

Dedication: The Anglican Calendar.

- 1) *The Monastic Noviate*; 2) *The Monastic legacy*; 3) *The Antichrist visits my hometown of Sydney, Australia (2008)*. 4) *The Succession of William III of Orange*. 5) *John Calvin's Nativity: 500th anniversary in 2009*. 6) *Broad Protestant support for Gunpowder Treason Day*: a) *Anglican Protestantism*; b) *Puritan Protestantism*. 7) *Papists' Conspiracy Day (5 Nov.)*
7a) *Bonfire Day at Lewes, England: 5 November 2008*;
7b) *Gunpowder Treason Day: 5 November*.

1) *The Monastic Novitiate*

Some reference is made at 2), *infra*, about monastic “novices” in pre-Reformation England. In the monastic system, a “novice” is a probationary monk (or nun). Unless the monk first passes this period, he cannot go on to be a member of the religious order. The period of a novitiate is usually 12 months. This can be a very trying period for a monk, considering his vows of “poverty, chastity, and obedience,” as illustrated by the following (fictional jocular) story.

A young Roman Catholic applied to be a monk, and was sent to a monastery. The Prior brought the young novice in for an interview. The Prior said to him, “During the next 12 months, we wish to see if you can successfully keep your vow of ‘obedience.’ You are required to take a ‘vow of silence.’ You may only speak two words every four months. At the end of each four months you will be brought in to see me for assessment.” “So, do you understand?” asked the Prior. “Yes” said the Novice, “But ...” “Ahhh, stop there,” said the Prior, “That’s your two words. You can say nothing more for another four months.”

The young monk was placed in a very chilly old room, where he was exceedingly cold. At the end of the first four months he came in to see the Prior. “Well,” said the Prior, “After 4 months, how are things going?” “More blankets,” said the cold young novice. “Certainly,” said the Prior, and he was given one extra blanket to “keep himself warm at night.”

When the young monk had entered the monastery, he was just under 14 stone or 90 kilos, but as a consequence of the sparse food rations at the monastery, after 8 months he was now 9½ stone or 60 kilos. At the end of the second four months he came in to see the Prior. “Well,” said the Prior, “After 8 months, how are things going?” “More food,” said the famished young novice. “Certainly,” said the Prior, and the monk in the kitchen was ordered to give him full cream milk in future, rather than the skim milk he had been receiving, so as to “fatten him up.”

Finally the 12 month novitiate period was over. Once again, the young novice was brought in to see the Prior. “Well,” said the Prior, “After 12 months, how are things going?” “I quit!” said the thin’n’gaunt, cold’n’sleepy, young monk. “GOOD!” said the Prior, “YOU’VE DONE NOTHING BUT COMPLAIN EVER SINCE YOU GOT HERE!!!”

2) *The Monastic legacy*.

King Henry VIII of England and Ireland broke with Rome in 1534, on the issue of *Biblical authority verses Papal authority* with respect to upholding the Biblical injunction prohibiting incest with a deceased brother's wife (Lev. 18:16; 20:21; Mark 6:18). For in monogamous marriage, a man and his wife are "one flesh" (Mark 10:8). The practical consequence of this under the rules of Christian monogamy (Matt. 19:9; I Cor. 7:2; Titus 1:6), is that, in the words of the Presbyterian's *Westminster Confession* 24:4, "The man may not marry any of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own; nor the women of her husband's kindred nearer in blood than of her own." This teaching results in the classic Anglican *Table of Consanguinity and Affinity*, known as *Parker's Table* because it was drawn up by the *Church of England's* Archbishop Parker in 1563, which prohibits such incest as marriage with a deceased brother's wife. For under the stricter rules of Christian monogamy found in the NT, when a man marries a woman, he is meant to think of his sister-in-law as his sister, and so he may not ever marry her; and so too, a woman is meant to think of her brother-in-law as her brother, and so she may not ever marry him.

But in the Kingdoms of England (England & Wales) and Ireland (the crown was not united with the third kingdom, Scotland, till the time of King James I, in 1603), the work of the English and Irish Reformation was a gradual process. Henry VIII (King of England, 1508-47; Lord of Ireland, 1508-41; King of Ireland, 1541-47), first broke with Rome on the issue of *Biblical authority (Lev. 18:16; 20:21; Mark 6:18) not Papal authority (giving "dispensations" to allow incest)*, maintaining that no man, including no Pope, can set aside the law of God. The role on effects of standing on Biblical authority now started to be slowly worked out. It included the wonderful reform of producing *The Great Bible* (1539), so named because of its great size, being 15 inches or 38 cm long, and 9 inches or 23 cm wide. The work of reform under King Henry VIII also proceeded with his closure of the monasteries.

Notwithstanding his requirement that monkish "vows" of celibacy *already made* "ought to be observed" in Article 4 of his *Six Articles* (1539); in harmony with broad Protestant Biblical sentiments of anti-monasticism which held that such vows were one example of the Roman Papacy's "forbidding" people "to marry" (I Tim. 4:3); and together with other prophetic identifiers manifested the Antichrist as a "man of sin" (II Thess. 2:3) who did not "regard" "the" natural "desire" that men have "of women" (Dan. 11:37), Henry VIII of England and Ireland moved to *stop any more* monkish vows of celibacy *being made from that time on*, with the closure of the monasteries from 1536 to 1540. (Of course, Anglicans recognized in Cranmer's marriage service that some have "the gift of continency," thus making the issue of whether or not they marry an option, and so they may choose not to marry, but that is a different matter, I Cor. 7:7,32-38; 9:5.)

Thus Book 1, Homily 5, "Of Good Works" (Part 3), Article 35 of the Anglican *39 Articles*, makes reference to "innumerable superstitiousness that hath been" found in monasticism "in strange apparel [of the religious habit], in [vows of] silence, in [a monastery's] dormitory, in [a monastery's] cloister [of an inner area prohibiting outsiders from entry], in [a monastery's] chapter [where they gathered each morning and heard the repetition of their order's rule], in choice of meats and drinks [I Tim. 4:3], and in such like things." Reference is then made to "the three essentials" of the monastic vows, "that it to say, obedience, chastity [here meaning celibacy], and wilful poverty." The monastic vow of "obedience" is criticized on the basis that by it, "they were made free by the rules and canons from the obedience of their natural father and mother" (5th commandment, Exod. 20: 12, cf.

Mark 7:9-13), “and from the obedience of emperor and king and all temporal power, whom of very duty by God’s laws they were bound to obey [Rom. 13:1-7; I Peter 2:17]. And so the profession of their obedience was a forsaking of their due obedience.”

“And how their profession of chastity was kept,” let us “pass over in silence, and let the world judge of that which is well known,” rather “than with unchaste words,” “expressing of their unchaste life to offend chaste and godly ears.” A record of the shameful unchastity in the monasteries may be found in the work of the Anglican clergyman, Henry Alcock (d. 1915, aged 76), in his work, *English Mediaeval Romanism* (1872)¹.

“And as for their willful poverty, it was such that, when in possessions, jewels, plate, and riches they were equal or above merchants, gentleman, barons, earls, and dukes, yet by this subtle sophisticated term, *Proprium* (Latin, [one’s] own) *in* (in) *communi* (common), that is to say, *Proper* (older archaic English = “one’s own”) *in common*, they mocked the world, persuading [themselves] that, notwithstanding all their possessions and riches, ... they kept their vow and were in ... poverty. But, for all their riches, they might neither help father nor mother, nor other than were indeed very needy and poor, without the license of their Father Abbot, Prior, or Warden. And yet they might take of every man [an offering], but they might not give aught to any man

“And so through their tradition and rules the laws of God could bear no rule with them; and therefore of them might be most truly said that which Christ spake unto the Pharisees, *You break the commandments of God by your traditions. You honour God with your lips, but your hearts be far from him* (Matt. 15 [verses 3,8]) *Woe be to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you go about by sea and by land to make more novices [a probationary monk] and new [monastic] brethren, and when they be let in or received [to the monastery] of your [religious order’s] sect, you make them the children of hell [who are then] worse than [even you] yourselves be* [giving Matt. 23:15 a pastoral application].

“Honour be to God, who did put light in the heart of his faithful and true minister of most famous memory, King Henry the Eighth [Regnal Years: 1509-47], and gave him knowledge of his Word, and an earnest affection to seek his glory, and to put away all superstitious and pharisaical [monastic] sects [i.e., closure of the monasteries, 1536-40] by Antichrist [i.e., the Pope] invented and set up against the true Word of God [Dan. 11:37; II Thess. 2:3, I Tim. 4:3], and glory of his most blessed name; as he gave the like spirit unto the

¹ Alcock, H.J., *English Mediaeval Romanism*, With a Preface by R.P. Blakeney, James Miller, London, England, UK, 1872. (Copy held in the Evangelical Library, Chilton St., London, W1.) A graduate of Trinity College, Dublin in Ireland, Alcock was a *Church of England* Minister. A man with a missionary zeal, he is a former Principal of the *Church Missionary Society’s* Fourah Bay College, Freetown, Sierra Leone (University of Sierra Leone). He was also in Australia for c. 5 years (Minister of Kerang, Victoria, 1897-8; Licensed Preacher in Diocese of Melbourne, 1898-1901). Maintaining a missionary zeal to the very end, he died as a member of the white Christian British raj in India, where as a retired clergyman he was at the Old Mission Church in Calcutta. (He was buried in the General Episcopal Cemeteries, Lower Circular Rd & Park Street, Calcutta.)

most noble and famous princes, Josaphat [II Chron. 17:3-6; Matt. 1:8], Josias [II Chron. 34:33; Matt. 1:10], and Ezechias [Hezekiah, II Chron. 32:24-26,32,33; Matt. 1:10]. God grant all us ... to eschew all ... pharisaical and papistical leaven of man's feigned [monastic] religion. Which, although it were ... contrary to God's commandments and Christ's pure religion, yet it was praised to be a most godly life and highest state of perfection; as though a man might be more godly and more perfect by keeping the [monastic] rules, traditions, and professions of men, than by keeping the holy commandments of God”

On the one hand, it is clear from this Book 1, Homily 5, in Article 35 of the Anglican *39 Articles*, that Reformation Anglicanism regards monasticism as an identifier of the Pope as Antichrist (Dan. 11:37; II Thess. 2:3, I Tim. 4:1,3), and supports the abolition of monasticism with the closure of the monasteries under King Henry VIII from 1536 to 1540. But on the other hand, Reformed Anglicans took a more moderate view of pre-Reformation monasticism than one finds among some Puritans. E.g., King Henry VIII, while prohibiting any new monastic vows, was careful to consider the fact that those who had already taken monastic vows and served as monks for many years, knew no other life.

Thus Henry VIII allowed, indeed upheld the proposition, that they should end their lives in fulfilment of their monastic vows. E.g., when living in London (on several occasions for a total of around 3½ years, 2001-9), in February 2006 I visited Battle Abbey. (I shall discuss this trip in further detail in a future volume.) Near the Abbey, I saw a house known as, “The Abbot's Cottage.” For when King Henry moved to phase out monasticism, he desired to show care and compassion for those monks experiencing the transition period, and so the old Abbot moved into this house. So too, when visiting Oxford in January 2002, at Christchurch College I saw the tomb of the last Abbot of Osney Abbey, who when Henry VIII closed the monasteries, he then graciously made the first Bishop of Oxford.

But there were limits to Henry VIII's kindness and generosity. E.g., in 1537, the Abbot at Whalley, Lancashire, England, took part in the shockingly Romish “Pilgrimage of Grace.” This was a shameful protest against Henry VIII's wise closure of the monasteries. The King was not amused and the Abbot incurred his royal displeasure. For his disgraceful part in this attempt to retain monasticism, the Abbot was hung high, even until he died.

While on the one hand, Reformed Anglicanism fully supports the closure of the monasteries under Henry VIII, and so through reference to e.g., Article 35 of the *39 Articles*, is opposed to any reintroduction of monasticism (which thing is desired by Puseyites); on the other hand, Reformed Anglicanism looks with some ambivalence on the history of monasticism for the more than a 1,000 years of its existence, that preceded the wise closure of the monasteries from 1536-40. This ambivalence is to some extent reflected in e.g., the fact that Westminster Abbey in London retained its old name of “Abbey,” though it had ceased to be a monastic abbey. Bath Abbey has also retained its older name. (The Roman baths connected to hot springs at Bath gave rise to the name of this place as “Bath.”) Indeed, other place names reflecting the valuable contribution made *to elements of religion and learning* by the monks of former pre-Reformation times were also retained. Thus “minster” meaning the church of a monastery, from the Latin, *monasterium*, meaning “monastery,” was retained in such English place names as e.g., Westminster (London) and Kidderminster (Worcestershire).

Thus e.g., in December 2008, I visited Axminster, in Devon, England. It is famous in

modern times for its Axminster carpets, which have been produced here since 1755. But it was named in older times. At Axminster, I walked over the Bow Bridge which passes over the River Axe. From 786 there was a Saxon monastery in this area, and after the Normans came (with William the Conqueror in 1066,) in the 1200s a new monastery was built on this river. The combination of “Ax” from the River Axe, and “minster” from “monastery,” thus gave the name, “Axminster.” In the town, I saw the architecturally beautiful sandstone *Church of England Church*, which from its tower was flying the Flag of St. George (a red cross on a white background, the national motif Saint of England). The best and most impressive remains of the old Norman monastery are now found here. Incorporated into Axminster Church, the South East Door is made from stonework taken from the old monastery. Then next to the Church is a building (presently called, “Archway Bookshop,”) in which the stone arch over the lower window also came from the old Norman monastery.

In harmony with this more moderate spirit, Reformed Anglicanism recognized that whilst the monasteries needed to be closed in the 16th century, they nevertheless were not all bad. I.e., the monasteries did provide some good and useful services, and in their lives and preaching, some monks presented some broad Biblical truths to the people. Thus there were some better monks who did have the gift of continency (I Cor. 7:2,9), and who freed from the call to marriage, e.g., acted as school teachers, manuscript copyists, or teachers and preachers of adults with respect to some broad Biblical truths found in e.g., the *Apostles’ Creed* or in Bible passages, especially from the four Gospels. In saying this, I do not wish to deny the necessity and desirability of the Protestant Reformation. After all, it is only when one truly understands the gospel justification by faith, that one can e.g., properly understand the deeper meaning of a Gospel story like that of blind Bartimaeus (Mark 10:46-52), and its connection with the preceding verse of Mark 10:45. But it must also be understood that monastic libraries and study formed a centre of literacy in largely illiterate communities, and so achieved some positive results which should not be forgotten.

Admittedly, if the Reformation had been earlier, then in the same way that these good and useful services in church and education were continued after the Reformation by other means, so they could and would have been maintained by such other means earlier than the 16th century; and likewise, the Biblical preaching emphasized among Protestants could have been conducted by Protestant preachers. Nevertheless, to the extent that these good and useful services, which sometimes, though by no means always included Biblically sound preaching, were maintained by those in monasticism, the Reformed Anglican Church drew the conclusion that it owed a qualified debt of gratitude to specified monks, who had made some sort of valuable contribution in some areas, notwithstanding the fact that they did so while remaining in a system with fundamental flaws and errors in need of reform, which process of reform was started by Henry VIII in the 16th century.

For example, on the one hand, Protestants quite rightly point out that elements of medieval monasticism were attacked by the Morning Star of the Reformation, John Wycliffe (d. 1384). E.g., Wycliffe rightly attacked monks whose preaching was characterized by irreverent jests and money-grabbing devices designed to fill the collection bags they carried with them. This type of thing was also later criticized by Luther with e.g., reference to Tetzel’s money-making indulgences.

But on the other hand, it must be said that some monks preached either to those in

religious orders who would then go out to influence people, or directly to people outdoors in the churchyard or elsewhere, in a broadly Biblical way. In considering monks of the 14th to mid 15th centuries (c. 1350-1450), in John Bale's records we learn of the monk, John Thorp, who is described as "a very frequent preacher to clergy," who "did not fear to reproach even the bishops for their sins and shortcomings." Or the monk, Staunton, referring to the Seventh Commandment (by his and Roman Catholic reckoning, the Sixth Commandment,) namely, "Thou shalt not commit adultery" (Exod. 20:14; Matt. 19:18), said "the bishops and other prelates" who would not correct the people's sins, would go to hell. Staunton whose records are at Greyfriars in Chester, dates from the early part of the 14th century. He appears to be the same Friar Henry de Staunton, who in the York Register of 1334 had an episcopal order made against him, forbidding anyone from listening to his preaching².

With specific regard to the issue of textual transmission inside the closed class of sources, whether Scripture manuscripts or Scriptural quotes in ancient or mediaeval church writers, whether from the Greek manuscripts copied out by Eastern monks or the Latin manuscripts copied out by Western monks; I am entirely unconcerned about any objection that many of the monks of both the Latin West and Greek East appear to have been unsaved. God committed the OT Oracles and their preservation chiefly to the Jews. It mattered not with respect to the Divine Preservation of the OT Hebrew (and Aramaic) Oracles that the Jews were in deep apostasy from inter-testamental to NT times, "For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance" (Rom. 11:29). Thus the general apostasy of the Jews notwithstanding (Matt. 23; Rom. 2:23,24,29), God used the Jews as his chief vehicle to preserve the OT Hebrew Oracles (Matt. 5:17,18; Rom. 3:1,2), through to Reformation times when their work was manifested in the Complutensian Bible (1514-17), and Bomberg editions of the Masoretic Hebrew Text (1516-17; 2nd ed. 1524-5). So too, it follows from e.g., Rom. 9-11, that God committed the NT Oracles and their preservation chiefly to the Gentiles (Rom. 11:13,25,28; II Cor. 3:13-15). Thus the general apostasy of both the Eastern and Western Church Gentiles notwithstanding (although a pure church was found among the Waldensians of the Continent and later Lollards of England), God used the Gentiles as his chief vehicle to preserve the NT Oracles through to Reformation times, when their work was manifested in the Complutensian Bible (1514-17) and other NT Greek editions.

To some extent, the recognition that we owe a debt of gratitude to elements of the monks' work, was an extension of the realization that the *Morning Star of the Reformation*, John Wycliffe, and his most famous disciple, John Huss of Bohemia, were both in Roman Catholic religious orders as celibate priests, yet still made very valuable contributions. Indeed, John Huss was placed on the Anglican Calendar in the Elizabethan New Calendar of 1578. He was specifically remembered on 8 July for his martyrdom in 1415. And his work was rightly linked to that of Luther, for in remembering Luther on 31 October, the calendar stated in a note that in "1517," "101 years after the death of John Huss, Martin Luther gave his propositions in the University of Wittenberg, against the Pope's pardon³."

² Owst, G.R., *Preaching in Medieval England*, An Introduction to Sermon Manuscripts of the Period c. 1350-1450, Russell & Russell, New York, USA, 1965, picture opposite title page of a monk preaching in a churchyard, and pp. 56, 60,66-7,118,120.

³ *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

In harmony with this type of thinking, i.e., after what is known in church history as THE GREAT APOSTASY foretold in II Thess. 2:3; I Tim. 4:1, there were still some true believers like Huss of Bohemia (martyred 1415) or Jerome of Prague (martyred 1416) inside the Roman Church; the Anglican Calendar in the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) only slightly modifies the earlier Elizabethan Calendar of 1561⁴.

A guiding principle of the 1561-1662 calendars was “an uncluttered” calendar i.e., relative to the old Sarum Calendar and Roman Catholic Calendars in general. Thus in the 1662 Calendar January has 6 black letter days, 3 red letter days, and 1 red letter day Office (30 Jan.); February has 3 black letter days, and 2 red letter days; March has 6 black letter days, and 1 red letter day; April has 4 black letter days, and 1 red letter day; May has 5 black letter days, 1 red letter days, and 1 red letter day Office (29 May); June has 4 black letter days, and 3 red letter days; July has 6 black letter days, and 1 red letter day; August has 6 black letter days, and 1 red letter day; September has 7 black letter days, and 1 red letter days; October has 6 black letter days, and 2 red letter days; November has 8 black letter days, 2 red letter days, and 1 red letter day Office (5 Nov.); and December has 5 black letter days, and 5 red letter days. Additionally there are the red letter days of Easter whose date varies in a given year; and an Office of Accession Day has sometimes existed for the reigning monarch.

In the month of June, on 20 June is the black letter day, *Translation of King Edward*; on 23 June is a *Fast* for 24 June; and then on 24 June is the red letter day, *St. John the Baptist's Day*. Therefore it looks to me as though in keeping with the generally “uncluttered” philosophy of this Calendar, putting St. Alban on 22 June would lead to four days in a row, of which one was a red letter day. Where they are all black letter this might occasionally be tolerated (20 Nov., King Edmund; 22 Nov. Cecilia; 23 Nov. St. Clement; 25 Nov. Catherine), and where they are all red letter days this was unavoidable (25 December, Christmas Day; 26 December, St Stephen the Martyr's Day; 27 Dec. St. John the Evangelist's Day; 28 Dec. Innocent's Day). But here in June, seemingly because of the importance of *St. John Baptist's Day*, the black letter day of St. Alban the Martyr, was transferred back five days to 17 June. But this “uncluttered” philosophy has been abandoned in both the 1978 Australian and 1980 C. of E. Calendars; and so from their paradigm they could see no good reason not to put St. Alban's Day back to 22 June, which both of them have done.

On the one hand, this Calendar limits figures connected with France up to the early eight 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. That is because 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 e.g., the

Calendar of 1578 (I have modernized spellings e.g., “ye” become “the”).

⁴ Over time six days were added to the 1561 Calendar: Charles I (30 Jan) (red letter day with office); Bede (27 May) (black letter day); Charles II (29 May) (red letter day with office); Alban (17 June) (black letter day, on the Sarum Calendar at 22 June); Evertius / Enurchus (7 Sept.) (black letter day); and Papists' Conspiracy (5 Nov., Bonfire Day) (red letter day with office, modified in 1689 to include William III, 5 Nov. 1688).

orthodox Waldensian *Albigenses*. (They should not be confused with the heretical Cathar *Albigenses*; both groups around Albi in southern France, being generally known simply as “Albigenses.” The matter is confused by the fact that both groups were attacked together by the Papists, and so both groups fought together as allies against the Papists.) By contrast, the Inquisition did not generally come to England until the late 14th and early 15th centuries. In saying this it should also be remembered that some lower level of persecution sometimes existed before this time, and seems to have started to build up in earnest more in the earlier parts of 14th century England, i.e., more than 50 years before the coming of the Inquisition, e.g., Wycliffe lost his position at Oxford, even though he was able to continue as a priest; or in 1334 the preaching of the monk, Henry Staunton, was forbidden, although he was not burnt at the stake, *supra*.

The Calendar also isolates figures historically connected with the Kingdom of England (England & Wales) in the British Isles before the 15th century⁵. I.e., the BCP Calendar’s methodology 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, and finds it necessary to end this process much earlier in France (8th century), than it does in England (13th century). That is because any such persons had to leave the Roman Church on the Continent from this earlier time, or else, like Huss of Bohemia (m. 1415) and Jerome of Prague (m. 1416), be persecuted as “heretics.” By contrast, in the Kingdom of England, the Inquisition did not come till the late 14th and early 15th centuries. Thus Wycliffe (d. 1384) could still operate in England at a time when on the Continent, such men had been martyred for many centuries e.g., the Waldensian confessors and martyrs, who though centered in north-west Italy, had spread their influence much more widely⁶.

There is thus a dichotomy between the pure church, found among e.g., the Waldensians, and some true believers operating on the Continent inside the impure church till the 8th century, and operating till the 14th century in England. Foxe’s *book of Martyrs* recognizes both groups, referring on the one hand to Wycliffe (c. 1330-1384) in the impure church, and on the other hand to the Waldensians in the pure church. Of course, those operating in the impure church faced various levels of difficulties, since the Church of Rome was riddled with errors. But the issue of enforcement of Rome’s errors was relevant, and unlike on the Continent, enforcement was mercifully lax in England. Inquisition decrees such as those of the Lateran IV Council (1215), though rigidly enforced on the Continent, were essentially a dead letter in England, with such inquisitorial rules essentially limited in England to the Order of Knights Templar⁷. Though some levels of enforcement are evident in the early 14th century with e.g., Wycliffe’s deprivation of a teaching position at Oxford, there was still a good deal of leniency in that he was permitted to continue as a priest.

But that which happened on the Continent in the latter part of the 8th century; happened in England from the latter part of the 14th century. Even as the pure church of the

⁵ See Divisions 6 & 7, in “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” section f), “King Charles the First’s Day,” in Commentary Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14).

⁶ Dowley, T. (Editor), *The Atlas of the Bible and the History of Christianity*, British & Foreign Bible Society, Swindon, UK, 1997, p. 104.

⁷ Bettenson’s *Church Documents*, pp. 132,179.

Waldenses had to carry the flame of truth outside the impure church on the Continent; so likewise, the Lollards had to carry the torch of truth outside the impure church in England. The formal denial of proto-Protestant truth at the *Council of Constance* (1414-18); and systematic denial of Protestant Christian truth by the *Council of Trent* (1545-63); ended for all time the possibility of those who are part of “the temple of God” in the Roman Church (II Thess. 2:4), staying for long anywhere in the Roman Church. This therefore now remains so, whether or not a Roman Catholic Inquisition is operating. This fact, coupled with the general accessibility of the gospel of the pure church with the Protestant Reformation from the 16th century, has meant that one no longer finds true believers in the Church of Rome as anything more than relatively rapid transitory figures, heeding the call, “Come out” (II Cor. 6:17; Rev. 18:4). But to the extent that they are there for any time, we are reminded that the Roman Pontiff still sits in the very “temple” of God (Eph. 2:21; II Thess. 2:4).

Is the teaching of Article 35 of the Anglican *39 Articles*, that the Roman Papacy was formed from the Bishopric of Rome by Decree of Phocas in 607, and thereafter the office of Papacy became the office of Antichrist, consistent with this usage of such figures on the Calendar? Indeed it is. For it recognizes that the Antichrist established himself, not as an external force, but in the very “temple of God” (II Thess. 2:4), that is to say, in the very church of God (I Cor. 3:16,17)⁸.

In this broad context, the Calendar refers to some monastic figures from these times. The list includes the following. Benedict (c. 480-543), an Abbott and founder of the Benedictine order at Monte Cassino, Italy (21 March)⁹. Alphege (954-1011), Abbot of a Benedictine monastery near Bath, England, Bishop of Winchester, and Archbishop of Canterbury (19 April). Dunstan (924-980), Abbot of Glastonbury (which became a famous school), Bishop of Worcester & London, Archbishop of Canterbury (19 May). Augustine of Canterbury (d. 604), a Prior of a Benedictine Monastery in Rome under St. Gregory, then Archbishop of Canterbury (26 May). Venerable Bede (673-735), a monk of Wearmouth & Jarrow (27 May). Boniface (d. 755), monk, Bishop, English missionary to the Germans (5

⁸ Before “An Act for the regulating of the Year, and for correcting of the Calendar now in use,” 24 George II (Regnal Years: 1727-1760), chapter 23, the Calendar year in England started on 25 March (Annunciation Day), but thereafter on 1 January. Since Boniface became Bishop of Rome on 19 February 607, before 1750 he was sometimes dated to “606” rather than “607,” and after 1750, some persons, not understanding this change, continued to cite the old “606” date,” although on the new calendar, it was now “607.”

⁹ I support the 1662 BCP Calendar, i.e., with the three days removed from the Calendar of the United 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 “Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury,” and “martyr” in “1556.” I also support a small number of additional black letter days found on the 1978 & / or 1980 Calendars, some local Australian black letter days on the 1978 Calendar, and a small number of other additional black letter days.

June); Giles, 7th century founder & Abbot of Benedictine Abbey near Nimes (Nismes), southern France (1 Sept.). St. Jerome (342-420), monk, established a monastery at Bethlehem, Israel (30 Sept). Etheldreda (d. 679), founder & Abbess of Ely Monastery (17 Oct.). Machutus (Malo), a Welsh monk (after whom St. Malo, Brittany, is named), Bishop of Aleth in Brittany (541-564) (15 Nov.).

The reader should however, note the absence from the Calendar of any Franciscans or Jesuits. In broad terms, Reformed Anglican ambivalence on the history of monasticism before 1536-40 did not extend to these two Romish orders of monks. The Franciscans were founded in the early 13th century by Francis of Assisi (d. 1226), and Protestant dislike for them is to some extent connected to the Devilish stigmata phenomena of their founder (Matt. 24:24). I.e., both with Francis and other stigmatics, it is clear that the stigmata phenomena, in which impressions replicating the wounds or scars of Christ's crucifixion appear on the stigmatic, most naturally requires a supernaturalist explanation; and thus one is compelled to conclude that it is either from God (Roman Catholic claim) or the Devil (Protestant recognition). Now what saith the Scripture? The kingdom of Antichrist "is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders" (II Thess. 2:9)¹⁰.

As observed in the Preface section on, "Scripture Citations of Bishop Gregory the Great in Matt. 15-20," *supra*, the AV translators warn their readers of deceitful "change" and "altering" to *Gregory's Office* by networks of Franciscan monks. Together with the sinister Jesuits, who were founded after the Reformation, and in opposition to it, in 1540; both the Franciscans and Jesuits were important Papal minions of the Counter Reformation. Hence in my book, *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist* (2006)¹¹, I say:

The Franciscans, together with the Jesuits, were important instruments of the Counter-Reformation and both have historically been important Romanist instruments for making converts to popery. As seen in the Romanist missionary work in South America, the Jesuits were sometimes the spearhead of Romish conversions, the Franciscans were sometimes the spearhead of Romish conversions, sometimes these two orders worked together (and as seen by tensions between them in China, they

¹⁰ "Stigmata" is a transliteration into English from the Greek, "*stigmata* (neuter plural accusative noun, from *stigma*)," meaning "marks." Though a relatively small number of fraudulent instances of would be "stigmatics" working up these kind of marks by their own efforts have been discovered, more than 300 instances have now been found in the Roman Church that exhibit supernatural activity and origins. But of all the stigmatics, Francis of Assisi is easily the most famous, having supernaturally received the impression of the stigmata five times, i.e., once on each hand, once on each foot, and also in his side.

¹¹ McGrath, G.B., *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 3 Some Relevant Historical Matters to the Independent State of Croatia (1941-5)." This book is available on the internet via yahoo under "Gavin McGrath Books" or direct at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.

were sometimes rivals).

The ugly history of the Franciscans is well illustrated in the martyrdom of the young French Protestant, Chevalier Del la Vay. In 1766 this godly young man was in a village of northern France when a group of ... Franciscan monks came past in a religious procession. These cruel and arrogant Franciscans considered this Protestant should doff his hat and so give these ... apostates a religious "greeting" ... forbidden by the Apostle John (II John 10,11). Not being prepared to do so, Chevalier Del la Vay was arrested, convicted of "blasphemy," and sentenced. His hands were chopped off, his tongue was ripped out with pincers, and then he was burnt alive

But while Anglican Protestant anti-monasticism is traditionally at its height with respect to Franciscans and Jesuits, (by convention more commonly focusing on the Jesuits than the Franciscans,) and while it is unequivocal in its support for the closure of the monasteries from the time of Henry VIII on; nevertheless, this ought not to be confused with the fact that there has always been some ambivalence on how other monks, especially, although not exclusively, those who operated in the British Isles before 1536-40, should be remembered. Certainly the monks and nun I have referred to on the 1662 Anglican Calendar, *supra*, were not the only monks or nuns who should be remembered for having made some kind of valuable contribution in pre-Reformation times. E.g., Robert Manning (1288-1338) of Bourne, Lincolnshire, in England. This monk was a pioneer of the idea of writing in a tongue that could be understood by the common man. We would be foolish to forget, deny, or conceal, so noble a character.

