in his *Canterbury's Doom*, that he saw "a large naked crucifix" (although "naked" may be a deliberately misleading ambiguity, really meaning e.g., "lacking a support rod behind it," i.e., a "crucifix" in the Jeremy Taylor sense), and also in a 1641 work written under the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60, that in the Diocese of Gloucester he saw a "hanging on the cross" (which once again may be a deliberately misleading ambiguity, really meaning e.g., a support rod "hanging on the cross" behind it, attached to the wall)<sup>265</sup>. Alternatively, this may simply be the unashamed lies of Puritan propagandists.

---

<sup>263</sup> *Hierurgia Anglicana*, p. 192. A much later 1829 edition changed this to "on light," since the editors could not understand this distinction.

<sup>264</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7; citing Bishop Cosins Notes on the Prayer Book at the end of Nicholl's Commentary, p. 17, fol. 1712.

<sup>265</sup> *Hierurgia Anglicana*, pp. 385,386.

*Hierurgia Anglicana* fails to look critically at this type of Puritan propaganda, but just accepts it at face value. But even if the natural meaning of “crucifix” is here taken, if we are to regard Prynne as a reliable source for such things, then we must also believe on the basis of the story of *Little Red Riding Hood*, that “a big bad wolf” really can, “huff and puff and blow a house down”! Prynne’s comments about Caroline Anglicans under Charles I are about as reliable as such a fairytale, and the fact that the Puseyites use him so much is really a comment upon the fact that they are grasping at straws<sup>266</sup>.

Or the claim that candles on or near the Communion Table were meant to designate it as an “altar” (Puritan type claim adopted by Puseyites) is incorrect; but we cannot doubt that Puseyites, purportedly following “Caroline” Anglicans, attached this kind of symbolic meaning to the candles that they placed on their “altars” since the 19th century. Or the claim that Charles’s Scottish Prayer Book which admittedly the Scots did not want, was what Close calls, a “Romanized Prayer Book” (Puritan type claim adopted by Puseyites), rather than an Anglican Protestant Prayer Book (as opposed to e.g., a Presbyterian form of worship), has allowed Puseyites to claim that their distorted *Romanized* interpretations of the prayer book are part of an established variation within Anglicanism, when in fact, they are wholly alien to the Reformation Anglicanism of the Church of England’s Protestant Prayer Books of 1559 & 1604 and 1662.

E.g., speaking at a Puseyite Church on *Charles I’s Day* in 1978, Bird claims “Charles the First” “laid” “the foundations of Anglicanism” as “non-Roman but not anti-Roman<sup>267</sup>.” In the first place this fails to put a proper distance between Laud and Charles I. In the second place, this is an overstatement of Laud’s position. This is very much like the Puritan Gillespie’s claim, *supra*, that Anglicans use “this very argument,” namely that they wish to “come as near” “as we can” to “Papists.” Whether made by Puseyites or Puritans, this claim does not sit well with e.g., the Office of *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* used by Caroline Anglicans. This prayer book Office is clearly anti-Roman; as indeed are the *Church of England’s* 39 Articles used by Caroline Anglicans, and the Protestant Prayer Book of 1559 & 1604 used by Caroline Anglicans.

I do not think that all of these type of Puritan or Puritan influenced writers are necessarily being deliberately dishonest; even if they necessarily all are being negligent to the truth of Protestant history in the way they present a Puritan Protestant view as *the* Protestant view. Some seem to be simply manifesting the fantasies, fears, and phobias that many Puritans (or Non-Conformists derived from a Puritan history,) have of

---

<sup>266</sup> If by chance evidence should one day emerge indicating that such crucifixes did exist, i.e., a cross with an image of Christ on it were used in Caroline times, then my response would be threefold. 1) The evidence still indicates that *many* references to the “crucifix” were in fact to a cross; 2) that those using such a crucifix with an image on it would have used it in a Lutheran way, rather than a Romish way; and 3) those that so used such a crucifix did so illegally and improperly, this being contrary to the publicly declared teaching of Article 35 of the 39 Articles.

<sup>267</sup> Close, A., *op. cit.*, p. 156; Bird, A., *op. cit.*, p. 8.

Anglicans. They are also blinded by the fact that they are trying to offer some kind of justification for, or at least create some kind of sympathy towards, Cromwell's Puritan republic, and its execution of Charles the First by beheading him.

As a consequence of this, they all try to link the innovations of Laud, the Anglican Primate of England, to Charles I. But none of them try to link the Protestantism of Ussher, the Anglican Primate of Ireland, to Charles I. The evidence is, that as Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland, Charles inappropriately adopted a typical English patron type approach to his two Primate, which then allowed them a good deal of freedom, and in Laud's case, far too much freedom. Thus I think Charles can be fairly criticized for not more actively restraining Laud. But that is different to saying that these were Charles' innovations, since if they were, why did Charles not get Ussher to apply them to the Church of Ireland? But nobody suggests Ussher was a Laudian.

I maintain that the usage by the Puseyites of these hysterical Puritan claims and perceptions to be a gross distortion. The Puseyites are turning to a notoriously unreliable source when they say to these type of Puritans or their modern derivatives, "What do you think of Anglicans and Anglican Churches under Charles I (or Charles II)?" Somebody like Prynne may be right or wrong on a given occasion, but one would need corroborating evidence from one or more credible witnesses before admitting what Prynne said about anything.

*One more of these many distortions will suffice to finishing demonstrating this point. I now turn to the fifth issue of clerical dress.*

The Puritan derived Non-Conformist, Close, criticizes the usage of "the Crosier" i.e., the bishop's staff, "during Charles I's reign;" and the Puseyite Bird refers to the fact that "in cathedrals and college chapels clergy vested in copes<sup>268</sup>." The Puritan, Peter Smart (in a quote not used by Spurgeon,) says of Archbishop Laud, "I appear'd before the Archbishop, and the High Commission, I gave him no grace, but told him to his face; that he favoured superstition. Boldly I preach, hate a cross, hate a surplice, mitres, copes, and rochets<sup>269</sup>." (For a discussion of these see the discussion on innovations 5 & 6 at "Some instances of "Laud's Popery" as fairly being characterized as Laud's Innovations," *supra*.)

*A modern Puritan: Charles Spurgeon* also continues this type of Puritan propaganda. Charles Spurgeon is a fairly well known, and *justifiably respected*, Reformed Baptist from a Puritan tradition. He has much to commend him as a godly defender of Reformed Protestantism. Yet he is not beyond criticism. I have made some reference to Spurgeon's claims of "crucifixes," *supra*. I shall now select some of the same issues already discussed, *supra*, from Spurgeon's article, "Notes on Ritualism," in

---

<sup>268</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 149; Bird, A., *op. cit.*, p. 4.

<sup>269</sup> "Peter Smart – Puritan Divine" ([www.lighthorneonline.com/PHsmart.htm](http://www.lighthorneonline.com/PHsmart.htm)).

his *Sword and Trowel* (June 1869)<sup>270</sup>, i.e., “crucifixes,” “altars,” “candles,” prayer book, and clerical dress under Charles I (Burton & Smart) and Charles II (Hickeringill)<sup>271</sup>.

---

<sup>270</sup> Spurgeon here cites as his source, “The Ritual Commission” “report.” The Royal Commission on Ritual (appointed 1867) issued four reports in four successive years, First Report 1867, Second Report 1868, Third Report 1869, & Fourth Report 1870.

<sup>271</sup> The Act of Uniformity (1662) produced four responses: 1) agreement and conformity; 2) ejection e.g., Baxter, or non-conformity with penalties, e.g., Bunyan; 3) a view that Anglicanism was one permissible form of Protestantism but not the only form, and that under the circumstances one would conform, even if one did not think it the best form of Protestantism e.g., it is uncertain if John Lightfoot was type 1) or 3). A final type, 4) did not agree with the Act of Uniformity and were not Anglican, but lacked the moral strength to join 2). Though I respect and expect to see in heaven saved persons from groups 1,2, & 3; I lack respect for those in group 4. An example of type 4 was Edmund Hickeringill (1631-1708). In the desire to extend the orbit of the Uniformity Act, some even in the church, such as Bishop Sanderson, seemed happy to assist such persons. *Hickeringill was both shady and unstable* (Jas 1:8). Under the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60, he fought with the Puritan army, then lived in Jamaica, returning to England in 1661. Seemingly to evade the penalties of the 1662 Act of Uniformity, he was ordained an Anglican clergyman by Robert Sanderson, Bishop of London, whom he described as “the Presbyterian bishop.” His religious profession varied from Puritan (Baptist) to Quaker to Deist to Anglican. It is possible he went into Deism because he did “receive to” himself “damnation” (Rom. 13:2) for his sedition as both a Roundhead soldier and a Puritan revolutionary pamphleteer. If so, he may have insincerely adopted Anglicanism after the Restoration for “political” reasons, and so this might explain why for such a man to then become an Anglican clergyman evidently meant nothing, as he continued to write anti-Anglican pamphlets as Vicar of All Saints’ Colchester (1662-1708). The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1911) records that “Hickeringill was an active pamphleteer,” and consequently made “to pay heavy fines for slander in 1682” against the Bishop of London, Henry Compton. (Bishop Compton gave his Anglican *Imprimatur* to du Moulin’s “Vindication of Protestants,” *infra*.) Though Hickeringill then made a “public recantation,” he was deprived of his vicarage from 1685-88, but around the time of Toleration Act allowed to return. His continued presence in the Anglican Church was an amazing testimony to her tolerance. In one of his many vacillations, he published a sermon entitled, “A Sermon preached on the 30th of January: Vindicating King Charles the Martyr and the keeping of the Day. By Edmd. Hickeringill,” Printed & Sold by J. Nutt, London, “1700/1699” [i.e., 1700 on a New Year’s Day Calendar of 1 January, or 1699 on an *Annunciation Day* New Year’s Day Calendar of 25 March], for which his text was I Kgs 21:12,13. (Copy from Cambridge University Library, England; in Early English Books online, British Library, London, UK.) But the reality is that Hickeringill remained a shady and seedy character to the end, for just a year before his death, in 1707 he was convicted of forgery. Whatever one thinks of him, *the claims of this convicted slanderer and forger should be treated with great caution and reserve, and it should be borne in mind that over time he consistently fluctuated again and again in his claims.*

Writing in the 19th century, Spurgeon represents a Puritan derived Protestant, who depicts the same Puritan picture of Caroline Anglicanism under Charles I and Charles II, that the 19th century Puseyites first adopted as part of their campaign to de-Protestantize the Anglican Church. It is certainly not a Reformed Anglican perspective of both Laudian and Reformed Anglicans of Caroline Anglicanism under Charles I and Charles II.

Spurgeon quotes from the Puritan critic, Henry Burton, *supra*. Though he is a favourite of the Puritans, and contemporary of Charles I also referred to by Close<sup>272</sup>, he was also charged with sedition in 1636, and was imprisoned and punished for writing inaccurate pamphlets. Burton, who is certainly not a reliable “witness,” wrote of Anglican “Cathedral churches ... be their old high places not removed. ... These be those nests and nurseries of superstition and idolatry wherein the old bedlam of Rome had muzzled up her brood of Popelings, and so preserved her *usum Sarum* [i.e., saying Anglicans are making use of the Roman Catholic ‘Sarum’ rite by using the Elizabethan and Jacobean Prayer Book of 1559 & 1604,] in life to this present day. ... ‘Innovations,’ say they. ‘We bring in no innovations, no new rites, but what hath been in use ever since the Reformation ...’.”

Spurgeon also quotes the Puritan Smart, who claims Anglican “bishops of our time” are “setting up altars with all manner of superstitious furniture, crosses, crucifixes, candles, candlesticks, etc. ... . [The] bishops ... persuade His Majesty (Charles I) to restore altars, organs, images, and all manner of Massing trinkets, more than ever they were in the time of Popery.” He further quotes Hickeringill (also found in the Puseyites’ *Hierurgia Anglicana*), who wrote, “the ‘ceremony-monger,’ ‘does not say the mass indeed in Latin; but his [academic] hood, his cope, his surplice, his [bishop’s] rochet, his altar railed in, his candles, and cushion and book thereon ... his organs, his violins, his singing men, his singing boys, ... are so very like Popery, that I profess, when I came from beyond the sea, about the year 1660 [Hickeringill was then a Puritan Roundhead army veteran, returning from Jamaica], to [Saint] Paul’s [Cathedral, London] ..., I almost thought, at first blush, that I was still in Spain and Portugal; only the candles on our altar, most nonsensically, stand unlighted, to signify, what? The darkness of our noddles, or to tempt the chandlers to turn downright Papists, as the more suitable religion for their trade? For ours mocks them with hopes only. He gasps and stares to see the lucky minute when the candles should be lighted; but he is cheated, for they do not burn out in an age’.” Spurgeon then concludes by calling “for an hour of” someone like “John Knox

---

<sup>272</sup> Close, A., *op. cit.*, pp. 150-1, uses the “witness” of not only this unreliable Burton, but also John Bastwick, *supra*, who was also imprisoned and punished in 1637 for the claims he made in his pamphlets, and who after his release in 1640, served in the republican Roundhead army during the civil war. So too Close refers to William Prynne *supra*, who was convicted as a “seditious libeller” in 1637, and following his release in 1640 supported Cromwell’s republican forces. While Prynne’s political allegiances proved to be unpredictable, *supra*, it is clear that the type of thing he was writing against Anglicans in the 1630s contained some “seditious libel,” and so his writings ought not to be accepted uncritically.

or Martin Luther!”

In the first place, I note that Spurgeon uncritically accepts what are Puritan *interpretations*. E.g., what Burton calls “high places,” or Smart and Hickeringill call an “altar,” were in fact Anglican Communion Tables placed in the east end chancel, as always allowed, and stated to be the Communion “Table” in the 1559 & 1604 prayer book. They are designated “high places” or “high altars” by Puritans because they are elevated, in part to allow greater visibility by the congregation, in part to create as step *that allows for kneeling by communicants at the Lord’s Supper*, and in part through reference to the private Lutheran sacramentalist views of Laud. The underpinning reason for this Puritan claim, namely, that because Anglicans receive the Communion kneeling, that they were “therefore adoring the Communion elements,” and “therefore these were really altars,” together with Anglicans denial of this, as seen e.g., in Lord Craighill’s correspondence with Rutherford, *supra*, are not mentioned. Rather, the false claim that what the Prayer Book of 1559 & 1604 used under Charles I and Prayer Book of 1662 used under Charles II call a “table,” was really a so called “high place” or “altar,” is simply allowed to stand as an established fact. It was at best a minority private view of some Laudians, and admittedly, an innovation for which Laud *et al* may be justly criticized.

Spurgeon’s quotation of Smart who refers to Anglican “bishops of our time ... setting up altars with ... crosses, crucifixes, candles ... , etc.,” fails to state that Smart appears to be using “crosses” and “crucifixes” to mean *crosses*. It is unclear if Smart means by a “crucifix” a *particular type of cross*, i.e., a *cruciferous* cross attached to a wall with *support rods*; or simply using “crosses, crucifixes” conjunctively as synonyms i.e., on the basis that *one can never look at a cross without seeing a crucifix*. It has to be admitted that his language not only lacks adequate clarity, but in all likelihood, deliberately lacks clarity (see Smart on “mitres,” *supra*), i.e., being calculated as Puritan propaganda to allow his Puritan listeners’ minds to run wild in thinking there were crucifixes in the sense of a cross with an image of Christ on it. But if challenged as to its accuracy, the smart-alec<sup>273</sup>, Smart, could then retort, “Yes, but I mean by ‘crucifixes,’ ‘crosses,’ just like ‘crucifer’ means a person carrying a processional ‘cross,’ or some Anglicans say that ‘one can never look at a cross without seeing a crucifix’.” However, usually he would not have to make this type of defence, since many of his Puritan readership would probably wrongly think, and wrongly accept, that Smart meant “crucifix” in its more common sense.

It should also be remembered that the distinction made between a cross being acceptable and a crucifix with an image of Christ upon it not being acceptable, was an Anglican distinction not recognized by the Puritans. (Although in more recent centuries, a number of non-Anglican Protestants have come to adopt the Reformed Anglican position on the usage of crosses but not crucifixes.) Like Gregory the Great or Martin

---

<sup>273</sup> “Smart alec” (smart aleck) is a colloquialism, referring to a person who is ostentatious in their display of knowledge, though frequently in spite of their ignorance or inability (see Macquarie Dictionary).

Luther, Anglicans did not consider the second commandment forbade the making of a graven image *per se*, but the making of a graven image for the purposes of worshipping of it i.e., *prima facie* both crosses and crucifixes with an image of Christ on it were permitted by the second commandment. But unlike Gregory the Great and Martin Luther, both of whom Reformed Anglicans held in high regard, Anglicans considered that crucifixes with an image of Christ on them should be banned from churches. This was on the basis of experience with the brazen serpent in Bible times (II Kgs 18:4), which was a type of Christ's crucifixion (John 3:14), and on analogy, from which a crucifix is sometimes justified. There were also similar experiences outside of Bible times, such as when Bishop Serenus of Massile found it necessary to destroy idolatrous images in the time of Gregory the Great. Such experiences indicate that there is a very strong tendency for such public images to be turned into idols by substantial numbers of people, but not all people. Obviously this conclusion of experience is based on the spiritual dangers and temptations posed to a sizeable number of people in an average group, since no-one adopting this position would suggest that e.g., either Gregory the Great or Martin Luther went into idolatry themselves<sup>274</sup>. This is a classic example of Anglican usage of the divine law in conjunction with godly natural law (or reason) that is not inconsistent with the Divine revelation<sup>275</sup>. *If we are to "walk in" Christian "love" (Eph. 5:2), we must not have crucifixes, or statues, or anything that is "a stumbling block" to our "brother" (Rom. 14:13). For the law of the second commandment prohibits idolatry (Exod. 20:4-6), and this law "is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (Rom. 13:9)*<sup>276</sup>.

Thus for Anglicans, the distinction between a crucifix with an image of Christ on

---

<sup>274</sup> The San Damiano Cross poses an unusual problem since it is variously classified as a cross or a crucifix. Originating in 12th century Italy, it was clearly influenced by some artistic elements of Eastern iconography, being a crucifixion scene painted onto a cross. I once thought that suchlike were acceptable in a non-church private context e.g., the wall of a study. But I later learnt of its connection with the Franciscans, and the history of idolatry connected with it; and I came to better realize that *some* private and public spheres may overlap e.g., a fellow Christian might still see such an image when entering his fellow Christian's study, and so potentially be inadvertently led into idolatry. Thus I changed my opinion and came to reject such usage of the San Damiano Cross, even though I had never committed such idolatry with it myself (Rom. 14:20,21; I Cor. 8:4-7,10-12).

<sup>275</sup> A similar type of logic is used in e.g., dealing with polygamous marriages or racially mixed marriages in the OT e.g., Abraham and Hagar i.e., sometimes permitted in OT but producing so many problems when so allowed, both polygamy (Matt. 19:9) and mixed marriages (Matt. 24:37-39) are from NT times now properly prohibited.

<sup>276</sup> Idolatry should be shunned by Christians via God's special grace (I Thess. 1:9) and by others via God's common grace (Rom. 1:20-23).

it (which was banned from churches or any public use<sup>277</sup>), and the cross as a Christian symbol (which could be used), was quite important. By contrast, the Puritan mind-set considered the second commandment acted to ban both crosses and crucifixes with an image of Christ on them *per se*. Thus for Puritans, the objection to crosses and such crucifixes was essentially the same anyway, and so for them making a clear distinction between a cross (without the image of Christ on it) and a crucifix (with the image of Christ on it) was not regarded as particularly important. For a Puritan like Smart, using the terms “crosses, crucifixes,” though misleading due to its lack of clarity (i.e., in order to try and capture some of the Anglican generated sentiment against crucifixes in the common sense of the term), would probably not strike his Puritan mind as “misleadingly dishonest,” because the way the Puritans conceptualized “idolatry,” they considered Anglicans were “idolaters” for using plain crosses anyway. “After all,” Puritans like Smart might well say, “Does not the *Anglican* King Charles wear an idolatrous *cross* on the top of his crown, and since this is a *cruciferous* cross *supported by his crown*, does he not in fact *have a crucifix on the top of his very head!*?”

Burton’s interpretation of the Elizabethan prayer book as equivalent to making use of the old Sarum rite, is once again highly interpretative. (It is comparable to the more modern claim of Close that, “Laud was a thorough-going Romish idolater,” who “set” about to “copy the forms of prayer from the Romish Mass Book<sup>278</sup>.” I do not doubt that Laud was a semi-Romanist, but to say he was “a thorough-going Romish idolater” etc. is excessive.) This type of Puritan view of Burton (or Close) fails to recognize that while elements of the Anglican prayer books did come from the old Sarum rite, under Cranmer the prayer book theology was Protestantized. The Prayer Book of 1559 & 1604 (or 1662) is thus Protestant, not Papist.

Likewise, Hickeringill’s description of the clerical dress of “[academic] hood, his [black] cope, his surplice, his [bishop’s] rochet,” and choir also wearing “[academic] hood,” was in fact standard Protestant Anglican clerical and choir dress. To call such things, “very like Popery,” is a gross distortion. It is the sort of thing the Jehovah’s Witness cult do when they claim belief in the Holy Trinity make one Romish. Romanism is a mix of good and bad, a combination of truth and error; and if one does not judge everything by the standard of Holy Writ, one might in over-reaction to Popery end up denying its good things e.g., its belief in the Trinity, virgin birth, and bodily resurrection of Christ.

Some Puritans (and their derivatives) object to the usage of musical accompaniment (others Puritan derived Protestants specify that some musical instruments can be used, but not others), or choirs, in church services. With respect to Hickeringill’s

---

<sup>277</sup> The public-private use distinction (based on the fact that the graven images of the angels on the Ark of the Covenant were not generally placed in public), mean that Reformed Anglicans have not historically objected to e.g., a book read in private that depicted scenes from the Bible including a scene of Christ hanging on a cross.

<sup>278</sup> Close, A., *op. cit.*, pp. 149-50.

concerns on “organs” “violins,” “singing men” and “boys,” I note that a choir was traditionally part of Reformed Anglican Cathedrals and those churches that could organize one. There is nothing intrinsically Romish about this. The rubric in the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* makes reference at Matins and Evensong to “Quires [Choirs] and places where they sing.”

Clearly on these and other issues, the claims of these Puritans are not reliable sources. These are all associated derivative interpretations and conclusions, emanating from, and embellishing the core Puritan claim, that because Anglicans kneel to receive Communion, they are therefore idolatrously “adoring” the consecrated elements. Like other Puritans, Hickingill was *clearly looking to find* a saying of “the mass” at St. Paul’s Cathedral, which was “so very like Popery” “in Spain and Portugal,” and he found it. But *he found what he was looking for through exaggeration, distortion, and fantasizing*. E.g., in a manner whose sentiment is reminiscent of the Latin-phobic tone in the comments of Burgonite Majority Text advocates such as David Ottis Fuller against St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, *supra*<sup>279</sup>; we see a strong tone of Latin-phobia in the statements of Hickingill, that though “the ceremony-monger,’ does not say the mass ... in Latin” at St. “Paul’s” Cathedral, nevertheless, the choir is “as unintelligible as [a] Latin service.” Hickingill is looking for a Roman Catholic Latin Mass, and finds it by strained analogy in a so called “unintelligible as Latin” Anglican service. Contrary to Hickingill’s claims, Article 24 of the 39 Articles is very plain in stating the Anglican position, “It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the primitive church, to have publick prayer in the Church, or to minister the sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people” (I Cor. 14).

Persons prepared to make such inaccurate descriptions as e.g., the “idolatry” “of Popelings” using the Roman Catholic “*Sarum*” rite, as a description of Anglicans using what was essentially Cranmer’s prayer book in the Elizabethan and Jacobean Protestant Prayer Book of 1559 & 1604 (Burton); or “Massing trinkets” (Smart); or an “altar” (Smart & Hickingill) on which was said “the mass” at St. Paul’s Cathedral “so very like Popery” (Hickingill); ought not to be taken seriously in terms of what was actually happening in Caroline Anglican Churches, whether under Charles I (Burton & Smart) or Charles II (Hickingill). (Compare Libel 8 on Philp. 2:10 in *Rex v. Bastwick, Burton, & Prinn, 1637, supra*.)

Furthermore, Hickingill is baffled by the fact that the candles are not lit during services. He concludes that “the candles on” the “altar most nonsensically, stand unlighted.” The reason is obvious enough. He has gone to a day-time service, and the candles *not being needed for lighting*, have not been lit. Thus *his testimony goes to show the real purpose for such candles was not in order to designate Communion Tables as “altars,” but rather, to be used for lighting*. Spurgeon ends by an appeal for someone like “Martin Luther” to arise, once again depicting Protestants as supporting Puritan perspectives, rather than recognizing the differences between Lutheran Protestantism or Anglican Protestantism on the one hand, and Puritan Protestantism on the other hand.

---

<sup>279</sup> Fuller, D.O., *Which Bible? op. cit.*, pp. 32-3; 89; 219-21.

Given the option between Reformed “Low Church” Anglican Protestantism or Puritanism, we cannot doubt that Luther would have chosen the former, and not the latter.

*Charles the First*, and assessment of him, is thus often blurred by such distortions. On the one hand, there is some “truth” in the Puritan claims, since *from a Puritan perspective*, e.g., an Anglican prayer book is *always* “Romanized” relative to that which is “purified” by the Puritans; or *from a Puritan perspective* some of the things Charles I allowed were “Romish,” relative to what they would be if “purified” by Puritan theology. Moreover, we cannot doubt that Laud was a semi-Romanist who introduced, or was in some way connected with, at least nine (or ten) innovations already itemized, *supra*.

But on the other hand, it is grossly irresponsible for Puritans and their derivatives to simply say, “Charles was Romish.” This needs to be qualified by statements that he wanted the Anglican Church to *stay inside broad Protestant boundaries such as those allowed under Lutheran theology, and more narrowly than the gains of the Lutheran Reformation, also inside the natural Protestant understanding of the Thirty-Nine Articles and Prayer Book*. This was evident in his Declaration of 1628, notwithstanding the breaches of that Declaration by Laud, in whom he put too much trust and failed to adequately monitor and discipline; although it must be said he was in difficult times with the Puritans, and may have been worried that he would be encouraging them by taking action against Laud. Alas, one extreme sometimes results in a more extreme reaction that would otherwise be the case. Charles I was at heart a good man, but not an infallible man. *As seen in the contrast with the Church of Ireland under Archbishop Ussher’s Primacy, Charles allowed his Primate a good deal of latitude, which Laud abused. Charles may be criticized for giving Laud too free a rein and not reining him back in. But that is different to what the Puritans are saying.*

The absence of such qualifications by even more generally moderate modern Puritans such as Spurgeon, essentially depicts Charles in Puritan propaganda as being outside of Protestantism and anti-Protestant, rather than outside of Puritanism and anti-Puritan, and allowing his Primate of England and Primate of Ireland to largely run their respective Anglican churches, rather than more actively intervening where he should have with Laud. It also fails to recognize the extent to which Laud misadvised and deceived Charles himself. E.g., there is no evidence that Charles, or his father James were aware that e.g., Laud had started to reintroduce auricular confession in 1622, *supra*. We only know this from Laud’s personal diary. But is it reasonable to argue that the King could have known of such matters only mentioned in Laud’s personal diary? We have good evidence that James I did not know, seen in the modernization of some of the words in the section of the Homily abolishing auricular confession in 1623, and this was retained and endorsed by Charles I’s Declaration in 1628. But this false Puritan image of Charles is then picked up and used with relish by the Puseyites.

Despite such Puritan and Puseyite claims, the reality, as seen in King Charles I’s usage of the Protestant Elizabethan and Jacobean Prayer Book of 1559 & 1604 and “Declaration” attached to the *Thirty-Nine Articles* since 1628, is that if any like the Puseyites had e.g., sought to introduce a monstrence in which there was adoration of the

consecrated sacramental elements i.e., adoration of the sacramental bread (contrary to e.g., Article 22, against “adoration” “of images,” which is what Communion bread would be if it were so adored as an “image” of Christ), or to his knowledge set up a crucifix in a church in the sense of a cross with an image of Christ on it (contrary to Article 35), or invoke saints (contrary to Articles 22 & 35), or move away from a Reformed understanding of justification by faith to an Arminian one (contrary to e.g., Articles 9-14,17), or to in any way “draw the Article aside” from “the plain and full meaning thereof,” then they would have incurred “our displeasure and the church’s censure;” “and we will see there shall be execution upon them.” I.e., Charles did impose some limits. He may be criticized for not enforcing this 1628 Declaration with sufficient rigour against Laud, e.g., not moving to stop genuflecting on the basis that it was a form of adoration (although Laud would deny this, and it seems with success to the King). In practice, those limits of Charles were admittedly too broad, and gave Laud too much latitude, but they were not as broad as the Puseyite movement.

A complicating factor is that the rise of 19th century Puseyite Arminianism was a furtherance of the rise of an 18th century Wesleyan Arminianism in the Anglican Church, connected with the corrosive doctrinal effect of Wesley’s preaching. In the 18th century, the preaching of the Arminian, John Wesley (1703-1791), and associated rise of Methodism, both complimented the inroads made by Arminians who had infiltrated the Anglican Church, and also produced a new group of semi-Arminians i.e., Wesleyan Arminians inside of Anglicanism. Both groups of Arminians did mental gymnastics with e.g., the very Reformed or Calvinist 39 Articles, e.g., Article 17, and in turn the 19th century rise of the Puseyites did the same. This means that these Anglicans who have fallen away from the Biblical and Protestant teachings of the thoroughly Reformed *Thirty-Nine Articles*, may also wish to abuse *King Charles I’s Day* by in the first instance agreeing with English Puritan propaganda that claimed Charles I was an Arminian, and then using this falsehood to try and justify their own egregious breaches of the 39 Articles in adopting Arminianism themselves.

This is evident in the following two very bad pro-Arminian *Charles I’s Day* addresses, the first a sermon by an 18th century Arminian Anglican, the second a pamphlet by a 20th century Puseyite Anglican. An anti-Methodist Arminian, Bishop Warburton<sup>280</sup>, preached a *Charles I’s Day* sermon in 1760. As one who has studied a

---

<sup>280</sup> William Warburton (1698-1779), Bishop of Gloucester from 1759. Warburton’s best known work is *Divine legation of Moses demonstrated on the principles of a religious Deist, from the omission of the doctrine of a future state of reward and punishment in the Jewish Dispensation* (2 volumes, Printed for Fletcher Gyles, London, 1738-1741). The Deists had claimed there is no doctrine of a future life in Moses’ Pentateuch and that this was a proof that it was non-inspired; and Warburton agrees with the Deist’s claim but additionally argues if Moses had not been Divinely inspired, he would never have omitted such a doctrine which could be used as a moral sanction. But the views of both the Deists and Warburton are here contrary to the teachings of our Lord. Christ recognized that because the Hebrew *’anoki* (אֲנֹכִי, ‘I,’ 1st person singular, personal pronoun) at Exod. 3:6 has the independent personal pronoun in

number of *King Charles I's Day sermons* ranging in dates from the 17th to early 21st centuries, I would have to say that this 1760 sermon has the dubious distinction of being the very worst *Charles I's Day* sermon that I have ever had the displeasure of reading in my entire life. Warburton was in my opinion a very bad choice for the Office of Bishop. He reminds us that even “in the good old days” of Protestant Anglicanism, there could be the odd “bad bishop” like Warburton. In his very tedious sermon, Warburton tries to harness the anti-English Revolutionary Puritan spirit of this day onto a more general anti-Calvinist spirit, and thus preaches contrary to the Biblical doctrine of the 39 Articles. Warburton said, “that while these English Puritans who embraced the abominable opinion of Calvin concerning predestination, were struggling with the State for an Establishment, the Dutch Remonstrants, who were raised, at the same time, by Providence to free the church ... from the impiety of this doctrine, never contended for more than a toleration<sup>281</sup>.” The Dutch Remonstrants were followers of Jacobus Arminius (1560-1609) who opposed the justly celebrated Dutch Reformed Synod of Dort (1618-1619). Thus Warburton here endorses Arminianism Proper, and seeks to abuse and misuse *Charles I's Day* to these shocking ends.

This same technique has been followed since the 19th century by the Puseyites. E.g., it is found in a 20th century pamphlet produced in the early 1960s by the Puseyite English clergyman, Sillitoe, in a revision of an earlier 1948 article produced by the Puseyite, “Society of King Charles the Martyr.” Sillitoe seeks to promote “King Charles’s Day,” saying the “number of observances” of 30 January “increases yearly.” Sillitoe greatly distorts Charles I’s clear endorsement of Calvinism in “His Majesty’s Declaration” or “The King’s Declaration” of 1628, falsely claiming that Charles sought “to prevent a Calvinistic and Puritan interpretation being riveted in the Articles,” *when in fact with respect to “a Calvinistic ... interpretation” Charles I did the very opposite*<sup>282</sup>.

---

a verbless clause preceding the noun, *'Elohe* (אלהי, ‘[the] God of,’ from *'Elohim*), it must contextually have the present tense verb “to be” supplied in translation; as indeed is rightly done in the Septuagint translation of Exod. 3:6 as Greek *eimi* (εἰμι, ‘I am,’ indicative active present, 1st person singular verb, from *eimi*). Hence we also read in the Greek of Matt. 22:32, “I am (*eimi*) the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob;” and since “God is not the God of the dead, but of the living” (Matt. 22:32), it follows that the Pentateuch does indeed teach the doctrine of the future life! Thus both the Deists and Warburton were here fundamentally wrong in their basic denial of this fact. While greater clarity came to the doctrine of “life and immortality” in the NT (II Tim. 1:10); nevertheless, the future life is clearly taught in the OT (e.g., Job 14:14; 19:25-27; Pss. 9:17; 23:6; Eccl. 3:21; 12:7,13,14; Isa. 25:8; 66:22-24; Dan. 11:2,3).

<sup>281</sup> *The Family Chaplain*, in two volumes, Printed for L. Davis in Holborn & R. Baldwin in Paternoster Row, London 1775, “On the Martyrdom of K. Charles the First.” January 30th, 1760, by Bishop Warburton, Vol. 1, pp. 218-238, at p. 224 (British Library copy).

<sup>282</sup> Sillitoe, H.J., “King Charles the Martyr,” *op. cit.* . Undated, the Moore Theological College library catalogue gives its date as “c. 1961,” and in harmony with this approximate date the pamphlet says, “In 1961, King Charles’s Day was observed in

We thus here find the same type of argument i.e., *Charles I's Day* is conceptualized as anti-English Puritan, and because the English Puritans were Calvinists, therefore *Charles I's Day* is abused and misused in an anti-Calvinist and pro-Arminian way. But, of course, to accomplish this deception it is *always necessary* to greatly distort what Charles I called in "His Majesty's Declaration" "the plain and full meaning" of e.g., Articles 9 (depravity), 10 (enabling), and 17 (election) of the 39 Articles, "in the literal and grammatical sense".

The Puseyites love to pick up and recite Puritan propaganda, such as "Laud's Arminianism," and use it to justify their own Arminianism as purportedly reflecting "Caroline Anglicans;" "which," they say, "is why the Puritans were so upset." I think the Puseyites who claim this are every bit as ridiculous spiritual "bastards" as the ridiculous Puritan "bastards" (Heb. 12:8) who first created the "lie" (Rev. 21:27; 22:15) of "Laud's Arminianism." *The plain truth is, that a Pusey or a Keble or an Arminian under King Charles I, would have been dealt with in a short, shrift, manner. A Pusey or a Keble or an Arminian under King Charles I would have been condemned and not condoned. He would have incurred the right royal displeasure of the king, and would not have been tolerated. Such persons deviate far worse than did Laud from Anglican doctrine, and are outside even the overly wide limits set by Charles I before he was prepared to intervene.*

*Charles I and Anglican hagiology recognizing him as a Christian martyr*, does not mean he was without blemish. Certainly from a Reformed Anglican perspective, Charles I was an imperfect man, who made some mistakes, e.g., he was too tolerant towards Laud. Nevertheless, he died a Christian death, being steadfast in Christian faith and so leaving us a good example to emulate, and also standing on the Biblical principle that men should, "Honour the king" (I Peter 2: 17), not kill the king (Exod. 20:13; Rom. 13:9; James 2:11). In this he reminds me of King Solomon, who though straying from the Lord at times ( I Kgs 11:1-8), nevertheless, by the grace of God, found his way home in the end; and so is remembered with favour (Matt. 6:29), but not so as to excuse his imperfections or errors (Neh. 13:26). Charles I is historically regarded by Anglicans as a Christian martyr; and thus Cromwell the leader of bad and murderous forces. The *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* Office for "King Charles the Martyr," refers to Cromwell and his republican forces as "cruel men, sons of Belial" (cf. I Sam. 2:12; II Cor. 6:15; I John 3:12,15). Cromwell's republic is described as a "tyranny." Those who committed regicide against Charles are said to have perpetrated a "foul" "act," in "the martyrdom of the Blessed King Charles the First."

In broad terms, while a Scottish Puritan Presbyterian tradition is anti-Cromwell and with qualification, pro-Caroline in that it is loyal to the Crown, and regards him as a king unjustly killed, rather than a Christian martyr; nevertheless, more generally Puritans have historically tended to be sympathetic towards Cromwell's republic, and whether or not they have sought to justify killing King Charles I, even if they have not they have still

---

more than 400 churches."

generally have not regarded him as a Christian martyr. Presbyterians have historically divided on this issue of regicide into two quite strong and opposing groups. Nevertheless, these are only broad general tendencies, and some Puritan derived Protestants would literally die before they would support the murderous and seditious forces of Oliver Cromwell, and regard Cromwell's murder of a king as wicked and prohibited by God's law. However, even those Puritan derived Non-Conformists who either consider that Cromwell's forces went too far in committing regicide, or who are not sympathetic to Cromwell's republic, do not generally refer to, or remember King Charles I, as a Christian martyr in their churches. Thus the celebration of King Charles as a martyr has been essentially an Anglican tradition. (Though in more historically recent times since 1859, some Anglicans have gone over to the Scottish Presbyterian view which sees him as a king unjustly killed, but not a martyr.)

Historically, support for Charles I as a martyr, was a general demarcation line within Protestantism between Anglicans and non-Anglicans. Reformed Anglicans may not look with any great favour on Laud, but they historically have a different and far more favourable view of Charles I. The civil war between royalist Cavaliers under King Charles the First and Roundhead republicans under Oliver Cromwell, cut deep into the social fabric of the British Isles, tragically turning white Protestant against white Protestant. It divided racial families (Gen. 10), with Anglo-Celt Japhethite fighting Anglo-Celt Japhethite; and religious families, with Protestant fighting Protestant. It divided households, with brother fighting brother.

If called upon by my king to fight, I would have supported King Charles I. I would have fought with the "Cavaliers" (Caroline royalists<sup>283</sup>) against the "Roundheads" (Cromwell's republicans<sup>284</sup>). But I would have truly preferred not to be in such an situation, and I would simply have done my duty for God, King, and country. I do not doubt that many in the Anglican Royalist army, the King included, had in varying degrees been deceived by the shifty and shady Laud. I do not doubt that many in the opposing Puritan republican army were deceived by such Puritan leaders as Cromwell

---

<sup>283</sup> "Cavalier" is derived from Latin, "*caballarius*," meaning "horseman" or "rider" (cf. "cavalry").

<sup>284</sup> "Roundhead" referred to their close-cut hair, compared to the cavalier's longer hair. In March-April 1641, Queen Henrietta Maria asked of John Pym, who that *roundheaded* man was; and in December 1641, an army officer, David Hide, raised his sword in a riot, and warned he would "cut the throats of those *roundheaded* dogs that bawled against the bishops" (*Encyclopedia Britannica*, Multimedia Edition, CD, International Version 1999, Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc. 1994-1999). The Biblical injunction against long hair is based in natural law (I Cor. 11:14), and thus relative to the hair of combatant males of the day. Though in former times such men could have longer hair than that historically allowed in the military since at least the First World War, such shorter hair is now the correct type for males, but not females. (This same factor makes earrings etc. inappropriate for males.)

and Rutherford, rather than essentially bad men. I would much rather be in an Anglican-Puritan allied army of *Protestants*, fighting against e.g., Papists or Mohammedans. Whatever differences may exist between Anglicans and Puritans, I think Anglican Protestants and Puritan Protestants are unnatural enemies on a literal battlefield.

The thought of white Protestants fighting white Protestants does not sit well with my racist (Gen. 10) and religious (Rom. 1:17) Biblical views and sentiments. For I believe if under God's directive will, white race based nationalism (Gen. 9:27; 10) and the Protestant religion (Ps. 2:10-12), are designed to be part of an adhesive glue that helps pull a people together in a most profitable manner, producing as its fruit a godly sort of patriotism. Alas, the times had created a great internal Protestant split, the like of which has not been seen before or since, and I hope and pray God, will never be seen again. But under these lamentable circumstances, I would have supported my earthly king, Charles, in humble obedience to my heavenly king, Christ.

Thus as a royalist and loyalist I declare:

*King Charles' good times,  
Never were so good;  
As when Caroline  
Great armies stood.  
To kill a king,  
Is no small thing;  
"Dieu Et Mon Droit,"  
"God and my right."*

In the 1660s, so serious was the threat adjudged to be to the security of the realm from Puritan Protestants who still harboured sympathies towards Cromwell following the Restoration in 1660, that Anglican Protestants enacted the *Act of Uniformity* in 1662, which removed religious freedoms from Puritan Protestants (although I regard this as an over-reaction to the threat posed by Puritan extremists). Then after about a quarter of a century, the *Act of Toleration* in 1689 again gave Puritan Protestants basic religious freedoms. This period of about 25 years was considered necessary to settle the realm from the dangers of possible republican sedition against the Crown. As further discussed, *infra*, once again, this period between 1662 and 1689 is one that Protestants do not agree on, especially, the denial of religious freedom to Puritan Protestants, some of whom held republican loyalties, but some of whom held royalist loyalties, so that the innocent were made to suffer with, and because of, the guilty. Alas, such an injustice was deemed by the parliament to be necessary in order to secure the overall justice of the Crown in the lamentable and regrettable circumstances of Cromwell's recent Puritan republic.

The religious tolerance granted under the 1689 Act was militated by the fact that the Test Acts continued against English and Irish Puritans. Their continued application against the English and Irish Puritans was connected with their ongoing anti-Caroline glorification of Cromwell and Rutherford. Under e.g., the English Test Acts of 1661 and

1673, government offices were made subject to the requirement that a person receive Communion at an Anglican Church, something that neither Papists, nor many Puritans were prepared to do. The Acts were less strenuously applied in the 18th century, where some Non-Conformists in Protestant Puritan Churches were prepared to so occasionally take Communion in a fellow Protestant Anglican Church, and hence be able to hold various government offices. But none of the Papists were ever prepared to do this, so that by the time of their repeal from the 1820s to 1870s, they were more anti-Papist than anti-Puritan, although it must be said that they did act to exclude those Puritans who like Rutherford considered kneeling to receive Communion was “intrinsic idolatry.” E.g., Test Acts for English Papists were removed in 1828, the University Test Acts repeal in 1871 opened universities to Papists, or in Ireland the Test Act of 1704 was repealed in 1871.

I don't like the fact that the Test Acts were necessitated by continued English (and Irish) Puritan glorification of Oliver Cromwell; and I know there were a number of innocent English (and Irish) Puritans who wouldn't support such sedition. *But in the end, I serve God, and not man.* God tells me to do what I can to “Honour the King” (I Peter 2:17) and uphold lawful authority (Rom. 13:1-7); and therefore, with sadness in my white Protestant breast, I say that unlike the Scottish Puritans, in general the English and Irish Puritans were never prepared to take seriously the fact that the Bible makes no so called “tyrant” exception that allows sedition and murder against the Crown.

The seriousness of glorifying Rutherford's and Cromwell's “seditions” and “murders” which manifested the fact that they “shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (Gal. 5:19-21; Matt. 7:21-23) never penetrated their skulls. One could grab hold of one of them, shake him and say, “For crying out loud! A king of England has been murdered by these Puritan revolutionaries!! What about the 6th commandment, ‘Thou shalt not kill’!!!” And yet somehow in their very layback attitude to sedition and murder as committed by these Puritans, it just never registered with them as anything immoral.

And so the Test Acts, which were a judgment against the English (and Irish) Puritans, savoured with the mercy of a general religious tolerance to Puritans from 1689, were tragically necessary. Moreover, we know that during the 18th century more reasonably minded Puritan Protestants could, and did, take Communion in Anglican Churches as occasionally required in order to hold government offices, and so there was this further mercy held out to Puritan Protestants.

The removal from the Anglican calendar of *King Charles I's Day* in 1859, to some extent signalled greater tolerance towards these Puritan derived Protestants who historically tended to sympathize with Cromwell's republic and the regicide of Charles I. This was the era in which religious tests protecting Anglican domains were being abolished in universities and other areas. The rise of Wesleyan Arminianism both inside the Anglican Church, and outside with the Methodist Non-Conformists, had a corrosive effect of creating greater tolerance to both Arminian Roman Catholics and Arminian Non-Conformists such as Methodists and General (or Arminian) Baptists. E.g., the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act (1829) allowed Romanists in England and Ireland

access to most public offices. The Test Act's antecedents from the Caroline restoration period of 1661, found in the associated Caroline Test Act of 1673, with its required sacramental test (i.e., to accept Anglican Communion was a condition of accepting civil office,) was removed in 1828, and was fully repealed within about 50 to 60 years. Among other things, the removal of these provisions in the Test Act (or Sacramental Test Act) in 1828, meant both Non-Conformists and Roman Catholics found it easier to become Members of the House of Commons<sup>285</sup>. This acted to further intensify the movement against the Anglican Church's privileged position.

In broad practical terms, a basic religious tolerance had been granted to Non-Anglican Protestants from 1689. Though I think we should live in Christian love with all true Protestant brethren, I nevertheless consider that the removal of *King Charles I's Day* from the Calendar in 1859 was an unnecessary, undesirable, and unwarranted concession by Anglicans to Non-Conformist Puritan sensibilities. Admittedly, Charles I has always been regarded as a Christian martyr largely by *Anglicans only*, and Reformed Anglicans see him as a King Solomon type figure, who made some serious mistakes e.g., in marrying a Roman Catholic and failing to restrain and discipline Laud. Nevertheless, if Charles I was martyred by some Puritan Protestants, we should not be surprised that there are some Non-Conformist Puritan derived Protestants who neither like him, nor consider him to be a martyr. There was nothing new about this reality in 1859. We should not walk away from a Christian martyr because he is unpopular with those who either support his murder, or have some sympathy with those who committed his murder.

Thus even though some Puritan Presbyterian Protestants derived from the *Church of Scotland* were royalists and loyalties, in broad terms, the removal from the Anglican calendar of this holy day in 1859 is therefore similar in its attitude towards Non-Conformist Puritan Protestants; to the way that the removal from the Anglican calendar of Papists' Conspiracy Day in 1859 signalled greater tolerance towards Roman Catholics, who sympathized with the desire to re-establish Roman Catholicism in the British Isles, seen in the attempts of Guy Fawkes in 1605 and the Jacobite forces of James II opposing the landing of William III of Orange in 1688.

In the Book of Common Prayer (1662-1859), Charles I's Office was entitled, "King Charles the Martyr." I agree with the theology of this Office. On the one hand, I think Charles the First was in some ways like King Saul or King Solomon in that he did some wrong things. E.g., he married a foreign Roman Catholic wife; and I agree with the later Act of Settlement that ended such unions with a Papist for the monarch. But on

---

<sup>285</sup> Wales was covered by English law. Roman Catholic Emancipation Acts were passed in England in 1778 (allowing acquisition of property), 1791 (removing civil penalties for the practice of Romanism); and similar Acts in Ireland in 1774, 1778, and 1782, with the 1792 Roman Catholic Emancipation Act in Ireland going much further and giving the franchise and admission to many civil offices. In Ireland, the Anglican Sacramental Test Act of 1704 gave way to English legislation from 1782, being fully repealed in 1871. In Scotland, a Test Act of 1567 required a person be of the Reformed religion; and this was repealed in 1889.

the other hand, I maintain that the Scriptures, “Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17), and “Thou shalt not kill” (Exod. 20:13; Rom. 13:1,2,9), prohibit the action of Cromwell and his republicans. Moreover, *Charles I not only died steadfast in Christian faith, but also died standing on Biblical principles of his right to be king. Thus I think he can be fairly classified as a Christian martyr, and in his death he has left us a good example to emulate.*

Removal of a day from a Church Calendar, such as the removal of *Charles I’s Day* in 1859 from the Anglican calendar, should not be confused with abolition of a day. Days may sometimes be removed or put back on a Church Calendar for any number of stylistic reasons thought to be relevant at a given point in time. The faithful were always entitled to remember *Charles I’s Day* after it was removed from the Anglican Calendar as a personal or private act of devotion; and it was e.g., still more formally remembered in about half a dozen English Churches dedicated to God in memory of King Charles. However, its removal from the calendar in 1859 meant it was no longer publicly celebrated as a holy day in the Anglican Church.

As a package deal I do not approve of either the Church of England’s *Alternative Service Book (1980)* or Anglican Church of Australia’s *An Australian Prayer Book (1978)*. The *Alternative Service Book (1980)* says it is “for use ... in conjunction with The Book of Common Prayer,” and likewise *An Australian Prayer Book (1978)* says it is “for use together with The Book of Common Prayer, 1662.” But unfortunately, in practice these books have tended to be used as replacements for the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)*. This has been an integral component in the decay of the spiritual standards and the worshipful giving of due honour to God in a number of Reformed Anglican congregations (as to its effects on non-Reformed Anglican congregations, I do not care, since they were much spiritually debased to begin with). Nevertheless, I find some very small value in part of both of them. In this highly qualified context I find the revival of *King Charles I’s Day* (and addition of a small number of other black letter days) to be the silver lining in what is very largely an ominous black cloud of prayer book changes.

In broad terms, I much prefer the Book of Common Prayer (1662) Calendar to these revised ones, with which I greatly disagree in many particulars. Thus I no more agree with all of these revised Anglican calendars than I agree with all of that which is in Roman Catholic Calendars. But as with Roman Catholic Calendars, so with these revised Anglican calendars, there are some points of intersecting agreement I hold with them. I note that the Calendars in both have placed King Charles I (1600-1649) on the Calendar for 30 January as a black letter day (with an option in England for a local church to make it a red letter day,) and I think that King Charles is worthy of this honour<sup>286</sup>. Thus e.g., the Church of England’s *Alternative Service Book (1980)* Calendar

---

<sup>286</sup> Anglican Church of Australia (Church of England in Australia), *An Australian Prayer Book, 1978*, Anglican Information Office (AIO), Sydney, Australia, p. 298 (King Charles, 1600-1649, on the Calendar for 30 January). A specific Charles I Collect for use together with the Anglican Church of Australia’s *An Australian Prayer*

refers at 30 January to *Charles the First, King, Martyr, 1649*<sup>287</sup>. This followed the earlier revival of the day in Canada in 1962 (and I would make the same qualifications about the Anglican Calendar of Canada as those if have made of the 1978 Australian and 1980 English Calendars, *supra*).

*Popish Jesuit involvement in Charles I's martyrdom* is made subject to the important qualification that it was very much a secondary influence. Put simply, at its heart the republican revolutionaries were first and foremost English Puritans who were anti-Papist.

Nevertheless, we have clear evidence of a Papist-Puritan alliance against the Established Anglican Church. In a 1713 *King Charles the Martyr's Day* sermon preached at Christchurch *Church of Ireland* Cathedral, Dublin, before the Lord Justices of Ireland, the Reverend Mr. John Echlin, quotes from Lord Chancellor Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*. His Lordship joined the exiled Charles II in the 1650s and became his chief advisor. His daughter, Anne, was James II's first wife, and Lord Chancellor Clarendon was thus the grandfather of both Queen Mary II (Regnal Years: joint reign with William III, 1689-1694) and Queen Anne (Regnal Years: 1702-1714). His Lordship is quoted by John Echlin in his *King Charles the Martyr's Day* sermon, who in regard to Puritan negotiations with Charles I says, "the chief and fundamental article was, 'For a total alteration in the Church, and the extirpation of Bishops.' This was so constantly ... insisted upon, ...he was pressed to satisfy those demands by the [Popish] Queen Regent of France, the [Papist] Cardinal, and the Queen his [Roman Catholic] wife, as the main point without which nothing could be done for him; and this was urged in such a manner, that 'His Majesty, looked upon their negotiations, rather as a joint conspiracy betwixt the Papists and the [Puritan] Presbyterians, to overthrow the [Anglican] Church ...'<sup>288</sup>."

---

*Book* (1978), remembers the good example of King Charles I, who in the face of death showed steadfast faith in God to the very end is found in: Sinden, G., *Times and Seasons*, Ambassador Press, Sydney, 1980, Distributed by the AIO (Anglican Information Office) Press, St. Andrew's House, Sydney Square, p. 61 (Collect for Charles I). This Collect is not endorsed by the Anglican Church of Australia, and was produced privately by Sinden. Thus *Charles I's Day* is regarded simply as a black letter day on the Australian Prayer Book's Calendar (1978).

<sup>287</sup> Church of England, *The Alternative Service Book 1980*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, UK, p. 18 (Charles I, Martyr, on the calendar), pp. 844-9 (Collects & readings general to any martyr). Usage of the general Collect of a martyr is optional (which refers to the suffering of a martyr unto death giving us an example to endure against reproach and persecution, and allows the insertion of the name of "King Charles the Martyr" on 30 Jan.). Thus *Charles I's Day* may be regarded as simply a black letter day in the English Alternative Service Book (1980).

<sup>288</sup> "The Royal Martyr," A Sermon preached before Their Excellencies the Lord Justices of Ireland in Christchurch Dublin, on the 30th of January, 1713, by John Echlin, Master of Arts, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-9; citing Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion & Civil Wars*

I shall further discuss the meaning of Charles I's view of "a joint conspiracy betwixt the Papists and the [Puritan] Presbyterians, to overthrow the [Anglican] Church," in discussing the three reasons for Jesuit involvement in assisting the Puritan republic, *infra*. In this context, it is also notable that in the late 1630s and early 1640s, Archbishop Laud formed the opinion on the basis of information available to him, there would be a Papist attempt to kill King Charles. Hence Davies says, "Laud ... believed that there existed a Popish plot which would result in ... the king's assassination<sup>289</sup>." On this issue, time would prove Laud right.

The Jesuits as an arm of Popery came in to assist Cromwell and the English Puritans *for very much their own purposes and reasons*. The Jesuits wanted King Charles dead for quite different reasons to why the English Puritan revolutionaries wanted him dead. The Jesuits undertook their work on the principle, "My enemy's [Charles I's] enemy [the English Puritan republic] is my friend." Jesuit influence was basically at the side-lines of the fray, and essentially consisted of Jesuits palming themselves off as pro-Cromwell Puritans. In this masquerade, they then worked with Cromwell's Puritans to incite other English Puritans into sedition against the Crown, and the murder of King Charles I. Once the Romish Jesuits had achieved their ends, to wit, the murder of King Charles, they slowly beat a tactical withdrawal from the scene, so as to keep their earlier involvement as covert as possible. Though the added vigour and enthusiasm that the Jesuits had brought and inculcated so many English Puritans with, was very much a secondary player, it is nevertheless an element of Charles' martyrdom that should not be forgotten.

Peter du Moulin Jr. (1610-1684) was an immigrant from France. He was a royalist Anglican clergyman who after the Restoration was made a Chaplain to Charles II and Prebendary (Canon) at Canterbury Cathedral, where he lies buried. A Canon of Christchurch Canterbury, Canon du Moulin was familiar with Jesuitry because his father, a Huguenot French Pastor, Peter du Moulin Sr. (1568-1658), wrote a defence of the French Reformed Confession of Faith against its Jesuit detractors, and his father had earlier been made a Prebendary (Canon) at Canterbury Cathedral under King James in

---

*in England*, by Edward Hyde (1609-1674), 1st Earl of Clarendon & Lord Chancellor, Vol. 2, p. 579. The Reverend Mr. John Echlin was part of a group of Dublin clergyman described in 1725 by Dean Jonathon Swift as "distinguished for their learning and piety." Echlin had musical skills (author of "In harmony would you excel," a Cantata with satirical words by Jonathon Swift), and was Swift's advisor on Church Choir matters. Echlin later became Vicar-General in the C. of I. Diocese of Tuam (in the north of Eastern County Galway). (Harrison, F., "Music, Poetry & Polity in the age of Swift," JSTOR, Illinois University, USA, [www.jstor.org/stable/30070813](http://www.jstor.org/stable/30070813); "Trolloping & Lolloping with Jonathon Swift – Windows Live," <http://irelandsotherpoetry.spaces.live.com/Blog/cns!28AE47B7A265791B1151.entry> .)

<sup>289</sup> Davies, J., *The Caroline Captivity of the Church*, *op. cit.*, p. 257.

1615<sup>290</sup>. Peter du Moulin Jr., wrote a work whose short title is *Vindication of Protestants*, first published in London in 1664<sup>291</sup>.

I shall make reference to his fourth edition of 1679 which received the Anglican *Imprimatur* of the Bishop of London, Henry Compton. Such an imprimatur was contextually reinforcing a distinction which advised people that unlike Rutherford's *Lex Rex* (a banned book<sup>292</sup>), Canon du Moulin's *Vindication of Protestants* was a theologically safe and orthodox work, and one whose basic integrity was vouched for by the Established *Church of England's* Lord Bishop of London<sup>293</sup>. It also has a Dedicatory

---

<sup>290</sup> The work of Peter du Moulin Sr. on the French Reformed Confession was entitled, *Bouclier de la Foi*; and his prebendary stall at Canterbury was Stall IV ("Pierre Du Moulin," *Wikipedia* [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pierre\\_Du\\_Moulin](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pierre_Du_Moulin)). This same stall later went to his son, Peter du Moulin Jr. (1610-1684) ("Peter du Moulin," [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peter\\_du\\_Moulin](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peter_du_Moulin)).