Or Bridget, a nun who founded the Kildare Abbey in southern Ireland, whose remains were translated to Downpatrick in Northern Ireland, UK. She had a reputation for being charitable towards the poor, which reminds us of the important Christian virtue of charity to those in need (Matt. 25:34-40). She is remembered in a London Church I inspected in February 2009, St. Bride's (Bridget's) *Church of England* (St. Bride's Avenue EC4 off Fleet Street, and known variously as "St Brides," pronounced, "St. Breed's," or "St. Bridget's," "Fleet Street"). It has some interesting history in its crypt dating back to Roman Britain.

In this context, reference should also be made to Catherine, a virgin and martyr (25 Nov.). She was a Christian lady from Alexandria, Egypt, who lived during the time of the Roman Emperor, Maximinus / Maxentius (Regnal Years: 310-313). Maximinus was a well known persecutor of Christians. E.g., in 306 and 308, Maximinus decreed that idolatrous sacrifices be made to pagan gods, and when Christians refused, they were either made confessors by being put to hard labour in mines and quarries, or made martyrs by being killed. (The defeat of Maxentius by Constantine the Great is referred to in the "Account of the Tenth General Persecution" of Christians, in Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*.) Catherine of Alexandria rightly refused the advances made to her by this gruesome Christ-hater, Maximinus. Refusing to succumb to the Emperor's lusts, she was put to death.

The name "Catherine" originates in the Greek, *Aikaterien*, from which it passed into the Latin as, *Katerina*, and its spelling was then assimilated to the Greek, *katharos* (clean) or *katharizo* (cleanse), and so it has come to acquire the meaning of "pure." We cannot doubt that by her moral purity, Catherine of Alexandria has left a wonderful example. By her witness unto death, she defended the Christian faith against "the wisdom of this world" (I Cor. 1:20). Catherine is thus remembered as a virgin and martyr. *Her example thereby*

reminds young Christian ladies, that it is BETTER TO DIE than lose their virginity outside of lawful Christian marriage to a fellow believer.

Catherine's certain death, sometimes dated at 307 A.D. (i.e., in between the emperor's decrees for idolatrous sacrifices the year before and year after,) occurred according to (an uncertain) legend on a spiked wheel, for which reason, the wheel shape in certain ornamental windows, fireworks, and heraldic symbols, are now known as "a Catherine wheel." Thus when e.g., one sees on Bonfire Night (5 Nov.) the lighting of "a Catherine wheel," the name of this firework is only properly understood by those who know the story of Catherine, remembered in the same month of November with a black letter day in the 1662 prayer book (25 Nov.). The fact that in a church, bell ringers would *pull the rope on the Catherine wheel, infra*, as before 1859 church bells were rung all day on 5 Nov., also gives an enhanced contextual significance to the lighting of "a Catherine wheel" on Bonfire Night. Alas, the church bells no longer ring during Bonfire Day; but the memory of the old tradition was to some extent retained, as Thank God, the Catherine wheels burnt bright on Bonfire Night!

Later medieval legend embellished the basic facts about the virgin and martyr, Catherine. E.g., falsely claiming that after her martyrdom, Catherine of Alexandria's body was "carried by angels to Mount Sinai." This body was then said to have been "rediscovered by monks" much later (although exactly how much later, is a varying detail in this "add on" addition to the real story). Such legendary details about Catherine, were brought back from the East (found in such places as Mt. Sinai and Syria,) to the West by Crusaders.

In England, the daughter of King Henry I of England (Regnal years, 1100-1135), and mother of Henry II of England (Regnal Years: 1154-1189), Matilda (1102-1167), founded St. Catherine's (Katherine's) collegiate Church and Hospital near the Great Tower of London in 1148. By the time of the Reformation, dozens of English Churches bore her name; and by an old English tradition, when church bells were rung by a wheel and rope mechanism, these Catherine wheel bells *might* be used as a reminder of Catherine, the virgin and martyr, *supra*. By the very English practice of ringing church bells, the memory of Catherine was thus sometimes referred to, and this may also be one factor in explaining her presence on the Anglican Calendar of 1561 and 1662.

The story of St. Catherine is thus clearly intertwined with St. Catherine's Monastery, Sinai, founded in 527 A.D. by the Byzantine (Eastern Roman) Emperor, Justinian I (Regnal Years: 527-65), with its first building dating from 530. It is, of course, the Byzantine Empire that preserved the NT Text type, we now call "the Byzantine Text"¹². In the Great Schism of 1054, the Patriarch of Constantinople broke with Rome. (The Patriarchate of Constantinople, founded by Constantine the Great as one of five Patriarchates, had been independent of Rome till 607). The Patriarch of Constantinople thus formed the Greek Orthodox Church (the first of the Eastern Orthodox Churches) in 1054, and St. Catherine's Monastery left the Roman Catholic Church to become Greek Orthodox. The Monastery was at first under the jurisdiction of the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem; however, in 1575 the Patriarch of Constantinople recognized it as an independent body. It nevertheless

¹² Cf. a picture of a Byzantine Empire Arch, together with another part of the Byzantine wall around the old city of Thessalonica in Greece, which I visited in 2002, at my webpage (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>).

continued to maintain some linkage with the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem, since the Abbot of this monastery is elected by the monks (by tradition, the monastery is limited in number to 36 monks), and then consecrated as the Greek Orthodox Archbishop of the Sinai by the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem.

The monastery served as a centre providing some protection for displaced persons when the sword of Islam moved to Mohammedanize the region from the 7th century. The monks exploited a sentiment in the Koran, used selectively by Mohammedans, which says, “thou shalt certainly find those to be nearest in affection to” Islam, “who say, ‘We are Christians.’ This, because some of them are priests and monks, and ... free from pride” (*Koran*, Sura 5:85)¹³. In order to appease the Mohammedans, the monks said that they would put a Muslim mosque inside the Monastery, and allow Arab Muslims from the surrounding region (beduins) to use it. The idea appealed to the Muslim invaders, who agreed to the deal. The consequence is that St. Catherine’s Monastery, (at the time of the deal, Roman Catholic, but later, Greek Orthodox,) thereafter survived with an unbroken history from the 6th century A.D. .

Yet notwithstanding the presence on the Anglican Calendar of St. Catherine’s Day (25 November), and so to some extent at least, its association with St. Catherine’s Monastery in the Sinai, which is Greek Orthodox; the emphasis in the Anglican Calendar on monks who are Benedictines is noticeable in the selection, *supra*. Indeed, the selection includes the founder of the that order, Benedict of Nursia (Umbria, central Italy), spoken of with favour in the writings of Gregory, even though in broad terms we Protestants more generally see this growth of monasticism as an undesirable development. Benedict founded a monastery at Monte Cassino. Cassino is in central Italy, about 87 miles or 140 kilometres south-east of Rome. The Benedictine Rule that he established in 529, cultivates both a community family spirit in Benedictine monasteries, and also establishes moderation as an ideal. The usual monastic austerities were lacking, and under their abbot monks were to be self-supporting. This more moderate form of monasticism had a greater appeal to the English spirit, than did the more austere forms of monasticism. Some concept of “moderation” also continued to resonate in the spirit of Reformation Anglicanism.

Reformation Anglicans sought to preserve that which was good from pre-Reformation monastic times, rather than type-casting it as “all bad.” “And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God” (Rom. 8:28). E.g., in October 2003 I visited Chester Cathedral. This was built in the 11th century as a Benedictine Abbey (1092). When Henry VIII closed the monasteries, this Abbey was dissolved in 1540, but this beautiful building, far from being demolished, then became the Cathedral for the newly created Anglican Diocese of Chester. This Cathedral is perhaps best known for the John Pearson monument, around which is written the Articles of the *Apostles’ Creed* under 12 facial busts representing the 12 apostles. Pearson’s *Exposition of the Creed* (1659, 1683) is a well-known Protestant work on the *Apostles’ Creed*¹⁴. The main text is in English, and it is

¹³ *The Koran*, translated by J.M. Rodwell, with an Introduction by G. Margoliouth, 1909, Everyman’s Library, London, UK, 1974. Rodwell’s footnote says, “Geiger derives both the Arabic words from Syriac terms, and renders *elders and clerics*, p. 51. But the root of the Arabic word rendered *monk* is generally said to be *rahaba*, to fear.”

¹⁴ James Nichols edition (Pearson, J., *An Exposition of the Creed*, 1659,1683, Ward,

replete with Latin and Greek quotations in the footnotes from relevant church writers. This work on the creed by the *Church of England* Bishop of Chester (1672-86), John Pearson (1612-1686) has gone through many reprints. (I inspected a memorial plaque to him at St. Clement's Church, Eastcheap, in London, to whose parishioners Bishop Pearson dedicated this work¹⁵.)

On the one hand, support for such monastic figures as found on the Anglican Calendar, *supra*, is qualified. By reference to Book 1, Homily 5, Article 35 of the 39 *Articles*, it is clear that Reformed Anglicans recognized that monasticism was unBiblical and wisely ended by King Henry VIII's closure of the monasteries in 1536 to 1540. Thus from the Reformed Anglican perspective, monasticism, which is one of the identifiers of the Pope as the Antichrist (Dan. 11:37; II Thess. 2:3, I Tim. 4:3), is now gone, and gone for good. But on the other hand, the Antichrist established himself "in the temple of God" (II Thess. 2:4), and that temple or church (I Cor. 3:16,17) included some good people. Though they were deceived in some errors swept away at the time of the Reformation, living as they did in pre-Reformation times, they made some witness, however imperfect, to the Christian faith. In this context, some of the better monks who made a better contribution are found as black letter days on the Calendar.

On the one hand, black letter days indicate that a figure is of some historical significance to the *Church of England*, and in some way, however limited, set a good example. But on the other hand, the more general quality of their profession of faith, or lives, are not commented on. Thus unlike the more important "red letter" holy days on the calendar, for which a Collect and Communion readings are provided, and the saints are specifically upheld as examples worthy of emulation; these "black letter" days do not have any special religious observance in the 1662 BCP's *Church of England*. In the absence of any collects or office, nothing of detail is specifically said about them. What one thinks of them is largely left to private judgment.

E.g., the calendar includes "Giles, Abbot" (1 Sept.), who was an abbot of the Benedictine Monastery near Nimes (Nismes) in France. He was a seventh century figure, whom the Calendar compilers evidently concluded was a part of "the temple of God" in which the Pope sat (II Thess. 2:4). The great Protestant hagiologist and Reformation Anglican, John Foxe (1516-1587), (ordained as an Anglican clergyman in 1560,) who wrote

Lock, & Co., London, UK, 1854 reprint), includes a picture of Bishop Pearson.

¹⁵ Clements Lane, London EC4 (near London Bridge). This is one of two rival London churches claiming to be the "bells of St. Clement's" in the rhyme, "Oranges and Lemons" ("Oranges and Lemons," said the bells of St. Clement's"), though I am happy to apply it to both. It was joined with the nearby St. Martin Orgar Church (Martin Lane, London, EC4,) in 1670 after the Great Fire of London destroyed St. Martin's in 1666. St. Martin Orgar is one of two rival London churches claiming to be "the bells of St. Martin's" in the rhyme, "Oranges and Lemons" ("You owe me five farthings," said the bells of St. Martin's"), though I am happy to apply it to both. The bell tower and knave of the old St. Martin's survived the fire, and from this was rebuilt a church used by immigrant French Huguenots till in 1820 it was pulled down, and rebuilt as a rectory in 1851. The old bell was rehung as a bell in a projecting clock, which still operates at the old Rectory. I have inspected all the London Churches referred to in this rhyme.

Foxe's Book of Martyrs (Latin edition, 1554, 1st English edition, 1563), was the preacher at St. Giles' *Church of England*, Cripplegate, London. (I first inspected this church where both John Foxe and John Milton are buried, in May 2001, and last inspected it in March 2009¹⁶, having also seen it in between these two times.) Reformation Presbyterians evidently formed a similar conclusion on such matters, as seen by St. Giles' *Church of Scotland Cathedral*, Edinburgh, where bonny John Knox (c. 1514-1572) preached at, and is now buried in the grounds of. (I inspected this Cathedral and burial place in December 2001).

Why did Anglicans in their liturgical calendar or such a notable London church as St. Giles' *Church of England*, Cripplegate; or Presbyterians in such a prominent church as St. Giles' *Church of Scotland Cathedral*, Edinburgh; seek to retain the memory of a Benedictine monk like Giles, the motif saint of cripples, when both Anglicanism and Puritan Presbyterianism abolished monasticism? Why were both happy to retain a word like "Westminster" meaning "West Monastery," in e.g., the Anglican's "Westminster Abbey" or the Presbyterian's "Westminster Confession"?

In the first place, while both Anglicanism (Book 1, Homilies 5 & 10; Book 2, Homilies 16 & 21, Article 35, *39 Articles*) and Presbyterianism (*Westminster Confession* 25:6) recognized that the Pope is the Antichrist; both also recognized that he established himself "in the temple of God" i.e., the church (I Cor. 3:16,17; Eph. 2:20-22; II Thess. 2:4). But in the second place, the answer lies in the fact that upon matured reflection, both Anglicans and Presbyterians realized that even though certain things could have been accomplished without monks, such as occurred after the Reformation; nevertheless, before the Reformation, monks carried on some important educational and religious work that needed to be remembered, and for which a debt of gratitude was owed. Some monks may have been involved in both education and copying out manuscripts i.e., working by day as school teachers, and outside of school hours as scribes. (If so, they would in some ways resemble myself.) We may not know much about them, but we would be ungrateful wretches to be unthankful for their valuable contributions.

¹⁶ Bramley-Moore says that when Foxe died in "1587," he "was interred in the chancel of St. Giles's Cripplegate, of which parish he had been vicar for some time, in the reign of Elizabeth," and reference is also made to a Latin tablet (since destroyed by fire) to his memory. Bramley-Moore, W., *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, 1563, revised folio edition, 1684, 3rd edition, Cassell, Patter, and Galpin, London, 1867 (hereafter called, Bramley-Moore's *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*), pp. xiii-xiv. Bramley-Moore is wrong to say Foxe was the "vicar" of this church. Foxe was a preacher but not a pastor at St. Giles' Church. The office of Lecturer that Foxe held has generally ceased to exist in the Anglican Church since 1844 ("Lecturers & Parish Clerks Act," 7 & 8 Victoria, chapter 59; 29 July 1844). But before that time it was filled by an ordained Anglican clergyman and was a preaching office with no pastoral or other parish duties besides preaching. As Parish Lecturer, the Reverend Foxe regularly preached the Sunday sermons at St. Giles' Church. (I obtained this information orally from Frank Major in March 2009, an official guide and historian of St. Giles' Cripplegate. He is the author of "St. Giles Church Cripplegate," PCC St. Giles' Church Cripplegate, 2000, a 22 page booklet published by, and available at, the church.)

On the one hand, the holy Apostle, St. Paul, could strongly condemn the apostate Judaism of his day, saying, “that blindness in part is happened to Israel” (Rom. 11:25), that their hearts had been hardened (Rom. 9:18 cf. 2:5), and that they were “broken off” from God’s salvation mercies (Rom. 11:19). But on the other hand, when asking, “What advantage then hath the Jew?,” St. Paul could also say, “much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God” (Rom. 3:1,2). So likewise, I strongly condemn the apostate Christianity of Roman Catholicism and Eastern / Greek Orthodoxy that chiefly developed in mediaeval times, and which the Protestantism of the Christian Reformation under the three great doctors of the Reformation, Martin Luther, John Calvin, and Thomas Cranmer, was so strongly opposed to, and by the grace of God set about to reform. But on the other hand, God committed preservation of the NT Oracles to the Gentiles, and it must be said that both Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox Gentiles had a great privilege, task, and responsibility, largely discharged by the monks, in taking care of the Oracles of God.

Thus important monastic work included the fact that monks were generally the scribes who copied out manuscripts containing the Word of God, or the works of ancient and mediaeval church writers citing the Word of God. *These manuscripts form the building blocks of the Textus Receptus.* Western monks were important as scribes of the Latin text, and eastern monks such as those of St. Catherine’s Monastery in the Sinai, were important as scribes of the Greek text. (It is unfortunate that St. Catherine’s monastery has come to be associated with the faulty Alexandrian text found there by Tischendorf, now known as London Sinaiticus. This was presumably collected originally as an item of interest, and placed in their library, something like the fact that my library contains such erroneous works as e.g., the RSV, NRSV, ESV, TEV, etc. . But this was by no means their only Greek manuscript.) Both Western Church and Eastern Church monastic scribes also copied out the writings of ancient and mediaeval church writers, which include important Biblical quotes.

And so it is, that the Anglican Calendar in the 1662 prayer book, reflects this wider Reformed Protestant tradition, found in both Anglicanism and Presbyterianism.

One final point should also be borne in mind about the monks. As recognized in the Calendar of the 1662 Anglican prayer book, there were some better spiritual figures still able to operate inside the Church of Rome till the 8th century on the Continent, such as the monk, Giles of Nimes (7th century). This was then followed by the formation of the “Holy” Roman Empire which brought such persecution as to necessitate independence of true Christians from it, as found in the Waldenses who (under various names) date from at least this time. And so too, in England since the late 14th or early 15th century, when the Inquisition finally came to England’s shores (in addition to its earlier limited presence with the Knights Templar), likewise this then necessitated independence of true Christians from it, as found in the Lollards. This also paralleled in broad time the formal denial of proto-Protestant truth at the *Council of Constance* (1414-18), and finally the systematic denial of Protestant Christian truth by the *Council of Trent* (1545-63); which ended for all time the possibility of those who are part of “the temple of God” in the Roman Church (II Thess. 2:4), staying for long in the Roman Church. Thus e.g., in England before this time, still inside the Roman Church, we look with favour on e.g., John Wycliffe, the Morning Star of the Reformation. This means that some of the better Latin monks involved in manuscript preservation may have been true Christians, although even if they were not, this is not a requirement for the normative operative requirements of Divine Preservation by (at least primarily) Gentiles of the NT text,

as seen by the Divine Preservation of the OT text by (at least primarily) apostate Jews (Rom. 3:2-4; 9:1-5, 11:29).

Likewise, inside Greek Orthodoxy a greater amount of latitude was *sometimes* allowed before the Eastern Orthodox equivalent of the Roman Catholic *Council of Trent*, namely, the *Synod of Jerusalem* (1672). In 1672 the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem, Dositheus (Dositheos) Notaras, convened this body of 68 Eastern Orthodox bishops and clergy. It met in the Patriarchate of the Greek Orthodox *Patriarch of Jerusalem* and included, e.g., Russian Orthodox representatives. Philip Schaff says the *Synod of Jerusalem* “is the most important in the modern history of the Eastern” Orthodox “Church, and may be compared to the” Roman Catholic “Council of Trent.” That is because, both the *Council of Trent* (1545-63) (Roman Catholic) and *Synod of Jerusalem* (1672) (Eastern Orthodox), were principally summoned in order to condemn the doctrines of the Protestant Reformation. Among other things, this *Synod of Jerusalem* claimed: a man is justified by a combination of faith and works (Article 13); seven sacraments (Article 15); baptismal regeneration (Article 16); the doctrine of purgatory although the term “purgatory” is avoided (Article 17); that the canon of Scripture includes the Apocrypha (Question and Answer 3); and the worship of the saints, particularly Mary the mother of Jesus, whom it said is the object of *hyperdulia* as distinct from the normal *dulia* worship of the saints, and also the *worshipful veneration* of, for example, crosses and images of Christ and icons of saints (Question and Answer 4). And as Schaff observes, it claimed in Articles 17 that “the eucharist is both a sacrament and sacrifice, in which the very body and blood of Christ are truly and really” “present under the figure and type” “of bread and wine.” Thus “the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation” “is taught as strongly as words can make it¹⁷.”

The Eastern Orthodox *Synod of Jerusalem* (1672), halted the advance of Protestantism inside of Eastern Orthodoxy, and denied and rejected Lucar’s *Confession of Orthodox Faith* (1629). This was part of a wider anti-Protestant backlash against the Protestant teachings of the Patriarch Lucar, which as set forth in *Lucar’s Confession* (1629) were also denied and rejected by the lesser Eastern Orthodox Councils of Constantinople (1638, 1672, & 1691), Kiev in the Ukraine (1640), and Jassy in Rumania (1642)¹⁸. They were also denied in the *Orthodox Confession of Faith* (1640) by the Russian Orthodox Metropolitan of Kiev, Peter Moglia; and the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem, Dositheus Notaras’s *Confession* (1672). Both this Russian Orthodox Confession of 1640 and the Greek Orthodox Confession of 1672, especially the Russian Orthodox one, were produced in conjunction with strong Roman Catholic influence¹⁹.

Yet before this time we know of some better figures in Eastern Orthodoxy, of which

¹⁷ Schaff, P., *The Creeds of the Greek and Latin Churches*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1877 (3 volumes), Volume 2, p. 136; Schaff, P., *A History of the Creeds of Christendom*, with translations, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1877, pp. 61,64-7.

¹⁸ Jassy (modern Iasi) was in Moldavia in 1642, but since 1859 it joined with Walachia to become modern Rumania (Romania).

¹⁹ *Encyclopedia Britannica CD 99*, Multimedia Edition, International Version, 1999, 1) “Jerusalem, Synod of (1672)” ; & 2) “Eastern Orthodoxy,” History subheading: “Orthodoxy under the Ottomans (1453-1821),” subsection, “Relations with the West.”

Lucar is a very clear example. Cyril Lucar (1572-1638)²⁰, was the Greek Orthodox *Patriarch of Constantinople*, the highest ranking position in the Greek Orthodox Church, and a position which due to its seniority, holds a position of ceremonial precedence (though with no governing power outside of the Greek Orthodox Church,) over and among all other Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs (e.g., he takes a ceremonial precedence over the Russian Orthodox *Patriarch of Moscow*). Lucar was desirous of forging some positive contacts with Protestants, and to this end, in 1628 he presented to no less a Protestant figure than the *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland*, King Charles I, *Codex Alexandrinus* (A 02, 5th century), which is Byzantine Text in the (incomplete) Gospels.

In this same year of 1628, largely responding to concerns about Arminians, King Charles I issued “His Majesty’s Declaration,” thereafter affixed to the Anglican *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.” Patriarch Lucar’s contact with King Charles I was therefore possibly at least one of the factors that acted as a catalyst in the timing of his Calvinist *Confession of Faith* in 1629.

Lucar undertook theological studies in both Lutheran Wittenberg in Germany, and Calvinist Geneva in Switzerland. Formerly the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria from 1602, he became Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople in 1620. In this position, he sought to promote the Reformed religion by sending younger Greek Orthodox theologians to Protestant universities in England, Holland, and Switzerland. One of these students, Metrophanes Kritopoulos, would in time become the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria. Between 1620 and 1638, Lucar was forced to resign some five times at the behest of the French and Austrian Papist ambassadors to the Ottoman Empire’s Sultan Murad IV (who reigned from 1623 to 1640); though on each occasion he returned to office with the help of British and Dutch Protestant diplomats²¹. Thus e.g., we know that the *Supreme Governor of the Church of England*, King Charles I, was working through his ambassador in Constantinople to help Cyril Lucar promote Protestant teachings, in opposition to Papists seeking to get rid of him.

Cyril Lucar clearly embraced Reformed Protestant teaching in his *Confession of Faith* (1629). Operating before the *Synod of Jerusalem* (1672) (and the other lesser Eastern Orthodox councils, *supra*), we cannot doubt that he tried to move the Greek Orthodox Church in the Protestant direction. Indeed, it was this factor that led to a Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox alliance between the Papist Austrian ambassador, Schwarzenborn, in cahoots with the Pope and Vatican, and the Greek Orthodox Cyril Contari, to stop Cyril Lucar. They did this through bribery money gained from the Vatican, and the assistance of a compliant Grand Vizir, Bairam Pasha, who made false insinuations to the Mohammedan Sultan, Murad IV, to the effect that Lucar was working in a military alliance against the Sultan, who then had Cyril Lucar killed on 27 June 1638. Thus Cyril Lucar is regarded as a Protestant “martyr,” since it

²⁰ Cyril Lucar or Lucaris; Greek, Kyrillos Loukaris.

²¹ *Encyclopedia Britannica CD 99, op. cit.*, 1) “Lucaris, Cyril”; 2) “Eastern Orthodoxy,” History subheading: “Orthodoxy under the Ottomans (1453-1821),” subsection, “Relations with the West.”

is clear that he died in the cause of defending important Protestant truths²².

Just one year after he gave *Codex Alexandrinus* to King Charles I, Cyril Lucar published the “Eastern Confession of the Christian Faith,” “Dated in Constantinople in the month of March, 1629,” by authority of “CYRIL, Patriarch of Constantinople.” A Latin form of it was published in Geneva, Switzerland, in 1629. *Lucar’s Confession* (1629) said it was a “brief Confession for the benefit of those who inquire about the faith and the religion of the Greeks, that is, of the Eastern Church²³.”

Unlike the seven sacraments (Article 15) in *Synod of Jerusalem* (1672), *Lucar’s Confession* (1629) stated that “the Lord hath instituted in the Gospel” only “two” “sacraments,” Baptism and Communion; although it maintained a Lutheran type of baptismal regeneration (chapter 16), and Lutheran type of consubstantiation (chapter 17). Unlike the “sacrifice” of the mass (Article 17) teaching of the *Synod of Jerusalem* (1672), *Lucar’s Confession* (1629) specifically said it did not adhere to “that which the devised doctrine of transubstantiation teacheth” (chapter 17). Unlike the Mariology and invocation of saints (Question and Answer 4) in the *Synod of Jerusalem* (1672), *Lucar’s Confession* (1629) said, “We believe that our Lord Jesus Christ sitteth on the right hand of his Father and there he maketh intercession for us, *executing alone the office of ... mediator ...*” (chapter 8).

Unlike the *Synod of Jerusalem* (1672), *Lucar’s Confession* (1629) specifically stated, “We believe the authority of the Holy Scripture to be above the authority of the Church ... and is infallible and has eternal authority” (chapter 2). Unlike the purgatory teaching (Article 17) in the *Synod of Jerusalem* (1672), *Lucar’s Confession* (1629) specifically stated, “We believe that the souls of the dead are either in blessedness or in damnation ..., and after this life there is neither power nor opportunity to repent; By which is evident that fiction of purgatory is not to be admitted ...” (chapter 18).

Unlike the justification by a combination of faith and works teaching (Article 13) in the *Synod of Jerusalem* (1672), *Lucar’s Confession* (1629) upheld justification by faith (Articles 9 & 13), and was specifically Calvinist (Article 3 & 14). It stated, “We believe that without faith no man can be saved. And we call faith that which justifieth in Christ Jesus ..., without which no man can please God” (Article 9). “We believe that man is justified by faith and not by works. But when we say by faith, we understand the correlative or object of faith, which is the righteousness of Christ, which, as if by a hand, faith apprehends and applieth unto us for salvation ...” (Articles 13). “We believe that free will is dead in the unregenerate, because they can do no good thing, and whatsoever they do is sin; but in the regenerate by the grace of the Holy Ghost the will is excited and in deed worketh but not without the assistance of grace. In order, therefore, that man should be born again and do good, it is necessary that grace should go before; otherwise man ... of himself ... cannot do anything” (chapter 14). “We believe that the most merciful God hath predestinated his elect unto glory before the beginning of the world, without any respect unto their works and that there was no other impulsive cause to this election, but only the good will and mercy of God.

²² Hadjiantoniou, G.A., *Protestant Patriarch, The Life of Cyril Lucaris (1572-1638)* Patriarch of Constantinople, John Knox Press, Richmond, Virginia, USA, 1961 (Library of Congress Catalog Card no: 61-7594), pp. 127-133, “The Martyrdom.”

²³ Complete English translation in *Ibid.*, pp. 141-145.

In like manner before the world was made he hath rejected whom he would ..." (chapter 3).

The Protestant teachings of Lucar had some wider Greek Orthodox support. E.g., Neophytus, the Archbishop of Heracleia supported them. So also, Sophronius, Bishop of Athens, of whom Patriarch Lucar wrote in March 1636/7, "He is one of my friends, with very good intentions towards the Reformed religion." Notably, the monk, Maximus Calliopolites, who later greatly helped in a biography of Cyril Lucar, also supported his Protestant reforms²⁴. That the monk Maximus Calliopolites thus believed in justification by faith, is significant for making the point that before the events following Lucar's death in 1638 and culminating in the *Synod of Jerusalem* (1672), some of the Greek Orthodox monks who worked on the Byzantine texts may have been true Christians, although once again, even if the Greek monks were not truly saved men, this is not a requirement for the normative operative requirements of Divine Preservation by (at least primarily) Gentiles of the NT text, as seen by the Divine Preservation of the OT text by (at least primarily) apostate Jews (Rom. 3:2-4; 9:1-5, 11:29).

3) *The Antichrist visits my hometown of Sydney, Australia* (2008).

I, for one do not doubt the accuracy of Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*, when it says, with reference to the teaching of Christ in his Olivet Discourse, "'Many (Matt. 24:5,24) shall come in my name,' saith Christ;" that in fact, "all the popes" "are worthily accounted among the number of" "'false Christs' (Matt. 24:24)" (Homily 16, Book 2). I.e., that Christ here teaches the office of Antichrist (singular) will be a succession of "false Christs" (plural) (Homily 16, Book 2). Article 35 is also certainly correct to conclude that the "bishop of Rome" "ought" "to be called Antichrist" (Homily 10, Book 1); and that the "bishop of Rome" is "the Babylonical beast of Rome" (Homily 21, Book 2).

For to be sure, the "Pope ... is the true Antichrist ..., who hath raised himself over and set himself against Christ This is called precisely, 'setting oneself over God and against God,' as St. Paul saith" (II Thess. 2:4) (Luther's *Smalcald Articles* 4:9-11, upheld in the Lutheran *Formulae of Concord*, Epitome 3). For "... the Pope of Rome" far from being "head of the Church" (a claim found in the decree of the Eastern Roman Empire Emperor, Phocas, making the Bishop of Rome "universal bishop" in 607 A.D.²⁵), "is that Antichrist,

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 135,160; quoting (for the 1636/7 letter), Legrand, *Bibliographie Hellenique du XVII Siecle*, Vol. IV, Encyclical Letter of 4 March, 1636/7, pp. 486-488.

²⁵ From 533 the claims of *some* Bishops of Rome to a *universal primacy* in the church, had been accepted by the Byzantine Emperor in Constantinople, Justinian. On the one hand, the issue was wider than Rome verses Constantinople. (E.g., we know of independent orthodox Trinitarian churches in the British Isles; or independent unorthodox monophysitist churches in the Eastern Mediterranean region.) But on the other hand, the issue was largely focused on the fact that the Archbishop of Constantinople was jurisdictionally independent from Rome. This meant that while there were other independent centres of power which repudiated Rome's claims, because Constantinople was the most politically and religiously powerful such centre, it was specifically targeted by Rome as its primary target. In 533, attached to *Justinian's Code* was a letter in which Justinian refers to

that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ and all that is called God” (Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 25:6; Congregational *Savoy Declaration* 26:5; Baptist’s *Baptist / London / Philadelphia Confession* 26:4).