<sup>291</sup> The long title is, "A Vindication of the sincerity of the Protestant religion in the point of obedience to sovereigns: opposed to the doctrine of rebellion authorized and practiced by the Pope and the Jesuits in answer to a Jesuitical libel entitled *Philanax Anglicus*," Printed by I. Redmayne for John Crook, London, 1664 (Microfilm copies held at: National Library of Australia, Canberra; & Newcastle University, N.S.W., Australia).

<sup>292</sup> The values of this mischievous work underpinned the English republic's Revolution (1642-1660), and elements of it were cross-applied to help gain American Puritan support for the American republic's Revolution (1775 & 1776). I omit references to e.g., publication details and locations of Rutherford's *Lex Rex*, which is a most Devilish work.

<sup>293</sup> "[Anglican] Imprimatur: Guil. Jane [Canon William Jane (1645-1707), Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral, London], R.P.D. [*Reverendissimus Pater Dominus* = 'Reverend Lord Father' cf., "Reverend Father in God," *The Ordering of Priests*, Book of Common Prayer, 1662, & title, "Lord Bishop"] Hen. *Episc.* [*Episcopus* = Bishop] Lond. [Henry Compton (1632-1713), Bishop of London (1675-1713)]," "Feb. 26 1678/9" [i.e., 1678 on an *Annunciation Day* New Year's Day Calendar of 25 March, or 1679 on a New Year's Day Calendar of 1 January]. The usage of an Anglican *Imprimatur* was more common in the earlier four decades of the Restoration era till about the 1690s; although its usage was still known in later times (e.g., the Anglican "Imprimatur" of 1746 on the sermon of Nathan Forster, preached at St. Mary's Oxford University, referred to in *Commentary* Volume 2, Matt. 15-20, Preface, "Dedication: The Anglican Calendar," section "(6) Broad Protestant support for Gunpowder Treason Day," subsection "(a) Anglican Protestantism"). This type of Anglican Imprimatur of 1679 should thus be put in the historical context of Rutherford's *Lex Rex* being wisely banned. (Although I maintain that a small group of intellectually gifted, spiritually mature, and trusted Protestant men must always be able to access such works in order to critique and expose their errors, albeit keeping quotations from, and references to, its contents to an absolute minimal level of necessity. Those who so look at something like *Lex Rex*, engage in a

Preface to the incumbent Archbishop of Canterbury (1663-1677), Gilbert Sheldon (1598-1677). The 1679 edition also includes a letter in it from the Secretary of State and Lord of the Treasury (1660-1668), Sir William Morrice, in which Sir William described “Dr. Peter du Moulin” as “my honoured friend<sup>294</sup>.” The longer title of this 1679 edition includes the words, *A Vindication of ... the Protestant Religion in the point of obedience to Sovereigns. Opposed to the doctrine of rebellion, authorised and practiced by the Pope and the Jesuits. ... The Fourth Edition: in which more light is given about the horrible POPISH PLOT, whereby ... Charles the I was murdered.* Unless otherwise stated, when I refer to Canon du Moulin’s *Vindication of Protestants*, it is to this 1679 edition that I am referring<sup>295</sup>.

The work has a strongly Protestant character, and is written “in answer to a Jesuitical Libel.” E.g., he supports such “Protestants” as “the English Reformers” persecuted “under Queen Mary [the First],” and remembers these Marian “Martyrs.” He refers to the union of “the Devil and the Jesuits” in “the Gunpowder Treason” of 1605. The Canon asks the Jesuit libeller he is replying to, “Do you think you are at Rome or Madrid, where you may bring, as you do, all Protestants to the Inquisition?” Du Moulin further defends “Protestant Prelates.” E.g., against “a Jesuit” who “should malign an Archbishop of Canterbury” (1660-1663), the Canon defends “Archbishop Juxon” (1582-1663), who as Bishop of London had accompanied King Charles I to the scaffold in 1649. On the one hand, Canon du Moulin refers to Oliver Cromwell’s rule as a

---

most onerous and unpleasant task, for the snake bites of deceit, and the stench of inciting bloodthirsty sedition and murder, runs throughout *Lex Rex* from go to woe.)

<sup>294</sup> Du Moulin’s *Vindication of Protestants*, 1679, p. 64. See the footnote on Sir William Morrice, *infra*.

<sup>295</sup> “A Vindication of the sincerity of the Protestant religion in the point of obedience to sovereigns: opposed to the doctrine of rebellion authorized and practiced by the Pope and the Jesuits in answer to a Jesuitical libel entitled Philanax Anglicus,” “The Fourth Edition: in which more light is given about the horrible POPISH PLOT, whereby our late sacred Sovereign Charles the I was murdered.” By Peter du Moulin, D.D., Canon of Christchurch Canterbury, one of His Majesty’s Chaplains. Printed for Benjamin Took, at St. Paul’s Churchyard, London, England, 1679. *Imprimatur*: Henry Compton, Bishop of London, 26 Feb. 1679. Copy of Michigan University, USA, available on-line at Google Books, search “Google scholar” under author and first part of title. This Michigan University copy contains some hand written footnotes, especially relevant to identifying the name of certain persons (“Father Philips” and “Papon,” *infra*). I have not verified the accuracy of the handwritten information the Michigan University copy from such stated sources as “Letter of Dr. du Moulin’s” (p. 60); but I regard this data of name identification as of only secondary importance to the main points; and so I am prepared to cite this information subject to the qualification that it has not been confirmed by me, and if perchance it is in any ways wrong, it does not affect the overall accuracy of the picture as found in the broader basic claims of du Moulin’s work.

“tyranny;” and on the other hand, the Canon refers to King Charles I as a “Saint and Martyr.” He says of the libeller he writes against, “this Jesuit ... had great reason to hate that godly Prelate,” Archbishop Juxon, because “after His Majesty had spoken ... upon the scaffold, he put him in mind to make a profession of his religion; which he did, and professed before God and the world, that he died a Protestant according to the ... Church of England. A profession which gave great discontent to the Papists and the [English Puritan] fanatics, for both wish’d that he had died a Papist ...<sup>296</sup>.”

Du Moulin refers to “our English Solomon King James,” and upholds the King James Bible, saying, “No English translation of the Bible is authentical to be read in [Anglican] Churches, but that which was made by the commandment of King JAMES of glorious memory<sup>297</sup>.” He celebrates the memory of “the Valdenses” (Waldenses)<sup>298</sup>, and reminds his readers of “the Massacre of S. Bartholomew[’s Day]<sup>299</sup>.” He also defends the works of Luther<sup>300</sup> and Calvin<sup>301</sup> against the “Jesuit” libeller’s false claims. E.g., he says, “It is good sport to see how incensed this gentleman [libeller] is against Luther for exhorting King and Princes to fall upon the Pope and his Cardinals, and to fulfil the prophecy of Rev. xvii.” This reference to the prophecy of Rev. 17:16,17, in which “the ten horns” “hate the whore, and ... make her desolate,” shows that du Moulin is a Protestant historicist who identifies the Church of Rome as “the great whore” (Rev. 17:1) of Revelation 17. Hence on a Protestant historicist view that considers “the great city” of Rev. 11:8 refers to the Papal jurisdiction of the world as centred in Papal Rome, (and thus it includes Jerusalem “where ... our Lord was crucified” under such pagan Roman power,) the Canon refers to the power of “the Pope and Cardinals” as “the filth of the Roman ‘Sodom’.” In this context, du Moulin’s reference to the Papal States “in Italy” as showing the Pope, “King of the Romans<sup>302</sup>” is also significant, since Dan. 11:36 refers to the Papal Antichrist as “the king,” and the Hebrew *Romiith* (meaning “Romans” i.e., “the Roman Kingdom”) tallies the number “666,” which in Rev. 13 is “the mark ... of the beast” (Rev. 13:17,18)<sup>303</sup>.

---

<sup>296</sup> *Ibid.*, Preface, pp. 51,67,137. I sometimes modernize spellings from this work.

<sup>297</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 5 & 13.

<sup>298</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 27.

<sup>299</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 46.

<sup>300</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 6-9; 18-25.

<sup>301</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10-12.

<sup>302</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 25.

<sup>303</sup> See McGrath, G.B. (myself), *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist* (2006), With a Foreword by the Reverend Sam McKay, Secretary of the Protestant Truth Society

Canon du Moulin says, “the Jesuited Catholicks acknowledge another Sovereign over their King, both for the Spiritual and the Temporal, a foreign power,” i.e., the Pope, “which can dispense them of their allegiance to him [the king]. The Protestants acknowledge no Sovereign above their King, and give no jealousy by their doctrine to the Roman Catholick Princes and States, under which they live, as the Jesuits have done, even to Roman Catholicks, by whom they been expelled out of their Dominions, as teachers of a doctrine tending to rebellion<sup>304</sup>.” He further notes that “Jesuits” were involved in the Gun “powder plot” of 1605 against “Protestants<sup>305</sup>.”

It is notable that in *The Oath of Allegiance* to King Charles I, while the statement is made with respect to “an other means with any other,” and that “neither the Pope, nor any person whatsoever hath power to absolve me of this Oath,” so that e.g., the Puritan Revolutionaries would be an example of “any other person whatsoever;” nevertheless, the principal concern was with Papists. This is seen in the following extract of *The Oath of Allegiance* to King Charles I (modernizing some spellings). “I ... do ... acknowledge ... that our sovereign Lord King Charles, is lawful King ... and that the Pope ..., nor any authority of the Church or See of Rome, or by an other means with any other, hath any power or authority to depose the king ..., or to discharge any of his subjects of their allegiance and obedience to His Majesty, or to give licence ... to bear arms, raise tumults, or to offer violence or hurt to His Majesty’s Dominions. Also I do swear ... to ... his heirs ... obedience ..., and ... them will [I] defend ... against all conspiracies ...., all treasons and traitorous conspiracies ... . And I do further swear, that I do from my heart abhor, detest, and abjure as impious and heretical this damnable doctrine ... that princes which be excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any other whatsoever. And I do believe ....., that neither the Pope, nor any person whatsoever hath power to absolve me of this Oath .... . And I do make this recognition ... upon the true faith of a Christian. So help me God.”

This Protestant Canon of Christchurch, Canterbury, Canon Peter du Moulin, now considers a philosophical basis upon which the Jesuits *sometimes* seek to justify such seditions and murders. He refers to the “the Jesuit Suarez.” Francisco Suarez (1548-1617), (also known as Doctor Eximius,) was a Spanish Jesuit who is regarded by many as the most prominent Popish philosopher of the Scholastic School (also known as Scholasticism,) after Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274). Du Moulin notes that “Suarez

---

(1996-2004), Sydney, Australia, 2006, “Appendix on the mark of the beast and meaning of 666 in Revelation 13,” section, “Counting the number of the beast’s name, ‘666’ (Lateinos, Romiith, and Vicarius Filii Dei).” This book is available on the internet via Yahoo or Google under “Gavin McGrath Books” or direct at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com> .

<sup>304</sup> Du Moulin’s *Vindication of Protestants* (1679), p. 36.

<sup>305</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 53.

taught that ... ‘the Commonwealth ... hath the power to defend herself against a tyrant. If a lawful King govern tyrannically, and that there be no other remedy for the kingdom, but to expel and depose the King, the whole Commonwealth by the public and common consent of the cities and the peers, may depose the King’<sup>306</sup>.” Upon request of Pope Paul V (Pope: May 1605 to 1621), whose effigy is by tradition burnt on *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* (5 Nov.) as the Pope of the Gunpowder Plot Treason of 1605, Suarez wrote a tract against King James I in 1613 entitled, *De defensione fidei*. King James then ordered that the hangman burn this wicked tract in London, and even the Popish French were so worried about its anti-monarchist tone, that in 1614 the French Parliament banned it.

Du Moulin further refers to “the Jesuit Mariana.” Juan de Mariana (1536-1624) was another Spanish Jesuit who also taught in Rome, Sicily, AND PARIS. His teachings in favour of the overthrow of a “tyrant,” were regarded as influential in the murder in 1610 of the King of France, Henry IV (Regnal Years of First Bourbon King: 1589-1610) (although some later Papists have tried to deny any such connection). Henry IV was an apostate who converted from Protestantism to Popery in 1593. When Henry IV was killed IN PARIS by a fellow Papist, Francois Ravaillac; there was an understandable corresponding outcry from Papists themselves in France against Mariana’s Jesuitry which taught the overthrow of a “tyrant.” Mariana called regicide, “tyrannicide,” and a monument to him was erected in Talavera, in Popish Spain in 1888. Against this historic backdrop, Canon du Moulin notes that “the Jesuit Mariana ... saith ‘... if the people ... meet in a public assembly, ... and ... [it] is agreed on by common consent [then,] the Prince must first be admonished and exhorted to mend: but if he refuse the remedy, and there be no hope of his mending [his ways], the sentence being once pronounced (against him) it will be lawful for the Commonwealth to refuse to obey him. And because a war must necessarily follow, ... arms must be quickly provided, ... and ... it shall be lawful, both by right of defence, and ... the authority proper (to the people) to declare the King to be the common enemy, and then kill him ...’<sup>307</sup>”

Du Moulin further observes that this view of a “common consent” of “the people,” was modified by Lessius, who considered that the politicians should make this decision<sup>308</sup>. Leonard (Leonardus) Lessius (1554-1623) was a Jesuit theologian who had studied under Suarez and Bellarmine. Lessius was a professor of theology at the Papistical University of Louvain (Leuven) in Belgium. In 1615, Pope Paul V (Pope: May 1605 to 1621), whose effigy is by tradition burnt on *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* (5 Nov.) as the Pope of the Gunpowder Plot Treason of 1605, personally thanked Lessius for the services he rendered unto the Roman Church, *as well he might!*<sup>309</sup> In the Roman

---

<sup>306</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 54.

<sup>307</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 55.

<sup>308</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 56.

<sup>309</sup> “Leonardus Lessius” Wikipedia ([en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leonardus\\_Lessius](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leonardus_Lessius)).

Church, a dead person can be declared “venerable” (the first step bringing with it the title “Venerable”), then be “Beatified” (the second step bringing with it the title “Blessed”), or “canonized” (the third step bringing with it the title “Saint”). There is no necessary progression through these three stages. Notably, Lessius has been declared “Venerable” by the Roman Church. He is thus known as “Venerable” Lessius, and there is the possibility, though by no means a certainty, he will later be “Beatified” and / or “canonized.” Whether or not these two next stages do or do not occur, the fact that he has been declared “Venerable,” is itself a statement of his high standing in Popery.

Suarez, Mariana, and Lessius are thus all well recognized Jesuits, who e.g., have biography entries in the Papists’ *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (1967 & 2003)<sup>310</sup>. Suarez’s Jesuitical teaching about a “tyrant,” equates Rutherford’s first of three (or four) broad criteria for sedition in *Lex Rex*, namely, “a tyrant is he who habitually sinneth against the catholic good of the subjects and state, and subverteth law” (*Lex Rex*, Question 24, Objection 4:3). Mariana’s Jesuitical teaching about self “defence” equates Rutherford’s *Lex Rex* jurisprudence of self-defence (*Lex Rex*, Question 24, Objection 3:2 & Question 31, *passim* – n.b., natural law basis); and Mariana’s jurisprudence about there being no further “remedy” against an “exhorted” “Prince,” equates Rutherford’s *Lex Rex* second criterion for sedition, namely, that it is “in the exigence [exigency] of the last and most inexorable necessity” (*Lex Rex*, Question 31:2) i.e., one has exhausted all lawful courses of action. Lessius’s Jesuitical teaching about leaving the decision to the politicians of the legislature was also adopted by Rutherford in his teaching, “the king’s power is ... borrowed from ... and ... must be less, and derived from Parliament,” and “those who make the king ... have power to unmake him in the case of tyranny” (*Lex Rex*, Question 21, Argument 11). This choice also reflected the political reality that the English Puritans controlled the House of Commons, and so they wanted to keep power with that body, rather than e.g., Mariana’s “common consent” of “the people.” Nevertheless, the English Puritans made some kind of jurisprudential connection between these ideas by saying that the House of Commons represented “the people,” although this was clearly not the case.

Hence in John Echlin’s *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* sermon at Christchurch Cathedral, Dublin, *supra*, we hear that “as a preparatory step to the execrable tragedy of this Day [30 Jan.], on the 4th of January ... they came to the following resolutions: *Resolved*: That the people are (under God) the fountain of all just power. That themselves being chosen by and representing the people, [they] have the supreme power of the nation. That whatever is enacted or declared for law by the Commons in Parliament are concluded thereby, tho’ [though] the consent of the King and Peers be not had thereunto<sup>311</sup>.” Of course, the House of Commons had a very limited electoral

---

<sup>310</sup> *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (1967, 2nd edition, 2003), Thomas Gale in association with Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., USA, 2003, Vol. 8, p. 518 (Lessius); Vol. 9, p. 160 (Mariana); Vol. 13, pp. 558-561 (Suarez) & pp. 561-3 (Suarezianism).

<sup>311</sup> “The Royal Martyr,” A Sermon preached before Their Excellencies the Lord

franchise based on wealth, which was how the wealthy Puritans had managed to gain control of it, and so the proposition that they spoke for “the people” is comparable to e.g., contemporary Communist claims in the so called, “People’s Republic of China.” But even if they did have a majority vote, under God’s law that does not make something intrinsically right, as seen e.g., in the fact that the vast majority of people go to hell (Matt. 7:14; 20:16; 22:14; Rom. 11:5).

Such *real politik* is also relevant to what some classify as Rutherford’s fourth and final criteria, but which is arguably impliedly present in his first three, namely, that those politicians spearheading the sedition must consider that they have a reasonable chance of success, and hence it does not apply if there are only a relatively “few” potential revolutionaries. Thus Rutherford refers to his “natural mandate of self-preservation,” or self-defence i.e., a “natural mandate” because it is based on his view of natural law (reason), and then he says it “does no[t] ... oblige a few ones to ... resistance” against a so called tyrant (*Lex Rex*, Question 34, Objection 16:3)<sup>312</sup>.

Rutherford’s teaching, “the king’s power is ... borrowed from ... and ... derived from Parliament” (*Lex Rex*, Question 21, Argument 11), *supra*, is a good example of how he distorts history to his own evil ends. I visited Lewes, England, from 4 to 6 November 2008, to celebrate on *Bonfire Day* the thwarting of the Guy Fawkes’ Gunpowder Plot sedition against, and attempted murder of, the King and Members of Parliament in 1605. Among other things, I visited the “Landport Bottom” Field where in 1264 A.D. the army of the King, Henry III (Regnal Years: 1216-1272), fought against that of Simon de Montfort who had occupied the hills above Lewes. I also saw the Windmill (now a private residence) near the battlefield, where the uncle of Prince Edward hid at one stage during this battle. After this *Battle of Lewes* (1264), the King agreed to call a council of Lords, Churchmen, merchants, and others who were to act as an advisory body to the king. This advisory council or “parlement” (hence “parliament”) meaning a “speaking

---

Justices of Ireland in Christchurch Dublin, on the 30th of January, 1713, by John Echlin, Master of Arts, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

<sup>312</sup> In *Lex Rex*, Rutherford doth “declare” his “sin as Sodom” (Isa. 3:9), as he wickedly creates anachronistic and inaccurate pseudo-Biblical examples filtered through his natural law (reason), to try and justify “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:20,21) in fighting against King Charles and the Royal Cavaliers. Though I shall spare the reader as many of the painful details of this repulsive and vile book as I can, since “it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in” the “secret” pages of this evil work (Eph. 5:12); it is still necessary for me to state some of its detail so that the reader may see the jurisprudential connection between this work and the earlier teachings of Jesuitry. In *Lex Rex*, Rutherford’s remorseless lies and incitement to murder, doth clearly exhibit “the lusts” of his “father the Devil,” who “was a murderer from the beginning” and “a liar” (John 8:44); and also reminds us that like all “murderers” and “liars,” Rutherford has his “part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone” (Rev. 21:8).

place,” in time evolved into the Westminster Parliament system of government with the Crown, Commons, Bishops, and Lords. Thus contrary to Rutherford’s claims, it would be more accurate to say that, *the Parliament is derived from a royal prerogative of the king!*

On the one hand, Rutherford does not acknowledge his reliance upon Jesuit sources in *Lex Rex*; a fact both understandable in the professedly Protestant context he writes, and also further reflecting the cross-application of another Jesuitical principle, namely, covert operations and trickery. But on the other hand, given that this type of Jesuitical thinking was publicly antecedent to *Lex Rex*, and clearly known at Rutherford’s times in the works of such Jesuit writers as Suarez, Mariana, and Lessius; and given that there is such a perfect correlation between Rutherford’s basic criteria for sedition and these writings, *supra*, seen in Suarez’s “tyrant,” Mariana’s notion of “the right of defence” resulting in an action to “publicly” “kill” “the King,” and Lessius’s idea that the power for this in the hands of politicians; it seems very hard to put any other construction on the matter than that Rutherford adopted these fundamental ideas from Jesuitry. This is certainly the most natural and probable conclusion to draw.

However, even at the time, Rutherford realized that his jurisprudence on e.g., his Suarez like views on “a tyrant” or Mariana like views on “defence” (*Lex Rex*, Question 24 Objection 3:2 & Question 31, *passim*), could easily be cross-referenced to Jesuitical teaching, and some were making the obvious conclusions.

He thus refers to a Protestant Prelate. By way of background knowledge, it should be remembered that through reference to e.g., Book 2, Homily 21, Article 35 of the Anglican 39 Articles, the six part Homily “Against Rebellion” condemns these types of views. In the 1662 prayer book Office of *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* the rubric states, “After the Creed, if there be no sermon, shall be read one of the six Homilies against rebellion.” In the 1662 Office of *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* the rubric says, “After the Nicene Creed, shall be read, instead of the sermon for that day, the first and second parts of the Homily against disobedience and wilful rebellion, ... or the Minister who officiates shall preach a sermon of his own composing upon the same argument.” We thus find that opposing such “rebellion” is orthodox Anglican teaching. Hence Anglican Protestant Prelates opposing the republic’s rebellion were articulating the publicly declared doctrine of the Anglican Church in her *39 Articles*. Moreover, one of the petitions in *The Litany* of the 1662 prayer book is, “[Minister says:] From all sedition, privy conspiracy and rebellion; from all false doctrine, heresy, and schism; from hardness of heart, and contempt of thy Word and Commandment, [People say:] *Good Lord, deliver us.*”

In Rutherford’s *Lex Rex* Question 41, concerning “Whether” “upon good grounds,” a Protestant “Prelate” does “ascribe to us the doctrine of the Jesuits in the questions,” Rutherford finds it necessary to make some reply to those making this obvious connection between his views and Jesuit teachings, a matter exhibited in the connection between Jesuitry and the Gunpowder Treason Plot of 1605. His argument is truly pitiful. E.g., he says, “The Jesuit teaches that power of government is in the

community originally; therefore, the [Revolutionary] Puritan is a Jesuit. But so the Puritan is a Jesuit, because he and the Jesuit teaches that there is one God and three Persons.” On the one hand, Rutherford is right to say that just because the Jesuits believe something that does not necessarily mean that this is why revolutionary Puritans believe it. But on the other hand, his analogy is flawed, for while teachings such as the Trinity are clearly Biblical, his claims in favour of sedition and murder are just as clearly unBiblical.

Indeed, in this context, it is notable that Canon du Moulin’s *Vindication of Protestants* contains an entire chapter entitled, “The Doctrine of the Protestant Churches about the obedience of subjects to the higher powers, as it is set down in the public Confessions of the several national churches.” In this he shows extracts from numerous Protestant Confessions, e.g., the French Reformed Confession (earlier defended by his father against its Jesuit detractors)<sup>313</sup>, the Belgic Confession (used by the Dutch Reformed Church)<sup>314</sup>, and Helvetic Confession (used by the Reformed Church of Switzerland)<sup>315</sup>, upholding lawful authority contrary to the revolutionary claims of Cromwell’s republic<sup>316</sup>. For instance, in addition to an Extract of Article 17 of the

---

<sup>313</sup> Article 39, “God hath put the sword in the magistrates’ hands to repress offences, not only against the Second Table [of the Decalogue] but also against the First. We ought therefore for his sake, who is the author of this order, not only to suffer those to govern whom God hath set over us, but also yield to them honour and all respect, as his Lieutenant and Ministers, appointed by him to bear a lawful and holy Office” (Du Moulin’s *Vindication of Protestants*, pp. 71-2).

<sup>314</sup> “All men of what dignity, quality or state soever they be, must subject themselves unto the lawful magistrates, pay unto them imposts and tributes, and please and obey them in all things that are not repugnant unto the Word of God: also pray for them, that God be pleased to direct them in all their actions, and that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life under them, in all piety and honesty” (Du Moulin’s *Vindication of Protestants*, pp. 72-73).

<sup>315</sup> “As God will work the safety of his people by the Magistrate, who he hath given to the world as a Father, so all subjects are commanded to acknowledge that benefit in the magistrate. Let them honour and reverence the Magistrate as the Minister of God. Let them love and assist him, and pray for him as their father. Let them obey him in all his just and equitable commands. And let them pay all imposts and tributes, and all other dues of that kind, faithfully and willingly. And if the public safety of the Country and justice require it, and that the magistrate undertake a war by necessity; let them also lay down their lives, and spill their blood for the good of the public and of the magistrate, and that in the name of God; willingly, valiantly, and cheerfully. For he that opposeth himself to the Magistrate, provoketh the heavy wrath of God upon himself” (Du Moulin’s *Vindication of Protestants*, pp. 73-74).

<sup>316</sup> Du Moulin’s *Vindication of Protestants* (1679), pp. 70-78.

Anglican Reformed 39 Articles, Canon du Moulin says Article “35 appoints Homilies against rebellion to be read in churches. The summary of these Homilies, and the whole drift of them, is contained in these words,” which he says are taken from the “First Part” of the “Homily Against ... Rebellion” (Book 2, Homily 21). “In reading of the holy Scriptures we shall find in very many ... places, as well the Old Testament as ... the New; that kings and princes, as well the evil as the good, do reign by God’s ordinance, and that subjects are bound to obey them.’ And that doctrine of the Church of England, which is that of the Word of God, is fully demonstrated in these godly Homilies, published and enjoined to be read in Churches ...<sup>317</sup>.”

In this *Lex Rex* (Question 41:4:1, second section 4), Rutherford then counters with the claim that his seditious and murderous revolutionary “doctrine was taught by lawyers, Protestants,” and “yielded to by Papists.” But his evidential support for this claim is most unconvincing and most strained, claiming e.g., “proofs ... by Scriptures” which he does not here cite (though elsewhere wrests the Word of God to these ends) (*Lex Rex* Question 41:3, first section 3). He claims support from such writers as, “Grotius, Barclay, and Winzetus,” rather than the “Jesuits” (*Lex Rex*, Question 41:4:1, second section 4). Rutherford is here referring to what he earlier says of these three, “Winzetus ... says of Nero, that he, seeking to destroy the Senate and people of Rome, and seeking to make laws for himself ..., lost right to the kingdom. And Barclaius ... says, a tyrant, such as Caligula, ... spoils himself of the right to the crown. And ... Grotius ..., if he turn enemy to the kingdom, for their destruction, he loses the kingdom” (*Lex Rex*, Question 26, Assertion 7, Argument 3)

Concerning Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), Rousseau fairly notes, “Grotius denies that all human government is established for the benefit of the governed, and he cites the example of slavery.” “It is” “not” “possible” “to imagine a” “method” “more favourable to tyrants<sup>318</sup>.” Rutherford in some sense supports a broad claim of Barclay (Barclaius) and Winzetus that the conduct of two New Testament times emperors, Caligula (37-41

---

<sup>317</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 78.

<sup>318</sup> Rousseau’s *The Social Contract*, Cranston, M., (translator), Harmondsworth, 1968; cited in Bull, H., Kingsbury, B., & Roberts, A. (Editors), *Hugo Grotius & International Relations*, Oxford University Press, 1990, Clarendon Paperbacks, reprint 2002, p. 62. Winzetus makes a qualification Rutherford does not, since Rutherford says in another part of *Lex Rex*, “Winzetus ... ‘will have it unlawful to resist kings, because God has made them irresistible.’ I answer” says Rutherford, that this is “a blasphemous supposition” (*Lex Rex*, Question 28:3). Can Rutherford therefore fairly quote Winzetus here in *Lex Rex*, Question 28:3? I am not familiar with Winzetus’s works and so I do not know the answer to this question, or how Winzetus reconciles these two *prima facie* antinomies of his jurisprudence. But without examining this element further, it is clear that Rutherford in some sense supports a broad claim by Winzetus that, “Nero, ... seeking to make laws for himself ..., lost right to the kingdom” (*Lex Rex*, Question 26, Assertion 7, Argument 3).

A.D.) and Nero (54-68 A.D.) meant they lost the right to the Crown. But this does not sit well with Rutherford's claim that the Bible supports him, for while Caligula and Nero were admittedly gruesome tyrants, it is against such a backdrop that St. Peter says, "Honour the king" (I Peter 2:17), and St. Paul says, "the works of the flesh are ... seditions, ... murders, ... of the which I tell you ... they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. 5:19-21).

Hence we read in Book 2, Homily 21, Article 35 of the Anglican 39 Articles of 1562, in part one of the Homily, "Against Rebellion," "Will you hear the Scriptures concerning this most necessary point? 'I exhort therefore,' saith St. Paul, 'that, above all things, prayers, supplications, intercessions, and giving of thanks be had for all men, for kings and all that are in authority, that we may live a quiet and peaceable life with all godliness: for that is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour' (I Tim. 2:1-3) ... This is St. Paul's counsel. And who, I pray you, was prince over the most part of Christians, when God's Holy Spirit by St. Paul's pen gave them this lesson? ... Caligula [37-41 A.D.], Claudius [41-54 A.D.], or Nero [54-68 A.D.]; who were not only no Christians, but pagans, and also either foolish rulers, or most cruel tyrants."

Moreover, at a fundamental level, Rutherford's articulation of his three (or four criterion) for sedition are not clearly stated in the succinct terms he uses by such writers as Barclay and Winzetus, or other earlier non-Jesuit writers. It is clear that even if some persons before the Jesuits sometimes engaged in seditions and murders, (as most assuredly they did,) the *Lex Rex* jurisprudence of expressing it in the terminology and specific categories of thought Rutherford succinctly articulates, are the Jesuitical criterion of: "a tyrant" from Suarez; the legal theory of self "defence" and exhausting all lawful courses of action from Mariana; and the usage of the legislature from Lessius. And that they should have a reasonable chance of success is necessarily part of their theories also; though on this point, I would accept that any more competent criminal mind planning sedition before these Jesuit writers would also make this stipulation. Thus Rutherford's attempt to find his criterion for sedition and murder in the Bible or earlier non-Jesuit writers is clearly anachronistic and unconvincing. *He has clearly first gotten his ideas from these Jesuit writers, and then gone on "a fishing expedition" to try and find non-Jesuit writers he can imply the same ideas from, as part of an elaborate ruse to de-Jesuitize his Lex Rex jurisprudence.* Rutherford's protestations to the contrary are about as convincing as an advocate of "Liberation Theology" in 20th or 21st century South America, claiming he did not get any of his categories of thought from the revolutionary socialist ideas of Karl Marx's teachings, who quite autonomously "just happened to agree with him;" but rather were to claim he got it all from "earlier sources" like "the Bible<sup>319</sup>."

---

<sup>319</sup> The "Liberation Theology" movement within Roman Catholicism was supported by the Second Latin American Roman Catholic Bishops' Conference at Medellin, Columbia, in 1968. Its leaders include the Spanish Jesuit writer, Jon Sobrino (b. 1938), e.g., his books "Jesus the Liberator" (1991) and "Christ the Liberator" (1999). Since the 1990s the Roman Church has in half-hearted ways increasingly sought to restrain this group. Certainly Liberation Theology is always dependent upon some Marxist concepts like class struggle. But while Liberation Theology always uses

Therefore I think it reasonable to conclude that Rutherford's *Lex Rex* (1644) succinctly articulated criterion for sedition and murder was at its heart a rehash of Jesuit principles in which Rutherford tried to "sanitize" their presentation by putting them in a more "Protestant" and thus more "Biblical" sounding outward overt package; but one which at its inner Jesuitical covert core was still nevertheless clearly contrary to Scripture (Eccl. 8:1-8; Rom. 13:1-9; Gal. 5:20,21; I Peter 2:17; Rev. 21:8). Rutherford was thus a man deeply influenced by Jesuitical teaching on this issue of overthrowing a "tyrant" and murdering him. Samuel Rutherford had "known the depths of Satan" (Rev. 2:24), and was very much the Devil's disciple. We are told in Scripture that those who engage in "seditions" and "murders" "shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. 5:20,21), and that "murderers" and "liars" "shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone," so that we cannot doubt that that Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford, following the teachings of Rutherford's *Lex Rex*, now burn in the flames of hell<sup>320</sup>.

---

Marxist categories of thought to analyze the situation, the degree to which Marxist political solutions are thereafter applied varies considerably between advocates. Its view of "Social Christianity" may e.g., integrate images of the stigmatic, Francis of Assisi (d. 1226), and founder of the Roman Catholic Franciscan monkish order. See e.g., "Liberation Theology," *Wikipedia* ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberation\\_theology](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberation_theology)); & Leonard Boff's *Saint Francis: A Model for Human Liberation*, translated from Spanish by John Diercksmeier, Crossroad, New York, USA, 1982, ISBN 0-8245-0488-7.

<sup>320</sup> I find Rutherford's work a most painful treatise to read. The Restoration hangman was quite right to publicly burn it, for in Christian paternalism (I Cor. 4:15) I say the people need to be shielded from this type of thing as much as possible. *Prima facie* it is a mix of natural law (reason) and divine law (Bible); and so resembles in its *prima facie* categories of thought e.g., Blackstone's *Laws of England*. But whereas Blackstone maintains that *the natural law may never be contrary to the divine law* (Article 34, 39 Articles); by contrast, Rutherford's form of reason (natural law) egregiously violates the divine law. E.g., setting aside Rom. 13:1-9 in *Lex Rex*, Question 33, "Whether or no[t] ... Rom. 13:1, prove that in no case is it lawful to resist the king," Rutherford sows a doubt by asking a question, "I desire to be informed, whether to resist the king's servants [e.g., the King's army], be to resist the king?" He uses as his example a "command of the king to kill the innocent," and I would agree that the saints may properly flee from suchlike (Matt. 2:13-23). *But this is quite different to sedition against the Crown and murder* (Matt. 19:18; 22:21). Hence like Satan (Matt. 4:3-7), Rutherford "so expounds one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another" (Article 20, 39 Articles). *Lex Rex* might be better entitled, "A seditious and murderous heretic's conversations with his father, the Devil." In *Lex Rex* Rutherford has "known the depths of Satan" (Rev. 2:24), and I would urge the good Christian reader to avoid reading this most horrible work himself, unless he is very mature in the faith, and needs to consult it for some reason connected with defending Scriptural truth such as I have done here. In reading it I feel like one of those poor olden time censors who had the most repulsive and horrible job of having to look at all kinds of pornographic and other filth, in order to legally state it was censored and so shield the masses from its evil. Like the godly who

Thus Canon du Moulin says, “Neither ought the Jesuits to find fault with the public ... murdering [of] the King, and making of the thirtieth of January a Thanksgiving Day, seeing that the Jesuits of Paris shewed the way for that to the rebels in England. ... So much the late rebels of England have learned of ... Jesuits ... . And by their gross dealing with their King, beheading him upon a scaffold, ... they have shewed themselves ... in ... King-killing, set forth by ... Mariana, how to put a King to death ...<sup>321</sup>.”

Canon du Moulin then makes reference to “Independents” and Fifth-Monarchy men.” These “Independents” later became known as the Congregationalists, and they maintain that church government should be localized to each congregation. They were very influential under Cromwell’s republic, reaching the peak of their power under Cromwell who aligned himself with them, although following Cromwell’s death their influence declined<sup>322</sup>. The “Fifth-Monarchy men” were a group that at first were pro-Cromwell and supported the republic, but later in the 1550s they withdrew their support for Cromwell, and within about 10 years they had disappeared into oblivion.

Du Moulin says, “That Jesuits professed themselves Independent [Congregationalist], ...; and Fifth-Monarchy men, that they might pull down the English monarchy, and that in the Committees, for the destruction of the King and Church; they had their spies and their agents. The Roman priest ... is known, [identified in a side-note as “Father Philips<sup>323</sup>,”] who when he saw the fatal stroke given to our ... King and martyr, flourished with his sword, and said, ‘*Now the greatest enemy we have in the world is gone*’<sup>324</sup>.”

---

have done so afore me, I do not enjoy looking at suchlike, but the Lord being my helper and gracious guide, *I do my duty*.

<sup>321</sup> Du Moulin’s *Vindication of Protestants* (1679), p. 57.

<sup>322</sup> On the one hand, the Congregationalists do not historically support the Establishment Principle i.e., an Established Protestant Christian Church, such as the Established *Church of England* (Anglican) or Established *Church of Scotland* (Presbyterian). But on the other hand, under the Congregationalist, Cromwell, the English Puritan Revolutionaries had some concept of a “Protestant State” without an Established Church. To some extent, this type of thinking *in some ways* approximated the First Stage of the secular state (till about the end of World War II), in which Christian morals were part of the law and society, but the issue of religious faith was regarded as a non-State matter, other than for a general upholding of “God” in e.g., National Anthems.

<sup>323</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 58; Michigan University copy, hand-written notes identifying “Father Philips.”

<sup>324</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 58.

This testimony is quite significant for understanding the Jesuit *modus operandi*. Given that under Rutherford's *Lex Rex* (1644) the English Puritan revolutionaries had adopted Jesuitical and unBiblical principles for the overthrow of a king, it was easy for Jesuits, masquerading as Puritans, to support Rutherford's *Lex Rex* principles, since they had been promulgating this type of thinking when it suited them as part of Jesuitry for many decades before the 1640s and 1650s. Thus Jesuits entered England, palmed themselves off as Puritans, and helped to incite sedition amongst the Puritans against King Charles I. Indeed, du Moulin further records that "many Jesuits came over, who took several shapes, to go about their work, but most of them took party in the army," i.e., fighting as Roundheads against the Cavaliers<sup>325</sup>.

The Jesuits operated largely through Congregationalist Churches. Lest the good Christian reader misunderstand my more general views, let me say that I believe that while the New Testament leaves some general rules of Church government to be followed after apostolic times, such as the need to have patriarchal structures, and some form of "bishop" (overseer) and "deacon" (I Tim. 2:8-3:13), there is no specific "Divine Law" form of church government prescribes for post-apostolic times. I consider the NT requirement to be under an apostle, becomes in post NT times a need to be under the apostle's teaching i.e., under Biblical teaching. Therefore I consider it a matter of permissible natural law or reason, i.e., natural law which is not contrary to the Divine revelation, whether one has, for instance, Episcopal government, Presbyterian government, or Congregationalist church government.

Furthermore, with respect to Congregationalist Church government, I think it has two quite different potentials<sup>326</sup>. On the up-side, the independent nature of such a local Congregationalist Church means that if one has a generally good Protestant Minister and congregation, they can hold out against a wider apostate church organization, and so be a blessing to others. One sees this type of positive potential with a Congregationalist

---

<sup>325</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 65.

<sup>326</sup> *With respect to Episcopal church government.* I have heard an Anglican Minister talking about "block-buster" Ministers, who go into a bad church, and to the great irritation and opposition of the congregation seek, under God, to correct a badly astray congregation. Then they get out after six months, with the Bishop then appointing another Minister who builds on the work of the former unpopular Minister, but in a more amicable manner. I have also heard about how the *Church of England* has been corrupted in more modern times by the appointment of many bad bishops. I have also heard about how at the time of the Reformation, appointment of good bishops like Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, and Hooper, was a mechanism to bring about much needed reform. *With regard to independent church government.* I have heard of a Minister who upon arriving and preaching a gospel sermon, was told by his congregation to never again preach the gospel to them, or he would be out of a job. And I have heard of faithful Ministers and congregations whose independent status has made them shine like beacons in the night.

Minister like Martin Lloyd-Jones (1899-1981), who held out against a wider apostasy associated with the *Billy Graham Crusades*. He left the Congregational Union when it merged with the English Presbyterian Church in 1972 to form the United Reformed Church, and thereafter affiliated his *Westminster Chapel* in London with the Fellowship of Independent Evangelical Churches (FIEC). This Congregationalist Minister rightly repudiated the Billy Graham Campaign's association with non-Evangelical Churches, and showed great Christian leadership when he publicly refused to appear on the platform with Graham in his 1954 Harringay Crusade in London. He rightly said, "We must not become subject to a false, vague, nebulous, ecumenical type of thinking." "I believe that one of the most potent factors in this respect has been the Billy Graham campaigns." "I believe that in a very subtle way the Graham" "campaigns have had" the "influence" of "shaking people's convictions as to what" "it means to be Evangelical"<sup>327</sup>. Likewise, the Congregationalist theologian J. Pye Smith (1774-1851), the Principal of Homerton College (1800-1850) located in London<sup>328</sup>. I have a tremendous respect for Pye Smith, and I thank God for the work he did on refining and improving the Genesis 1 Gap School (a process he most valuably contributed to, though did not complete).

But it must be also said that on the down-side, the independent nature of the local Congregationalist church gives it another more negative potential. The fact that it is basically a law unto itself means that a highly organized, insular group can, especially if the congregation is relatively small, get in and quickly take it over. Thus one can point to the fact that during the 19th century, Unitarians who deny the Trinity were able to so access, and take over, a number of Congregationalist Churches in the USA.

This factor was significant in 1640s and 1650s England, because it meant that the Jesuits, who were looking for a quick access point to Puritan Churches (the Puritan movement divided into General / Arminian Baptists, Particular / Reformed Baptists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists), found that for their purposes, *some* of the Congregationalist Churches were *exactly what they were looking for*. Like the later 19th century Unitarian infiltrators working amongst USA Congregationalist Churches, the earlier 17th century Jesuit infiltrators working amongst English Puritan Churches moved in to exploit the independent character of Congregationalist churches and took control of, or gained significant influence in, a number of them to their own advantage. The Jesuits thus employed what in outward form were recognized and established Congregationalist Churches, and used them as a platform to enhance their masquerade as "Puritans." The pride and arrogance of so many Puritans in believing that Jesuits never could or would attempt such an infiltration of their churches, also worked to the Jesuits advantage. *The*

---

<sup>327</sup> Lloyd-Jones, D.M., *What is an Evangelical?*, The Banner of Truth Trust, UK, 1992, pp. 22-24.

<sup>328</sup> Homerton College was known as Homerton Academy till 1823. It later divided into a Theological College, namely, New College, London University till its closure in 1977; and a Teacher's College, namely, Homerton College, Cambridge, which since 1978 has been a part of Cambridge University.

*English Puritan's arrogant pride, was a foundation stone for the Jesuit's hijacking ride.*

Certainly it would be very wrong to suggest that the English Puritan revolution was run by, or even primarily guided by, the Papist Jesuits. Indeed, quite to the contrary, the evidence clearly shows that at its heart the revolutionary republic was English Puritan and anti-Papist. Nor is there any evidence that the vast majority of Puritan Congregationalist Churches were under the immediate church government influence or control of, these Jesuits masquerading as Puritans. Any such claims would be irresponsible and erroneous. But Canon du Moulin's work documents that *the Jesuits were there, masquerading as Puritans, frequently in a number of the more easily and quickly controlled Congregationalist Churches that were aligned with Oliver Cromwell, a man who preferred Congregationalist Churches over other Puritan Churches. We would be foolish to follow the Puritans of the time who like ostriches put their heads in the sand and so were blind to this important factor.*

Canon du Moulin records how "the year before the King's death, a select number of English Jesuits were sent from their whole party in England, first to Paris," and then to "Rome," both of which "concluded" "that it was both lawful and expedient for the [Roman] Catholics to promote" the "alteration of State" to a republic. And so "the Jesuits went to work." Du Moulin says that "when the horrible parricide committed in the King's sacred person, was so universally cried down as the greatest villainy," then "the Pope commanded all the papers about that question to be gathered and burnt." However, a Roman Catholic "Gentleman" (by the name of Papon,) who had been to both Paris and Rome on this mission, having "had time to consider and detest the wickedness" that had been done, "shewed" the evidence "to a Protestant friend of his; and related to him the whole carriage of this negotiation with great abhorrence of the practices of the Jesuits<sup>329</sup>."

Naturally, this all raises the question, "Why did the Jesuits so support the English Puritan republic and seek the murder of King Charles?"

One theoretical reason, raised by du Moulin, relates to "a get back" against Charles for anti-Papist laws he agreed to when in Roundhead captivity on the Isle of Wight, *infra*<sup>330</sup>. But given that these were also part of the Puritan legislature's anti-Popish laws, must surely mean any hostility against Charles I for these would also be replicated in a comparable Popish hostility for the English Puritans. Thus under strict scrutiny this type of explanation does not provide a satisfactory explanation.

Nevertheless, du Moulin does mount up some evidence for the Jesuits involvement. We know that some Jesuits claimed in the presence of a Mr. "Roan," that

---

<sup>329</sup> Du Moulin's *Vindication of Protestants* (1679), pp. 59-60, Michigan University copy, hand-written notes identifying Papon (precise spelling unclear on copy).

<sup>330</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 65-67.

their reason for wanting Charles killed, which du Moulin describes as “most false,” was that “The King ... had promised us [Jesuits] the reestablishing of the [Roman] Catholic Religion in England.” But “when he ... came so far as to” say “he would not do it,” then “We [Jesuits]” had “given him lawful warning, and when no warning would serve, we ... kept our word to him,” to “bring him to his destruction.” Canon du Moulin is surely correct to describe this reason as “most false,” but it is a valuable testimony for telling us *the sort of thing they were saying*, since “Roan” is described by du Moulin as “a Protestant Gentleman<sup>331</sup>.” I.e., if Jesuits were prepared to make this kind of statement to a known “Protestant gentleman” at the time; then it tells us that in all likelihood they were saying something similar to other Protestants *when palming themselves off as Puritans*. Thus they quite likely were saying words to the effect that Charles had agreed to make England Papist, but then when masquerading as Puritans, adding that he had to be killed in order to stop this happening. This type of claim would have fitted in well with the hysteria of the English Puritans’ republic which e.g., was claiming that Laud was trying to reconcile the Church of England with the Church of Rome.

But given that such a claim is fairly described by Canon du Moulin as “most false,” still leads us to seek an answer to the question, “Why did the Jesuits so support the English Puritan republic and seek the murder of King Charles?” The answer to this is both speculative and inferential, and so may be disputed by some. Nevertheless, it seems to me that on the available facts, two reasons reasonably emerge. A third reason is not conjectural, for it is based on the words of Christ in John 8:44, that those involved in such forbidden “lusts” as “murder” have as their spiritual “father the Devil.” We know that the Devil generally works through his hosts of lesser devils (e.g., Rev. 12:9); and thus we cannot reasonably doubt that devils were helping to drive the Jesuits on to murder King Charles. But let us now consider a further two conjectural reasons.

One reason appears to have been that if England had an unpopular Puritan leader like Cromwell, then a military invasion by a Popish country such as France or Spain, orchestrated with the intent of making the British Isles Papist, would be more likely to succeed. In this context, the evidence we have from Lord Chancellor Clarendon’s *History of the Rebellion*, quoted in Reverend John Echlin’s *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* sermon at Christchurch Church of Ireland Cathedral, Dublin, *supra*, is significant. In this sermon, Echlin citing Clarendon, says that the Puritan revolutionaries “chief and fundamental article was, ‘For a total alteration in the Church, and the extirpation of Bishops.’ This was so constantly ... insisted upon, ...he [Charles I] was pressed to satisfy those demands by the [Popish] Queen Regent of France, the [Papist] Cardinal, and the Queen his [Roman Catholic] wife, as the main point without which nothing could be done for him; and this was urged in such a manner, that ‘His Majesty, looked upon their negotiations, rather as a joint conspiracy betwixt the Papists and the [Puritan] Presbyterians, to overthrow the [Anglican] Church ...’<sup>332</sup>” Why would a French Queen,

---

<sup>331</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 58-9.

<sup>332</sup> “The Royal Martyr,” A Sermon preached before Their Excellencies the Lord Justices of Ireland in Christchurch Dublin, on the 30th of January, 1713, by John Echlin,

a Popish Cardinal, and Charles French Roman Catholic wife who had been obviously deceived by the French Papists into seeking to lead her husband astray on this matter (cf. I Kgs 11:1,4), all urge Charles to agree to the “extirpation of bishops”?

We cannot doubt that the religious character of the average Englishman was as strongly Anglican as the religious character of the average Scotsman was Puritan Presbyterian. If Charles had agreed to the “extirpation of bishops” in England, he would have been as popular there as he had been in Scotland when he sought the extirpation of Presbyterian church government, a position that he later wisely withdrew from. English Anglicans liked things such as the prayer book, Christmas, Easter, and Papists’ Conspiracy Day; and in general did not warm to the austerities of Puritan worship and lifestyle, with e.g., its strict Sabbatarianism, in the same way the Scots clearly did. Thus the Popish French were urging Charles I to act in a most unpopular way in England by agreeing to the English Puritan revolutionaries ridiculous and highly unpopular demands to force convert England to Puritanism. Why? The only reasonable explanation can be that in such turmoil, they hoped that “a Puritan” Charles would become as understandably unpopular as Cromwell, and that an invasion by Popish France, possibly in conjunction with Popish Spain, could at last succeed where the Spanish Armada of 1588 had failed, and England could be force converted back to Popery.

While some small percentage of washed and saved Englishmen might be Puritans, in the wider English context, Puritanism was “a dud religion,” and so the Papists wanted Charles to associate himself with it. By contrast, Anglican Protestantism was a careful adaptation of Protestantism to the religious culture of England, i.e., in the context of the Establishment Principle (Ps. 2:10-12; Isa. 49:23) making the Anglican Church an Established Church. In this church, the presence of both “wheat” and “tares” (Matt. 13:24-30,36-40), meant that the larger masses would probably always be unwashed, but the inner core could be washed and Protestant, i.e., with a special emphasis on seeking by the grace of God for something better among the clergy, university and school teachers, and others in certain key positions, and beyond that, *of course*, as many normative parishioners as possible. By contrast, if the average Englishman could be persuaded that “Protestantism” was to be equated with “Puritanism,” then he would be unlikely to fight hard for a Puritan identifying regime if the Papists attacked. Therefore, the pressure the French Papist Queen, Cardinal, and his French Roman Catholic wife were all putting on Charles to agree to the Puritans demands of force converting England to Puritanism was one approach; and the work of the Jesuits to help Cromwell kill Charles was another approach; in both instances, hoping for an attempted forced conversion of England to Puritanism which would be so unpopular that they could then seek to militarily invade this England which had such an unpopular religious policy. For while the Scots were enthusiastic Puritans, the English most assuredly were not!

---

Master of Arts, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-9; citing Clarendon’s *History of the Rebellion & Civil Wars in England*, by Edward Hyde (1609-1674), 1st Earl of Clarendon & Lord Chancellor, Vol. 2, p. 579.

*There is more than one way to skin a cat. Thus on the one hand, in international politics the French Papists “were playing hardball” by trying to use Charles’ wife the way the Devil had used Eve in the Garden of Eden, while a Popish Queen Regent of France and a Popish Cardinal “egged Charles on” to adopt Puritanism in England. The French Papists had the end game in sight, to wit, a French and / or Spanish invasion of England to Romanize England. But on the other hand, Charles was showing himself too astute for them. He had described the French actions as a “conspiracy betwixt the Papists” and Puritans, and his usage of “conspiracy” with “Papists” had overtones of the type of thing remembered in Papists’ Conspiracy Day (5 Nov.), which together with Christmas and Easter was one of the three most popular days on the Anglican Calendar. Hence the Popish Jesuits were fundamentally working for the same thing as these unsuccessful French Papists by palming themselves off in England as Puritans and seeking to promote an English Puritan regime which would have Charles killed. The Jesuits also had the same end game in sight as the French Papists moving in diplomatic circles, to wit, a French and / or Spanish invasion of England to Romanize England.*

Thus against this backdrop we better understand one of the reasons for the Papist Jesuits working to help the anti-Papist English Puritan regime of Cromwell in England. King Charles had the overwhelming support of both the English who were mainly Anglicans, and the Scots who were mainly Presbyterians, so that so long as there was a king on the throne who under the Establishment Principle was the *Supreme Governor of the Church of England*, there was a respected and popular Protestant figure who was a counter-weight to the Roman Pope. Hence the Jesuits sought to work with the English Puritans to remove the Anglican Protestant King for the relatively unpopular Puritan leadership whose support base was very narrowly located in a small percentage of mainly English Puritans who controlled the House of Commons, since this meant that the country would not pull together well in defence against a Papist military assault. *And so, in the longer term, a successful military invasion of the type envisaged at the time of the Spanish Armada in 1588 which was designed to snuff out Protestantism and reintroduce Popery was made more likely by the existence of the highly unpopular Puritan republic!* For while to this day English Puritan derived propaganda depicts Cromwell in popularist terms, the reality is that this reflects the perception of a very small percentage of mainly English Puritans who supported Cromwell. More generally, Anglican England certainly did not look with such popularist favor on Cromwell and Puritanism. *Thus the Jesuits worked with the English Puritan regime, palming themselves off as Puritans, inciting Puritans into support for the murder of King Charles the First.*

Indeed, in this context it is notable that du Moulin says that when the king “assented in the Treaty of the Isle of Wight to pass five strict Bills against Popery,” then “the Jesuits in France, at a General Meeting there, presently resolved to ... take off his head, *by the power of their friends in the [Roundhead] army.* For “in pursuance of” an “order from Rome, for pulling down ... the monarch and the monarchy of England, many Jesuits came over, who took several shapes, to go about their work, but *most of them took party in the army,*” i.e., fighting as Roundheads against the Cavaliers. Hence e.g., “about thirty of them,” when meeting “a Protestant gentleman, between Rouen [Belgium] and Diep [Holland], ... said (taking him for one of their party) that they were going into

England, and would take arms in the Independent [Congregationalist] army, and endeavour to be agitators.”

Then after the king’s murder in 1649, intelligence came from a number of Romish “convents and seminaries, about the King’s death, *as having overcome their enemy*, and done their main work for their settlement in England; of which they made themselves so sure, that ... nuns were contending who should be Abbesses in England<sup>333</sup>.” Moreover, “many Friars ... in several places,” being “jealous of the glory which the Jesuits ascribed to their ... Order, ... *promoted the King of England’s death* ...<sup>334</sup>.”

On the one hand, any decision to kill King Charles on the basis that he agreed to anti-Papist laws must be counter-balanced by the fact that Cromwell’s republic also support such anti-Papist laws. Why then would the Jesuits support Cromwell against Charles, were it not for the fact that this could in the longer term facilitate the rise of Popery in England. Though du Moulin does not link this information with the possibility of a French and / or Spanish invasion to Romanize England, how else could “nuns” be “contending” about “who should be Abbesses in England,” since Cromwell clearly would not have allowed the reintroduction of Popery in England?

Another factor in understanding Jesuit support for the English Puritan republic, further discussed in the Appendix 5 Dedication Sermon, was King Charles support for a Protestant Reformation inside of Greek Orthodoxy. Canon du Moulin’s *Vindication of Protestants* (1664 & 1679), which comes with an Anglican Imprimatur from the Bishop of London, is an important work for showing the type of thinking prevalent when *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* was still being introduced as part of the *Church of England’s* Book of Common Prayer of 1662, and the *Church of Ireland’s* Book of Common Prayer of 1666. It is clear that while that Office was first and foremost concerned with the English Puritan Revolutionaries’ republic of 1642-1660, there was also a concern for the secondary involvement of Popish Jesuits

These same elements are also evident in the *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* sermon of Bishop St. George Ashe at Christchurch *Church of Ireland* Cathedral in Dublin, preached some 50 years after 1664 in 1716. In that sermon, Bishop Ashe cites Canon du Moulin with regard to the presence of Jesuits among “Independents [Congregationalists<sup>335</sup>], Levellers, and Fifth-Monarchy men<sup>336</sup>.” It is therefore of some

---

<sup>333</sup> Du Moulin’s *Vindication of Protestants* (1679), pp. 65-66 (emphasis mine).

<sup>334</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 67 (emphasis mine).

<sup>335</sup> “Pride’s Purge” of 1648 forcibly removed c. 140 Presbyterian Members from the House of Commons, leaving c. 60 Members of the “Rump Parliament.” This put the “Independents” i.e., Congregationalists, in control of the House of Commons, and they then moved to have a show trial of Charles I before killing him. But some of the Presbyterians later came back into favour with Cromwell’s regime. E.g., Sir William Morrice (Morrice) (1602-1676) was elected to the House of Commons as the Member for

further interest to observe that in the *King Charles the Martyr's Day* sermon of John Echlin at Christchurch *Church of Ireland* Cathedral in Dublin, preached in 1713, that reference is also made to the fact that King Charles I, “knew, that the malignity of those times, ... had brought forth ... distempers in religion: swarms of Brownists [Congregationalists<sup>337</sup>], Muggletonians<sup>338</sup>, Levellers, and Fifth-Monarchy men<sup>339</sup>.”