In the greater fulfillment of the “false prophet” prophecy of the so called “Ecumenical Councils” (Rev. 16:13; 19:20; 20:10), i.e., from the time of the *First Lateran Council* in 1123 onwards, the Pope calls and presides over such councils, of which the *Vatican II Council* of 1962-5 has been the most recent. In connection with his role as president of such councils, St. John the Divine (Theologian) pictures the false prophet as having “two horns” (Rev. 13:11). The Pope was pictured in his *two-horned* papal mitre on the front page of the *Sydney Morning Herald* on Friday 11 July 2008; and showing his relationship to the other bishops under him, we find a picture of Cardinal Pell, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Sydney, later pictured in a bishop’s mitre (which is minimally different to a papal mitre)²⁶. Three pictures of the Pope appeared in the Herald on the day after his Sunday Mass at Randwick, in Sydney. They each showed the Pope under the Papal Coat of Arms, which contains this Papal mitre on the top of it, together with the so called, “Keys of St. Peter.” (This heraldic usage of the papal mitre is a new innovation by Benedict XVI, as previous Popes have used the papal tiara, rather than the papal mitre, on the top of their papal arms.) In the third of these three pictures, the Pope is leaning forward, and so one can see the *two horns* of his *two-horned* papal mitre²⁷.

Thus it was, that in July 2008, the old Roman Antichrist, who is devil-possessed by Lucifer himself (Rev. 12:3; 13:1,2; cf. Isa. 14:12-14; Ezek. 28:17), came to my own hometown of Sydney, Australia²⁸. This was part of the Romanists, “World Youth Day” from Tuesday 15 to Sunday 20 July 2008, though it might have been more accurately called, the “Papists’ World Youth Week.”

The Devil sat in the control panel of the Pope Benedict XVI’s head, just as he has sat

the Bishop of Rome, John II (Bishop of Rome 533-535), as “the head of all churches.” But these words were in *a letter, not a legal enactment*. They thus meant that under Justinian, the Bishop of Rome had a titular primacy from 533 till Justinian’s death in 565. (This makes the 533 *letter* a *prophetic type* of the 607 *legal decree* some 70-80 years later.) But this essentially honorary and titular primacy, which still left the Bishop of Rome without jurisdictional power over the Archbishop of Constantinople and his Patriarchate, thus expired in 565. Indeed, this claim to a “universal” jurisdiction was then specifically repudiated by a later Bishop of Rome, Gregory the Great, before it was then successfully revived by Boniface III in 607. At that time, says the [*Roman*] *Catholic Encyclopedia* (1913, Vol. 2, p. 660), “Boniface obtained a decree from Phocas ... by which it was ordained that ‘the See of Blessed Peter the Apostle should be the head of all the churches,’ and that the title of ‘universal bishop’ belonged exclusively to the Bishop of Rome - an acknowledgment somewhat similar to that made by Justinian eighty years before (Novell, 131 c. II tit. xiv.)”

²⁶ *Sydney Morning Herald*, Fri. 18 July 2008, p. 8.

²⁷ *Sydney Morning Herald*, Mon. 21 July 2008, p. 5.

²⁸ Though I have lived elsewhere, and own a flat in Nowra, south of Sydney (where I have also sometimes lived), I have lived most of my life primarily in Sydney.

in the control panel of every Roman Pope, since the time of the very first Pope, Boniface III in 607²⁹. As Lucifer moved the Roman Pontiff around, he received accolades and praises from e.g., the Australian Prime Minister, Kevin Rudd, and New South Wales Premier, Morris Iemma. How he loved the people addressing him with the title of God the Father, calling him, “Holy Father” (John 17:11), which is one way, he “denieth the Father” (I John 2:22). How he who transforms himself into an angel of light (II Cor. 11:14); smirked through the Pope he controls by having him wear white, while requiring others around him, such as his Cardinals, to wear a darker colour. For thus he takes some of the glory that properly belongs to God alone who is “the Father of lights” (Jas. 1:17)³⁰.

How Lucifer controlling the Pope, basked in the glory of being regarded as, “the vicar of Christ.” This papal title comes from the Latin form, “Vicarius Christi” (in the place of Christ), which is a synonym for the Greek form, “Antichristos” (in the place of Christ, I John 2:18,22; 4:3; II John 7), from which we get the English word, “Antichrist.” This is how the Pope commits the unpardonable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, by usurping the place of the Holy Ghost as Christ’s representative (John 15:26); and thus the Devil has access to, and control of the Pope, who as “vicar of Christ” claims “universal” jurisdiction in the church. This is how, as a vice-God or vice-Christ, “he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God” (II Thess. 2:4).

How Lucifer in control of the Pope, enjoyed claiming that he and his minion priests, created the Creator in the Mass. This is one way he “denieth ... the Son” (I John 2:22); for it is against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be in more places than one at the same time, and since Christ’s natural body is in heaven, it cannot be on earth in the Roman mass. By this Trinitarian heresy called, transubstantiation, the Pope “confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh” (I John 4:3), for by it he denieth the humanity of Christ³¹. Through it, the injunction to uphold the Second Commandment (Exod. 20:4-6), “Little children, keep yourselves from idols” (I John 5:21), is also set aside; for “the sacramental bread ... may not be adored,” “for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians” (Final Rubric, The Communion Service, Anglican *Book of Communion Prayer*, 1662).

How the blinded masses doted over the Devil in control of the Pope. To be sure, the god of this world, the Devil, is a master of deception. Only a relatively small number have the spiritual insight to really see what is going on. The rest are simply “blinded” by “the god of this world” (II Cor. 4:4).

²⁹ While the term “pope” was sometimes used of any Diocesan Bishop before (and increasingly less so after) this time, I here use the term “Pope” to mean the formation of the Roman Papacy which occurred in 607. The older usage of the term “Pope” for a Diocesan Bishop, is still found in the unofficial title of the Superior General of the Jesuits as “the black Pope,” since he is like a Diocesan Bishop to Jesuits. I.e., like other Jesuits he wears a black robe, and so he is called, “the black Pope,” meaning “the black bishop.”

³⁰ *Sydney Morning Herald*, Mon. 14 July 2008, front page (Pope with Prime Minister); *Sydney Morning Herald*, Tues. 15 July 2008, front page (Pope in white with cardinals in black).

³¹ *Sydney Morning Herald*, Wed. 16 July 2008, front page (Popish pilgrims stretch along “the hungry mile for the opening Mass of the World Youth Day celebrations”).

Application of Dan. 11:36-39 to the Roman Papacy is classic Protestant historicism. Let us consider from the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*, an interesting example of applying this Antichrist passage. A propounding of Dan. 11:38 is found in Homily 2, Book 2, Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*. This Homily first identifies the Antichrist as Romish, and thus Papal, through the Romish teachings of “Latria and Dulia.” (This is more plainly stated in other Homilies, e.g., Homily 10, Book 1 says, The “bishop of Rome” “ought” “to be called Antichrist”). Reference is then made to “idolaters” who “burn incense, offer up gold to images, hang up crutches, chains, and ships, legs, arms, and whole men and worship men of wax before images, as though by them or Saints (as they say) they were delivered from lameness, sickness, captivity, or shipwreck. Is not this” “to worship images, so earnestly forbidden in God’s Word? If they deny it, let them read the eleventh chapter of Daniel the Prophet; who saith of Antichrist, *He shall worship [a] god whom his fathers knew not with gold, silver, and with precious stone, and other things of pleasure*” (“Dan. 11:38”). Therefore what Article 22 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* calls the “Romish doctrine concerning” “worshipping and adoration” of (among other things) saints, “as well” as “of images” of (among other things) saints, “and also invocation of Saints,” is in this Homily 2, Book 2, Article 35 of same the Anglican Articles, seen as a prophetic fulfilment of the Antichrist prophecy of Dan. 11:38.

A long Protestant tradition of historicism has understood the “forces” of Dan. 11:38 to refer to saint mediator “forces;” and a long Protestant tradition of historicism, evident in the Anglican Homilies of the *Thirty-Nine Articles*, has understood Dan. 11:38 to apply to Popish saints and idols of saints (Homily 2, Book 2, Article 35). Some Protestant historicists have taken a different view, e.g., applying this to the Roman Mass. On the one hand, I do not doubt that the Roman Mass involves a situation where “the sacramental bread” is “adored,” which thing is “idolatry” (Final Rubric, Communion Service, Book of Common Prayer, 1662), and its notion of “the sacrifices of masses” which claim “the priest” does “offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt,” are “blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits” (Article 31, Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*). But on the other hand, I think the requirement that the Antichrist “shall cause them” i.e., *both* “the God of forces” and the “strange god,” “to rule over many,” cannot really be applied to the Roman Mass. On the one hand, papists do not actually pray to the Roman Mass as a “force,” or seek its “protection,” in such a way that one could say that by it the Antichrist “shall divide the land for gain,” and “cause them to rule over many.” But on the other hand, these associated words of Dan. 11:39 are met with “Saint” mediators in general, and Mary in particular, with the practice of “patron saints” in Romish dioceses and parish churches which “divide the land” into areas, and allocate different saint mediators, always including Mary, “to rule over many” in the designated area. Therefore, I think that the most likely and natural interpretation of Dan. 11:38,39, includes within its meaning, a clear reference to “Saint” mediators in general, and Mary in particular as the “strange god” (Dan. 11:39).

And nor do we Protestants doubt that genuine miracles are sometimes connected with such invocation of saints. For as Homily 2, Book 2, Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* continues, “... And, if it were to be admitted that some miraculous acts were by the illusion of the Devil done where images be, ... yet followeth it not therefore, that such images are either to be honoured, or suffered to remain For the Scriptures have, for a warning hereof, foreshewed” in “Matt. 24:24; II Thess. 2:9-12; Rev. 13:13,14,” “that the kingdom of Antichrist shall be mighty in miracles and wonders to the strong illusion of all the reprobate.”

The Pope is called in Scripture, “that man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3), and the same St. Paul who penned these words, also said, “I had not known sin, but by the law” (Rom. 7:7), and contextually he clearly means the Ten Commandments (Exod. 20:1-17). As part of the preparations for the Papal arrival, in violation of the First Commandment, “I am the Lord, Thou shalt have no other gods before me,” the Second Commandment, “Thou shalt not make, bow down to, nor serve, any graven image;” and the Third Commandment, “Thou shalt not take the Lord’s name in vain,” the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Sydney, Cardinal George Pell, unveiled a picture which elevated Mary as a mother-goddess figure in accordance with Romish teaching blasphemously ascribing to her such Divine Attributes as an ability to hear and answer prayer, or act as a mediator between God and man³².

Moreover, violations of the second commandment (idolatry) and third commandment (blasphemy), are clearly evident in the Roman Mass. The Roman Mass dishonestly denies the completed work of Christ on the cross, *who made there, by his one oblation of himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world* (Communion Service, Book of Common Prayer, 1662). “The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore 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” (Article 31, Anglican 39 Articles). And “under the papacy,” “the mass” “has been the highest” “of all the various papal idolatries” (Lutheran *Smalcald Articles* 2:1, upheld in Lutheran *Formula of Concord*, Epitome 3). To be sure, the “Mass is” “a denial of the one sacrifice and suffering of Jesus Christ and a condemnable idolatry” (Dutch Reform *Heidelberg Catechism*, Question & Answer 80). And so we cannot doubt, that “transubstantiation” “is the cause” “of gross idolatries” (Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 29:6, Congregational *Savoy Declaration* 30:6, and *Baptist Confession* 30:6).

Yet nor can we doubt the centrality of the idolatrous and blasphemous mass to Papists. E.g., “the closing Mass of World Youth Day” on Sunday 20 July was repeatedly pre-announced³³. When this much anticipated event finally took place, the *Sydney Morning Herald*, which for more than a week had given front page coverage to the Pope’s visit every day, again gave front page coverage to the closing Papal Mass on the following day, with a so called, “Papal Mass Souvenir Edition.” Reminding us that the Roman Church is a politically powerful organization whose influence reaches deep into the media and elsewhere, the front page of the Herald showed the old Antichrist kissing a baby. It reported positively the fact that “thousands of pilgrims” had attended what was “the largest” “Mass” “ever” “held in Australia³⁴.” By contrast, the *Sydney Morning Herald* does not give any coverage to the true Biblical gospel of Protestantism, let alone, repeated front page coverage.

In violation of the Fourth Commandment, “Remember the sabbath day, to keep it

³² *Sydney Morning Herald*, Sat. 12 July 2008, front page.

³³ E.g., *Sydney Morning Herald*, Sat. 19 July 2008, front page.

³⁴ *Sydney Morning Herald*, Mon. 21 July 2008, front page.

holy,” the Pope had arrived in Sydney by plane from Rome, at 3 pm on Sunday 13 July³⁵. This Sunday traveling was not a necessity, and so violated the fourth commandment. For in the double meaning of the NT Greek, Christ rose on “the first of the week (*sabbaton*)” or “the first of the sabbaths (*sabbaton*),” thus making Easter Sunday the first of many sabbaths (John 20:1,19,26; Acts 2:1; 20:7; I Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10).

The Papal celebrations abused the concept of parenthood protected by the fifth commandment, “Honour thy father and mother,” as Popish priests called themselves “Father,” and indeed the Roman Pontiff himself was called “Pope,” meaning “Father³⁶.” That this type of title is abused was further seen in reports of a Popish priest, “Father” O’Donnell, who had repeatedly raped two prepubescent sisters at a Roman Catholic primary school, in further violation of the seventh commandment, “Thou shalt not commit adultery,” and tenth commandment, “Thou shalt not covet³⁷.” Calling such a religious figure, “Father,” i.e., as a general or common title of address, is specifically forbidden in Scripture (Matt. 23:9) (although one may use the term in certain more descriptive contexts of spiritual fathers³⁸). Among other things it gives the clergyman too much control power with young children, and so is an integral element to the way Popish priests both rape young children, and then ensure they keep quiet about it till they are adults, at which point the legal evidence for prosecution of the Romish priest is usually well and truly gone.

³⁵ *Sydney Morning Herald*, Mon. 14 July 2008, front page.

³⁶ *Sydney Morning Herald*, Mon. 14 July 2008, front page.

³⁷ *Sydney Morning Herald*, Thurs. 17 July 2008, front page; *Sydney Morning Herald*, Tues. 22 July 2008, front page.

³⁸ An Anglican Bishop is occasionally addressed as, “Reverend Father in God” (The Ordinal, *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662). But this is not a general title of address, such as “Bishop N,” and is qualified, as a “Father *in God*.” Likewise a similar type of qualification is found for the requirement that at an Anglican baptism there is a “Godfather” and “Godmother” (Infant Baptism Service, *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662, local canon law may vary the number of godparents required). While it must be admitted that the spiritual standard of such persons vary; if they are godly, such terminology is compatible with Scripture (I Cor. 4:15; I Thess. 2:11; I Tim. 1:2,18; II Tim. 1:2; 2:1; Titus 1:4; I John 5:21.) This Anglican distinction is not always accepted by Puritan derived Protestants, some of whom may object to this usage in the Ordinal of “Reverend Father in God” for a Bishop, or “Godfather” and “Godmother” in the Baptism Service, or similar references to “the Church Fathers.” E.g., at about the same time that Puseyite Anglicans forsook their Protestant heritage and went Romeward into semi-Romanism; some semi-Puritan Anglicans forsook elements of their Anglican heritage and formed the *Free Church of England*, which among other things removed references to the Bishop as “Reverend Father in God.” In my opinion, such Puritans, or semi-Puritans in the case of the *Free C. of E.*, have not accomplished a viable synthesis of all relevant Scriptures, in which they understand Matt. 23:9 in the light of I Cor. 4:15 *et al*; and so, while they are strong on the citation of Matt. 23:9, they are weak on, and make it contradict, I Cor. 4:15 *et al, supra*. Nevertheless, we Anglican and Puritan Protestants are agreed that Matt. 23:9 forbids the common Roman Catholic (and Puseyite) practice of calling a clergyman, “Father” or “Father N” as a general title of address; or the Romish tradition giving the Bishop of Rome the common title, “Pope” (meaning, “Father”).

The seventh commandment, “Thou shalt not commit adultery,” also has a spiritual application with the Roman Papacy, for St. John the Divine says that, “the kings of the earth have committed fornication” with “the great whore” (Rev. 17:1,2) with “seven heads,” which are “seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth” (Rev. 17:9) i.e., Rome, the City of Seven Hills. This spiritual “fornication” (Rev. 17:2) takes different forms, but one form is the diplomatic recognition that “the kings of the earth” (Rev. 17:2) give to Rome. What other world religious leader has a seat on the United Nations, or diplomatic relations with various countries around the world? Thus the *Sydney Morning Herald* reported that just before the Roman Pontiff left Sydney, he was greeted at Sydney Airport in the presence of the Prime Minister, by a former Deputy Prime Minister, Tim Fischer, a Roman Catholic. Fischer is pictured in the paper bowing down his head to kiss the Pope’s hand, as the Prime Minister watches on, smiling happily. The article then reports that Fischer was then heading off to Rome to be Australia’s first resident ambassador to the Vatican City State in 35 years. This type of thing is one example of spiritual “fornication.” What other world leader with whom Australia has diplomatic relations, ever has his hand kissed? It reminds me of former times when the Pope used to have his foot kissed. In referring to this ambassadorial appointment, it was announced that not since Australia first established diplomatic relations with the Vatican in 1973, at which time a resident ambassador was appointed, has there been this higher level of diplomatic relations. (In the interim, Australia’s ambassador to the Republic of [southern] Ireland has been responsible for relations with the Vatican.)³⁹

The sixth commandment, “Thou shalt not kill,” was set aside, with the announcement that, “The Premier” of New South Wales, “Morris Ieema, who defied Cardinal George Pell by voting for stem cell research, wants to take Communion with the Pope at the closing mass for World Youth Day” on Sunday 20 July⁴⁰. We here see the hypocrisy of Popery. While such stem cell research involves killing of unborn children, and is theoretically opposed by the Roman Church, they fail to take serious action against those Papists involved in it. The Scriptures teach, “if any man that is called a brother be” involved in egregious violations of doctrine, “with such an one no not to eat” (I Cor. 5:11). This injunction refers to spiritual fellowship meals, and so clearly includes the Lord’s Supper. The failure to excommunicate figures like Ieema, a Papist of Italian extraction who violates the sixth commandment, or Romish priests who rape children in violation of the seventh and tenth commandments, means that in reality they are not serious about stopping this type of thing. (And I would make a similar criticism here about various Protestant Churches who also fail to exercise proper church discipline).

The Pope sets about violating the ninth commandment, “Thou shalt not bear false witness,” in many ways, as he works “with all deceivableness” (II Thess. 2:10). E.g., his Mariolatry or idolatry in the Roman Mass, *supra*, not only sets aside the injunction, “keep yourselves from idols” (I John 5:21), it also further exposes him with respect to the issue of honesty. For St. John also says, “He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him” (I John 4:2 cf. John 8:44).

³⁹ *Sydney Morning Herald*, Tues. 22 July 2008, p. 4.

⁴⁰ *Sydney Morning Herald*, Sat. 12 July 2008, p. 6, “[Roman] Catholic ministers join the queue to say Amen.”

But nowhere is this papal violation of the ninth commandment more apparent, than in the false gospel which the Pope peddles. He preaches “another gospel” (Gal. 1:6), than the “gospel” of “grace” (Gal. 1:6), which says, “The just shall live by faith” (Gal. 3:11). For “when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman,” the Scripture does not say, “a woman and a man,” i.e., this teaches a virgin birth, “made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law” (Gal. 4:3-5). “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree” (Gal. 3:13) i.e., here meaning “the cross” (Gal. 6:14). We have the evidence for this in the fact that “God the Father” “raised him from the dead” (Gal. 1:1).

By contrast, the Pope’s teaching, which is contrary to the gospel statement, “by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified” (Gal. 2:16), includes as its so called “good works,” the taking of the Roman Mass. This is a shocking perversion of the Lord’s Supper, which is a symbolic *memorial*, for Christ saith, “this do *in remembrance* of me” (I Cor. 11:24,25). Not only then was this violation of the ninth commandment apparent in the focus on the Roman Mass; it was also apparent in the notion of “a pilgrimage” to Sydney. During this week, those involved in the Romish “World Youth Day” were referred to as “pilgrims⁴¹.” I.e., they believed that as “pilgrims” they were earning merit with God by attending these activities. To be sure, this is “another gospel” (Gal. 1:6) than the one which says, “The just shall live by faith” (Gal. 3:11).

What of the eight commandment, “Thou shalt not steal”? We see it in the stealing of God’s glory by the Roman Pontiff. Now we know that Lucifer, who has personally devil-possessed every Pope since the first Pope, Boniface III, “is transformed into an angel of light” (II Cor. 11:14), and hence the propriety of his name, “Lucifer” (Isa. 14:12), meaning, “light-bringer” or “day star.” Through his devil-possession of the Pope, Lucifer likes to steal the glory that belongs to God, and focus it on himself.

Now the highpoint of this Popish “World Youth Day,” was Thursday 18 July 2008, known as, “Super Thursday.” The front page of the *Sydney Morning Herald* on Friday 18 July, read under the caption, “Super Thursday Souvenir,” the headline, “Shining his light.” This showed Pope Benedict XVI in his popemobile as “thousands lined the streets to get a glimpse of the pontiff,” shining brightly in an illuminated popemobile carriage, with relative darkness around him. Reminding us that “the whore” of Rome “sitteth” upon “peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues” (Rev. 17:9,15), this same front page article said that on “Super Thursday,” “an estimated 150,000 young people” constituting “pilgrims,” “waving 168 different flags craned, surged and clambered to catch sight of the pontiff.”

Here we see the focus. *The focus is not on God the Father who sent the Son into the world to save sinners. The focus is not on God the Son who died for our sins, and was raised the third day. The focus is not on the power of God the Holy Ghost who points us to Christ and enables and strengthens us. NO! NO! NO! THE FOCUS IS ON THE POPE!* The words with which Isaiah addressed the Devil-possessed “king of Babylon” (Isa. 14:4), may surely be also used to address the Devil-possessed Pope of Rome who “exalteth himself above all that is called God” (II Thess. 2:4), “O Lucifer, son of the morning! ... thou hast said

⁴¹ *Sydney Morning Herald*, Wed. 16 July 2008, front page (Popish pilgrims stretch along “the hungry mile for the opening Mass of the World Youth Day celebrations”).

in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God ... : I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High. Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit” (Isa. 14:12-14).

Good Christian reader, who else can set aside all these precepts of the Holy Decalogue, in most cases, reported on the front page of the *Sydney Morning Herald* on every day of the week, and still be described as a great “Christian” personage, “Shining his light”? Only it seems “that man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3), of whom it is said, “all the world wondered after” him (Rev. 13:3).

But the Pope did not have it all his own way. The Herald reported that on Friday 18 July, 2008, there was, in the words of its story headline, a “Reproach for Pope at all-churches gathering.” The newspaper reported that “in a speech on behalf of Protestant ... leaders,” “one of Australia’s highest ranking Anglicans ... delivered a ... rebuke to Pope Benedict, reminding him in a face-to-face meeting that despite his ... title as the Vicar of Christ, he was not accepted as the leader of all Christians.” This was the Evangelical Anglican Bishop of South Sydney (one of the assistant bishops under the Archbishop of Sydney), Bishop Robert Forsyth (who before becoming a bishop, was the Rector of St. Barnabas’ Church, Broadway, *infra*). Bishop Forsyth further said to the Pope “in ... St. Mary’s [Roman Catholic] Cathedral, ‘I cannot but be aware that there are, and remain, very great and significant differences between us, differences which still matter today, including ... your very office [of Pope].’” Elucidating on this to the Herald afterwards, Bishop Forsyth referred to “the claim” of the Pope “to being the leader of all the world’s Christians.” The Anglican Bishop said, “We cannot accept that historical claim that he is some sort of universal vicar⁴².”

In isolating the claim of the Pope to have a “universal” jurisdiction as “vicar” of Christ, and so claiming to be “leader of all the world’s Christians,” Bishop Forsyth of the Evangelical Anglican Diocese of Sydney, thus in fact isolated the key issue to the formation of the Roman Papacy in 607 A.D. . In rejecting these claims, Bishop Forsyth was thus upholding established Protestant orthodoxy which repudiates any such claims to a “universal” jurisdiction by the Roman Pope⁴³. E.g., Article 37 of the *39 Articles* says, “The Bishop of Rome hath no” such “jurisdiction.”

On what was billed as the most important day of this “World Youth Day” week, “Super Thursday,” i.e., Thursday 17 July, 2008, the front page of the *Sydney Morning Herald* also advised people, “Where to see the Pope,” with a special “guide to super Thursday” at “page 5.” But the front-page story headline said, “A cranky father tells the [Roman] church: the wounds are still raw and open.” It was all about how his two daughters had been repeatedly raped by a Romish priest, “Father” O’Donnell, at a Roman Catholic Primary School in Melbourne. One later committed suicide, the other became a drunkard who was involved in a car crash that left her mentally and physically disabled in 1999. Sadly this type of this is all too common in the Roman Church, which does not defrock or excommunicate those priests so involved.

⁴² *Sydney Morning Herald*, Sat. 19 July 2008, p. 9, Andrew West’s article, “Reproach for Pope at all-churches gathering.”

⁴³ Cf., McGrath, G.B. (myself), “Papal Visit to Australia,” *English Churchman*, 15 & 22 August, 2008, p. 2.

The bishop in charge of the World Youth Day celebrations had replied to this, by saying that a number of sexually abused victims of Popish priests were “crankily dwelling ... on old wounds,” as Popish pilgrims happily celebrated World Youth Day. Such it seems are some of the problems of a system in which the one whom Daniel describes as himself being celibate, “shall” have no “regard” “the desire of women” (Dan. 11:37); and who imposing celibacy on his clergy, the Apostle Paul says, engages in “forbidding to marry” (I Tim. 4:3, although this verse also refers to refusing to remarry those with Biblically sound divorces, and refusing to marry persons because of the extended “incest” laws of Rome)⁴⁴.

On this same Thursday, I was in the libraries at Sydney University and Moore Theological College, looking up matters connected with these textual commentary volumes. My car was being serviced that day, and I was using public transport. Coming off the Sydney Harbour Bridge with the Sydney Opera House to our left, as the bus drove down George Street and Broadway to Sydney University, I saw groups of Popish pilgrims walking along these streets, flying a variety of different flags, indicating the places they came from all over the world. Moreover, both sides of these main streets were lined with flags promoting “World Youth Day” from different sponsors, e.g., one flag I looked at said its sponsor was, “[Roman] Catholic Insurance Ltd. Serving You - Serving [the Roman] Church.”

When leaving the university, I walked from Sydney University, up Broadway, into George Street, as far as St. Andrew’s Cathedral. I was walking on the left-side of the road, and for this part of my journey, I shall mainly limit discussion to the churches I passed by on my immediate left. The first church I came across was St. Barnabas’ Anglican Church, Broadway. This Evangelical Anglican Church had a large sign at the front of it which read:

Why I’m a catholic,
But can’t be a Roman.
Talk & Dialogue Mon. 21 July 7.30 pm Broadway.

This Evangelical Church, commonly called, “St. Barney’s” or just “Barney’s,” was thus giving a good Christian witness to these Popish pilgrims, which makes an important distinction between being a “catholic” i.e., a Christian of the *universal* church referred to in e.g., the *Apostles’ Creed*⁴⁵, and the fact that this is inconsistent with being a Roman Catholic⁴⁶.

⁴⁴ I Cor. 7 makes it clear that there are some Christians, who like the holy Apostle, St. Paul, have the gift of continency, and may fairly exercise ministries as celibate persons. But others, like the holy Apostle, St. Peter, may marry, and fairly exercise ministries in the sexual relationship of marriage. I do not say that celibacy is wrong for those with the gift of continency; but I do say it is clear that large numbers of Romish priests do not have this gift, and hence they engage in rapes of minors, more commonly homosexual than heterosexual.

⁴⁵ Article 10 of the Apostles’ Creed says, “I believe ... the holy catholic (universal) church; the communion (fellowship) of saints (believers).”

⁴⁶ In July 08, St. Barney’s was still a burnt out shell of a building (and still remains so more than 12 months on), following an earlier fire, with the congregation meeting elsewhere. But the notice board at Barney’s is well located on Broadway, and was still being

The next church I came across on my left, was a Popish Church bearing a large sign, “St. Peter Julian’s Catholic Church.” A banner outside of it read, “Festival Saint Jean,” and it was packed with Popish pilgrims, waving various flags. This (together with an earlier Popish Church on the right side of the road,) was one of the important stopping off points of these Popish pilgrims as they proceeded along Broadway and George Street.

The next church I walked past, now in George Street, was the Central Baptist Church. This church had a large poster on it (being displayed by a number of Sydney churches at the time), which read, “There is one mediator between God and people, the man Christ Jesus’ The Bible. I Timothy 2:5.” While I disapprove of changing “men (AV)” to “people” (like, “*man* Christ Jesus,” “between God and *men*” is the same Greek root word, *anthropos*⁴⁷), this poster nevertheless gave an important theological message. Our Lord taught his disciples to pray, using on different occasions different forms of *The Lord’s Prayer* (Matt. 6:9-13; Luke 11:2-4); but these forms both clearly teach that *prayer should be addressed to God*. Other New Testament passages make it clear that Christ “is the mediator of” the “new testament” or “new covenant” (Heb. 8:6; 9:15; 12:24), and thus the “one mediator between God and men” (I Tim. 2:5) through whom we have access to God and should offer our prayers.

But as part of the Popish celebrations, the Romanist Cardinal, George Pell, had unveiled an idolatrous picture of Mary, *supra*, and the Roman Church is deeply into Mariolatry, and usage of saint or angel “mediators.” Indeed, the news reported that the Pope had given Rosary beads to NSW Premier Iemma’s family, and the Roman Catholic State Premier made a public statement that he would treasure them always. These rosary beads teach Papists to pray to Mary ten times more than to God, with ten “Hail Mary’s” (Angelus), followed by one “Our Father” (Lord’s Prayer). Such are the “vain repetitions” of Popery (Matt. 6:7).

Therefore, the message the Baptists were giving was both timely and important for the Popish pilgrims to see. “For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus” (I Tim. 2:5, AV). The threefold *Reformation Motto*, “*sola fide, sola gratia, sola Scriptura*” (Latin, “faith alone, grace alone, Scripture alone”), is sometimes stated in elucidation as the fivefold: *faith alone, Christ alone, grace alone, Glory to God alone, Scripture alone*. When this is done, the focus on “Christ alone” (Latin, *solo Christo*), refers to our justification “by faith” imputing to us “the righteousness” of “Christ” alone (Philp. 3:8), and connected truths that Christ alone is our redeemer (Gal. 3:13; 4:5); and Christ alone is our mediator (I Tim. 2:5). The focus is thus *Christ alone*. Therefore the Baptist’s usage I Tim. 2:5, acted to give a focus on the important Protestant teaching of *solo Christo* (Christ alone).

As I, a good Protestant, continued to walk up George Street, on the same route being taken by so many Popish pilgrims, the next church I came to was St. Andrew’s Cathedral. This is an Evangelical Anglican Cathedral, and this beautiful sandstone building stands next

used for advertizing purposes.

⁴⁷ I.e., “... there is ... one mediator between God and men (*anthropon*, masculine plural genitive noun, from *anthropos*), the man (*anthropos*, masculine singular nominative noun, from *anthropos*) Christ Jesus” (I Tim. 2:5).

to the beautiful sandstone building of the town hall. This follows the English tradition in which church and town hall are next to, or opposite, each other. Outside St. Andrew's Cathedral, there was a large sign which read:

Welcome Pilgrims.
Don't Leave Sydney without
Certainty
Talks. Here 1 pm Monday to Friday.