Thus is it clear that in the first instance, Samuel Rutherford cross-applied pre-existing and well known contemporary Jesuit jurisprudence in his threefold (or fourfold) *Lex Rex* criteria for sedition. I.e., Rutherford claimed that Biblical injunctions against “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:20,21), and requiring that Christians, “Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17), could be set aside in harmony with contemporary Jesuitical teaching whose knowledge was publicly accessible among educated society. Suarez’s Jesuitical teaching about a “tyrant;” is found in Rutherford’s first criterion of a “tyrant;” and connected definition, “a tyrant is he who habitually sinneth against the catholic good of the subjects and state, and subverteth law.” Rutherford’s second criterion comes from Mariana’s Jesuitical teaching about self “defence” and there being no further “remedy” against an “exhorted” “Prince,” which equates Rutherford’s *Lex Rex* second criterion for

---

Devon in 1648, but before he had taken up his seat he was expelled in “Pride’s Purge.” However, he later came back into favour with Cromwell’s regime, being made Sheriff of Devon in 1651, and again becoming a Member of the House of Commons under Cromwell’s First, Second, and Third Protectorate Parliaments. He was a relative of General Monck, and with him he came to realize the error of his ways, and assisted Monck in bringing about the Restoration in 1660. He was a Member of the 1660 Convention Parliament bringing back King Charles II. He was Secretary of State (for the Northern Department) and Lord of the Treasury (1660-1668); and is referred to in Pepys’ Diary (“The Diary of Samuel Pepys,” “Sir William Morice ...,” <http://www.pepysdiary.com/p/5947.php>). See the footnote on Sir William, *supra*.

<sup>336</sup> Bishop Ashe’s sermon is further discussed in “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” section “a) Preliminary Qualifications & Remarks,” *supra*, and the Appendix 5 Dedication Sermon, *infra*. The meaning of the terms, “Independents [Congregationalists], Levellers, and Fifth-Monarchy men” is explained in Appendix 5.

<sup>337</sup> Congregationalists were sometimes known as “Brownists,” being so named after Robert Browne (c. 1550-1633), a Puritan Congregationalist church leader urging separation from the *Church of England*.

<sup>338</sup> A group named after Ladowick Muggleton (1609-1698). He was an anti-Trinitarian heretic whose followers regarded him as a “prophet.”

<sup>339</sup> “The Royal Martyr,” A Sermon preached before Their Excellencies the Lord Justices of Ireland in Christchurch Dublin, on the 30th of January, 1713, by John Echlin, Master of Arts, *op. cit.*, p. 12. For the meaning of “Levellers, and Fifth-Monarchy men” see the Appendix 5 Dedication Sermon.

sedition i.e., one has exhausted all lawful courses of action. Rutherford's third criterion that one must leave the matter to the support of the politicians, comes from Lessius's Jesuitical teaching that the power to make the decision for revolution should be in the hands of the politicians. Rutherford's preference for Lessius over Mariana on this point, reflected the *real politick* of the situation since the Puritans had control of the House of Commons, and they wanted to ensure that they, and no-one else, ran the revolution. Hence Rutherford dispensed with Mariana's broader "common consent" of "the people," preferring here the view taught by his fellow Jesuit, Lessius (although some connection was made by the Revolutionaries saying they represented this type of "common consent" via the very limited electoral franchise House of Commons). Whether one considers the requirement that there must be a reasonable chance of success is necessarily implied by the first three *Lex Rex* criteria, or is a separate fourth criterion, the reality is that by definition these Jesuits certainly were not advocating sedition and murder unless they thought there was a reasonable chance of its success.

After the Restoration in 1660, Rutherford was removed from all offices and summoned by Parliament in 1661 to appear on the charge of high treason, but he died before he could be prosecuted. Also in 1661, King Charles II ordered that Cromwell's body be exhumed, and his skull placed on a public gazing pole at Westminster Hall, next to the Westminster Parliament, where Cromwell's skull remained throughout the further 24 year duration of this Caroline reign. The remainder of Cromwell's body was hung in chains at Tyburn in Hyde Park. Notably, following the Gunpowder Treason Plot of 1605, "two heads of the Gunpowder [Plot] traitors ... were set upon the House of Lords." But at "the height of" Cromwell's "tyranny," they "were taken down ... by the same zeal which had plotted that treason" of 1605<sup>340</sup>. Thus to place Cromwell's head on a public gazing pole at Westminster Hall, made a clear nexus between the events remembered in *Papists' Conspiracy Day* and *King Charles the Martyr's Day*. I.e., Cromwell who banned the keeping of Anglican holydays such as *Papists' Conspiracy Day* (although in the dying days of the republic he allowed a non-Anglican public form of Bonfire Day to be kept,) had taken down the heads of those guilty of this sedition against the Crown, and now his head was placed here for his sedition against the Crown. Whether the sedition was Papist (*Gunpowder Treason Day*) or Puritan (*King Charles I's Day*), it was essentially the same in that it was unlawful and unBiblical rebellion.

Furthermore, following the Restoration Rutherford's *Lex Rex* was black-listed as a banned book which promoted "rebellion," and copies of *Lex Rex* were publicly burnt by the general hangman in London, and also in Scotland at St. Andrews (where Rutherford had been ejected from the University and a Church,) and Edinburgh. Those of the Restoration were not wrong to take these measures, for they thereby explained to the people that those who should follow in the ways of these wicked Jesuitical teachings would burn in the flames of hell (Rom. 13:2; Gal 5:19-21; Rev. 21:8), even as Rutherford's *Lex Rex* was burnt by the hangman. After the Second Advent and resurrection of the body, like the hung head (Num. 25:4) and body of Cromwell, the slain

---

<sup>340</sup> Du Moulin's *Vindication of Protestants* (1679), p. 70.

of the Lord shall ... not be lamented, neither gathered, nor buried; they shall be dung upon the ground” (Jer. 25:33 cf. Num. 24:4). And like Rutherford’s *Lex Rex* which was burnt by the hangman, they will also experience the “fire” of hell (Isa. 66:24).

Therefore, *in summary of the Popish Jesuit involvement in Charles I’s martyrdom*, the following facts may be itemized. Samuel Rutherford clearly realized that in a book designed for Puritans of the British Isles, were he to cite as his jurisprudential sources such Jesuit writers as Suarez, Mariana, and Lessius, this would be effectively like waving a red rag before a bull. He was therefore careful to omit all specific reference to the Jesuitical jurisprudential basis for his legal theory, (not making any specific reference to these three Jesuits or their teachings in his Question 41 reference to “the doctrine of Jesuits,”) and packaged it in terms that were “more Biblical sounding.” In itself, this shows that Rutherford had further internalized another important element of the Jesuit’s *modus operandi*, to wit, covert operations. The devious Rutherford successfully hoodwinked the Puritans, mainly the English ones. And his true spiritual fathers in these teachings, the Jesuits, were careful not to overtly “blow his cover.”

Indeed, in the second instance, the Jesuits realized that for the first time since the unsuccessful Spanish Armada of 1588 and Guy Fawkes Gunpowder Plot of 1605, there was a chance that they could kill the *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* and reintroduce Popery to the British Isles. For if someone as unpopular among the average Anglican Englishman as Cromwell was “the Lord Protector,” the English would not fight hard for him if France or Spain attacked. The Restoration of 1660 ended this possibility before it was played out, but as things stood in the 1640s and much of the 1650s, that outcome was not yet clear to either English Puritans or Popish Jesuits. The Papists were also anxious to close off any possibility of the Protestant Reformation reaching into Greek Orthodoxy, and King Charles support for the convert to Protestant and Patriarch of Constantinople, Cyril Lucar, meant that the Papists wished to add to their murder of Lucar, the blood of Charles, so as to try and seal the fate of Greek Orthodoxy as a non-Protestant Church forever.

Thus, in the third instance, the Jesuits came in masquerading as Puritans. They were eagerly embraced by the English Puritans who were desperately looking for support from a slim percentage of the population. Thus they largely came in on a “no questions asked” policy, which considered that anyone who “yelled loudly for Cromwell and the Roundheads against King Charles and the Cavaliers,” and professed to be a Puritan, “just had to be alright.” The crafty Jesuits thus gained influence in, or control of, certain Congregationalist Churches, and also extended their influence into other Puritan areas, most especially the Roundhead army. With great zeal they helped to incite English Puritans into sedition against the Crown and murder of the King. Their mission accomplished, they stealthily withdrew in stages, careful not to “give the game away” in their exit, any more than they had in their entry.

The English Puritans who had supported the revolution were generally fooled by the Jesuits’ tactics, and those directly involved in resisting “the powers” of the King “ordained of God,” did “receive to themselves damnation” (Rom. 13:2). By contrast,

Christian men of intellect and spiritual discernment *smelt the strong stench of a Jesuit rat*. Following the Restoration in 1660, the Jesuits' tactics were exposed by Restoration Anglicans in the work of a Canon of Canterbury Cathedral, Canon du Moulin; in which a Secretary of State, Sir William Morrice, described "Dr. Peter du Moulin" as "my honoured friend<sup>341</sup>;" and the Bishop of London endorsed this work with an Anglican Imprimatur. These findings about the Jesuits continued to be proclaimed by such respected men as the Bishop of Clogher (1697-1717)<sup>342</sup>, who later became Bishop of Londonderry (1717-1718), Bishop St. George Ashe (1658-1718), in his 1716 *King Charles the Martyr's Day* sermon at Dublin Cathedral. Good Protestant reader, let us thank God for the work on this matter of such men as the *Church of England* Canon du Moulin and *Church of Ireland* Bishop Ashe, who by the grace of God sought to set the record right with respect to this matter of Popish involvement in the martyrdom of the *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland*, King Charles I.

Let us now consider *the immediate events of Charles I's martyrdom*.

Fabian Philipps' book, *Veritas Inconcussa* (Latin, "Unshaken Truth"), or *A most certain Truth asserted, that King Charles the First, was ... a martyr*, written in 1649 just after Charles' martyrdom, and then republished at the time of the Restoration in 1660, is a very useful work for showing the type of background issues that were relevant to the immediate events of 1649.

It is clear that the issue of lawful authority is relevant. E.g., Phillip's refers to the revolutionaries' ordinance of 8 March 1641, "that whatsoever the two houses of Parliament should vote or declare to be law, the people were bound to obey," i.e., the Royal Assent of the King was said to be not required. Then when King Charles "offered to go in person to suppress the Irish Rebellion" of Papists in 1641, the Puritans "voted"

---

<sup>341</sup> Du Moulin's *Vindication of Protestants*, 1679, p. 64. See the footnote on Sir William Morrice, *infra*.

<sup>342</sup> The *Church of Ireland* Diocese of Clogher (pronounced, "Clogger"), covers a rural area straddling both sides of the border between the north (Northern Ireland, UK) and south (Republic of Ireland) of Ireland. Its Diocesan Office is in Enniskillen, County Fermanagh, Northern Ireland (NI). Clogher is about 18 miles or 29 kilometres south of Omagh on the River Blackwater in County Tyrone, NI. The Diocese has two Cathedrals, both named after Macartan but distinguishable by the two slightly different spellings with regard to the second last letter of his name, St. Macartan's Cathedral, Clogher, and St. Macartin's Cathedral, Enniskillen. Macartan (d. 506) was brought up in northern Ireland as a pagan, and he then converted to Christianity. He was the uncle of Brigid (Bridget) (d. 525), and companion of St. Patrick (d. 5th century after 460). He established a church in Clogher and evangelized the surrounding areas of Tyrone and Fermanagh. A saint of local significance only to this area, he is remembered on 24 March.

that “to be against the law, ... and they declared that whosoever should assist him in his voyage thither, should be taken as an enemy to the Commonwealth.”

On “18 June 1642 the King by his proclamation, disclaiming any intention to make war against his parliament” n.b., the King regarded it as “his” legislature i.e., he wished to govern *with* and *not against* the Parliament, “forbiddeth all levies of forces without his Majesty’s express pleasure signified under his Great Seal.” I.e., the King was meant to be Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces.

“4 July 1642, the King by his Letter ..., commanded all judges ... in their circuits, to use all means to suppress Popery, riots, and unlawful assemblies, and to give the people to understand his resolution to maintain the Protestant religion and the laws of the kingdom, and not to govern by any arbitrary power.” I.e., rejection of Puritan claims of seeking to usher in Popery, and upholding rule of law, requiring King and Parliament.

“19 Sept. 1642” the King said he looked to “Almighty God, and” said “he hoped for his blessing and protection to maintain to the utmost of his power the true Reformed Protestant religion,” as “established” by law, i.e., Anglicanism, “and that he desired to govern by the known laws of the land.” He asked “Almighty God” “to preserve him from that Rebellion” now afoot, and “to maintain the just privileges and freedoms of Parliament.” I.e., rejection of Puritan claims of seeking to usher in Popery, and upholding rule of law, requiring King and Parliament.

“1644.” “The King” “entreated some expedient” for “hopes of peace.”

By the mid 1640s, “votes and Ordinances and miscalled Acts of Parliament,” having gone over four or five years” of “sad experience in the wars of Parliament against the King.” Many of the King’s subjects also suffering from tyranny, for “almost as much” or “more times spent in settling and subduing the people” loyal to the Crown.

“The” Anglican “religion of the Kingdom, once so glorious, is now cut into fancies and blasphemies. The Churches where God was ... worshipped, either defaced, pulled down, or made stables for horses.” E.g., typical of this type of thing, (though from a slightly later time,) when I visited Worcester in December 2008, one of the guides at the Cathedral opened the Chapter House for me, and said that during the interregnum, following the Battle of Worcester in 1651 Cromwell had used this Chapter House in the Cathedral as a stable for his horses.

As a summary of the situation, Philipps says in 1649, “we but served God and the King, as we ought to have done, and not wrested the sense as well as the plain words of the Scripture and the laws of the land, to enable the sons to Zeruah to be too hard for us, and bring all manner of mischief, confusion, and wickedness upon us.” (I.e., “And the king,” David, “said ..., Know ye not that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel? And I am this day weak, though anointed king; and these men the sons of Zeruah be too hard for me: the Lord shall reward the doer of evil according to his wickedness,” II Sam. 3:38,39; see II Sam. 2:18-23; 3:22-39). In specific terms, Philipps

further says, “The intending,” or “advising, or declaring of war is treason of compassing the king’s death.” That there has been “an endeavour to subvert the fundamental laws and government,” “and introduce a tyrannical government against law,” which “is treason,” for “an intention to alter laws or government is treason.” “*That it is treason to counterfeit the Great Seal.*”<sup>343</sup>

He also gives elucidation on the “King bemoaning” the situation, and before his death still seeking “hopes of peace,” saying that the English Puritan Revolutionaries had hoped to secure such peace, not through negotiations with Charles, but through killing Charles. “But to reconcile the differences” proved unsuccessful, for “Cain’s sins” (i.e., the Puritan Revolutionaries are murderers, Gen. 4:8-15; I John 3:12), being greater than could be forgiven him, ... after” the killing of Charles “was done, [they] could find none ... to purchase a peace for the people ... . For the truth was the *Independent* party [i.e., the Congregationalists in the legislature] desired no peace at all, and the *Presbyterian* [i.e., Presbyterians in the legislature] desired it only to get into their hands the King’s power and authority<sup>344</sup>.”

Philipps thus gives a 1649 definition of “tyranny” as a “war” “compassing the king’s death,” and “an endeavour to subvert the fundamental laws and government,” i.e., for the parliament to rule without the king, and repeatedly refuse offers by Charles for some kind of “hopes of peace.” The examples he uses includes war on the king; war on the people by a large amount of “times spent in settling and subduing the people;” and desecrating Anglican Churches, destroying Anglican Churches, or turning Anglican Churches into some other use e.g., horse stables. Writing in the same year as the King’s martyrdom, he says that the claim that killing the king would bring “peace” has proven illusive, and that the “Independent [Congregationalist]” and “Presbyterian” parties in Cromwell’s legislature had not obtained such “peace” by the king’s death, but simply justified the king’s killing as a pretext to further their own political ambitions. The “treason” and “tyrannical government” of Cromwell’s republican Commonwealth is said to be symbolized and summarized in the fact that in order to palm itself off as a true government, the republican regime had *counterfeited the Great Seal*. (This is a clear usurpation of power and violation of the Scripture, “Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers,” Rom. 13:1.)

In elucidation of this point it should also be noted that the English Puritan controlled House of Commons was acting most unconstitutionally and therefore most illegally, by purportedly abolishing first the power of the king (1641) and then the House of Lords (1649). Thus in John Echlin’s *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* sermon at

---

<sup>343</sup> Philipps, F., *Veritas Inconcussa, A most certain Truth asserted, that King Charles the First, was no man of blood, but a martyr for his people*, Printed by Richard Hodgkinson, London, 1649, reprinted by Thomas Newcomb, London, 1660, pp. 21,22,39,43-44,71-2,160-1,209,210,218-9,232-3 (sometimes modernizing spellings). (Copy held at Sydney University Library.)

<sup>344</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 160-2.

Christchurch Anglican Cathedral, Dublin, *supra*, we hear that “as a preparatory step to the execrable tragedy of this Day [30 Jan.], on the 4th of January ... they came to the following resolutions: *Resolved*: ... That whatever is enacted or declared for law by the Commons in Parliament are concluded thereby, tho’ [though] the consent of the King and Peers [in the House of Lords] be not had thereunto<sup>345</sup>.” Hence King Charles declared, “how the House of Commons can erect a court of Judicature which was never one itself, ... I leave to God and the world to judge. And it were full strange, that they should pretend to make laws without King or Lords’ House ...<sup>346</sup>.” Given such unconstitutional governing, understandably after the beheading of Charles the realm is said by Philipps to still be in turmoil with a lack of promised “peace” that the Puritans said would come following the king’s martyrdom.

Thus when we read in the *Office of King Charles the Martyr* in the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)*, that Cromwell’s republic was a “tyranny,” of “cruel men,” who were “cruel enemies” of the King and “true religion,” then this 1649 account by Philipps which uses some similar terminology helps us better understand some of the immediate issues that were seen as leading to the martyrdom of King Charles the First.

After Cromwell’s republican forces had captured King Charles, and held him fast bound in prison, Cromwell started to boast that he would “cut his head off with the crown on it<sup>347</sup>.” Did e’er our Lord or St. Paul or St. Peter say this of pagan kings that did not so much as even profess to be Christians? Did not our Lord say, “Render ... unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s” (Matt. 22:21); and quoting the *Ten Commandments*, “Thou shalt do no murder” (Matt. 19:18; Exod. 20:13)? Did not St. Paul say, “Render therefore to all their dues;” “honour to whom honour” is due (Rom. 13:7); and quoting the *Ten Commandments*, “Thou shalt not kill” (Rom. 13:9; Exod. 20:13)? Did not St. Peter say, “Fear God. Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17); and in harmony with the *Ten Commandments* say, “let none of you suffer as a murderer” (I Peter 4:15)? *To kill a king is no small thing*.

As Sir Winston Churchill observed, “No English jurist could be found” who could or would “frame the indictment” against the King. So Cromwell turned to a foreigner, a “Dutch lawyer, Dorislaus, who had long lived in England.” The Dutchman lacked the British sentiment of loyalty to the King, and so proved to be a useful pawn in Cromwell’s hands. “Cromwell,” Churchill further says, “had found great difficulty in holding together enough of his signatories” prepared to sign the King’s “death warrant.”

---

<sup>345</sup> “The Royal Martyr,” A Sermon preached before Their Excellencies the Lord Justices of Ireland in Christchurch Dublin, on the 30th of January, 1713, by John Echlin, Master of Arts, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

<sup>346</sup> Quoted in Flint, D., “King Charles I,” A sermon preached on Sunday 30 January 2000 at All Saints’, Wickham Terrace, Brisbane, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

<sup>347</sup> Shamas, S., *A History of Britain, The British Wars 1603-1776*, BBC Worldwide, London, UK, 2000, p. 169.

“Fairfax, no mean person, still Commander-in-Chief, was outraged<sup>348</sup>.” But the brutal Cromwell would not relent. *Cromwell signed the king’s death-warrant*, even though he found it hard to find others willing to put their name to the dirty deed and counter-sign it. Now for those involved in such a deed of seditious murder of a king, His Divine Majesty, the Lord Jehovah, also a king, in Divine Law prescribes this penalty, “damnation” (Rom. 13:2) as “murderers” “in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone” (Rev. 21:8).

On 30 January 1649, the son and successor of King James I, after whom the King James Bible of 1611 is named, to wit, the Stuart king, Charles I, King of Great Britain and Ireland, Supreme Governor of the *Church of England* and *Church of Ireland*, Defender of the Faith, prepared himself to be martyred by virulently anti-Anglican Puritans. It was a cold winter’s day, and the scene of His Majesty King Charles’ martyrdom was set against the silhouette of a bleak and dark execution block and axe, elevated at the Banqueting House at Whitehall in London, for the spectacle of a public execution. In witness of his Christian faith, Charles first took Communion at St. James’ Palace. When Blessed Charles was led to the place of his public execution on 30 January, as recorded in the *Moderate Intelligencer* journal of 8 February, 1649, he “died a good Christian,” who “had forgiven all the world, yea, those who chiefly caused his death. He wished their repentance, ... and ... said he was a martyr.” When the cold, calculating, sharp blade whirred through the chilled air and fell on the king’s neck, and his head then fell down into a basket of blood, the historians record that a great cry spontaneously went up from the people, now known as the “groan by the thousands” *OOOOOOHHHHHHH!!!!* For *to kill a king, is no small thing*.

**... HERE THE GOOD CHRISTIAN READER MAY FIND IT NECESSARY TO PAUSE ... IN ORDER TO WEEP OVER THE KILLING OF KING CHARLES ...**

In his book, *Veritas Inconcussa, A most certain Truth asserted, that King Charles the First, was ... a martyr* (1649), Fabian Philippus, said, “The blood of old England is let out by” this “great” “witchcraft” (i.e., “For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft,” I Sam. 15:23). “The king, laws, religion, and liberties of the people murdered, an action so horrid, and a sin so great a magnitude,” that “from the one end of the earth to other, there will not be found any wickedness like to this great wickedness, or hath been heard like it.” It cannot be removed, “though all the rain which the clouds shall bring forth, and impart to this nation, and the tears of those that bewail the loss of a King of so eminent graces and perfection shall be added to it<sup>349</sup>.” Though Philippus’ idea that the guilt of it cannot be removed by e.g., men’s tears is correct; it can of course be removed by genuine repentance through the blood of Jesus Christ our Lord (I John 1:7,9).

The holy Apostle Paul says, “the works of the flesh” include “seditions” (Gal. 5:20) and “murders” (Gal. 5:21); and “that they which do such things shall not inherit the

---

<sup>348</sup> Churchill, W., *A History of the English-Speaking Peoples, op. cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 222-3.

<sup>349</sup> Philippus, F., *Veritas Inconcussa, op. cit.*, pp. 235-7.

kingdom of God” (Gal. 5:19-21). Fabian Philipps’ 1649 book, refers to King Charles’ “martyrdom,” and says how “Satan hath cunning[ly] lodged and imprisoned ... deluded souls, making them believe that they are in the church way to heaven, when as without timely repentance they are going down to the place of everlasting burnings ... for [they are] wickedly ... a seditious party ...<sup>350</sup>.” Thus when we read in the *Office of King Charles the Martyr* in the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), that Cromwell and others who “martyred” “King Charles the First,” were “sons of Belial” (i.e., “the sons of Belial” are “they” who “knew not the Lord,” I Sam. 2:12), then this 1649 account by Philipps which uses the same idea, helps us better understand some of the issues.

In referring to his death, Philipps further says, Charles “rejoiced in the comfort of imitating Christ’s example in suffering for righteousness’ sake, and thanked God he could pray for them” who were about to kill him. Charles prayed “that God would not impute his blood to them, further than to convince them what need they had of Christ’s blood to wash their souls from the guilt of shedding his<sup>351</sup>.” In his First Epistle to the Thessalonians, St. Paul refers to the Christians there who for “the word of God,” “suffered” “things of your own countrymen” (I Thess. 2:13,14), and the Greek word used here for “suffered,” is *pascho*, which is also used of Christ’s sufferings (Luke 24:26; Acts 17:3; Heb. 2:18). The Office for *King Charles the Martyr* in the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), refers to the fact that this “martyred Sovereign” “was enabled so cheerfully to follow the steps of his blessed Master and Saviour, in a constant meek suffering of all barbarous indignities,” that “at last resisting unto blood,” he “even then,” followed “according to the same pattern, praying for his murderers” (Luke 23:34). The fact that in his death, this saintly king prayed for his murderers to be forgiven is surely one of the most extraordinary acts of Christian virtue ever shown by a martyr, emulating in this our Lord’s prayer to forgive his killers. Thus did Blessed Charles show Christian virtue and steadfast faith in God even to his very death.

*The second feast was that of the restoration of the monarchy, under King Charles I’s son, King Charles II.* It is also called, “Royal Oak Day” (or “Oak Apple Day”), because of its focus on the Restoration in 1660, and God’s associated protection of Charles II when he hid in the oak tree at Boscobel, England, from Cromwell’s Roundhead following the Battle of Worcester in 1651. When I was a boy in 1960s and 1970s Australia, “Bonfire Night” was still annually celebrated (although it no longer generally is<sup>352</sup>). Indeed, I remember when I lived at Watsonia (Melbourne, Victoria), I

---

<sup>350</sup> *Ibid.*, Dedicatory to Charles II.

<sup>351</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 167.

<sup>352</sup> Due to bushfire problems in Australia, in those parts of south-eastern Australia that I grew up in during the 1960s and 1970s, it was moved back from 5 November to the Monday long-weekend of Queen’s birthday, thus still being a day of loyalty to the Crown. (However, a man who as a boy moved from Queensland to NSW in the 1960s, told me that he remembers being surprised that Bonfire Day was kept in June in NSW, because in Queensland it was kept in November.) But the usage of fireworks was always explained through reference to Guy Fawkes foiled plot to blow up

looked at one particularly large bonfire being built up over some days as I walked to and from school at Watsonia Heights State School in 1969 or 1970. It was the general shape of Ayers Rock. *We children were told that the reason for the fireworks was that Guy Fawkes had tried to blow up the Parliament with gunpowder, and being stopped from doing this, fireworks made from gunpowder were now used to celebrate this.*

In those days one could still buy many fire-works that subsequently were banned in most parts of Australia<sup>353</sup>. One of them was the penny-bunger<sup>354</sup> (and it retained this name even after decimal currency in 1966 introduced dollars and cents). Sometimes a fire-cracker e.g., a penny-bunger would not explode for some reason, but would fizzle something like a sky-rocket. This was called “a fizzer.” A “fizzer” could also be made by breaking open a cracker e.g., a penny-bunger (the largest bungler) or a tom-thumb (the smallest bungler), and holding a match to the broken end. With reference to this phenomena, the term “fizzer” came to be used in those parts of south-east Australia that I grew up in, as a term meaning anything that *failed to live up to its expectations*, i.e., *something unreliable or a failure*. The term also often carried a humorous connotation, i.e., it was regarded as good and / or humorous thing that something had so failed, and was thus “a fizzer.”

We cannot doubt that Cromwell’s republic proved to be a “fizzer.” In 1660 the c. 20 year Puritan Revolution of 1640 to 1660 which had produced the Puritan republic from 1642 stopped short, never to go again. It had taken Laud and Charles I three years of unsuccessful warfare between 1637 and 1640, to realize that the Kingdom of Scotland did want to become Anglican, and that the attempt to Anglicanize them was hopeless. But it had taken Cromwell and the republicans about 20 years from 1640 to 1660 to realize that the Kingdoms of England and Ireland did want to become Puritan, and that the attempt to Puritanize Anglican England was hopeless. As the realization dawned on some of the Puritan republic’s more astute supporters that it was a “fizzer,” lacking the stamina and support needed to survive, they started to look for the exit doors and a way to extricate themselves from involvement with it. One of these was George Monck, who decided to get out of the sinking ship. He was a leading general in Cromwell’s army who had fought with Cromwell to defeat the Caroline forces of Charles II at Dunbar,

---

the British Parliament in 1605. The day’s festivities and general popularity suffered greatly when in the 1980s private fire-works were regrettably banned in most parts of Australia (even though some public fireworks may still be used).

<sup>353</sup> Though theoretically banned for “safety” reasons, I think covert republican sentiments may also have been connected to these decisions since this was a very popular celebration of the monarchy. Rather than ban them outright, they were more sensibly regulated in the Australian Capital Territory, Northern Territory, and Tasmania. So too in New Zealand (where they are only sold to persons over the age of 18, on the three days before 5 Nov., and they must be only used on 5 November).

<sup>354</sup> A “bungler” is an Australian colloquialism for any fire-cracker, probably derived from “banger.”

Scotland, in 1650. In 1660, Monck now moved to create the circumstances necessary for the Restoration; and after the Restoration he was made Duke of Albermarle.

*Celebration of the holy day of the Restoration under Charles II (Royal Oak Day), is the other side of the coin to King Charles I's Day* (even though *Charles I's Day* includes in it a lesser remembrance of the interregnum's tyranny, royal oak, and Restoration). I.e., if one regards the regicide of Charles I as a Christian martyrdom, one necessarily celebrates the restoration of the monarchy under Charles II in 1660. *But this does not mean one thereby necessarily endorses any of Charles II's later actions.* Indeed the name of this as "Restoration Day," "Royal Oak Day," or "Oak Apple Day," all point to the emphasis of the 1660 Restoration. Moreover, the 1662 Office was revised in 1664 and then left i.e., because it was focused on these earlier events it did not need to be changed with regard to any later events under Charles II. It is abbreviated on the 1662 Calendar as "Nat. & R" i.e., "Nativity and Restoration" because 29 May was both the day of the Restoration and also the day of Charles II's birth.

Charles II was a king, and like any fallible, fallen human being who is a king, he may be criticized for his actions, if and when, appropriate. The emphasis of *Charles II's Day* or *Royal Oak Day* is thus very much on the associated events of the Restoration of 1660, rather than a more general reference to the reign of Charles II. As with Charles I, *supra*, once again, Charles II is not regarded by royalists as beyond criticism. E.g., Charles II showed a lack of sexual restraint, as required by the standards of sexual purity set forth in Holy Writ, for instance, he married a foreign Roman Catholic wife, and also fathered some illegitimate children.

*The removal of religious liberty to Puritans from 1662 to 1689* is an important issue of Charles II's reign. But the Act of Uniformity and *Lesser Ejection* of the 1660s (especially 1662) should also be remembered in the context of the preceding Puritan republic's Ordinances of 1645 requiring Puritan forms of worship and making the Anglican prayer book "illegal." This Elizabethan and Jacobean Prayer Book of 1559 & 1604 is regarded by Anglicans as a celebration of the triumph of Protestantism, since it came in after the reign of the Popish Queen, Bloody Mary.

Indeed, this element is crucial to understanding why the Caroline Prayer Book of 1662 required the printing in the front of it of "An Act for the Uniformity of Common Prayer", "Primo Elizabethae." This statute of 1559 is still printed at the front of *Church of England* 1662 prayer books (and was also printed at the front of the *Church of Ireland* 1666-1800 prayer book). Among other things it says, "Where at the death of our late Sovereign Lord King Edward the Sixth, there remained one uniform Order of Common Service and Prayer ... in the Church of England, ... the which was repealed, and taken away ... in the first year of the reign of ... Queen Mary [the First], to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ's religion: be it therefore enacted ... that the said ... repeal ... shall be void and of none effect, ... and that the said Book with the Order of Service, ... with ... alterations and additions therein ... shall stand and be, from and after the ... Feast of the Nativity of St. John Baptist ... ." This reference to "the professors of the truth of Christ's religion" is a broad

reference to the Marian Confessors and Marian martyrs, and clearly endorses Protestantism over Popery. Thus the Marian Confessors and Martyrs are remembered in the 1662 prayer book at this point, as is the reintroduction of Protestantism under Elizabeth I. Hence from the Reformed Anglican perspective, the making “illegal” of the 1559 & 1606 prayer book in 1645, *was an attack on a symbol of Protestantism* i.e., Anglican Protestantism, as opposed to Puritan Protestantism, even as the 1662 prayer book which endorsed this 1559 Act was a corresponding endorsement of Anglican *Protestantism*.

In this context, it should also be noted that when remembered in a broad way, the Marian martyrs are by convention remembered with special reference to Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, and Hooper. But of these, the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer is regarded as the most single important Marian martyr. This fact is in more recent times reflected in his presence on the Anglican Calendars of England and Australia (21 March<sup>355</sup>); and before that, in this *Primo Elizabethae* statue found in the 1662 prayer book, since its reference to the reintroduction of the Edwardian prayer book as modified under Elizabeth was known to be the reintroduction of Cranmer’s *Protestant* prayer book.

The *Greater Ejection* from 1643 saw between 7,000 and 10,000 Anglican clergymen, school teachers, and others ejected by the English Puritan regime. This was between five to ten times more Anglicans being ejected in the *Greater Ejection* than the 800 to 2,000 Puritans later ejected under the *Lesser Ejection* of the 1660s (especially 1662). Puritan propaganda tends to focus on the *Lesser Ejection* of Puritans from Anglican Churches in 1662 without any reference to the *Greater Ejection* of 5 to 10 times this number of Anglicans ejected before this time from 1643<sup>356</sup>. Indeed, in Puritan accounts, the *Lesser Ejection* with special reference to 1662 is often simply referred to as “the Ejection,” giving the impression that there was none other. But for all that, this matter needs to be considered since the *Lesser Ejection* of 1662 has become a major “bone of contention” among English Puritans.

Charles II reigned during the period when the *Act of Uniformity (1662)* removed religious freedoms from Non-Conformist Puritan Protestants, *supra*. E.g., the Rescissory Act (1661) rescinded all proceedings of former parliaments back to 1633. After the Restoration of 1660, Episcopalians and Presbyterians in Scotland united into one church which had a modified form of episcopacy. But this united Episcopal-Presbyterian church was pulled apart by the Episcopal wing which was predominately Jacobite, a fact which forced the Presbyterian wing to understandably withdrew from it in their Williamite support<sup>357</sup>. Thereafter, Reformed Anglicans in England and Ireland worked

---

<sup>355</sup> Transferring in the 1978 Australian and 1980 English Calendars, Benedict’s black letter day from 21 March to 11 July.

<sup>356</sup> Ella, G.M., “Ejection & Rejection,” *English Churchman*, (EC 7766), 8 & 15 May 2009, p. 2.

<sup>357</sup> Before this time, elements of the Presbyterian wing had indicated some level

with the Established Presbyterian *Church of Scotland* as fellow Protestants, being Established from 1690 under William III and Mary II. From 1691 title pages in Acts of the *General Assembly of the Church of Scotland* bore the Latin words, “*nec (not) tamen (yet) consumebatur* (it was being consumed<sup>358</sup>),” meaning, “Yet it was not consumed,” in allusion to the Burning Bush of Exod. 3:2. In time, this became the motto of the *Church of Scotland*. (And later again, this motto would be continued by the *Free Church of Scotland* from 1843.)

Before the *Act of Toleration* in 1689, the innocent Puritan Protestants of England suffered with the guilty, and because of those guilty Puritan Protestants still harbouring sympathies for Cromwell’s republic. After 1689, they were still subject to the Test Acts, but had basic religious toleration. One of those arrested for his Puritan Non-Conformity was the Baptist, John Bunyan; and two of those ejected in 1662 were Matthew Poole and Richard Baxter. In 2003 I inspected the Bunyan sites at Bedford, England, where Bunyan lived and wrote parts of his *Pilgrim’s Progress*, as well as Elstow (birth place), and London (burial site at Bunhill Fields Cemetery). Bunyan was a godly man, whose saintliness cannot be denied. It is certainly both sad and wrong, that such a man was persecuted by Restoration Anglicans for not attending an Anglican Church on Sundays. Paradoxically then, when I have visited St. Mary’s *Church of England (Continuing)* at Reading (just outside of London), I have been reminded of these events since the outside Church noticeboard of this independent Reformed Anglican Church reads at the bottom of it, “This Chapel was built on the site of the old County Gaol [Jail] where it is said that John Bunyan was once imprisoned.”

I have also been to Amsterdam in Holland, and inside the enclosed city square of Bagijnhof I entered through St. Ursula’s Door in 2002, and I there inspected the *English Reformed Church (Presbyterian)* connected with both the *Dutch Reformed Church* and the *Church of Scotland*, founded in 1607. A tablet in this church says that in this church is buried the Bible Commentator, Matthew Poole (1624-1679), who resigned as Rector of St. Michael le Querne, London, upon the passing of the Act of Uniformity in 1662. In 2003 I also inspected St. Mary’s *Church of England*, Kidderminster, where Richard Baxter had to build five galleries to accommodate his congregation. Though inside the church is displayed “Baxter’s Chair,” on which is engraved the words, “Chaplain to King Charles II,” and outside the church is a statue of Baxter; nevertheless, he too was one of those ejected in 1662 because he did not assent to the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)*.

The arrest of men like Bunyan, and the ejection of men like Poole and Baxter, were certainly unhappy events. But I think the ejections from Anglican Churches of

---

of unease about this union. E.g., the Presbyterian wing was especially strong in the south-west of Scotland, and they had indicated that they were *something less than fully satisfied* with the united Episcopal-Presbyterian Church of 1660-1688/9.

<sup>358</sup> Indicative passive imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *consumo* (from which comes our English word, ‘consume,’ although also partly through ‘consumer’ from the Latin language of French).

Poole, Baxter, and others were justified as these men were clearly not Anglicans. But while I support the ejection of non-Anglicans from Anglican pulpits, I do not support the further denial of religious freedom to them on the basis that they were Puritans not Anglicans. I.e., I think they should have been allowed to establish Puritan Churches in the British Isles, and then preach in them.

*It must also be borne in mind that Puritan Protestants were the backbone of Cromwell's republic, that these regicidal men had shown that they were prepared to kill the King in order to achieve their republican goals, and security of the realm was essential.* Under the circumstances, there are two views as to what might be done.

*View 1.* A “cooling off period” of about 25 years was needed, during which these Puritan Non-Conformists were forced to think through the seriousness of their many lies e.g., their excessive criticisms of “Laud’s Arminianism;” and the associated gravity of the offence of murdering an Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud, not that I thereby wish to exonerate Laud from abuses in office that would have rightly led to him being deprived of the Archbishopric of Canterbury; and associated abuses by Laudians that needed to be restrained. But more than this, there were many horrendous killings for “treason” under the Puritan Revolution of 1640-60 of royalists and Anglicans. In particular, the magnitude of the sin in killing a king. Laud may not command the respect or support of traditional Reformed Anglicans; but the King, as Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland, most assuredly does. Though Charles I admittedly appointed a much better Primate of Ireland in James Ussher than his appointment of William Laud as Primate of England, nevertheless the King stands as a Christian martyr, even though Reformed Anglicans do not thereby regard him as prefect or beyond criticism.

The English and Irish Puritans needed to think through their support for the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60, and their actions to achieve their political designs. They needed to repent of their support for Samuel Rutherford and his wicked work, *Lex Rex*, whereby the plain and clear words of Scripture in such passages as Matt. 22:21; Rom. 13:1-9; Gal. 5:20,21; I Peter 2:17 had been set aside, and men had made egregious violations of that sixth precept of the Holy Decalogue which says, “Thou shalt not kill” (Exod. 20:13; Matt. 19:18; Rom. 13:9).

Thus the Act of Uniformity (Kingdom of England i.e., including Wales, 1662; & Kingdom of Ireland, 1666) was defensible, albeit, deeply regrettable. The Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60 had by Ordinances of 1645, made the Elizabethan and Jacobean Prayer Book of 1559 & 1604 “illegal,” replacing it with the Puritan “Directory” of worship. They evidently believed in their own kind of Act of Uniformity. Indeed, the Puritans ejected five to ten times more Anglicans in *The Greater Ejection*, than the Puritans ejected by Anglicans in *The Lesser Ejection* (in the 1660s). Under *The Greater Ejection* (from 1643 onwards), between 7,000 and 10,000 Anglican clergymen, school teachers, and others, were ejected by the Puritan republic; whereas under *The Lesser Ejection* (from 1660 onwards, especially in 1662), 800 to 2,000 Puritans were ejected by Restoration Anglicans. During the interregnum, many of those disagreeing with the

Puritan Revolutionaries had been killed on charges of “treason.” Time was needed to undo the effect of this. (To which the Puritans may reply that Laud had enforced worship in Anglican Churches on them, and so the tit for tat debate goes back and forth.)

The Puritans also needed to think through the foolishness of either persisting in their Puritan lies about Anglicans “adoring” the consecrated elements by kneeling to receive Communion, or refusing to discipline those Puritan liars making these outrageous claims such as Rutherford, and the way this lie led to the production of many more lies about Anglicans, e.g., that they had “altars” not Communion “tables” (although the private view of Laud sometimes referred to the Communion Table as a Lutheran type “altar,” as did the illegal 1640 canons). They needed to pause and reflect, on how ultimately these multiplied lies were indissolubly interconnected with sedition against the Crown, the killing of hundreds of innocent Anglicans on trumped-up charges of “sedition,” including a king, Charles I, and the attempted killing of Charles II. They needed to give careful thought to the way they had allowed the ideas of Samuel Rutherford’s *Lex Rex* and Rutherford’s lies about Anglicans “adoring” the consecrated elements by virtue of the fact they knelt to received Communion, had led them to put aside the very word and commandments of God himself in the Biblical multiple injunctions e.g., “Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake, whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him.” “Fear God. Honour the king” (I Peter 2:13,14,17). “Thou shalt not kill” (Exod. 20:13; Matt. 19:18; Rom. 13:9). “Thou shalt not bear false witness” (Exod. 20:16; Matt. 19:18; Rom. 13:9). “But the ... murderers, and ... all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone” (Rev. 21:8). Cf. Matt. 7:21-23.

*These were very serious matters indeed!* One might wish that one could somehow safely be able to legally discern between good and godly Non-Conformist Puritan Protestants who did not hanker for a return to a Cromwell type republic, and did not harbour a seditious spirit to overthrow the restored king; as opposed to those who did. But at a practical level, this is *arguably* too difficult at a legal level (although I for one do not accept this argument). The Puritan Protestant support for Cromwell’s republic had been overwhelmingly strong. If one takes security of the realm seriously, there was precious little option to the Act of Uniformity in 1662, even though one should also strongly support the passage of the Toleration Act to Non-Conformist Protestants some quarter of a century later in 1689.

Puritan Sabbatarianism produced a notoriously strict Sunday. Basking in the power of the English Revolutionaries of 1640-60, in 1641 John Cotton’s American Puritans had enacted laws in New England making failure to keep the Puritan concept of the Sabbath a crime “to be punished with death<sup>359</sup>.” *Though Puritans might complain about penalties under Laud of one shilling or later under the Act of Uniformity (1662) for not attending Anglican Divine Service on Sunday, these were mild in comparison with the Puritan’s death penalty which required the life of any Lutheran, Anglican, or other*

---

<sup>359</sup> “An Abstract of the Laws of New England, As they are now established,” London, 1641, chapter 8:11; *op. cit.* .

*person in New England, who did not keep the Puritan Sabbath.* Those who disagreed with Puritan Sabbatarian theology in New England, whether because they believed in a more moderate form of Sabbatarianism (e.g., Anglicans), or because they were anti-Sabbatarians (e.g., Lutherans), were not met with the relatively milder penalties of the Act of Uniformity (1662), but rather were made by the Puritans to look into the face of death itself and die as “sabbath-breakers.”

All Puritan Non-Conformists i.e., Presbyterian, Congregationalist, and Baptist Puritans, held objections to the Anglican usage of *the sign of the cross* at baptism, which at times generated some friction. But Presbyterian and Congregationalist Puritans still recognized the Anglican baptism as a valid Christian baptism. By contrast, the fact that Baptist Puritans did not recognize the Anglican baptism wherein a child was baptized “in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,” and signed “with the sign of the cross” on “the child’s forehead,” created some greater background friction<sup>360</sup>.

The unrelenting insistence by Puritan propagandists that Anglicans “adored” the Communion elements that they had received from an “altar,” effectively called the Anglicans “liars.” It treated as false, both the prayer book’s exclusive description of a Communion “table,” and Anglican denials of “adoration,” both of which were followed by Anglicans in general adhering to the publicly declared Anglican doctrine of the prayer book of 1559 & 1604 and 39 Articles; as well as Laud whose private Lutheran consubstantiation views of a corporeal presence of Christ’s body and blood over an “altar” still forbade adoration of the consecrated Communion elements. Although to this it must be admitted that Laud’s distinction of adoring at a corporeal presence is not one

---

<sup>360</sup> Baptists historically divided in the British Isles between General Baptists (Arminians) and Particular Baptists (Reformed). Both groups regarded themselves as coming from Puritanism, so that the General Baptists made the extraordinary claim that part of the “purifying” of Anglican doctrine and worship that they accomplished was the movement from *Reformed* Anglican doctrine to *Arminian* Baptist doctrine. (I say “extraordinary,” because among other things the Protestant Anglican Church in e.g., her 39 Articles, was a specific embrace of Calvinism in movement away from Romanist Arminianism.) The other Puritans (Presbyterians, Congregationalists / Independents, and Particular Baptists) did not agree with this, and many are understandably reluctant to embrace them as “fellow Puritans,” even though it cannot be denied that they arose from the general Puritan movement. After the preaching of Wesley, the General Baptists adopted Wesleyan Arminianism over their previous position of Arminianism Proper, and the two Baptist groups generally, though not always, sought closer ties. Reformed Baptist views on universal salvation for dead infants is open to different theological explanations (the best of a bad lot of interpretations, is the proposition that God only allows elect infants to die in infancy; although in an age of mass abortion murder, this position is more strained than ever). None of the different Reformed Baptist views on this issue find favour with the Reformed in general, who would agree that “Elect infants, dying in infancy, are ... saved ...” (*Westminster Confession* 10:3), not “Infants, dying in infancy, are ... saved ...” (*Baptist Confession* 10:3; modifying Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 10:3). (Rom. 9:7,8,11-13.)

that any decent Protestant could accept. Indeed, this semi-Romanist Laudian nonsense reminds me of the sort of Romanist Proper nonsense the Papists get into when e.g., with respect to the idolatrous *Second Council of Nicea* (787), they claim one can bow down to an image *with the head but not the heart*. But the Puritans had isolated not just semi-Romanist Laudianism, but also Reformed Anglicanism, in their “adoration” “idolatry” claims through reference to the Anglican practice of kneeling to receive Communion.

This clearly generated a good deal of friction against the Puritans by Reformed Anglicans who considered the ninth commandment against lying (Exod. 20:16) was being violated through their claims that Anglicans were breaking the second commandment against idolatry (Exod. 20:4-7). The Anglicans were not only fed up with these false claims, in the wake of the martyrdom of King Charles, and continued Puritan glorification of Cromwell and Puritan figures like Rutherford, they were understandably frightened. Frightened that since the Puritan propagandists kept glorifying seditious and murderous men like Cromwell and Rutherford, that these Puritans were not sincere and genuine seekers after truth, but rather seeking to create a pretext to whip up anti-Anglican sentiment. But why? Could the possibility of another revolution with a regicidal aim against Charles II be reasonably ruled out? Thus these claims by obstinate Puritans of “adoration” together with their continued glorification of Cromwell and Rutherford threw fat onto the fire, and fuelled the flames of Anglican anger, resentment, and fear against all, or at least a substantial number of, the Puritans in England and Ireland.

Significantly, not only the taint of murder (regicide of King Charles I and Puritan glorification of Cromwell) in violation of the sixth commandment (Exod. 20:13); lies about “adoration” of consecrated elements at Anglican “altars” in repeated and unrelenting violation of the ninth commandment (Exod. 20:16); but also in the case of Puritans other than Presbyterians, the odour of incest in violation of the seventh and tenth commandments (Exod. 20:14,17), hung over the heads of Non-Conformists Puritans i.e., Congregationalists and Baptists. The same position found in the *Church of England’s* Parker’s Table (1563), and upheld by Lutheran Protestants<sup>361</sup>, was stated in the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession*, “The man may not marry any of his wife’s kindred

---

<sup>361</sup> In replying to an enquiry made by King Henry VIII, the Lutheran theologians of Germany held, “It is manifest, and cannot be denied, that the law of Lev. 18 prohibits a marriage with a sister-in-law. This is to be considered as a Divine, a Natural, and a Moral Law, against which no other law may be enacted or established . . . . Agreeably to this, also, the decrees of synods, and celebrated opinions of the most holy fathers . . . prohibit such marriages . . . . Wherefore . . . nor will we dispense with, nor permit in our [Lutheran] churches, that such marriages shall be contracted; and this doctrine we can, and as God shall enable us, we will resolutely defend” (Paton, C.I., *Marriage with a Deceased Brother’s Wife*, James Nisbet & Co., London, UK, 1869, pp. 49-50). In a January 1835 letter to the Lutheran Pastor Leonard, Luther forsook his earlier tolerance to such incest, and joined Philip Melancthon and others in recognizing that marriage between a man and his deceased brother’s wife was incestuous (*Luther’s Works*, Vol. 45, p. 8).

nearer in blood than he may of his own; nor the woman of her husband's kindred nearer in blood than of her own" (24:5). I.e., one element of a man and wife being "one" (Gen. 2:24 *et al*), is that in-laws become the same relationships as that of the spouse. Thus e.g., a wife's sister becomes a man's sister-in-law and he can no more marry her than his own sister. The sister-in-law and brother-in-law relationship formed at the marriage creates a brother-sister relationship which under Christian monogamy morality forever rules out any possibility of romance between the two.

Thus e.g., the *Council of Elvira* (near Granada, Spain) in 306 pronounced a five year excommunication upon such persons. The church doctor, St. Basil the Great (d. 379), condemned such unions (Basil's *Epist. Canonica III, Epist. 217, can. 78; Epist. 160*). Or the seventh century missionary, Kilien of Ireland, who went to Germany and worked in the pagan area of Wurtzburg (Warzburg) in Franconia, was killed in 689 for opposing such incest<sup>362</sup>.

Thus Kilien died for the moral principle of doing what is right according to God's law against incest. On the one hand, when the Pope of Rome grants a dispensation for this type of incest, such as he did for the marriage of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon, he dishonors both the law of God and also the moral stand of men like Kilien, and in effect dances on the grave of Kilien of Ireland. But on the other hand, when he who was the King of England from 1508 to 1547, the Lord of Ireland from 1508 to 1541, and the King of Ireland from 1541 to 1547, namely, King Henry VIII, withdrew from the incestuous union he had entered into with his deceased brother's wife, Catherine of Aragon, he honoured both the law of God and also the moral stand of men like Kilien of Ireland.

King Henry's stand on this issue is remembered in e.g., Shakespeare's play, *King Henry VIII*. (This is a fictional work very generally based around historical facts.) Here the king says, "respecting" his "marriage with" his "brother's wife. This respite shook the bosom of my conscience," "methought I stood not in the smile of heaven; *who had commanded nature*" concerning "*my lady's womb*," as "a judgment on me" (Act 2, Scene 4). Thus is remembered that which is sometimes called, "the king's great matter."

But section 24:5 of the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* (24:4) had been specifically modified in the Congregationalist's *Savoy Declaration* (25:4) and *Baptist Confession* (25:4); both of which left certain forms of incest to private interpretation of Lev. 18 *et al*. The practical effect of this was that such Non-Conformists could argue for or against some forms of incest condemned by Anglicans, Lutherans, and Presbyterians e.g., marriage with a deceased brother's wife. But even those that agreed with Anglicans and Presbyterians that this was wrong, gave tolerance to others of their sectarian church who disagreed with them. Henry the Eighth of England and Ireland, had broken with the Church of Rome on this issue, on the basis of Biblical authority (Lev. 18:16; Mark 6:18) not Papal authority (granting a dispensation to allow such incest); and Almighty God had unleashed his power, exercising his reserve right stated in Lev. 20:21, to slay the children

---

<sup>362</sup> Bramley-Moore's *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, pp. 54-6.

of the union between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon. How could Congregationalists and Baptists claim to be loyal Protestants when they were prepared to allow such incest, for which thing Henry VIII broke with Rome on the basis of Biblical authority not Papal authority?<sup>363</sup> Should tolerance be given to those who glorified liars and murderers like Rutherford and Cromwell; and in the case of Congregationalists and Baptists, also condoned incest?

*View 2.* There was guilt on both sides of the Anglican-Puritan conflict. Reformed Anglicans largely disown Laud and Laudians, and would not agree with their innovations, even though they would not be as critical of him overall as the Puritans, who condemned him as much for his Laudianism (e.g., nodding at Jesus' name) as his Anglicanism (e.g., kneeling to receive Communion). By contrast, traditional Reformed Anglicans have historically recognized Charles I as a Christian martyr, albeit an imperfect man, whom they criticize in some particulars. Clearly then, the Anglican side cannot claim to be "squeaky clean." The principle of Scripture is that we should be generous in such matters, (Matt. 18:23-35; Mark 11:26), praying in the words of the *Lord's Prayer*, "And forgive us our sins, for we also forgive everyone that is indebted to us" (Luke 11:4). Rather than being high-minded, Anglicans needed to remember that they had gotten the Restoration not by their military might, not by their power, but by the grace of God bringing down the English and Irish Puritan Revolution. I.e., it was by a miracle that His Divine Majesty, the Lord Jehovah, brought about a bloodless restoration in 1660. They needed to remember that many of the English and Irish Puritans had already been humbled, not by them, but by God, and they now needed to be generous in victory, even as the God who gave them the victory would want them to be, to fellow Christians in Protestantism.

The unfairness of making the innocent suffer with the guilty by the Act of Uniformity 1662 (England; and 1666 in Ireland), is such that the realm should have taken this risk of Non-Conformist Puritan Protestants using their churches and religion as organizational centres to foster a further regicidal attack on King Charles II, and re-establishment of a further Cromwell type republic, and taken measures inside of religious freedom for Puritans, to try and monitor this potential threat. E.g., the Test Acts to keep Puritans out of Parliament would probably be sufficient because Rutherford's *Lex Rex* required that the politicians of the legislature spearhead any revolution against the monarch. Thus they should not have tried to impose the Act of Uniformity on Puritans.

"Blood begets blood," and trying to justify this on a "tit for tat" basis that the Puritans had prohibited Anglican worship from 1645 just leads to even more unnecessary hostility among Protestants. And of course, the Puritan "tit for tat" rejoinder is then that

---

<sup>363</sup> Of course, Congregationalists like Cromwell and his "Rump Parliament" had a revisionist view of history that (like the wider English Puritan Revolution which included English Presbyterians,) used "Puritan" and "Protestant" as synonyms, and these ingrates exhibited great ingratitude to the wonderful work of God in the English Reformation wrought by God in the Protestant *Church of England*.

Laud reactivated a statute fining them a shilling for not attending Anglican Churches on Sunday. And then the Anglican “tit for tat” rejoinder is that Puritan laws in the Americas executed those who “broke” the overly strict Puritan Sabbath, thereby making Laud’s admittedly bad reactivated law look rather minimalist in comparison. And so the debate goes back’n’forth. Most of these Non-Conformist Puritans glorified Cromwell as a “great” man. Therefore, they would be unlikely to accept a prayer book with an Office for King Charles the Martyr describing Cromwell and his fellow republicans as “sons of Belial,” such as one finds in the *Church of England’s* Book of Common Prayer of 1662 and the *Church of Ireland’s* Book of Common Prayer of 1666. Cromwell’s republic had run its course, had run out of steam, and it was an over-reaction to now penalize all Non-Conformist Puritans because of the overwhelming support they had given Cromwell’s civil war forces and subsequent republic.

While Baptist Non-Conformists did not recognize an Anglican baptism, this issue was not of a type and kind as to warrant a denial of religious liberty to them. With respect to the issue of the general sympathy of many Puritans, other than Presbyterian Puritans, to certain forms of incest, it would be possible to force all Non-Conformist Puritan Protestants to accept the laws of the realm against incest, and so at a practical level, restrain their unsavoury and peculiar proclivities and tolerances in these directions.

Personally, I support *View 2*. While I support *The Lesser Ejection* (1660s) which includes the ejection from Anglican Churches of those who did not agree with the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* and *Thirty-Nine Articles* in 1662 (England & Wales) and 1666 (Ireland), I would not support the more general removal of religious freedom from Puritans i.e., beyond the Test Acts (since if they were allowed into Parliament and governments positions with Rutherford type views, they might attempt another seditious revolution against the Crown; but if they were more moderate Puritans, they could occasionally take Anglican Communion to meet these requirements). Though I accept the gravity of the situation Royalist Anglicans found themselves in, I nevertheless consider that this was as an over-reaction to the threat posed by Puritan extremists. I think the Anglicans should have made a clearer distinction in their minds and rhetoric between extremist Puritans (who needed to be dealt with quite severely at times), and the general Puritans (who did not pose such a serious threat, and indeed, were Protestant brethren in Christ). I think *Anglicans should also have remembered that God brought about the Restoration, and that he could protect it from Puritan and Papist alike*.

There was also the issue of Charles I’s promise in 1640 not to be involved with religious matters in Scotland, and associated Charles II’s promise of religious tolerance to Scottish Presbyterians who fought for him, and against Cromwell’s republic, following the martyrdom of Charles I in 1649. Presbyterian Scotland had put a distance between themselves and Charles I, but still recognized him as king, and more vigorously supported his heir and successor according to law, Charles II. On the one hand, the 1660-1688/9 Scottish union of Anglicans and Presbyterians into a united Protestant Scottish Church with a modified episcopacy, clearly put royalist Scottish Presbyterians in a better position than their republican Presbyterian counterparts in e.g., England. But on the other hand, Did these Scottish Puritan Presbyterian Protestants have to wait for the

fuller manifestation of their Puritan religious freedom seen in the very special honour and distinction of making Presbyterianism the established *Church of Scotland* in 1690? Could not these things have been done earlier?

Following his father's martyrdom in 1649, Charles II was proclaimed King by the Scots, and in Scotland he agreed for the Scots to be permitted to be Puritan Presbyterian Protestants. The Scottish Presbyterians required that Charles subscribe to the *National Covenant* or *Second Scotch Confession (1580 & 1640)* and *Solemn League and Covenant (1643/4)*, the latter of which included a commitment to "endeavor the extirpation of" both "Popery" and "Prelacy." "Prelacy" here means Anglican "prelates" or bishops i.e., an episcopal form of church government, in a word, Anglicanism. Thus this was a commitment for Charles II to "endeavor" to convert himself and his realm to Puritanism. But it may be reasonably doubted if Charles II ever took this commitment seriously.

Moreover, being signed in his minority while under the age of 21, Charles II's agreements of 1650 and 1651 require legal qualification, i.e., as discussed, *infra*, they should be read subject to his then dead father's wishes of 1640, *infra*. Charles no more sought to fulfill this Scottish *Solemn League and Covenant* commitment to convert to Puritanism, than he sought to fulfill the French *Treaty of Dover* (1670) commitment to convert to Popery. The evidence is, when Charles II was faced with such outrageously unreasonable demands, requiring as the price of support for his monarchy, that he convert to Popery (French *Treaty of Dover*) or Puritanism (Scottish *Solemn League and Covenant*), that he would sign the relevant document, with no intentions of fulfilling the promise. Does this mean Charles was a duplicitous politician? Or does this mean that he considered he signed such documents "as a necessary political expedient in his battles with parliament," and was thus "under some form of duress," and so was not bound by them? Either way, Charles II was Anglican, and had no real intentions of converting to either Popery or Puritanism. From a purely legal perspective, the words of the common law maxim are relevant; *the king can do no wrong*. And this covenant was declared null and void under the *Church of England 1662 Act of Uniformity*.

After Charles signed the *Solemn League & Covenant* he was then defeated by Cromwell at Dunbar, Scotland, in 1650, and later defeated at Worcester, England, in 1651. *Was this a judgment of God on Charles II for his having signed the Solemn League and Covenant?* I.e., should Charles II have simply gone into hiding awaiting the ending of the interregnum by God's good pleasure?

Cromwell then organized a massive 40 day man-hunt for the king. Cromwell's forces frantically crisscrossed the length and breadth of England to try and capture Charles II. Thus amidst any possible judgment of God upon Charles II for his having signed the *Solemn League & Covenant*, there was also the mercy of God. For under God's protection, Charles II was hid under the Lord's protective wings, at one point, hiding in an oak tree at Boscobel as Roundheads ran underneath the tree unsuccessfully looking for him; an event which gave rise to the memory of "the Royal Oak" e.g., on *Royal Oak Day* (29 May). Thus to the chagrin of Cromwell's republican forces, Charles slipped though Cromwell's death-net and went into interregnum on the Continent, till his

triumphal return in 1660. Thus Charles II claimed the Bible promise, written by another imperfect, but still legitimate monarch, King Solomon, “When the wicked rise, men hide themselves: but when they perish, the righteous increase” (Prov. 28:28).

On the one hand, these Scottish Puritan Presbyterians had been outrageously unreasonable in requiring Charles to sign any anti-Anglican document that he did not really agree with as the price of their support. In doing so, they debased both themselves and the Crown. But on the other hand, Laud had been outrageously unreasonable in advising Charles I to try and Anglicanize Puritan Scotland in 1637-40; although it must be said, that from 1640 Charles I accepted that Scotland was Puritan, and he should not further intervene. Moreover, Charles II did owe something to these simple-minded and somewhat crude Scottish Presbyterians. That is because in the first place, they had continued to recognize Charles I as king at the time of Cromwell’s English and Irish republic; and in the second place, they had supported Charles II following the martyrdom of his father. These Caroline (Charles II) royalists might reasonably have asked for the Charles II to have been prepared to support an Established Presbyterian Church in Scotland, with dissenter tolerance to Anglicans; *but not to make demands for the removal of Anglicanism as the Established Church of England and Ireland*. They had demanded of Charles II more than was reasonable in return for their support, and debased themselves in the process; quite possibly bringing upon themselves the judgment of God in their defeats at Dunbar (1650) and Worcester (1651). Nevertheless, for all that, they had, to their credit, been prepared to fight for Charles II against Cromwell’s republicans.

In the final analysis, these Scottish Presbyterians had not supported the English (and Irish) Puritan revolutionaries in their “seditions” and “murders” against the Crown (Gal. 5:20,21; I Peter 2:17). E.g., they continued to count their Parliament in Charles I’s regnal years till 1649; and contrary to Cromwell’s Ordinances they proclaimed his heir and successor, Charles II king on 5 Feb. 1649, crowned him at Scone on 1 Jan. 1650; and supplied him with troops to fight against Cromwell. Did these type of innocent Caroline (Charles II) Royalist Presbyterian Puritans from Scotland, really have to suffer and wait for that promise not to be met till 1690, because of the guilty Cromwellian Republican Presbyterian Puritans from Scotland? To some extent they did not, since the united Episcopal-Presbyterian church of Scotland that existed from 1660 to 1688/9 with a modified episcopacy, meant that the Presbyterians of Scotland had clearly been put in a much better position than had the English Puritans.

Of these two views with regard to the Act of Uniformity’s provisions against Puritan worship there is a never-ending debate. On the one hand, we cannot deny that men like John Bunyan, Matthew Poole, and Richard Baxter were godly Protestant men; and I for one would expect to see these men in heaven. But on the other hand, we cannot deny that many of those involved in supporting Cromwell’s republic became Deists or other “unbelieving” (Rev. 21:8) persons, although knowledge of this came out more after 1660. Let the good Christian reader consider e.g., the case of Edward Herbt (1583-1648). Herbt (Herbert) is generally considered “*The father of English Deism*.” In *De Veritate* (Latin, “Of truth,” Paris, 1624), he argued that knowledge of God should be based on so called reason not revelation.

In May 1642 he was imprisoned by the legislature for urging that the words, “without cause,” be added to a resolution that Charles had broken his oath by defending himself with military force against the rebel’s legislature; and Herbt thereafter decided to take no further active part in the civil war. This “fearful” man (Rev. 21:8), “cringed in the corner” of his Montgomery Castle, and cowardly refused a summons by King Charles. When the Puritan army later arrived in September 1644, he quickly “hoisted a white flag,” and “waved a yellow feather,” for Herbt “was no hero<sup>364</sup>.” He then returned to London. Covering before the republicans, he pledged his submission to them, and for his treason against the Crown he was granted a pension of £20 (twenty pounds) a week.

Then in 1645 he published *De religione Gentilium* (Latin, “Of the Religion of the Heathens,” London), in which by studying heathen religions he came up with what have become known as the “Five Articles” of English Deists, which it must be said, are more the beliefs of what we would now call a vaguely defined Theist, than a Deist<sup>365</sup>. For try and try as he might, Herbt could never get beyond a common grace recognition of “THE UNKNOWN GOD” (Acts 17:23), whom he recognized as Creator (Rom. 1:20). Why? Because like others of his ilk, they “received to themselves damnation” (Rom. 13:2) for their rebellion against the lawful authority of the Crown.

Notably then, in his 1709 *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* Sermon at St. Margaret’s Westminster, in London, John Pelling says that if “God” is “entreated for the land,” because of “the effusion of” “Christian blood,” remembered “at this time” i.e., on *King Charles I’s Day*, “that he will give a timely check ... to that spirit of atheism, irreligion, and profaneness, which ... infests the Christian Church: in a word, that he will wash away the guilt of this day’s sin, and of all our other transgression, in the blood of his dear Son; which blood we know speaketh better things, than that of Abel” (Heb. 11:4; 12:24)<sup>366</sup>. Similar comments were also made in the 1673 *King Charles the Martyr’s Day*

---

<sup>364</sup> The usage of the terms, “cringed in the corner,” “hoisted a white flag,” and “waved a yellow feather,” are metaphoric only, i.e., the last two simply mean that he surrendered in a cowardly manner.

<sup>365</sup> 1) A belief in a deity; 2) An obligation to reverence the deity; 3) the identification of worshiping the deity with some practical morality; 4) an obligation to repent of sins; 5) belief in a divine recompense in this world and the next. On one level I would regard these as some good deductions in harmony with Rom. 1 & 2; but on the other hand, I would regard these as woefully inadequate relative to the Divine revelation.

<sup>366</sup> *A sermon preached before the House of Commons at St. Margaret’s Westminster, on Monday, January 31, 1708/9 [i.e., 1708 on an Annunciation Day New Year’s Day Calendar of 25 March, or 1709 on a New Year’s Day Calendar of 1 January; with the Day here transferred from the Sunday to Monday because it was being kept as a fast day, and Anglicans do not fast on Sundays which is a Day of rejoicing for the Resurrection of Christ], being the Anniversary Fast of the Martyrdom of King Charles I, by John Pelling, D.D., Rector of St. Ann’s Westminster, Printed by Order of the House of*

Sermon of Canon Benjamin Parry (later Bishop of Ossory), who at Christchurch Cathedral in Dublin, said “atheism and profaneness ... schism and sedition,” had brought about Charles’ martyrdom<sup>367</sup>.

And so too, in his *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* sermon of 1713 preached at Christchurch Cathedral in Dublin, John Echlin refers to one of “the sad effects” of the “execrable deed” of Charles’ martyrdom. This was that some did “approve, applaud,” and continue “to propagate and cherish” the “infernal principles upon which it was accomplished” i.e., Rutherford’s *Lex Rex*, and says this had acted “to open the mouths of atheists ... under the mask of which it was committed” i.e., the mask of pro-Cromwell and pro-Rutherford Puritanism. He further says that the “Church, to which the Queen [Anne, Regnal Years: 1702-1714] has always manifested her affections,” i.e., the Anglican Church, “has been attacked by Deists, Unitarians, schismatics, and libertines,” as an example of “all the old methods to ruin and divide the Church<sup>368</sup>.” Those who think the sin of “unbelieving” (Rev. 21:8) with e.g., atheism (Pss. 14:1; 53:1), are the “new methods” of “a modern” world are surely mistaken; for like Deism or the vaguely defined Theism of e.g., Unitarianism, God may give people over to it as an outward judgment of “damnation” (Rom. 13:2) for their support “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:20,21) against the Crown (I Peter 2:17).

In this context, it is surely notable that in the same year of 1859 that *King Charles I’s Day* was taken off the Anglican Calendar, Darwin published his *Origin of Species*. Darwin’s work is Deist in theology<sup>369</sup>, though it has frequently either given rise to, or

---

Commons through Paul Jodrell, Printed for Jonah Bowyer, at the Rose in Ludgate Street, London, 1709, p. 16. (Electronic copy held in “Eighteenth Century Collections Online” at British Library, London, UK.)

<sup>367</sup> “More than conqueror,” A Sermon preached on the martyrdom of Charles the I, Dublin, pp. 301-1,33,36; cited in: Connolly, S.J., “The Church of Ireland and the Royal Martyr: Regicide and Revolution in Anglican Political Thought c. 1660-c.1745,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 2003, *op. cit.*, p. 489.

<sup>368</sup> “The Royal Martyr,” A Sermon preached before Their Excellencies the Lord Justices of Ireland in Christchurch Dublin, on the 30th of January, 1713, by John Echlin, Master of Arts, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-20,24.

<sup>369</sup> The Deist Darwin saw God as a lawmaker, whose laws then “naturally” created life-forms. Hence he refers to, “the laws impressed on matter by the Creator” (*Origin of Species*, 1859, chapter “Recapitulation & Conclusion”). Darwin’s *creation by law* mechanism was his own theory of natural selection. E.g., he said, “It is scarcely possible to avoid comparing the eye to a telescope ... . Have we any right to assume that the Creator works by intellectual powers like those of man? ... In living bodies, variation will cause the slight alterations, generations will multiply them almost infinitely, and natural selection will pick out with unerring skill each improvement. Let this process go on for millions on millions of years; and during each year on millions of individuals of

acted to assist, the advance of atheism<sup>370</sup>. Did God permit Darwin's *Origen of Species* (1859) with its seeds of Deism, vaguely defined Theism, and atheism, to so to flourish as an *Act of Divine Judgement* because of the removal in the same year of the *Office of King Charles the Martyr* from the 1662 prayer book of the United Church of England and Church of Ireland?

And here I note a similar result followed the American Revolution of 1775 & 1776 about a hundred years later, so that it too was deeply immersed in either Deism or a vaguely defined Theism of the type one finds in the anti-Trinitarian Unitarian Church, or one also finds allowed in Freemasonry. America's "founding fathers" (I put this title in inverted commas for her true founding fathers were Protestant Christians of an earlier

---

many kinds; and may we not believe that a living optical instrument might thus be formed "as superior" to one of glass, "as the works of the Creator are to those of man?" (*Ibid.*, chapter 6, "Difficulties on Theory, emphasis mine). Thus for Darwin, nature constituted "the works of God" (*Ibid.*, chapter 5, "Laws of Variation"). Like a number of Deists or vaguely defined Theists, Darwin considered "God" and "Nature" were near synonyms. Thus he refers to "the works of God" or "the works of the Creator;" and also "the works of Nature" (*Ibid.*, chapter 3).

<sup>370</sup> Darwin's religious belief has been the subject of debate and dispute; and though his theory is much liked by atheists, it seems to me he is best regarded as a Deist. Darwin refers to how his unstable mind went through "extreme fluctuations" of religious belief, in which he says, "I have never been an atheist," but thinks "an agnostic would be the more correct description of my state of mind" (Darwin, F. {Editor}, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, John Murray, London, 1887, Vol. 1, Vol. 1, pp. 304-317). But in Darwin's day "agnostic" was capable of a meaning that has now fallen into disuse. Both Charles Darwin and Alfred Wallace were part of the Huxley-Spencer-Wallace-Darwin-Erasmus (Darwin's brother) circle of friends. The word "agnostic" as used by Darwin's close friend Huxley meant a belief in an unknown / unknowable god. Thus the *Oxford English Dictionary* refers to an 1881 letter by R.H. Hutton. Hutton says the word "agnostic" had been "suggested by Prof. Huxley at a party held previous to the formation of the now defunct Metaphysical Society, ... one evening in 1869, in my hearing. He took it from St. Paul's mention of the altar to 'the Unknown God'" (Acts 17:23). I.e., in this sense "agnostic" did not mean a person questioned the existence of God, rather *they questioned what may be known about him*. The *Oxford Dictionary* shows that both meanings were in use around the time Darwin described himself as an "agnostic." On the one hand, in 1880 Bishop "Fraser in *Manch. Guardn.* 25 Nov.," said "The Agnostic neither denied nor affirmed God. He simply put Him on one side" - this is the meaning of "agnostic" still in use. But on the other hand, in 1871 "R. H. Hutton *Ess.* I. 27" said, "They themselves vehemently dispute the term [atheism] and usually prefer to describe their state of mind as a sort of know-nothingness or Agnosticism, or *belief in an unknown and unknowable God;*" or in 1876 we read in "*Spect.* 11 June" that "Nicknames are given by opponents, but agnostic was the name demanded by Professor Huxley for those who disclaimed atheism, and believed with him in an 'unknown and unknowable God'."

era,) such as Benjamin Franklin (a signatory of the American Declaration of Independence, 1776), Thomas Jefferson (USA President: 1801-1809; a signatory of the American Declaration of Independence, 1776), and George Washington (First USA President: 1789-1797), are known to have been immersed in the writings of such Deists or vaguely defined Theists as e.g., Voltaire (d. 1778); or Descartes (d. 1650), whose religious belief is a matter of dispute but whose writings sought to use “reason” to diminish references to God to the type of proportions one finds in Deism or a vaguely defined Theism.

On the one hand, Robert Johnson of the “World Union of Deists” is not entirely wrong in his claim, “The reliance on reason that Deism demanded enabled those ... of the American Revolution to overcome the Biblical prohibitions against rebellion in political and governmental matters ... found in Romans 13:1-2 ... .” But on the other hand, one needs to qualify his use of this to reject the claims of “many sincere people ... that America was founded on ... Christian principles,” e.g., “US Senator ... John McCain said, ‘The Constitution of the United States established the United States of America as a Christian nation.’” The Deist Johnson replies, “He says this even though the Constitution does not! ... The Declaration of Independence mentions God but ONLY in Deistic terms! ...<sup>371</sup>” Senator John McCain is a Baptist, and so in his kind of Puritan tradition various Puritans glorifying men like Rutherford and Cromwell would consider the American Revolution and its many killings of innocent human beings was permissible sedition against the Crown. Unlike Johnson, I would therefore add to any pre-existent Deism (or vaguely defined Theism) of 1775 & 1776, an expansion of such Deism or vaguely defined Theism as God’s judgement on the sin of rebellion by many American Puritans as they did “receive to themselves damnation” (Rom. 13:2).

Year in and year out, for more than a 100 years, a number of American Puritan Ministers had gone into pulpits and made favourable references to Samuel Rutherford and Oliver Cromwell. Their adoration of Cromwell and Rutherford was the means by which many American Puritans had “sold their soul to the Devil.” For Cromwell and Rutherford were their “golden calf,” even though like Aaron their impurity of worship was a syncretism, so that when they bowed their knee to the Devil whose power stood behind Rutherford’s *Lex Rex* and its manifestation in Cromwell’s seditious and murderous republic, they would do so in the pulpit on a Sunday, having declared it to be “a feast to the Lord” (Exod. 32:5). But in 1775 and 1776 the Devil whom Jesus said in John 8:44 is the spiritual “father” of those who “murder,” declared it was “pay back time,” as he came around to these American Puritan churches “to collect his dues.” Their “daddy” the Devil declared:

“Now, now, hast thou not proclaimed again and again;  
Not on ‘our Cromwell’ is Charles’ murder a stain?  
With Rutherford to hell thou must now go down;

---

<sup>371</sup> Johnson, R.L (of the World Union of Deists), “Deist Roots of America” ([www.deism.com/deistamerica.htm](http://www.deism.com/deistamerica.htm)).

For now I say WE REBEL AGAINST THE CROWN!!!”

And so in 1776 large numbers of the Cromwell glorifying American Puritans joined with Papists from Boston and elsewhere, who in their instance were able to support sedition against the Protestant Crown for similar reasons of a “tyrant,” as taught by such earlier Popish Jesuit writings as those of Suarez, Mariana, and Lessius, *supra*. And such Papistical opposition to the Protestant Crown was of course also seen in the formation of the southern Irish republic in 1922. Thus in 1775 and 1776 anti-Anglican Puritans and anti-Protestant Papists united against the Anglican Protestant Crown to form the secular republic of the United States of America. And we also know that in connection with the American Revolution there was a lot of Deism or vaguely defined Theism around. By God’s common grace they could come to recognize a Creator God, but they couldn’t get past that, even if, like Esau, they sought repentance with tears. Why? Because in the words of Rom. 13:2, they did “receive to themselves DAMNATION.”

Certainly the secularists of the 1770s and 1780s American Revolution were not identical with the English Puritan revolutionaries of the 1640s and 1650s. But their basic idea that through natural law, one can justify a revolution against a so called “tyrant,” was the same basic idea that Rutherford had argued. And so by keeping this idea alive among Puritans glorifying Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford, politicians in what became the United States of America were able to draw on this latent background “tyrant” idea and sentiment among many of the American Puritans for their own purposes in the American War of Independence.

Upon visiting Boston, USA, in March 2009, I walked the long, interesting, and informative, length and breadth of “The Boston ... Trail.” This is a red line on the footpath (or sidewalk), usually in red brick, but sometimes in red paint, which starts at the Massachusetts State Legislature, and then goes though various points of historical interest e.g., The Paul Revere House, or The Old North Church where Revere hung lanterns on the steeple in 1775 as a signal that the rebellion would shortly start against the advancing pro-Protestant Christian State British liberator troops, as he helped incite American enslavers to cast off America’s historic birth-right of liberty in a Christian State under a Protestant monarch who was Defender of the Faith, and instead to fight to enslave America in secular state republicanism. The red line “Boston” Trail” then ends with the naval ship the USS Constitution<sup>372</sup>, and the Bunker Hill Monument to the American Revolution of 1775. One of these places on the red line “Boston” “Trail” was “The Old State House” which is now a Museum, where the 1776 “Declaration of Independence” was first read to Bostonians. Inside it I was interested to see a glass canister containing some of the actual tea from “The Boston Tea Party,” taken from the boots of Major

---

<sup>372</sup> The US Navy tourist guide at this ship said that in 1812 the British fired on the USS Constitution, but when it did not sink the USA lookout on the ship yelled out that it had, “sides made of iron.” As a consequence, this wooden sailing ship came to be nicknamed, “The old ironside.”

Thomas Melvill following “The Tea Party.”

Another place on the red line “Boston” “Trail” was the “Old South Meeting House” where “the Boston Tea Party” began. Significantly this was built in 1729 as a Puritan Meeting House i.e., a Puritan Church. A plaque for tourists outside of it read, “NO TAX on TEA!!” Inside, was an old Puritan Church with a Pulpit and boxed in pews. It is now a museum but seated in the pews was a class of about 30 school students from a primary school, with their teacher out the front talking to them. They were re-enacting some of the events of the Boston Tea Party; and this involved the school students yelling and screaming out approval for burning down the Governor’s House, i.e., the representative of the Crown (King George III, Regnal Years: 1760-1820). Such seditious sentiments are wholly at variance with the Word of God which says, “Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God” (Rom. 13:1); “Honour the King” (I Peter 2:17); and “the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these;” “seditions,” “murders,” “and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (Gal. 5:19-21).

*The symbolism of the Boston Tea Party being in an old Puritan Church speaks for itself. It bespeaks the importance to the American revolutionaries of the ideas of sedition against the Crown and murder found in pro-Cromwell and pro-Rutherford Puritan sentiment in connection with their ongoing anti-Caroline glorification of the English republic of 1642-1660.* The founders of the American secular republic, looking to God’s common grace, could still recognize God, and both live godly lives and frame generally moral laws by God’s common grace. But because they too did “receive to themselves damnation,” many of them found it impossible to recognize the Trinitarian God or be Christians. At that time, some godly Christians, often Anglicans, exited.

For example, when visiting the English Midlands and North Wales in Oct. 2003, I came across a stone plaque in St. Philip’s *Church of England* Cathedral, Birmingham. It refers to the nearby “remains of the Hon. Peter Oliver, ... formerly His Majesty’s Chief Justice of ... Massachusetts Bay in New England. In ... 1776, on a dissolution of government, he left his native country, ... nothing could ... lessen his love & loyalty to his Sovereign.” He died “13<sup>th</sup> of Oct. 1791, in the true faith and hopes of a Christian ... . Aged 78.” Now lest any wrongly think that I be unduly anti-American i.e., rather than simply opposed to sedition against the Crown, I further note that the McGraths from which I descend came to Australia in the mid 19th century, starting with Thomas McGrath, an Irish-American, born in Boston, Massachusetts, USA, in 1830.

Thus in March 2009, “the genes were back in Boston” for the first time in over one and a half centuries. Upon visiting Boston, *supra*, among other things on the red line “Boston” “Trail,” *supra*, I inspected King’s Chapel. Thus church’s graveyard includes the first Governor of the Massachusetts Bay Company, established in 1629 by Royal Charter of Charles I, to wit, John Winthrop (a Puritan), and one of the passengers on the 1620 Mayflower, Mary Winslow nee Chilton. This was an Anglican Church till the American War of Independence (1775). The anti-Anglican Revolutionaries then

gave this Chapel to the anti-Trinitarian Unitarians, who celebrate it as “the first Unitarian Church in the USA.” The stronger type of Protestant Reformed Anglicans who live their lives under God’s directive will, never returned to the USA in any great numbers (other than as visitors), but in their place some trimmed down, relatively weak and anaemic, “Episcopalian” Churches were later set up. They were never “the full quid” or “full dollar,” e.g., they could never quite bring themselves to recite the *Athanasian Creed* (Article 8, 39 Articles), uphold the Establishment Principle (Article 37, 39 Articles), condemn the American Revolution as unlawful rebellion (Homily “Against Rebellion,” Book 2, Homily 21, Articles 35, 39 Articles), or denounce the Pope as the Antichrist (Book 1, Homilies 5 & 10; Book 2, Homilies 2 & 21, Articles 35, 39 Articles). But these USA Episcopalian Churches were nevertheless still a lot better in the past than they became in the post World War II era.

E.g., some years ago now, (from memory the 1980s, but possibly the earlier 1990s,) a Diocese of Sydney Evangelical Anglican clergyman who had spent 12 months in the USA (from memory in an ECUSA Curate vacancy), spoke to me about the main Anglican or “Episcopalian” Church there, ECUSA<sup>373</sup>. I recall he said three things about ECUSA clergyman: 1) None of them knew any New Testament Greek, and in their College training studying any Biblical language was at best an elective; 2) their “theology” never went beyond a “Sunday School” level; and 3) he then added (I’m not sure of his exact words, but they were very close to,) “I won’t say all of them are homosexual (pausing) ..., but (pausing) ..., a lot of them are” (smiling in disapproval)<sup>374</sup>.

As I previously observed in 2006<sup>375</sup>:

---

<sup>373</sup> Episcopalian Church of the United States of America, known as “ECUSA.”

<sup>374</sup> While God does not do so with all idolaters, God sometimes gives people over to homosexuality as a judgement for their idolatry (I Kgs 15:12; II Kgs 23:7; Rom. 1:18-27). Hence the high levels of sodomy in ECUSA would relate to their idolatrous Puseyite practices e.g., adoration of the consecrated Communion bread, or the idolatrous invocation of saints, for instance, in Mariolatry (although sometimes the antecedent idolatry may come from a non-church source; and there may also be more than one form of idolatry being committed.) Even if such persons wish to repent of their homosexuality, they will retain a homosexual orientation unless God lifts his Divine judgment upon them, and so a good Christian counsellor must first isolate the antecedent sin(s) of idolatry, which must also be repented of. In the case of ECUSA, this would mean radical religious change in the Reformed (Evangelical) so called “Low Church” direction, with humble submission to an authoritative Bible. While some individuals may still be given over to this vice due to antecedent idolatry from a non-church source, this would nevertheless radically reduce ECUSA’s sodomy problem.

<sup>375</sup> McGrath, G.B. (myself), *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist* (2006), With a Foreword by the Reverend Sam McKay, Secretary of the Protestant Truth Society (1996-2004). “Appendix on the mark of the beast and meaning of 666 in Revelation 13,” subsection, “Ecumenical Marian Developments with special reference to ARCIC.”

In its present form, the Ecumenical Movement dates from the twentieth century<sup>376</sup>, and seeks to bring churches together in some vague, woolly, religiously liberal way, that thoroughly repudiates the teaching of Christ, that any unity among believers must be on the basis that God will “sanctify them through” his “truth,” in which God’s “word is truth” (John. 17:11,17). The Ecumenical Movement derives in its modern form, from the World Missionary Conference of 1910 held in Edinburgh Scotland. When the apostate Anglican Bishop from the Episcopalian Church of the USA (ECUSA), Bishop Brent, returned from this conference, he condemned the Protestant Reformation as a *sinful schism*. Of men like Bishop Brent, the prophet Isaiah says, “Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!” (Isa. 5:20). Brent proposed that a conference be held in which the Protestant, Eastern Orthodox, and Roman Churches come together under the presidency of the Pope of Rome. ... Bishop Brent’s approach has been further developed, so that ECUSA continues to use the term “sin” for that which God’s Word condones. ECUSA has degenerated even further, e.g., ordaining women priests and homosexuals priests, and more recently woman bishops and a homosexual bishop. These gender-benders and race-breakers love to pervert nature, by putting the woman over the man contrary to the natural order, Gen. 2:22,23; 3:16; I Cor. 11:3,8,9; I Tim. 2:3-3:1; putting the coloured over the white contrary to the natural order, Gen. 9:27; Matt. 8:8-10; 15:22,26-28; and elevating the homosexual whose acts are contrary to the natural order, Gen. 19:5; Rom. 1:26,27; Jude 7<sup>377</sup>. In 1989, a mixed race woman with black African ancestry, Barbara Harris, was made first female bishop of ECUSA, as a suffragan bishop in Massachusetts. In 2002, a mixed race woman with Red Indian ancestry, Carol Gallagher, was made an ECUSA suffragan bishop in South Virginia. In 2003, an openly homosexual man, Gene Robinson, was made

---

(Available on the internet via Yahoo and Google at “Gavin McGrath Books,” or direct at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com> .)

<sup>376</sup> See McPherson, A. (Editor), *op. cit.*, pp. 344-8.

<sup>377</sup> Anti-miscegenationist lust denies racial traits of different groups e.g., higher creative and inventive genius in Caucasians, lower IQs for Negroes, or higher propensity to violence in the Arabs (a Hamite-Semite mixed race). It also attacks a racial family unit as the basic unit of a society; regarding a lone individual as the basic unit, and so feeds into an ideology of “born equal and the same.” Such thinking naturally flows into anti-sexist feminist lusts, which denies male-female traits e.g., making men better suited to leadership and women to domestic duties; and also attacks the notion of a family unit as the basic unit i.e., an ideology of “born equal and the same.” Fundamentally, sexual perversion (homosexuality) is simply one form of sex role perversion (feminism), and so ECUSA’s practices are a philosophically consistent manifestation of French Revolution derived “human rights” ideology. But such thinking is in warfare against both the natural law, and Divine law revealed in Holy Writ.

ECUSA's Diocesan bishop in New Hampshire. The ECUSA Diocese's official internet home-page, says Robinson is the "co-author of three AIDS education curricula for youth and adults," "has been an advocate for anti-racism," and he "now lives with his partner, Mark." Homosexual bishop, "Vicki" Gene Robinson, said at the 2005 "Planned Parenthood's" annual Conference in Washington D.C., "I am so grateful for this experience of being" homosexual. "It's my little window into what it must be like to be a woman," or "to be a person of colour." He then said homosexual sodomites and bloodthirsty abortion advocates should unite together as one. In June 2006, ECUSA elected a woman, Katharine Schori as Presiding Bishop i.e., primate of ECUSA<sup>378</sup> ... .

Now we find that ECUSA has continued this trend still further. In December 2009 it was reported in the *British Church Newspaper* that ECUSA had made Mary Glasspool, a Lesbian sodomite, the Assistant Bishop of Los Angeles in California, USA. *British Church Newspaper* further reported that, "In a statement from Australia, the Anglican Archbishop of Sydney, Peter Jensen, said that confirmation of Glasspool's election, 'will make clear beyond any doubt whatsoever that the [Episcopal Church] leadership has chosen to walk in a way which is contrary to Scripture and will continue to do so'." Archbishop Jensen is to be commended for these anti-sodomite comments which are harmonious with such passages of Scripture as Rom. 1:18-26,28,32<sup>379</sup>.

In June 2009, at St. Vincent's Cathedral<sup>380</sup>, Bedford, Texas, USA, a new North American Church formed from six Anglican bodies in the USA and Canada, including the Reformed Episcopal Church in America (which as a group of Evangelical Anglicans withdrew from ECUSA in 1873 because of its Puseyism)<sup>381</sup>, united to form the *Anglican*

---

<sup>378</sup> "Our Bishop - Diocese of NH - The Episcopal Church" (home-page as at June 2006) ([www.nhepiscopal.org/bishop/bishop.html](http://www.nhepiscopal.org/bishop/bishop.html)); Brown, J. & Francer, W., "Pro-Aborts & Homosexual Bishop ..." *Agape Press* 15 Nov 2005 ([www.headlines.agapepress.org/archive/4/152005d.asp](http://www.headlines.agapepress.org/archive/4/152005d.asp)). See my comments on ECUSA in *English Churchman* 22 Feb & 1 March 2002 (No 7579), p. 2 ("worshipping" should read "worship in"). The (jocular) story goes, that upon entering an ECUSA Church, a man asked, "Are there any white, heterosexual, males left in this church?" ... After a pause, finally at the back of the room, just *one* lone hand went up ... . But this lone man then stood up, and said in a strong American accent, "Yea, but I'm married to a Negress!"

<sup>379</sup> *British Church Newspaper*, No. 175, Friday 18 Dec. 2009, p. 6.

<sup>380</sup> Vincent was a deacon from Saragossa in Spain who was martyred in 304. He has a black letter day in the 1662 prayer book Calendar on 22 January.

<sup>381</sup> The other five were: Anglican Communion Network, Anglican Mission in America, Forward in Faith North America, Anglican Province of America, and the American Anglican Council.

*Church in North America* (ACNA), which is distinct from both ECUSA and the Anglican Church of Canada<sup>382</sup>. ACNA has about 100,000 members. Like a number of other Anglican Churches e.g., the *Church of England in South Africa* or the *Church of England (Continuing)*, ACNA is outside of the Anglican Communion. On the upside it has made a stronger commitment to the Bible and historic Anglicanism than ECUSA, e.g., it upholds the three Creeds, and thus in addition to the *Apostles'* and *Nicene* Creeds, also the *Athanasian Creed*; says the 1662 prayer book is “a standard for Anglican doctrine and discipline;” says they “receive the Thirty-Nine Articles .. in their literal and grammatical sense ... as expressing the fundamental principles of authentic Anglican belief;” and opposes female bishops.

But on the down side, their claim to support the *Athanasian Creed* is subverted by the fact that at their opening they were addressed by an Eastern Orthodox leader, and are working in conjunction with St. Vladimir’s Eastern Orthodox Theological Seminary in New York, USA<sup>383</sup>, whose contemporary Board of Trustees includes Eastern Orthodox bishops from the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America, Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese, [Eastern] Orthodox Church in America, and Serbian Orthodox Church<sup>384</sup>. The *Athanasian Creed* upholds the orthodox teaching of the double procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, saying, “The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son: neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding,” and condemns to hell Trinitarian heretics such as the Eastern Orthodox who deny this, saying, “He therefore that will be saved: must thus think of the Trinity.” This is a most Biblical position (John 14:26; 15:26; Rom. 8:9; 16:17; Gal. 4:6; 5:20,21), and among other things is an elucidation on Article 19 of the 39 Articles which says the Greek Orthodox “Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred<sup>385</sup>.” We thus see that ACNA’s

---

<sup>382</sup> See “Anglican Church in North America,” *Wikipedia* (7 Dec. 2009) ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anglican\\_Church\\_in\\_North\\_America](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anglican_Church_in_North_America)); “Theological Statement,” Anglican Church in North America (<http://www.anglicanchurch-na.org/about/theology.html>).

<sup>383</sup> “Anglican Church in North America,” *Wikipedia* (7 Dec. 2009), *op. cit.*, says, “Metropolitan Jonah, leader of the [Eastern] Orthodox Church in America, addressed the audience,” and “An agreement was announced between Saint Vladimir’s [Eastern Orthodox] Theological Seminary and Nashotah House, an Anglican Seminary, to guide ... relationships ... between the two churches.”

<sup>384</sup> “St. Vladimir’s Orthodox Theological Seminary,” “About our Seminary” (Board of Trustees as at Dec. 2009) ([www.svots.edu/](http://www.svots.edu/)).

<sup>385</sup> The *Athanasian Creed* is a threshing instrument used to separate wheat from chaff (Matt. 3:12). In the first place it recognizes that all those in any heathen religion (e.g., Hinduism or Buddhism) or infidel religion (e.g., Judaism or Mohammedanism) are damned to hell (Mark 16:15,16; Eph. 2:12; Rev. 21:8); and in the second place, that those holding various “heresies” likewise “shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (Gal. 5:20,21) e.g., Arian heretics (e.g., Jehovah’s Witnesses), monophysitist heretics (e.g., Oriental

commitment to the *Athanasian Creed* does not go beyond lip service, as evidenced in their unhealthy and undesirable connections with the Eastern Orthodox Church, greater sympathy towards which is one of the Puseyites goals. *Methinks I smell a Puseyite rat.*

ACNA's inaugural opening was also addressed by Rick Warren. Rick Warren proclaims a "social gospel" with focus on such things as "poverty," "illness," and "illiteracy." While Christ does make certain commands in some of these types of areas (Matt. 25:31-46), this type of thing must be subject to the broad proclamation of the Christian gospel (Matt. 28:18-20), with its emphasis on repentance (Matt. 4:17) from sin (Matt. 19:18,19), turning to Christ in saving faith (Matt. 9:2; Matt. 27:54), with salvation on the basis of his vicarious and substitutional atonement (Matt. 20:28; 26:26,27), evidenced in his bodily resurrection on the third day (Matt. 28:1-10), and mindful that he is returning at his Second Coming (Matt. 24; 26:29). By contrast, Rick Warren's emphasis is on this world, with an unBiblical approach sometime called, a "seeker sensitive" approach, as opposed to a *Biblical* approach<sup>386</sup> (e.g., Matt. 23:1-39; Acts 2:14-40). *Our job is not to change the Gospel, but to proclaim it as we find it in Holy Writ!* By contrast, Rick Warren says, "I stopped reading from the approved Evangelical reading list and began to distance myself from the Evangelical agenda. I discovered new authors" such as "St. Teresa of Avila<sup>387</sup>" (1515-1582), a "mystic" Spanish opposed to the Protestant Reformation. Indeed, in a 2007 address on how to "establish the kingdom of God here on planet earth," "Rick Warren ... indicated ... he can work with those of diverse faith and beliefs such as Muslims, homosexuals and Roman Catholics" as part of his "PEACE" programme<sup>388</sup> (Jer. 6:14; 8:11). Yet he draws some lines, for "Rick Warren assures his followers that 'fundamentalism of all varieties will be one of the big enemies of the 21<sup>st</sup> century'<sup>389</sup>." *Methinks I smell an ecumenical compromised and inter-faith compromised worldly lusts rat.*

---

Orthodox), heretics who deny the *Filioque* (Latin, "and the Son") (e.g., Eastern Orthodox), or various religious liberals (e.g., those who deny the reality of hell or Second Advent). In broad terms this then creates a bi-polar focus on the remaining battle of *Papists verses Protestants* which much of the 39 Articles address. Yet clearly ACNA are inhibiting the *Athanasian Creed* from fulfilling its task as a threshing instrument.

<sup>386</sup> "A critical analysis by Dr. Don Jasmin of the biography of the life of Reverend Rick Warren entitled 'Life with a Purpose' authored by George Mair," in *Faith & Freedom*, Para Hills, South Australia, May 2008, pp. 4,9,10.

<sup>387</sup> "Rick Warren Moves On!" in *Faith & Freedom*, June 2006, p. 7; citing "Apostasy Alert," 3 June 2006.

<sup>388</sup> "Rick Warren and Peace" in *Faith & Freedom*, Dec. 2007, p. 9; citing "Apostasy Alert," 2 Nov. 2007.

<sup>389</sup> "Rick Warren Again" in *Faith & Freedom*, Oct. 2007, p. 6; citing "Apostasy Alert," 2 Sept. 2007.

ACNA also considers the issue of whether or not one has female priests and deacons is a Diocesan matter, and some do have them. This is contrary to clear Biblical teaching (I Cor. 11:3; 14:34-37; I Tim. 2:11-3:12) that patriarchy is based in the creation (Gen. 2:21-25) and the fall (Gen. 3:16), and so transcends any cultural values of the day. ACNA also says, “Concerning the seven Councils of the undivided Church, we affirm the teaching of the first four Councils and the Christological clarifications of the fifth, sixth and seventh Councils, in so far as they are agreeable to the Holy Scriptures.” Usage of the Trinitarian and anti-Pelagian teachings of the first four General Councils is classic Reformed Anglicanism<sup>390</sup>. Some Anglican use has also been made of the fifth and sixth Councils<sup>391</sup>, so that pursuant to Article 21 of the 39 Articles on “General Councils,” one could say, “we affirm ... the Christological clarifications of the fifth [and] sixth Councils, in so far as they are agreeable to the Holy Scriptures.” However, one could *not* refer to “the seven Councils of the undivided Church” since in the first place, the condemnatory “anathema” of the fifth Council (Constantinople II, 553) against those who rejected the unBiblical teaching of an “ever-virgin Mary<sup>392</sup>” (contrary to e.g., Matt. 1:25; 12:46-50); or the unBiblical claim of the sixth Council (Constantinople III, 681) to the status of Divine “inspiration” for general councils as composed by “God-inspired fathers” (Greek *Theopneuston pateron*)<sup>393</sup> (contrary to the teaching that prophets only existed in Bible times e.g., Luke 11:49-51; Eph. 2:20)<sup>394</sup>; meant that these fifth and sixth Councils testify to a divided church, in which they wrongly condemned as heretics some orthodox

---

<sup>390</sup> E.g., in 1558 Reformation Anglicanism defined “heresy” as teaching contrary to: (1) “the words of the canonical Scriptures,” (2) “the first four General Councils, or such others as have only used the words of the Holy Scriptures,” or (3) whatever is “hereafter ... so declared by the Parliament, with the assent of the clergy in convocation” (*Blackstone’s Commentaries*, Vol. 4, p. 48).

<sup>391</sup> Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 91-3,305,335 (John Cosin, Bishop of Durham, England, Letter in 1660, “A Letter to the Countess of Petersborough,” in Cosin’s *Works*, 4:332-336).

<sup>392</sup> Bettenson’s *Documents*, p. 92.

<sup>393</sup> This same Greek word is found in II Tim. 3:16 where we read “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God (Greek *Theopneustos*); in: Tanner, N.P. (Editor), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, Steed & Ward, London, UK and Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., USA, 1990.

<sup>394</sup> Article 21 of the Anglican 39 Articles rightly repudiates this 680 A.D. claim of “inspiration,” saying, “General Councils ... when they be gathered, (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God,) they may err, and sometimes have erred ... in things pertaining unto God ... .” It thus makes “the Word of God” by men “governed with the Spirit” the authority, by which such councils are judged i.e., the *sola Scriptura* (Scripture alone) of the Reformation Motto.

Christians who were clearly outside this Church, while simultaneously they rightly condemned certain Trinitarian heretics<sup>395</sup>. Of course, it is also true that due to lack of enforcement of such teachings before the formation of the “Holy” Roman Empire which on the Continent brought such persecution as to necessitate independence of true Christians from the Roman Church, as found in the Waldenses who date from at least this time, there were some better spiritual figures still able to operate inside the Church of Rome on the Continent till the 8th century; *but this is not the claim ACNA is making.*

As regards the seventh Council or Nicea II (787), whose adoption of idolatry is well known<sup>396</sup>, this was certainly not from a time “of the undivided Church” (ACNA). Rather, this Council itself was part of a deep division within Christendom. *The First Iconoclasm (730-787)* which opposed idolatry was reversed by the *Nicea II Council of 787*. The anti-icon idolatry teachings and practices connected with the Byzantine Emperors of *The First Iconoclasm (730-787)*, Leo III (Regnal Years: 717-741), Constantine V (Regnal Years: 741-775), and Leo IV (Regnal Years: 775-780), are rightly praised in Article 35 of the 39 Articles, Book 2, Homily 2 (Part 2), “Against peril of idolatry<sup>397</sup>.” By contrast, this same Homily (Part 2) refers to how at the Council of “Nicea” II, “the Bishop of Rome’s legates” reversed the earlier Council of “Constantine the Fifth [Regnal Years: 741-775],” which “had decreed that all images should be destroyed,” and “condemned” it as “an heretical Council,” “and a decree was made that images should be set up ... and that honour and worship also should be given unto the said images.” This being described in the wider context of the Homily as “idolatry,” and reference is in this context also made to “the errors of” “that Nicene Council.”

Traditional Reformed Anglicans who use the 1662 prayer book and 39 Articles thus do not look with favour on this seventh council of Nicea II (787), which most assuredly does not come from a time of “the undivided Church.” Notions about “the seven Councils of the undivided Church” (ACNA) are the type of thing the Eastern Orthodox Church claims, which in this context is sometimes called, “The Church of the Seven Councils.” Given that the Puseyites seek closer ties with Eastern Orthodoxy, when ACNA refers to “the seven Councils of the undivided Church,” *methinks I smell both a Puseyite rat and an Eastern Orthodox rat in the formation of ACNA’s “Theological Statement.”*

Working on a relativistic basis that they are a better Anglican Church than ECUSA, which is not saying much given that ECUSA is such a bad Anglican Church,

---

<sup>395</sup> Constantinople III, 681 condemned the Monothelites. Homily 2, Book 2, (Part 2), Article 35 of the 39 Articles says, “Constantine, Bishop of Rome [708-715], assembled a Council of bishops in the West Church, and did condemn ... the heresy of the Monothelites, not without a cause indeed, and very justly.”

<sup>396</sup> Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 93-94.

<sup>397</sup> Relevant elements of this Homily are further discussed in Commentary Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, “\* Determining the representative Byzantine Text.”

some like Archbishop Peter Jensen of Sydney have been running to embrace ACNA<sup>398</sup>. I admit that in some ways it is difficult in an age of great religious apostasy not to want to encourage an alternative Anglican group to ECUSA. But while Peter Jensen has taken some commendable Biblical stands on e.g., libertinism, he has e.g., also embraced the ecumenical compromise, and under the name of “contemporary worship services,” supported the debasement of Reformed Anglican worship away from the standards and usage of the 1662 prayer book and Authorized Version. Indeed, his comments about “dated buildings” which are “museums to a lost form of religion,” even outraged more traditional Puritans who declared, “Dr. Peter Jensen faces two ways<sup>399</sup>.”

I would say that Peter Jensen’s quick support for ACNA has been *too quick*, and we need to be more circumspect and careful in subjecting all things to the Word of God. Given e.g., ACNA’s views on female Ministers, enthusiasm about someone like Rick Warren, “ecumenical” relations with the Eastern Orthodox, and favourable statements about the Nicea II Council (787), I think one should clearly exercise great caution and qualification with respect to them. *Two wrongs do not make a right*, and on the spiritual front e.g., the idea that there are “seven Councils of the undivided Church” necessarily requires the belief that the “Church” was “undivided” at the time of the idolatrous *Nicea II Council* of 787, a teaching which panders to Puseyite attacks on e.g., Article 22 of the 39 Articles, “The Romish doctrine concerning ... worshipping and adoration ... of images ..., and also invocation of Saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.” ACNA’s worldly conformity on an issue like female Ministers is also contrary to Article 36 of the Articles, and the Ordinal which requires before a man be a priest he be a deacon, and e.g., by quoting I Tim. 3:8-13 contextually requires that such a person be an adult male (I Tim. 2:8,11,12; 3:11,12).

Bearing in mind the sad state of Anglicanism in what became the USA ever since the Reformed Anglican “good guys,” or at least most of them, left because of the American Revolution of 1775 and 1776, must be understood inside a still broader picture. On the one hand, some godly Christians, often Anglicans, exited the USA following the American Revolution of 1775 and 1776, for they repudiated sedition against the Crown as unBiblical (Rom. 13:1-7; Gal. 5:19-21; I Peter 2:17); and believed in the Biblical teaching of the Establishment Principle a Christian State with a Protestant Christian king (Ps. 2:10-12; Isa. 49:22,23), not a secular state. The USA Deists and vaguely defined Theists (sometimes connected with Unitarianism and / or Freemasonry), were deemed

---

<sup>398</sup> “North American Anglicans,” Synod News, in *Southern Cross* (Magazine), Publication of the Anglican Diocese of Sydney, Dec. 2009, p. 9. “Anglican Church in North America,” *Wikipedia* (7 Dec. 2009), *op. cit.*, says, “Archbishop Peter Jensen of the Diocese of Sydney ... formally announced support for ANCA.”

<sup>399</sup> “Dr. Peter Jensen faces Two Ways” in *Faith & Freedom*, Oct. 2007, p. 6; commenting on, and citing, “Church leader rues the price of libertarian philosophies,” in *The Australian* (newspaper), Tues. 18 Sept. 2007.

poor substitutes for a Christian king who bore a Christian cross on his crown, and held the Bible and 39 Articles in his hands. Nevertheless, *some godly Christians remained in America, in spite of what had happened and not because of what had happened.* A number of the American revolutionaries were honest enough to admit their Deism or a vaguely defined Theism at the time, and then work with Christians in the area of morals in law and society, a policy that was continued in the USA till the post World War Two era. During this *First Stage* of the secular state, the secularists gave freedom of religious belief, but not freedom from Christian morals, justifying the latter on the basis of “natural law” or “reason” in the legislatures and courts, while simultaneously saying to the masses things like, “Vote for me and I’ll uphold the Bible.” For under Blackstonian jurisprudence, natural law and divine law were deemed to have the same morals. But in the *Second Stage* of the secular state, which commenced in the USA in earnest with *Brown’s case* in 1954, this nexus was broken, and moral reprobates assumed control of the legislature, judicature, and other areas. But whereas the American Revolutionaries were known to be Deists or vaguely defined Theists who set up an openly secular state; by contrast, those of this ilk involved in Cromwell’s republic more commonly concealed any Deistic beliefs they held, till it all came out in the wash after the Restoration of 1660.

On the one hand, the 1662 (England) and 1666 (Ireland) Acts of Uniformity can be seen as a judgement upon English and Irish Puritans for having supported Cromwell’s republic, and either peddling the pack of lies spun by men like Rutherford that Anglicans idolatrously “adored” the Communion bread at “altars,” or a judgment for failing to discipline men like Rutherford, who indeed was also held in high regard by many Puritans. The 1662 and 1666 Acts may thus also be seen as a judgement against sedition and murder as taught by Rutherford and Cromwell. These Acts declaration that the Scottish *Solemn League and Covenant* was null and void certainly made it clear that Charles II was not under any legal obligation to this covenant with respect to the *Church of England* or *Church of Ireland*, it being in e.g., the 1662 Act “an unlawful Oath ... of this Kingdom” of England (i.e., England and its Dominion of Wales, where the *Church of England* was Established).

This statement of this 1662 Act that “the Oath, commonly called ‘The Solemn League and Covenant,’ to endeavour ... change, or alteration of government in Church or State; ... was in itself an unlawful Oath ... of this Kingdom’,” ended for all time the absurd Scottish Puritan claim that one should “endeavor the extirpation of” “Prelacy” i.e., Anglican “prelates” / bishops / episcopal church government, in short, Anglicanism. Quite apart from the issue of Charles II during his minority nullifying his vow (Num. 30:4,5); the statement of this 1662 Act, that there is “no obligation upon ... any other person,” takes the view that any such commitment *by anyone* was an unlawful vow, and so not binding (Num. 30:4,5,8,12,13; I Sam. 25:21,22,32-34; Ps. 24:4; Matt. 14:7-10; Acts 23:12-14).

Thus on the one hand, the Crown was under no moral or legal obligation to honour this document in England or Ireland. But on the other hand, Charles I had agreed to leave religious matters to the Presbyterian Scots, and so arguably some element of this non-binding promise of Charles II to the Scots should be met in goodwill to the Scottish

Presbyterians as fellow Protestants, *in Scotland but nowhere else*, given their loyalty to the Crown in the 1640s and 1650s and associated support for the Restoration in 1660. The issue of the Kingdom of Scotland was different to the other two Kingdoms, because while this “Solemn League and Covenant” had never gained any broad general support in the Kingdoms of England and Ireland, it had gained such a broad general support in the Kingdom of Scotland. Between 1660 and 1689, Scottish Episcopalians and Presbyterians merged into a modified form of Episcopal church government. But in 1688/9, the Episcopal wing of the Scottish union supported the Jacobites, whereas the Presbyterian wing of the union supported the Williamites. Reformed Anglicans from England and Ireland were in no doubt as to where their first loyalty lay. They would back their Presbyterian Protestant Royalist brethren against their fellow Anglicans in Scotland.

From 1689 the general thrust of this Puritan document was thus allowed in Scotland, at which time the Presbyterian Church became the Established *Church of Scotland*. This saw a clear Protestant alliance between Reformed Anglicans of England and Ireland, and Presbyterians of Scotland who united in opposition to sedition against the Crown. This Protestant alliance opposed sedition against the Crown, whether that of the English or Irish Puritans in the 1640s and 1650s (against whom Test Acts would continue to operate in England and Ireland after 1689<sup>400</sup>), or that of the Jacobites from 1688/9 (against whom the Presbyterian Church was Established against Scottish Anglicans from 1690). In this context, it is also notable that with some justification (although the mater requires qualification,) Scottish Presbyterians trace the history of this 1690 development through reference to Charles II and the “Solemn League and Covenant<sup>401</sup>.”

The fundamentals of the faith include not just spiritual religious teachings such as those found in the *Apostles’ Creed*, but also broad moral teachings in the *Ten Commandments*, and the English (and Irish) Puritans who had supported Cromwell were in serious breach of the third, sixth, and ninth commandments. For they set aside oaths of allegiance to the king (3rd & 9th commandments), perpetrated Rutherford’s lies about Anglicans kneeling to receive Communion being intrinsic idolatry (9th commandment), and engaged in murder (6th commandment). Thus the Act of Uniformity was arguably a

---

<sup>400</sup> After 1689, more moderate Puritans in England and Ireland were known to occasionally take Communion in an Anglican Church in order to meet the requirements of the Sacramental Test Act, and thus hold government positions. By contrast, no Papists would ever take Anglican Communion because it was Protestant. Hence at the time of their repeal in the 19th century, in practice the Test Acts were more an anti-Papist than anti-Puritan device, although they still militated against the extremist Puritans which like Rutherford, claimed that kneeling to take Communion was “intrinsic idolatry.”

<sup>401</sup> *Westminster Confession of Faith*, With a Foreword by Alexander McPherson, Free Presbyterian Publications, Bell & Bain Ltd., Glasgow, Scotland, UK, pp. 355-368 on the “Solemn League and Covenant” and “King Charles II.”

judgment of God on such Puritans, and an answer to the prayers of God's saints for the restoration of the monarchy (cf. Exod. 2:23-25; 9-11; Rev. 6:9-11; 8:3,4; 9:13). But on the other hand, God gives men religious freedom to worship him according to the dictates of their consciences in harmony with Holy Scripture (Acts 5:29); and in broad terms the Non-Conformist Puritan Protestants accepted the fundamentals of the faith (in theory they believed in the Ten Commandments), other than some of them on incest (7th and 10th commandments), which they could nevertheless be compelled to keep by the laws of the realm, as indeed they were after 1689.

In saying this, some might think that I therefore speak in an anti-Anglican and pro-Puritan way. If so, I would remind such people that I hereby simultaneously condemn the (mainly English) Puritan Revolutionaries. For they likewise denied religious freedom to Anglicans. E.g., they made the Elizabethan and Jacobean Anglican prayer book "illegal" in 1645. Then in 1649 they accepted the Presbyterian's *Solemn League and Covenant* (1643 & 1644) seeking "the extirpation of Popery" and "Prelacy" ("prelacy" meaning Anglicanism), "in the kingdoms of Scotland, England [i.e., England & Wales], and Ireland<sup>402</sup>." Hence in 1649, Cromwell's Republic promulgated an ordinance saying, "It is intended that the Christian religion be held forth and recommend as the public profession in this nation. ... Nevertheless it is not intended to be hereby provided that this liberty shall necessary extend to Popery or Prelacy." Then in 1657 another ordinance which e.g., abolished all Anglican holy days (other than the Puritan form of the Sabbath), said, "the true Protestant Christian religion ... be held forth and asserted for the public profession of these nations." But "this liberty *be not extended to Popery or Prelacy*<sup>403</sup>." Here was a statement that not only was "Prelacy" or Anglicanism a proscribed religion, but a good example of how Puritans used the terminology of "Protestant Christian religion" to exclude Anglicans, and thus claim that Puritanism was the only "true" form of the "Protestant Christian religion." I necessarily also condemn this religious intolerance of Anglicanism under Puritanism.

*While recognizing such complexities and contradictions, I nevertheless maintain that while Anglicans of the Restoration were quite right in the Lesser Ejection to eject from Anglican Churches those who were clearly not Anglican, nevertheless, the concomitant denial of religious liberty to all Puritans was an over-reaction, and was both morally and spiritually wrong. Their justifiable concern with men like Cromwell and Rutherford, and the fact that they had been denied their own religious freedoms under the Puritan Revolutionaries needed to recognize that two wrongs do not make a right. Their concerns needed to be dampened by the recognition that there were many good and godly Puritans, such as John Bunyan, and it was wrong to deny religious freedom to Protestant*

---

<sup>402</sup> *Westminster Confession of Faith*, With a Foreword by Alexander McPherson, Free Presbyterian Publications, Bell & Bain Ltd., Glasgow, Scotland, UK (ISBN 0 902506 35 8). This *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland* edition is somewhat misleading named as it is in fact a very useful source book containing a number of important Presbyterian documents well beyond the Westminster Confession.

<sup>403</sup> Bettenson's *Documents*, pp. 289-292.

*brethren in Christ who clearly accepted the broad teachings of the Protestant Reformation on grace alone, faith alone, and Scripture alone. I think they also needed to show greater gratitude, appreciation, and recognition than they did for the fact, that a number of Puritans realized that they had made a mistake in supporting Cromwell, and such Puritans had sought to make amends by helping facilitate the Restoration, which had not been accomplished by a military victory on the part of Royalists. They also needed to recognize that God had brought about a bloodless Restoration, and this same God was able to safeguard them against any future Puritan Revolution (not that I think this means one should not take reasonable precautions such as the Test Acts). But I am but a poor, frail, and fallible man, who may in some way be wrong on some of these matters, and so in the final analysis, we must all leave the final judging of all those involved in this era of denying religious liberty to Puritan Protestants between 1660-1689 to the hands of an infinitely wise, good, and just God.*

*Church building and the Great Fire of London* also occurred under Charles II. The era of Charles II is also remembered as the great church building time of Christopher Wren, following the Great Fire of London in 1666. Charles II declared 10 Oct. 1666 an official day of fasting to commemorate the Great Fire of London. Thereafter annual services were held at St. Paul's Cathedral in London every 2 September, asking God to deliver Londoners from another fire like the Great Fire of London in 1666. Many had formed the view that God had sent this fire as a judgment for the sin of gluttony (Prov. 23:21; Matt. 24:38,39, cf. 24:49; Philp. 3:19). The fire started at Pudding Lane (near London Bridge, where Christopher Wren's "the Monument" to the 1666 Great Fire now stands), and its terminus is remembered by the monument of the "Golden Boy of Pye Corner" statue at Giltspur Street, London<sup>404</sup> (between the nearby church of Holy Sepulchre, where the Marian martyr John Rogers was minister, and the place where Rogers was martyred in 1555 at Smithfield). This latter monument says, the "boy of Pye Corner" statue, "was erected to commemorate the staying of the great fire which beginning at Pudding Lane, was ascribed to the sin of gluttony when not attributed to the Papists."