The false gospel of Romanism lacks *assurance*. On their own theology, Papists are never certain as to whether or not they will be saved. Both the Romish doctrine of purgatory (contrary to Luke 16:26; John 9:4; II Cor. 6:2; I John 4:17,18), and justification by works (contrary to Rom. 4:2,3; Gal. 2:16; 3:11), means they can never be sure if they will or will not make it. They admit this themselves. By contrast, the Biblical doctrine of justification by faith, gives the Christian believer *assurance*. E.g., the holy Apostle, St. John, says, "Whosoever *believeth* that Jesus is the Christ is *born of God*." "We love God, and keep his commandments," e.g., "keep yourselves from idols." "He that believeth on the Son of God *hath the witness in himself*" (I John 5:1,2,10,21). "Herein is our love made perfect, that we *may have boldness in the day of judgment*: because as he is, so are we in this world. *There is no fear* in love; but *perfect love casteth out fear*" (I John 4:17,18). These verses are the death-knell to the Romish doctrine of purgatory and lack of assurance to the believer. Thus St. Andrew's Cathedral was giving a good Christian witness to the Popish pilgrims.

When the threefold *Reformation Motto* is stated in elucidation as the fivefold: *faith alone, Christ alone, grace alone, Glory to God alone, Scripture alone*, one of the five forms is "Glory to God Alone" (Latin, *Soli Deo Gloria*⁴⁸). Scripture says, "For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof *to glory*; but not before *God*." "He staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief, but was strong in faith, giving *glory to God*" (Rom. 4:2,20). "For ... *to him ... be glory* forever. Amen" (Rom.11:36). That is because "the everlasting gospel" includes in it the teaching that we "*give glory to*" "*God*" (Rev. 14:6,7). For no man can "glory" "before God" about his own righteousness (Rom. 4:2; Isa. 64:6; Gal. 2:21); but rather he should be found, "giving glory to God" (Rom. 4:20; cf. 5:2; 11:36; 15:7; 16:27; Eph. 3:21). No man can ever put God in his debt, whether by works righteousness to attain salvation (Eph. 2:8,9), or by works righteousness to attain some extra "reward" in heaven (Matt. 20:1-16; Luke 17:5-10)⁴⁹.

⁴⁸ Latin, "*Soli* ('alone,' singular masculine dative adjective, from *solus*) *Deo* ('to God,' singular masculine dative noun, from *Deus*) *Gloria* ('glory')." The dative indicates the "to" of "to God alone," and thus contrasts with the usage of the ablative in the other forms. I.e., "*sola* ('alone,' singular feminine ablative adjective, from *solus*) *fide* ('faith' or 'by faith,' singular feminine ablative noun, from *fides*), *sola* ('alone,' singular feminine ablative adjective, from *solus*) *gratia* ('grace' or 'by grace,' singular feminine ablative noun, from *gratia*), *sola* ('alone,' singular feminine ablative adjective, from *solus*) *Scriptura* ('Scripture' or 'by Scripture,' singular feminine ablative noun, from *Scriptura*), *solo* ('alone,' singular masculine ablative adjective, from *solus*) *Christo* ('Christ,' or 'by Christ,' singular masculine ablative noun, from *Christus*)."

⁴⁹ E.g., concerning the Romish "Works of Supererogation," *Article 14* of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* rightly says, "Voluntary works besides, over and above, God's

Thus the message the Anglicans were giving at the Cathedral was both timely and important for the Romish pilgrims to see. For if we truly understand “the everlasting gospel,” we “give glory to” “God” (Rev. 14:6,7). The teaching of *Soli Deo Gloria* (Glory to God alone) is based on a repudiation of all works righteousness. And whereas works righteousness entails *uncertainty* and hence a *lack of assurance*, by contrast, the true doctrine of justification by faith, which is based on Christ’s righteousness alone, gives the Christian believer *certainty* or *assurance* of salvation. In the words of the well-know hymn, “Blessed assurance, Jesus is mine. O what a foretaste, of glory divine⁵⁰.”

Here, on this Thursday in July 2008, outside St. Andrew’s Cathedral and Sydney Town Hall, I then got onto my bus. We went past more Popish pilgrims, each with their small “World Youth Day” backpacks on. We passed one more city church. It was St. Phillip’s Church Hill, an Evangelical Anglican Church I used to attend in her better days of the AV and 1662 BCP back in the 1980s and 1990s. They had made no special sign for the occasion, but simply had up their normal sign. “You’re Welcome.” Still, it is to be hoped that some may have learnt something of gospel truths by attending this church, which contains within it the Richard Johnson Chapel. (The Reverend Richard Johnson, an Evangelical Anglican clergyman, preached the first Christian service in Australia on 3 February, 1788. He is thus a motif saint for Christianity in Australia. His black letter day on the Anglican Calendar is 3 February.)

The bus then moved off onto the Harbour Bridge, and past the Opera House on our right. It was clear to me, that between them, the Baptists and Anglicans were thus giving an important Christian witness to some gospel issues recovered and set forth at the time of the Protestant Reformation. We can only hope and pray that God used these witnesses, and any other witnesses that were given to Protestant truths⁵¹, to help some Popish pilgrims or others

commandments, which they call Works of Supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety: for by them men do declare, that they do not only render under God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake, than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants.” I remember debating with both a Presbyterian man and woman, who both claimed they could merit some extra “reward” with God. The woman kept talking about, “the crowns” she had merited. Alas, both had deviated greatly from the proper understanding of justification by faith, which requires, *Glory to God alone! Christ alone* has done it all, how then can any man talk of doing something extra? And how dare any man thereby become a “wicked and slothful servant” (Matt. 25:26), who on that basis sits back and does nothing. If he is truly saved, his works will *manifest* that fact, even as the fruit of a tree *manifests* the type of tree it is (Matt. 25).

⁵⁰ Written 1873, words by Fanny Crosby (1823-1913); music by Phoebe Knapp (1839-1908), also known as Mrs. Joseph Knapp.

⁵¹ E.g., when I was in the city of Sydney, the Sunday (6 July) before the Pope’s arrival (13 July), a Christian walked by and handed me a flyer while I was on the street. This flyer upheld certain Protestant truths, and specifically targeted the errors of Rome in connection with the forthcoming Papal visit of Benedict XVI. Denis Shelton, the Elder of a Sydney Presbyterian Church (referred to in Preface section, “Byzantine Text Bonus for Commentary: Two Sydney University Greek Lectionaries!,” Part B, subsection 2, Case Study

who saw and heard them, to come to the saving truths of the gospel, found in Protestantism, but not found in Popery.

What is that gospel (Rom. 1:16,17)? “By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified,” “for by the law is the knowledge of sin” (Rom.3:20). What law gives us “the knowledge of sin,” that we might “repent” “and be converted” (Acts 3:19)? The law that says, e.g., “Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet” (Rom. 13:9; cf. 7:7), i.e., the Ten Commandments (Exod. 20:1-17). Now “all have sinned” (Rom. 3:23). But “Christ died for the ungodly” (Rom. 5:6). God treated him as we deserve, that we might be treated as he deserves. It’s a swap, called, “substitutionary atonement.” Thus “to him that ... believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin” (Rom.4:5-8). “The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved” (Rom. 10:8,9).

4) *The Succession of William III of Orange.*

The bigger picture of *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* in the context of the three state offices of 1662-1859, was an opposition to “seditions” and “murders” (Gal 5:20,21), and corresponding upholding of lawful authority by the *Anglican Protestant* Crown in the Christian State. I.e., the Papists’ sought to justify “seditions” and “murders” (Gal 5:20,21) against the Protestant Crown in 1605 on the basis that Papal authority was higher than Biblical authority requiring that we “Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17) and “be subject unto the higher powers” (Rom. 13:1).

Or the English Puritan revolutionaries sought to justify “seditions” and “murders” (Gal 5:20,21) against the *Anglican* Protestant Crown in 1642-60 on the basis that there was a “natural law” higher than the Bible’s Divine Law, allowing the Bible’s injunctions against “seditions” and “murders” (Gal 5:20,21) to be set aside. E.g., since all Papists are Arminians, the English Puritan republican revolutionaries claimed this about Charles and Laud; and it helped “meet” a *Lex Rex* criterion for sedition, “a tyrant is he who habitually sinneth against the catholic good of the subjects and state, and subverteth law.” In fact, e.g., partly responding to concerns about Arminians following the Dutch Reformed *Synod of Dort* (1618), in 1628 Charles I made a royal proclamation on “new inventions, or opinions” against “the literal and grammatical sense” of the Reformed (Calvinist) 39 Articles, thereafter affixed as “His Majesty’s Declaration.” This has been reprinted at various times; indeed, I have copies of the 1662 prayer book and 39 Articles, “printed and published” by “Royal Warrant” of 26 “July 1958,” by “Elizabeth R,” which has with the 39 Articles, “by command of His Majesty King Charles I,” “his royal declaration prefixed thereunto.” So too, the English Puritan’s typical claim that Charles I rejected all *reasonable* terms advanced by Cromwell; is a fiction spun to meet a *Lex Rex* criterion for sedition, i.e., one has exhausted all lawful

3), also advised me by email just over 2 weeks before the Pope’s arrival, of another such “focus” sheet being then distributed.

courses of action.

In the English Puritan Revolution of 1642-60, the BIG ISSUE IS if one thinks a ruler is a “tyrant,” i.e., on the basis of one’s NATURAL LAW (reason), “it was essential to permanently remove the King,” then such “natural law” overrides Divine Law prohibiting “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:20,21) and requiring that we “Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17). (This should not be confused with the natural law that is consonant with, and never contrary to, the Divine revelation, Ps. 19:1; Rom. 1 & 2.) Christians are bound to “obey God rather than men” (Acts 5:29), and so e.g., NT Christians rightly refused to engage in emperor worship, for which some were martyred. But this did not involve overruling God’s Word by e.g., trying to kill even gruesomely tyrannical Roman Emperors like Nero.

The *Lex Rex* English Puritan view that such “natural law” means one can set aside the Bible’s Divine Law 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 Ella notes the glorification of Rutherford and his *Lex Rex* by “antinomian politico-religious extremists⁵².” This also relates to the removal of *Charles I’s Day* from the Anglican Calendar in 1859, and the associated glorification of Cromwell in the secular “democratic view⁵³.” 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 understand why Charles I is indeed a Christian martyr. I.e., with steadfast Christian faith, he died upholding the Biblical teaching of e.g., Matt. 19:18; 22:21; Rom. 13:1-9.

The monarchy was restored under Charles II in 1660 when under God, e.g., Monck, recognized the strength of Protestant Christian royalist sentiment in both predominately Puritan Scotland and predominately Anglican England. Thus on one level, *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* (30 Jan.) and *Restoration Day* (29 May) are the two sides of the one coin. But on another level, *Charles I’s Day* (30 Jan.) and *Charles II’s Day* (29 May) are one side of the coin, i.e., rejecting the English Puritan claim that one can justify “seditions” and “murders” (Gal 5:20,21) against the *Anglican Protestant Crown* in 1642-60 on the basis of Rutherford’s *Lex Rex* type of “natural law” being a “higher authority” than the Bible’s Divine Law (Rom. 13:1-19; I Peter 2:17); and *Gunpowder Treason Day* (5 Nov.) is the other side of the coin, i.e., rejecting the Papist claim that one can justify “seditions” and “murders” (Gal 5:20,21) against the *Anglican Protestant Crown* in 1605 on the basis of the Pope’s powers being a “higher authority” than the Bible’s Divine Law (Rom. 13:1-19; I Peter 2:17).

How then does this general thematic construct relate to the inclusion of William of Orange’s coming in 1688 to the Office for *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* from 1689? Given the false and spurious claims of Jacobites (whether Papists, Puseyites, or others), it is important to distinguish between the unlawful “seditions” and “murders” (Gal 5:20,21) against Charles I, known as, “King Charles the Martyr,” (martyred 1649, Regnal Years: 1625-1649, remembered on *Charles I’s Day*, 30 Jan.), and the lawful removal of James II, known as, “The Popish Duke,” and associated happy accession of William III, known as “William of

⁵² Ella, G., *English Churchman* 7760, 13 & 20 Feb. 2009, p. 2.

⁵³ McGrath, G.B. (myself), *English Churchman* 7757, 2 & 9 January, 2009, p. 2.

Orange” (1688, Regnal Years: 1689-1702, remembered on *Papists’ Conspiracy Day*, 5 Nov.). At common law, something may be illegal, even though there is no black letter statute law to that effect. The law of England required that the monarch be Supreme Governor of the Church of England (and at that time, the Church of Ireland also). As such, he had to agree with the 1662 Anglican prayer book and 39 Articles.

James II clearly did not meet his legal obligations and requirements as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* (and Church of Ireland). Before becoming King James II (Regnal Years 1685-8), James Duke of York had become a Papist in the late 1660s. He had refused to submit to the Anglican *Test Act* (1673), resigning from all offices. He refused to take the Lord’s Supper at an Anglican Church from 1672 (Roman Catholics do not recognize the Protestant sacrament of Holy Communion); in 1673 he married a Papist (although marriage to a Papist did not intrinsically bar a monarch from legally holding the throne before legal changes under William III); and he then ceased to attend Anglican Protestant church services from 1676.

These facts (other than the unwise and undesirable but not then illegal marriage to a Papist in 1673) meant that James II could not now properly be king. At Common Law, some things are void *ab initio* (Latin, “from the beginning”) i.e., invalid from the outset, and others are voidable i.e., valid until declared void by lawful authority. James II’s kingship was voidable as he failed to meet the necessary requirements in the office of monarch as Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church. This remained so, notwithstanding earlier unsuccessful attempts by Parliament to enshrine this Common Law principle into black letter statute law (i.e., an Act of Parliament). James II was given a reasonable time to repent and meet the legal requirements of a monarch as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland*.

By his Popish actions, in substance, though not in specific form, James II *de jure* abdicated the throne. This consisted of both his acts of omission e.g., 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 acts of commission e.g., his unconstitutional “Declaration of Indulgence” of April 1688 illegally repealing / 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 summoned in the normal manner by the King. A Convention Parliament of 1689 met on the established precedent of the Convention Parliament of 1660, and used its exact 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 12 February 1689 recognized that James II had by his conduct *de facto* abdicated by deserting his post when fleeing the capital and discarding the Great Seal of the Realm into the River Thames. *The next in line to succeed* (not some “Lord Protector” as under Cromwell’s republic,) then became monarch. 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, (James II’s second wife, Mary of Modena, whom he married in 1673,) meant he was clearly being raised as a Papist, and so he could not inherit the throne. Thus the next in line to succeed was James II’s Protestant daughter, Mary (b. 1662); who had become the Princess of Orange when she married Prince William of Orange in 1677. Thus the Parliament then recognized William III of Orange and Mary II as the successors to the throne.

(William III & Mary II, joint reign 1689- 1694; William III, sole reign 1694-1702).

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. Elements of these principles of Common Law were then enshrined in black letter statute law, which specified by Act of Parliament that the monarch had to be a Protestant and member of the Established *Church of England* (the *Act of Settlement*, 1701 & *Act of Union*, 1707). Thus the great common law jurist, Sir William Blackstone, says such Acts *mean 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” (Blackstone’s *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, Vol.1, p 217). (Although before these Acts, a king could still marry a Roman Catholic wife and fulfill his Common Law requirements as Supreme Governor of the C. of E., as did both Charles I and Charles II, nevertheless, they were unwise to do so; and acted against Biblical teaching to e.g., marry “in the Lord,” I Cor. 7:39. Hence these later legal provisions putting a legal end to such mixed marriages were certainly very wise.)

5) *John Calvin’s Nativity: 500th anniversary in 2009.*

2009 is the 500th anniversary (or Quincentenary) of the nativity of John Calvin, born in 1509. I shall again return to discuss this event and the importance of John Calvin to we of the holy Reformed faith in the Preface of a later volume. Suffice to here note that before further discussing the holy day of *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* which was historically found in *Anglican Books of Common Prayer*, I think it right for us to remember that in her *39 Articles*, the *Church of England* recognized and embraced the wonderful truths of justification by faith and election, as set forth under Martin Luther and John Calvin. Outside of Biblical characters, my greatest hero is Martin Luther (1483-1546), known as *the first man of the Reformation*. But (while I would make some qualifications with respect to Calvin,) I also think highly of John Calvin (1509-1564), known as *the second man of the Reformation*.

Referring to this event of “the 500th anniversary of the birth of John Calvin,” an editorial in the (Anglican) *English Churchman* entitled, “A good dose of Calvinism,” says, “Doctrinally, though not governmentally, the *Church of England* followed Calvin. As Augustus Toplady demonstrated in his *Proof of the Doctrinal Calvinism of the Church of England*, the message of free grace is enshrined in the 39 Articles ...⁵⁴.”

Though I more commonly use the term “Reformed” than the term “Calvinist,” the two are in fact synonyms. I am a five point Calvinist, as defined by the acronym, “TULIP.” I.e.,

Total depravity (i.e., inability due to original sin, requiring enabling to be saved
e.g., Ps. 51:5; Jer. 17:9; Ezek. 16:6; John 1:12,13; 3:27; 6:28,29,44;
12:32; Rom. 5:12-14; Eph. 2:5,8,9).

Unconditional Election (e.g., Rom. 8:28-30; 9:11-13,15,21; Eph. 1:4-9).

Limited Atonement (e.g., Lev. 16:17,33,34; 23:27; Matt. 1:21; 26:28;
John 10:11,15; Eph. 5:25-27).

⁵⁴ The Editor (Peter Ratcliffe), *English Churchman*, EC 7753, 7 & 14 Nov. 2008, p. 6.

Irresistible Grace (e.g., John 1:12,13; 6:28,29; Acts 13:48; Rom. 9:16).
Perseverance of the saints (“once saved always saved,” e.g., John 6:47; 10:27,28;
Eph. 6:18; Philp. 1:6; Rev. 14:12).

Thus in 2009 let us thank God for the life and work of his saint, John Calvin, born 500 years ago in 1509. Praise be to “God that sheweth mercy” (Rom.9:16) and who is “rich” (Rom. 10:12) in “mercy” (Rom. 11:32)⁵⁵.

6) *Broad Protestant support for Gunpowder Treason Day: a) Anglican Protestantism; b) Puritan Protestantism.*

6a) *Anglican Protestantism.*

We cannot doubt the historic support given by Anglicans for *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* or *Gunpowder Treason Day*. In this context, let us consider a very much reduced selection of some of the Anglican Sermons that were preached on this day during the more than a quarter of millennia that it was a red-letter day for Anglicans from 1606 to 1859 (other than for a period of less than 20 years during the interregnum)⁵⁶.

On 5 November 1618, Jeremiah Lewis preached at All Saints C. of E., Northampton. He drew an analogy with “Israel’s triumph, occasioned by the destruction of Pharaoh and his host, in the Red Sea.” He said, “God hath his Israel, his Church, in this land” of England. “This Israel hath her Pharaoh,” “the Pope of Rome, that Antichrist,” and his “house-creeping priests and Jesuits.” But with “Israel’s deliverance we can” find a “parallel,” for “the flourishing Church of God in this Land.” “God” brought “salvation” “from the cruel jaws of the lion, and paws of the bear, from that deep plot of the Gunpowder Treason, framed in the forge of Hell, allowed in the Church of Rome, to be hatched in Britain.” Jeremiah Lewis thus enjoins “thankfulness” to his listeners, reminding them of the deliverance they thus enjoy from “the erroneous doctrine and practice of the Romish Church;” which among other things, has “molten and carved images, before which they fall,” of “the Virgin Mary, angels, and Saints,” so that they are “thieves and idolaters, robbing ... God of his honour, giving that to the creature, which is due only to the Creator⁵⁷.”

On 5 November 1678 under the Restoration monarch, Charles II, John Tillotson, later Archbishop of Canterbury (1691-1694), preached “On the Anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot” “before the House of Commons.” Speaking to the Honourable Members in the lower

⁵⁵ See McGrath, G.B. (Myself), “Calvin and Charles I,” *British Church Newspaper*, No. 169, 25 Sept., 2009, p. 10.

⁵⁶ I have sometimes modernized the spellings in these sermons, without specifically saying so. I obtained access to all the sermons in this section on, “Broad Protestant support for Gunpowder Treason Day,” from the British Library in London, UK.

⁵⁷ Jeremiah Lewis’s *The Doctrine of Thankfulness, or Israel’s Triumph, occasioned by the destruction of Pharaoh and in his host in the Red Sea*, A Sermon Preached in the Parish Church of All Saints’ in Northampton, November 5, 1618, on Luke 19:40, “If these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out.” Printed by T.S. for Edward Brewster in London, 1619, pp. 2-3,38,46.

house of Westminster Parliament, Tillotson, quoting from Luke 9:54-56, said, “James and John ... desire our Saviour to give them power to call for ‘fire from heaven’ ‘to’ ‘consume them’ Our Saviour seeing them in this heat, ... doth very calmly but severely reprove this temper of theirs, ‘ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of: for the Son of Man is not come to destroy men’s lives, but to save them.’ Grotius [1583-1645] observes, that these two excellent sentences are left out in a manuscript that is in England ... [and] if it were a copy written out in the height of Popery, no wonder if some zealous transcriber, offended at this passage, struck it out of the Gospel, being confident our Saviour would not say anything that was so directly contrary to the ... doctrine and practice of those times. But thanks be to God, this admirable saying is still preserved, and can never be made use of upon a fitter occasion.”

“He ... speaks of the proper intention and design of his coming: he came not to kill and destroy, but ... for the salvation and redemption of mankind” “This spirit which our Saviour here reproves in his disciples, is directly opposite to ... inhuman cruelties and persecutions, treacherous conspiracies and bloody massacres, [or] a barbarous inquisition” “And this was the language of the holy fathers, [Latin,] *Lex nova non se vindicat ultore gladio, the [new i.e., the] Christian law doth not avenge itself by the sword.* This was then the stile of Councils, [Latin,] *Nemini ad credendum vim inferre, to offer violence to no man to compel him to the faith.*”

“Is the Church of Rome persuaded that those whom she persecutes are heretics and schismatics, and that no punishment can be too great for such offenders? So the disciples were persuaded of the Samaritans; and upon better grounds: only the disciples had some excuse in their case, which the Church of Rome had not; and that was ignorance: and this apology our Saviour makes for them, ‘Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of’ [Luke 9:55] But in the Church of Rome, whatever the case of particular persons may be, as to the whole church and the governing part of it, this ignorance is wilful ... and therefore inexcusable. For the Christian religion, which they profess to embrace, does as plainly teach the contrary, as it does any other matter whatsoever”

“But there is a much worse spirit ... contrary to Christianity, ... which by falsehood and perfidiousness, by secret plots and conspiracies, or by open sedition and rebellion, by an inquisition or massacres, by deposing and killing kings, by fire and sword, ... doth incite men” “For example, ... Popery ..., and their doctrines of extirpating heretics, ... deposing kings, and subverting government by all the cruel and wicked ways that can be thought of” “I would not be understood to charge every particular person who is, or hath been in the Roman communion, with the guilt of these or the like practices: but I must charge their doctrines and principles with them: I must charge the heads of their church, and the prevalent teaching and governing part of it, who are usually the contrivers and abettors, the executioners and applauders, of these cursed designs. I do willingly acknowledge the great piety and charity of several persons who have lived and died in that communion, as Erasmus ... and ... others And yet he that considers how universally almost the Papists in Ireland were engaged in that Massacre [of 1641] ... will find it very hard to determine how many degrees of innocency and good nature ... are necessary to over-balance the fury of a blind zeal and a misguided conscience.”

“I doubt not but Papists are made like other men. Nature hath not generally given them such a savage and cruel disposition, but their religion hath made them so. I am

confident ... that many Papists would have been excellent persons, and very good men, if their religion had not hindered them And God be praised for those matchless instances which we are able to give of the generous humanity and Christian temper of the English Protestants. ... And ... the Protestant ... is, the true Christian religion

“And now what remains, but to make our most devout and thankful acknowledgement to Almighty God, for the invaluable blessing of our Reformed religion, and for the miraculous deliverance of this day To him therefore, our most gracious and merciful God, our shield, and our rock, and our mighty deliverer: who ... hath set us free from Popish tyranny and ... delivered us from the bloody and merciless designs of wicked ... men; and hath rendered all the plots ... of none effect: who did upon this day, rescue our king ... and the heads of our tribes, ... from that fearful destruction which was ready to have swallowed them up: ... unto that great God, who hath ... saved us by a mighty salvation: ... be glory and honour, thanksgiving and praise, from generation to generation. And let all the people say, ‘Amen’⁵⁸.”

On 5 November 1684/5, the Rector of St. Martin’s Ludgate, and Chaplain to the Duke of Somerset, Edward Pelling, preached a Sermon. On the front is printed, II Thessalonians 2:3,4. He noted how e.g., “the faith of the Roman Church was found in St. Paul’s times, and so down to St. Jerome’s time.” Yet it was later lost under “Popery,” as seen e.g., by the “Bull” of “Pope Leo the Tenth” (Pope: 1513-1521) “against Martin Luther.” To the question when this apostasy occurred, the Reverend Mr. Pelling says, “that for near 600 years after Christ the Bishops of Rome never had the Title of ‘Universal Pastors’ of the Church, till the days of Boniface the Third [Bishop of Rome, 607, First Pope, 607], and he gat it basely ... by the grant of that bloody wretch, Phocas, who had murdered the Emperor Mauritius, and all his children” His identification of the “mark of the beast” (Rev. 13) with “the present degeneracy of the Church of Rome,” acts to identify the Pope as Antichrist from the formation of the Roman Papacy in 607⁵⁹.

On 5 November 1696, the Rector of St. Mary-Le-Bow (the “great bells of Bow” in the rhyme, “Oranges & Lemons,”) preached a Sermon before the Lord Mayor of London. He referred to both the how “in the days of our Fathers, the Romanists formed a Plot against us for the subverting our Government, and especially for the changing of our religion” in 1605; and also how “in our own days, the same sort of men had formed a very dangerous design against us” with James II, “but in this instance also the Providence of God hath given them a very remarkable disappointment” through William of Orange. Thus 5 November now gave a

⁵⁸ *The Family Chaplain*, in two volumes, Printed for L. Davis in Holborn & R. Baldwin in Paternoster Row, London 1775, “On the Anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot. November 5th. Preached before the House of Common, 1678. By Archbishop Tillotson,” Vol. 2, pp. 336-358 at pp. 338-9, 340, 341-2, 345-6, 348, 353-8 (British Library copy).

⁵⁹ Edward Pellings, “The True Mark of the Beast: or the Present degeneracy of the Church of Rome from the Faith once delivered to the Saints. A Sermon on November 5.” Printed at the Golden Bull, London, 1685, pp. 4,11,20 (British Library copy). Before “An Act for the regulating of the Year, and for correcting of the Calendar now in use,” 24 George II, chapter 23, (1750), the new year started in England on *Annunciation Day* (25 March), and so Boniface III was sometimes dated to 606, rather than 607.

“second occasion of this day’s thanksgiving to the first⁶⁰.”

On 5 November 1709, at John Edwards preached at Cambridge University. He was “thankful” for the “goodness which was showed to our ancestors and forefathers in turning them ... from paganism to the Christian religion.” “It is said, that the first fabric of a Christian Church that was in all the world was erected at our Glassenbury (Glastonbury). But this seems to be a fable invented by the monks of that place.” “We are to call to mind this day, and to bless God for the rescuing of this land, not only from Pagan, but Popish idolatry.” “Praised be the name of the Most High, that ... the Pope’s jurisdictions ... over this Church and nation were declared null ... by King Henry the Eighth” And “this ... made way for a greater change which ensued: for God was pleased to raise up a young Prince” i.e., Edward VI (Regnal Years: 1547-1553), “to restore the old and primitive religion. In his reign ... the Kingdom took ... the name of ‘Protestants,’ and established religion under that denomination” “Queen Mary ascended the throne [Regnal Years: 1553-1558]. And under her dire ... influence ... of ... Popery; ... those who stood firm to their religion were ... hurried to the stake, and there sealed the truth of their religion with their blood. But ... this bloody Queen ... was soon snatched away This made way for the virgin princess” i.e., Elizabeth I (Regnal Years: 1558-1603), “who had ... miraculously escaped the fury of the Papists Here I might remind you of the Spanish ... Armada, which was ... defeated and shattered [by] the winds and waves, and, above all, the Hand of God fighting against them.”

“But these men of blood, ... the Romanists intended to exert on the 5th of November, in the third year of the ensuing reign” i.e., James I (Regnal Years: 1603-1625) “their designs.” “This Plot was” stopped by “the finger of God which pointed to the dark vaults where the fatal provision and ammunition was laid up” for this “Hellish contrivance.” Then “that late Prince, who was of the Roman religion, ascended the throne” i.e., James II (Regnal Years: 1685-1688). “It is well known with what zeal ... he endeavoured to ... advance the Papal interest. Hell and Rome were at work Our forts and castles were in the hands of Papists, or their fellows, the Roman worship was set up in several places Jesuits, those frogs of the mystical Egypt [Rev. 11:8], were in the King’s Chambers; monks and friars appeared in their habits in our very streets. Our laws were trampled upon It is owing to the Almighty ... that our misery was averted, by sending us a ... deliverer” i.e., William III (Regnal Years 1689-1702), “who happily freed us from the just fears of Papal tyranny and bondage, which we then groaned under, and saved us from inquisitions and massacres, and all mischiefs that relate to our souls or bodies, and restored to us our laws, our liberties, our religion, which is that ... blessing which we ... commemorate this Day⁶¹.”

⁶⁰ A Sermon preached before the Right Honourable Lord Mayor, the Alderman, and the Citizens of London, at St. Mary-Le-Bow, on Thursday, November, 1696, by Samuel Bradford, Rector of the said Church. Printed at the Three Pigeons against the Royal Exchange in Cornhill, London, 1697, p. 2 (British Library copy).

⁶¹ John Edwards, “A Sermon Preached before the University of Cambridge at St. Mary’s, November 5, 1709, being appointed a Day of Thanksgiving for the deliverance from the intended bloody massacre by gunpowder; and for the happy arrival of King William, and the great blessings that accompanied it,” Printed by J.H. for Jonathan Robinson, John Lawrence, and John Wyat, London, 1710, pp. 7-9,12-17 (British Library copy).

On 5 November 1714/5, preaching at St. Peter's Broadstreet, Benjamin Hoadly warned of the dangers posed by the Jacobite "Pretender," who "hath devoted himself with an uncommon bigotry" to "Rome;" and correspondingly represented a serious threat to "this Protestant nation" and "this Protestant Church"⁶². His concerns were later realized, and ended with the *Battle of Culloden* in 1746.