On a number of occasions I have inspected these sites in London which still stand as memorials to this event. E.g., after a closure of 18 months, Wren's *The Monument*, which is very close to London Bridge, reopened in mid February 2009, and shortly thereafter I walked to the top of it, among other things getting a very good view of Tower Bridge over the Thames. Upon exiting I was handed a document "to certify that" I had "climbed the 311 steps of the Monument the tallest free standing stone column in the world!" On one outside face of *The Monument* a Latin inscription (with a lower English translation plaque) reads, "Charles the Second, son of Charles the Martyr, King ..., commiserating the deplorable state of things whilst the ruins were smoking, provided for the comfort of his citizens and the ornament of this city; [in that he] remitted their taxes and referred ... petitions ... to the Parliament who immediately passed an Act that ... the

---

<sup>404</sup> Like so many statues (and paintings) erected in the name of "art," this one is of a nude figure. I accordingly regard it as a *statue of perversity* which I think immoral. Better by far is Wren's "Monument."

Cathedral of St. Paul's should be rebuilt ... [and] he [Charles II] also established an annual service of intercession [i.e., the Great Fire of London Cathedral Service] and caused this column to be erected ... ." On another face a Latin inscription (with a lower English translation plaque) reads (with my emphasis), "In the year of Christ, 1666, on the 2nd of September, at a distance eastward from this place of 202 feet [or c. 61 metres], which is the height of this column, a fire broke out in the dead of night ... merciless to the wealth and estates of the citizens, it was harmless to their lives [i.e., none were killed], *so as throughout to remind us of the final destruction of the world by fire.* The havoc was swift. A little space of time saw the same city most prosperous and [then] no longer in being. On the third day, when it had now altogether vanquished all human counsel and resource, *at the bidding*, as we may well believe *of heaven*, the fatal fire stayed its course and everywhere died out. *But Popish frenzy, which wrought such horrors, is not yet quenched.*"

The last sentence was added under Charles II in 1681, but *chiselled out* by the secularists in 1830, following the *Roman Catholic Emancipation Act* of 1829. Hence at the bottom of this Latin inscription one sees a huge chisel mark as the legacy of the secularists' anti-Protestant rage and fury, as with Popish like frenzy these Protestant cultural vandals sought to erase this element of England's Christian history. But the metal plaque at the bottom still records the former place that these words were at.

On 10 October 1666 money was collected across the country for the relief of destitute Londoners. This followed the Great Fire of London that had broken out on 2 September at Thomas Farriner's bakery on Pudding Lane. Services dealing with the Great Fire of London first appeared in the *Book of Common Prayer* under Charles II, "by His Majesty's special command" for 2 September following the initial service on 10 October 1666, and are also found in Oxford Prayer Books printed during 1681-3. The service was revised in 1696 under Archbishop Tenison, including a new prayer for preservation of the City of London from fire. Different forms of it appeared in prayer books over time e.g., in 1821. The fact that its use continued at St. Paul's Cathedral in an annual service till 1859 was a statement of belief that God is control; God is interested in the affairs of men and may send Divine Judgments on sins such as gluttony, or laxness to the dangers of Popery, either directing or by permitting such fires as the Great Fire of London; and God is able to prevent any such future fires. Its discontinuance from 1859 was a Deistic type statement that God is not really in control of such things; God is disinterested in the affairs of men and does not really send judgments on men for sins such as gluttony or laxness to the dangers of Popery; and God either could not, or would not, be prepared to stop another such fire, even if petitioned to do so. In addition to this anti-supernaturalist sentiment relevant to its removal in 1859, it was also a positive link to King Charles II who first authorized such services in 1666. In short, it was part of the secular state's deconstruction of the Protestant Christian State.

The Caroline era of Charles II's church building is also celebrated as a time when under one of the multiple exceptions to the *Act of Uniformity* (1662)<sup>405</sup>, *religious*

---

<sup>405</sup> Another exception to the 1662 Act of Uniformity was that a small number of

*tolerance was developed for Lutheran Non-Conformist Protestants from 1668.* Though in Edwardian times, King Edward VI had established a “Stranger’s Church” for non-Anglican Protestants in 1550, this had in practice fairly quickly become a Dutch Reformed Church, although it probably ministered to some Lutherans.

Lutherans, many of whom were wealthy and connected with the London Steelyard, generally held reserved pews at *All Hallow’s the Great Church of England*, which was next to the steelyard. But this Lutheran frequented Anglican Church had been destroyed by the Great Fire of London in 1666. On behalf of London Lutherans, the Lutheran ambassador of Sweden, Sir John Barkham Leyonbergh (who was given English nationality in 1671, and made a baronet), petitioned King Charles II for the construction of a Lutheran Church in London. A Royal Warrant of 1669, written in English, authorized that upon “the site ... of the ... late parish of Trinity [burnt down in the fire of 1666] unto ye said residents of Sweden and others following the *Lutheran Confession* and their successors residing in our said City of London,” there was “by them” “to” be “rebuilt for their use in the public service of God” a Lutheran Church. This was followed by the Royal Charter of 1672 written in Latin, which required that both Anglican spiritual authorities and temporal authorities respect the privileges of this grant of religious freedom to the Non-Conformist Lutheran Protestants of London.

Construction on the new Lutheran Church commenced in 1672 and was completed with a church consecration in 1674. The Church was known as *Trinity Lutheran Church*, London, because it was built on the site of *Holy Trinity the Less Church of England* which had been burnt down in the Great Fire of London. It stood for about 200 years, but in 1873 it was requisitioned for the building of the London Underground railway station, *Mansion House*, near St. Paul’s Cathedral (both this tube station and the area near it are known to me as this is also near St. Mary-le-Bow with its plaque to Richard Johnson at St. Mary Aldermary’s). Its first Minister was a Swede of German birth, Pastor Gerhard Martens, who had been appointed in 1668 (and who died in 1686, aged 46 years); and the first congregation was largely drawn from the wealthy Lutherans of the Steelyard. The recognition of his appointment in 1668, *twenty years before religious tolerance was granted to Puritans*, effectively distanced Restoration Anglicans from Laud’s view that episcopal church government was Divine Law, and included church government under Article 34 of the 39 Articles, as something “every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish.” This was an important preliminary to the events of 1689. It simultaneously distanced them from the Puritans view which did not embrace the Lutherans as fellow Protestants, with e.g., their Lutheran teachings of consubstantiation and their associated beliefs in an “altar.”

It is surely notable that all this was happening at the same time as the *Sacramental Test Act* (or *Test Act*) (1673), *supra*, and English Puritans were without religious freedom. Anglican Protestants clearly made a distinction between Puritan Protestants and

---

Roman Catholics (and their biological descendants), who had given timely assistance to Charles II in the 1650s following the battle of Worcester, of which one was “Father” Huddleston, *infra*, were exempted and permitted to follow the Roman religion.

Lutheran Protestants. Under the Test Act, to accept Anglican Communion was a condition of accepting civil office. Lawmakers knew that Lutherans were prepared to do this since before the opening of Trinity Lutheran Church, they had generally held pews in *All Hallow's the Great Anglican Church*. Hence while Papists, Puritans, and secular writers influenced by their views, tend to depict the Test Act as designed to net "Anglicans only," even though this was *generally* the case, it might more accurately be said to be designed to net "Anglicans and Lutherans only." Furthermore, after 1689 we know that a number of the more moderate Puritan Protestants were, like the non-Puritan Lutheran Protestants afore them, prepared to receive Communion at a fellow Protestant Anglican Church on an occasional basis in order to hold government offices. When the Act of Toleration (1689) was passed, Lutherans would no longer require a special warrant or charter to build a church. But before that time, Lutheran Non-Conformist Protestants were certainly tolerated. (Cf. the marriage of Princess Anne, later Queen Anne, *infra*).

*Charles II's final years and death*, involve some further matters of contention. His brother James, Duke of York (later James II, from 1685-8) had become a Papist in the late 1660s, and had refused to submit to the *Test Act* (1673), resigning from all offices. At Charles II's insistence, he had continued to take Anglican sacraments up till 1672, and continued to attend Anglican services without taking Communion till 1676. In 1673 the widower James married his second wife, and she was a Papist. There was fear of a Popish plot to kill Charles II and reintroduce Popery through James, Duke of York. A second *Test Act* (1678) excluded all non-Anglicans from Parliament, but by two votes, made an exception for the openly Papist, James, Duke of York, to sit in the House of Lords. The fact that it received Royal Assent made it part of Charles II's wider strategy. Charles II claimed it was possible to protect the Church and keep it Protestant while his brother was on the throne.

However, in English law if something is voidable, it is lawful till declared void<sup>406</sup>. Among other things, a monarch is required to be Supreme Governor of the *Church of England*, and in James II's day, also Supreme Governor of the *Church of Ireland*. This required that he subscribe to the *39 Articles* and uphold the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662). He clearly was prepared to do neither, for which reason he had resigned all offices in 1673, not taken Anglican Communion since 1672, and not attended an Anglican Church service since 1676. If e.g., the man could not hold such offices since 1673, he most assuredly could not properly hold the office of *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland*, which sacred office was indissolubly part of the wider office of king. Thus it was possible for James II's voidable office as king to be declared void by the proper lawful persons.

Who were these lawful persons? One was the next in line to succeed him, which was Mary II or her consort, William III, if a joint rule was envisaged. The others were

---

<sup>406</sup> In law, if something is *voidable*, it has full legal effect till declared to be void. By contrast, if something is *void ab initio*, it has no legal effect and is void *from its initiation* or outset. Thus I do not doubt that before the operation of the legal process to declare his voidable office void, James II's reign was lawful from 1685-1688.

Members of Parliament, who could lawfully invite William III over *providing* they fairly represented the Parliament as seen by a subsequent vote of the Parliament within a reasonable period of time. By his actions in willfully refusing to fulfill his required duties of office as the Protestant *Supreme Governor* of the Anglican Church, James II had *de jure* abdicated the throne in substance though not in form. Some members of Parliament therefore were quite within their legal rights to invite William III over and he landed on 5 November 1688. *James II's voidable office of king was thus declared void by the acts of these Members of Parliament and William III, but to have full legal force was subject to a required ratification by Parliament within a reasonable period of time.*

A Convention Parliament was summoned by William III on 22 January to meet on 13 February 1689. This was within three months of his landing, and thus within a reasonable time of his arrival. The Convention Parliament which in broad terms met on the same legal basis as the Convention Parliament of 1660 which restored the monarchy under Charles II, and it found that James II had *de facto* abdicated the throne by deserting his post when fleeing the capital and discarding the Great Seal of the Realm into the River Thames<sup>407</sup>. It recognized William III and Mary II. Thus the succession of William III was perfectly proper and legal. It mattered not that James II later decided he wanted the throne back. He and his Jacobite heirs were clearly nothing more than *pretenders*.

But in order to avoid this type of problem before it occurred, many Members of Parliament had wanted Charles II to give his Assent to an Act that would have seen succession to the throne pass over James II in the first place. With understandable Protestant foresight and forethought, in manifestation of their concerns about the Popish Duke, James, from 1679 a series of bills were passed by the House of Commons to exclude James, Duke of York, from the throne. But Charles II refused to support these Bills, continually dissolved parliament in an unsuccessful bid to remove the anti-Jacobite forces; and the House of Lords also rejected a proposal for the throne to go straight to Mary II and William III of Orange. From 1679, the veteran Cavaliers who had called their legislature *the Cavalier parliament* since 1661, were now disconsolate; and these Anglican Protestants who served God first, and King second, then meeting in humble submission to the King of Kings who held their first loyalty, purposed that they should call themselves by that name, "Cavalier," no more.

---

<sup>407</sup> I visited Lewes, England in Nov. 08. It contains many interesting sites, including the *House of Anne of Cleves* (1515-1557). Inside it I saw in a glass cabinet the Duke of Newcastle's purse, used to hold the silver matrix of the Great Seal of England. (Anne of Cleves was the fourth wife of Henry VIII, Regnal Years: 1509-1547, whose marriage was annulled in 1540 for lack of consummation. We have portraits, but no entirely reliable portraits, depicting Anne of Cleves. Henry had agreed to marry Anne, sight unseen, as part of a political alliance with German Protestants. Upon her arrival in England, it emerged that Anne was of very plain appearance, and poor King Henry found himself unable to consummate the union. After the annulment, Henry generously provided her with an income, and she discreetly lived in Lewes.)

In 1684 Charles II refused to recall parliament as required by Act of Parliament, and he was so now acting illegally. He had clearly lost his political judgment. But “the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men” (Dan. 4:17). Charles II died at the height of his power in 1685.

We cannot doubt that Charles II was too sympathetic to his brother, James, Duke of York, and he should have given his support to a Bill to exclude his brother from the throne, for Christ says, “he that loveth” family members “more than me is not worthy of me” (Matt. 10:37). This indicates a loss of political and spiritual judgment on Charles II part. But this misguided support for his brother, James, Duke of York, does not necessarily mean that he was, as is often claimed by Puritans, a secret Papist. On the one hand, it is clear that he considered a plan could be introduced to preserve the church from Popery during his brother’s reign; and he had supported a Bill keeping the Parliament in Anglican Protestant hands. But on the other hand, to put a man on the throne as Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church when that man did not e.g., believe in the 39 Articles, would clearly constitute the reign of a voidable monarch; and Charles II had failed to recall parliament as he should have in 1684. Both of these factors clearly showed a loss of wise political judgment near the end of his life, and also helped raise the possibility of his brother ruling as a Papist without consulting parliament. This makes a hard and fast assessment of his religious beliefs in his final years difficult.

At his death-bed, Charles II received the last rites from “Father” Huddleston, a Roman Catholic priest. There are two possible interpretations of these events.

*View 1: The Story of Charles II’s “deathbed conversion to Popery” is true.* On this view, the reason why Charles II is remembered on 29 May is that he was the legitimate monarch. The Restoration in 1660 is the opposite side of the coin to recognizing that Charles I was a martyr, and illegally deposed by the Puritan Revolutionaries. This sentiment is well captured in its name as “Royal Oak Day” or “Oak Apple Day,” since this puts the focus on God’s preservation of Charles II in the oak tree at Boscobel when hunted by the republican Roundheads, and thus relates to the later Restoration. Of course, for these same reasons this usage of “Royal Oak Day” or “Oak Apple Day,” also remains valid for those following *View 2, infra*.

Charles II was known to have a weakness in the area of sexuality, being the father of some illegitimate children. He also had married a foreign Papist. It is clear that by not supporting the Bill to exclude his brother, James, from the throne, and by acting illegally and not recalling parliament in 1684 as required by law, Charles II had lost his political judgment. This fact means one cannot definitely rule out the possibility that he also lost his religious judgment with respect to his own religious profession, and so possibly he did convert to Popery. If so, Charles lack of sexual restraint now proved to be a fatal moral flaw in his character. Like King Solomon, whose “wives turned away his heart after other gods,” so that “Solomon did evil in the sight of the Lord” (I Kgs 11:4,6); Charles II “did evil” in converting to Popery, no doubt to at least some extent, influenced by his poor marriage choice. But God overruled to ensure that this did not

happen before his deathbed conversion, and overall the realm stayed safe for Protestantism.

*View 2: The Story of Charles II's "deathbed conversion to Popery" is false.* Though Charles II had shown a weakness in the area of human sexuality, there is also some evidence of repentance on his part. If the repentance was genuine (and this may be disputed), then while this would not excuse his sins (Exod. 20:14), it would put them in a different light (John 8:1-11). When King Charles II lay-a-dying, and was first greeted by the *Church of England* Bishops, when they left, and the later James II brought in a priest, Charles II was understandably entitled to believe, and presumably did believe, that this was an Anglican priest. I.e., Charles II was by this time probably bleary eyed and largely non-compos mentis. Alternatively, it is also possible that if this "conversion" story was contrived by James II and "Father" Huddleston, that Huddleston lurked in the room's shadows, and they waited till Charles had just died, at which point they then falsely claimed that in his last gasp of breath he had just "converted" to Popery. Either way, on the basis that "dead men tell no tales," Charles II could not jump up and deny this very convenient "conversion story."

*One cannot doubt that this is the type of thing Papists have been known to do.* This was brought home to me when I was in Ireland visiting McGrath's Castle. (I was at the McGrath's Castle township for two days, one of them being *Irish Massacre Day*, 2001.) It is a border-town the north call Tulleyhomen and the south call Pettigo. Can you hear two people debating, "'It's Tulleyhomen' ... 'NO! ... It's Pettigo' ... 'NO! ... It's Tulleyhomen'" etc.? McGrath's Castle is traditionally used by all persons of "the McGrath Clan" as a symbolic rallying point; not that all would be descendants of Miler McGrath who built this castle with money from Queen Elizabeth I in the early 1600s. Originally a Roman Catholic Bishop, Miler McGrath, converted to become a Protestant, and indeed the *Church of Ireland* Archbishop of Tipperary. (Known in the song, "It's a long way to Tipperary.") The Papists greatly dislike the idea of any Papist, *and especially an Irish Papist Bishop* converting to Protestantism. Hence many false stories have been put out about Archbishop McGrath. But one of them, that was insisted upon by Papists I met at Tulleyhomen / Pettigo, is that Archbishop McGrath "converted back" to Popery on his deathbed. Of course, *this is absolute balderdash!* If this had occurred the Papists would e.g., have gotten him to sign documents to this effect. The reality is that he died a Protestant, and lies buried in a sarcophagus bearing his effigy at Cashell Cathedral near Tipperary (which I inspected later in that same month of October, 2001).

*Under the circumstances, it is not safe or wise, to theorize that this sick and dying man, Charles II, really did convert to Popery.* James II, or the Popish priest with whom he was in cahoots, are highly unreliable and untrustworthy sources for information on such matters. Thus there is no evidence to suggest that Charles II was aware that a figure lurking somewhere in the room was in fact "Father" Huddleston. But even if he did know, there is no evidence that they made such a claim about Charles II's "conversion" to Popery till *after he had gasped his last breath.* *For all we know, Huddleston might have tried to entice him into Popery, and Charles II might have died blurting out, "NEVER! NEVER!! NEVER!!!"* Whatever happened, we certainly

cannot take the word of the Popish Duke, James II, or the Popish priest, “Father” Huddleston, seriously on this matter. This story was all part of the political propaganda machine of James II, the Papist king, designed to try and strengthen his hand to help the encroachments of Popery.

While Charles II was involved in a secret pact with the King of France (Treaty of Dover), that included a statement for him to convert to Popery, this was nothing more than politicking, to keep the King of France at bay, and string him along to keep the British Isles safe from French invasion. Certainly, his successor, James the Papist used this, and his marriage to a Roman Catholic, as a backdrop to try and help give his political propaganda about Charles II converting to Popery some greater credence. But claiming that Charles II would convert to Popery on the basis of the French *Treaty of Dover*, is as improbable as claiming that he would convert to Puritanism on the basis of the Scottish *Solemn League and Covenant*, *supra*. Thus for the purposes of advancing Romanism in the realm, James II “told a whopper,” and the story of Charles II’s “deathbed conversion to Popery” is a falsehood.

This *View 2* is supported by e.g., the fact that Charles II had consistently resisted attempts by his mother and sister to convert him to Romanism, and he had openly remained Protestant. He also supported the second *Test Act* (1678) to keep the Parliament in Protestant hands; and this was part of what he considered a viable strategy to protect the church during the reign of James II.

Furthermore, *View 2* is supported by the fact that that Princess Anne (who under the later *Bill of Rights*, 1689, was made successor to William III and Mary II), was the daughter of the Roman Catholic, James, Duke of York, who became the Roman Catholic king, James II from 1685 to 1688. But King Charles II, who was Princess Anne’s uncle, was alarmed at the prospect of his niece, Anne, becoming a Papist. Thus Charles II *insisted that his niece be raised as a Protestant*, and indeed this was done as part of her Christian upbringing. Charles II thus believed he had put a strategy in place that would ensure the throne reverted to a Protestant monarch. As the later Queen Anne from 1702 to 1714, she was an Anglican Protestant whose religious sentiment was both anti-Papist and anti-Puritan, although more anti-Papist (whose religion was proscribed) than anti-Puritan (whose religion was in general tolerated as that of *fellow Protestants*, and in particular was the Established *Church of Scotland*). Princess Anne married the Lutheran, Prince George, at St. James Court Chapel in 1683. This was five years before the Act of Toleration (1689), but Lutheran Protestants were tolerated before 1689, *supra*. Prince George had two Lutheran pastors appointed as his Royal Chaplains, and by law their stipends of 200 pounds per annum were paid out of the revenues from the tin mines on Crown Lands at Cornwell.

Charles II’s actions of insisting that the Princess Anne be raised a Protestant, are inconsistent with one who harbored a secret desire to become a Roman Catholic, since he could have simply stayed out of the matter of his niece’s religious upbringing and kept quiet, thus by default allowing Anne’s father to raise her as a Papist. Instead, he chose active involvement to ensure she was raised as a Protestant. Princess Anne was born in

1665 and Charles II died on her 20th birthday, 6 Feb 1685. This means that one can show that for the last 20 years of his life, he was, *where he thought it reasonably possible*, ensuring the promotion of the Protestant religion inside his closest family circles.

Whichever view one takes of Charles II<sup>408</sup>, both the reigns of Charles I and Charles II are qualified by the service of Papists' Conspiracy Day, with its message, "All's well that ends well." Before 1689, God was thanked in this annual service for his preservation of the Protestant "religion" from "Popish treachery" in 1605. This sentiment was reinforced when from 1689 the same service thanked God for "King William," who came on 5 November 1688 "to preserve" "our religion." This was a powerful statement that what the *Bill of Rights* (1689) called the "Protestant" religion, was established and celebrated.

*Papists' Conspiracy Day* is also important in the context of *Charles II's Day*. After Charles II's death, the Papist James II had tried to forge a Papist-Puritan political alliance with offers of religious tolerance to the Puritans. But the Puritans had not succumbed to this temptation. The Anglicans were impressed at this pro-Protestant and anti-Papist sentiment. In broad terms, the Anglican Protestants first matched the Papist offer, by granting religious liberty to the loyalist Protestant Puritans in the Act of Toleration (1689) (although still making them subject to the Test Acts); and then with the Scottish Puritan Presbyterians who had more generally show their loyalty to the Crown under both Charles I and Charles II, bettered that offer, by allowing and supporting the Establishment of Scotland as a Puritan Kingdom under the Crown in 1690. This was also a statement that they were *Protestants first and Anglicans supporters of episcopal church government second per Article 34 of the 39 Articles*, since the united Episcopal-Presbyterian Church of Scotland (1660-1688/9) had been ripped apart by the Jacobite Episcopal wing of that church, and the Anglicans of England and Ireland now supported the Williamite Presbyterian wing of that church in becoming the Established *Church of Scotland*. In addition to celebrating God's protection of the Protestant King James I and Protestant parliament from Popery on 5 November 1605, *Papists' Conspiracy Day* now also included celebrating God's providential protection of Protestantism against Popery with the coming of the Protestant King William III on 5 November 1688. The effect of this was to make *Papists' Conspiracy Day* a celebration that all Protestants, both Anglican and Puritan, could clearly rejoice in.

---

<sup>408</sup> My views are not settled, and have fluctuated as to which of these two views about Charles II's deathbed conversion are correct. Though I once favoured *View 1*, I now favour *View 2*. Certainly there is a degree of ambiguity in the evidence, and a degree of ambiguity in the life of Charles II, who showed some of the qualities of a King Solomon with his lack of sexual restraint; and also clearly lost his political judgement in the closing years of his life, and so also possibly lost his religious judgement with regard to his profession of religious faith. On the one hand, "among the many nations was there no king like" "Solomon king of Israel." But on the other hand, "Did not" "outlandish woman cause" "Solomon king of Israel" "to sin"? (Neh. 13:26). Thus I am not dogmatic on the matter.

*Papists' Conspiracy Day* now also reminded people that King William of Orange's reign brought with it both the Act of Toleration granting a general though not absolute religious freedom to Puritans, and the establishment of a Puritan Church with Presbyterianism becoming the Established *Church of Scotland*. "Long live the King!" was echoed by both Anglican and Puritan Protestants around the realm, and *Papists' Conspiracy Day*, which had always been the Protestant holy day of the British Isles *par excellence*, was now further reinforced as a great and rousing celebration of God's protection of Protestantism against Popery. This means there is an even greater meaning to the opening words, "Remember, remember the fifth of November," in one of the traditional ditties of *Papists' Conspiracy Day*, which commences with the words,

Remember, remember the fifth of November,  
The gunpowder treason and plot,  
I know of no reason why the gunpowder treason,  
Should ever be forgot . . . .

The *Bill of Rights* (1689) stated that it was "inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant Kingdom to be governed by a Popish Prince [such as James II], or any King or Queen marrying a Papist [such as Charles I and Charles II]." It stated, "that all and every person or persons that is [such as James II], are, or shall be, reconciled to, or shall hold communion with, the See or Church of Rome [such as, according to *View I, supra*, Charles II on his death-bed], or shall profess the Popish religion, or shall marry a Papist [such as Charles I and Charles II], shall be excluded, and be ever incapable to inherit, possess or enjoy the Crown and Government of this realm and Ireland," and that "in all and every such case" "the people of these realms shall be and are hereby absolved of their allegiance, and the said Crown and Government shall" "descend to," "such person or persons, being Protestant, as" if these others "were naturally dead."

The *Act of Settlement* (1701) also passed in the reign of William of Orange (12 & 13 William III, chapter 2), requires that, "whosoever shall hereafter come to the possession this Crown shall join in communion with the Church of England as by law established." A Monarch must state his rejection of "any transubstantiation" in "the Lord's Supper," "and that the invocation or adoration of" "any" "Saint, and the sacrifice of the Mass," "are superstitious and idolatrous. And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration and every part thereof in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants." This oath was then modified in 1910, and as first taken by George V in 1910 it now reads simply, "I . . . , do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare that I am a faithful Protestant, and that I will, according to the true intent of the enactments to secure the Protestant Succession to the Throne of my realm, uphold and maintain such enactments to the best of my power." The *Act of Settlement* (1701) and associated *Act of Union* (1707) ensures a Protestant monarch. In legal commentary on it, the common law jurist, Sir William Blackstone, in the first volume of his *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, said that it *means in law*, that the throne can go to "such heirs only of the body of the Princess Sophia, as are

Protestant members of the Church of England, and are married to none but Protestants” (1 Blackstone's Commentaries, p. 217). E.g., Queen Anne left no heirs, and so after her the throne went to the German derived House of Hanover, whose first British King, was George I (Regnal Years:1714-1727). George I was a Lutheran, but as required under the Act of Settlement, he became an Anglican.

Thus both before 1689 through reference to the events of 1605, and after 1689 through reference to both the events of 1605 and 1689, the *Gunpowder Treason Service* forming the Office for *Papists' Conspiracy Day*, qualified the services in the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) for Charles the First and Charles the Second. Both King Charles I and II were regarded as legitimate monarchs; but neither was regarded as perfect; and both were regarded as erring in marrying Roman Catholic wives, and thus in being too sympathetic to Roman Catholicism.

And so it was, that in the good Providence of God, the Papists' conspiracy to put a Roman Catholic on the throne in James the Second, acted to unite the disunited Protestants of the British Isles. It helped to facilitate the Act of Toleration in 1689. It formed a Protestant alliance between English and Irish Anglicans on the one hand, and Scottish Puritan Presbyterians on the other hand, that made the three kingdoms and their successors (1707-1800 the Kingdom of Great Britain with the ongoing Kingdom of Ireland, and from 1801 the United Kingdom,) safe for Protestantism into the 19th century. While non Presbyterians Puritans were tainted by the spirit of sexual immorality (incest), and such persons were meant to be excommunicated (I Cor. 5:1,11); the fact that they were made subject to the laws of the land, acted to restrain the liberties of private judgement they sought in their (Congregationalist and Baptist) Confessions on this issue of incest. Thus they could under these circumstances be tolerated subject to the Test Acts.

It had been grossly unreasonable for Scottish Presbyterians to require that before supporting him against Cromwell's republic, Charles II must subscribe to the *Solemn League and Covenant* in 1650 and 1651, which included a commitment to “endeavour the extirpation of” “Prelacy” i.e., Anglicanism “in the kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland.” Charles II was legally a minor, and so the agreement should be reasonably read down to his father's 1640 wishes i.e., an agreement to leave *Scotland* free in religious matters, *infra*. The evidence is that Charles *took this with a grain of salt*, and lacked any serious commitment to so undermine the Anglican Church. The Anglican Church would remain established as the *Church of England* (which included Wales) and *Church of Ireland*. From a legal point of view, it should be remembered that the king enjoyed legal protections against this type of thing, which are given to no-one else. These are found in the common law maxim, *the king can do no wrong*. Moreover, the Acts of Uniformity in England (1662) and Ireland (1666) declared this “Solemn League and Covenant” to be of no legal effect in the Kingdoms of England and Ireland.

But these Scottish loyalists and royalists would not be forgotten. Certainly it would have been reasonable for these Scottish Presbyterians to request that Charles II allow Scotland to have an Established Presbyterian Church, with an option for non-

Presbyterians to still be Anglicans. The broad substance of this type of idea, though not the exact specifics, had been earlier agreed to by King Charles I following the inconclusive *Bishops' War* of 1639, with the *Pacification of Berwick* in 1640, and then a temporary short war in which Charles I's Anglican forces were defeated by a Scottish Puritan army, after which Charles I had agreed to the Scots having their own church assembly and parliament. (This had followed an unsuccessful attempt to Anglicanize Scotland with Laud's prayer book, which was withdrawn in 1638. This was followed by the Scottish National Covenant of 1638 and rejection of Anglicanism by the Scots, which had resulted in the *Bishops' War* of 1639.) To some extent the matter was soured by the Directory in Scotland taking away religious freedom from Anglicans in 1645<sup>409</sup>. However, the Restoration had seen an unprecedented level of co-operation between the Anglican Crown and Presbyterians in Scotland which had the united Episcopal-Presbyterian Church of 1660-1688/9. Upholding the Scottish Rescissory Act of 1661 (which among other things declared the *Solemn League and Covenant* invalid,) and having an Established Scottish Puritan Church from 1690 with religious tolerance to other Protestants was thus the final solution to the problem.

Prince Charles was born on 29 May, 1630, and so when he signed the Scottish *National Covenant* (1640) and *Solemn League and Covenant* (1643/4) on 23 June 1650 and 1 Jan 1651, he was under the age of 21 years, and so a minor. Under normal circumstances he would have had a regent appointed for the duration of his minority. But these were not normal times. Therefore in the first place, even if one puts aside the fact that this was later legally recognized to have been an unlawful oath, I think it fair to say that the wishes of his now dead father, Charles I in 1640 ought properly to qualify the signing of these documents by a minor. I.e., Charles I had agreed in 1640 that Scotland may be free to choose its own Puritan religion, rather than be Anglican, and free to have its own parliament. This had e.g., seen a Puritan Scottish Parliament pass a 1645 Caroline Act establishing the Presbyterian Directory of worship in Scotland. Therefore the agreement of Charles II in his minor years to the *Solemn League and Covenant* seeking to extend the Puritan religion to the three kingdoms of England, Ireland, and Scotland, ought properly to be *read down to only include Scotland*, and also to still allow for Anglican religious freedom in that kingdom. If this is done, then the assent of the minor, Charles II, in 1650 and 1651, conforms to his father's wishes of 1640. To be sure, the dealings of the boy-king Charles II with these royalist Scots in 1650 and 1651 shows *that he was a very brave boy indeed*. But *he was only a boy*, and with neither father nor regent to help him, the boy-king lacked the necessary guidance that he needed.

But more importantly again, this "Solemn League & Covenant" was later deemed at law to have been an unlawful oath. E.g., under the 1662 Act of Uniformity, every

---

<sup>409</sup> "CHARLES I, Parl. 3, Sess. 5, An Act of the Parliament of the Kingdom of Scotland, approving and establishing the Directory for Publick Worship. At Edinburgh, February 6, 1645." (Copy with Act in: *Westminster Confession*, With a Foreword by Alexander McPherson, Free Presbyterian Publications, *op. cit.*, pp. 369-394.)

Minister of an Anglican Church was required to say, “I A.B. do declare, That it is not lawful ... to take arms against the King; and that I do abhor that traitorous position of taking arms ... . I will conform to the liturgy of the Church of England ... . And I do declare, That I do hold there lies no obligation upon me, or any other person, from the Oath, commonly called ‘The Solemn League and Covenant,’ to endeavour any change, or alteration of government in Church or State; and the same was in itself an unlawful Oath ... of this Kingdom” (emphasis mine). The statement of this 1662 Act, “no obligation upon ... any other person” e.g., Charles II, takes the view that any such commitment *by anyone* was an unlawful vow, and so not binding in the Kingdom of England (Num. 30:4,8,12,13; I Sam. 25:21,22,32-34; Ps. 24:4; Matt. 14:7-10; Acts 23:12-14).

However, we cannot doubt that this “Solemn League and Covenant” gained a general support in the Kingdom of Scotland. From 1689, the general thrust of this Puritan document was allowed in Scotland, at which time the Presbyterian Church became the Established *Church of Scotland*. After the Act of Toleration in 1689, the 1640 promise of Charles I to allow Scottish Puritans to determine their own church matters was honoured; and *in the kingdom of Scotland*, the basic promise of Charles II in 1650 and 1651 was honored in Scotland, as there was the virtual “extirpation of” “prelacy,” when this kingdom was essentially given over to the Presbyterian Puritans who now formed the established *Church of Scotland*. Presbyterians basically had Scotland, even though there were a small number of Anglicans there. Thus those Scots who had fought against Cromwell *for bonny King Charles the Second* were now generally given their heart’s desire for a Puritan kingdom; but this was limited to Scotland, rather than the three kingdoms they had wanted of England (which includes Wales), Ireland, and Scotland, which was excessive and more than Charles I had ever agreed to; and more than any reasonable Scottish Puritan would have asked for.

There were also some small number of Papists in the remote regions of the northern Highlands. They lurked in their black hearts an evil spirit of sedition against the Williamite Crown that was also to be found among Jacobite Episcopalians in the highly suspect *Episcopal Church of Scotland*. These Jacobite Papists from the north, would wait their time and then make their presence felt some 60 years later, when Jacobite forces would strike like a dagger into Scotland and England in order to try and take it by storm for Popery, before being halted by God through Protestant armies in the *Battle of Culloden*, 1746. In the aftermath of which horror, the Jacobite *Episcopal Church of Scotland* would also be wisely closed down.

Thus the Caroline guarantees of Puritan religious freedom for the Scots given by Charles I in 1640 and Charles II in 1650 and 1651, together with the Scottish desire for an Established Presbyterian *Church of Scotland*, were graciously enshrined in Williamite law under William III of Orange and Mary II in 1689. The Puritans now had the Established *Church of Scotland*, which from 1690 was Presbyterian. An Act of 1690 for “Ratifying the [Westminster] Confession of Faith, and settling Presbyterian Church Government,” stated that, “Our sovereign Lord and Lady, the King and Queen’s Majesties, and ... Parliament,” would “settle and secure” “the true Protestant religion, according to the truth of God’s word,” and “confirm the Presbyterian Church” “within”

the Scottish “kingdom.” Such was the gracious magnanimity and generosity of the Crown and Parliament under King William III and Queen Mary II.

After all, do not all we Protestant Christians believe in an infallible Bible? Do we not all uphold the Trinity? Do we not all believe in the Apostles’ Creed? Are we not all committed to uphold the Christian morality of the Ten Commandments? Are we all not washed in the blood of the Lamb, being justified freely by God’s grace, accepted by faith alone, understood in the great doctrine of justification by faith recovered at the time of the Christian Reformation by Martin Luther? Do we not all uphold the Reformation Motto, *sola fide* (faith alone), *sola gratia* (grace alone), *sola Scriptura* (Scripture alone)? Do we not all believe in prayer as set forth in the *Lord’s Prayer* e.g., only to God, and never through some so called “Saint mediator,” or *God of forces* as the prophet Daniel calls “Saint mediators” (Dan. 11:38), or *seducing spirits* as St. Paul calls these same “Saint mediators” (I Tim. 4:1), for he maintains that “there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus” (I Tim. 2:4)? Do we not all uphold the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, and maintain that any adoration of the consecrated elements is idolatry (2nd commandment) to be abhorred by all faithful Christians? Do not we Reformed Anglican and Puritan Protestants (though not Lutheran Protestants,) reject any corporeal presence of Christ’s natural flesh and body at Communion (requiring this for Anglicans after 1662), for do we not think that it is against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one, for is not this a denial of Christ’s true humanity, which thing does not St. John in prophesying the coming of transubstantiation, say is the *spirit of antichrist* (I John 4:2)?

Do we not all likewise maintain that Christ’s offering on the cross is a perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and that there is no other satisfaction for sins, so that the so called “sacrifice of the Mass” in Roman Catholicism is a *blasphemy* (3rd commandment, Rev. 13:1), and dangerous deceit? Do we not maintain that the Romish practice of what Holy Daniel calls, not regarding *the desire of women* (Dan. 11:37), or St. Paul calls, *forbidding to marry* (I Tim. 4:2), in which those in Romish religious orders are forbidden to marry, is contrary to Scripture, which allows Christians to enter a Biblically sound marriage at their discretion (I Cor. 7)? Do we not uphold the fact that what St. Paul calls “forbidding to marry” is also seen in the Romish doctrine of marital indissolubility, which contrary to NT teaching will not allow Biblically based divorce and remarriage (e.g., Matt. 19:9; I Cor. 7:15)? Do we not maintain that the representative of Christ to us here on earth is the Third Person of the Trinity, the Holy Ghost (John 15:25; I John 2:27)? So that when the Pope of Rome says he is the “Vicar of Christ” being in the Latin, “*Vicarius* (‘substitute’ / ‘one in the place’) *Christi* (of Christ),” or in the Greek, “*Anti* (in the place of) *Christos* (Christ),” do we not say rather, that in pretending to be the “Vicar of Christ,” the Pope of Rome claims a Divine Attribute, thus sitting in the Church of God, and as a Vice-God “shewing himself that he is God” (II Thess. 2:4)? Is not this Papal claim a terrible *blasphemy* (3rd commandment, Rev. 13:1)? Do we not say, in the words of what the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) says is “one of the six Homilies” that may be read “if there be no sermon” in the Office for *Papists’ Conspiracy Day*, namely, Book 2, Homily 21 (Part 6), Article 35, of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*, that in fact, the “bishop of

Rome” is “the Babylonical beast of Rome” (Rev. 17)?

Ought we not then to stand united, as Protestants, heeding the injunction, “Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17), and thanking God for the coming of the great Protestant King, William of Orange to the shores of the British Isles on 5 November 1688? “Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!” (Ps. 133:1).

Thus we thank God on *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* for the coming of William of Orange to the throne of Great Britain and Ireland. The health of his Protestant beliefs were healing balm to the Protestants, who now came together, united as one on the centrality of the gospel truths that they held in opposition to the Papists. And this was most especially seen in the unity of the Anglican-Puritan Protestant alliance of Anglicans in England and Ireland with Presbyterians in Scotland. O may the godly ever be joined together in brotherly love, helping and not hindering one another, caring and not cruel to one another, defending and not hurting one another. “Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!” (Ps. 133:1).

c) ii) *Removal of these three holy days from the BCP (1662) in 1859.*

In the Anglican hagiological rules of the Church of England’s *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 (and Church of Ireland’s *Book of Common Prayer* of 1666), red letter days with an Office are reserved exclusively for Protestant figures. Specifically, *King Charles I’s Day* (30 Jan., an Anglican Protestant Supreme Governor), *Royal Oak Day* (29 May, Restoration of Charles II and with him the Established Anglican Protestant Church), *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* (5 Nov., triumph of Protestantism against Popery in 1605 & 1688), *Irish Massacre Day* (C. of I., 23 Oct., Protestant martyrs at Papist hands in 1641), and *Accession Day* of a ruling monarch (Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church). The removal of all but one of these days from the C. of E. and C. of I Calendar in 1859 was thus a diminution in the Protestant hagiology of the 1662 and 1666 prayer books. Only the red letter day Office of Accession of a reigning monarch survived after 1859. Thus on these hagiological principles, the primary reason why e.g., Queen Elizabeth II is annually remembered in the *Accession Day Service* every 6th day of February since 1952, is that as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* she is a symbol of Protestantism.

With the qualified exception of All Saints’ Day (1 Nov., which is a general catch-all and may be used for any saints), all other red letter days (without an Office) are reserved on these hagiological rules for persons or events in the New Testament. That these are the only type of red letter days makes the point that *Protestant Christianity is Biblical Christianity*. Even though the monarch has evolved into an essentially titular or ceremonial role nowadays, the fact that the *Accession Day Service* remains means that *the symbolism* is still to be found in the 1662 prayer book which through reference to this Office for the *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* and *Defender of the Faith* still keeps this important basic message in place.

The Offices of these holy days of the Anglican Church’s Calendar, were a

statement that the Anglican Church was neither Puritan (Charles I Day & Charles II Day) nor Papist (Papists' Conspiracy Day; & in the C. of I., Irish Massacre Day), but Protestant (Accession Day, Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church)<sup>410</sup>. On the one hand, first and foremost through reference to the martyrdom of Charles I remembered on *King Charles I's Day*, and in a closely connected derivative secondary sense through reference to the Restoration on *King Charles II Day*, the Anglican Church celebrated the fact that she adhered to a form of Reformed Christianity which in many ways, though not all ways, was more like that of Lutheran Protestantism than like that of Puritan Protestantism<sup>411</sup>. But on the other hand, through reference to *Papists' Conspiracy Day* (and in Ireland, *Irish Massacre Day*), the Anglican Church celebrated the fact that she was Protestant and not Papist, and on *Accession Day* that in broad terms she was Protestant. Thus Anglicanism was upheld as a Protestant *via media* (Latin, "middle road") between the errors of Roman Catholicism and the extremes of Puritanism.

On the one hand, the odour of incest hung over the heads of both Papists (Papal dispensations for incest such as that granted for Henry VIII to marry Catherine of Aragon) and a number of Non-Conformists Churches such as Congregationalists and Baptists (Congregationalist's *Savoy Declaration* 25:4 and Baptist's *London Confession* 25:4), although not Presbyterians (*Westminster Confession* 24:4). So too, the concern of harbouring seditious sympathies against the Crown was relevant with regard to both Papists (gunpowder treason plot of 1605 against King James I and Parliament) and Puritans who glorified Cromwell (republican era and associated regicide of King Charles I), although the Scottish Presbyterians had more generally divided between royalist and republican factions in favour of the royalists.

But on the other hand, as seen by the Toleration Act of 1689, and the united Protestant response against James II's Roman Catholicism and for William III of Orange's Protestantism, there was a greater tolerance by Anglicans to Puritans *as fellow Protestants*, than there was towards Roman Catholics. Indeed, even though the

---

<sup>410</sup> This is a broad-brush overview e.g., in its finer particulars, *Charles I's Day* and *Charles II's Day* also contained some anti-Papist elements in that e.g., both were Anglican Protestant Supreme Governors.

<sup>411</sup> This is a general, not absolute, rule of thumb. E.g., the theology of the prayer book on the Lord's Supper is symbolic, rather than the Lutheran's consubstantiation. Thus the Final Rubric of the Communion Service rejects both transubstantiation and consubstantiation. So too the words of the Communion Service derived from Cranmer, such as, "Take and eat this *in remembrance* that Christ died for thee, and *feed on him in thy heart by faith* with thanksgiving," "Drink this *in remembrance* that Christ's blood was shed for thee;" are clearly symbolic. The words "Take and eat this" also do away with the Romish practice of putting a wafer on someone's tongue that they then suck on, since the communicant is himself to "Take and eat" the bread; which other rubric at the end of the Communion Service says is to be "the bread" "as is usual to be eaten," and "the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten."

sacramental Test Acts cut both ways against Papists and Puritans, in practice it was known that after 1689 more moderate Puritans were prepared to sometimes take Anglican Communion in order to hold government offices, as the Lutherans had done from the 1660s; and so in practice they were more anti-Papist than anti-Puritan. Puritan Protestants in general, and Scottish Presbyterian Puritan Protestants in particular, came to be tolerated *as fellow Protestants*. Indeed from 1689/90 a strong Protestant alliance between English and Irish Anglicans and Scottish Presbyterians was formed which laid the basis of the Reformed Protestant Christian State in the British Isles till the 19th century. From 1690 in Scotland, the Puritan derived Presbyterians became the established *Church of Scotland*, and other Puritan derived Protestants were generally tolerated, whereas Papists were not. Thus the balance in this Anglican *via media* was the balance of a very specifically *Protestant Church*.

The removal of these three days from the Anglican Calendar in 1859 was not only a statement that demarcations lines establishing Anglican Protestantism against both Popery and Puritanism in the wider legal and cultural society were to be removed, but also an internal statement that the Reformed Protestant faith of the 39 Articles and prayer book doctrine largely, though not exclusively of Cranmer, would no longer be upheld and enforced against non-Protestant and non-Anglican internal elements. Thus the removal from the Church Calendar and societal public life of these three days in 1859, was welcomed externally by e.g., Puritans, Papists, Jews, Deists, and others; and welcomed internally by Puseyites Proper (Anglo-Catholics), semi-Puseyites (Broadchurchmen), and religious liberals. *Reformed (Evangelical) Anglicans were to be the meat in the sandwich.* The secular state would no longer uphold Protestantism in general, and Anglican Protestantism in particular in England and Ireland, and Presbyterian Protestantism in Scotland. Deprived of her protecting shepherds who were thus derelict in their duty to God and man, the C. of E., C. of I., and C. of S., would become horribly racked with religious liberals and other heretics, and the Anglican Church would additionally see the most unwelcome rise of the semi-Romanist Puseyites and semi-Puseyites in her ranks. (And in time, semi-Puritans would arise in the Diocese of Sydney increasingly making their presence known from about the 1970s with semi-Puritan services brought in under the name of “Contemporary Worship Services.”)

Except for a short time in the 16th century under the Popery of Bloody Mary, or those parts of the Anglican Church under the 17th century Laudian bishops, or under the Puritan Revolution of 1640-1660, and a short time under Popery in the north of England in 1745 before the Battle of Culloden (Scotland) in 1746, law and society in England, Wales, and Ireland, had been governed by the spiritual and moral values of Reformed Protestant Anglicanism. But as at 1859, all that was now changing, and indeed, had been changing for some decades. The removal of these three days from the calendar in 1859, was simply one public statement among others, as to the sad and bad direction that the UK and through it the larger British Empire, had been going in for decades under increasingly ungodly lawmakers. They were following the lead of the USA in creating a secular state, and politically packaging this as the defining quality of “modern” times and “modern history.” It was a statement that the spiritual and moral standards that had governed England, Wales, and Ireland for around 300 years, were to be removed. *There*

would be no more Reformed Anglican standards in church or society.

The Offices for *Charles I's Day* and *Charles II's Day* recognized the Biblical Divine right of kings, the Christian history of the United Kingdom, and as part of this, the fact that King Charles I was a Christian martyr. The Office of *Papists' Conspiracy Day* recognized and thanked God for the Protestant Christianity of the United Kingdom as safeguarded and protected by God under James the First and William the Third. In Ireland, *Irish Massacre Day* had a similar anti-Papists and pro-Protestant message. When these three Anglican feasts were removed from the English calendar in 1859, and all four removed from the Irish calendar in 1859, *externally, both Protestants derived from Puritans, and non-Protestants such as Papists, Jews, libertines, agnostics, deists, and atheists, smiled from ear to ear, that the Anglican Church would no longer be the protected species in law and society.* The Office for *Papists' Conspiracy Day* which among other things celebrated the coming of William of Orange on 5 November 1688, and the associated Protestantism of the Crown and Anglican Church, was now no more. *Internally, in the centre of the city, Puseyites (Anglo-Catholics), Semi-Puseyites (Broadchurchmen), and religious liberals, clicked their champagne glasses together in celebration of the fact that Protestants of the Reformed faith were clearly no longer the protected species inside the Anglican Church.* But at the other end of London town, the Reformed (Evangelical) Anglicans declared, "Spare the champagne, there'll be no celebrations tonight." "*Corruptio optima pessima*"<sup>412</sup>."

The effects of what had happened in England, fairly robotically resounded throughout the British Empire. Anglicans in countries such as Australia always got their *Book of Common Prayer* from English printers; and so if these three days were gone in England, they were gone in Australia and elsewhere. Nevertheless, on the other side of the planet to London, as the shockwaves of what was happening in England reverberated, and the word was passed around as to what had happened in once merry old England, orders were issued in the Anglican Diocese of Sydney, Australia, to rally around the Protestant banner and brace for a mighty fifth columnist attack by Puseyites and religious liberals. Most other Anglican Dioceses fairly sheepishly decided to raise the white flag and not put up a fight; but the Diocese of Sydney decided that it would. Sydney Anglicans would "push back" at the "Puseyite push" and "religious liberal push"<sup>413</sup>."

---

<sup>412</sup> A Latin saying meaning, "The corruption of the best is the worst."

<sup>413</sup> Judd, S. & Cable, K., *Sydney Anglicans*, With a Foreword by the Most Reverend, Donald Robinson, Archbishop of Sydney, Anglican Information Office, St. Andrew's House, Sydney, 1987. When I was a student at Moore Theological College (1992-1994), all the students in one of the classes I was in, (*New Testament II*, with the lecturer / teacher, Peter O'brien,) were given a free copy of this book in February 1994. Bishop Robinson who wrote the Foreword to this book when he was Archbishop, has been known to me over the years, first as Bishop of Parramatta, then as Archbishop of Sydney, and now as a retired bishop. Unlike the new style Jensen type Anglicans, he is much more of the traditional Diocese of Sydney type Anglican. On the one hand, he was one of those involved in producing the non-traditional Australian prayer book of 1978; but on the other hand, he understood this was in the words of its title page, "for use

I have some reserve about using the terminology of, “High Church” for Puseyites, “Broadchurch” for semi-Puseyites, or “Low Church” for Reformed (Evangelical) Anglicans. That is because the Puseyites did not exist before the 19th century, and so on this schemata I regard what are now called “High Church” or “Broadchurch” as religious apostates. Moreover, because people do not always understand what is meant by “High Church” and “Low Church” they may misunderstand this terminology. But I make some minimalist usage of these terms. In such terminology, “High Church” means a person (or church) has a “high” view of jingle-jangle ostentatious semi-Romanist pomp and ritual; whereas “Low Church” means a person (or church) has a “low” view of this; and “Broadchurch” is a half-way house compromise position between the two views.

“High Church” means a person (or church) has a “high” view of semi-Romanist sacramentalism e.g., consubstantiation, although unlike the Lutherans, adding to it idolatrous adoration of the consecrated elements, and using terms like “Mass” and “Eucharist” (although occasionally “Holy Communion”); whereas “Low Church” means a person (or church) has a “low” view of this semi-Romanism and uses only the terms “Lord’s Supper,” “Communion,” or “Holy Communion.” “Broadchurch” is a half-way house compromise position between the two views generally using the terms “Eucharist” and to a lesser extent, “Holy Communion.” The Broadchurch would not have a “High Church” “monstrance” in which they idolatrously adored the consecrated “Mass” wafer, but they would have people in their congregation who would idolatrously nod their heads at the consecrated elements when they came up for Communion. The “High Church” talk of “seven sacraments,” whereas the “Broadchurch” sometimes use confusing terminologies such as “two sacraments” (Baptism and Communion), and then refer to the further five as “sacramental” but not “sacraments.” Because of their sacramentalism, they regard it as important for the Minister to wear a stole, rather than a preaching scarf, for Baptism and Communion (or for what Article 22 of the 39 Articles calls the other “five commonly called sacraments” of “Romish doctrine”); although Lutherans also make such a distinction for Baptism (Lutheran baptismal regeneration) and Communion (Lutheran consubstantiation). The “Low Church” has a “low” view of these notions of sacramental “magic;” and upholds a symbolic view of the two sacraments.

The “High Church” (and usually “Broadchurch”) also have Romish notions of “apostolic succession,” and claim their so called “catholicity” on the basis of Episcopal

---

together with The Book of Common Prayer, 1662,” as seen in the fact he still attends 1662 prayer book services at St. Swithun’s Pymble which is where I see him nowadays. I.e., Bishop Robinson is Reformed and Protestant *inside an Anglican tradition of worship* as opposed to the Puritanized “contemporary worship services,” or the type of thing Dean Jensen now does in the Cathedral which e.g., seeks to remove the Anglican tradition of kneeling at Communion and other times in a church service. Hence in this history of “Sydney Anglicans,” one should not think that these semi-Puritan “contemporary worship services” which have increasingly plagued the Diocese for about the last 30 years are part of the traditional Diocese of Sydney “Low Church” tradition; rather they are a most unwelcome and quite recent semi-Puritan excretion.

church government. This also makes them more “ecumenical” to Roman Catholics and Eastern Orthodox who also have such so called “apostolic succession” and “catholicity,” and less well disposed to those hated “Protestants” who do not. They generally would walk a million miles before they would call themselves “Protestants,” and I have heard them using the term “Protestant” as a term of contempt and derision for “Low Church” Anglicans or other Protestants. By contrast, “Low Church” means a person (or church) has a “low” view of this semi-Romanism, and does not maintain Episcopal church government on this supercilious “magic” basis. Rather, the three-fold ministry of bishop, priest, and deacon, was retained at the Reformation since it is not contrary to the Word of God, and was found to be useful and good. But as per Article 34 of the 39 Articles, other Protestant Churches can have other valid forms of church government. The NT left no specific command as to what to do on church government once the apostolate died out. While Episcopal church government is one possible way to meet the Biblical requirements of e.g., I Tim. 2:8-3:12, other Protestants have come up with other ways that are also valid, whether Lutheran, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, or Baptist. (Thus the claims of any such groups that their form of Church government is “*the* correct Divine Law” form are also rejected i.e., beyond these broad all encompassing parameters of validity on the basis of general faithfulness to Biblical Protestantism.) The “Low Church” thus has a “low” view” of these crazy and bizarre notions of magical preservation of “catholicity” by a magical “touch” of one person, who magically “touched” another etc., to get “apostolic succession.” Rather, “apostolic succession” is determined on the basis of Biblical faithfulness.

Thus let the reader imagine there is a fence. On one side of it stands a man who says he is “High Church” i.e., a semi-Romanist Puseyite. On the other side of it stands a man who says he is “Low Church,” or Evangelical, or Reformed Anglican. A third man then starts to climb the fence but stop and sits down. The question is asked him, “Which side are you going to?” He replies, “I’m not sure. ... I’m a Broadchurchman. ... To me, being an ‘Anglican,’ ... is all about just sitting on the fence.”

On this terminology of “High Church,” “Broadchurch,” and “Low Church,” I would be “Low Church.” I remember from many years ago a joke that used to be sometimes told in the “Low Church” Diocese of Sydney<sup>414</sup>. The exact details of how this joke is told vary from one person to the next, but the following rendition contains the essential elements. A Diocese of Sydney man may say something like, “I’m Low Church!” ... (pausing) ... And then (pointing to about the middle of an inside wall with his finger) adds something like, “If that wall from the ceiling to the floor represents Anglican churchmanship, and the top of that wall [moving his finger to point to the top of the wall] is the highest point of the High Church, then I’m so low, [moving his finger to point downwards] ... *I’m under the carpet!*”

But though holding the fort for about a century, in time the Diocese of Sydney

---

<sup>414</sup> The Diocese has historically allowed less than 10% of churches in it to be non-“Low Church.” E.g., in the City, St. James King Street (semi-Puseyite “Broadchurch”) or Christchurch St. Lawrence (Puseyite Proper “High Church”).

would sadly make a number of compromises. E.g., it embraced the ecumenical compromise with Papists *et al.* In 1981 the Diocese adopted the “revised” 1980 General Synod’s provisions allowing the type of incest that Henry VIII broke with Rome over. In connection with the general, though not absolute, disuse of the *BCP (1662)* and its replacement with *An Australian Prayer Book (1978)*, and associated demise of the Authorized King James Version, the Diocese has also introduced services in some churches (especially, although not always, the Sunday evening service), that are more like a Non-Conformist Puritan service than an Anglican service. Over time, these “contemporary worship services” have been gradually expanded further throughout the Diocese both in terms of geographical spread to parishes, and also with regard to their encroachment into morning “contemporary worship services,” rather than as “youth services” that replaced Evensong. Where 1662 prayer book services survive it is a very much reduced form e.g., (among churches known to me,) the annual 1662 Evensong service at 3 p.m. at St. Philip’s Church Hill (always held on the Sunday before or after 3 Feb., unless 3 Feb. is a Sunday, e.g., on Sun. 31 Jan. 2010, Richard Johnson’s Day)<sup>415</sup>; or Evensong (held variously about every 2 or 3 months i.e., 4 to 6 times a year) at a 3 p.m. service at St. Swithun’s Pymble. It has also built some newer churches that look more Puritan than Anglican, both inside and out. *But notwithstanding its defects and errors, it has, to its credit, maintained to this day a greater commitment to the gospel truths of the Reformation than is commonly found in the Dioceses of the Anglican Communion.*

When these three Offices went in 1859, some important signposts were removed. *How can men walk on a road, and know where to turn when the road divides again and again, if the signposts have been removed?* E.g., in a *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* sermon preached at Christchurch *Church of Ireland* Cathedral in Dublin, the Reverend Mr. John Echlin said 30 January was “a monument to future ages, a mark to teach our children’s children to avoid the rocks on which our father suffered shipwreck,” when “they dressed up” Charles “as a ... tyrant,” and “thus moved the people to sedition,” and did “murder him, ... to the reproach of the Protestant profession, and to the great scandal and injury of the Christian religion<sup>416</sup>.” The historical balance in the Anglican Church had been manifested in the fact that the Anglican Church was both anti-Papist and anti-Puritan, but more anti-Papist *since the Roman religion was proscribed*, than anti-Puritan *since the religion of Puritan derived Protestantism was in general tolerated* since 1689 as being that of *fellow Protestants*, and in particular since 1690 had formed the Puritan derived form of Presbyterianism found in the established *Church of Scotland*. But then

---

<sup>415</sup> Placed on the Anglican Calendar of Australia in 1978, Richard Johnson was the Evangelical Anglican Chaplain of the First Fleet (to Australia), and he conducted the first Christian service in Australia at Sydney on 3 Feb. 1788. He is a motif saint for Christianity in Australia, and St. Philip’s Church Hill has the Richard Johnson Chapel. On 30 Jan. 2008, the original volume 1 of my textual commentary was dedicated at the nearby Richard Johnson Memorial at the Corner of Hunter & Bligh Streets.