On 5 November 1719, Thomas Knaggs preached a sermon before the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London at St. Paul's Cathedral, London. In giving thanks to "God for his wonderful mercies ... wherein he wrought two great deliverances for us," he made reference to "the Conspirators of this Day," and their "Hellish invention." He noted that Roman Catholic "Canonists impiously style" the Pope, "Lord God the Pope," and referred to the Latin form of this, "*Dominus Deus noster Papa*"⁶³. He also sought to "honour the memory of our late glorious deliverer King William, by whose great wisdom ... the glorious legacy, the succession in the Protestant line was confirmed to us"

Thomas Knaggs upholds the "Church of England, as it is by law Established." In what would have been contextually understood as an allusion to *King Charles the Martyr's Day* (30 Jan), whose Office refers to those who killed Charles I as "sons of Belial," he further says, "it is not unworthy of your observation, that those men who despised Saul after he was anointed King, God calls them 'the Children of Belial,' I Sam. 10:27, but the 'men, whose hearts God had touched' followed King 'Saul' 'home to Gibeah' [I Sam. 10:26]." I.e., by this allusion Thomas Knaggs is here making the point that he opposes sedition against the Crown from the Papists in 1605 remembered on *Gunpowder Treason Day* (5 Nov.), and he also opposes sedition against the Crown from the English Puritan revolutionaries of 1642-60, since any involved in such sedition are "Children of Belial" (Knaggs on Office of Papists' Conspiracy Day) or "sons of Belial" (Office of King Charles the Martyr)⁶⁴.

On 5 November 1722, the Lord Bishop of Gloucester, Joseph Wilcox, preached a sermon before members in the House of Lords, at St. Peter's Westminster, in London. He

⁶² Benjamin Hoadley, "The present delusion of many Protestants, considered in a sermon preached in the Parish Church of St. Peter's Poor, in Broadstreet, November 5," London 1715, p. 10 (British Library copy).

⁶³ "*Dominus* (Lord) *Deus* (God) *noster* (our) *Papa* (Pope)," i.e., "our Lord God the Pope." This is found in *Extravagantes of John XXII*, 14:4, *Corpus Juris Canonici*, in some post *Council of Trent* editions. E.g., I have inspected and found it the Lyons (Lugduni), France, edition of 1584, kept at the British Library in London, England. *Extravagantes* Tit. XIII, Cap. III, gloss on "ac haereticum declaramus," p. 153, in: *Liber Sextus Decretalium*, D. Bonifacii Papae VIII, Clementis Papae, V., Constitutiones, Extravagantes tum Viginti D. Ioannis Papae XXII, Tum Communes, Delicentia Dom Nostri GREGORII XIII Pont. Max., Lugduni [Lyons, France], MDLXXXIII [1584]. The canon law meaning is the Pope is "God" as a vice-God (see II Thess. 2:4) (British Library L.23.f5).

⁶⁴ Thomas Knaggs, "The cruelty and tyranny of Popery. A sermon preached before the Right honourable the Lord Mayor and Alderman of London, at the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, on Thursday the fifth of November 1719," London, 1720, pp. 1,6,22,23,24 (British Library copy).

referred to how historically, “the Romish Prelate found means to aggrandize himself, assuming the style and title of Christ’s Vicar General upon earth, ... and claiming ... universal jurisdiction And this usurped authority ... and its tyranny [was] so insufferable, that in the 16th century several Kingdoms and States, for the Reformation of religion and the rescuing [of] their civil rights, were obliged to throw off the yoke of his pretended Holiness, to renounce his jurisdiction, and assert their own independency in all causes, as well ecclesiastical as civil.”

In consequence of this, the “Gunpowder Treason Plot” of 1605 “was formed and carried on,” but “the power of God ... brought ... to light that dark design and ... ‘mystery of iniquity’.” I.e., the Bishop is here interpreting “the mystery of iniquity” (II Thess. 2:7) as murder or attempted murder of God’s saints, which thing was “already” at “work” (II Thess. 2:7) in NT times with various Christian martyrdoms, but is continued with Papal Rome (Rev. 17:6; 18:24), of which the 1605 plot is an example of *attempted* murder.

And there was also “a secret and clandestine plot” of “popish tyranny and arbitrary power,” “when the Councils of Rome had possess themselves of our Supreme Authority” i.e., the throne under James II (Regnal Years 1685-8); “and with an eager impatience endeavoured to destroy the purity of our Sion and the peace and freedom of our Jerusalem; when ... our nurseries of learning [were] converted into Popish Seminaries, and Mass Houses erected in our cities, ... in defiance of our constitution.” “As well may the sheep commit themselves to the protection of the wolf, or the fowls of the air make choice of the hawk or kite for their defender,” as a “Popish King,” who “insulted” the “*Church of England* loyalty.” “Let the Popish nation be shewn us that permits a Protestant Prince to rule over them, or the Popish Sovereign that is a Defender of the Protestant Faith.” Thus “it was on this day” in 1688, “that the wisdom and goodness of God timely interposed in our extreme danger, by giving the Prince of Orange a safe arrival in our land, and making all opposition fall before him till he became our King and Governor.”

“Which of these two deliverances was the most considerable, is a doubtful point to determine.” Thus we have “upon the British throne, ... blessings ... in a Protestant and numerous Royal Family, ... to be ascribed to the Providential interposals and repeated deliverances of this memorable day.” And “till ‘Babylon the Great’ be ‘fallen,’ and ‘the mother of abominations’ [i.e., Papal Rome. Rev. 14:8; 17:5] be no more, may the Sovereign that sits upon the British throne, and the nobles that surround it, be always honoured May there never be wanting [/ lacking] in this illustrious assembly an integrity and honour equal to their rank and dignity, a contempt of Popish superstition, ... and an undaunted ... zeal in defence of ... the purest religion, and the happiest government⁶⁵.”

On 5 November 1746, a Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford University, Nathan Forster, preached at St. Mary’s. His sermon was published with an “Imprimatur” of Oxford University, and among other things, refers to how “the spirit of Popery, ... brought by the

⁶⁵ Bishop Joseph Wilcox’s “A sermon preach’d before the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in Parliament Assembled at the Collegiate Church of St. Peter’s Westminster, on Monday November 5, 1722. By the Right Reverend Father in God, Joseph, Lord Bishop of Glo[u]cester.” Printed at the White Hart, in St. Paul’s Churchyard, London, 1722, pp. 9,10,11,12,15,16 (British Library copy).

Church of Rome against the Reformation,” doth “resemble in several respects” the “spirit” “of Pharisaism among the Jews⁶⁶.”

On 5 November 1758, the Rector of Yelling, and Chaplain to the Earl of Buchan, the Reverend Mr. Venn, preached a sermon at Clapham in London. The front cover of the printed sermon gives a quotation from “I TIM. IV. I,” “Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times, some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrine of devils;” and so applies I Tim. 4 to the rise of Popery. Mr. Venn reminded his listeners that “this anniversary is set apart ... to enliven our gratitude to God for twice preserving our civil liberties, and still more precious faith ... from ... Popery.” “Popery ... is beyond a doubt, an enemy to the religion of Christ, [and] consequently ought to be resisted unto blood by every Protestant ...⁶⁷.”

On 5 November 1765, the *Church of Ireland* Bishop of Clonfert and Kilmacduagh, Dennison Cumberland, preached a sermon before the House of Lords of the Irish Parliament in Christchurch 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, 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?”

“It was this spirit, which ... the Son of God” referred to, when he said “of it ... ‘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] ... Alas! We need not go so far as the Valleys of Piedmont⁶⁸, or Bohemia⁶⁹, France⁷⁰, or Spain⁷¹, for proofs into what infernal

⁶⁶ Forster, N., “Popery destructive of the evidence of Christianity. A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, at St. Mary’s, on Wednesday, Novemb. 5. 1746,” Printed at the Theatre for James Fletcher, Oxford; & sold by J. & J. Rivington in St. Paul’s Churchyard, London, with “Imprimatur,” of “Eus. Isham, Vice-Can. Oxon, Nov. 8, 1746,” pp. 5,6 (British Library copy).

⁶⁷ “Popery a perfect contrast to the religion of Christ. Proved in a Sermon preached at Clapham, November 5, 1758, ... by H. Venn, A.M., Rector of Yelling, and Chaplain to the Earl of Buchan.” Printed in London, 1778 (British Library copy).

⁶⁸ This refers to the Papists’ 16th century killing of the Waldensian Protestants in the Piedmont region of north-west Italy. Cf., Sonnet 18 of the poet, John Milton (1608-1674), entitled, “On the Late Massacres in Piedmont,” which reads, “Avenge, O Lord, thy slaughtered saints, whose bones; Lie scatted on the Alpine mountains cold; Even them who kept thy truth so pure of old, ...” etc. .

⁶⁹ See Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs* (1867), pp. 145-152 (“Particular Account of the Persecutions in Bohemia and Germany under the Papacy”), 152-159 (Huss of Bohemia), 159-165 (Jerome of Prague).

⁷⁰ See *Ibid.*, pp. 126-134 (St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre, Paris, 1572); 619-666; & William Forbush’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, New York, USA, 1826, 1954, 1962, pp. 332-349 (Persecutions of the French Protestants in the south of France,

beings ignorance and superstition are capable of transforming men, who dare to assume the name of Christians and Catholicks; this nation [of the Kingdom of Ireland], has the dreadful evidence and memorial of it, recorded in characters of blood.” Of course, at this time in 1765, *Irish Massacre Day*, remembering the events of 1641 when Papists massacred large numbers of Protestants in Ireland, was still annually remembered in a *Church of Ireland* Office (in Ireland: red-letter day with its own *Church of Ireland* Office 1666-1800; by law publicly recognized black letter day, and red-letter day on C. of I. Calendar 1801-1859⁷².)

The “deliverance of our neighbouring Kingdom [of England], which we now commemorate, ... is the most Providential ... of the intended victims of this Day’s Conspiracy.” But “the wicked spirit of Popery” that “lurked and laid plots in the dark” in 1605, then “appeared in triumph, armed with all the splendour and power of royalty” in 1685 to 1688; “by an unhappy prince, perverted in his youth and education in that Belief, attempting to introduce once more amongst us that yoke of superstition, which had so long galled the necks of our fathers” But it ... pleased God to preserve us” “Have not we then of these realms [of England and Ireland], a just cause to rejoice in this ... joyful Day; for the double Deliverance obtained in it, the one [in 1605] from the Conspiracy of Popery, and the other [in 1688] from its tyranny ... ?⁷³”

On my second trip to Bristol, England, in December 2008, I there inspected in Queen Square Park a statue of King William III of Orange riding on a horse, which had been erected in 1736. Therefore this statue would have been present, and given some kind of contextual city appropriateness to the next sermon we consider. For on 5 November 1775, in a sermon preached in Bristol England, Caleb Evans said that “as Britons and Protestants,” “this anniversary” was about the “liberty” of “Christians.” He regarded this as part of “British

1814-1820, n.b., “Nismes” = Nimes).

⁷¹ The Spanish Inquisition; see Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs* (1867), pp. 100-110 (“Barbarities exercised by the Inquisitions of Spain and Portugal”), 110-116 (“A singular discovery of some enormities of the Inquisition”).

⁷² *Irish Massacre Day* (23 Oct.) was repealed as a publicly recognized black letter day in Ireland, by the same Act that removed the three Offices (King Charles Martyr’s Day, 30 Jan; Royal Oak Day, 29 May; and Papists’ Conspiracy Day, 5 Nov), since it repealed “in Ireland” “the twenty-third day of October” with the others “as Anniversary Days,” specifically repealing the Act of (what before the 1801 Union had been an act of the 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). It had ceased to be a red-letter day with its own Anglican Office about 60 years earlier, when as part of the 1801 Union the *Church of Ireland* lost its 1666 prayer book, and as the *United Church of England and Ireland*, started to use the Church of England’s 1662 prayer book. But under 14 & 15 Car. II, Sess. 4, c. 23 continued as a C. of I. red-letter day till 22 Vic. c. 2 (1859).

⁷³ “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. 11,14,15,16,17 (British Library copy).

Constitutional Liberty⁷⁴.”

On 5 November 1835, the Archdeacon of London, Joseph Pott, preached a sermon at St. Peter’s Cathedral, Exeter, in Devon, England. His text was Acts 23:12, “And when it was day, certain of the Jews banded together, and bound themselves under a curse, saying that they would neither eat nor drink, till they had killed Paul.” Commenting on this, Archdeacon Pott said, “the conspiracy, recorded in the text, was founded on the grossest mispersuasion of what might be acceptable before God.”

Archdeacon Pott refers to how in “history,” “a solemn mission at a later period came from the Roman See into this realm of Britain, where the faith of Christ had been long planted; ... and ... a claim was instantly set up by the Romish missionaries to dictate ... discipline” “Conformable to this pattern has been the conduct of the Romish See, and that of those by whom its claims have been set forward and supported in succeeding ages.” “With what joy, then, may we call to mind, that the knowledge of the gospel was welcomed at an early period in this land, long before the Roman Mission could set foot in it, and that in due time” in the 16th century, “the call to reformation was as gladly and as readily received.”

Archdeacon Pott isolates various errors of Romanism, as found in “that council held at Trent” (1545-63). These include, the Roman view “that tradition is a necessary rule of faith,” whereas “we judge the Word of God to be the single standard of belief.” “They hold the fathers of the Church to be received interpreters of Scripture, upon whose word also we must therefore build our faith. We [Anglicans] respect their writings, and their judgment, and use them gladly ...; but we do not allow them an authority which they never claimed, and were never qualified to exercise” i.e., “to inspiration” “They hold, that the number of ... sacraments extend to seven;” whereas we recognize only “baptism and the Supper of our Lord.” “They hold, that men are justified ... by pleas of merit. We restrain the only meritorious cause of our salvation and acceptance before God, to the death and merits of one only righteous Saviour, who purchased both forgiveness and eternal glories by the satisfaction he wrought”

“They hold, that the consecrated elements ... convey ... the real ... Christ’s body ... and blood,” i.e., transubstantiation, whereas we hold to “the figurative import of our Lord’s words, together with their spiritual meaning,” for “the figurative sense is certainly intended” by “Christ.” “They hold that the cup in the sacrament may be withheld; although Christ said, ‘Drink ye *all* of it’ [Matt. 26:27].” “They hold that there is a state of purgatory, ... although our Lord reminds us that we must work ‘whilst it is day,’ that is, whilst ... life endures, ‘for the night cometh’ (the night of death) ‘when no man can work’ [John 9:4]; and when that which is finished here, must remain for ... judgment.”

“They hold that the saints are to be worshipped ... and invoked ..., although the Scripture teach us distinctly that there is but one mediator between God and man [I Tim. 2:5], and that his intercession is alone effectual and sufficient.” “They hold that images may be

⁷⁴ “British Constitutional Liberty. A sermon preached in Broad-mead, Bristol, November 5, 1775, by Calen Evans, M.A.” Printed and sold at Bristol by W. Pine, T. Cadell, M. Ward., &c, and in London by J. Buckland, G. Keith, E. & C. Dilly, and W. Harris, St. Paul’s Churchyard, pp. 5,6 (British Library copy).

used in religious worship, and honoured ... with ... veneration: against the plain word of commandment [Exod. 20:4,5]. ... Although God permitted images in the ark and in the temple, certain it is that they were not to be worshipped. The chief of them were placed in a part of the temple, not frequented for that purpose; and which was only entered once a year by the high priest alone, who never worshipped them, or produced them for that purpose. That the cherubim were not to be worshipped, we may be quite sure, if we will but regard the answer given by the angel, when present, to St. John the Divine (Theologian): ‘See thou do it not; for I am thy fellowservant’ [Rev. 19:10].”

“They hold that the power of granting pardons and indulgences was left to the dispensation of the Church, to be purchased and bestowed at pleasure;” whereas, “The best comment was the Reformation, which was ... stimulated ... by this mercenary traffic.” “They hold, that the Roman Pontiff is supreme, as vicar and vicegerent of Christ Jesus: and all this, because he sits in the chair, where St. Peter sat, though not always, for he sat at Antioch, nor exclusively, for St. Paul also had his special charge at Rome: nor did St. Peter ever exercise this supremacy, as is plain from what passed at Jerusalem in the case of the Gentiles, and from the temporary differences between him and St. Paul; nor has he ever been succeeded by men inspired by God, as he was.” “And ... they hold, that a general submission must be rendered to the canons and councils of the Church” as “unerring or infallible.” “They claim ... deference to the Council held at Trent.”

“Alas,” such is “the evil disposition” of “Rome.” By contrast, “we have to testify our gratitude, not only for deliverance from the danger ... so craftily contrived” in 1605, “but for securing to us the blessing of good government.” For “the destruction of” this would be “a calamity of no less magnitude than the blow which was aimed at the chief persons in the state” in 1605⁷⁵.

On 5 November 1840, the Curate of Cheltenham, Francis Close, preached a Sermon at St. Mary’s *Church of England*, Cheltenham, in Gloucestershire. He started by saying, “We are assembled this morning, beloved brethren, under the highest sanction of our Church and nation: the authorities, both ecclesiastical and civil, ... require us this day to celebrate our memorable and merciful deliverance from that foul treason known by the name of ‘The Gunpowder Plot.’ ... Ministers ... are required not only to read the Service, but to preach a sermon, or if there be no sermon, to read one of the six homilies against rebellion.” He then said he would “speak of truth and error, of light and darkness, of the Protestant and Romish religion.”

Concerning “charity” to the “Roman Catholic,” he said, “I disown the charity of the world, and of the liberalist, who would leave men to perish in their sins, rather than tell them of their danger!” The *Roman Catholic Emancipation Act* had been passed in 1829. Francis Close records how since that time an organization called “the Roman Catholic Institute,” had been busy attacking the public celebrations of *Papists’ Conspiracy Day*. Concerning a reference by this Popish group seeking to downplay “‘the Conspiracy of 1605’,” Reverend

⁷⁵ “A Sermon preached at the Cathedral Church of St. Peter’s, Exeter, on November V, MDCCCXXXII. By the Ven[erable] Joseph Holden Pott, M.A. Archdeacon of London, and Chancellor of the Church of Exeter,” Printed by Gilbert & Rivington, St. John’s Square, London, 1835, pp. 2,10,11,12-19,20-21 (British Library copy).

Close said, “we do affirm that such a deed is in accordance with the tenets of the Romish Church, which authoritatively inculcates and teaches the destruction of heretics. ... We look in vain in the articles of the Protestant faith for any dogma to encourage or sanction such a diabolical crime ... But when we consider the intolerant articles of the Council of Trent, and the many cruel dogmas taught by their ... doctors, and the slaughter of St. Bartholomew’s day” i.e., of Protestants in Paris in 1572, “for which public thanks were offered to Almighty God by the Pope and his Roman Conclave,” then that “such acts” “are fairly chargeable upon the ... principles of” the Roman “Church which has ever propagated her doctrines by fire and sword.”

The Reverend Mr. Close also refers to the Roman Church’s “lying wonders” (II Thess. 2:9). He then asks of the Reformation, “Was it the piety of Wickliffe [Wycliffe], the rigid reasonings of Calvin, the energetic denunciations of the German reformer [Luther]? No – but it was the Word of God, wielded by them all – the sledge hammer which beat in pieces the darkest superstition that ever bound the minds of men in misery and sin!”

Mr. Close further attacks the unBiblical Romish doctrine of “the ‘Queen of Heaven,’” in which ones can “see the deluded votary worshiping the Virgin Mary, ... applying epithets to her wholly unwarranted by Scripture, and fearfully profane!” He concludes, “All false doctrine ... springs from ignorance of the Holy Scriptures!”

Following the *Roman Catholic Emancipation Act* 11 years earlier in 1829, *supra*, with respect to the associated inroads thereafter being made in the United Kingdom by “the Romanists,” Mr. Close says, “when we see the lofty towers and spires of Romish chapels, monasteries, and convents, thrusting themselves up in the length and breadth of the land,” “we assure you that *Protestant indifference* contributes as much as Romish zeal; to these lamentable results. Our remedy is *Scriptural education on the principles of the Established Church [of England and Ireland]*. We affirm that that had this prevailed in the days of James I the Gunpowder Plot would never have been contemplated⁷⁶.”

Sadly our list of sermons draws to a close with the removal of this day from the Anglican Calendar in 1859, which made 5 November 1858 the last of these in the Established *United Church of England and Ireland*. In conjunction with the Reverend Mr. Close’s *Church of England* sermon (1840), we shall now consider one Puseyite sermon (Denison, 1854), and one inter-denominational Protestant sermon (Drew, 1856), to help us better understand the historical context of the unhappy removal of this day from the Anglican Calendar and associated loss of its Office (Service).

On the one hand, we know of Puseyite opposition to the day from a sermon preached

⁷⁶ “Corrected Edition by the Author. A Sermon Preached in the Parish Church of Saint Mary, Cheltenham, on Thursday, November 5, 1840; being the Day appointed by Act of Parliament to be observed in commemoration of ‘The happy deliverance of King James I, and the three estates of England from the most bloody intended massacre by gunpowder,’ and also ‘For the happy arrival of His Majesty King William on this Day, for the deliverance of our church and nation.’ By the Rev. Francis Close, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Cheltenham,” Published by Thomas Arnold, Paternoster Row, London pp. 3-5,10,14-16 (British Library copy).

in Somerset, England, on 5 November, 1854 by the Archdeacon of Taunton, George Denison. Among other things, he wickedly attacked “William III,” and opposed the fact that with him, “the English nation ... made a Calvinist their king” i.e., he was a Jacobite⁷⁷.

But on the other hand, at an inter-denominational Protestant service in a non-Anglican Church, we have e.g., the record of “A sermon preached in Christ Church Belfast, on ... November 5, 1856, being the anniversary of deliverance from the Popish Gunpowder Plot, and of the arrival of William III, Prince of Orange, ... by Thomas Drew, D.D., LL.D.⁷⁸” This among other things repudiates “Popish aggression” and “the horrors of a fabulous purgatory, and blasphemously elevating ... Mary to the place of a heathen goddess ... to ... Queen of Heaven.” Rather, “we should show our colours by manifesting such boldness as Paul exhibited before Agrippa, and as Luther exhibited” But with a sense of *Realpolitik*, Dr. Drew says, “The great obstacle in converting Romanists ... will be found in our bad Protestant politicians, whose theology is weighed in their shop-scales, or noted in the ledgers of their counting houses. We must seek to honour God, and .. our Protestant institutions”⁷⁹

Alas, in a climate of what the Reverend Close referred to as the external force of Papists in “the Roman Catholic Institute” seeking by Popish propaganda to subvert *Papists’ Conspiracy Day*; and the internal force of “Protestant indifference,” *supra*; together with a fifth column attack from within the Anglican Church by Puseyites like Archdeacon Denison, who was using the day for the very opposite purpose for which it was intended by attacking, rather than supporting, the coming of William III, *supra*; and in a climate in which a further fifth column attack from within the UK was coming from secularist politicians whom Dr. Drew refers to as “bad ... politicians,” *supra*; this day was removed from the Anglican Calendar in 1859. The sun was setting on the once great Protestant Christian State of the British Isles, and within three years of Dr. Drew’s warning, these cheap, slimy’n’grimy politicians who had for some years been shutting down, and turning around, the great gains and accomplishments of the Protestant Christian State, would move to close down three Anglican Offices of the Christian State, together with the public legal recognition of *Irish Massacre Day* in Ireland. In this context, *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* on 5 November was one of the four casualties. And so Dr. Drew’s inter-denominational Protestant sermon of 1856 shall be the last one in this series that we consider that was addressed to (at least some) Anglicans in the British Isles. We see then, how historically on this day, was excited a strong spirit of Protestantism in the bosom of the Anglican Church, and beyond this, among other Protestants of the British Isles. But from 1859 though the day was still remembered with Bonfire Night, alas, it did so without the benefits of an Anglican Church Service, and other associated benefits of the Christian State’s endorsement.

⁷⁷ “A Sermon Preached in the Cathedral Church of S. Andrew, Wells, on Sunday, November 5, 1854. By George Anthony Denison, ... Archdeacon of Taunton,” Printed by Joseph Masters, London, 1854, p. 22 (British Library copy).

⁷⁸ Printed by A. Welsh, Arthur Square & Police Place, Belfast, 1856 (British Library copy).

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 5,6.

6b) *Puritan Protestantism.*

Historically Puritans only kept Sunday as a holy day, although in more recent centuries a number of them have kept Christmas and Easter. But while the Puritans historically forbade holy days other than Sunday, paradoxically, they allowed some days of public fasting or Thanksgiving. Given that the Anglican holy days which have, or had, an Office were always one of these two things, poses the question, What is the merit of this Puritan distinction in such instances?

If e.g., we consider the historic Solemn Days, for which a particular service was appointed by Anglicans i.e., an Office, of which only one now remains, namely, *Accession Day* (presently 6 Feb. for Elizabeth II), then they may all be so categorized. I.e., *King Charles I's Day* (Anglican support, 30 Jan., or 31 Jan. if the 30th falls on a Sunday,) a Fast Day (although since its revival as a black letter day, or optional red-letter day, it does not have this intrinsic element of a fast day); *King Charles II's Day* or *Royal Oak Day* (Anglican and some broader Protestant support, 29 May,) a Day of Thanksgiving; *Papists' Conspiracy Day* (Broad Protestant support, 5 Nov.,) a Day of Thanksgiving; *Irish Massacre Day* (Broad Protestant support, 23 Oct.,) a Day of Thanksgiving; and *Accession Day* of a reigning monarch, (Broad Protestant support, under Queen Elizabeth II, 6 February,) a Day of Thanksgiving.

Notwithstanding the loss of the Offices for these days other than *Accession Day* in the 19th century, the three solemn days of the 1662 *Church of England* prayer book (the fourth day of 23 October was only in Ireland; a red-letter day with its own *Church of Ireland* Office 1666-1800; by law publicly recognized black letter day 1801-1859), or the events they remember, have in a diminished form, continued to be remembered in other ways. E.g., the revival of *King Charles Day* (30 Jan.) as a black letter day on Anglican Calendars in Canada (1962), Australia (1978), and England (1980, optionally a red-letter day)⁸⁰; or the memory of the Restoration and *Royal Oak Day* (29 May) in the name "Royal Oak" of e.g., *Royal Oak Restaurants*. Thus these events have continued to be remembered, albeit in a diminished form, without an Anglican Office being said. Certainly with *Gunpowder Treason Day* or *Papists' Conspiracy Day*, this has continued on 5 November as the ever-popular *Bonfire Day*, with its well known fireworks displays on *Bonfire Night*.

In this broader context, it is also clear that 5 November has historically enjoyed broad

⁸⁰ The historic Scots Presbyterian view which agrees with the historic Anglican position that we oppose "seditions" and "murders" (Gal. 5:20,21) and "Honour the king" (I Peter 2:17); but which unlike the traditional Anglican position does not regard Charles I as a Christian "martyr," but simply as a king unjustly killed; is a view that has also come to be adopted by some Anglicans in recent centuries. Thus the absence of the term "martyr" in the Canadian (1962) and Anglican (1978) Calendars for 30 January reflects an allowance in which one can adopt either view in remembering *Charles I's Day* or *King Charles Day* i.e., only some (like myself) would *also* sometimes call it, *King Charles the Martyr's Day*. By contrast, the English Calendar (1980) specifically uses the word, "martyr," and so like the 1662-1859 Office of "King Charles the Martyr," this unambiguously endorses the traditional Anglican view that *Charles I's Day* remembers a martyr.

Protestant support from both Anglican Protestants and Puritan Protestants, as a *Day of Thanksgiving*. Indeed, even Cromwell's republic, which originally banned the day, in 1656 relented to pressure to allow the celebrations of Bonfire Night, *providing it was not with an Anglican service, infra*.

But even before this time, some non-exclusive veiled allusion to the event, *but not the day*, was to some extent allowed under the republic. Four years earlier in 1652, the Puritan, Peter Sterry, preached a sermon to the Puritan's legislature. Puritans said they were "purifying" Anglican worship of "Romish" elements, and Sterry stressed his Puritanism e.g., talking about the "purer" "church form of Presbytery." More generally, among other things, reference is made to "England's ... deliverance from the Roman Papacy;" and Romanism is denounced as "the great whore Babylon, [and] mother of fornications." Amidst some shocking Puritan republican revolutionary rhetoric that I shall not trouble the reader with, "the Lord" is still thanked for his "mercies ... of saving us from the bloody designs of the ... Papacy...⁸¹." Though broadly generalist in tone, while "the bloody designs of the ... Papacy" would have also conjured up memories of e.g., the Spanish Armada; in this non-exclusive sense, we cannot doubt that contextually such "bloody designs" would also have included in people's minds the Gunpowder Treason Plot of 1605.

Furthermore, reference has already been made to an inter-denominational Protestant Church service and sermon on *Papists' Conspiracy Day* 1856 at Christ Church, Belfast, in northern Ireland. In this context, it is also worth noting a more recent work by Clive Anderson, entitled, *Gunpowder, Treason and Plot: The Gruesome story of Guy Fawkes* (2005). Clive Anderson is the Puritan Minister of Butts Church, Alton, Hampshire, in England. This is a Reformed Baptist Church. Describing his Church, he says, "We are [a] conservative Evangelical Church (Baptistic) ... [and] use the NIV [New International Version]." "We are Reformed (Calvinistic) My heroes are Martin Luther, John Calvin, George Whitfield, C.H. Spurgeon, Martin Lloyd-Jones." His Church is affiliated to the *Fellowship of Evangelical Churches*⁸².

On the downside, unless otherwise stated, all Scripture quotations in this work are from the NIV. This NIV using Baptist Minister also laces his work with some rabid anti-Anglican rhetoric, in which he e.g., he takes a perverted Puritan view of Henry VIII, by seeking to justify the filthy immorality of incest with a brother's wife (Lev. 20:21; Mark 6:18) which thing Henry extricated himself from by breaking with Rome, and in typical Congregationalist and Baptist Puritan fashion, Anderson then seeks to depict Henry VIII in a negative way. So shocking is his book at this point, that I dare not even repeat the ugly details of it, for I recoil from them so greatly⁸³. For what saith the Word of God? "It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife" (Mark 6:18); and to so attack Henry VIII's stand

⁸¹ "England's deliverance from the Northern Presbytery, compared with its deliverance from the Roman Papacy: by Peter Sterry, ... Preacher to ... the Councill of State at White-Hall, Printed by Evan Tyler, England, 1652 pp. 6,7,9,14 (British Library copy).

⁸² Email replies of Clive Anderson (23 Oct. 2008 & 24 Oct. 08) to my email questions.

⁸³ Anderson, C., *Gunpowder, Treason and Plot: The Gruesome story of Guy Fawkes*, Day One Publications, Leominster, England, 2005, pp. 2,34,35.

on *Biblical authority not Papal authority* (granting Papal “dispensations” for incest), is to fundamentally attack the English Reformation, whose first stage was wrought by God under Henry VIII, when he chose to put himself under God’s directive will on this matter of incest.

It is clear from Lev. 20:21 that His Divine Majesty, the Lord Jehovah, reserves unto his royal Prerogative, the right to at any time kill off the issue from the union between a man and his brother’s wife. It is also clear that the King of the Universe unleashed his holy power, slaying the bastard children of the union between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon, bar one, Mary. This was enough for those with spiritual insight to see that the anger of the Lord was kindled, and was saying to Henry VIII that he must break with Rome since the Pope had granted a dispensation to allow such incest which was most unBiblical. Archbishop Cranmer and King Henry got the message. They heard God’s voice and acted upon it. But he who had for a season withheld his judgment on the bastard girl, Mary, after first allowing her to ascend the throne and earn the sobriquet, “Bloody Mary,” as she killed Protestant upon Protestant; having first permitted this, that all the world might see how evil she was, and how much God abhors Popery; he then completed his acts of slaying the offspring of the union between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon, by also slaying this most horrible Papist, a long time before she would have died of natural causes in old age. Let those who do not acknowledge this repent of their sin, and “kiss the Son, lest he be angry” and “his wrath” be “kindled” against them (Ps. 2:12; John 5:22,23).