<sup>416</sup> “The Royal Martyr,” A Sermon preached before Their Excellencies the Lord Justices of Ireland in Christchurch Dublin, on the 30th of January, 1713, by John Echlin, Master of Arts, *op. cit.*, pp. 16,17,18,19-20.

came the *Roman Catholic Emancipation Act* of 1829. This helped to facilitate a change in the center of theological gravity in the *Church of England and Ireland*, in which semi-Romanist fifth columnist Anglicans no longer feared the legal repercussions of being Romanist or semi-Romanist. This was one factor that led to the rise of Puseyism within Anglicanism; and sadly, this was met by a monumental failure by the bishops of the Anglican Church to effectively discipline these semi-Romanists. Such bishops were a disgrace to the tradition of Archbishops of Canterbury like Thomas Cranmer (Archbishop 1533-1556) or Matthew Parker (Archbishop 1559-1575).

The removal of these three Offices in 1859 both manifested and intensified this trend. With these three Offices removed, Puseyites more staunchly kept heading off in a Romish direction; whereas the Diocese of Sydney, since around the time of the 1978 prayer book has in many, though not all instances, headed off in a Non-Conformist Puritan direction. Indeed, under the incumbent Dean, Philip Jensen (brother of Archbishop Peter Jensen), the Anglican element of the Diocesan Cathedral, St. Andrew's, has been sadly diminished. In 1662 men like Dean Jensen were ejected from Anglican Churches, alas, today, such a man is made Dean of an Anglican Cathedral<sup>417</sup>. With the signposts of these three Offices removed, it is clear that numerous Anglicans can all too easily become disorientated, get off track, and get lost in different directions.

On the one hand, since more Anglicans have gotten off track in the Puseyite and religiously liberal direction than the Puritan direction, the importance of *King Charles the First's Day* as a corrective in favour of celebrating Protestantism, through reference to King Charles maintenance of the Protestant theology of the Elizabethan and Jacobean prayer book of 1559 & 1604, and his uncompromisingly Protestant interpretation of the *Thirty-Nine Articles* required in His Majesty's Declaration of 1628, (even though he failed to properly enforce this against Laud,) is arguably the more important element to remember on this day; rather than the celebration of *King Charles the First's Day* as a corrective in favour of Anglican rather than Puritan forms of worship. But on the other hand, the importance of *King Charles the Martyr's Day* (and its connected derivative, the restoration in 1660 remembered on *Royal Oak Day*), as a corrective in favour of Anglican forms of worship rather than Puritan forms, is also clearly important. That is because we cannot ignore what has happened in, for instance, the Diocese of Sydney in more recent decades; or some similar departures from Anglican tradition by some Anglicans outside the Anglican Communion, for instance, the *Free Church of England* (formed in 1844 for anti-Puseyite Protestant reasons; but which then became semi-Puritan in e.g., its revised prayer book).

---

<sup>417</sup> Though he held some views that were out of harmony with historic Reformed Anglicanism (e.g., he publicly spoke against the consumption of alcohol *per se*, whereas traditionally Reformed Anglicans would only speak against drunkenness), nevertheless, in fairness to him, a well known former Dean of St. Andrew's Cathedral, Lance Shilton, like his predecessors, maintained a basic Reformed Anglican tradition in the Cathedral. Dean Shilton came from Holy Trinity Church in Adelaide, which I was told (although I have never confirmed this,) is the only Evangelical Anglican Church in that benighted Diocese.

The British Empire had been built up to protect white Protestant Britain against attack from Papists on the Continent, or anywhere else. It had been God's instrument to fulfil large parts of the Caucasian racial prophecy in Gen. 9:27, "God shall enlarge Japheth." But with the destruction of a Protestant Britain, the ultimate justification for the British Empire was also destroyed. Had Britain remained faithful to God, she through her empire would have been what in today's terminology is a super-power. But by turning away from the truth of Protestantism, as e.g., represented in, though not exhausted by, the removal of these three holy days from the calendar in 1859, she now started to sow the seeds for her own destruction as a white Protestant land; and the destruction of her empire as a white supremacist super-power. God had given her the empire to protect and promote the Biblical values of white supremacism and Protestantism; and now she had increasingly moved out of God's directive will, and increasingly under his permissive will, her strength and greatness would be diminished. *England had been a backwater at the start of the Reformation; God had given her much, but as she now moved to deconstruct the Protestant Christian State and form a secular state, she increasingly showed herself to be an arrogant ingrate.* "Rivers of waters run down mine eyes, because they keep not thy law" (Ps. 119:136).

And so it was, that sadly, these three days were all removed from the Calendar of the Book of Common Prayer (1662) in 1859; as was also the annual 2 September service (Great Fire of London, 1666) at St. Paul's Cathedral. This was done as part of a wider action to signal that Reformed Anglicanism would no longer have its privileged position outside of Scotland as the religion regarded by UK lawmakers as the preferred religion to express the truthfulness of Protestantism in England, Ireland, and Wales. Thus it meant that important demarcation lines against agnostics, atheists, and religious liberals who denied the supernatural, and who denied that God might visit judgements upon e.g., the gluttonous or those too tolerant to Popery (*Great Fire of London Day*), would now be removed. Likewise, important demarcation lines against Puritan derived Protestants who glorified Cromwell's republic would now be removed (*Charles I's Day & Charles II's Day*). And likewise, important demarcation lines against Roman Catholics who harboured sympathies for Guy Fawkes and James II, would now be removed (*Papists' Conspiracy Day*; & in Ireland, *Irish Massacre Day*).

The removal of these external protections for the Anglican Church were matched by the removal of internal protections of the Anglican Church. Hence there was also tolerance allowing the rise of religious liberalism, Puseyism, and Broadchurchmen (semi-Puseyism), within the *Church of England*. Thus important demarcation lines within the Anglican Church that meant it was a Reformed Protestant Church were also being removed, and this also signalled that Reformed Anglicanism would no longer have a privileged position as the religion regarded by lawmakers as the religion of choice used to express and manifest the truth of the Protestant Reformation.

Thus the removal from the Anglican calendar of these feast days in 1859 was part of a wider movement by lawmakers in the UK to turn away from the truth of Reformed Protestantism, no longer maintaining the *Church of England* as the principle vehicle by

which to express these wonderful truths. The Protestant Gospel as nurtured and manifested in the Established *Church of England and Church of Ireland* was like a huge beautiful green tree that spread its branches over the British Isles, and beyond that, whose leaves spread to the British Empire, which had been built up to protect white Protestants in the United Kingdom; ensuring that they could beat off attacks by Papists or anyone else against them in the British Isles. But these decisions to remove both internal protections of the Anglican Church from non-Protestants; and external protections of Anglican Church from both Puritan Protestants and Roman Catholics; meant that the lawmakers had effectively poisoned the roots of this great tree; and it now began to die. It increasingly ceased to be a safe haven for the Reformed Anglican “Low Church” saints of God, or a place which helped to facilitate their rise to positions of prominence and influence in church and society. God still saved his saints, and some still operated in enclaves inside the Anglican Church; but increasingly, they no longer could grow widely in the Anglican Church or use the Anglican Church to express the truth of Protestantism. This lush and green great tree of Protestant Anglicanism which at its height had permeated and influenced the British Isles, took some time to kill off.

In 1628, largely responding to concerns about Arminianism, His Majesty, King Charles the First, attached a “Declaration” to the *Thirty-Nine Articles* which has thereafter remained. Among other things, “His Majesty’s Declaration” states, “the Articles of the Church of England” “do contain the true doctrine of the Church of England agreeable to God’s Word: which we do therefore ratify and confirm.” And “though some differences have been ill raised,” “we will,” “that no man hereafter shall either print, or preach, to draw the Article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof: and shall not put his own sense or comment to the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense.” So “that if any” “affix any new sense to any Article,” “he, or they the offenders,” “shall be liable to our displeasure, and the Church’s censure,” “and we will see there shall be due execution upon them.” Thus King Charles acted in unison with the *Dutch Reformed Synod of Dort* (1618) to protect the *Thirty-Nine Articles* against an Arminian interpretation (such as later placed on them by Wesley and Pusey), or any other non-Reformed interpretations. And we know that the 1628 Declaration was so used by Anglican Bishops of Caroline times as a phalanx against Arminianism<sup>418</sup>.

In the 17th century men like Baxter and Poole, had such moral and spiritual integrity, that finding themselves unable in good conscience to give their assent to the broad doctrine in the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* and *Thirty-Nine Articles*, they accepted ejection from their churches in *The Lesser Ejection* of the 1660s. This would not have been easy for them. Though I do not agree with them on these issues, I respect them as men for standing true to their beliefs; I embrace them as Protestant brethren in Christ; and I expect to see them in heaven. By contrast, in the 19th century, men like Pusey and Keble, together with all the Puseyites Proper (Anglo-Catholics) clergy, semi-Puseyite (Broadchurch) clergy, and religious liberals, were so morally and spiritually

---

<sup>418</sup> Davies, J., *The Caroline Captivity of the Church*, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

putrid, that they gave grossly fraudulent interpretations to the doctrine in the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* and *Thirty-Nine Articles*, ultimately reinterpreting the concept of “giving assent” to these as meaningless terminology. They did not in any broad sense truly believe in the doctrine of the Anglican Church, which in e.g., the broad natural sense of the *Thirty-Nine Articles* is clearly Reformed and Protestant. In accordance with the “Declaration” of King Charles the First attached to the *Thirty-Nine Articles (1562)* since 1628, they should have incurred the Anglican Church’s censure and been excommunicated as heretics and defrocked as clergy. I do not respect such men; and expect that they have been cast down into the pits of hell.

Thus with internal protections of the C. of E. removed, apostates within the pale of the *Church of England* set about to “profane the name of” “God” (Lev. 18:20) by idolatry (Ezek. 36:18-20), either by adoration of the consecrated communion elements, or by tolerance towards such Anglicans (II John 10,11). This was in clear breach of the Protestant Anglican teaching, that “adoration” “either unto the sacramental bread or wine” is “idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians” (Final Rubric of “The Communion Service,” *Church of England Book of Common Prayer, 1662*). The C. of E. then followed the worldly lusts of English law-makers, who from about the same era as 1859, had been seeking to repeal various incest laws. In 1946, the apostate *Church of England’s* Convocations revised Parker’s Table (1563) (“A Table of Kindred and Affinity, wherein whosoever are related are forbidden in Scripture and our Laws to marry together,”) and reduced the numbers of marriages within the prohibited degrees. This *revised list of sins*, claimed that incest which was condemned as “fornication” since the time of the Reformation, (and before that time condemned under Roman Catholic canon law *unless* a Papal dispensation was granted,) would now be allowed for incestuous marriages in the relationships of affinity prohibited in Lev. 18:12-14,16,18; 20:19-21.

Among other things, the laws of England now allowed marriage with a deceased brother’s wife. This had been a demarcation line between Anglicans, Lutherans, and Presbyterians on the one hand, and both Papists (allowing a papal dispensation for it) and a number of Non-Conformists (allowing it *per se*) such as various Congregationalists on the other hand. Cromwell’s Congregationalists had historically warmed to the idea of moral duplicity on this type of incest, i.e., on the one hand, a good Congregationalist could frown at, and oppose it, but on the other hand, a bad Congregationalist could smile at, and engage in it. The next Sunday, both Congregationalists could then take Communion together, notwithstanding the words of I Cor. 5:11, “I have written unto you ... if any many that is called a brother be a fornicator ... with such an one no not to eat.” Such Cromwell glorifying Congregationalists now smiled to learn that these apostate Anglicans e.g., no longer regarded Henry VIII as having broken from Rome on the incest issue of “Biblical Authority not Papal authority,” and that such apostate Anglicans therefore now joined with those Papists and Puritans who regarded Queen Elizabeth I as of “bastard” birth.

The Papists allowed such incest with a Papal dispensation, and a number of Non-Conformist Protestants either allowed it *per se* and thus more freely than even the Papists, or were tolerant towards those who so interpreted Lev. 18, regarding it as a

matter of private interpretation. While godly Anglicans and Presbyterians might therefore historically challenge these Non-Conformists Protestants to accept the true meaning of Lev. 18, they only ever met with mixed success in this noble endeavor since at a Confessional level Puritan churches such as the Congregationalists and Baptist allowed diversity of opinion on this incest issue. The (Anglican) *Church of England*, (Anglican) *Church of Ireland*, and (Presbyterian) *Church of Scotland*, historically prohibited such unions. On this basis, Anglicans and Presbyterians were known to be more sexually pure than both Papists and a number of Non-Conformists; and they also claimed their inheritance as children of the Reformation commenced when Henry VIII of England and Ireland, who broke with Rome on this very issue.

Marriage with a deceased wife's sister (or a deceased sister's husband), was permitted in England in 1907; and marriage with a man's deceased brother's wife (or a woman's deceased husband's brother), was permitted in England from 1921. When these laws passed to the praise of wicked secularists, they also removed a demarcation line against anti-supernaturalists, such as agnostics, atheists, deists, vaguely defined theists, and religious liberals, since they thereby denied that God exercised his right to slay the children of such a union between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon (Lev. 20:21), in the case of all but one in their infancy, and in the case of Bloody Mary with a premature death after a short and bloody reign. The Protestant theology of Lev. 20:21, that God had acted supernaturally to both confirm that Henry VIII should break with Rome on the issue of Biblical authority (Lev. 20:21; Mark 6:18) not Papal authority, and had chosen to slay the remaining child, Bloody Mary, in later life, so as to wonderfully confirm the truth of Protestantism against Popery; was a spiritually blinded secularist denial of the supernatural in the history of the British Isles, and a denial of historic Protestantism. That the C. of E. would then also adopt such revised incest laws in 1946, was a mark of her great apostasy<sup>419</sup>.

Thus did the *Church of England* ridicule, "Beheading of St. John the Baptist" Day (*BCP, 1662, Calendar, 29 August*). Thus did the *Church of England* pour contempt upon "Saint John Baptist's Day" (*BCP, 1662, Calendar, 24 June*), with its reading at *Evening Prayer* of Matt. 14:1-12 (*BCP, 1662, Lessons Proper for Holy-Days, St. John Baptist, Evensong, 2nd Lesson*). For in this reading we learn that John the Baptist died a martyr's death when he was beheaded and had his head put on a platter (Matt. 14:8,10-12), because "Herod" had married "Herodias," "his brother Philip's wife," and "John had said unto him, It is not lawful for thee to have her" (Matt. 14:3,4). And thus did the *Church of England* make mockery of the prayer in Cranmer's *Litany Service* in the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)*, which says, "From fornication, and all other deadly sin [e.g., I Cor. 6:9; Gal. 5:19]; and from all the deceits of the world, the flesh, and the devil [e.g., Eph. 6:11; I John 2:15-17; 3:8], *Good Lord, deliver us.*"

The morals of Protestant Christianity continued to be largely supported in the wider society by the electorate through reference to the Divine Law of the Bible, and

---

<sup>419</sup> Smethurst, A.F., & Wilson, H.R., (Editors), *Acts of the Convocations of Canterbury & York*, SPCK, London, UK, 1948, pp. 89-90.

largely retained in the law through reference to such non Divine Law rationales as Blackstonian natural law (Sir William Blackstone<sup>420</sup>), Bentham's utilitarianism (Sir James Fitzjames Stephen<sup>421</sup>), or the Christian history and fabric of society (Lord Patrick Devlin<sup>422</sup>). And so it was, that within about 100 years this remnant of the great tree of

---

<sup>420</sup> Blackstone, W., *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, Vol.1, 1765; Vol. 2, 1766; Vol. 3, 1768; Vol. 4, 1769; 15th Ed., London, 1809. Blackstone (1723-1780) was a Protestant Christian of the Anglican Church. Blackstone's natural law and divine law is classic Anglican natural law in that the two run in parallel to each other, never at cross purposes to each other. But by detaching all overt reference to Divine Law, the danger existed that a person could say they believed in "natural Law," and mean by that one of the rival forms of "Natural Law" e.g., the Roman Catholic or French Revolution types. In the USA, since their revolution, US Supreme Court judges had been appointed which maintained this nexus, even though their judgements would only refer to this natural law, or manifest this natural law (cf. "pursuit of happiness," Stephen, *infra*). But the dangers of not maintaining a clear nexus with the divine law became apparent in the post World War Two era when US Supreme Court judges abandoned Blackstonian natural law for French Revolution type natural law. This tragedy occurred in earnest from the time of *Brown's case* (1954) onwards.

<sup>421</sup> Stephen, J.F., *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity*, 1873, 2nd ed. 1874; Reprint: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1967. Stephen (1829-1894) was an agnostic who supported Protestant morality for non-religious reasons of utilitarianism. Near the end of Blackstone's life, Blackstone's views had been attacked by Bentham. Nevertheless, Stephen sought reconciliation between the two strands of thinking on Christian morals. Stephen's usage of Bentham's overall happiness of society was qualified because it had a nexus with the divine law. But once again, because lawmakers and judges tended to detach all overt reference to this nexus with the divine law of Protestant Christianity, the danger existed that a person could say they believed in "utilitarianism" or "Benthamism," and mean by that the rival form of anti-divine law utilitarianism found in e.g., the libertine writings of John Stuart Mill. This happened in e.g., the UK, USA, and Australia in the post World War Two era, and in time Mill's form of libertine utilitarianism became the only one promoted in academic journals and secular colleges / universities.

<sup>422</sup> Devlin, P., *The Enforcement of Morals*, *op. cit.* . . . This worked so long as society was mono-cultural or largely mono-cultural as a white Protestant society, and those in the power positions were either white Protestant males, or supported these general power structures (e.g., the odd Roman Catholic or Jew). It was generally upheld by politicians who believed in maintaining Protestant Biblical morals and who would say so quite overtly to members of their electorate, but simultaneously only say so covertly through reference to these type of "social cohesion" arguments when in the legislatures justifying the "secularized" law. But once again because overt references to the *truth* of Protestant Christianity's divine law were removed at "the official level" by lawmakers and judges, the danger existed that a person could say they believed in such "social cohesion," but then apply it to a society other than one based on maintaining the social cohesion of a predominately white Protestant society. Alas, this also occurred in the post

Protestant Christianity, *supra*, would be largely dead branches, ready to be removed by God-hating secularists who followed libertinism and French Revolution type “rights of man.” They argued that society had been “secular” for over a hundred years with regard to religious belief, and so now it should become “secular” with regard to Christian morals. The new school “modernist” or “post-modernist” secularists, ignored or sidelined the old school secularists who for over a 100 years had been arguing for the retention of Christian morals for non-religious reasons. Their lusts had been oozing out in more secretive ways, hidden from “decent society” for about a hundred years, but now they would rear the ugly heads in public, and drag the rest of society down with them as far as they could into the gutter of moral putridity. The philosophical vehicles they would use to give their dubious, and indeed unjustifiable “intellectual justifications,” were a combination of Mill’s type libertinism, and French Revolution derived type “rights of man” or “human rights.” Really, they were just dirty, filthy lusts, dressed up with the veneer of names like “human rights” and nothing more than human *wrongs*!

And so it was, that in less than a hundred years of 1859, this great tree of the C. of E. was very largely a dead tree. It had some small, discreet, and insular enclaves of Evangelical or Protestant Anglicans, but it was very largely, and mainly, dry and dead wood. Internally, the *Church of England* was no longer Protestant, being ruined by Puseyites, religious liberals, and others. Externally, the *Church of England* had also been crippled. The great tree’s lifeless branches still theoretically underpinned Christian morality, including a racial and cultural definition of a nation (Gen. 10), as a white Caucasian / Japhethite Protestant land. But while there was some small number of Evangelical Anglicans, in broad terms, the C. of E. no longer facilitated or permitted or encouraged the rise of the Protestant saints of God inside her pale, as she had once done. The *Church of England* was now unable and unwilling to defend a white Protestant Britain, and offered no real resistance, and indeed some assistance, to its destruction.

The God-haters now moved in to start sawing off its dead branches from remaining areas that it had once reached into, introducing first libertinism by removing Christian morality from the legal system; and then more thoroughly destroying the concept of a white Protestant United Kingdom by the immigration of coloureds and non-Protestants; together with many other ungodly laws. In the place of God’s law, the French Revolution derived “rights of man” or “human rights” became the new law, for those who worshipped the god of *Demos* in their “democracy” (Greek *demos* / people + *kratos* / rule) saying to their new masters, “ye shall be as gods” (Gen. 3:5). Thus the post World War Two assault on white Protestant Britain, in which coloureds and non-Protestants poured into the country at the behest of fifth columnist politicians; and the Christian social fabric of the UK was ripped and torn asunder by lawmakers and judges, experienced no tangible resistance from the now largely spiritually dead and dry, once

---

World War Two era, in countries like the UK and Australia. (Of a Roman Catholic background, Devlin renounced religious faith whilst at university. As he lay-a-dying in August 1992, aged 86, a Roman priest was summoned, and in a surprising turn of events, Devlin was reconciled to the Roman Church of his youth and family.)

great tree of the C. of E. .

In Australia, men like Sir Robert Menzies and Sir Garfield Barwick held the fort, and gave *The Land of the Southern Cross* an extra 20 years or so till the mid 1960s of the old style Type 1 secularism. I was privileged to know Sir Garfield (d. 1997), and like myself, he was most unhappy about Type 2 secularism. When Sir Garfield and Sir Robert stood guard as two white knights each side of Australia's gateway, they ensured the *White Australia Policy* and section 127 of the Australian Constitution (subsequently repealed<sup>423</sup>) gave Australia a white race based and Christian cultural nationalism. E.g., Sir Garfield referred to his usage of 1662 prayer book when as Commonwealth Attorney-General of Australia in the Menzies Government, he put together the *Barwick Act* (Matrimonial Causes Act, 1959, Commonwealth of Australia), saying to me: "Cranmer's marriage service is marvelous because it expresses so clearly the purpose of marriage. If you take the words - they are beautifully written. Cranmer's *Book of Common Prayer* is a beautiful bit of English and you there see the obligations of the parents, and the need to comfort one another, and the need to raise children, and the need to nurture children. So I had that in my mind, of course, and if you call that an ideology, I would accept that." GBM: "So for the *consortium vitae*, you used the *Book of Common Prayer*, the service for the 'Solemnization of Marriage' or 'Matrimony'?" SIR GB: "Yes. ...<sup>424</sup>."

And notwithstanding the general spiritual deadness of the C. of E. and decline of the spiritual and moral standards of such lands, "at this present time also there is a

---

<sup>423</sup> Before its regrettable repeal in 1967, section 127 read, "In reckoning the numbers of the people of the Commonwealth, or of a State or other part of the Commonwealth, aboriginal natives shall not be counted." Before 1788, Aborigines only had local tribal identities, much smaller than any one Australian State or Territory, and in no sense thought of themselves as a unified group or anything approximating "Australia." The idea of "Australia" was a white man's idea; given to him by God in partial fulfilment of Gen. 9:27. The Aborigines were part of pre-Australia, and though permitted to be citizens of this or that State or Territory in Australia, were not regarded as "Australians," since this was defined racially, culturally, and religiously as white Anglophone Christian. The sad repeal of section 127 meant Australia was no longer Biblically defined per Gen. 10; and thereafter it went into great moral and spiritual decline (the origins of which obviously preceded this milestone event). For as the citizens of the USA also found following the 1950s racial desegregation particularly associated with *Brown's case* of 1954 (although once again with antecedent origins), any invocation of God to corporately "bless this Babelist mess" with moral and spiritual decency, falls on the deaf ears of a holy God (Gen. 6:3; Prov. 15:29; 28:9).

<sup>424</sup> INTERVIEW WITH SIR GARFIELD BARWICK (SIR GB) and Gavin Basil MCGRATH (GBM) on Tuesday 12 February 1991 at SYDNEY. Transcript as modified and approved by Sir Garfield. The *consortium vitae* refers to the important common things in the life association of a marriage e.g., love (Eph. 5:29), companionship (Gen. 2:20), marital services (Prov. 31:13-15; Gen. 3:16; Titus 2:5), and sexual relations (I Cor. 7:2).

remnant according to the election of grace” (Rom. 11:5), who maintain an Anglican tradition. E.g., there are some godly Reformed Anglicans who operate *outside* of the Anglican Communion of Churches in, for instance, the *Church of England (Continuing)*.

d) *Defending King James the First.*

Anglican hagiology has always had a special place for the Marian confessors and martyrs as being at *the heart of the Protestant memory of confessors and martyrs*. Thus the Protestant 1662 prayer book includes in it the “Primo Elizabethae” 1559 prayer book Act which was a celebration of the reintroduction of Protestantism after Popery, when “Queen Mary [the First], to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the Professors of the truth of Christ’s religion,” had “repealed” the Protestant “Common Prayer” book of “Edward the Sixth.”

But Anglican Reformation hagiology in Article 35 of the 39 Articles, largely focuses on the monarch as Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church and Defender of the Faith. E.g., Book 2, Homily 21 refers to “the Pope’s curses” as “the Babylonical beast of Rome” (Rev 17), as compared and contrasted with “God’s manifold blessings,” under “King Henry the Eighth,” “King Edward the Sixth,” and Queen Elizabeth the First. And likewise the Anglican prayer book’s Reformed hagiology largely focuses on the monarch as Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church, with King James I and King William III in *Papists’ Conspiracy Day*, Charles I in *King Charles the Martyr’s Day*; or the re-establishment of the Established *Church of England* with the Restoration under Charles II in 1660. The dedicatory Preface to the King James Version likewise looks with favour on King James I, “Defender of the Faith,” who was “a most tender and loving nursing Father,” and whose “writing in defence of the truth” “hath given such a blow unto that man of sin,” the Pope, “as will not be healed;” as well as his predecessor, “that bright Occidental Star, Queen Elizabeth of most happy memory.”

*The level of anti-Anglican rhetoric found against Anglican Protestant monarchs among Puritans and their Puritan Protestant derivatives varies considerably. At its lowest level, it is essentially limited primarily to Charles I, and to some lesser extent to Charles II. At its highest level, it includes every monarch from Henry VIII up to James II, and then becomes more positive from the time of William III of Orange on. I.e., Henry VIII (Regnal Years: 1509-1547); Edward VI (Regnal Years 1547-1553); the Papist Queen, Bloody Mary (Regnal Years 1553-1558); Elizabeth I (Regnal Years 1558-1603); James I (Regnal Years 1603-1625); Charles I (Regnal Years: 1625-1649; from 1640 in conflict with the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60); Charles II (Regnal Years: King *de jure* of the three kingdoms, 1649-1685; King *de facto* of Scotland, 1649-1650/1<sup>425</sup>; King*

---

<sup>425</sup> In July 1650, Cromwell invaded Scotland encroaching to the eastern edge of Edinburgh at which point the Scots formed a defensive shield within the city against him; though Cromwell occupied much of the south of Scotland following the Battle of Dunbar in Sept. 1650. Then in January 1651 Charles II was crowned King of the Scots at Scone. In Aug. 1651 Cromwell left General Monck to complete the conquest of Scotland which he did when he captured Stirling; and bonny King Charles II reached Worcester England

*de facto* of England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1660-1685); the Papist King, James II (Regnal Years 1685-1688); then William III of Orange and Mary II (the queen died in 1694) (Regnal Years: 1689-1702).

On the one hand, all Puritans share the Reformed Anglican's hostility to the Papist monarchs, Bloody Mary and James II. But on the other hand, the more extreme form of anti-Anglican Puritan rhetoric has a Puritan negativity to e.g., Henry VIII, Elizabeth I, and James I, which is discernibly similar to, and not always easily differentiated from, Papist negativity towards these monarchs. E.g., a traditional Reformed Anglican holds that God wrought the first stage of the English Reformation by exercising his reserve right to supernaturally kill off the children of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon per Lev. 20:21, so that Henry VIII broke with Rome on the issue of *Biblical Authority* (Lev. 18:16; 20:21) versus *Papal Authority* (allowing dispensations for incest), finally killing off the only survivor, Bloody Mary, after it was clear to all that she was wicked (cf. Gen. 38:7; Lev. 20:21). Now Catherine of Aragon was still alive when Henry VIII married Anne Boleyn and when Elizabeth I was born, and so if this first marriage was not invalid due to incest, then Henry's marriage to Anne was bigamous, adulterous, and invalid (Matt. 19:9). For which reason the Papists have loved to speak ill of Elizabeth I's legitimacy.

And (though I hesitate to repeat such error,) there is fine line between a Puritan and Papist sentiment that Queen Elizabeth I was illegitimate i.e., whether a Puritan view of, "*that Anglican bastard, Queen Elizabeth I*<sup>426</sup>," or a Papist view of "*that Protestant*

---

in the same month, in the following month of Sept. 1651 being defeated at the Battle of Worcester. Thus Charles II was king *de facto* of only part of Scotland from July 1650, and remained king *de facto* of only part of Scotland till 1651.

<sup>426</sup> This view is disallowed by Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 24:4, but allowed, though not required, by Congregationalist *Savoy Declaration* 25:4 and *Baptist (London) Confession* 25:4; and some modified Presbyterian *Westminster Confessions*. E.g., the *Orthodox Presbyterian Church of America* left the *Presbyterian Church in the USA* (PCUSA) in 1936; and in doing so retained a 1903 PCUSA amendment to *Westminster Confession* 24:4, which adopted the Congregationalist and Baptist position, *supra*. Cromwell's Congregationalists were evidently attracted to the idea of moral duplicity on this issue of incest. This 17th century Puritan (Congregationalist & Baptist) idea, and 20th century idea of *some* Presbyterians (of Puritan derivation), that what constitutes incest is a matter of *private interpretation only*, is conceptually comparable to a 21st century resolution of the *Uniting Church of Australia*, (formed from *some* Presbyterian, *some* Congregationalist, and Methodist Churches,) passed in a resolution of its National Assembly on 17 July 2003. This resolution allowed *Uniting Church* presbyteries (regional councils) to decide between one of two views, either allowing the ordination of homosexual ministers, or prohibiting the ordination of homosexual ministers. Thus the *Uniting Church* allows moral ambiguity as to whether or not one of its local churches condones or condemns sodomy (Lev. 18:22; 20:13; Mark 6:11), in the same way that Congregationalists, Baptists, and in historically modern times some Presbyterian Churches, allow moral ambiguity as to whether or not one its local churches

*bastard*, Queen Elizabeth I,” *infra*. And in response to this from an Anglican perspective, there is a fine line between a Reformed Anglican such as myself, in my anti-anti-incest stance, whether its form is anti-Puritan or anti-Papist, for both those Puritans (though the Puritans are historically divided among themselves on this issue,) and those Papists holding such views, are to be denounced for promoting sexual immorality and vice (I Cor. 5:1,11; 6:9), even as St. John the Baptist denounced Herod, saying, “It is not lawful ... to have thy brother’s wife” (Mark 6:18; Lev. 18:16; 20:21).

I.e., some Puritans (by which I here include in meaning Puritan derived Protestants,) deny that in the Christian era the Bible prohibits a man from marrying his deceased brother’s wife (Mark 6:18; 10:8). E.g., Section 24:4 of the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* was specifically modified by section 25:4 of the Congregationalist’s *Savoy Declaration* (1658) and *Baptist (London) Confession* (1689), as was section 24:4 (1979 PRC amendment) of the Presbyterian Reformed Church of Australia’s *Westminster Confession with Amendments* (1999), so as to leave certain forms of incest, such as marriage with a deceased brother’s wife, to *private interpretation* of Lev. 18 *et al.* *As well might they allow “private interpretation” as to whether adultery or sodomy is wrong, as to so allow “private interpretation” on incest!*

On the one hand, there are some good and godly men among those in these churches, and I would challenge these men to accept the true meaning of Lev. 18 which is synonymous with the section gratuitously excised from the *Westminster Confession* 24:4 i.e., “The man may not marry his wife’s kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own; nor the woman of her husband’s kindred nearer in blood than of her own (Lev. 20:19-21).” I would challenge them to stop attacking the first stage of the English and Irish Reformation when King Henry VIII of England and Ireland broke with Rome on this very issue, upholding Biblical authority as opposed to Papal authority which claimed the Pope *could set aside the very law of God itself and so allow some incest for those eager to run into this wickedness.* Indeed, there are Protestant brethren in Christ in these churches who accept this, and reject such incest. But on the other hand, with all due respect to those in these churches, leaving such issues of incest to *private interpretation*, facilitates a situation where “fornication” is “among you” (I Cor. 5:1).

Hence there is a documented history of incest among such Puritans, as well as among Wesleyans who, though coming much later in time, nevertheless adopted Puritan forms of worship and these types of Puritan permissive sexual views on incest. E.g., the mid 19th century UK Royal Commissioners on Incest, focusing on the related issue of marriage with a deceased wife’s sister, found pockets of incest were isolated to particular geographical areas or groups of religious Dissenters. On the one hand, the Royal Commissioners found that, “In Scotland, the opinion of the” Presbyterian *Church of Scotland* “clergy is decidedly against these marriages.” But by contrast, “The various bodies of Dissenters in England do not appear to entertain the opinion that these marriages” “are in themselves reprehensible<sup>427</sup>.”

---

condones or condemns some forms of incest (Lev. 18:16; 20:21; Mark 6:18).

<sup>427</sup> Hope, A.J.B., *The Report of H.M. Commission on the Laws of Marriage*

A common finding was that “Dissenting Ministers,” e.g., “Baptist” and “Wesleyan Methodists,” were “generally” “in favour of a relaxation of the law” i.e., to allow marriage with a deceased wife’s sister<sup>428</sup>. For instance, “F.A. Cox,” “a Baptist Minister” was “in favour of the relaxation” of the law to allow this incest. Or the Judaizer “Thomas Binney,” a “well known Congregationalist Minister,” was “decidedly in favour of” a “relaxation” in the law to allow this incest. Binney also thought that “perhaps bigamy” should be tolerated<sup>429</sup>. But the scandalous web of incest was found to extend to a number of Dissenter Ministers themselves. E.g., “An Independent Minister who had married the sister of his deceased wife,” “gave rise to much family bickering,” “on account of the present state of the law,” against this union, rather than “any objection” “to the incest itself<sup>430</sup>.” This type of incest also broke out in pockets of both Suffolk and Norfolk. Thomas Campbell gave “evidence,” of “a Dissenting Minister at a town in Suffolk,” who “married his deceased wife’s sister.” So too, there was “a shoemaker in the same town who cohabits with his deceased brother’s wife;” and “there is another case,” of “a surgeon in the same town, marrying his deceased wife’s sister.” Then there was “a Wesleyan Minister, who married” “his deceased wife’s sister” in Norfolk. There were other cases also in Norfolk<sup>431</sup>.

The Royal Commissioner’s stated the legal history of the provisions prohibiting incest with a deceased wife’s sister. They said, “The question, whether marriage within the present degrees of affinity were permitted by the law of God, was the subject of much discussion when King Henry VIII [Regnal Years: 1509-1547] sought to be relieved from his marriage with Queen Katherine. This marriage was pronounced null and void by Archbishop Cranmer<sup>432</sup>.”

This well documented and shocking tolerance of some Puritans, and Wesleyans who have adopted many Puritan forms, towards such incest, has another very disturbing element to it. In its ugliest anti-Anglican form, it gives rise to claims that Henry VIII did

---

*Relative to Marriage with a Deceased Wife’s Sister*, James Ridgway, London, UK, 1849, p. 11; cf. pp. 32-3,42,67-8.

<sup>428</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 149-50.

<sup>429</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 78. Binney here claimed that “A bishop” “must be” “the husband of one wife” in I Tim. 3:2, “means that if a person had two wives, he was not required to put one away, or dissolve the marriage, but he was not to be an officer of the church.” By contrast, Christ taught that to marry a second wife constitutes “adultery” (Matt. 19:9), and so he prohibited bigamy (or polygamy) for Christians.

<sup>430</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 35.

<sup>431</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 173-4.

<sup>432</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

not, “as the Anglicans claim,” break with Rome on the issue of *Biblical authority* (*Lev. 20:21; Mark 6:18*) versus *Papal authority* (granting a “dispensation” to allow such incest), but rather, it was a case, (and I find it hard to even report such wicked blasphemous, and scandalous claims,) of Henry VIII seeking a divorce of “convenience” due to “sexual lust.” Of course, in this type of scenario, the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, is necessarily also cast in an unfavourable, and indeed very unfair, light, i.e., *that Anglican* Archbishop responsible for *those Anglican* prayer books, whose work is largely preserved in the 1662 prayer book.

This in turn feeds into a derivative claim that since Catherine of Aragon was still alive when the princess Elizabeth was born, that this second marriage with Anne Boleyn being “adulterous,” Princess (later Queen) Elizabeth was therefore of “illegitimate” birth. Hence *that Anglican* Queen, Elizabeth I, was “a bastard.” Though I reject this, (I note its similarity to Papist rhetoric about “*that Protestant* bastard,” Elizabeth I,) “*That Anglican* bastard, Elizabeth I” i.e., the one responsible for *that Anglican* prayer book of 1559, which (with minimal Jacobean modification in 1604,) was the prayer book used by Charles I and made “illegal” by the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60 in 1645.

Now in its ugliest anti-Anglican form, many lies are also told about King James I i.e., “*that Anglican King*,” under whom came the 1604 modifications to the 1559 prayer book, thus producing the Elizabethan and Jacobean prayer book of 1559 & 1604, used by Charles I and made “illegal” by the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60 in 1645. I shall not repeat the details of the most shocking and false lies that I once heard from the profane and filthy lips of a Scotsman. His anti-Jacobean sentiment marked him out as either a Papist or (one type of) a Puritan (though which of the two he was, I do not know.) This wicked Scotsman, (a disgrace to the name of “Scotsman,” for I generally hold my Aryan Protestant brethren of Scotland in higher regard,) told filthy lies, all centred around, and based on, the central false claim that James I was one of those who “defile themselves with mankind” (I Tim. 1:8 cf. Lev. 18:22,24). This type of false claim about “*that Anglican* bugger, James I,” is further discussed, *infra*.

Indeed, many falsehoods have been perpetrated against King James I. While I do not regard King James I as a perfect man, or beyond criticism, I nevertheless consider that in broad terms he is a great and important symbol of Protestantism. Like all the saints of God, he was “a man subject to like passions as we are” (James 5:17). On the one hand, King James was an imperfect man who had blemishes and made mistakes. But on the other hand, such imperfections should not be used to deny that as a package deal he stands out as an important Protestant saint. Indeed, one of the reasons why the *King James Bible* became *the* Protestant Bible, was that King James stood out as a leading Protestant saint. King James was remembered every 5 November as canons ceremonially fired at various times throughout the day, Anglican church bells rang out throughout the day, bonfires were lit at night, and bright gunpowder rockets blazed multiple colours across the night-sky, remembering the foiled regicidal Roman Catholic gunpowder treason of Guy Fawkes *et al* aimed at killing this Protestant King and his Protestant Parliament, on *Papists’ Conspiracy Day*.

Though I hesitate to stereotype those Protestants who perpetrate these lies against King James I, and stress that there are many good and godly Non-Conformists who hold a more favourable view of King James I; nevertheless, there tends to be *one type* of Non-Conformist that likes to spin negative stories about King James, and they may be joined by religious liberals of various religious affiliation in this pursuit. E.g., these fools like to say, “King James was a fool;” when in fact, there is no fool, like these silly fools, who join with the Papists in attacking King James I.

Indeed, as recently as the year 2007, a Free Presbyterian woman (in the *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia*, which has a number of much better people in it than this one,) I was speaking to, who was opposed to the *King James Version* being used in church, dipped her tongue in the slim of slander, and claimed to me that King James the First had many “mistresses.” This claim of an adulterous King James is absolute fiction (and many other Free Presbyterians, would distance themselves from this ridiculous claim). King James was known as a youth for his chastity, and the evidence we have strongly indicates that he was faithful to his wife, Queen Anne.

Indeed, more generally, the enemies of King James the First find it so hard to find any such evidence of “mistresses,” that they go the other way and fraudulently claim he was one of those “abusers of themselves with mankind” (I Cor. 6:9; cf., Gen. 19; Lev. 20:13; Rom. 1:26,27,32). Now in some contexts, one may plainly refer to a “sodomite” (Deut. 23:17), or “sodomites” (I Kgs 14:24; 15:12; 22:46; II Kgs 23:7), or the sin of Sodom (Gen. 19:5; Matt. 10:15; Jude 7). But whereas “it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret” (Eph. 5:12); great care should be exercised when discussing issues such as sodomy, and like issues of great wickedness such as witchcraft or other devil-worship. Thus the terms “abusers of themselves with mankind” (I Cor. 6:9, cf. Lev. 20:13; Rom. 1:26,27,32) and “them that defile themselves with mankind” (I Tim. 1:10, cf. Lev. 18:22,24), were wisely retained from Tyndale (1534), by both Cranmer (1539) and the *Geneva Bible* of 1557.

And though some may prefer a plainer rendering like “buggers,” such as found in the *Geneva Bible* of 1560 at I Cor. 6:9; I Tim. 1:10<sup>433</sup>, the crudeness of such a reading of Scripture in a public church service, plus the explicitness that may lead to an unpleasant issue being raised by children asking about what this means, led the Authorized Version to wisely return to the earlier renderings of Tyndale found in the 1557 Geneva Bible *et al.* (One can use these terms i.e., “abusers of themselves with mankind” or “them that defile themselves with mankind,” more freely if children are present, whether in the public reading of Scripture or some other context. For if a child asks the meanings of these terms, one can simply say, “someone who abuses themselves,” or “someone who defiles themselves,” etc., which though an incomplete answer, is still a reasonable one under the

---

<sup>433</sup> The *Geneva Bible* (1560) reads, “bouggerers” (I Cor 6:9) and “buggerers” (I Tim. 1:10) i.e., the modern “buggers.” The earlier *Geneva Bible* (1557) reads, “abusers of them selues with the mankynde” (I Cor. 6:9); and “them that defyle them selues with mankynde (I Tim. 1:10). Certainly this 1560 revision is not always an improvement on the 1557 Geneva Bible.

circumstances. If the child persists, one can repeat this, and add, “You’ll understand it better when you’re older;” adding e.g., “Now go and play with your toys.”)

I think we should avoid unnecessary details. For ungodly and unsaved people, claiming to “give news” is a device used that prioritizes and cultivates a focus on the unseemly elements of e.g., a murder, and having first generated an undesirable “taste” for such information, then in fact seeks to pander to, and cultivate, men’s baser natures. E.g., they unnecessarily focus on rapes, murders, thefts, riots, and other sickening things, and do not seek to “set” their audiences “affections on things above” (Col. 3:2). This is a devious way of seeking to cultivate wicked lusts, gossip, and a fascination with evil rather than a horror and repulsion to evil, and is a poor substitute for setting of one’s “affections on things above” (Col. 3:2). What the world calls “the news” in its newspapers or other media, is frequently unfit for Christian consumption. (Indeed, more generally, there is very little in the secular media that is fit for Christian consumption.) In all such things, I think it best that we “have not known the depths of Satan” (Rev. 3:24), but only so much as is needful for us to know.

Specifically, unnecessary details ought not to be given, nor perverse facts dwelt on, nor overly focused on, and most especially is this so in any oral public dissertation on such matters. (In a written dissertation, designed *not for the profane and obsessed with evil reader*, but for the discreet and learned reader, there is a greater leniency in an appropriately restrained book.) And so it was, that when dealing with the sin of Sodom, the English common law was very restrained in its language. The great common law jurist, Sir William Blackstone (1723-1780), writing in the fourth volume of his *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, says, “I will not act so disagreeable a part, to my readers as well as myself, as to dwell ... upon a subject, the very mention of which is a disgrace to human nature.” I “will” follow “in this respect the delicacy of our English law, which treats it, in its very indictments, as a crime not fit to be named ... .” “This the voice of nature and of reason, and the express law of God” in “Lev. 20:13,15,” “determined to be capital. Of which we have a signal instance, long before the Jewish dispensation, by the destruction of two cities by fire from heaven: so that this is an universal, not merely a provincial, precept.” “But now the general punishment” “is” “hanging” “by statute 25 Hen[ry] VIII c[hapter] 6 revived and confirmed by 5 Eliz[abeth I] c[hapter] 17.<sup>434</sup>” (And it remained a capital crime till Victoria’s time.)

Thus under King James I sodomy was a capital crime. Moreover, under James I, in 1609 (7 Jac. 1, cap. 24) legislation supporting earlier legislation under Henry VIII, was passed, and assented to by the King on this issue. As recorded in Gibson’s *Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani* (1761), this ensured that “buggery” or “sodomy” was “excepted of a general pardon.” I.e., if convicted of sodomy (whether an unnatural act by a man on: a woman, or a man i.e., a homosexual act, or a beast; or an unnatural act of a woman with a beast), then the king could not grant a pardon to the sodomite, which is hardly the type of legislation James I would support if, as is falsely claimed, he engaged in this vice

---

<sup>434</sup> 4 Bl. Com. 215-6.

himself<sup>435</sup>. Hence it is simply that those making these claims about James I, are themselves so given over to all kinds of lusts and excesses, that they cannot imagine that anyone else would not be as reprobate as they are. And since James the First had mainly male friends, they then interpret this as meaning he and his male friends *just had to be* sodomites. These fools “just know” James “was a homosexual” as an outgrowth of their uncontrolled and ungodly lives which are full of worldly lusts. *I find these evil people to be a real pain!*

Reference is sometimes made by these persons, to a statement of King James to a male friend of his, that he would “live a sorrowful widow’s life without you.” This is clearly a metaphoric usage of “widow’s life,” indicating great affection for his friend. It is comparable to the statement of King David about Jonathon, “O Jonathan,” “I am distressed for thee,” “very pleasant hast thou been unto me: thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of woman” (II Sam. 1:25,26).

Those who claim that such statements indicate that King James I or indeed King David were among “them that defile themselves with mankind” (I Tim. 1:10), ignore the bigger picture. Under King David of Israel, the law of Lev. 20:13 made sodomy a capital offence. And under King James I of Great Britain and Ireland, the law of 25 Henry VIII chapter 6 (revived and confirmed by 5 Elizabeth I chapter 17), made sodomy a capital crime (4 Blackstone’s Commentaries, pp. 215-6; operative until in the 19th century a Victorian statute reduced the penalty to imprisonment). These type of metaphors were possible precisely because in the context of these societies, it was simply unthinkable that those listening would take them in a homosexual way. These were virulently anti-sodomite societies.

Thus we find that one form of attacking the King James Version has come in the form of slanderous stories about King James I. Of course, no man, Christ except, is perfect. But any criticism of James I must recognize that in broad terms he was a symbol of Protestantism, and it was for this reason that Popery in general, and Jesuitry in particular, sought to commit regicide and murder King James on 5 November 1605, in order to re-establish Roman Catholicism in the British Isles. The status of King James I as a Protestant symbol, celebrated annually on 5 November in *Papists’ Conspiracy Day*, is one important element of the story as to why the King James Bible became *the Protestant Bible*. It is not the only element, but it is one element. In a day and age

---

<sup>435</sup> Gibson’s *Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani*, Vol. 2, p. 1080 (Title XLVII, cap 3), p. 1082 (Title XLVII, cap 18, 35 Hen. 8 cap. 18; 7 Jac. 1, cap 24; 12 Car. II, Cap. 2; 25 Car. II. Cap. 5; 2 Wm. & Mary, Cap. 10; 6 Wm. & Mar. cap. 20; 7 Anne Cap. 22; 3 Geo. Cap 19; 7 Geo. Cap. 29. The legal offence of sodomy is wider than male homosexual acts, and more generally includes various unnatural acts, i.e., (depending on the jurisdiction of the Anti-Sodomy Statute,) *per anum* (anus) and *per os* (mouth) whether heterosexual or homosexual or bestial. In the widest legal sense, *all homosexuals are sodomites, but not all sodomites are homosexuals*.

when the King James Version is under attack, those spearheading this attack may therefore seek to sully the name of King James the First. Thus it has become necessary to defend this admittedly frail and imperfect man, against the many “slings and arrows of outrageous fortune” (Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*, 3:1:58) that have been cast against him.

**\*e) *Charles I’s Day sometimes kept on Monday 31 January.***

King Charles the First was martyred on Saturday the 30th of January, 1649. Before 1750 (24 George II, chapter 23), the new year started in England on *Annunciation Day* (25 March); but because some people also followed the 1 January new year calendar, both dates were sometimes given for 1 January to 24 March. Thus 30 January 1649 might be written as 30 January 1648/49.

In the 1662 prayer book, *King Charles I’s Day* was a red-letter day with its own office. But from 1662 to 1859 the Office of King Charles the Martyr required that the day be transferred to Monday 31 January when 30 January fell on a Sunday in a given year (as did the earlier 1661-2 remembrance of it under 12 Caroli II, chapter 30, passed in January 1661<sup>436</sup>), because this Office made it a fast day and Anglicans never fast on Sundays as this is a day of rejoicing for the resurrection of Christ. Under the “Tables and Rules” of the 1662 prayer book for “fasting” and “abstinence,” by “fast” is meant either a full fast, *or a partial fast i.e., abstaining from red meat in favour of eating fish and / or milk’n’sugar in one’s tea or coffee and / or abstaining from delicacies such as lollies or deserts on the day.* The rubric at the beginning of the Office says, “A Form of Prayer with Fasting, To be used yearly on the thirtieth of January . . . . If this day shall happen to be Sunday, this Form of Prayer shall be used . . . the next day following. And upon the Lord’s Day next before the Day to be kept, at Morning Prayer, immediately after the Nicene Creed, notice shall be given for the due observation of the said Day<sup>437</sup>.”

E.g., in 1689, the 30th day of January fell on a Sunday, and so the Office for *Charles I’s Day* was celebrated that year on Monday 31st January 1688/89. 1689 was the 50th anniversary of Charles’ martyrdom. It was a very good year for the reconciliation process between Anglicans and Puritans as Protestant brethren in Christ. It was the year of the *Toleration Act* of 1689, and the following year the Anglicans of England supported a Puritan Church becoming the established *Church of Scotland* in

---

<sup>436</sup> This Act says, “That every thirtieth day of January, unless it falls . . . upon the Lord’s day, and then the day next following, shall be . . . observed . . . as an anniversary day of fasting and humiliation, to implore the mercy of God , that neither the guilt of that sacred and innocent blood, nor those other sins by which God was provoked to deliver up both us and our King unto the hands of cruel and unreasonable men, may at any time hereafter be visited upon us or our posterity.”

<sup>437</sup> The reason for this was that it was kept as a “fast” day. In the 1662 prayer book’s “Tables and Rules,” “Days of Fasting” can also be “days of . . . abstinence.” Such “abstinence” is traditionally understood as a voluntary deprivation of certain foods. But this was not practiced on Sundays, so the day was transferred to Monday.

1690. This saw the end of the united Episcopal-Presbyterian church of Scotland (1660-1688/9) which had a modified form of episcopacy but which had been pulled apart by the Episcopal wing being Jacobite, and the Presbyterian wing being Williamite. The Anglicans of England and Ireland backed their fellow Reformed and Protestant brethren in the Presbyterian wing which then became Established as the *Church of Scotland*; and this also saw an Anglican-Presbyterian Protestant alliance then underpin the Established Protestant Churches and States of the three kingdoms of England, Ireland, and Scotland, and their successors (1707-1800 the Kingdom of Great Britain with the ongoing Kingdom of Ireland, and from 1801 the United Kingdom).

Thus the Anglicans of England and Ireland preferred the Scottish Presbyterians over Episcopalians in the *Episcopal Church of Scotland*, who it must be sadly said, generally had certain Jacobite sympathies stemming from their failure to grasp the fact that Kings are subject to laws, and that the office James II held from 1685-8 was voidable. These Jacobites failed to recognize James II's voidable office was rightly declared void by the Members of Parliament inviting over the next in line William III to succeed, by William III landing in England on 5 November 1688, and by the subsequent ratification within a reasonable period of three months by the Parliament in February 1689, which held that by his conduct, James II had *de facto* abdicated. James II had clearly *de jure* abdicated by his willful refusal to meet the legal requirements of a *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland*, and so his voidable office had fairly been declared void. Regrettably, substantial numbers of Jacobite Episcopalians in the *Episcopal Church of Scotland* showed sympathy with Jacobite Papists in 1715 and 1745, and in response Anglicans supported Scottish Presbyterians closing them down (they were allowed to re-open in 1792). (Cf. my comments on a certain Scottish Jacobite Papist at Matt. 13:15.)

Irish and English Anglicans thus had a somewhat ambivalent view about Episcopalians in the *Episcopal Church of Scotland*. On the one hand, they were fellow Episcopalians in church government. But on the other hand, they were frequently Jacobites, and at this point, Irish and English Anglicans entered a firm and resolute pact of Protestant friendship and defence of the Protestant Crown with Presbyterian Puritans in the established *Church of Scotland* against Episcopalians in Scotland. For English and Irish Anglicans *Charles I's Day* stood against the excesses of Puritanism; but it was counterbalanced with the fact that as represented by the Protestantism of *Papists' Conspiracy Day*, English and Irish Anglicans stood more generally with Puritans as fellow Protestants against Popery, and in particular with the Presbyterians in the *Church of Scotland* as fellow Protestants against the *Episcopal Church of Scotland*.

Thus the sense of King Charles the Martyr was not the same for English and Irish Anglicans as most Scottish Episcopalians. The traditional English and Irish view of *Charles I's Day* was like a contemporary Reformed (Evangelical) Anglican view; whereas the *Episcopal Church of Scotland* generally had a view more like the Puseyite authors of *Hierurgia Anglicana*. As a package deal, English and Irish Anglicans preferred Scottish Presbyterians over Scottish Episcopalians from the time of James II. (In broad terms, Scottish Presbyterians had been united against the Anglicanism of

Charles I while still recognizing him as king, divided over Charles II, united against James II, and united for William III.) When this sentiment is understood, it shows that the Jacobite sympathies expressed by the Puseyite writers of *Hierurgia Anglicana, supra*, which in typical Jacobite terms refers to “the *usurpation of William of Orange*<sup>438</sup>,” would be regarded by traditional Reformed Anglicans in England and Ireland as treason against the Crown.

It is also relevant to the Puseyite writers of *Hierurgia Anglicana* referring to the return to a more stridently Reformed Protestant form of Anglicanism after 1688, as “the ascendancy of *Presbyterian principles* at the usurpation of William of Orange.” I.e., these Puseyites are here strongly identifying with the *Episcopal Church of Scotland* Jacobite Episcopalians in their opposition to the established *Church of Scotland* Williamite Presbyterians, and claiming that the Reformed Anglicans of England and Ireland who opposed these Scottish Jacobite Episcopalians were in fact really “Presbyterian” in their outlook, as they backed the Scottish Williamite Presbyterians. Suffice to say, this is a gross distortion of history, tailored to suit the fancies of anti-Protestant Puseyites, for whom *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* with its great celebration of Protestantism under both James I and William III, was evidently much hated.

English and Irish Anglicans stood with the Presbyterians in the *Church of Scotland* as fellow Protestants against the *Episcopal Church of Scotland*; and as one good turn deserves another, in this alliance they stood together against English and Irish Puritan glorifying Cromwell’s “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:20,21), for both Papists and Puritans were subject to the Test Acts in England and Ireland. Anglicans supported closing down the *Episcopal Church of Scotland* following the *Battle of Culloden* in 1746, and we cannot doubt that if such godly men were in Parliament a century later, they would likewise have moved to close down these Puseyites and their movement.

There was some level of anti-Puritanism against excessive forms of Puritanism in England and Ireland, seen in the Puritan’s relationship to the Test Acts, since after 1689 a number of them met these requirements by occasionally taking Anglican Communion when procuring governmental positions; whereas more extremist Puritans, like Papists, would not do this. There was also an alliance of friendship between Anglicans in the Kingdoms of England (i.e., England & Wales) and Ireland, and Puritan Presbyterians in the Kingdom of Scotland. The three Kingdoms stood united under the Protestant Crown. Hence when in 1689, *Charles I’s Day* was celebrated on Monday the 31st January, it was done so by Anglicans who preferred Scottish Puritans in the Presbyterian Church, over Episcopalians in the *Episcopal Church of Scotland*. Why? Because *they were Protestant Christians first, and supporters of episcopal church government second!*

But this transference of the day to Monday if it fell on a Sunday was a changeable rule of the Anglican Church. It related to the fact that 30 January was made a fast day; which is not the case for 30 January wherever it has been revived. Thus following the revival of *Charles I’s Day* in 1962 in Canada, 1978 in Australia, or 1980 in England, this

---

<sup>438</sup> *Hierurgia Anglicana*, p. 354.

rule has not reintroduced. Hence whether regarded as a black letter day (Canada 1962, Australia 1978, and England 1980) or a red letter day (an option in England from 1980), it is now generally remembered as a black letter day on the 30th of January irrespective of what day of the week it is. In fact, it has now sometimes become subject to a quite different rule becoming more common from the mid to latter part of the 20th century, which will transfer the main memory of a day to the Sunday before or after it falls, unless it falls on a Sunday, since in modern society it is difficult to get people to church on any day but Sunday (other than Good Friday and Christmas Day). Thus paradoxically, Sunday is now a preferred day for such a remembrance, and so if a Minister were to preach a *King Charles Martyr's Day* sermon he may well do it on the Sunday before or after 30 January, although he might also state in the church notices on the Sunday before 30 January that e.g., the following Wednesday will be *King Charles I's Day* (a procedure he might also adopt for a number of holy days during the year). Thus *Charles I's Day* fell on, and was generally remembered on, Sunday the 30th of January in 1983, 1994, 2000, and 2005. Though we do not know when the Lord will return, presently looking into the future, the 30th of January will also fall on a Sunday in e.g., 2011, 2022, and 2028 (the 50th anniversary of the reviving of *Charles I's Day* in 1978).

It is nevertheless a matter of historical interest, that before 1859, (as for any wishing in their private devotions to keep it as a “fast” day of abstinence after 1859,) when *Charles I's Day* fell on a Sunday, it was always kept on Monday the 31st of January. Such a year was e.g., the 90th anniversary of King Charles' martyrdom in 1739<sup>439</sup>. This is illustrated by the following (fictional jocular) story.

*There was an Englishman, an Irishman, and a Scotsman.* The Englishman was a Puritan who lived permanently in London. The Irishman was an Anglican from the *Church of Ireland* who was living temporarily for about six or so months in London.

The Scotsman had moved permanently to London on the basis that he was “a good Anglican” and “a good Scotsman,” and he wanted “to get away from those blasted Jacobites in the *Episcopal Church of Scotland*,” with their “silly pretending towards Popish pretensions, because,” he said, “I support bonny King William of Orange.” “And lest I be misunderstood,” the Scotsman added, “though like all good Anglicans I am a Sabbatarian, I also fully support bonny King William's Act of 1700, which continued the pre-existing Anglican practice of allowing public transport on Sundays with watermen on the Thames River of London, contrary to the claims of overly strict Sabbatarian Puritans who will not use public transport on Sundays.” Both the Irish and Scottish Anglicans were Sabbatarians who attended *Church of England* services in London, and used public transport watermen on Sundays.

It was Monday the 31st of January in the year 1739, and because the 90th

---

<sup>439</sup> At that time reckoned by those using an Annunciation Day New Year's Day Calendar (25 March) as 1738, and sometimes written as 1738/9 to reflect the diversity of practice between this and the 1 January New Year's Day Calendar.

anniversary of King Charles' martyrdom on 30 January fell on a Sunday in that year, *King Charles the Martyr's Day* was kept on that Monday. Both the Irishman and Scotsman had just returned from a *Church of England* service celebrating the day, when they met up with their friend, the English Puritan, in London.

The three men all owned cats, not because they were "cat lovers" as such, but because London had a problem with mice and rats, and keeping a cat in the house served a practical function of chasing down mice and rats. The three men were talking about the prowess of their cats. *It emerged that everyone's cat had caught a rat the day before.*

The Scottish Anglican said, "My cat's called James, after James the First, who was also James the Sixth *of Scotland*. The James after whom our King James Bible is named. Yesterday, my cat caught a 10 inch rat! So I rewarded him by giving him a big bowl of milk, and letting him run around outside during the night."

The Irish Anglican said, "My cat's called Charles, after King Charles the First, the son of King James the First. Yesterday, my cat caught an 11 inch rat! So I rewarded him by letting him play with a big ball of string, and I let him go outside so he could climb up onto the roof of the nearby Puritan Church."

Then the English Puritan said, "My cat's called Oliver, after Oliver Cromwell. Yesterday, my cat caught a 12 inch rat! ... But I had to hang him ..., because in doing so he'd broken the Sabbath day!"

**\*f) *King Charles the First's Day: with Dedication of Volume 1 in 2008.***

Under Cromwell's republic, the prayer book had been made "illegal," all Anglican holy days other than Sunday had been forbidden, Anglicanism prohibited, and many Anglican churches gutted, striped down, ripped down, or used for horse stables. One of the most unpopular elements of what the Office for King Charles the Martyr calls the "tyranny" of the Puritan Revolutionaries was their abolition of Christmas Day.

A republican ordinance of 1644 insisted 25 December be kept as a "fast day," in "remembrance" of the "sins" of those keeping "this feast, pretending the memory of Christ" on the day, but really showing "forgetfulness of him." Then by republican ordinance of 1647, it was "resolved ... that no observation shall be had of ... Christmas-Day ...;" and town criers were sent up and down English streets yelling out, "No Christmas! No Christmas!" Exercising their Christian rights under Acts 5:29 and Rom. 14:5,6; a reply resolution was made by 10,000 men of Canterbury and its environs, that they would "have Christmas Day," and if as republicans claimed "not," then "they would have the King back on his throne again." A bloody riot ensued. Later, by republican ordinance of 1652, it was again repeated that "no observation shall be had of ... Christmas-Day." Trying to force Anglicans to not keep Christmas, and trying to get as many people as possible to open their shops on Christmas Day, resulted in bloody riots.

Yet Christmas continued anyway. E.g., John Evelyn (1620-1706) is a well

known diarist who wrote in Caroline times. When in Lewes for the Bonfire Day period in 2008, I saw his boyhood home, *Southover Grange*. Evelyn records in his dairy that on Christmas Day 1657 he attended an Anglican Church (even though the Church of England had been made “illegal,”) at Exeter Chapel in London. The sermon was on Micah 5:2, “But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, . . . out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.” But the Roundheads learnt of it and arrived, and Evelyn records that “as we went up to receive the sacrament, the miscreants held their muskets against us.” Arrested and imprisoned the Roundhead’s “Colonel Whalley” said to Evelyn, “that none should . . . observe the superstitious time of the Nativity (so esteemed by them), . . . and particularly be at [Anglican] Common Prayers, which they told me was but the [Roman Catholic] Mass in English, and particularly pray for Charles Stuart.” I.e., because they followed the Biblical injunction of I Timothy 2:1,2 to make “prayer . . . for kings,” the Roundhead’s claimed they were praying for Charles II, though Evelyn replied “we did not pray for Charles Stuart” specifically, “but for all Christian kings, princes, and governors<sup>440</sup>.” Nevertheless, the Roundheads charge is a perverse testimony against them, that *deep down they still recognized that Charles II really was the King of England*.

Banning, or at least trying to ban Anglicans from keeping Christmas, trying to open as many shops as possible on Christmas Day, and if necessary, holding Anglicans at the point of a gun if they went up to receive Communion on Christmas Day, was not well received. There were bloody riots throughout the land. The backlash against this type of thing helped prepare the way for the 1660 Restoration; and the prayer book of 1662 with its Anglican Calendar. The Church of England’s *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), together with the Authorized (King James) Version (1611), are documents of Reformation Anglicanism. The Protestant 1662 prayer book includes in it the “Primo Elizabethae” 1559 prayer book Act which was a celebration of the reintroduction of Protestantism after Popery, when “Queen Mary [the First], to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the Professors of the truth of Christ’s religion,” had “repealed” the Protestant “Common Prayer” book of “Edward the Sixth.”

Dyson Hague, a Canon of St. Paul’s Anglican Cathedral, London, Ontario, in Canada, and one of the authors of *The Fundamentals* (1910-1915, 2nd ed., 1917, whose articles are a mix of good and bad), was an Anglican Lecturer in Liturgics and Prayer Book History at Canada’s Wycliffe College. He refers to the distinction between the Prayer Book’s Red Letter Days (which have a Collect and readings for Communion, Matins, and Evensong) and Black Letter Days. He notes of “the Black Letter Days,” that

---

<sup>440</sup> “The English Civil War Society of America Home Page,” “An English Civil War Christmas: Being a discourse on some of the celebrations and the Puritans of Parliament outlawing thereof” ([www.ecwsa.org/relocwchristmas.html](http://www.ecwsa.org/relocwchristmas.html)); “Google Answers: Law against Christmas in 1652” ([answers.google.com/answers/threadview/id/121234.html](http://answers.google.com/answers/threadview/id/121234.html)); “In Search of Santa,” Television documentary, Produced & Directed by Chris Oxley, Executive Producer Tony Moss, Laurel Productions for BBC (British Broadcasting Corporation), UK, 1995.

they “were left in the final revision in 1662, ‘not that they should be kept as holy days, but were useful for the preservation of their memories and for other reasons as for leases, law days, etc.’<sup>441</sup>” I.e., a lease might be said to expire on e.g., “Etheldreda’s day” (17 Oct.); or girl’s might be named “Audrey” at baptism (from Etheldreda).

Etheldreda is more commonly known as Audray / Audrey. The Saxon daughter of the King of East Anglia, though twice married she frigidly maintained a vow of virginity. Widowed from her first marriage after a few years, and separated from her second husband, Cyfrid, the King of Northumbria, the marriage was annulled, and she founded the Monastery at Ely. Her frigidity reminds us that the wilful refusal to consummate a marriage makes that marriage voidable; and that the persistent and wilful denial of conjugal rights is a valid grounds for separation and/or divorce (Matt. 5:32; I Cor. 7:1-5). Nevertheless, St. Paul says of the Jews, “I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge” (Rom. 10:2). So too, by her vow of virginity, Etheldreda showed “a zeal” towards “God, but not according to knowledge.” Yet this example may still challenge us to have a more Biblical “zeal” towards God, for Christ said, “Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven” (Matt. 5:20).

Contrary to the Biblical teaching, “that women adorn themselves in modest apparel” (I Tim. 2:9); when young, Etheldreda was attracted to unduly splendid necklaces. She developed a tumour in her throat which she regarded as a just retribution for her youthful lust after the “costly array” (I Tim. 2:9) of necklaces; and from this cause, she died when in her late thirties or early forties. Etheldreda’s admission that her terminal throat tumour was a just retribution means that for all her faults and failings, on this issue, she left behind a goodly example of the psalmist’s prayer, “Remember not the sins of my youth” (Ps. 25:7). To remember her, an annual “St. Audrey’s Fair” was held in medieval times, at Ely (on an island of east Cambridgeshire in England). At St. Audrey’s Fair, the lace for necklaces and other dress items, was unduly shoddy i.e., seemingly as an over reaction to the desire not to replicate her youthful sin of seeking unduly costly necklaces. The shoddiness of merchandise sold at St. Audrey’s Fair, especially the lace, gave rise to the English word, “tawdry,” a corruption of, “St. Audrey,” also capable of being spelt e.g., “St. Awdrie” or “St. Awdry<sup>442</sup>.”

In December 2008 I visited Ely Cathedral as part of a wider tour of England. Its former unusual location on an inland island (Ely Island), upon the entrance to which one would then find the additional marvel of Ely Cathedral, no doubt was a contributory factor to the Cathedral’s designation as “one of the seven wonders of the Middle

---

<sup>441</sup> Hague, D., *Through the Prayer Book*, Longmans, Green, & Co., London, UK, 1932, p. 30.

<sup>442</sup> On the transposition of “St.” to “t” in “tawdry,” compare the transposition of “St. Olave” (Olaf) to “Tooley” Street (Onions, C., *Oxford Dictionary of Etymology*, Oxford, 1966, p. 905).

Ages<sup>443</sup>.” And for the more distant traveller, this combination of an inland island and an architecturally beautiful Cathedral would also have surely been part of the attraction of a longer journey to attend St. Audrey’s Fair. The traditional status of Ely Cathedral as “one of the seven wonders of the Middle Ages,” would no doubt also have been a contributory factor to the inclusion of Etheldreda on the prayer book Calendar at 17 October. Alas, since the 18th century Ely is no longer an island because at that time the Fens (Fenlands) were drained. However, Ely Cathedral remains a well-built, beautiful, and impressive sandstone Cathedral. Inside this Anglican Cathedral I saw an Etheldreda Banner, which shows the continuing interest in Audrey at Ely.

For those given black letter days, their inclusion in the calendar indicates that they are figures of historical significance to the *Church of England*, who in some way, however limited, set a good example. Thus the black letter day of Etheldreda on the BCP Calendar kept alive the memory of Etheldreda, i.e., her “zeal,” though “not according to knowledge,” for “God” (Rom. 10:2) with regard to her perpetual virginity (Matt. 5:20); and the moral lesson of women not wearing unnecessarily “costly array” (I Tim. 2:9) like Audrey in her youth, nor swinging to the other extreme of wearing tawdry clothing such as came to be associated with St. Audrey’s Fair; and the need to turn away from any “sins of” one’s “youth” (Ps. 25:7). Some of these moral issues are more fully explored in Homily 6, Book 2, entitled, “Against Excess of Apparel,” Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*<sup>444</sup>.

The story of Etheldreda reminds all of us, both males and females, to maintain the Biblical balance in dress standards, avoiding both exorbitant and unnecessarily showy dress, and also shabby or tawdry dress. It reminds us that we must one day answer to God on the day of our death for all things, our dress included; and that in this life, we may receive just retribution for inappropriate dress. E.g., Caucasians on west coast America and east coast Australia have the highest incidence of skin cancer in the world, a fact that frequently results from immodest dress or insufficient clothing e.g., the desire to be “trendy” by not wearing a hat when required. But how many white people, like Etheldreda, use the occasion of such illness to reflect upon their faithfulness or otherwise to the laws of God?

Nevertheless, such black letter days as e.g., that of Etheldreda (17 October), do not have any special religious observance in the BCP (1662). In the absence of any collects or office, nothing of detail is specifically said about them. Therefore, *what one thinks of those on the Calendar with black letter days is largely left to private judgement.*

---

<sup>443</sup> The other six vary between commentators, but are on one count: 1) Stonehenge, England (which I saw in May 2001); 2) Mound of Shards / Potsherds (showing the Pharaonic funeral cult with Hellenistic and early imperial Roman influence,) Alexandria, Egypt; 3) Colosseum, Rome (which I saw in Aug. 2001 & March 2002); 4) Hagia Sophia Cathedral, Constantinople (Istanbul); 5) Cluny Abbey, France; & 6) The Leaning Tower of Pisa, Italy (which I saw in March 2002).

<sup>444</sup> Griffiths, J. (Ed.), *The Two Books of Homilies*, Oxford, 1859, pp. 308-19.

By contrast, Red Letter Days clearly uphold either the example of specific saints worthy of emulation by all the saints of God; or matters connected with the liturgical year's two focus points of Christmas (incarnation) and Easter (atonement and resurrection). Subject to only one exception and one qualification, the BCP (1662) reserves red-letter days for New Testament events or figures. The one exception is All Saints' Day which may be used to remember a saint or saints from any age.

The one qualification is that a red-letter day with an Office are reserved for figures from Protestant history, usually, though not always, Supreme Governors of the Church of England i.e., *Papists' Conspiracy Day* (King James I, William III & Mary II) (removed from the Calendar in 1859, continued in the popular culture as Bonfire Day); *Charles I's Day* (removed from the Calendar in 1859, revived as a black letter day in Canada in 1962, Australia in 1978, and England in 1980 optionally as a red-letter day with a general martyr's collect and readings), *Royal Oak Day* or *Charles II's Day* (removed from the Calendar in 1859, continued to be annually remembered after 1859 in some places e.g., Royal Chelsea Hospital, London; more commonly continued to be remembered after 1859 in the name "Royal Oak" e.g., Royal Oak Restaurants), *Irish Massacre Day* (*Church of Ireland* prayer book Office 1666-1800 remembering the massacre of Protestants by Papists in Ireland, 1641, continued as a red-letter day in *Church of Ireland Churches*, 1801-1859; the events of *Irish Massacre Day* continue to be remembered especially by Protestants of Northern Ireland); and what is now the only Office, *Accession Day* of the reigning monarch (presently Elizabeth II, annually remembered on 6 February,) this is the last remaining Solemn Day, for which a particular service is appointed.

This type of Protestant emphasis connected with e.g., *Charles I's Day* was evident from its very outset. Thus the 1661 Act of Parliament that first declared *Charles I's Day* "an anniversary day," says the "murder of ... Charles the First" was "contrived" as a "destruction" "of the true Reformed Protestant religion;" and that while "the Protestant religion hath received the greatest wound and reproach" by this "murder," nevertheless, it should be remembered that the Puritan revolutionary republicans under figures such as "Oliver Cromwell," "were as far from being true Protestants, as they were from being true subjects" of King Charles<sup>445</sup>. Certainly this is *Anglican* Protestant history as opposed especially to English and Irish *Puritan* Protestant history; but nevertheless, it is clearly *Protestant* hagiology.

The fact that in the 1662 prayer book only New Testament Biblical figures and events have specific red-letter days (although a qualified exception is All Saints' Day which is a general catch-all), and only Protestant figures have Offices, makes the point

---

<sup>445</sup> Act of the Westminster Parliament, 12 Car. II, chapter 30. This plenary Protestant spirit clearly evident in the 1661 Act for *Charles I's Day* is quite at variance with the anti-Protestant spirit evident in the abuse and misuse of *Charles I's Day* by the Puseyites.

that *Protestant Christianity is Biblical Christianity*. Notwithstanding the loss of the three Offices upholding Protestantism from the *Church of England* (and four Offices upholding Protestantism from the *Church of Ireland*), the continuation after 1859 of the Office of *Accession Day*, continues to make this point. That is because under the Act of Settlement and other legislation, the monarch must be a Protestant, and as *Supreme Governor of Church of England*, the *Defender of the Faith*. Thus even though the monarch e.g., Queen Elizabeth II (annually remembered in the *Accession Day Service* every 6th day of February since 1952) nowadays holds these titles of *Supreme Governor of Church of England* and *Defender of the Faith* in a largely symbolic, titular, and ceremonial way; (and even though the Church of England is in sad apostasy,) nevertheless, (through reference to e.g., her doctrinal standards of the 1662 prayer book, 39 Articles, or Act of Settlement,) this is still enough to make the basic liturgical point that this *Accession Day Service* is a red letter day Office because *Protestant Christianity is Biblical Christianity*. I.e., the *Accession Day Service* exists because the monarch as Supreme Governor of the Church of England is by law required to be a Protestant.

The BCP Calendar has ten broad divisions<sup>446</sup>.

---

<sup>446</sup> I support the 1662 BCP Calendar, i.e., with the three days removed from the C of E. & C. of I. in 1859 and the C. of I.'s former Irish Massacre Day, whether these four days are simply black letter days or something more; and the Office of Accession Day (reigning monarch). Beyond this, I support the 1662 Calendar with no omissions whatsoever. But with the 1978 Australian Anglican Calendar and 1980 English Anglican Calendar, I support transferring Benedict's black letter day from 21 March to 11 July, and making 21 March a black letter day for Archbishop Cranmer. I only support a small number of the additional black letter days found on both the 1978 & 1980 Calendars, and some local Australian ones in the 1978 Calendar. These are: the revival of King Charles I's Day (30 Jan.); inclusion of St. Patrick (17 March, but not as a "patron" saint); and 31 Dec. for John Wycliffe, which I support providing it is understood the day is also St. Silvester's Day i.e., Silvester & Wycliffe are both to be remembered on 31 Dec. . The 1978 Calendar makes 7 Oct. and 1980 Calendar makes 6 Oct. a black letter day for William Tyndale, but of these two possibilities, I think the Australian Calendar's date of 7 Oct. is to be preferred so as to not affect St. Faith's Day on 6 Oct. . The 1978 Australian Calendar has two days, 16 Oct. "Reformers & Martyrs of the English Reformation, 1555" and 30 October (Eve of the Eve of All Saints' Day), "Martin Luther (1483-1546) and the Continental Reformers;" whereas the 1980 English Calendar has one day for both, 31 October (Eve of All Saints' Day), "Saints and Martyrs of the Reformation Era." Of 30 or 31 Oct., I prefer the English Calendar's date since it better recognizes the long standing tradition of using the Eve of All Saints' Day to remember Luther and the Reformation (a date e.g., found in the Notes to the Calendar from 1578 in the Elizabethan prayer book, rather than "the Eve of the Eve of All Saints' Day"). At 16 Oct. the Australian Calendar's addition of the year, "1555," gives the date for the martyrdoms of Latimer and Ridley; but the title more generally makes 16 October a memory to other Marian martyrs; and this reflects a Protestant emphasis on the Marian martyrs, also evident in both the *Primo Elizabethae Act* of the 1559 prayer book reprinted near the start of the 1662 prayer book and Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*. The Australian

1) Feasts connected with the liturgical year, revolving around the two great events of Christmas (the incarnation) and Easter (Christ's atonement and resurrection), including the days before and after Easter Sunday. (Some days before and after Easter; Ash Wednesday; Ascension; O Sapientia; all the Sundays of the Year.)

2) All Saints' Day which (unlike the Romish notion of a "Saint,") recognizes the universal sainthood of all believers in its readings from Matt. 5:1-12; Rev. 7:2-12.

3) Holy Angels who by their goodly example followed God and did not join in the rebellion of Lucifer. (St. Michael & All Angels, Rev. 12, historically remembered at Cambridge and Oxford Universities in Michaelmas Term.)

4) NT saints which are always given the honourific title, "Saint" or "St." before their name (Christ's Circumcision & Name of Jesus; St. Paul; St. Mary; St. Matthias; St. Mark; St. Phillip & St. James; St. John; St. Barnabas; St. John Baptist; St. Peter; St. Mary Magdalene; St. Anne - who though not mentioned by name in Scripture, as Mary's mother, was part of the prophesied line of "Jesse" that the Messiah was to come through, Isa. 11,1,10; St. Matthew; St. Luke; St. Jude; St. Andrew; St. Thomas; St. Stephen; and Innocents' Day.)

5) Figures from the first five centuries. A) Figures, usually martyrs, from the time of Pagan Rome, of which the most prominent are given the honourific title, "St." before their name. (Lucian, 290 A.D.; Prisca, 275; Fabian, 250; Agnes, 304; Vincent, 304; Blasius, 316; Agatha, 251; Valentine, 270; Perpetua, 203; Nicomede, late 1st century; Margaret, 278; St. Lawrence, 258; St. Cyprian, 258; Faith, 290; St. Denys, 272; Crispin, 308; Cecilia, 230; Clement, early 2nd century; Catherine, 307; and Lucy, 305.) B) Four selections of prominent figures from the Church Fathers' Era (post NT to Council of Chalcedon, 451 A.D.); of which the most prominent are given the honourific title, "St." before their name. (Hilary, 367, and three of the four church doctors: St. Ambrose, 397, St. Augustine, 430, St. Jerome, 420.)

6) Figures historically connected with France up to the early eighth century; i.e., before the French king, Pepin III helped the Pope become a temporal power in 756; and the Pope made the king of the Franks, Charlemagne, the first "Holy Roman Emperor" in 800. Originally entailing parts of France, Germany, Austria, Czech, parts of the Low

---

Calendar also has some days of more local Australian significance: 26 Jan. (Australia Day, a State occasion); 3 Feb. (Richard Johnson, an Anglican clergyman who conducted the first Christian Service in Sydney in 1788); 25 April (ANZAC Day, a State occasion; also St. Mark's Day); & 5 June (William Broughton, Bishop of Australia, & pioneer Christians in Australia; also Boniface's Day). It also has 20 Sept., for "Saints & Martyrs of Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific," but I think this is an example of an undesirably cluttered calendar as All Saints' Day covers this. I would also allow a small number of other black letter days.

Countries (Belgium, Luxemburg, Netherlands) and parts of Italy; centering largely on Germany, it was weakened by the Reformation; and after the Thirty Years War (1618-1648), the power of the emperor was far more nominal. It ended in 1806. Temporal power in the Papal states of Italy; and the “Holy” Roman Empire in e.g., France, resulted in more widespread persecutions of the saints on the Continent (Dan. 7:24,25), long before the Inquisition came to England in the late 14th and early 15th centuries.

Thus the BCP Calendar’s methodology which looks for better persons who were part of “the temple of God” (II Thess. 2:4), operating during this time inside the Church of Rome, finds it necessary to end this process much earlier in France (8th century), than it does in England (13th century). I.e., any such persons had to exit the Roman Church on the Continent from this time, or else, like Huss of Bohemia (m. 1415) and Jerome of Prague (m. 1416), be persecuted as “heretics.” In harmony with wider practice, the most prominent figures on the Calendar from within the first five centuries are given the honourific title, “St.” before their name. (St. Martin of Tours, 397; Translation of St. Martin, 397, from Cande where he died, to Tours in 478; Giles of Nismes / Nimes, 725; Enurchus / Evurtius of Orleans, 340; Lambert of Maastricht, 709, in Holland, near the Belgium border, killed in Liege, his relics were later translated to the French speaking Belgium Cathedral of Liege; Remigius / Remi of Rheims, 535; Leonard of Limoges, 559; and Britius a student of Martin of Tours, and his successor as Bishop of Tours.)

7) Figures historically connected with the Church of *England* (the pre 1707 Kingdom of England included England’s Dominion of Wales), who were either on the Continent before the latter part of the 8th century; or in England or Wales before the 15th century. The most prominent of these within the first five or six centuries are sometimes given the honourific title, “St.” before their name. (David, 544, National [Motif] Saint of Wales; Chad, 673, born in Northumbria, England, raised in Ireland, educated at Lindisfarne in Northumbria, England, and then at Rathmelsigi in Ireland, he became an English bishop; Gregory, 604, who as one of the four doctors might also be reasonably placed in the previous section 6, but as the Bishop of Rome who sent Augustine of Canterbury to England I have placed him here in this 7th section; Benedict, 543; Richard, 1253; Alphege, 1012; St. George, 290, National [Motif] Saint of England; Dunstan, 988; Augustine of Canterbury, 604; Venerable Bede, 735; Boniface, 754, the English missionary to the Germans, and Archbishop of Mainz / Mayence; St. Alban, 303; Swithun, 862; Etheldreda / Audray, 679; Machutus / Malo, 560, a Welsh saint who was Bishop of Aleth in Brittany, northern France; and Hugh, 1200.)

8) Invention (Discovery) of the Cross (3 May) and Holy Cross Day (14 Sept.). *Prima facie* it may appear to be genuine, although if this was a common place of execution by crucifixion, it may have been another’s cross, and it is also possible that in post New Testament times at some point up to, and including, the fourth century, a cross intended to be understood as a replica to remember Christ’s cross was first placed there as an appropriate resting place, and then removed, and that these actions later led to a misinterpretation that this was the actual cross. Certainly it is not to be venerated as in Popery, and so the Popish claims of superstitious “miracles from God” associated with its discovery and subsequent history, may be reasonably rejected. The cross connected with

this site by the octogenarian Helene (/ Helena), the mother of Constantine, in the fourth century A.D., went missing in medieval times. It was divided by Helene into three. One section of it went to Constantinople, and in about the 8th century was lost by so gross a negligence that no-one is sure exactly when it was lost, or what happened to it (some speculate it was foolishly taken into battle). Another section of it, located at Jerusalem, was later lost by foolhardy Crusaders, attaching to it superstitious powers and recklessly carrying it into battle in the late 12th century. The final section of it, located at Rome, mysteriously disappeared. Whether or not the one “rediscovered” at Rome in 1492, and now housed at the Church of the Holy Cross in Rome (Santa Croce in Gerusalemme), is in fact the same as that connected with Helena, and taken to Rome, has never been satisfactorily demonstrated. But whether or not the one now at Rome is the one connected with Helena, both *Invention of the Cross Day* and *Holy Cross Day* remind us of the importance of the cross as a Christian symbol. They remind us that from the time of St. Constantine and St. Helena (/ Helene), the cross became an important Christian symbol. It is e.g., historically placed on the Crown of the British monarch.

9) Figures relevant to the qualified Divine Right of Kings. Irrespective of what one thinks of the quality of these king’s religious profession of faith, these days may be justified on the basis that “the higher powers” “are ordained of God” (Rom. 13:1); and we should, “Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17). This was originally said of pagan Roman Emperors, senators, and governors, who knew far less about Christianity than did any of these kings on the calendar.

Kings given black letter days: King Edmund, King of East Anglia (Regnal Years: 855-869/870) (20 Nov.). Died by regicide at the hands of invading Danes. His remains were translated under King Canute in 903, to Bury St. Edmund’s, West Suffolk, England. King Edward of the West Saxons (Regnal Years: 975-978) (18 March), who was murdered by order of his evil step-mother, Elfrida. Translation of King Edward, 978 (20 June), whose body was taken from its original resting place near Corfe Castle, to Shaftesbury. Translation of King Edward (sometimes called “Edward the Confessor”) (Regnal Years 1041/1042-1066) (13 Oct.); his body was translated from its original resting place in the tomb built by William the Conqueror in Westminster Abbey; to a more magnificent tomb in Westminster Abbey, in 1163.

State occasions recognizing the supernatural power of God in the qualified Divine Right of Kings, represented by King Charles I, 1649 (30 Jan.); and King Charles II (*Royal Oak Day*), Restoration 1660 (29 May), for whom Offices are also provided in the BCP (1662). The two Offices given for these two days from 1662 to 1859 overlap with the tenth division.

10) A celebration of Protestant history with respect to Great Britain and Ireland. Of course before the Disestablishment of the *Church of Ireland* from 1871<sup>447</sup>, the

---

<sup>447</sup> This sad event transpired under the *Irish Church Act of Disestablishment (1869)*. Of course, even if southern Ireland was lost as it was from 1922, it would be possible to have the *Church of Ireland* established in Northern Ireland and functioning in

monarch was *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland*, and so these Offices also linked the English and Irish Reformations making an important nexus between the Protestant hagiologies of England and Ireland. This nexus thus remained in the one surviving Office of *Accession Day* of a reigning monarch from 1859 to 1870, but thereafter the monarch was no longer *Supreme Governor of Church of Ireland*, though remained *Supreme Governor of the Church of England*.

As noted above, these are found in red-letter days with Offices so there is an overlap between the ninth and tenth divisions: *Charles I's Day* (30 Jan., Anglican Protestant support, some broader more qualified Protestant support for Charles I which though not regarding him as a martyr, supports him as lawful king against the seditious republic, especially among Presbyterians derived from the *Church of Scotland*.) and *Charles II's Day* or *Royal Oak Day* (29 May, Anglican Protestant support, and some broader Protestant support, especially among Presbyterians derived from the *Church of Scotland*). The *Church of Ireland* also had the Office of *Irish Massacre Day* (23 Oct., broad Protestant support mainly in Ireland).

The Office of *Papists' Conspiracy Day* (5 Nov., broad Protestant support), and on this day in 2009, Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20) of these textual commentaries was Dedicated. *Papists' Conspiracy Day* (established as a day of public thanksgiving by Westminster Parliament in Jan. 1606) for which an Office was provided in the BCP (1662-1859). This Office originally dealt only with the gunpowder treason of 1605, in which Papists sought to destroy the Protestant King and Parliament in order to reintroduce Popery. However, from 1689 this Office was modified so as to also include thanksgiving to Almighty God, for the coming of William III of Orange on that same day, 5 November, in 1688. From the time of William III's reign, black letter law of Great Britain and Ireland under the *Act of Settlement* (1701, passed under William III, Regnal Years: joint reign with Mary II, 1689-1694, sole reign 1694-1702) and the later associated *Act of Union* (1707, passed under Anne, Regnal Years: 1702-1714), specifically stated that the monarch be a Protestant, and not ever marry a Papist<sup>448</sup> (although before this time the throne was legally Protestant through reference to the status of the monarch as Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church).

The one continuing red-letter day Office is that of *Accession Day* of the reigning Sovereign, remembered annually, presently (since 1952) Elizabeth II, the Protestant *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* (6 February, broad Protestant support).

It is to the ninth division dealing with kings, here overlapping with the tenth

---

southern Ireland, much like the *Church of England* is established in England but functioning in Wales since 1920 (under a 1914 Act). Of course, in saying this I do not wish to thereby support the sad disestablishment of the C. of E. in Wales, but merely point out a model that might still be used for Ireland.

<sup>448</sup> See Sir William Blackstone's *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, Volume 1, p. 217.

division dealing with Offices for figures from the *Protestant* Anglican Church, that I now turn. In doing so, I note that e.g., the days are long gone when anyone would harbour hostility against contemporary Danes because in 869 they killed King Edmund (20 Nov.), King of East Anglia, *supra*. Nevertheless, he is still remembered on the calendar.

With these thoughts in mind, in particular, I now turn to *King Charles the First's Day*. On the one hand, traditional Reformed Anglicans see him as a King Solomon type figure, who made some serious mistakes in his failure to restrain and discipline Laud. But on the other hand, we see him as one who died steadfast in Christian faith, thus leaving us a good example to emulate. We further oppose sedition against the Crown. We are thus anti-Cromwell, a factor putting some level of distance between us and some Puritan Protestants (historically more connected with English and Irish Puritanism as opposed to Scottish Puritanism,) who to this day promote Cromwell as a “great” man. We maintain that it would have been wrong for NT Christians to kill even a bad emperor, like Nero. We maintain that it was wrong to kill even a bad king like the OT King Saul. So how much more is it wrong to kill a Christian king like Charles I? We cannot doubt that Charles died standing on Biblical principles of his right to be king (I Peter 2:17). Thus Charles I is recognized by us as a Christian king and martyr. Our perspective on *Charles I's Day* is not as extreme as the Puseyites, and we do not use it the way they may use it to try and justify 17th century Laudianism or 19th century and later Puseyism. Nor do we use it to try and justify the Jacobites, since James II was lawfully removed and the next in line to the throne then succeeded him. Some prefer *King Charles I's Day* as a black letter day, and some as a red-letter day. Either way, we maintain the value of this day.

As one whose father served in the second *AIF* (*Australian Imperial Forces*) army and whose mother served in the *WRANS* (*Women's Royal Australian Navy*) during World War Two (WWII), and who lost a patrilineal uncle in WWII (*Royal Australian Air Force*); and as one whose patrilineal grandfather and matrilineal great-grandfather served in the first *AIF* army during WWI, and who lost a matrilineal great-uncle in WWI (*AIF* army), I am conscious of the fact that one can celebrate the memory of those who fought, and those who died in war-time, without carrying over any animosity into the present against those who are descended from one's former enemies.

When on ANZAC (Australian & New Zealand Army Corps) Day (25 April) or Armistice Day (11 November), I wear a red poppy in my coat lapel above my *Sydney University Regiment (SUR)* badge<sup>449</sup>, I do not harbour any hatred or animosity against the descendants of old enemies. E.g., I harbour no grudge against contemporary white Aryan Germans descended from those whose ancestors fought against my ancestors and killed by matrilineal great-uncle in WWI. Nor against contemporary slanty eyed and straight-haired Japanese Mongoloids descended from those whose ancestors fight in the East Asian parts of Australasia as well as the Pacific was responsible for the death of my

---

<sup>449</sup> Black insignia of SUR under a black bar reading “SUR,” on red backing. I was a member of SUR (1985-7) as a university student, (active list 1985-6; non-active list 1986-7), during peace time.

patrilineal uncle in WWII. We must let bygones be bygones, and move on.

However, we still remain opposed to the war-time leaders of our former enemies e.g., the WWII Axis powers leaders Hitler or Mussolini. Yet we now work in harmony with e.g., Germans and Japanese. But we Australians and our old allies in the UK, USA, Canada, and elsewhere, still remember our war dead.

So likewise, we still remain opposed to the leaders of the English Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60 e.g., Oliver Cromwell, and their English and Irish republican Commonwealth dating from 1642. Thus e.g., I might from time to time tell an anti-Puritan joke on, near, or in some connection with, *Charles I's Day*. But contextually, this would be aimed against extremist anti-Anglican Puritans, such as Alexander Hislop. (I do not say everything in his work, *The Two Babylons* is bad, but I do regard him as a pseudo-historicist rather than a true historicist.) The more general reality, is that we are no longer hostile to biological or spiritual descendants of our old civil wartime enemies, i.e., those in (mainly English) Puritan derived Protestant Churches. Indeed, a clear and enduring pact of friendship was formed between Reformed (Evangelical) Anglicans and Puritans in connection with the events of 1688 and 1689. This was at its strongest in an Anglican (England and Ireland) Scottish Presbyterian Protestant alliance; but included religious tolerance to English and Irish Puritans (albeit subject to the texts Acts; which did not inhibit the more moderate Puritans after 1689 from occasionally taking Anglican Communion so as to meet these necessary requirements. We Anglican and Puritan Protestants are now long and strong Protestant allies who recognize each other as Christian brethren in Christ. But we Anglicans still remember our civil war dead.

E.g., when I spoke to Archbishop Donald Robinson (a retired Anglican Archbishop of Sydney<sup>450</sup>), in October 2007 at an Evensong Service from the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* held at St. Swithun's Church, Pymble (in Sydney), among other things we specifically had a favourable discussion about King Charles the Martyr<sup>451</sup>. This Church has a very good choir which came in and out in dignified procession at this

---

<sup>450</sup> An Anglican Minister is consecrated as a Bishop, and thereafter only some Bishops ever additionally hold the Office of an Archbishop. Hence a retired Archbishop remains a Bishop but not an Archbishop. But in the Diocese of Sydney there is a tradition, inconsistently applied, referring to a former Diocesan Bishop as "Archbishop." Hence he is variously referred to as "Bishop Robinson" or "Archbishop Robinson."

<sup>451</sup> Contextually, our discussion was both anti-Puseyite, and also anti-Puritan forms of worship introduced in more recent years at St. Andrew's Cathedral by Dean Phillip Jensen e.g., his unwarranted removal of the Communion Table and general anti-Anglican spirit. (I doubt that one could have such a favourable discussion about Blessed Charles with Dean Jensen.) Lest these comments be misinterpreted, let me say that neither the retired Archbishop nor I were advocating anything other than a traditional Diocese of Sydney service which is both *Evangelical* and *Anglican*. We certainly were not advocating any movement whatsoever in the Laudian or Puseyite direction, for we do not advocate nodding, or stoles, or ceremonial copes, or any such things.

service of Evensong. Interestingly, it was announced before the Dedication of Volume 1 on *King Charles I's Day* 2008, that this St. Swithun's choir would be singing at St. George's Chapel in Windsor Castle, England, during part of August 2008. I spoke to choir member both before and after they returned from this successful trip. This is the official Chapel of Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, Queen of Australia, Queen of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Supreme Governor of the Church of England.

In April 2002, I was privileged to inspect this same Windsor Castle. (I have lived in London, England, several times totally about three and a half years between 2001 and 2009.) There amidst beautiful sandstone buildings forming the castle, I beheld e.g., an old canon that once guarded the castle, the Throne Room, and a large number of white Aryan British Grenadiers of good Anglo-Celtic stock marching around inside the castle grounds, together with a British Grenadiers' brass band numbering about three dozen. But my visit was somewhat unusual in that outside St. George's Chapel there were many bunches of flowers placed on the ground for what was then the recent death of the Queen Mother. Inside St. George's Chapel, I inspected the resting place of both the Queen Mother, Queen Elizabeth (d. 2002) and her consort, King George VI (d. 1952; Regnal Years: 1936-1952).

The fifty year disparity between the times of their deaths reminds me of the words drawn from Ps. 90:12, "teach us ... so to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom," and found in the Office for *King Charles the Martyr*, in the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662). In prayer, this says:

O Almighty Lord God, ... permitting cruel men, sons of Belial, ... to imbrue their hands in the blood of ... King Charles the First, ... [who was] given up to the violent outrages of wicked men, ... who by that barbarous murder ..., hast taught us, that neither the greatest of Kings, nor the best of men, are more secure from violence than from natural death: *teach us also hereby so to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom* ... for thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ his sake; to whom with thee and the Holy Ghost be all honour and glory, world without end. Amen.

Inside St. George's Chapel, Windsor Castle, I also beheld an attractive reredos featuring in the middle of it a depiction of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. In front of this reredos was a large marble slab. On this are etched in gold engraving the words, "IN A VAULT BENEATH THIS MARBLE SLAB ARE DEPOSITED THE REMAINS OF" four royal personages, including "KING HENRY VIII" and "KING CHARLES I" in "1648." Thus the final resting place of King Charles the Martyr is here at the Chapel of Windsor Castle. The year given of Charles' death is given as "1648" because before the mid 18th century (Act of Westminster Parliament, 24 George II, chapter 23), the Calendar year in England started on 25 March (Annunciation Day), but thereafter on 1 January i.e., 30 January was deemed "1648" before this time, and "1649" after this time.

About 100 years after its removal in 1859, *King Charles I's Day* was revived on the Anglican Calendar of Canada in 1962. Then following a most regrettable absence

from the Anglican Calendar of about 120 years, the Anglican Church of Australia (formerly, and then known as, the Church of England in Australia), revived the holy day of *King Charles I's Day* (30 Jan.) on its liturgical calendar in 1978, *supra*. This was followed two years later by the Church of England, which then revived this holy day on their liturgical calendar in 1980, *supra*.

[Other than some punctuation changes, the following section to the 2008 Dedication is preserved as it was in 2008].

This means that this first volume of the *Textual Commentary* (Matt. 1-14), is dedicated to Almighty God in special thanks to Almighty God for the grace given to the *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland*, King Charles I, to die a martyr's death in 1649, on what is the 30th anniversary year (1978-2008) of the revival on the Anglican Calendar of this holy day.

On the corner of Hunter & Bligh Streets, in the central business district of the inner City of Sydney, a stone memorial is erected, "To the Gory of God and in commemoration of the first Christian Service held in Australia February 3<sup>rd</sup> 1788" by "Rev. Richard Johnson B.A. the Chaplain." The memorial includes a Biblical quote from the Authorized Version, saying, "The text of the first sermon preached in Australia. 'What shall I render unto the Lord for all his benefits toward me[?].' Psalm cxvi. 12." Johnson's Sunday Service was from the 1662 prayer book at a time when the prayer book included in it the Office of King Charles the Martyr.

The days of the calendar year for January and February in 1788 correlate with those in 2008. On Saturday 26 January 1788, by the grace of God, Australia was born. On Sunday 27 January and Monday 28 January 1788, the marines landed, successfully advancing and ensuring the area was safe from hostile natives. The splendid white Christian British red-coats had arrived. The gallant marines, having a dual role as both a military force and a police force, also brought the convicts ashore. Land was cleared, tents were pitched, and stores were brought ashore. Due to the exigencies of landing with the First Fleet at Botany Bay, Johnson did not hold a public service on either Sunday 27 January 1788 or Charles I's Day, Wednesday 30 Jan. 1788. However, he would have remembered both privately in his Anglican clergyman's daily offices for Morning Prayer and Evening Prayer in the Church of England's *Book of Common Prayer* (1662). Thus just four days before the first Christian service on Sunday 3 February 1788, Johnson would have kept Charles I's Day; this being the first holy day other than a Sunday, ever remembered in the Australian civilization that dates from Saturday 26 January 1788.

Exactly 220 years since in his private daily offices, the Reverend Richard Johnson first remembered Charles I's Day in Australia on Wednesday 30 Jan. 1788, and almost 220 years to the day that Johnson conducted the first Christian Service in the Land of the Southern Cross on this spot now marked by the Johnson Memorial, I too have come to this same place where the two streets meet, and dedicated this first volume of my textual commentary on the Received Text to Almighty God, on *Charles I's Day*, Wednesday 30 Jan. 2008. "What shall I render unto the Lord for all his benefits toward me? I will take

the cup of salvation, and call upon the name of the Lord.” (Ps. 116:12,13).

In the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), at Matins is sung the great Christian hymn, known by its longer Latin title as the, “*Te (Thee) Deum (God) Laudamus* (we praise).” This title comes from the first line of the hymn, “We praise thee, O God,” although the hymn is commonly known by its shorter title simply as the *Te Deum*. Contextually addressing God in the first line, “O God,” some of the later lines in this hymn are, “The glorious company of the apostles: praise thee. The goodly fellowship of the prophets: praise thee. The noble army of martyrs: praise thee. The holy church throughout all the world: doth acknowledge thee.” This Biblical teaching (Rev. 5:8-14; 6:9-11; 19:5,6), found in the *Te Deum* as, “The noble army of martyrs praise thee,” “O God,” includes in that list of noble martyrs, King Charles the Martyr.

Let us then join with the son of King James the First after whom the King James Version of the Bible is named, that is, King Charles the First, together with the Anglican Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland that Charles I appointed, namely, James Ussher, together with all the saints of God who are in glory (Heb. 12:1,23), in praising God. We who are still here on earth are still awaiting the time that we “depart” “to be with Christ” (Philp. 1:23); or if it should happen in our own day that the Lord returns (I Cor. 15:50-57), then having never tasted of death we shall then receive “the redemption of our body” (Rom. 8:23). But as we so await our glorification, let us like the saints of God in heaven, be mindful to give thanks to God. Let us thank him for his Divinely inspired Word. Let us thank him for his Divinely preserved Word. Let us thank him for his open Word as set forth for us in the King James Version of 1611. Let us proclaim with angels and saints in glory, “Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing.” “Blessing and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.” “Amen.” (Rev. 5:12-14).

*King Charles the Martyr’s Day.*  
Wednesday, 30 January 2008.  
Sydney, Australia.

***\*g) King Charles the First’s Day: with Dedication of Revised Volume 1 in 2010.***

Though I remembered *King Charles I’s Day* in 2009 and 2010 as a red letter day, I would more normatively remember it as a black letter day. But given the importance of this day to Anglicanism, if the day falls on a Sunday, and if not, on either the Sunday before or after it, I would think it appropriate for it to be referred to in the Parish Church notices, and for the Minister to give some accompanying sermon in the tradition of better *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* sermons. *The last three years have seen a trilogy of King Charles the Martyr’s Day Anniversaries.* 2008 was the 30th anniversary of the reviving of the day in Australia, upon which I dedicated Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) of these

textual commentaries in Sydney. 2009 was the 360th anniversary of Charles' martyrdom, upon which I visited some relevant sites in and around London, including a church service in which the Dean of Westminster gave a *King Charles the Martyr's Day* sermon. And 2010 is the 30th anniversary of the reviving of the day in England, upon which I now dedicate the Revised Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) of these textual commentaries, and also deliver a *King Charles the Martyr's Day* sermon at Mangrove Mountain.

The final *Textus Receptus* of the AV represents the matured reflection and consideration of neo-Byzantines over about 100 years. We neo-Byzantines do not claim the powers of Biblical "prophets" (I Cor. 12:28) whose words as set forth in Scripture are the infallible Word of God (II Tim. 3:16); but rather, those the Bible calls "teachers" (I Cor. 12:28) (although we do not thereby doubt that God also calls men to other teaching offices in the church besides this one), in which (unlike e.g., the old Latin Papists, neo-Alexandrians, or Majority Text Burgonites,) we are broadly and fundamentally correct in our works but sometimes must make refinements and corrections to our works. If it were not so for those of us who are neo-Byzantine textual analysts, then e.g., Erasmus would not have produced five NT editions (1616, 1519, 1522, 1527, & 1535), nor Stephanus four editions (1546, 1549, 1550, 1551), nor during his life Beza five editions (1560, 1565, 1582, 1589, 1598), nor Elzevir three editions (1624, 1633, & 1641).

On the one hand, the Elzevir family of Leiden was, and is remembered, for their great textual analytical work. The Elzevirs were Christian saints whose memory is rightly celebrated in Protestant hagiology. But on the other hand, we are here reminded that no man, Christ except, has ever been perfect, and from time to time, we all make mistakes; as seen in the need to produce three Elzevir editions of the NT Greek text in which refinements and corrections were made (1624, 1633, & 1641). During the intervening two years of the Dedication of Volume 1 on *Charles I's Day* 2008, and the Dedication of the Revised Volume 1 on *Charles I's Day* 2010, I to have been able to make some refinements and corrections which have now been incorporated into the Revised Volume 1<sup>452</sup> (and I also include a Corrigenda at Appendix 6 for Volume 2). Chief among these is a special Greek treat and Latin treat. The Greek treat is the addition of information from two Byzantine Text Sydney University Lectionaries, a vellum paged one from the eleventh century (Greek Lectionary 2378) and a paper paged one from the sixteenth century (Greek Lectionary 1968). The Latin treat is the addition of information from the writings of the church doctor, St. Gregory (d. 604), found in Migne.

---

<sup>452</sup> E.g., after a proof-read of Vol. 1 I encountered a computer malfunction which amalgamated one file under the names of multiple files, and totally erased the content a number of files by replicating this one file under multiple file names. This happened on both the hard drive and copies. To meet the 30 Jan. 2008 deadline, I rapidly recomposed the relevant parts of Vol. 1 as best I could from some back-up copies I had which had been made before the final proof-reading. This had to be done quite quickly, and sadly a number of things got in that would not have survived a decent proof-read. Among other things, I have used the opportunity of this revised Volume 1 to correct this defect.

Without malice to contemporary Germans we still remember our World War One and Two war dead on Armistice Day, the 11th of November; and also ANZAC Day (25 April, Australian & New Zealand Army Corps). Likewise, without malice to contemporary English or Irish Puritans, or any other Puritans, we still remember our civil war dead on Charles I's Day, the 30th of January.

Given that last year we saw the celebration of the 500th anniversary of John Calvin's nativity; it is well to remember that the legal document of "His Majesty's Declaration," first promulgated by King Charles I in 1628, and found in contemporary editions of the 1662 prayer book and Articles under Queen Elizabeth II (Regnal Years: since 1952), upholds the thoroughly Reformed Protestant teachings of the Anglican *39 Articles*. In "His Majesty's Declaration," Charles I upheld "the plain and full meaning" of e.g., Articles 9 (total depravity) 10 (enabling) and 17 (election) "in the literal and grammatical sense."

Historically, Reformed Anglicans regard Luther as the first man of the Reformation; Calvin as the second man of the Reformation, and Cranmer as the third man of the Reformation. When we say we are "Calvinists" or "Reformed" (the two are synonyms, though I use the term, "Reformed" far more commonly than the term, "Calvinist"), it is to *the doctrines of grace* that we are referring i.e., Calvinist as opposed to Arminian. That is because Calvin most succinctly stated and taught elements of these. However, Anglicans like Lutherans, follow the view of Luther that if a church practice has been found to be useful and good, and not contrary to Scripture (Article 34, *39 Articles*), then it may be used; whereas Puritans follow the view of Calvin that looks to a specific Biblical injunction (known as "The Regulatory Principle").

In terms of *The Five Points of Calvinism*, the *39 Articles* may be divided thus:

Total depravity	(i.e., inability due to original sin, requiring enabling to be saved Articles 9, 10, & 11).
Unconditional Election	(Article 17).
Limited Atonement	(in the symbolic type of Leviticus 16:29-34; 23:27-32, Homily 4, Book 2, Article 35, upholds the teaching of a limited atonement, i.e., it was <i>particular</i> to "the children of Israel" and did not include the Gentiles outside of Israel. And in its greater fulfilment in the Christian Church which is now God's Israel, limited atonement is taught by reference to Matt. 1:21 in Homily 2, Book 1, Article 35, "Jesus ... is <i>that high and everlasting priest</i> (Heb. 7:24-27; 10:14), <i>which hath offered himself once for all</i> upon the altar of the cross, and <i>with that one oblation hath made perfect for evermore them that are sanctified</i> . He ... <i>paid our ransom to</i>

*God with his own blood; and with that hath he cleansed us all from sin. ... He is that Saviour which saveth his people from all their sins* (Matt. 1:21)” (emphasis mine). I.e., a limited or particular atonement for “his people” (Matt. 1:21), rather than a general or universal atonement.

Irresistible Grace (Article 17).  
Perseverance of the saints (Article 17).

I maintain that King Charles’ Calvinism is evident in “His Majesty’s Declaration,” in which Charles upholds “the plain and full meaning” of e.g., Articles IX (total depravity), X (enabling), & XVII (election) “in the literal and grammatical sense.” This Declaration was given freely by King Charles, and is still found in various printings of the 39 Articles in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer<sup>453</sup>. This is also consistent with the fact that in a letter to his son, Charles II, Charles I said (using the “royal we” for “I”), “We do not more affectionately pray for you (to whom we are a natural parent) than we do, that the ancient glory and renown of this nation be not buried in irreligion and fanatic humour [‘humour’ = ‘state of mind’]; and that all our subjects ... may have such sober thoughts, as to seek their peace in the orthodox profession of the Christian religion, as it was Established since the Reformation in this Kingdom<sup>454</sup>.” Since Charles sought to uphold “the orthodox profession of the Christian religion, as it was Established since the Reformation in this Kingdom,” we cannot doubt that this was religion of the Established *Church of England* found in the Reformed or Calvinist 39 Articles.

This Revised Volume 1 of the *Textual Commentary* (Matt. 1-14), is dedicated to Almighty God, in special thanks to Almighty God for the grace given to the *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland*, King Charles I, to die a martyr’s death in 1649, on what is the 30th anniversary year (1980-2010) of the revival on the Anglican Calendar of England of this holy day.

In the Reformed Anglican tradition of Protestantism, the Biblical teaching is upheld of a universal sainthood of all believers (e.g., Ps. 30:4; Rom. 1:7; Eph. 1:1), in which some believers / saints are isolated as “ensamples” or examples for some particular reason (Philp. 3:17; I Peter 3:3). Clearly then, this is very different to the Romish notion of “canonization” of so called “saints.” Thus the Collects for Anglican saints’ days say things like, e.g., “O Almighty God, whom truly to know is everlasting life; grant us

---

<sup>453</sup> See McGrath, G.B (myself), “Calvin and Charles I,” *British Church Newspaper*, 25 Sept., 2009, p. 10; and (in reply to Westfold of 8 Oct. 09, p. 11), *British Church Newspaper*, 23 Oct. (Irish Massacre Day), 2009, p. 10; and (in reply to Westfold of 6 Nov. 09, p. 11), *British Church Newspaper*, 20 Nov., 2009, p. 11.

<sup>454</sup> “The Royal Martyr,” A Sermon preached before Their Excellencies the Lord Justices of Ireland in Christchurch Dublin, on the 30th of January, 1713, by John Echlin, Master of Arts, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-13 (emphasis mine).

perfectly to know thy Son Jesus Christ to be the way, the truth, and the life; that, *following the steps of thy holy Apostles, Saint Philip and Saint James*, we may steadfastly walk in the way that leadeth to eternal life; through the same thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen” (Collect for St. Philip & St. James Day, 1 May; 1662 Book of Common Prayer, emphasis mine).

Or e.g., “Blessed Lord, in whose sight the death of thy saints is precious; we magnify thy name for thine abundant grace bestowed upon our martyred sovereign; by which he was enabled so cheerfully to follow the steps of his blessed Master and Saviour, in a constant meek suffering of all barbarous indignities, and at last, resisting unto blood; and even then, according to the same pattern, praying for his murderers. *Let his memory, O Lord, be ever blessed among us; that we may follow the example of his courage and constancy, his meekness and patience, and great charity.* And grant, that this ... land may be freed from the vengeance of his righteous blood, and thy mercy glorified in the forgiveness of our sins: and all for Jesus Christ his sake, *our only mediator and advocate.* Amen” (One of the Collects for King Charles the Martyr’s Day, 30 Jan.; 1662 Book of Common Prayer, emphasis mine).

But remembering a saint who leaves behind an example of Christian virtue which is in some way particularly memorable by placing him on the Church’s calendar, is only one way to so recall his good example. Another way is reference to a saint in sermons. For instance, the Homilies of Article 35 in the Anglican *39 Articles*, refer to e.g., the martyrdom under Julian the Apostate (361-3 A.D.), of the schoolmaster (school teacher), Cassian of Imola, for refusing to sacrifice to idols in 362, at which time his unruly and wicked students were permitted to murder him by a slow process sometimes called, “death by a thousand and one cuts,” as they repeatedly jabbed into him a small sharp ancient writing instrument which is the forerunner to the modern pen. Yet Cassian has no day on the Anglican Calendar. Likewise the Homilies refer favourably to St. Basil the Great, yet once again he is not on the 1662 Calendar. Examples of such saints from the Homilies could be multiplied. Or historically English Common Law Courts had the “terms of Saint Hilary and Saint Michael” (24 George II, chapter 23), and while St. Michael is on the 1662 Calendar (29 Sept.), St. Hilary is not.

Another way to remember a saint, whether or not he is on the Calendar, is to dedicate a church to God, in special memory of the life and example of a particular saint. Indeed, it is clear from the names of Anglican Churches from the time of the Reformation, that more saints are so remembered than the lesser number placed on the Anglican liturgical calendar. E.g., the old Sarum Missal from which much of the 1662 Anglican Calendar is drawn, included St. Bridget’s Day (1 Feb.), which was thus consciously omitted in the 1662 Calendar. But Bridget of Kildare, Ireland, continued to be remembered in St. Bride’s (Bridget’s) *Church of England*, Bride Lane (off Fleet Street, and sometimes called “St Brides” or “St. Bridget’s,” “Fleet Street”), London.

In this broad context it is noteworthy that to date the Anglican Church has had seven churches in England, and one church in Australia, dedicated to God in special memory and thanks for the life of Charles the First. With respect to the seven English

Churches, two, or possibly three of these are from the time of the interregnum, three are from the time of Charles II, and one is from the mid 20th century. The one Australian Church originates from the mid 20th century, but its new church building dates from the late 20th century.

During the 1640s and 1650s interregnum, Anglicanism was banned by the Puritan republican revolutionary regime. But as a mark of resistance, *King Charles the Martyr's Church* was built at Newton-in-Wem, Shropshire, in 1656. In the following year of 1657, the Duchess of Devonshire built *King Charles' Church* for the Royal Foresters, thereby defying Cromwell's legislature whose laws were not accepted as valid. (This church was restored in 1964.) A third church, *King Charles the Martyr's Church* at Shelland, near Stowmarket, Suffolk, was rebuilt in 1760. However its origins are shrouded in the mystery of obscurity. Was this a third interregnum church (and so does this account for the lack of information on its origins), or does it come from a later time?

Under the Caroline reign of Charles II, another three such churches were consecrated. These were at Plymouth, Falmouth, and Tunbridge Wells.

*Charles' Church* at Plymouth, Devon, was destroyed by enemy action from the World War II Germans in the *Plymouth Blitz* of 21 March 1941, although the vestry remains intact. (It was united with the surrounding parishes of St. Matthew and St. Luke in 1964.) I inspected the burnt out shell of *Charles' Church* in the city at Charles Cross, in December 2008. Its general state of preservation reminds me of Coventry Cathedral. Built in 1641 (under Charles I), due to the interregnum it was not consecrated till 1665 (under Charles II), when it was consecrated as *Charles' Church*, and completed in 1708 (under Anne). The Church includes (to the right of an inside door,) the gravestone of "Rev. Samuel Payne," who "died 18<sup>th</sup> Jan. 1859;" a date of interest to me, (not only because 18<sup>th</sup> Jan. is my birthday, but) because the shortly following 30<sup>th</sup> Jan. 1859 was the last time the old red-letter day Office of *King Charles the Martyr's Day* was authorized in the 1662 prayer book. The Reverend Mr. Samuel Payne would thus be one of the last clergymen who lived, ministered, and died, while this Office was still in place.