Anderson clearly perceives Protestantism though a Puritan paradigm that generally excludes positive references to Anglican Protestants. This is clear in both an expressed positive sense with regard to the way he deals with “the Puritan movement” and “The Great Ejection of 1662⁸⁴,” and also in an unexpressed negative sense of omission to Reformed Anglican figures. Specifically, when he deals with his support for Bonfire Day on 5 November, he cites the Puritan figures of Spurgeon, Flavel, and Matthew Henry, *infra*; but makes no reference to the writings of any Anglican figures, nor to the historical place of this day on the Anglican Calendar. A strange omission indeed, given that King James himself was Anglican, and indeed *Supreme Governor* of the Anglican Church.

Yet for all that, Anderson’s book is a useful work for showing how some Puritan Protestants are prepared to see value in remembrance of the events of 1605, and the celebration of an anti-Papist and pro-Protestant *Bonfire Day* on 5 November. He cites the Puritan, John Flavel (1628-1691), who said, “And O God would make our honourable representatives in Parliament still ... zealous to oppose the motions of the enemy. We bless the Lord for what you have already done ... O be ... zealous for the Protestant interest ... Remember what a matchless salvation was once given to our English Parliament, I mean from the [gun] powder plot, that ‘[Roman] Catholic villainy,’ as one aptly calls it ... Rome is a nettle, the more gently it is handled, the more it stings. My lords and gentleman, here is an enemy that deserves your hottest zeal, and greatest vigilance, much better than honest loyal Non-Conformists, who plead with God night and day on your behalf⁸⁵.”

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 86-7,92.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13, quoting Flavel’s *Tidings from Rome or England’s Alarm*, in *The Works of John Flavel*, Banner of Truth Trust, London, UK, Vol. 4, p. 570.

Pastor Anderson further quotes from the Puritan, Matthew Henry (1662-1714). Matthew Henry says in an address given on 5 November, 1712, “Sometimes God is pleased when he takes the cup of trembling out of the hands of his oppressed people, to put it into the hands of their oppressors This was fulfilled in the glorious deliverance which we this day celebrate the memorial of. What a cup of trembling was put into the hand of our Popish adversaries, when the plot was discovered We are this day giving thanks for the deliverance of our land from Popery; its first deliverance at the Reformation, when Popish errors and delusions were discovered, disowned, and protested against, Popish powers shaken off and broken, and Popish idolatries and superstitions rooted up and purged out; its many deliverances since ...; particularly its deliverance from the base and barbarous design of blowing up the Parliament House with gunpowder this day ...; a deliverance never to be forgotten ..., inasmuch as we should to this day have been groaning under the dismal fatal consequences of the plot, if it had taken effect⁸⁶.”

And Anderson also quotes from the Puritan, Charles Spurgeon (1834-1892). Preaching on Sunday 5 November 1854, Spurgeon says, “This is the fifth of November, a day notable in English history. The events which transpired on it ought never to be forgotten. On this memorable day, the [Roman] Catholics, foiled in all their schemes for crushing our glorious Protestantism, devised a plot horrible and diabolical enough to render them for ever hateful amongst upright men. The vast Armada of Spain [in 1588], on which they had relied, had been by the breath of God scattered and given to destruction; and now the cowardly traitors attempted, by the foulest means, the end of which they could not accomplish by open warfare. Under the Houses of Parliament the deadly powder was concealed which they hoped would ... annihilate the power of Protestantism; but God looked from heaven, he confounded their ... tricks ... and ... treachery. Hallelujah to the King eternal, immortal, invisible, who guarded us, and guards us still from the devices of Rome and Hell! Praise to his name, we are free from the Pope of Rome ...⁸⁷.”

Clive Anderson’s Puritan Baptist view, which seeks to detach *Gunpowder Treason Day* from its Anglican connection, most especially the Anglican Office of *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* (removed in 1859), while still maintaining the anti-Papist and pro-Protestant elements of 5 November, kept as a Day of Thanksgiving in Bonfire Night, is thus essentially the same type of thing that Cromwell’s republic begrudgingly moved to from 1856, *supra*. It is thus an interesting contemporary example of Puritan Protestant support for Bonfire Day. Pastor Clive Anderson’s final words are noteworthy for showing this clear Puritan Protestant support for Bonfire Night. He says, “Every year when the anniversary comes around and many fireworks light up the night sky, let all remember and be thankful that God permitted The [Gun] Powder Treason to fail, so that by contrast the light of his Word might be seen more clearly, and that through its growing influence in the world since 1605, many have turned from their sin to the Saviour of the world⁸⁸.”

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 88, quoting Henry’s *Popery, A Spiritual Tyranny*, in *The Complete Works of Matthew Henry: Treatises, Sermons, and Tracts*, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA, pp. 335 & 337, (emphasis mine).

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 10, quoting Spurgeon’s Sermon of 5 Nov. 1854 at New Park Street Chapel, Southwark, London, in: *Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit*, Sermon number 2908, Pilgrim Publications, Pasadena, Texas, USA, p. 529.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 92.

The publication of Anderson's book in 2005 is also significant, for that was the 400th anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot (1605-2005). As I further discuss below, on 5 November 2005 I attended a meeting in London of the *United Protestant Council's* 400th anniversary of the Gunpowder Treason. This was an inter-denominational Protestant meeting, held at the venue of a Baptist Church in St. John's Wood Road; and so again reminds us of the broad Protestant support that can be found, to this day, for remembering 5 November.

7) *Papists' Conspiracy Day (5 Nov.)*.

7a) *Bonfire Day at Lewes, England: 5 November 2008.*

7b) *Gunpowder Treason Day: 5 November.*

7a) *Bonfire Day at Lewes, England: 5 November 2008.*

On Sabbath 2 November, 2008, I was a communicant at the Lord's Supper held at St. John's *Church of England (Continuing)* South Wimbledon, in London. All services in this church are from the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* and Authorized (King James) Version of the Bible. Since it was just three days before 5 November, the Minister, the Reverend Mr. Peter Ratcliffe, announced that instead of using the Collect and Communion readings for the 24th Sunday after Trinity, we would on that Sunday be using the Communion readings and collects (prayers) from the *Papists' Conspiracy Day Communion Service* in the 1662 Office for Gunpowder Treason Day. He said that while this service had been removed from the *Church of England* prayer book in 1859, since this was the *Church of England Continuing*, we could use them. Thus the two Communion readings were from Rom. 13:1-7 (Epistle) and Luke 9:51-56, with the Gospel being read by the Reverend Mr. Brian Felce (a retired Anglican clergyman who is *Vice-Chairman of the Trinitarian Bible Society*).

The first Communion Collect from the *Gunpowder Treason Day Communion Service* used at this Communion Service that Sunday was: "Almighty God, who hast in all ages shewed thy power and mercy in the miraculous and gracious deliverance of thy church, and in the protection of righteous and religious kings and states professing thy holy and eternal truth, from the wicked conspiracies, and malicious practices of all the enemies thereof; we yield thee our unfeigned thanks and praise, for the wonderful and mighty deliverance of our gracious sovereign King James the First, the Queen, the Prince [later King Charles the First], and all the royal branches, with the nobility, clergy, and commons of England, then assembled in Parliament, by Popish treachery appointed as sheep to the slaughter, in a most barbarous and savage manner, beyond the example of former ages. From this unnatural conspiracy, not our merit, but thy mercy; not our foresight, but thy providence delivered us: And therefore not unto us, O Lord, but unto thy name be ascribed all honour and glory, in all churches of the saints, from generation to generation; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*"

The second Communion Collect from the *Papists' Conspiracy Day Communion Service* used at this Sunday Service was: "Accept also, most gracious God, of our unfeigned thanks for filling our hearts again with joy and gladness, after the time that thou hadst afflicted us, and putting a new song into our mouths, by bringing His Majesty King William [on 5 Nov. 1688], ... for the deliverance of our church and nation from Popish tyranny and arbitrary power. We adore the wisdom and justice of thy providence, which so timely interposed in our extreme danger, and disappointed all the designs of our enemies. We beseech thee, give us such a lively and lasting sense of what thou didst then, and hast since

that time done for us, that we may not grow secure and careless in our obedience, by presuming upon thy great and undeserved goodness; but that it may lead us unto repentance, and move us to be the more diligent and zealous in all duties of our religion, which thou hast in a marvellous manner preserved to us. Let truth and justice, brotherly kindness and charity, devotion and piety, concord and unity, with all other virtues, so flourish among us, that they may be the stability of our times, and make this Church, a praise in the earth. All which we humbly beg for the sake of our blessed Lord and Saviour. *Amen.*”

The final Communion Collect we used from this *Papists’ Conspiracy Day Service* was: “O God, whose name is excellent in all the earth, and thy glory above the heavens; who on this day [of 5 Novemeber⁸⁹] didst miraculously preserve our church and state from the secret contrivance and hellish malice of Popish conspirators; and on this day also didst begin to give us a mighty deliverance from the open tyranny and oppression of the same cruel and blood-thirsty enemies: We bless and adore thy glorious majesty, as for the former, so for this thy late marvellous loving-kindness to our church and nation, in the preservation of our religion and liberties. And we humbly pray, that the devout sense of this thy repeated mercy may renew and increase in us a spirit of love and thankfulness to thee its only Author; a spirit of peaceable submission and obedience to our gracious sovereign lady, Queen Elizabeth the Second; and a spirit of fervent zeal for our holy religion which thou hast so wonderfully rescued, and established, a blessing to us and our posterity. And this we beg for Jesus Christ his sake. *Amen.*”

Two days later, on Tuesday 4 November 2008, I journeyed down south from London to Lewes (south-east England, near and north-east of Brighton,) in east Sussex, in order to spend both the Eve of Papists’ Conspiracy Day (4 Nov.) and Papists’ Conspiracy Day (5 Nov.) in Lewes, before travelling back to London on the Thursday (6 Nov.)⁹⁰.

The *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* celebrations at Lewes, Sussex, are particularly colourful⁹¹. The list of Protestant martyrs under the Roman Catholic Queen, Bloody Mary

⁸⁹ While we were remembering 5 November on Sunday 2 Nov., 2008, this should be placed in a broader Anglican context. As a consequence of modern living in which Anglicans will frequently only attend church services on a Sunday, there has been an increased tendency to refer to holy days of significance to a particular church on the Sunday before or after that day, if it falls on a weekday. E.g., when I visited King Charles the Martyr’s Church, Potters Bar, Hertfordshire in the Diocese of St. Alban’s (not far from London), on the afternoon of the Sunday next before *Charles I’s Day*, 2009; while the notice board said: “Friday 30 January” would have a “9.15am Morning Prayer,” it also said there would be such a 9.15am Morning service on some other days in that week. But it further said: “Sunday 1 February 2009 King Charles Day” would have “10.30am United Holy Communion,” i.e., the memory of *Charles I’s Day* was transferred to the following Sunday. However Christmas and Good Friday have remained exceptions to this tendency; as have come city churches with short early morning pre-work or lunch-time services.

⁹⁰ My memory on the events of Lewes in November 2008 have in part been refreshed by reference to some photographs I took at the time.

⁹¹ Goring, J., *Burn Holy Fire: Religion in Lewes since the Reformation*, Lutterworth Press, Cambridge, England, UK, 2003; Simmons, J. (Ed.), *Common Ground: Around Britain in 30 Writers*, Marshall Cavendish, London, 2006, pp. 155-6; “Guy Fawkes Night,”

(1556-8), recorded in Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*, and *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*, includes seventeen Marian martyrs at Lewes. 1) Dirick Carver, a brewer, martyred outside the Star Inn (22 July 1555); 2) Thomas Harland, a carpenter, 3) John Oswald, a husbandman, 4) Thomas Avington, a turner, and 5) Thomas Read (Reed), a labourer, (all four martyred on 6 June 1556); 6) Thomas Mills (Myles), and 7) the clergyman, Reverend Thomas Wood (both martyred on 20 June 1556); 8) Richard Woodman, an ironmonger, 9) George Stevens, 10) William Mainard, 11) Alexander (Alex) Hosman (Mainard's manservant), 12) Thomasine (Thomasina) Wood (Mainard's maidservant), 13) Margery Moris (Morris), and her son, 14) James Moris (Morris), 15) Denis (Dennis) Burgis (Burgis), 16) Ashdon's wife, and 17) Groves' wife (all ten martyred on 22 June 1557).

At Lewes, I inspected the Town Hall, which in the time of Bloody Mary was the site of the Star Inn. It bears a stone plaque reading, "In the vault beneath this building were imprisoned ten of the seventeen Protestant martyrs who were burned at the stake within a few yards of this site 1555-1557. Their names are recorded on the Memorial to be seen on Cliffe Hill. 'Faithful unto death'." At the time, the (Barclays Bank) building next door had a large red "WATERLOO" banner draped across it, "Waterloo" being one of the Lewes Bonfire groups.

I also walked up the steep mountain forming "Cliffe Hill," at Lewes. After an arduous up-hill walk, this affords a picturesque panoramic view of Lewes. I inspected "The Martyrs Memorial" both from a step access into a park; and also from the other side of the Memorial as accessed from an adjoining golf course and parkland area. The inscription (on both sides) reads, with a quote from Revelation 12:11 below it:

In loving memory
of the undernamed seventeen Protestant Martyrs,
who for their faithful testimony to
God's truth,
were during the reign of Queen Mary
burned to death,
in front of the Star Inn – now the Town Hall – Lewes.
This obelisk,
provided by public subscriptions,
was erected A.D. 1901.

	Dates of Martyrdom.
Dirick Carver, of Brighton,	July 22 nd 1555.
Thomas Harland, and John Oswald, both of Woodmancote }	
Thomas Avington, and Thomas Reed, both of Ardinclly. }	June 6 th 1556.
Thomas Wood (A Minister of the Gospel), of Lewes.]]	
Thomas Myles, of Hellingly.]]	About June 20 1556.
Richard Woodman, and George Stevens, both of Warbleton. }	
Alexander Hosman, William Mainard, Thomasina Wood. }	
All of Mayfield }	

Margery Morris and James Morris (her	son), Both of }	June 22 nd 1557.
	Heathfield }	
Denis Burges, of Buxted.	}	
Ann Ashdon, of Rotherfield.	}	
Mary Groves, of Lewes.	}	

Thus Lewes near the south coast of east England was a front-line spiritual battleground in the defence of Protestantism against Popery under Blood Mary. *Lewes is where a number of this world's little people, who were God's big people, took their stand for the Gospel of Jesus Christ as rightly recovered by the Protestant Reformation, and died as Christian martyrs between 1555 and 1557.* By longstanding convention and tradition, the Protestant people of Lewes do not forget to honour the memory of their Minister, brewer, carpenter, turner, ironmonger, and others martyred for their Protestantism, and in this context, *Bonfire Day* is a special day in Lewes. On the Eve of Bonfire Day Celebrations (4 Nov), *infra*, a banner is hoisted to these seventeen Marian Martyrs; and in the Bonfire Night Procession (5 Nov.), a replica of this "Martyrs Memorial" is carried in procession, *infra*.

A red-letter Anglican holy day begins on the Eve (evening) of the day before (liturgically usually defined as from 6 pm, irrespective of when the sun actually sets), and reflecting its origins in the Anglican holy day of *Papists' Conspiracy Day*, I attended celebrations on the Eve of Bonfire Day (known as, "Badge Night," run by those with the badge of Cliffe Bonfire Society). From between 7 pm and 8 pm in Cliffe High Street, i.e., the area of the Cliffe Bonfire Society, there were a number of colourful activities.

At this point, both with respect to the Eve of Bonfire Day Celebrations (4 Nov.) and Bonfire Night Celebrations on Bonfire Day (5 Nov.), let me say that some of those involved in these popular, carnival like, celebrations of Bonfire Day in Lewes and elsewhere may go to excess with e.g., unsaved persons engaging in drunkenness; in the same way that popular celebrations of Christmas often go to such excess. Nevertheless, they have a more restrained and godly form, and it is to be hoped that men will seek for, and look to, the true underpinning meaning of these days, and then will turn away from their lusts to rightly serve the true and living God. What of those who never seek to know the true meaning of these types of days? "Why speakest thou unto them" of days like Christmas Day and Bonfire Day in an incomplete manner, so they misunderstand their fuller meaning? "Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, but to them it is not given" (Matt. 13:10,11)⁹².

⁹² As a tendency or general rule, the failure to appreciate this type of thing is more likely to occur among those who do not support the Establishment Principle (Gen. 17:5,6; 35:11; Ps. 2:10-12; Isa. 49:22,23; 52:14,15; 60:3,10), e.g., Congregationalists and Baptists; than it is among those who support the Establishment Principle e.g., Anglicans and Lutherans. However, this is not a precise demarcation line and there are clear exceptions to this general rule, since historically Presbyterians have supported the Establishment Principle, but like other Puritan Protestants, did not historically support holy days such as Christmas and Easter, although in more recent centuries some of them have done so. Moreover, some Protestants who do not support the Establishment Principle and formation of a specifically Christian state, may also still support such public holy days.

It is made clear to those attending these Eve of Bonfire Day Celebrations on 4 November, that they do so *at their own risk*, and if they want a *more sedate celebration*, they should exit and come back for the processional march followed by the separate bonfires held by the different Lewes Bonfire groups, the next night, 5 November. This is done in conjunction with an agreement with the Police, that by telling people this, the Police will stay away from the Eve of Bonfire Day Celebrations, but then come out *en masse* and line the streets for the more sedate 5 November Bonfire Night celebrations. As far as I am concerned, if anyone wants to whinge, whine, or complain, with regard to “health and safety issues” about the sort of thing I saw in these 4 November (or 5 November) celebrations, they should simply close their mouths, exit the scene, and leave those who are there unmolested!

Standing as I did on the relatively narrow roadway on these Eve of Bonfire Day Celebrations, one certainly has to keep one’s wits about oneself. (As recommended by the Cliffe Bonfire Society,) I had earplugs in my ears (as I also did the following night), and since people from time to time threw down smaller crackers on the ground, one had to be able to jump quickly when one saw one in the vicinity. Personally, I managed to take some refuge behind a pillar, not far from where I could watch the main action, and so I maximized my chances of safety.

After some colourful detonations of fireworks on the street, a large cherry-picker crane and tractor started to come down the road, in order to hoist the Cliffe Bonfire Society banners. These are raised as part of the Eve of Bonfire Day celebrations, and continue to fly throughout Bonfire Day, and then form an element of Bonfire Night as the Bonfire Night parade marches underneath them. These banners are hung up over the street by attaching the ropes each side of the relatively narrow road to buildings there. By tradition, the climax point is the “NO POPERY” Banner. E.g., in the *Cliffe Bonfire Society Programme* (CBS Programme) for “Wednesday 5th November 2008,” included an old black’n’white photo showing the “NO POPERY” banner used back in the 1920s. On one side of the “NO” is a Lewes martyr being burnt, and on the other side is a picture of the Pope, underneath which is the “POPERY” of “NO POPERY⁹³.”

The first banner was orange (a good Protestant colour,) and with black writing referred to the “CLIFFE BONFIRE SOCIETY,” including its Latin motto, “Nulli Secundus” (Second to None). The second banner was white, with red writing on the very bottom, reading, “FAITHFUL UNTO DEATH.” In black, there was a picture of the Lewes Martyrs Memorial on Cliffe Hill, with the names of the 17 Marian martyrs written out, on the left side in a row going downwards, “Dirick Carver Thomas Harland John Oswald Thomas Avington Thomas Reed Thomas Wood Thomas Myles Richard Woodman George Stevens,” and on the right hand side of the banner in a row going downwards, “Alexander Hosman William Mainard Thomasina Wood Margery Morris James Morris Denis Burges Ann Ashdon Mary Groves.” Then underneath these names the words, “PROTESTANT MARTYRS OF LEWES 1555-1557.”

⁹³ *Cliffe Bonfire Society Programme 2008* (hereafter called the “CBS Programme”), p. 15. This CBS Programme is a 50 paged A4 sized page colour photograph and advertizing booklet produced by the Cliffe Bonfire Society, Lewes (WWW.CLIFFEBONFIRE.COM).

Now came the climax of the banner hanging, the “NO POPERY” banner. Amidst cheers, the “NO POPERY” banner was slowly hung, first on one side, with it draping down the side of a building, then with the cherry picker moving over to the other side, was hoisted the white banner, depicting the red mitred Pope in a red chasuble in the corner. By tradition, all effigies and pictures of the Pope used as part of the Bonfire Day Celebrations are of the Pope at the time of the 1605 Papists’ Conspiracy, namely, Pope Paul V (Pope: May 1605 to 1621). Thus just like effigies and pictures of Guy Fawkes also used as part of the Bonfire Day Celebrations, known as “the Guy,” never change; so likewise, the picture of “the Pope” never changes, it is always Paul V. Hence in the context of Bonfire Day, “the Pope” always means Pope Paul V, just like “the Guy” always means, Guy Fawkes. (A fourth banner reading “Best wishes to Cliffe Subscribers” was then hoisted.)

Along much of the middle of the narrow street, there were red fire-crackers tied together in heaps. This unbroken stream of fire-crackers went for some tens of yards (or metres). Moving up to area near the bridge over the River Ouse, I could see a long line of these red firecrackers in the middle of the road going down from Cliffe Bridge into Cliffe High Street for some 20 or 30 yards (metres) or more. They had been laid under where the banners had been hoisted. Then the signal was given, and they were lit, so that the middle of the street lit up as the fireworks exploded in a long sequence up Cliffe High Street, terminating at Cliffe Bridge. This event, which follows shortly after the hoisting of the “NO POPERY” banner, signalled the end of the main part of the Eve of Bonfire Day celebrations, although some other firework rockets were sent into the air near Cliffe Bridge.

Lewes is known for the fact that by tradition, all throughout Bonfire Day the banner bearing the words, “NO POPERY,” flutters and curls in the wind, and flies sky high. I walked down Cliffe High Street the next day, i.e., on Bonfire Day itself (5 Nov.), to see all these banners in the day-time, especially the “PROTESTANT MARTYRS OF LEWES 1555-1557” banner and the “NO POPERY” banner.

There are seven different Bonfire Societies in Lewes, and these all have their own separate bonfires which people go to after the Bonfire Night processions, i.e., after they have all united by marching in their own groups in the Bonfire Night parade. The members of these Bonfire Societies who help organize matters, all wear their own stripped guernsey, with different colours to identify themselves. The seven are: Cliffe (black’n’white stripes), Founded 1853, Motto: “Nulli Secundus” (Latin, “Second to None”); Commercial Square (black’n’gold), Founded 1855, Motto: “For Independence;” Lewes Borough (blue’n’white), Founded 1853, Motto: “Death or Glory;” Nevil Juvenile (green’n’white, designed especially for young people), Founded 1967, Motto: “We Dare;” Southover (black’n’red), Re-formed 2005, Motto: “Advance;” South Street (brown’n’white), Founded 1913, Motto: “Faithful Unto Death;” and Waterloo (red’n’white), Founded 1964, Motto: “True to Each Other.”

In my opinion Cliffe runs the best bonfire. Since it was my intention to attend the Cliffe Bonfire Society’s bonfire on Bonfire Night, for which I had purchased a £7 (seven pound) ticket at Lewes, I thought I should make sure I knew where the location of it was during the day, so I could more easily find it at night. I am glad I did so. I was able to take some excellent day-time photographs of the large wooden effigies of the Pope (Pope Paul V) and Guy Fawkes, that were being readied to be publicly burnt as part of the Bonfire Night celebrations, *infra*.

Back in the main part of Lewes, I walked past the Royal Oak Hotel, underneath whose, “The Royal Oak Lewes” painted street sign bearing a Caroline picture, there was a large chalk-board street sign which read, “The Royal Oak Bonfire Night. We are OPEN.” The naïve might ask, “Why a sign so saying, “We are OPEN” on Bonfire Night?” Such a person would evidently not know about the famous, *LEWES SHUT-DOWN*.

Tens of thousands of people flood into Lewes for the annual Bonfire Night celebrations. The centre of the town is closed down, and in preparation for this, in the afternoon of Bonfire Day commences, *The Lewes Shut-Down*. Accommodation in Lewes Hotels can be booked out for the Bonfire Day period 6 to 12 months in advance. When I tried to book a room for the two nights of 4 and 5 November 2008 in early 2008, it was already *too late* when I rang a hotel (long-distance call from Sydney, Australia). Fortunately, in March 08 I managed to pre-book a room at another hotel for these two nights at Berkeley (pronounced, “Barclay”) House in Albion Street, Lewes, which is in the heart of the Bonfire Day parade area, and very close to Cliffe Bridge and Cliffe High Street.

But let the reader be warned, that if he should go to Lewes at this time, not only is accommodation hard to get and must be pre-booked long before, *the hotel prices can shoot up!* The first-time visitor should, depending on his culinary tastes, also be advised to think about whether or not he wants to take his own food (as I did), since what small number of restaurants are opened on the night can scarce cater for tens of thousands of people; although, if he is happy with it, there are a number of mobile “snack bars” set up on the night, selling e.g., hot-dogs and such-like. Moreover, if like myself he sees Lewes over three days and two nights, there are a number of other sites of interest, since *for a 3 day tourist there is much to see and do in Lewes* (some of which may need to be seen before or after the Lewes shut-down⁹⁴.)

⁹⁴ Other places of interest that I saw at Lewes included the historic buildings of: The Dorset (established 1670), County Hall (1812), whose building next door includes a sun-dial bearing the Latin inscription, “Carpe Diem” (“Seize the day”); the old Town and Castle of William de Warrenne (one of William the Conqueror’s Generals), with its intentionally undulating bowling-green, and later added Norman Barbican Gate (14th century), and Barbican Museum; Bull House (house of the radical, Thomas Paine, 1768-1774, who debated against Edmund Burke); Southover Grange (boyhood home of Diarist, John Evelyn, 1620-1706, when a pupil of the Grammar School); St. John the Baptist C. of E., an Evangelical Anglican Church. By tradition the Bishop of Chichester appoints an Evangelical Bishop of Lewes who is then given autonomy to speak and function as an Evangelical Anglican Bishop (even though he is a suffragan bishop). In this Church one also finds the tombstone of Gundrada / Gundrad, wife of William de Warrenne (who built the castle) and daughter of William the Conqueror. At Lewes I also inspected the Priory ruins (founded by William de Warrenne, one of the outlying chapels of the priory was located approximately where my hotel, Berkeley House, now is); and Anne of Cleves House. (At times, misleadingly flattering artworks were sometimes made of royal ladies. The 4th wife of Henry VIII, Henry arranged a marriage with this Lutheran German princess, having never seen her, as part of a political alliance. But she was very plain, and Henry VIII who had known a number of women, was unable to become sexually aroused by her; so that the union having never been consummated, was under the ever faithful Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, declared void by Anglican Convocation in 1540, for want of consummation. King Henry then gave Anne of Cleves a generous income, and she lived in this house, occasionally making visits to the

On the afternoon of Bonfire Day, as part of *The Lewes Shut-Down*, e.g., a sign at the “Southover Grange Gardens” of the “Lewes District Council” read, “These gardens will be temporarily closed at midday on Wednesday 5th November. They will reopen as usual at 8am on Thursday 6th November. We apologise for any inconvenience this may cause” A sign at the Lewes train station told of its intended closure also; and a large chart there with a pink square around the Lewes station and some other nearby railway stations warns, “On Wednesday 5 November 2008 Group Save tickets will not be available to or from any station in the shaded area of the map below.” So too, down near Cliffe Bridge a sign read, “Advance Notice This Car Park will be Closed 5th November Thanks.” As I walked along the main street of Lewes that afternoon, I saw shops closing down and men nailing wooden boards over shop windows. The annual *Lewes Shut-Down* was now on in earnest.

Though the main parade on Bonfire Night at Lewes does not start till about 6.30 to 7 p.m., what I regarded as the best spot, which is on the Cliffe Bridge over the River Ouse, starts to get people taking up positions on it from about 5 p.m.⁹⁵. Having been forewarned about this, I had an early dinner, and arrived at the Cliffe Bridge around 4.30 to 4.45 p.m., and noted that the Police were already out in force, lining the streets. As is my usual custom, I was wearing an orange tie in memory of William of Orange for Papists’ Conspiracy Day; and I was pleased to read in the CBS Programme, that they remember not only, “the anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot” in “1606,” but also, that, “On 5th November, 1688, William, Prince of Orange landed at Brixham⁹⁶.”

At the far end of Cliffe High Street to where I was at Cliffe Bridge, the programme and those I spoke to told of various Bonfire Day poems that would be read. But I was unable to both attend these and keep my position at Cliffe Bridge. The CBS Programme included two such Bonfire Day ditties (whose form changes slightly in different traditions of their usage,) already known to me. One was a form of, “Remember, remember the fifth of November, The gunpowder treason and plot,” etc., *infra*. The other, also of relevance to understanding elements of the Bonfire Night celebrations (and also coming in slightly different forms), was that which includes the words:

“A penny loaf to feed the Pope,”
 “A faggot of sticks to burn him.
 Burn him in a tub of tar.
 Burn him like a blazing star.
 Burn his body from his head.

King’s Court.) I also saw the Lewes Battlefield of 1264, which originated the Westminster Parliament; for after Henry III and Simon de Montfort did battle here, the king accepted a Council of Lords, Churchmen, and merchants to advise him, and this Council or *parlement* (speaking place) became over time, the Westminster *Parliament* form of government.

⁹⁵ Though times were not rigidly kept to, the CBS Programme (pp. 23-6) includes for 2008 e.g., 6.00 pm, Barrel run; 6.30, First Procession; 7.10 Second Procession; 7.20 Cliffe Bridge blazing tar barrel hurled into River Ouse; 7.30 War Memorial wreath laying; 8.45 Grand Procession (to Bonfire Sights).

⁹⁶ CBS Programme, *op. cit.*, pp. 7 & 11.

Then we'll say 'old Pope is dead'.
Hip hip, Hoorah! [Hip hip, Hoorah!]⁹⁷”

I shall return to relevant elements of this Bonfire Day ditty, *infra*.

The centre of the town was now well and truly closed down in the Lewes shut-down. Thousands and thousands of people had poured into Lewes, choking the pavements next to its narrow main street, which had to be kept free for the march. Police enforced silver metal barriers, which had been erected to keep people off the road for the marchers. Then the long awaited for processions of the various Bonfire Societies began. Dressed in their different colours, wearing one of the seven guernsey colours of each Lewes Bonfire Society, *supra*, they marched. Some were pushing *blazing barrels*. Fireworks were sometimes let off.

Fancy dress is also a part of the Lewes parade. In the mid 19th century, following the removal of *Papists' Conspiracy Day* as an Office in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) in 1859, the secular British government sought to prohibit and close down Bonfire Day altogether. In this sense, their ultimately unsuccessful efforts resembled Cromwell's republic, which first tried to stop it, and then, in its dying days, relented and allowed it, though without an Anglican Church Service. So likewise, the secular government of the mid 19th century first tried to prohibit Bonfire Day and close it down, and then, this proving impossible, they permitted it, though without an Anglican Church Service and not as a public holiday. However, during this interim period when the secular state government was trying to prohibit Bonfire Day because it was a pro-Protestant and anti-Papist day; large numbers of people, believing "We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29), and so should continue to show gratitude to God for his protection of the Protestant King and Parliament from the Papists' conspiracies of 1605 and 1688 to put a Papist on the throne in place of a Protestant monarch; practiced a limited form of civil disobedience. I.e., they continued to celebrate Bonfire Day. But in order to make it difficult for the Police to identify them, they wore fancy dress that emphasised head-dress which concealed, or largely concealed, their facial features. (This also allowed sympathetic Police Officers to fairly say, "We don't know who they are.") E.g., this included dressing up as "Vikings," and wearing "Viking helmets" with two horns coming out the top of them, and a facial front-piece that breaks up and so blurs the wearer's facial features. When after a relatively short time the secular government finally relented of its foolish attempt to ban Bonfire Day, which proved as unpopular in the mid 19th century under the secular state as it had 200 years earlier in the mid 17th century under the Puritan's republic; Lewes still kept the tradition of fancy-dress in their Bonfire Night Parade. However, the fancy dress was expanded, and so no longer necessarily includes any effort to conceal or blur facial features.

Thus the colourful procession continued on this 5 November 2008 Bonfire Night, including marchers with hand-held fiery torchlights. Then came one of the Cliffe Bonfire Society groups carrying 17 blazing crosses, one for each of the 17 Protestant Marian martyrs killed at Lewes by the Papist Queen, Bloody Mary. They marched back and forth over Cliffe Bridge, carrying these 17 blazing crosses high in the night air. With a birds-eye view of the action on Cliffe Bridge, I was able with no other spectators in front of me, to see one of the highlights of the night, as those carrying the 17 crosses then individually walked up to

⁹⁷ CBS Programme, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

edge of Cliffe Bridge, and threw their cross into the River Ouse. Thus Lewes remembers her 17 Marian Martyrs on Papists' Conspiracy Day.

The procession continued. As I stood at Cliffe Bridge with the Police everywhere along the street, I saw marchers carrying banners reading, e.g., "We Burn to Remember" on a banner with two fiery torchlights attached to its top. Another banner with three fiery torchlights attached to its top read, "NO POPERY," and was followed by those in fancy-dress as "Vikings" carrying fiery hand-held torch-lights. A kilted Scottish piped band also marched past, playing its bagpipes and other instruments. More fancy-dress included those who appeared to be wearing some kind of sailor's uniforms, also carrying fiery hand-held torch-lights. Suddenly fireworks were dropped and detonated all over Cliffe Bridge, and as the Police watched on, the smoke and red-paper of the fire-crackers blew all around in the air.

Also dragged past on a large float, was "a Guy." A "Guy" is a large wooden effigy, variously made about 2 to 3 times life-size, of Guy Fawkes, which is later burnt at the relevant Bonfire Society's Bonfire. The "Guy" had his hands tied behind his back and was wearing the stereotypically tall black hat of a Bonfire "Guy." He had a hangman's rope around his neck, pulling his head forward so as to make him look shamefacedly towards the ground. The "Guy" was hauled over Cliffe Bridge in a float surrounded by fiery torchlights, as the Police continued to watch on.

More fancy-dress marchers came past, seemingly dressed at King's Guards or some kind of Royalist Officers. They wore red on black cloaks bearing the Latin initials, "IR" for "King James," the Protestant King whom the Papists under Guy Fawkes had tried to blow up in the gunpowder treason of 5 November 1605. Hence the significance of crackers and other gunpowder fireworks on 5 November, remembering this foiled attempt of sedition against the Crown, Supreme Governor of the Church of England. They too were carrying fiery hand-held torch-lights. Then came an open blazing barrel, with burning embers blowing into the night air as it passed over Cliffe Bridge.

With my birds-eye view of the action on Cliffe Bridge, *supra*, I was once again able to clearly see with no other spectators in front of me, another of the night's highlights. This relates to the words of the Bonfire Ditty about "the Pope," "Burn him in a tub of tar. Burn him like a blazing star." (I shall again return to this part of the ditty, when I later recount matters at the Bonfire sight.) For the moment, suffice to say, "Here comes the tub of tar." Surrounded by those carrying fiery hand-held torch-lights, a lane from the road to the very top of Cliffe Bridge, with a ceremonial type-guard each side was formed, and the blazing barrel of tar was first carried up to the edge of the bridge, and then cast over the top of the bridge into the River Ouse.

Then the procession march continued for a short while. This included a group who were carrying a reduced size replica of the Lewes Martyrs' Memorial to the 17 Protestant Marian Martyrs killed by the Papists in the mid 16th century. A banner bearing the words, "NO POPERY," then came by. In general though not exact time terms, the burning barrel of tub marks, and so comes near, the end of this parade. As marchers exited, Cliffe Bridge again went up in a series of detonated fire-crackers with smoke and red cracker paper enveloping the surrounding air. Sky rockets and other aerial fireworks also went up near the bridge. This marked the end of the main procession. People could now move off to their separate respective seven different Bonfire sites.

It was now about 7.45 p.m., and the Cliffe Bonfire I was attending was not scheduled to start till about 9 p.m. . I moved off the bridge and sat down for about 15 minutes, resting my very tired legs on a nearby public seat I fortuitously found a vacant spot on. (“Thankyou God.”) I knew it to be about a 15 minute walk to the Cliffe Bonfire Society’s bonfire site, and wanting to get there before the main crowds left in the scheduled 8.45 “march” to the site, I set off at about 8 pm.

On the way I saw people in the streets holding burning “sparklers.” This is a hand-held long pencil-shaped firework, which for about the first 75% of its length burns slowly, as with a bright white glow, it emits a shower of sparks. I had not seen “a sparkler” since I had celebrated Bonfire Night as a boy, and when I saw people holding “sparklers” in the street I suddenly remembered I had totally forgotten about them⁹⁸. (Sadly, personal fireworks have been banned in New South Wales for over a quarter of a century.) As I continued to move towards the Cliffe Bonfire Society site I was very glad that I had already familiarized myself with the location much earlier in the day, when it was broad day-light.

I was also glad for the clear day-light photographs I had taken of the effigies of the Pope and Guy Fawkes earlier in the day at the Cliffe Bonfire Society site. I shall divide these into “Bonfire 1,” “Bonfire 2,” and “Bonfire 3,” since on the night they were separately lit.

The first of these, had on top of a large bonfire whose wood spiralled up into the air, both a wooden effigy of the Pope and also “a Guy” i.e., Guy Fawkes. They were seated in chairs, with their backs tied to each other, so that the Pope looked one way and Guy Fawkes looked the other way. This cone-shaped pile of wood rose *c.* 3 or 4 yards / meters into the air. I shall hereafter refer to this as “Bonfire 1.”

These figures were also shown on two further large effigies. As one faced the main part of the bonfire site, with Bonfire 1 to one’s right, these were both to the left of Bonfire 1. One effigy, hereafter called, “Bonfire 2,” was “a Guy.” It showed Guy Fawkes in his stereotypically tall black hat. He was depicted holding a barrel of gunpowder on his right-hand shoulder. He also had about a dozen barrels of gunpowder surrounding him. These artistically recalled the words of a Bonfire Day Ditty, in which one always says, “God save

⁹⁸ Due to bushfire problems in Australia, in those parts of south-eastern Australia that I grew up in during the 1960s and 1970s, Bonfire Night was moved back from (what in Australia is) the hotter weather of 5 November to cooler weather of the Monday long-weekend of Queen’s birthday. In Eastern Australia, Queen’s Birthday (Queen Elizabeth II, Regnal Years: From 6 Feb. 1952), is in early June i.e., Bonfire Day was still a day of loyalty to the Crown, since Guy Fawkes had tried to blow up *the King* (with his son and heir) and Parliament, when King James was present in 1605. (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.) Moreover, the usage of fireworks was always explained through reference to Guy Fawkes foiled plot to blow up the Parliament with gunpowder 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).

the King,” with reference to King James I of the King James Bible i.e., these words do not, as per usual, change to “God save the Queen,” if there is a crowned queen. The ditty is:

“Remember, remember the fifth of November,
 The gunpowder treason and plot,
 I know of no reason why the gunpowder treason,
 Should ever be forgot.
 Guy Fawkes, Guy Fawkes, ’twas his intent,
 To blow up the King and Parlia-ment.
 Three score barrels of powder below,
 Poor old England to overthrow:
 By God’s Providence he was catch’d,
 With a dark lantern and burning match.
 Holloa boys, holloa boys, makes the bells ring,
 Holloa boys, holloa boys, God save the King!
 Hip hip, Hoorah! Hip hip, Hoorah!”

Then in between Bonfire 1 (the Pope & the Guy) and Bonfire 2 (the Guy), was a large effigy of the Pope. He was wearing a white mitre with red trimming, and a red stole. The depiction of Pope Paul V’s face (Pope: May 1605 to 1621) was most uncomplimentary to him. He was seated up in the air on a Papal throne. I shall hereafter refer to this as “Bonfire 3.” As I shall later more fully explain, on the night, this effigy was relevant to the words of the Bonfire Day Ditty:

“A penny loaf to feed the Pope,”
 “A faggot of sticks to burn him.
 Burn him in a tub of tar.
 Burn him like a blazing star.
 Burn his body from his head.
 Then we’ll say ‘old Pope is dead.’
 Hip hip, Hoorah! Hip hip, Hoorah!”

At about 8.15 p.m., I arrived at the Cliffe Bonfire Society site down near the Lewes Leisure Centre, accessed via Pinwell Road. I was very pleased to learn that there were only two other spectators there. I took up what I knew to be a good spot, based on my day-time knowledge of the locations of Bonfires 1,2, and 3. While the outline of Bonfires 1,2, & 3, were visible, these were now enveloped in a general darkness, with only a small amount of artificial lighting at the bonfire sight; so that if one did not already know what these were, then in the darkness, one could not at this stage guess.

Between 8 p.m. and 9 p.m., I spoke to one of the Cliffe Bonfire Society people who was guarding a cordon that kept back spectators, and which I was at the front of. I was interested to learn that he was “a Cockney.” From time to time he had to look around “the Johnny ’Orner” (Cockney, “corner”) to make sure no-one was leaving the beaten “parf” (Cockney, “path”), and climbing over the rail. “It ain’t ’alf hot,” as the Cockney would say, to learn there are still some Cockney people about (though you will probably look in vain to find many of them in their historic stomping grounds of East London!) Up till about the end of World War II, a Cockney was a white Christian Englishman, generally of the London

working class, born under the sound of Bow Bell i.e., St Mary-le-Bow Church of England near St. Paul's Cathedral. (Referred to, with other East End London churches, in the rhyme, "Oranges and Lemons.") Yet this man had been brought up in the country. How so for "a Cockney"? He told me the sad story of how the white Cockney of East London had largely started to exit East London in the 1950s and 1960s because of the large presence of coloured people brought in by the secular state government. He explained that some culturally derived "Cockney" communities had moved to various places in the country-side, where they could better maintain a white Protestant English heritage. For such Cockneys, "Hy' Par'" ("Hyde Park" as they would say it), is now largely a memory or something they may see on an occasional visit to London. I gave him my white racist Christian sympathies and support, referring to various Scriptural passages opposing what had happened to London and elsewhere in the post World War Two era (Gen. 10 & 11)⁹⁹.

By the time 9 p.m. came, the place was absolutely packed out (I'm pleased to say, that like elsewhere on the night, *by the white man*). I was very glad to be up at the front of the cordon. The Cliffe Bonfire Society made a total about 5,700 torches, each about 2-3 feet long (c. 60-90 cm) for Bonfire Day in 2008¹⁰⁰; and Bonfire marchers arrived at the site carrying their hand-held fiery torchlights. As part of the fireworks display, at various times beautiful shells exploded in the sky. (These are a circular shaped firework, discharging lines of flames outwards from the middle which in toto form a circular or shell shape. The completed burst shell-shape varies depending on the size of the shell, from c. 30 yards / metres up to c. 200 or c. 300 yards / metres.) Spectators (of which I joined in as one of them,) were heard to call out, "NO POPER!!!"

Then the main action started! First Bonfire 1 was lit with a hand-held fiery torchlight. The flames generated on this large cone-shaped pile of wood rising about 3 to 4

⁹⁹ I would like to see the UK (and other Western lands) ethnically "cleansed ... from all" coloureds and non-Christians (other than Jews who in a Christian land may be permitted as an unusual and one-off exception) (Neh. 13:30). As many as possible should be repatriated; and the remainder segregated and sterilized (Matt. 19:12). It matters not how many generations they or their mixed race spawn have been in the land, under God's law (notwithstanding the fact that some very small amount of assimilation may be very occasionally permitted), they have no lawful business being here in their first place. It should be a "heinous" crime to refuse such sterilization if suchlike do not leave the country, and so attract the death penalty (Article 37, Anglican 39 Articles). But the execution, and the execution of any of their mixed race spawn that show any non-Caucasian features or who are not Christian, that so refuse to either leave the country or submit to sterilization, should be by public execution; that men may learn to fear and tremble at the commission of so terrible a moral crime as the destruction of white Caucasian race based nationalism in a culturally Christian land. Let them be denied burial, that their bodies may rot in public, and the birds of the air feed upon their carcasses (Num. 25:4); or if their numbers be very large, let their carcasses be burned (Gen. 18 & 19), and their remains publicly disposed of in the sewerage works, that they may be as "dung upon the ground" (Jer. 25:33). And as for those noble politicians, judges, and others involved in this ethnic cleansing, who so say, "Thus cleansed I them from all strangers" (Neh. 13:30), let be writ on their gravestones and public monuments erected to their memory these words, "Remember me, O my God, for good" (Neh. 13:31).

¹⁰⁰ CBS Programme, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

yards / metres into the air, acted to light up the life-size effigies of the Pope and Guy Fawkes seated in chairs on top of it. Bonfire 1 was geographically closest to the spectators, and the usage of these life-size figures acted to give it more of a “real-life” feel. I.e., on Bonfire 1 one could almost think that the Pope and Guy Fawkes really were being burnt in the faggots for their sedition against the *Protestant* Crown in 1605. It took a good 15 minutes for Bonfire 1 to burn. The flames leapt gloriously and spectacularly into the air, generating great balls of fire, and lighting up both “the Pope” and “the Guy” on top of it. In the end, Bonfire 1 came crashing down on itself into the ground as all the wood had burnt up on it, and “the Pope” and “the Guy” had been burnt to a cinder.

Two blazing crosses were now lit (symbols of martyrs), and allowed to burn, in broad terms directing people’s gaze by their location towards Bonfires 2 & 3.

Bonfire 2, a wooden effigy of Guy Fawkes with a barrel of gunpowder on top of his right shoulder, and standing amidst barrels of gunpowder, was suddenly ignited. This was done as streams of sky rockets shot out from around “the Guy” in a V shape, firing a large “V” for “*Victory*” over *Guy Fawkes* into the air, and igniting “the Guy.”

After “the Guy” had been burnt away, another blazing cross was lit.

Suddenly Bonfire 3 exploded into action exactly the same way as Bonfire 2 had done. Sky-rockets shot up from the effigy of the Pope in a V shape, firing a large “V” for “*Victory*” over *the Pope* into the air, and igniting “the Pope” as he sat on his Papal Chair. The Pope, with his two-horned papal mitre (cf. Rev. 13:11), was now very visible amidst the flames as he started to burn (cf. Rev. 20:10). Shells exploded in the air as the Pope burnt on his Papal Chair. A spectacular colour display of red and yellow flames occurred as more and more sky-rockets were fired from the Papal Chair in a large “V” shape. And then ... fireworks were ignited around the neck of the Pope, as balls of fire parallel with the ground went out from both sides of the Pope’s neck, and then ..., with a large “Bang” and explosion ..., the head of the Pope was blown off from the rest of his body.

This colourful blasting of the Pope’s head from off his body, thus recalled the words, “Burn his body from his head,” in the Bonfire Day Ditty:

“A penny loaf to feed the Pope, ...
 A faggot of sticks to burn him.
 Burn him in a tub of tar,
 Burn him like a blazing star.
Burn his body from his head.
 Then we’ll say ‘old Pope is dead.’
 Hip hip, Hoorah! Hip hip, Hoorah!

This burning of “the Pope,” in which, in effigy, a bonfire will “Burn his body from his head,” is the climax of the three bonfires. Thereafter, the nigh-sky exploded with sky-rockets and shells, in a series of spectacularly colourful displays.

Amidst such displays I then exited the Cliffe Bonfire Society site, slowly working my way through the labyrinth of people packing in, and by leaving before them, avoiding the great push that occurs when, *en masse*, they would all leave at about the same time. It was

now somewhere between about 10.00 p.m. and 10.30 p.m. .

I knew from their Programme that the Cliffe Bonfire Society ran some other events at about 11.00 p.m., with a Final Procession at about 11.45 p.m., which would “conclude,” according to their programme, “with Bonfire Prayers, ‘Rule Britannia,’ the National Anthem and ‘Auld Lang Syne’¹⁰¹.” But for me, this had already been “a late night,” and so I made my way back to my Hotel room, which was about a further 15 minutes away. As I did so, I saw fireworks exploding in the night-sky from a variety of different sources.

I thanked God then, as I thank him now, for the privilege of being able to attend the Bonfire Day celebrations on both the Eve of Bonfire Day and also Bonfire Night at Lewes in 2008. These pro-Protestant and anti-Papist celebrations capture the spirit of Papists’ Conspiracy Day, and while I would not condone all that I saw or heard at Lewes, nevertheless, in broad terms the Lewes Bonfire Day celebrations are a pointer in the right direction as to how Bonfire Day should be kept in its public celebratory form.

7b) *Gunpowder Treason Day: 5 November.*

This second volume of my textual commentary (Matt. 15-20), has been dedicated to God at *Mangrove Mountain Union Church* on Thursday 5 November 2009. This was in a meeting of Christians as Reformed Protestants, in what was otherwise a non-sectarian and independent meeting of Christian brethren. The Dedicatory Church Service was conducted by Alex Neil, an Elder of the Hawkesbury-Nepean Congregation (Western Sydney) in the *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia*, which is a Free Presbyterian Church¹⁰²; and the Sermon was by myself, an independent Anglican. The *Mangrove Mountain Union Church* (established 1912), is a traditional looking rural white wooden church with a slouched roof, picturesquely set in a beautiful woodlands region of Mangrove Mountain, north of, and not far from, the capital of New South Wales, Sydney¹⁰³. This Dedicatory Sermon will be available (for at least 12 months from November 2009), at *Sermon Audio*, on-line at the internet address of: www.sermonaudio.com. A written copy of it may be found in Appendix 6.

¹⁰¹ CBS Programme, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

¹⁰² Alex Neil is a Ruling Elder of the Free Presbyterian Church at 115 Mt. Druitt Rd., Mt. Druitt (in Western Sydney), N.S.W., 2770. The stamps inside the Bibles of this church read, “Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia (commonly known as Free Presbyterian) Hawkesbury-Nepean Congregation.”

¹⁰³ Corner of Bloodtree Rd. & Wisemans Ferry Rd., Mangrove Mountain, N.S.W., 2250. A Union Church is simply a church building, designated by the local council for usage as a church. It is then used by different persons, churches, or groups. The Constitution of this particular Union Church requires that those who are hiring it out both profess to be Christians, and believe in the *Nicene Creed* (so that hiring access is thus denied to e.g., Jehovah’s Witnesses or Mohammedans). However, as with other Union Churches, each person or group that hires out the church does so independently, and gives no intrinsic religious support, recognition, nor endorsement to, any other person, church, or group that hires it out, nor to any other Union Church.

In Protestantism, the memory of a saint on the Church's Calendar, simply refers to a member of the universal sainthood of all believers, who has left some particular *example* that is *worthy of emulation* (Philp. 3:17). Thus e.g., All Saints' Day has a very wide potential for referring to any Christian believer who may wish to be remembered. Lutheran and Anglican Protestants have historically exercised their Christian liberties under Rom. 14:5,6, to "esteemeth one day above another," and "regardeth the day ... unto the Lord" with various holy days other than Sunday (John 20:1,19,26; Acts 2:1; 20:7; I Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10). By contrast, Puritan Protestants have historically preferred to exercise their Christian liberties under Rom. 14:5,6, to "esteemeth every day alike" (Rom. 14:5), and so only keep Sunday holy (Exod. 20:8-11); although in more recent historical times an increasing number of Puritan derived Protestants have been prepared to keep Christmas (25 Dec) and Good Friday in conjunction with Easter Sunday. But I have e.g., known of Free Presbyterians who still keep no day holy other than Sunday. Rom. 14:5,6 gives Christian liberty to both groups.

The general hagiological principle evident in the *Church of England's* Book of Common Prayer, 1662, or the *Church of Ireland's* Book of Common Prayer, 1666, is that red-letter days are reserved for Christian figures in the New Testament, or red letter days with their own Office are reserved for specifically Protestant figures¹⁰⁴. Thus e.g., the 1661 Act of Parliament (12 Car. II, chapter 30) 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 Charles¹⁰⁵. Certainly this is *Anglican* Protestant history as opposed to *Puritan* Protestant history; but nevertheless, it is clearly *Protestant* hagiology.

Therefore in both the 1662 and 1666 prayer books, one finds *Charles I's Day* (30 Jan., Anglican Protestant support¹⁰⁶), *Charles II's Day* (*Royal Oak Day*¹⁰⁷, 29 May, Anglican Protestant support, and broader Protestant support among *some* Puritans¹⁰⁸, especially though

¹⁰⁴ A qualified exception for red letter days is All Saints' Day (I Nov.), which contains within it a discretion that means it may be used to focus on various saints which either have black letter days, or which have no mention on the Calendar, from any era.

¹⁰⁵ This plenary Protestant spirit clearly evident in the 1661 Act which first instituted *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.

¹⁰⁶ 2009 is the 360th anniversary of 1649; and I shall make some more detailed reference to this in the section on the Anglican Calendar in the revised Volume 1 of this Commentary.

¹⁰⁷ Like *Bonfire Day* for 5 November, *Royal Oak Day* (or *Oak Apple Day*) for 31 May is more populist terminology. It refers to the oak tree (the Royal Oak) near Boscobel House at Shropshire, England, where Charles II hid after the Battle of Worcester (1651).

¹⁰⁸ With respect to Royal Oak Day, Papists' Conspiracy Day, Irish Massacre Day, and Accession Day of a reigning monarch, it should be remembered that while the Puritans

not exclusively, Presbyterians from Scotland¹⁰⁹), and *Papists' Conspiracy Day* (*Bonfire Day / Bonfire Night*, 5 Nov., Broad Protestant support); and also in the 1666-1800 Church of Ireland prayer book (thereafter at law a publicly recognized black letter day, 1801-1859), *Irish Massacre Day* (23 Oct., Broad Protestant support). So too, an Accession Service (since 1689 there has been Broad Protestant support for the Protestant Crown) in various forms existed before Queen Anne, but from Queen Anne's reign to this day, (with some modifications to service,) annually remembering with thanksgiving to God the day upon which a monarch began to reign, is interconnected with the fact that the throne is Protestant and the monarch is Supreme Governor of the Church of England. The annual date of the Accession Service varies from monarch to monarch e.g., the present annual Office of Accession for Elizabeth the Second falls on 6 February. The basic idea of this, with which I am in full agreement, is that we should liturgically focus primarily on *Biblical* Christianity (red-letter days) and *Protestant* Christianity (red-letter days with an Office, since 1859 only *Accession Day* for the monarch who is Supreme Governor of the *Church of England*,) because Protestant Christianity is Biblical Christianity.

Nevertheless, a selection of better figures from church history outside of these two

historically forbade holy days other than Sunday, paradoxically, they allowed some days of public fasting or Thanksgiving. Thus these four State days might still be remembered as Days of Thanksgiving by those in such a Puritan tradition, and indeed historically some Puritan Protestants have so remembered them; although this is always a personal choice, and others in such a tradition have chosen not to so remember them. (By contrast, I know of no historical instances of Puritans keeping Charles I's Day as a fast day.)

¹⁰⁹ The Puritans are historically divided over Charles II. On the one hand, the English Puritans passed an Ordinance to prevent Charles II being proclaimed king of England or Ireland after his father's martyrdom on 30 Jan. 1649. But on the other hand, Scottish Puritans in the Parliament of Scotland, counted their parliament in the regal years of Charles I until his death, (although do not historically recognize him as a specifically Christian "martyr,") and then counted it in the regnal years of Charles II. They recognized Charles II's reign from the time of Charles I's death, proclaiming him *King of the Scots* (and recognizing him as king of the three kingdoms) on 5 Feb. 1649, and crowning him King of Scotland on 1 Jan. 1650. They never accepted the republic, but were occupied by the English republican army following the Battle of Worcester. On the one hand, Puritan royalist soldiers from Scotland fought for Charles II at the Battle of Dunbar, Scotland, in 1650, and the Battle of Worcester, England in 1651; but on the other hand, following the Battle of Worcester in 1651, Puritan republican soldiers searched in vain to find and kill Charles II when he hid in the Royal Oak. On the one hand, Puritan republican revolutionaries deprived first Charles I and then Charles II of their throne, sending Charles II into exile on the Continent; but on the other hand, when the Puritan republic ran out of puff'n'steam, repentant Puritan royalists invited Charles II back from the Continent with the Restoration in 1660. On the one hand, Charles II gave his royal assent to provisions depriving English Puritans of their religious freedoms. But on the other hand, he later argued unsuccessfully against the Westminster Parliament for their greater religious freedom. *In short, the Puritans were inconsistent in their dealings with Charles II, and Charles II was inconsistent in his dealings with them.* On the one hand, some Puritan derived Protestants have historically remembered Royal Oak Day; but on the other hand, others of them have not.

periods of time might be given a black letter day. Such days have no specific or necessary religious observance, and so while such figures are in some way regarded as worthy of being remembered, there is also a qualification that what one makes of them is largely left to private judgment. Depending on local customs, such days may have some kind of public celebration, for instance, St. Audrey's Fair (Etheldreda, 17 Oct.), St. George's Day (23 April, the national saint of England), or St. David's Day (1 March, the national saint of Wales).

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). The BCP Calendar has ten broad divisions¹¹⁰

The tenth division is a selection of Protestant history with respect to Great Britain and Ireland. This is represented in *Papists' Conspiracy Day* (5 Nov.). This was a Red Letter Day, which not only had its own Collect and Readings for Communion, Matins, and Evensong, but also had its own Office (or Service), the *Gunpowder Treason Deliverance Service*. Thus the BCP (1662) regards it as an important Anglican Feast Day. Little wonder then the King James Version is sometimes called, the St. James Version.

At the time of the Protestant Reformation, Henry VIII broke with Rome, moving more and more towards Protestantism throughout his life, and finally embracing it on his deathbed. The torch of Protestant truth was then carried by Edward VI, Elizabeth I, and other monarchs. When we think of Christian kings such as James I and Charles I, for all their imperfections and human frailties, their belief in Christianity was a fulfillment of Biblical prophecy. Isaiah foretold this. "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will lift up mine hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people: and they shall bring their sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon thy shoulders. And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers" (Isa. 49:22,23). How privileged such people were to have good and godly kings and queens who were the "nursing fathers" and "nursing mothers" of the Christian church!

This is referred to in the Dedicatory Preface of the Authorized (King James) Version, "To the Most High and Mighty Prince James," "Defender of the Faith." Here the translators say of King James, that "by caring for the Church," he was "as a most tender and loving *nursing father*." They then say, "There are infinite arguments of this right Christian and religious affection in Your Majesty; but none is more forcible to declare it to others than the vehement and perpetuated desire of accomplishing and publishing of this work ... of the Holy Scriptures into the English tongue."

Thus the King James Version manifests a Biblical prophecy. That is because, in the first instance, the fact that King James, known as, "The British Solomon," was a Christian king, was a fulfillment of the prophecy of Isa. 49:22,23 concerning the rise of Gentile Christian states, i.e., that from "the Gentiles" God would make "kings ... thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers." Then in the second instance, it is clear from the

¹¹⁰ For a more detailed discussion of these, see my work, *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist*, *op. cit.*, "The Anglican Calendar" in Part 1, "Prefatory Remarks and Principles."

Dedicatory Preface of the KJV, that King James exercised this role of being “a most tender and loving nursing father,” by very specifically having the King James Version published. Thus we who hold in our hands the KJV, hold in our hands an amazing fulfillment of Biblical prophecy!

After the Calendar of 1561 under Elizabeth I, (with slight modification found in the BCP 1662), from 1578, the great Reformation history embraced by Anglican Protestantism was itemized in the Notes to the Calendar of the Elizabethan Prayer Book of 1559. (This prayer book remained in use till the time of King Charles I, when made “illegal” by Cromwell’s Puritan regime). These Notes both reflected and manifested the fact, that the Eve of All Saints’ Day (31 Oct.) was an annual Protestant festival, remembering Luther’s 95 theses. Thus these 1578 Notes to the Calendar of the Elizabethan Anglican Prayer Book said that on, “This day, in” “1517,” “Martin Luther gave his proposition in” the “University of Wittenberg, against” the “Pope’s” doctrines of “pardon.” These Elizabethan Notes to the Calendar of the prayer book, further refer to Luther, together with Huss, Melancthon, Calvin, and Zwingli. This shows the importance of these Protestant figures to Reformation Anglicanism, and the fact that their godly examples were deemed worthy of remembrance.

Following on from this, in addition to being a day to remember pre-Reformation saints, All Saints’ Day itself (1 Nov), naturally evolved into a day to also remember great Protestant saints. A good Reformed Anglican Minister could preach a sermon on e.g., Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli in celebration of these Protestant saints on All Saints’ Day. This was further intensified with the addition of Papists’ Conspiracy Day (5 Nov). I.e., the Eve of All Saints’ Day (31 Oct., Feast of Luther’s 95 Theses, 1517), All Saints’ Day (1 Nov), and Papists’ Conspiracy Day (5 Nov.), may form a liturgical trilogy in a Protestant week focusing on Protestant hagiology. If so, the threefold focus is, the start of the Reformation (Eve of All Saints’ Day), one or more Protestant saints (All Saints’ Day), and safeguarding the gains of the Reformation (Papists’ Conspiracy Day). (And if the Sunday in this Protestant week does not fall on one of these three days, then a further Protestant history emphasis in the Sunday sermon.) While the prayer book allows such a Protestant Week as a private view, it does not require it as part of the publicly declared doctrine of the Anglican Church, and until historically modern times, *Church of England* prayer book hagiology for the 16th and 17th centuries more usually focused on Protestant history via a strong focus on the monarch as Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church. The exception to this was the Church of England’s *New Calendar* of 1578 (and in the *Church of Ireland*, a semi-exception was *Irish Massacre Day*). Thus (with a qualification in regard to the Ireland¹¹¹), the Anglican Church

¹¹¹ The qualification is that from 1666 to 1800 the Anglican *Church of Ireland’s* Calendar included as a red letter day with its own Office, *Irish Massacre Day* (23 Oct.), as a martyrs’ memorial service of those Protestants killed by Papists in 1641, *supra*. Its memory continued more generally thereafter in law as a publicly recognized black letter day in Ireland till 1859 and as a red letter day on the Anglican Calendar of Ireland. From 1859 it no longer had the benefit of any legal recognition. Thus when this day is so remembered, there is in effect a period of about a fortnight which has a liturgical focus on upholding the truthfulness of Protestantism against Popery with 23 October (Office of *Irish Massacre Day*) and 5 November (Office of *Papists’ Conspiracy Day*). Although the day had some focus on Kings Charles’ I and II, to a large extent this *Church of Ireland* holy day was like the *Church of England* 1578 Notes to the Calendar of the Anglican Prayer Book of 1559, in that its focus was not primarily on the monarch as Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church. I shall

only historically required the climax of any such week i.e., *Papists' Conspiracy Day*.