King Charles II also ordered the building of *King Charles the Martyr's Church of England* at Falmouth, Cornwall, and this was consecrated in 1665. I also saw this church in December 2008, though only from the outside as it was locked. An architecturally attractive looking church with multiple coloured bricks, its notice board uses the large initials, "KCM," but puts "The Church of King Charles the Martyr" in much smaller lettering underneath this.

Also under Charles II, in 1678 was consecrated *King Charles the Martyr's Chapel* at Tunbridge Wells, Kent. I inspected this Church on *King Charles I's Day*, 2009. It is near London from which I got a train. Its white dome is visible above some other buildings from a distance as one heads toward the church. Out the back of the Church, I also saw the building which housed *King Charles' School*, founded in 1698, from 1848 to 1960. (The school then closed.) Founded as *King Charles the Martyr's Chapel*, it was originally a *chapel of ease* to Tunbridge Parish (i.e., larger parishes sometimes have such

*a chapel of ease* where it was easier for people to attend church, an issue generally of greater importance before the times of modern transport). The Church contains a wall plaque of Charles I's Royal Coat of Arms, and a nearby painting of King Charles the First.

In 1882 it was enlarged to a church under Queen Victoria. Inside a golden plaque in the upper gallery at the northern end shows where the Princess Victoria, later Queen Victoria (Regnal Years 1837-1901), used to sit during church services<sup>455</sup>. There is also a sketch of the Princess Victoria sitting in the gallery, made on one of the occasions she attended *King Charles the Martyr's Chapel*<sup>456</sup>. Thus when Queen Victoria agreed to the removal of *Charles I's Day* from the Calendar in 1859, she knew his memory and martyrdom would continue to be honoured here. On an outside church wall I saw a large vertical sundial which says of time, "Ye may waste but can not stop me"<sup>457</sup>.

Finally in this history of these seven English churches, in 1941 *King Charles the Martyr's Church* was consecrated at Potters Bar, Hertfordshire. (Before 2002, *King Charles the Martyr's Church*, Potters Bar, was known as *King Charles the Martyr's Church*, South Mymms.) Earlier in 1939, the Foundation Stone had been jointly laid by Bishop Wilherden and the Reverend Mr. T. Basil Woodd. Mr. Basil Woodd was a descendant of Captain Basil Woodd, a Gentleman-at-Arms to King Charles I, who was present with King Charles the Martyr on the scaffold on 30 January 1649. (Historically, in the context of Western Protestantism, "Basil" has traditionally been *a very Anglican* Christian name.) He received his Garter Star from the King just before the King's martyrdom, and the cross over the Communion Table depicts this symbol. (Before 1965 this Church was in the Diocese of London, it then became part of the Hertfordshire diocese till 1980, when it then became part of the St. Alban's Diocese<sup>458</sup>.)

---

<sup>455</sup> The pulpit was then at the western end, with the Communion Table at the eastern end, and so her seat in the upper gallery is at the western end. But the pulpit is now at the eastern end.

<sup>456</sup> The sketch and plaque are on opposite sides of the gallery, but for my presentation purposes the two are blended into one photo size at my Internet Textual Commentary Introduction page.

<sup>457</sup> Underneath this motto appear the words, "Alex Rae Fecit." "Fecit" is Latin for, "he made (indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *facio*)" i.e., Alex Rae made this sundial.

<sup>458</sup> The traditions of e.g., the Potters Bar Church are sadly marred by both Puseyism (e.g., use of the term "altar" and "high altar") and religious liberalism (e.g., they had a female Minister 1995-8). E.g., an official history of the church in a pamphlet given to me by the Vicar when I inspected the Church in January 2009, *infra*, says, "The position of the altar [Communion Table]... was against the east wall and, being an Anglo-Catholic [Puseyite] foundation, mass was celebrated with the priest's back to the congregation. After Vatican 2, the pressure was on to bring the altar forward and to

The Potters Bar *King Charles the Martyr's Church* was built about 80 years after *Charles I's Day* was removed from the Anglican Calendar in 1859, about 20 to 25 years before *Charles I's Day* was revived on the Anglican Calendar of Canada in 1962, and about 40 years before *Charles I's Day* was revived on the Anglican Calendars of Australia in 1978 and the *Church of England* Calendar in 1980. It thus poignantly reminds us that a saint may continue to be remembered even if he is not on the Calendar.

On the Sunday before Friday 30 January 2009, after attending church at St. John's *Church of England (Continuing)* South Wimbledon in London, I went out and inspected *King Charles the Martyr's Church* at Potters Bar, Hertfordshire. This is north of, and not far from London (about half an hour by train from King's Cross Station, London). I arrived in the afternoon. The Minister of the Potters Bar *Church of England* was nearby and agreed to open the church for me.

The Church includes a banner I saw on display of King Charles. It was made by the Royal Schools of Needlework for an exhibition. Queen Mary, consort of King George V (Regnal Years: 1910-1936) saw it at this exhibition. The Queen then said that she considered this banner should be placed in one of the King Charles' Churches. It thus came to be earmarked for, and eventually placed in, what was then the new King Charles the Martyr's Church at Potters Bar built 1939-41<sup>459</sup>. This once again also shows that royalty continued their interest in, and support for, King Charles the Martyr, during the period in which Charles I's Day was not on the Anglican Calendar.

Also of interest were two pictures in the church. The first was a copy of a family portrait by Jean Massaud of Paris in 1784, made after the engraving of Anthony van Dyke. It portrays the king and his consort, with the infant Prince John on the Queen's lap, and the young Prince Charles (later King Charles II,) leaning on King Charles I's lap. There was also a copy of an oil on canvas painting by Ernest Crofts (1847-1911). Painted in 1883, it depicts King Charles going to the scaffold with Bishop Juxton.

But of greatest interest to me was a fair white linen Communion cloth in a glass

---

celebrate facing the congregation. This was done in Father Grainger's time ... ." (John Rowley's "King Charles the Martyr Church, South Mymms, A Short History, 2001, revised 2008, pp. 3,5,6.) The idea that the placement of a so called "altar" in an Anglican Church, should hang on what the Roman Catholic *Vatican II Council* (1962-5) decides, shows how deeply semi-Romanist the Puseyites are. See my above comments on St. Charles' Church, MacKay West, Queensland, Australia, *infra*, also relevant here and any other such Puseyite Anglican Church i.e., we should not allow such errors as those found at Potters Bar Church to cloak the good memory it also points to, but still see in such churches *some* good memory of King Charles' martyrdom. *Let us look for the silver lining in the black cloud!!!*

<sup>459</sup> Rowley's "King Charles the Martyr Church ...," *op. cit.*, p. 4.

frame on the wall. The plaque underneath it says that this was the Communion cloth used by Bishop Juxton for King Charles I's final Communion. He took Communion at St. James' Palace on 30 Jan. 1649, before going with the Bishop to the scaffold to be executed by being beheaded. I regard this Communion cloth of particular interest because Charles I's taking of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was one element of the Christian witness that he gave at the time of his martyrdom.

The Church notice board stated that "King Charles Day" would be remembered in a service of "Holy Communion" at the Church on the following Sunday (1 Feb. 2009). Transferring remembrance of a day to the Sunday before or after it falls, when it does not fall on a Sunday, has now become more common as a consequence of societal changes.

An eighth church of interest is found in Australia<sup>460</sup>, St. Charles' Anglican Church, Mackay, Queensland<sup>461</sup>. Located in the Anglican Diocese of North Queensland, the North Queensland twang is stereotypically depicted in overseas productions as "the Australian accent;" and while one of my uncles who lives further south in Queensland's capital city of Brisbane has picked up this accent<sup>462</sup>, one would be unlikely to hear it much further south. The Church at Mackay is sometimes referred to by the long title, "St. Charles King and Martyr Church," although its common short title is "St. Charles'

---

<sup>460</sup> I procured information on this church from both the Rector (Don Ford, appointed Rector in 2007) (Phone discussion Nov. 09 & Letter 7 Dec. 09); and the Diocesan Archivist (Email of 9 Dec 09 from A. Watkins, Anglican Diocese of North Queensland Diocesan Archivist, P.O. Box 1244, Townsville, Qld, 4810). North Queensland is "a sleepy rural" Diocese where records have not always been kept as diligently as they are in a city Diocese. The Archives Office has only one staff member, and this is a part-time position. The Archivist tells me this is a recent advance on the former position where there was no specific position of "Archivist," and so archival work was covered under the general duties of this or that Diocesan employee; although seemingly nobody was sure as to exactly who was meant to do exactly what. The Archivist advises me there is "no" Archival "information" for Rectors of St. Charles "from 1995 to 2005 and from 2006 to 2008;" and Parish records and Diocesan records disagree on some Rector's years (Parish records claiming C. Desgrand left and J. Payne came in 1981; and Diocesan records claiming this happened in 1980; the era of 1990-1995 is also disputed, *infra*).

<sup>461</sup> Sadly this is a Puseyite Church in a Puseyite Diocese. However, in the same way that we should not allow the errors of Romanism to cloak the memory of St. Paul in the Roman Catholic *Church of St. Paul's-Outside-the-Walls* in Rome, but still see in such a church *some* good memory of St. Paul's martyrdom; so we should not allow such errors as those found at the MacKay West Church to cloak the fact that there is still *some* good memory of King Charles' martyrdom in this Church.

<sup>462</sup> One of my father's brothers, Denzil McGrath (b. 1931), (retired from the *Royal Australian Air Force*.) lives with his wife in Inala, a suburb of Brisbane.

Church<sup>463</sup>.” It was originally formed from Holy Trinity, MacKay as a separate parish when the old parish was split into two parishes in 1956, and the first Rector appointed in 1957. But following various subsequent divisions and amalgamations of parishes, together with St. Margaret’s Nebo and St. Paul’s Glendon, St. Charles’ MacKay West is now one of three churches in the parish of West MacKay<sup>464</sup>.

Its first Rector, Rev. R.D. Collins, was appointed on Sunday 3 February 1957, which was the first Sunday following *Charles I’s Day* that year on Wednesday 30 January 1957, and so this reflects the tradition of remembering a day on the Sunday before or after it, when in a given year it does not fall on a Sunday<sup>465</sup>. The Church

---

<sup>463</sup> Originally named the Church of “King Charles the Martyr” in 1956, it is listed in the Diocesan Year Book of 1964 as the Church of “St. Charles the Martyr.” From 1968 it is listed in all Diocesan Year Books as “St. Charles’ Church” (although there were no Diocesan Year Books published 1998-2004, 2006-2008), including (as at 2010) the last printed Diocesan Year Book of 2009. The Rector told me its full name is, “St. Charles, King and Martyr,” although its short title is “St. Charles,” and the Archivist said the name on the Archives Data Base is, “St. Charles, King and Martyr,” although the Diocesan Year Books simply refer to it as “St. Charles’ Church.” The official webpage of the Anglican Diocese of North Queensland refers to it as “Anglican Parish of West MacKay (including St. Charles’, Mackay West; St. Margaret’s, Nebo and St. Paul’s, Glendon” (<http://anglicannq.wordpress.com/parishes/the-parishes-of-west-mackay/>). Parish records include a photograph of a newer hall on which a permanently affixed sign reads, “ST. CHARLES PARISH HALL” (“A Service of Thanksgiving for the Completion of the Church of Charles, King and Martyr, West Mackay and the Official opening of the building for worship,” “Saturday 14th July 1984,” p. 16).

<sup>464</sup> Holy Trinity MacKay had been earlier established in 1926. In 1984 St. Margaret’s Nebo (established 1930), St. John the Baptist’s North Eton, and Homefield Infirmary were included in the parish; then following further changes, in 1995 St. Paul’s Glendon was added to the parish. As at 2009 there are three churches in this parish, and St. Charles’s Church is at the Corner of McGuinn Street and Nebo Road, Mackay.

<sup>465</sup> Rectors to date: 1) R.D. Collins (1957-62); 2) A.T.B. Haines (1962-74); 3) Archdeacon R.B. Smith (1975-8); 4) in 1979 Archdeacon Smith was appointed Rector of Holy Trinity, MacKay, but continued as *Locum Tenens* of St. Charles, with C.J. Desgrand as both Assistant Minister and Resident Minister at St. Charles (1979-80/1); 5) Canon J. Payne 1980/1-1986 (Diocesan and parish records disagree on 1980 or 1981); 6) S.H. Redhead (1986-90) (with A.J. Hall appointed Assistant Minister in 1986 & P.M.D. Gregg appointed as a second Assistant Minister in 1988); 7) *Parish Records*: W.D. Crossman (Rector 1990-95); or *Diocesan Archive Records*: J. Lewis *Locum Tenens* in 1991, with W.D. Crossman as Assistant Curate from 1991; & A. Hall and P. Gregg continuing as Assistants; 8) *Parish Records*: W.R. Darnley (1995-2001) (no Diocesan Archival records); 9) *Parish Records*: H.G. Smith (2001-2006) (Diocesan Archival records only record H. Smith was Rector in 2005); 10) *Parish Records*: D.P. Ford (2007 to present)

initially met in a Halls<sup>466</sup>. Showing Royalty's ongoing interest in, and support for, King Charles the Martyr, on 22 May 1959, Princess Alice (1883-1981) laid the foundation for the first church building. A photograph from Parish Records showing the Princess looking over an artist's interpretation of the planned church reads in the caption, "Princess Alice of Athlone inspects proposed plans for the ... Church of St. Charles ..., May 1959.<sup>467</sup>" Princess Alice was a granddaughter of Queen Victoria (Regnal Years 1837-1901), who was also her godmother after she was baptized in St. George's Chapel, Windsor Castle in 1883; where she was also married in 1904; and where her funeral was also held in 1981, and attended by Queen Elizabeth II (Regnal Years: since 1952) and all members of the Royal Family in 1981. Styled as, *Her Royal Highness Princess Alice, Countess of Athlone*, her husband, Major-General Alexander Cambridge (1874-1957), 1st Earl of Athlone, served as both Governor-General in the British Empire's white supremacist Union of South Africa (1924-1930), and also as the World War II Governor-General of Canada (1940-1946).

Following the revival of *King Charles I's Day* as a black letter day for 30 January, entitled, "Charles, King of England (1600-1649)," on the Anglican Calendar of Australia in 1978; a new St. Charles' Church building was built at Mackay. It was opened in July 1984, and the old foundation stone of Princess Alice was incorporated into the new building<sup>468</sup>. A Collect said by "All," included the words, "O God, ... grant that after the example of Blessed Charles, we may learn to count the wisdom of this world as foolishness, and only to know Jesus Christ, and him crucified ... . Amen<sup>469</sup>." Bishop John Lewis, the Bishop of North Queensland (1971-1996), Dedicated it in 1984 (Sunday 14 Oct.), and Consecrated it on 2 February 1986<sup>470</sup>. Sunday the 2nd of February 1986

---

(Diocesan Archival records only record D.P. Ford is presently Rector in 2009).

<sup>466</sup> One such hall was in Adrian Street (sold in 1957). Another hall was on the Corner of Bridge Street & Holland Street, and had been purchased from Holy Trinity, Mackay, who had it earlier built in 1935; and it was then sold in 1958 to finance the new church building whose foundation stone was laid in 1959. Where did they then meet till the new church was built? Both Parish and Diocesan Archival records have failed to answer this question. However, in Parish Records, a photograph of "The old Church Hall, Bridge Road," is found in "A Service of Thanksgiving for the Completion of the Church," "Saturday 14th July 1984," *op. cit.*, p. 15.

<sup>467</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>468</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 15.

<sup>469</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>470</sup> Unlike the Puseyites, Reformed Anglicans quite properly reject entirely Romish notions about so called "canonizations of saints." Inside the universal sainthood of all believers (e.g., Philp. 1:1; Col. 1:2), we remember some more prominent saints for their good Christian example (e.g., Philp. 3:17; James 5:10,11; I Peter 3:6). Hence I am

was the first Sunday following *King Charles I's Day* that year on Thursday the 30th of January 1986, and so this Church Consecration of the new building for St. Charles' Church reflects the tradition of remembering a day on the Sunday before or after it, when in a given year it does not fall on a Sunday.

*Charles I's Day* 2009 was the 360th anniversary of his martyrdom in 1649. While I usually remember *Charles I's Day* as a black letter day<sup>471</sup>, since I was in London (5th trip to London, Sept. 2008 to March 09) for this anniversary, I kept it in 2009 as a red letter day, attending a special annual service for King Charles the First held at 11.00 am at the Banqueting House, Whitehall (London, SW1).

I usually remember *Charles I's Day* as a black letter day and do not normally hang up black cloth where I live, but I did so for 2009. Whether one does so annually, or like myself, just on a special anniversary, I think the tradition of hanging up some black drapery around the house on *Charles I's Day*, whether on a wainscot, or from the wooden board marking off the lower one-third of the wall (which is what I did from the Eve of *Charles I's Day*), or elsewhere, is commendable. As an Anglican I "esteemeth one day above another" (Rom.14:5), and one such day of the Calendar that I so remember is this one.

*Charles I's Day* was first declared "an anniversary day" by Act of Parliament in 1661 (passed in January 1661). The statute, "An Act for the attainder of several persons guilty of the horrid murder of his late sacred Majesty King Charles the First"<sup>472</sup>, This Act

---

happy to have a church called, "St. Charles' Church," because this conforms with Reformed Anglican practice which considers that from the universal sainthood of believers, the honourific title "St." may be used before the name of those from NT times; or prominent figures in post NT times to the 5th (or less commonly 6th) century; and for those coming later than the 5th or 6th century in a localized context such as a church dedicated to the glory of God and in their memory. E.g., St. John's Anglican Cathedral, Parramatta (Diocese of Sydney), Australia, was named in memory of the early (Presbyterian) New South Wales Governor, John Hunter (see Commentary, Volume 1, Matt. 1-14, at "Title" 'The Gospel According to Matthew' ... stylized ... to read, '... St. Matthew' ...").

<sup>471</sup> A black letter day may be mentioned in a church service, and / or in conversation after a church service, on the Sunday before it, or the Sunday after it, when it does not fall on the Sunday itself. Thus if *King Charles I's Day* does not fall on a Sunday, this is a lesser way of transferring its remembrance to the Sunday before or after 30 January in e.g., the sermon, in which the Minister refers to the nearby "30 January."

<sup>472</sup> 12 Car. II, chapter 30, in: Pickering, D. (Ed.), *The Statutes at Large*, from the 39<sup>th</sup> year of Queen Elizabeth to the 12<sup>th</sup> year of King Charles II, Cambridge University, England, 1763, Vol. 7, pp. 491-496. So far as it enacted that 30 January was to be annually kept as *Charles I's Day*, or of it fell on a Sunday, then the Monday next following was to be so kept, it was repealed by, "An Act to repeal certain Acts and Parts

states, “That the horrid and execrable murder of ... Charles the First, of ever blessed and glorious memory, hath been committed by a party of wretched men, desperately wicked, and hardened in their impiety, who having first plotted and contrived the ruin and destruction of this monarchy, and with it, of the true Reformed Protestant religion, ... found it necessary ... to ... their pernicious and traitorous designs, to throw down all the bulwarks and fences of law, and to subvert the ... constitution of Parliament ...; until at last, upon the thirtieth day of January one thousand six hundred and forty eight<sup>473</sup>, his sacred Majesty was brought unto a scaffold, and there publickly murdered ... .”

This type of reference to “the true Reformed Protestant religion” is properly part of *King Charles the Martyr’s Day*. E.g., Canon du Moulin of Canterbury Cathedral refers to how Charles, “upon the scaffold, ... professed before God and the world, that he died a Protestant according to the ... Church of England. A profession which gave great discontent to the Papists and the [English Puritan] fanatics, for both wish’d that he had died a Papist ... .,” *supra*<sup>474</sup>. Or the *Church of Ireland* Bishop Ashe says in a *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* sermon, “every ... Protestant” should “concur ... in most heartily opposing all the attempts of bloody deceitful rebels” such as the English Puritan revolutionaries<sup>475</sup>. Or Canon Lambert of Salisbury Cathedral says in a *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* sermon, “Remember that the blood of this most excellent prince hath given a most ample testimony to the Protestant cause<sup>476</sup>.”

---

of Acts which relate to the Observance of the Thirtieth of January and other Days” (25 March 1859), by 22 Victoria, chapter 2, in *A Collection of the Public General Statutes* passed in the 22<sup>nd</sup> year of the reign of ... Victoria: being the 3<sup>rd</sup> session of the 17<sup>th</sup> Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain & Ireland, Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1859, pp. 5-6.

<sup>473</sup> I.e., before 1750 counting New Year’s Day as Annunciation Day (25 March), so that what we now regard as 1649 is reckoned as 1648; or given that the tradition of starting New Year’s Day on 1 January was known, some would write it as 1648/49. Annunciation Day was sometimes called, “Lady Day.” In the 1662 Book of Common Prayer, the “Lessons Proper for Holy-Days” table refers to 25 March as “Annunciation of our Lady.” The meaning in such Anglican usage was we emulate “our” example “Lady,” Mary, in godliness of life. The oral form of “our Lady” all but disappeared in the second stage of the Reformation, but this written form remained in the prayer book. It was relevant to the usage of the term “Lady Day” as an alternative to “Annunciation Day” terminology, as (the former) New Year’s Day.

<sup>474</sup> Du Moulin’s *Vindication of Protestants* (1679), Preface.

<sup>475</sup> Ashe, St. George, A sermon preached at Christchurch in Dublin, January 30th, 1716, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

<sup>476</sup> Lambert, Thomas, *Sad Memorials of the Royal Martyr*, Sermon, 30 Jan. 1669, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

The 1661 Act further declares, “Oliver Cromwell deceased,” *et al*, “shall by virtue of this Act, be adjudged to be convicted and attainted of high treason.” The Act also says, “by this horrid action,” in which “His Majesty was brought unto a scaffold, and there publickly murdered,” “the Protestant religion hath received the greatest wound and reproach, and the people of England the most unsupportable shame and infamy, that it was possible for the enemies of God and the King to bring upon us, whilst the fanaticke rage of a few miscreants,” i.e., the Puritan revolutionary republicans, “who were as far from being true Protestants, as they were from being true subjects” of King Charles, “stands imputed by our adversaries to the whole nation: we therefore ... renounce, abominate and protest against ... the execrable murder ... .” Therefore, “every thirtieth day of January, unless it falls ... upon the Lord’s day, and then the day next following, shall be ... observed in all the churches and chapels... of England and Ireland, dominion of Wales, ... and all other ... dominions, as an anniversary day of fasting and humiliation, to implore the mercy of God, that neither the guilt of that sacred and innocent blood, nor those other sins by which God was provoked to deliver up both us and our King into the hands of cruel and unreasonable men, may at any time hereafter be visited upon us or our posterity<sup>477</sup>.”

These same elements are found in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer Office of *King Charles the Martyr*, which is described as a day of “Prayer with fasting, to be used yearly on the Thirtieth of January, being the Day of the Martyrdom of the Blessed King Charles the First, to implore the mercy of God, that neither the guilt of that sacred and innocent blood, nor those other sins, by which God was provoked to deliver up both us and our King into the hands of cruel and unreasonable men, may at any time hereafter be visited upon us or our posterity.”

With respect to fast days, the Anglican teaching, found e.g., in the “Table and Rules” of the 1662 prayer book, is that they may be called, “Days of Fasting, or Abstinence.” I.e., the Bible clearly teaches that Christians may fast (Mark 2:20; I Cor. 7:5), and that special days may be set aside for this (Rom. 14:5,6). The Reformed Anglican position is that if something has been found useful and good, and is not contrary to the Scripture, then the Church may use it (Article 34, 39 Articles). Hence Anglicans refer to “Days of Fasting, or Abstinence,” i.e., one may keep the full fast, or a partial fast in which one abstains from some delicacy e.g., chocolate during the 40 days of Lent, or milk and sugar in one’s tea, or flesh meats other than fish. Of course, such fasting or abstinence is voluntary. By contrast, because under their “regulatory” principle the Puritans look for a specific Biblical law, and the Bible refers to fasting but not a partial fast i.e., abstinence, the Puritans allowed fasting but not a partial fast i.e., abstinence, on a set day<sup>478</sup>.

---

<sup>477</sup> 12 Car. II, chapter 30, in: Pickering, D. (Ed.), *The Statutes at Large, op. cit.*, Vol. 7, pp. 491-496.

<sup>478</sup> “An Ordinance for taking away the Book of Common Prayer, and for establishing and putting in execution of the Directory ...” (4 Jan. 1645), in: Firth, C.H. & Rait, R.S. (Editors), *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum 1642-1660, op. cit.*, Vol. 1,

It must be said, that when *Charles I's Day* was revived on the Calendar after 1859, whether in Canada (1962), Australia (1978), or England (1980), it was not made a fast day. It thus is not transferred to the following Monday if it falls on a Sunday (since Sundays are never used as fast days in the Anglican tradition). Thus whether the day is remembered as a black letter day (the more common form, and the one that I usually follow), or a red letter day (the less common form), it is not generally kept as a fast day. Nevertheless, since it did not fall on a Sunday, and since it was the 360th anniversary, though I do not normally do so, in 2009 I kept it as a day of abstinence, eating no flesh meats on the day but fish instead of red meat. "He that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks" (Rom. 14:6).

Arriving in the city on the morning of Friday 30 January 2009, I undertook a trek, which started at St. James' Palace (near Buckingham Palace). This is where Charles I took his last Communion on 30 Jan. 1649, before being executed at the nearby Banqueting House. I had seen the previous Sunday the 17th century white Communion veil at King Charles the Martyr's Church, Potters Bar, which is thought, by an unconfirmed tradition, to have been used by Bishop Juxton, in celebrating the king's final Communion.

On this Communion cloth are embroidered the initials, "IHS." These stand for the Latin words, "*Iesus Hominum Salvator*" and may be rendered into English as, "Jesus Humanity's Saviour"<sup>479</sup>. In addition to representing three words, the initials "IHS" may also be a *double entendre*, and used represent the name of "Jesus." On the one hand, this is derived from the fact that "IHS" are the first three initials of "Jesus" in *Greek*, i.e., "IHSOYS (*Iesous / Ιησους*)." But on the other hand, there is a tradition that comes from ecclesiastical *Latin*, which sometimes uses this abbreviated Greek form (rather than the Latin form, *Iesus*). Thus e.g., in the Latin column of *Codex Claramontanus* (6th century), one finds this abbreviation on the page for II Cor. 4:11-15, with a line over the

---

pp. 582-609. At p. 604 this permits, "publique solemn fasting" as "a duty to God," but claims, "A religious fast requires total abstinence, not only from all food... but, also from all worldly labour, discourses and thoughts, ... all bodily delights, ... rich apparel, ornaments and such like, during the fast ... ." While Anglicans allowed such austerity on a fast day, since they were "Days of Fasting, or Abstinence," one could do far less than this. The degree of fasting is thus left to the individual, who may be as austere or non-austere as he thinks fit on the day, for "He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord." "But why dost thou judge thy brother" about such things (Rom. 14:6,10)?

<sup>479</sup> The absence of any nearby cross is the indicator that this is the full contextual meaning of "I.H.S." as the initials for three words. They are also commonly found on Anglican bookmarks, where there is I.H.S. at one end and a cross (+) at the other end. (A matching and associated cross, is the contextual indicator that the three words also mean, Latin, "*In Hac [cruce] Salus*," that is, "In this [cross] is salvation," and Latin, "*In Hoc Signo [vinces]*," that is, "In this sign [thou shalt conquer].")

“IHS” indicating abbreviation<sup>480</sup>. Or in the old Latin Version e (4th / 5th century), at John 1:6-2:6, the name of Jesus is twice abbreviated as “ihs” with a line above the “s” indicating abbreviation. But these letters are coloured in on the manuscript in gold, so that they stand out from the generally white writing of this Latin Codex<sup>481</sup>.

I happened to be examining both of these Latin manuscripts, in printed copies held at King’s College, London University, (Chancery Lane, London, WC2A) around the time of *Charles I’s Day*. I was thus vividly reminded by my work at King’s of this *double entendre* meaning of *the Greek*, found in *the Latin* textual tradition. Thus the “IHS” on this Communion cloth might be fairly said to mean both, “Jesus’ Humanity’s Saviour,” and also, “Jesus.”

Leaving St. James’ Palace on the morning of 30 January 2009, I then trekked up the road to Charing Cross via Marble Arch, to the statue of King Charles I riding on a horse in front of Trafalgar Square. Here some flowers had already been laid, in a beautiful wreath with a card bearing a picture of Charles I, and reading, “The King’s Army. We Remember our Martyred King.”

I then trekked down to the Banqueting House, Whitehall, SW1. The Banqueting House was built by King James I to whom the King James Bible of 1611 is dedicated. James I was a patron of the arts, and both literature and drama thrived in his court. It was therefore a sad and somber twist of fate, that his son, his heir, and his successor to the thrones of the three kingdoms according to law, King Charles I, should be martyred by the Puritan republican revolutionaries outside the Banqueting House. In many ways it was a snub to the King James of the King James Bible, as well as the brutal and ugly murder of King James’ son.

As I arrived, a couple of people were tying flowers for *Charles I’s Day* to the black’n’gold metal fence surrounding the Banqueting House. I spoke to them, and also tied my red rose and card to the fence. This contained a small card, (5½ inches / 14 cm by 4 inches / 10 cm,) with a matching picture of a single red rose<sup>482</sup>. The red rose was packed in cellophane, with card in black ink handwritten copperplate writing. This read:

---

<sup>480</sup> Tischendorf, C., *Codex Claramontanus*, F.A. Brockhaus, Lipsiae, 1852, p. 204 (King’s College, London, Folio BS 2640.T5). A Greek-Latin diglot (D 06), the Latin is inside the closed class of sources, whereas the (Western Text) Greek is not.

<sup>481</sup> Tischendorf, C., *Evangelium Palatinum Ineditum*, F.A. Brockhaus, Lipsiae, 1847, pp. 93 & insert (reproducing this section as it appears in the manuscript) (King’s College, London University, Folio BS 2552.P1 T 52). I was fortunate to hold a “Visitor Library ticket” for King’s spanning the three months of January to March 2009.

<sup>482</sup> See photo at Internet Textual Commentary Introduction page.

[Inside page 1]

A Reformed, Evangelical,  
Protestant, Anglican  
Christian, remembering the  
360<sup>th</sup> anniversary of  
King Charles the Martyr  
(1649-2009),  
Supreme Governor of the  
Church of England &  
Church of Ireland, who  
by the grace of God, gave  
a Christian witness at  
his martyrdom.

[Inside page 2]

“ ‘Correct us, O Lord, but  
with judgment: not in thine  
anger, lest thou bring us to  
nothing’ Jer. 19:24.” (Office  
for King Charles the Martyr,  
Anglican Book of Common  
Prayer, 1662-1859.)

[signature] *Gavin McGrath*

of Sydney & London.  
Friday 30<sup>th</sup> Jan. 2009.  
Charles I's Day.

I then left and returned to the Banqueting House at about 11.00 am for a function being held in Charles I's honour. Being advised the function would not start for some time (it was scheduled for 11.40 am), myself and some others were allowed in to look around the Banqueting House. Of interest were some paintings of King Charles I on the steps leading up to the Hall in the area of the old window that he walked out onto the scaffold from. Flower wreaths were also placed on the windowsills<sup>483</sup>.

---

<sup>483</sup> The ceiling of this Hall also had some ornate paintings, though I do not approve of the bodily nudity or semi-nudity of some of the figures. I reject the idea that

Outside earlier, about a dozen young people arrived who said they were the choir for this function, and were from the Choir of *King's College*, London. As one who had been using the London University Library at King's around this time, *supra*, I was interested to learn that this was the King's Choir. Inside the Hall, these university students from King's were practicing their singing before the function commenced.

When I returned outside the area was now packed with people. Printed cards were handed out. Underneath the bust of Charles I stating that near here he had been executed, a Minister now went through the card's contents. This was "in praise and thankful remembrance of King Charles the Martyr at the place of his martyrdom outside the Whitehall Banqueting House 30th January 1649." The Minister read the following "last words of the Royal Martyr. In Westminster Hall at the conclusion of his 'trial' and sentence of death, 27th January, 1649, 'I may speak after the sentence – EVER!' On the scaffold erected at this place 30th January, 1649, 'I die a Christian according to the profession of the Church of England.' 'I have a good cause and I have a gracious God.' 'I go from a corruptible to an incorruptible Crown.' 'REMEMBER!'"

We all then went up inside the Hall of the Banqueting House. A large banner with an executioner's axe and tree branch in an X shape, with Charles I's crown underneath, and a heavenly crown above, read, "SAINT CHARLES KING & MARTYR."

Elements of the Office of King Charles the Martyr (1662-1859) for Communion were used, including the reading from I Peter 2:13-22. So too was this Collect, linking *Charles I's Day* with *Charles II's Day* (Royal Oak Day): "O Lord, our heavenly Father, who didst not punish us as our sins deserved, but hast in the midst of judgment remembered mercy; we acknowledge it thine especial favour, that, though for our many and great provocations, thou didst suffer thine anointed blessed King Charles the First, (as on this day) to fall into the hands of violent and bloodthirsty men, and barbarously to be murdered by them, yet thou didst not leave us for ever, as sheep without a shepherd; but by thy gracious providence didst miraculously preserve the undoubted heir of his Crowns<sup>484</sup>, our then gracious Sovereign King, Charles the Second, from his bloody

---

because it is called "art," such immodesty is therefore permissible.

<sup>484</sup> "Crowns" plural, i.e., before the formation from 1707 to 1800 of the Kingdom of Great Britain (England & Scotland) with the ongoing Kingdom of Ireland, and from 1801 of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and since 1922 the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, there were the three crowns of the three Kingdoms of England, Ireland, and Scotland. Thus e.g., when in 1650 Charles II was proclaimed "King of Scotland," and in 1651 crowned "King of Scotland," the Kingdom of Scotland was simply continuing to function as per normal, even though the other two Kingdoms of England (which included the Dominion of Wales) and Ireland were not, being then under Cromwell's republican regime.

enemies, hiding him under the shadow of thy wings, until their tyranny was overpast; and didst bring him back, in thy good appointed time, to sit upon the throne of his father; and together with the Royal Family didst restore to us our ancient Government in Church and State. For these thy great and unspeakable mercies we render to thee our most humble and unfeigned thanks; beseeching thee, still to continue thy gracious protection over the whole royal family, and to grant to our gracious sovereign Queen Elizabeth the Second, a long and happy reign over us: so we that are thy people will give thee thanks for ever, and will alway be shewing forth thy praise from generation to generation; through Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour. *Amen.*”

This Collect manifests the *nexus between Charles I's Day and the Restoration under Charles II* in 1660. The reference to how God “didst miraculously preserve ... Charles the Second, from his bloody enemies, hiding him under the shadow of thy wings, until their tyranny was overpast, and didst bring him back, in thy good appointed time, to sit upon the throne,” includes the later events of the royal oak at Boscobel in 1651, interregnum, and Restoration on 29 May 1660. *Charles I's Day* (30 Jan.) and *Charles II's Day* (29 May) were historically the two sides of the one Royalist Anglican coin since if one recognizes that Charles I was martyred upholding Biblical teachings in 1649 (Matt. 22:21; Rom. 13:1-9; Gal. 5:19-21; I Peter 2:17), one necessarily also celebrates the Restoration in 1660. Any remembrance on the Anglican Calendar to Charles II is now limited to this connection with *Charles I's Day*. Therefore this nexus is now more important than ever, since while *Charles I's Day* is formally back on Anglican Calendars, *Charles II's Day* or *Royal Oak Day* (29 May) is not. Thus it should never be forgotten that while the primary remembrance of *Charles I's Day* is the martyrdom of Charles I in 1649; the secondary remembrance of *Charles I's Day* is the subsequent events of God's protection over Charles II as he hid in the royal oak at Boscobel in 1651, the tyranny of the interregnum, and the final Restoration under Charles II in 1660. Indeed, in this year of 2010 we are celebrating the 350th anniversary of the Restoration.

The function at the Banqueting House in London included an address by the Dean of Westminster, Dr. John Hall. The Dean again referred to this Collect, and made the interesting and important point that the 1662 to 1859 Office of King Charles the Martyr attributed the murder of Charles I to the judgment of God for the sins of the nation, and the need for us to repent of sin. The Dean said this stood in contrast to the secular education system, which sees only a battle between “Roundheads” and “Cavaliers,” with no supernatural element to it. The Dean quoted Rom. 6:23, “For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life ....” Also referring to *mortification* (Rom. 8:13), he said of Charles I, “The holy martyr ... offers an example... of dying to ourselves ... .”

The Dean was quite right to refer to this element of the 1662 Office of *King Charles the Martyr*. This says it was because of the “provocations of our sins” that in God's “judgment” he “didst suffer ... King Charles ... to be murdered;” and hence we must all “truly repent,” and petition the Lord to “pardon us for thy mercies' sake, through the merits of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.” Thus the *Ten Commandments* (Exod. 20:1-17) have sometimes been used in *King Charles the Martyr's Day* Sermons.

For instance, violations of the third commandment, “Thou shalt not take the Lord’s name in vain,” and the ninth commandment, “Thou shalt not bear false witness;” with egregious breaches by republicans who set aside solemn oaths of allegiance to the king<sup>485</sup>. Such persons ultimately engaging in sedition against the Crown, and thus making further egregious violation of the sixth commandment, “Thou shalt not kill” (although they had also earlier committed murder). E.g., in his *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* sermon preached at Christchurch *Church of Ireland* Cathedral in Dublin, John Echlin said, “when God was pleased, for the sins of these nations, to deliver” Charles “into their hands, they then avowed the principles upon which they all along had acted;” as “by an Ordinance” of the English Puritan legislature “they declared void the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance<sup>486</sup>.”

Or in a 1918 *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* sermon at St. Thomas’s *Church of England*, Oxford, Maynard Smith said, “Charles ... wrote in a private letter to his Queen: ‘Nothing can be more evident than that Strafford’s innocent blood hath been one of the great causes of God’s just judgment upon this nation by a furious civil war, both sides being in truth almost equally guilty ...<sup>487</sup>.’” Thomas Wentworth Strafford (1593-1641), also known as Viscount Wentworth and Earl of Strafford, was an advisor of King Charles, and Member of the House of Lords. In November 1640 he was impeached by the House of Commons under John Pym, and in his trial of March 1641 it was alleged that he had offered to bring over the Irish army to fight the King’s enemies in England. (Strafford had been Lord Deputy of Ireland 1633-9.) When it looked like Strafford would not be successfully prosecuted, Pym introduced a Bill of Attainder. Charles, apparently fearful for the safety of the Queen, in a moment of weakness committed an act of gross disloyalty and sin, by giving his royal assent and allowing Strafford’s execution. On the scaffold, Strafford stated his allegiance to the King.

In the OT, King David committed murder in connection to his adultery with Bathsheba (II Sam. 11:2-5,14-17), but later repented of these most horrible violations of the 7th commandment, “Thou shalt not commit adultery” and 6th commandment, “Thou shalt not kill,” e.g., seeking God’s pardon for his “bloodguiltiness” (Ps. 51:14). Nevertheless, King David still suffered the righteous judgment of God in this life for his sins (II Sam. 12:1-14). So likewise, King Charles was a party to Pym’s Bill of Attainder

---

<sup>485</sup> On the sin of such false swearing, see Ashe, St. George, A sermon preached at Christchurch in Dublin, January 30th, 1716, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-17; & Lambert, Thomas, *Sad Memorials of the Royal Martyr*, Sermon, 30 Jan. 1669, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-20.

<sup>486</sup> “The Royal Martyr,” A Sermon preached before Their Excellencies the Lord Justices of Ireland in Christchurch Dublin, on the 30th of January, 1713, by John Echlin, Master of Arts, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

<sup>487</sup> “He being dead yet speaketh” (Heb. 11:4), A sermon preached in the Church of St. Thomas, Oxford, on the anniversary of the death of King Charles, 30 January, by H. Maynard Smith, *op. cit.*, 1918, p. 15.

to murder Strafford, but he later repented of this most horrible violation of the 6th commandment, “Thou shalt not kill,” speaking of “Strafford’s innocent blood,” and seeing in the subsequent “furious civil war” the hand of “God’s just judgment upon this nation,” in which “both sides” were “guilty” of this “innocent blood.”

Charles had sought to curry favour with the English Puritans like Pym by giving them their blood-lust for Strafford. Too late, and with deep remorse and regret, Charles realized that by his sin of complicity in Pym’s Bill of Attainder, all he had done was to help the Puritan revolutionary murderous monster grow bigger, by feeding the monster with Strafford’s blood. We know that Charles came to repent of his complicity in this scandalous affair, though as far as we know, none of the English Puritan revolutionaries ever came to a similar repentance over it. The Strafford Affair is significant when one considers the statement at the beginning of the Office of *King Charles the Martyr* in the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662). It seeks “the mercy of God” for “those” “sins, by which God was provoked to deliver up our King” to death. One of the prayers asked “God,” “who in thy heavy displeasure didst suffer the life of” “Charles the First, to be” “taken away,” to “pardon us for thy mercies’ sake, through the merits of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord.” This service clearly condemned the fact that “King Charles the First” was “murdered” in 1649, even as II Sam. 1:13-16 condemns the alleged murder of King Saul, who was a king that clearly left something to be desired. Nevertheless, the fact that the murder of Charles was attributed to God being prepared to “suffer” this because of unspecified “sins,” meant one was certainly free to interpret this in a way that was at least to some extent critical of some of Charles’ actions e.g., his mixed marriage (I Kgs 11:1,2,4)<sup>488</sup>. On the authority of Charles himself, “Nothing can be more evident than that Strafford’s innocent blood hath been one of the great causes of God’s just judgment upon this nation by a furious civil war, both sides being in truth almost equally guilty.”

Thus the sin of murder was one of the crying sins of the 1640s, although it must be said that there were even more murders on the hands of the republicans. Therefore it certainly seems reasonable to conclude that violations of the 6th commandment, “Thou shalt not kill,” were one of the reasons why, in the words of the Homily entitled, “Against Rebellion,” in Article 35 of the Anglican 39 Articles, Book 2, Homily 21, Part 1, referring to Hosea 13:11 in the context of the reign of King Edward VI (Regnal Years: 1547 to 1553), that ““God giveth a prince in his anger,’ meaning an evil one, ‘and taketh away a prince in his displeasure,’ meaning especially when he taketh away a good prince for the sins of the people, as ... he took away our good Josias, King Edward.” For God gave a bad ruler in Oliver Cromwell, and took away a good prince in Charles I.

Furthermore, the Reverend Dr. John Pelling, in a *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* Sermon at St. Margaret’s Westminster preaching before the Members of the House of Commons, made reference to the second commandment, specifically that part which

---

<sup>488</sup> On the down side, Charles ought not to have married this French Roman Catholic. But on the upside, he exhibited wedded chastity in that he did not, like his son, Charles II, engage in various acts of adultery.

says, “I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me” (Exod. 20:5). He made the point that there are “other sins upon which the curse in the text may likewise be ... entailed.” For “we learn” this “from the declaration in the text, ... *that he will visit the sins of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that HATE him.*” Thus “the sins of guilty parents” may fall “on a guiltless offspring. For in such cases, that [spoken] by the prophet Ezekiel holds true, ... ‘The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge’ Ezek. 18:2<sup>489</sup>.”

In this *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* sermon context, the Reverend Dr. John Pelling refers to morals of the Holy Decalogue found in the second (Exod. 20:5), third (Exod. 20:7), sixth (Exod. 20:13), and ninth (Exod. 20:16) commandments. Thus he observes, “The persons ... concerned in this bloody tragedy, were not some few sons of Belial only; it was the joint performance of many thousands of persons, closely confederate together ... [in] that surprisingly wicked work. Upon which account, if it be just in God, under some special circumstances, to visit one man’s sin ... on himself, and his posterity after him [“visiting the iniquity of the fathers ... unto the third and fourth generation,” 2nd commandment]; it must be allowed ... that the complicated guilt of such vast numbers of men, ... should descend to generations of men, that were afterwards born. Especially if we proceed to take a cursory view of the wickedness now before us, ... in which multitudes of persons of all ranks and conditions were known, in open defiance of God’s laws [“Thou shalt not kill,” 6th commandment], and of the most solemn oaths of duty and allegiance [“Thou shalt not take the Lord’s name in vain” & “Thou shalt not bear false witness,” 3rd & 9th commandments], to have wilfully interested themselves.”

In upholding the lawfulness of Charles I’s power as a king, Dr. Pelling also refers to Prov. 8:15 and Eccl. 8:4. Thus he concluded that such Scriptures “ought to be a powerful motive, to raise in us such godly sorrow for this [King Charles] Day’s offence, as shall work in us *a repentance not to be repented of.* ... In performance of which great end of this Day’s annual solemnity, ... let us humble our souls after a godly sort ... . Instead of detracting from the heroic virtues of that ... Prince, let his memory be ever precious among us, and his exemplary goodness be singled out ... for our imitation. Most especially, let the surprising wickedness of this Day, raise in us just detestation of those pernicious doctrines which made way for it; [namely,] That of the lawfulness of rebellion in particular, which the Scriptures represent to be, ‘as the sin of witchcraft’ [I Sam. 15:23] ... . Whatever apprehensions we may still have of Popery and [Puritan revolutionary] arbitrary power, if there be any just grounds and fears of that kind, they cannot ... be pretended to spring from the [Anglican Protestant] Throne, but are to be

---

<sup>489</sup> I.e. “The fathers have eaten sour grapes” = “the fathers” have sinned; “and the children’s teeth are set on edge” = “the children” inherit the bitterness in their mouths or “teeth.” Thus *the children suffer for their fathers sins* (cf. Deut. 23:2-8; Jer. 31:29; Lam. 5:7). Pelling, J., *A sermon preached before the House of Commons at St. Margaret’s Westminster*, on Monday, January 31, 1709, *op. cit.*, pp. 2,5,7-8.

resolved into the restless endeavors of [Papist and revolutionary Puritan] factious spirits, sworn enemies to [Anglican Protestant] monarchy, and to the *continuance* of an [Established Anglican] Episcopal Church<sup>490</sup>.”

Having now elucidated on the point of the Dean of Westminster made on *King Charles the Martyr's Day* 2009, i.e., that the 1662 Office of King Charles the Martyr attributes the murder of Charles I to God's judgment for the sins of the nation, and the need for us to repent of sin, I now return to another matter in this service at the Banqueting House, Whitehall. One of the better hymns at this function in 2009 was “Royal Charles,” which was sung with the accompaniment of the Choir from King's, and to the same tune as, “Rock of Ages,” *infra*. Later in the service, following the Dean's address and the singing of this hymn, I left during the singing of another hymn before the formal conclusion of the service<sup>491</sup>. Leaving Whitehall, I then went and visited King Charles the Martyr's Church, Tunbridge Wells, *supra*.

It should be remembered that King Charles I was the son of King James I, and so he lived in the era of the King James Bible. In December 2008 I went to the Isle of Wight off the south of the English coast, and among other things I inspected Carisbrooke Castle. This is a Norman Castle in which the captured King Charles was held by Cromwell's republican army from 1647 to 1648, not long before his martyrdom. Among other things, I saw in the Castle's museum King Charles's Bible and prayer book. I also saw the Castle Chapel, and it was in 1899 that the decision was made to build this chapel in order to mark the 250th anniversary of King Charles' martyrdom, although it was not completed till 1905. Among other things, it contains an impressive bust of King Charles the Martyr erected as part of this 250th anniversary remembrance.

King James of the King James Bible was the father of King Charles I. The King James Bible is very much an Anglican work, conducted under the oversight of what the Dedicatory Preface calls the “loving nursing father” of “King” “James” (Isa. 49:22,23). As recorded in the AV's Prefatory address, “The Translators to the Reader<sup>492</sup>”, in 1604

---

<sup>490</sup> *Ibid.*, 2,5,7,8,10,11,13,14,16 (modernizing some spellings).

<sup>491</sup> This was because the Service was being run by Puseyites holding View 4 (see the five views on Oliver Cromwell's republic in Commentary Preface section, “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” at “Preliminary Qualifications & Remarks,” *supra*). Due to corresponding irregularities in the Service, (the pain of which I do not wish to here recount, but rather point only to the more positive elements of that service,) I was a spectator but not a participant in the Communion Service. I decided to leave early during a hymn, since the programme indicated further Puseyite actions would follow wholly at variance with Biblical teaching and e.g., Article 22 of the Anglican 39 Articles. Thus did I selectively “refuse the evil, and choose the good” (Isa. 7:16).

<sup>492</sup> Scrivener's 1873 Cambridge Paragraph Bible, reprint in Trinitarian Bible Society's *Classic Reference Bible*.

the King of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and Supreme Governor of the established Anglican Church, King James I (Regnal Years: 1623-1625), summoned a meeting. And “upon the ... petitions of the Puritans at ... the conference at *Hampton Court* ... [heard they] had recourse ... to this ..., that ... the Bible as it was ... translated, ... was ... a ... corrupt translation. And although this was judged to be ... a very poor and empty shift [in their former position], yet even hereupon did His Majesty begin to bethink himself of the good that might ensue by a new translation, and ... gave order for this translation which is now presented unto thee. Thus much to satisfy our scrupulous brethren.”

Describing their work, we further read in what is a classic Reformed Anglican statement that is neither Papist nor Puritan, and which is Christian rather than heathen (“the Philistines”) or infidel (“the ... Jews”), these words. “Lastly, we have on the one side avoided the scrupulosity of the Puritans, who leave the old Ecclesiastical words, and betake them to other, as when they put ‘washing’ for ‘baptism,’ and ‘Congregation’ instead of ‘Church’: as also on the other side we have shunned the obscurity of the Papists, in their ‘Azyne,’ ‘Tunik,’ ‘Rational,’ ‘Holocausts,’ ‘Praepuce,’ ‘Pasche,’ and a number of suchlike, whereof their late [Douay-Rheims] translation is full, and that of purpose to darken the sense, that since they must needs translate the Bible, yet by the language thereof it may be kept from being understood. But we desire that the Scripture ... may be understood ... .” “Ye are brought unto fountains of living water which ye digged not; do not cast earth into them, with the Philistines, neither prefer broken pits before them, with the wicked Jews. Others have laboured, and you may enter into their labours. O receive not so great things in vain: O despise not so great salvation. ... The Lord work a care and conscience in us to know him and serve him, that we may be acknowledged of him at the appearing of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, to whom with the Holy Ghost be all praise and thanksgiving. Amen.”

As far as I am concerned, trying to produce “new versions” of the Bible to replace the Authorized Version of 1611, or “new prayer books” to replace the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 (other than some small number of black letter day additions to the Calendar and minor rubric changes<sup>493</sup>), is a proverbial case of “trying to reinvent the wheel.” If all the wasted time and energy that has been spent on producing these “new versions” and “new prayer books” over the last 50 or so years, had been more profitably

---

<sup>493</sup> I.e., stating established practice found to be useful and good that Reformed (Low Church) Anglicans would generally agree with and have already done, such as the biddings before the prayer for the “Church militant here in earth” at Communion, or the Minister’s free prayers before the “Prayer of St. Chrysostom” at Morning or Evening Prayer. And a rubric at least allowing as an option (which is a time saver compensation for the added free prayers), a practice known to me from a number of Sydney Diocese Churches over the years of combing the first two prayers after the Third Collect at Matins and Evensong so that it goes from “O Lord our heavenly Father, high and mighty, King of King” to “our most gracious Sovereign Lady, Queen Elizabeth,” and from here then continues with the next prayer starting at, “Philip Duke of Edinburgh” etc. to the end of this second prayer.

spent in explaining to people the great values of the Authorized Version of 1611 and Anglican prayer book of 1662, we would now be in a much better spiritual position. *As far as I am concerned the AV and BCP (1662) should be retained until Doomsday!*

Volume 1 of this Textual Commentary on Matthew 1-14 was Dedicated to Almighty God on *Charles I's Day* 2008, on what was the 30th anniversary of the reviving of *King Charles I's Day* on the Anglican Calendar in Australia in 1978. The Revised Volume 1 of this Textual Commentary on Matthew 1-14 is Dedicated to Almighty God on *Charles I's Day* 2010, on what is the 30th anniversary of the reviving of *King Charles I's Day* on the Anglican Calendar in England in 1980. In doing so, I pray God that this textual commentary may be used to his honour and glory in the defence of the Received Text and Authorized King James Version of the Bible; and with it, there may be a revival of godliness and associated advance of the glorious truths of the Christian faith as rightly recovered at the time of the great Protestant Reformation, and taught by the great doctors of that Reformation, Martin Luther, John Calvin, and Thomas Cranmer. Even the great truths of the Protestant Reformation as defended by such men as James Ussher, a Primate of the *Church of Ireland* appointed by King Charles the First.

Notwithstanding his undoubted blemishes and imperfections, Charles I died with steadfast Christian faith for the Biblical teachings found in such passages as Rom. 13:1-9; Gal. 5:19-21; and I Peter 2:17. He thus died “for the witness of Jesus, and for the Word of God” (Rev. 20:4) as a Christian martyr, and by all accounts, he died well with great kingly dignity, as Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church. King Charles is sometimes known as “the White King” because of the unusually white robes he wore at his Coronation in 1626 on the 2nd of February which was *Purification Day*<sup>494</sup>. The text read in the coronation sermon by Bishop Richard Senhouse (d. 1626), Bishop of Carlisle (1624-1626), was Rev. 2:10, “Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life”<sup>495</sup>. While this passage applies to any Christians, it was particularly apt for Blessed Charles who was ultimately one of those “that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the Word of God” (Rev. 20:4).

And so it was with great appropriateness, that in his *King Charles the Martyr's Day* Sermon at Christchurch Anglican Cathedral, Dublin, John Echlin preached on Matt. 5:10, “Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake,” and referred to the well known Protestant martyrological maxim, that “the blood of” “the Gospel[’s]” “martyrs,” has “proved” to be “the seed of the church.” Thus with reference to “that ‘cloud of witness’ [Heb. 12:1], that ‘noble army of martyrs’ [*Te Deum*, Matins, *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662],” he refers to the “dignity” of “the royal martyr, whom we this

---

<sup>494</sup> *Purification of St. Mary the Virgin Day*, St. Luke 2:22-40. Referred to in Sillitoe, H.J., “King Charles the Martyr,” [c. 1961], *op. cit.* .

<sup>495</sup> *Ibid.*. Bishop Carlisle had earlier been a Chaplain to both King James I (Regnal Years: 1603-1625) and Prince Charles (later King Charles I). Crowned on 2 Feb 1626, Charles I's reign began on 27 March 1626.

Day commemorate,” as “a Christian hero” of the faith<sup>496</sup>.

In compatibility with the Dedication of Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) of these Commentaries on the 30th anniversary of the revival of *King Charles I's Day* on the Anglican Calendar of Australia in 1978; the revised Volume 1 of these Commentaries is now being dedicated on the revival of *King Charles I's Day* on the *Church of England* Calendar in 1980. But more than that, 2010 is also the 350th anniversary of the terminus of the interregnum and its tyranny with the Restoration under Charles II in 1660.

After a long sad absence of *King Charles I's Day* from the Anglican Calendar dating from 1859 and spanning more than a century; for those of us with Anglican hearts it is good and pleasant to have *Charles I's Day* back on the Calendar. On this occasion, I leave the reader “with singing.” He may wish to read, *or if he is daring, to even sing*, the following four verse hymn, “Royal Charles,” which I and others sung with the accompaniment of the Choir of King’s College, London University, on *Charles I's Day*, 2009, to same well-known Hastings’ tune as “Rock of Ages, cleft for me, let me hide myself in thee,” *supra*<sup>497</sup>.

Royal Charles, who chose to die,  
Rather than the Faith deny,  
Forfeiting his kingly pride,  
For the sake of Jesu’s bride;  
Lovingly his praise we sing,  
England’s martyr, England’s King.

Mirror fair of courtesy,  
Flower of wedded chastity,  
Humble follower day by day,  
Of the Church’s holy way;  
Lovingly his praise we sing,  
England’s martyr, England’s King.

All the way of death he trod,

---

<sup>496</sup> “The Royal Martyr,” A Sermon preached before Their Excellencies the Lord Justices of Ireland in Christchurch Dublin, on the 30th of January, 1713, by John Echlin, Master of Arts, *op. cit.*, pp. 1,2.

<sup>497</sup> “Rock of Ages” was written by Augustus Toplady (1776), Tune by Thomas Hastings (1830), 7.7.7.7.7.7. The hymn, “Royal Charles,” was written by Dorothy Frances Gurney (1858-1932). She also wrote the hymn, “O Perfect Love” (1883), the music for which is available with the printed (but not sung) lyrics at: “SermonAudio.com – Online Hymnal,” “O Perfect Love” by Dorothy F. Gurney, Music by Joseph Barnby (1838-1896) ([www.sermonaudio.com/hymn\\_details.asp?PID=operfectlove](http://www.sermonaudio.com/hymn_details.asp?PID=operfectlove)). The “Hymn History” section at Sermon Audio says this hymn, “O Perfect Love,” is a popular hymn at weddings, and when Dorothy Gurney died the *London Times* wrote a tribute to her.

For the glory of his God,  
And his dying dignity  
Made a bright epiphany;  
Lovingly his praise we sing,  
England's martyr, England's King.

Bless we God the Three in One,  
For all faithful 'neath the sun,  
For all faithful gone before,  
And for those our country bore,  
Chiefly him whose praise we sing,  
England's martyr, England's King.

*King Charles the Martyr's Day.*  
Saturday, 30 January 2010; in  
the 350th anniversary year of  
the Restoration in 1660.  
Mangrove Mountain Union Church,  
New South Wales, Australia.