E.g., in such a Protestant Week 2007, on 31 October I remembered Luther's 95 Theses and the start of the Reformation. The theme of All Saints' Day was remembered by me from 1-4 November 2007, with special reference in my mind to two Protestant Christian saints. One was Anglican, Richard Johnson (1753-1827), who conducted the first Christian service in Australia (deservedly remembered on 3 February in the Calendar of the Anglican Church of Australia's *An Australian Prayer Book, 1978*¹¹²); and the other was Puritan, John

discuss *Irish Massacre Day* more fully in a future volume. From 1801 to 1871 the *Church of England* and *Church of Ireland* were united and used the 1662 *Church of England* prayer book. Thus the C. of I. had Charles I's Day (30 Jan), Charles II's Day (Restoration) (29 May), and Papists' Conspiracy Day (5 Nov.) removed from their Calendar at the same time the C. of E. did in 1859.

¹¹² I generally do not support these two modern prayer books, but agree with a small amount of the changes in them. 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 additional black letter days found on both the 1978 & / or 1980 Calendars, some local Australian ones in the 1978 Calendar, and a small number of other black letter days. 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 the 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 Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*. The Australian 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 support the

Bunyan of Bedford (1628-1688), the Baptist author of e.g., *Pilgrim's Progress*.

Both Johnson and Bunyan were AV men. E.g., on the corner of Hunter & Bligh Streets, Sydney, a stone memorial celebrates Chaplain Johnson's First Christian Service. One face of the monument reads, "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." Or in his dissertation on the *Ruin of Antichrist*, Bunyan quotes from II Thess. 2 in the AV. Bunyan refers to Pope as "the man of sin" (II Thess. 2:3, AV). He upholds the work of the English Reformation, saying that "the noble King, Henry VIII," "the good King Edward his son," and the "Queen [Elizabeth I] also, the sister to King Edward," all cast down the "Antichristian-worship" of "Antichrist"¹¹³. Bunyan is not alone in his recognition of Antichrist. Indeed, in King James' work, *A paraphrase upon the Revelation of the Apostle S. John*, King James the First said Rev. 13 refers to "the Pope's arising." And in the Dedicatory Preface to this same King James in the King James Version of 1611, the AV translators upheld King James' recognition that the Pope was the "man of sin" (II Thess. 2:3).

On Saturday 3 Nov. 2007 I attended a Prayer Book Society (PBS) service in Sydney conducted by a retired Anglican clergyman, John Bunyan (b. 1940). He advised me that he had traced his Bunyan ancestry to Bedford in England. On the one hand, he said he was not a descendant of the 17th century Puritan, John Bunyan; but on the other hand, he said that the Bunyans of Bedford were a small family, and so he could confidently say that both he and the Puritan, John Bunyan, had a common Bunyan ancestor from Bedford, England. The two services he conducted, Matins and Communion, were from the 1662 prayer book and Authorized Version. I attended Matins, but did not remain after the break for Communion. This was both the first and last PBS service I have attended, since it emerged from both this service and literature that PBS sent me, that PBS lacks a suitable commitment to the principles of Protestantism¹¹⁴. On the one hand, I was forcefully reminded that just because

inclusion of a small number of black letter days for traditional Irish figures, namely, Bridget (Brigid), who like Patrick was on the old Sarum Calendar (1 Feb., if transferred to 7 or 8 Feb. to keep the Calendar uncluttered, this is still close enough to 1 Feb. to maintain the Irish tradition of annually making a St. Brigid's Cross from rushes around this time); Kilien of Ireland (8 July), Columba of Iona (9 June), and possibly Kevin (3 June). I would also add such Protestant figures as John Donne (31 March, Dean of St. Paul's Church of England Cathedral, London, d. 1631); and James Ussher (4 Jan., *Church of Ireland Primate*, d. 1656).

¹¹³ Owens, W.R. (Ed), *John Bunyan*, Vol. 13, Miscellaneous Works, "Of Antichrist and His Ruine," 1692, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1994, pp. 434,438,440,441.

¹¹⁴ Before attending this service, I had been misadvised by a PBS member that, "Bunyan is an orthodox PBS man but the Anglo-Catholics have tried to 'quieten' him." But Bunyan's conduct at this meeting did not support this claim. E.g., he referred to the Minister of the Church (Holy Trinity Anglican Church, Dulwich Hill) as "Father" (and this same title was used for him on the flyer given out) (Matt. 23:9); he nodded at the Communion Table; and he said he had formerly been an Assistant Minister at St. James, King Street (a well known Puseyite Church). Likewise, PBS literature sent to me (Prayer Book Society in Australia, New South Wales Branch, *Newsletter*, October 2007), supported Puseyism (referring to PBS services in the Puseyite Diocese of Bathurst), sex role perversion (referring favourably to the ordination of priestesses etc., I Tim. 2:8-3:13), and sexual perversion

a Minister or a church uses the Authorized Version, that does not necessarily mean that such a Minister or Church is *ipso facto* orthodox. But on the other hand, elements of this Matins service reminded me of the Anglican Church's better days when the 1662 prayer book and AV were more generally used in Reformed (Evangelical) Anglican Churches.

Then on Sabbath 4 Nov. 2007, as an Anglican visitor, I attended a Free Presbyterian Church (St. George's *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia*, Castlereagh Street, Sydney). Both the AV and old *Church of Scotland* Psalter in this church were printed by the Trinitarian Bible Society in the UK. St. George's is an AV only Church; and I commended the Minister (Reverend John McCallum) for maintaining the Authorized (King James) Version in his church, and also for the general message of his sermon on Mark 13.

I marked the climax of this Protestant Week in 2007 with *Gunpowder Treason Day* on Monday 5 November, as is my custom, by wearing an orange tie. The colour orange for Protestants as popularized in Ireland derives from the importance of King William III of Orange. E.g., cockades were historically worn by Protestants in Ireland on *Papists' Conspiracy Day*, that contained the colour orange (for William III) and blue (formerly the colour of Ireland). So too, orange ribbons and lilies were also worn by Protestants¹¹⁵.

As a Protestant of Irish descent, I am happy to so thank God for his deliverance and protection of Protestantism throughout the British Isles on *Papists' Conspiracy Day*. When buying some stationary items on this day, a check-out girl at the till of a Sydney department store complemented me on my tie, which she took to be an unusually colourful and attractive all orange silky shiny tie (an Italian tie made by Frangi). I was able to use the opportunity to tell her it stood for "Gunpowder Treason Day," or "the old Bonfire Night," remembering the attempt to kill King James in 1605 and the coming of William of Orange to be king in 1688. I told her no more than this. Though this was only a very basic introduction to the deeper meanings of this day, it is a starting point, and for some people, it is as far as they will ever go in understanding it. (But similar issues arise with Christmas and Easter. In all such cases, I think some knowledge is better than none.)

Thus I am pleased that the memory of kings important to the history of the Reformation, are remembered in various ways. E.g., in 2001, I was privileged to inspect Hampton Court Palace in London (Greater London), England, UK. At the time I was living at West Croydon in London (Greater London), and I was able to get there on two separate occasions by bus trips. This Palace is remembered because under King James I (Regnal Years: 1603-1625), the *Hampton Court Conference* of 1604 started the process that culminated in the King James Version of 1611. Hence in the Authorized Version's Prefatory address, "The Translators to the Reader"¹¹⁶, we read, "For the very historical truth is, that

(criticizing the Evangelical Diocese of Sydney's opposition to "them that defile themselves with mankind," I Tim. 1:10, cf. Lev. 18:22,24). *Such are the hazards we Reformed (Evangelical) Anglicans face and must dodge in this Laodicean church age (Rev. 3:14-22).*

¹¹⁵ Hill, J., "National festivals, the State & 'Protestant Ascendancy' in Ireland, 1790-1829," *Irish Historical Studies*, Vol. 24, 1984-5, pp. 30-51, at pp. 33,43.

¹¹⁶ Scrivener's 1873 Cambridge Paragraph Bible, reprint in Trinitarian Bible Society's *Classic Reference Bible*.

upon the ... petitions of the Puritans at His Majesty's coming to his Crown, 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 presently after gave order for this translation which is now presented unto thee. Thus much to satisfy our scrupulous brethren." But Hampton Court is also remembered because it was used as a Royal Palace by both King Henry VIII (Regnal Years: 1509-1547) and King William III (Regnal Years: 1689-1702; jointly with Queen Mary II, 1689-1694).

When visiting this amazing Palace in June 2001, I found that for the benefit of tourists such as myself, a number of its staff members were dressed in clothing from the era of the two kings who used it as a royal residence. Hence I had one photo taken of myself with a woman in a red dress who was dressed in the clothes of a lady-in-waiting to the Queen, in the Court of King Henry VIII; and another photo taken with two men and a young woman, one man in the green clothes of a merchant, the other man in the blue clothes of a physician, and the girl in the clothes of a maid; all three being costumed from the time of King William III. Inside the Palace, I saw such interesting sites as e.g., the Tudor Kitchen (Henry VIII was a Tudor King - the House of Tudor starting with King Henry VII in 1485 and ending with Queen Elizabeth I in 1603); the King's Staircase leading to King William III's rooms; and King William of Orange's study, where e.g., he gave his Royal Assent to Acts of Parliament e.g., the *Act of Settlement* (1701).

Papists' Conspiracy Day was first declared a "joyful day of deliverance" to be remembered annually by "due observation of the" "fifth day of November," by Act of Parliament in 1605. The statute, "An Act for a publick thanksgiving to Almighty God every year on the fifth day of November¹¹⁷," says, "... no nation of the earth hath been blessed" by "Almighty God" "with greater benefits than this kingdom," "having the true and free profession of the gospel under our most gracious sovereign lord King James," "enriched with a most hopeful and plentiful progeny, proceeding out of his royal loins," i.e., Prince Charles (later King Charles I). Nevertheless, "many malignant and devilish Papists, Jesuits, and seminary priests," "conspired most horribly, when the King's most excellent Majesty, the Queen, the Prince [Charles], and all the Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons, should have been assembled in the upper House of Parliament upon the fifth day of November in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred and five, suddenly to have blown up the said House [of Lords] with gun-powder"

This "would have turned to the utter ruin of this whole kingdom ..., therefore the King's most excellent Majesty ... and all his ... faithful ... subjects, do ... acknowledge this great ... blessing to have proceeded ... from God ..., and to his most holy name do ascribe all

¹¹⁷ 3 Jac. 1, chapter 1, in: Pickering, D. (Ed.), *The Statutes at Large*, from the 39th year of Queen Elizabeth to the 12th year of King Charles II, Cambridge University, England, 1763, Vol. 7, pp. 145-146. The whole Acts was repealed by, "An Act to repeal certain Acts and Parts 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 22nd year of the reign of ... Victoria: being the 3rd session of the 17th Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain & Ireland*, Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1859, pp. 5-6.

the honour, glory and praise: and to the end this unfeigned thankfulness may never be forgotten, but ... all ages to come may yield praises to His Divine Majesty for the same, [we enact] and have in memory THIS JOYFUL DAY OF DELIVERANCE.

“Be it therefore enacted That all ... Ministers in every Cathedral and parish church... within this realm of England ..., shall always upon the fifth of November say Morning Prayer, and give unto Almighty God thanks for this most happy deliverance And ... that every Minister shall give warning to his parishioners publicly in the church at Morning Prayer, the Sunday before every such fifth day of November, for the due observation of the said day, and that after Morning Prayer or preaching upon the said fifth day of November, they read publickly, distinctly and plainly this present Act.”

In the Church of England’s *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), the principal holy day designated with an Office, *specifically designed* to celebrate the truthfulness of Protestantism and God’s protection of Protestantism in the British Isles in 1605 and 1688, is *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* or *Gunpowder Treason Day* (5 Nov.)¹¹⁸. While originally celebrating just the protection of the Protestant King James I and Parliament from those seeking to re-establish Popery in 1605; it came to also include from 1689, a celebration of the coming of the Protestant King, William III on 5 Nov. 1688, against those seeking to re-establish Popery. Indeed, in the wider celebrations of *Papists’ Conspiracy Day*, from the time that in 1673 the Roman Catholic Duke of York, and future monarch, James II, both resigned all offices rather than take an anti-Papist oath under the *Test Act*, and also married the Popish Mary of Modena, the tradition arose of burning an effigy of the Pope on *Papists’ Conspiracy Day*¹¹⁹. Thus even before 1688, the day had acquired a particular anti-Papist element with respect to James II, that was then further heightened by the arrival of William of Orange on 5 November, 1688.

The associated Williamite *Act of Settlement* (1701), required that the monarch be a Protestant, reject “transubstantiation,” and declare that “the invocation or adoration of” “any” “Saint, and the sacrifice of the Mass,” “are superstitious and idolatrous,” “in the plain and

¹¹⁸ Before the Royal Warrant of 17 Jan. 1859 revoking the Royal Warrant of 21 June 1837 for the Services of 5 November, 30 January, and 29 May; and the later Act of 22 Victoria chapter 2, (25 March 1859), repealing relevant sections of various English, Great Britain, and Irish Acts, one finds in e.g., 24 George II, chapter 23, that on the Calendar of “Days of Fasting or Abstinence,” a section entitled, “Certain Solemn Days, for which particular Services are appointed,” and the first of these three in the United C. of E. & C. of I., which were continuing offices, (but not the black letter day of 23 October in Ireland,) together with the day of Accession Service whose date was changed for the reigning monarch as Supreme Governor of the C. of E. & C. of I, (since 1859 put in the singular for one Office rather than the plural for multiple Offices, i.e., “A Solemn Day, for which a particular Service is appointed,) is itemized as, “I. The Fifth of November, being the Day kept in Memory of the Papists Conspiracy.” So also on “The Calendar, with the Table of Lessons,” one finds for “November,” that day “5” is called, “Papists Conspir.” But while the term *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* is thus clearly used, the Office itself was called, “Gunpowder Treason,” and so “Gunpowder Treason Day” and “Papists’ Conspiracy Day” were alternative designations.

¹¹⁹ Chadwick, O., *The Reformation*, 1964, Penguin Books, 1972, reprint 1978, p. 292.

ordinary sense of the words,” “as they are commonly understood by English Protestants.” Commenting on this Act, the classic common law jurist, Sir William Blackstone, says in the first volume of his *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (p. 217), that this *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.” Thus *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* was an unmistakable Anglican celebration of Protestantism. This was e.g., manifested in the words of the Office which thanked God “for the happy arrival of His Majesty King William” in 1688, “for the deliverance of our Church and nation” “from popish tyranny,” and “to preserve” “our religion” (*Papists’ Conspiracy Day Office*, Book of Common Prayer, 1662, as altered to include reference to William III in 1689).

The fact that *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* was a rousing celebration of the truthfulness of Protestantism and its embrace by the *Church of England*, thus had a further particular significance because of its celebration on 5 November. That is because, while the Eve of All Saints’ Day (31 Oct.) and All Saints’ Day (1 Nov) may be used with this feast to form a Protestant trilogy; it is also the case that these two former days may be used to remember *any* and indeed *all* saints e.g., St. Basil the Great or St. John Chrysostom. This holy day, known in the prayer book as *Papists’ Conspiracy Day*, is found in the popular culture of England as “Guy Fawkes Day” or “Bonfire Day,” when bonfires are lit, and gunpowder rockets are sent into the night sky, to remember the defeat of the gunpowder treason plot of 5 November 1605, to blow up the Protestant King and Protestant Parliament, in order to reintroduce Popery. In terms of the wider culture of England, it is *the* annual Protestant Day in which is remembered that significant symbol of Protestantism, King James the First; and the associated defeat of the Roman Catholic forces of Guy Fawkes.

One of the traditional poems or ditties or rhymes used in this wider popular culture celebrations of *Bonfire Day* is the following.

Remember, remember the fifth of November,
 The gunpowder treason and plot,
 I know of no reason why the gunpowder treason,
 Should ever be forgot.
 Guy Fawkes, Guy Fawkes, ’twas his intent,
 To blow up the King and Parlia-ment.
 Three score barrels of powder below,
 Poor old England to overthrow:
 By God’s Providence he was catch’d,
 With a dark lantern and burning match.
 Holloa boys, holloa boys, makes the bells ring,
 Holloa boys, holloa boys, God save the King!
 Hip hip, Hoorah! Hip hip, Hoorah!

This Ditty may also be connected with the burning of “a Guy,” since the burning of an effigy of Guy Fawkes is a well-established *Bonfire Night* activity. These popular celebrations sometimes occur with the eating of special *Bonfire Night* foods. These include: parkin, a cake made with a black treacle; a toffee, which is a dark toffee with black treacle; and a traditional “apple lollypop,” made of an apple coated with toffee placed on a stick.

Potatoes are also sometimes baked in the fire of the bonfire or its embers (a modern form encases them in metal foil wrapping). *Potatoes have a symbolic significance because the Spanish Armada of 1588 tried to destroy Protestantism in the British Isles with the hope of enslaving it to Popery.* In human terms, the power of the Spanish Armada was too great for the English and Irish Royal Navy to inflict much damage on. But when the Armada rounded the north of the British Isles, the winds blew the Spanish Papists southwards, dashing them against the coasts of Scotland and Ireland, smashing and bashing them and their galleons into thousands of little pieces. About 15,000 papists were killed, and at least 40 Spanish galleons were destroyed, with only about 60 of the 130 ships of the Spanish Armada surviving. The medal struck to commemorate the defeat of the Spanish Armada makes no vain-glorious revisionist attempts to paint the Protestants as having won the day by their own strength, or stealth, or gallantry, or tactical brilliance. The medal struck by the Queen of England and Ireland, Queen Elizabeth I, to commemorate this victory contains the Latin inscription, *Flavit Deus et Dissipati Sunt*, meaning, “God blew and they were scattered.” When the Irish went to the shores of northern Ireland, they there found as booty of war, boxes of potatoes washed ashore from the Spanish Armada. Before this time, potatoes were essentially unknown in the British Isles, having been brought over from the Americas by the Spanish. The wise Irishmen found that these potatoes grew well in the climatic conditions of Ireland, and they soon came to replace other less productive crops. They later spread their influence throughout the British Isles. Thus potatoes in the British Isles may in the context of *Bonfire Day*, be characterized as Protestant trophies of victory over the Papists.

Certainly when I have been in London on 5 November, the memory of *Bonfire Day* has been present, with e.g., the night-sky lit by fire-rockets some days before and after this great event. E.g., even though I attended *Bonfire Night* at Lewes, outside of London in 2008, around that time of year I saw large posters at Wimbledon advertising “Bonfire & Fireworks” for both the Saturday night before *Bonfire Day*, Saturday 1 November at Morden Park, and also on *Bonfire Night* itself at Wimbledon Park on Wednesday 5 November. This was at a cost of £7 (seven pounds) per ticket, per night. Though I did not attend the weekend bonfire, I recall on the night of Saturday 1 November seeing many fireworks exploding in the air, which I assume were from this event, and if not, then they were from another similar bonfire. Also at Wimbledon (known in the wider popular culture for its tennis stadium and matches,) I recall a shop putting up a large “FIREWORKS” sign, in order to sell suchlike for *Bonfire Day*. Nor was Wimbledon unusual. London *Bonfire Night* celebrations were also held at e.g., Battersea Park (paid entry) and Victoria Park at Shoreditch (free entry). These *Bonfire Night* celebrations would have been more sedate than those I was privileged to witness at Lewes, but they nevertheless acted to celebrate the same basic event. E.g., the usage of fireworks gains its symbolism from the fact that the *gunpowder* treason plot under the Papist Guy Fawkes to blow up the Protestant King and Parliament was *unsuccessful*. This is an irreducible element in the fireworks symbolism of *Bonfire Night*.

In Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, we read an “Account of the Discovery of the Gunpowder Treason, in the Year 1605, in the reign of King James I.” This tells of the attempted regicide of King James the First. It recounts how the Roman Catholic Guy Fawkes, together with others, “consulting together how they might restore the Popish religion in England,” “proposed to kill the king,” together with members of Westminster Parliament “devoted to the Protestant religion,” by “blowing up” the King and Parliament. Involved were “two priests of the Jesuits’ order, who applauded the design,” “since it was to be

executed upon excommunicated heretics, a doctrine” “approved of by Pope Paul V” (Pope, May 1605-1621)¹²⁰. Hence the propriety in the tradition of burning effigies of both *Guy Fawkes* (“*the Guy*”) and *Pope Paul V* (“*the Pope*”) on *Bonfire Night*, *supra*.

But the great God of the universe, protected the Protestants from the Papists, and in gratitude, the Parliament enacted in 1606, that 5 November each year should be celebrated as *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* in thanksgiving to God for the protection of the Protestant religion in the British Isles from Popery. This great Protestant holy day, which from 1689, also included in the Office of the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), thanksgiving to God for the coming of the Protestant King, William of Orange (William III), on that same day, 5 November, 1688, to end the papists’ conspiracy to put a Roman Catholic on the throne of Great Britain and Ireland, necessarily had an important focus on King James I. This was the same King James that the dedicatory preface of the Authorized King James Version of the Bible (1611) was made to, and from which the name, “King James Version” derives. Thus the Authorized Version has a special place as *the* Protestant Bible, connected with King James, *the* king who symbolized the Protestant religion, that God protected in 1605, as remembered annually in *Papists’ Conspiracy Day*.

One of the reasons that the *King James Version* became *the* Protestant Bible, thus relates to the fact that King James was a great symbol of Protestantism. I thank God for the wonderful King James Version that came forth under his reign!

In thanking God for the King James Version, it should also be clearly understood, that one cannot thank God for this version, without simultaneously thanking him for the *Textus Receptus*. Thus the work of the good and godly men who produced the Received Text is also remembered. Specifically, such men as Erasmus of Rotterdam, Stephanus (Stephens) of Geneva, Beza of Geneva, the later Elzevirs of Leiden, and the King James translators of the British Isles.

¹²⁰ Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs* (1867), pp. 587-91; *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*, with the life of the martyrologist and a vindication of his work by George Townsend (1788-1857), Seeley, Burnside, & Seeley, London, 1843-49 edition, Vol. 7, pp. 324-6; Vol. 8, pp. 151,334-5.

Since the Authorized (King James) Bible was published six years after the foiled gunpowder treason plot of 1605, it was and is an important symbol of the triumph of Protestantism over Popery in the British Isles, as celebrated in *Papists' Conspiracy Day*. The King James Bible of 1611, was later made the Authorized Version by Act of Parliament in 1662 (*Act of Uniformity*). This states in the Preface to the Church of England's *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), that the "portions of holy Scripture ... are now ordered to be read according to the last Translation." Since the "last Translation" was the *King James Version* (KJV), this Act thus made the KJV the *Authorized Version* (AV) i.e., it was the *version authorized* to be read in *Church of England Churches* by Act of Westminster Parliament.

This same *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) has *Papists' Conspiracy Day* on the Calendar (5 Nov), and an Office or Service of "Thanksgiving" to annually remember *Gunpowder Treason Day*. This Office makes specific reference to King James; and thanks God for the preservation of the Protestant "religion." E.g., one of the Collects (Prayers), says to "Almighty God," "we yield thee our unfeigned thanks and praise, for the wonderful and mighty deliverance of our gracious Sovereign King James the First," "the royal branches," "nobility, clergy, and Commons," "then assembled in Parliament, by Popish treachery, appointed as sheep to the slaughter, in a most barbarous and savage" "conspiracy." The Office is entitled, "A Form of Prayer with Thanksgiving, to be used yearly upon the fifth day of November, for the happy deliverance of King James I, from the ... massacre by gunpowder: and also for the happy arrival of ... William on this day, for the deliverance of our Church and nation." The first prayer thanks God, "for wonderful and mighty deliverance of our gracious sovereign King James the First," from "Popish treachery." Thus through reference to King James, the Authorized King James Bible was linked to the one and only holy day on the Anglican Calendar that was a specific celebration of Protestantism over Popery (although the Eve of All Saints' Day may be used for remembering Luther's 95 Theses and associated Protestant Reformation); and was connected in the wider society with a rousing celebration of Protestantism that annually had church bells ringing and canons firing throughout the day, and bonfires ablaze at night. *Papists' Conspiracy Day* is very much a Protestant Day.

As already discussed, there is a Reformed Anglican tradition of using the honourific titular prefix "St.," for *prominent* "saints" from the first five centuries in general, e.g., St. Jerome and St. Augustine, (or less commonly first six centuries e.g., St. Gregory,) and for "saints" after this time only in a localized context, for instance, a church dedicated to the glory of God and in memory of a saint. Unlike in Roman Catholicism, such saints are understood simply as worthy examples (e.g., Philp. 3:17; II Thess. 3:9; Heb. 11; I Peter 5:3), in the universal sainthood of all believers (e.g., Rom. 1:7; Philp. 4:21). Given both this tradition, and the fact that *Papists' Conspiracy Day* was on one level, King James Day, it is of note that one tradition refers to the King James Version as the *Saint James Version*. Of course, King James would not normally be called "St. James" in this tradition, since he was not a prominent saint from the first five (or six) centuries. Nevertheless, in this localized context, one may, in this tradition, refer to the *Saint James Bible*.

For example, in discussing and defending “the Authorized Version,” “that came into being” under “King James,” “when the English language had reached its peak of richness and beauty,” the former President of the USA, Ronald Reagan (President 1981-1989), referred to it as “the *St. James Version*.” He asked, “what would you say if someone decided Shakespeare’s plays,” “or the music of Beethoven could be rewritten and improved?” In giving examples, he compared a number of passages from “the *St. James Version* and *Good News Bible*.” For instance, we read in Eccl. 1:18 of “the *St. James Version*,” “‘For in much wisdom is much grief: and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow.’ Is it really an improvement to say instead” in “the *Good News Bible*,” “‘The wiser you are, the more worries you have; the more you know the more it hurts’?” “The Christmas story has undergone some modernizing, but one can hardly call it improved. The wondrous words, ‘Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy,’ has become, ‘Don’t be afraid! I am here with good news for you’.” “In the New Testament, in Matthew, we read” in “the *St. James Version*,” “‘The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way’ [Matt. 3:3]. The *Good News Version* translates that, ‘Someone is shouting in the desert. Get the road ready.’ It sounds like a straw boss announcing lunch hour is over.” “The sponsors of the *Good News* version boast that their Bible is as readable as the daily paper - and so it is. But do readers of the daily news find themselves moved to wonder, ‘at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth’ [Luke 4:22]? Mr Hanser suggests that sadly the ‘tinkering and general horsing around with the sacred texts will no doubt continue It will not dawn on them that it has already been gotten right’.¹²¹”

The BCP (1662) rubric at *The Communion Service* requires that “every parishioner shall communicate at least three times in the year, of which Easter [is] to be one.” For those meeting just this basic requirement, the other two “obvious days” would have historically been Christmas and Papists’ Conspiracy Day. When in the nineteenth century, ungodly men sought as fifth columnists to destroy the wonderful Protestant heritage of the United Kingdom, both this holy day and the AV were attacked vigorously. Wicked and evil religious liberals, with the sentiment support of Puseyites, had this holy day and office of *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* removed from the *Book of Common Prayer* in 1859. No other religious day outside of Christmas and Easter was as popular. No other Protestant King had such a popular acclaim of “Saint” before his name¹²², found in the tradition of sometimes calling the *King James Bible* the *Saint James Bible*. Only a self-

¹²¹ Discussing Richard Hanser’s, “The Law and the Prophets” (NBC TV, Fox, USA) . This was part of a Radio address by Reagan some 3-4 years before he became President, on 6 Sept. 1977. Reagan was defending the AV against modern translations, especially “The *Good News Bible*” of 1966, (also known as “Today’s English Version”), which had a third edition published in 1971. (Ronald Reagan & the King James Bible,” www.av16.org/kjv/reagan.html).

¹²² Charles I is sometimes called, “Saint Charles,” e.g., some Churches dedicated in memory of King Charles are called, “St. Charles.” But such usage has never enjoyed anything like the wider more popular usage of “Saint James” in the “*Saint James Bible*.”

destructuring religion such as apostate Anglicanism, would seek to remove, or negligently allow to be removed, a day from its religious calendar that was so popular and significant to its people. While the ringing of church bells all day, the celebration of the Gunpowder Treason Service in *Church of England* churches, and the firing of canons were all great elements of the day before they were discontinued from 1859; they were not absolutely essential to its survival, which has continued outside the revised Anglican Calendar.

For example, I was also living in London for six months from October 2005 to April 2006¹²³. During that time there fell the 400th anniversary of 5 November 1605. On Saturday the 5th of November, 2005, I journeyed to St. John's Wood Road Baptist Church, London, (near Lord's Cricket Ground,) in order to attend the Autumn Conference of the *United Protestant Council*. The speaker was the Rt. Hon. Dr. Ian Paisley, Moderator of the Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster, Member of Parliament, and Privy Counsellor. Ian Paisley gave two addresses. The first at 1.00 p.m. was entitled, "The Glorious Revolution," and dealt with the events of 5 November 1688. The second at 3.00 p.m. was entitled, "The Gunpowder Plot," and dealt with the events of 5 November 1605, as the 400th anniversary of that event. At this *United Protestant Council* meeting, I spoke to Ian Paisley and had a photograph taken with him as a personal memento of this important event.

It is clear from this kind of *United Protestant Council* event I attended in London on 5 November 2005, that the memory of the events celebrated in *Papists' Conspiracy Day* continue to live on in the hearts and minds of godly Protestants, whether e.g., Anglican, Presbyterian, or Baptist. This was clearly a spiritual celebration of the day, and so like the old Anglican Office of *Papists' Conspiracy Day* had a religious focus; as distinct from the public celebration of Bonfire Day where people's levels of attendant Christian religiosity varies greatly, and includes ungodly persons for whom it becomes a night of e.g., drinking excess. For example around this time of the year a lot of fireworks were let off, but even for a number of people involved in such celebrations, the religious significance of the day is lost or marginalized. But this *United Protestant Council* meeting I attended, reminds us that the spiritual meaning of *Papists' Conspiracy Day* has continued to survive outside the Anglican Calendar since its removal as a red letter day in 1859, and I pray God, it will continue to be so remembered.

The removal of *Papists' Conspiracy Day* from the Calendar in 1859, and a short-lived attempt to actively suppress it, was as unpopular and unsuccessful as the attempt some 200 years earlier by the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60 to suppress, Christmas, Easter, and *Papists' Conspiracy Day* (together with the rest of the liturgical calendar). *Christmas, Easter, and Papists' Conspiracy Day* were THE THREE BIG DAYS of the Calendar in both the 1650s and 1850s, and trying to "bring down" any of them, would not be easy. Christmas and Easter reminded the people that they and England were *Christian*; and *Papists' Conspiracy Day* reminded the people that they and England's

¹²³ I went to London, April 2001-April 02 (1st trip); Dec. 02-July 03 (2nd trip); August 03-April 04 (3rd trip); Oct. 05-April 06 (4th trip); & Sept. 08-March 09 (5th trip).

Christianity was *Protestant*. For many of the people, the name of King James and the protection of this Protestant King from the Papists' conspiracy of 1605 would not be forgotten. The result was that *Papists' Conspiracy Day* or *Gunpowder Treason Day*, or *Bonfire Day* survived. It continued to be celebrated with fireworks each 5 November as "Guy Fawkes Day" (on which effigies of Guy Fawkes were burnt,) with *Bonfire Night*.

Notably, much to the chagrin of the Puritan Revolutionaries of 1640-60, who believed in no holy days other than Sunday, they failed to successfully suppress *Papists' Conspiracy Day* (and e.g., Christmas and Easter lived on as "illegal" holy days in parts of the British Isles). But Cromwell's Puritans Revolutionaries were not just anti-Anglican, they were also anti-Papist. In 1656 Cromwell relented and allowed celebrations for *Papists' Conspiracy Day*, though not an Anglican liturgical service¹²⁴. In this sense, there is a precedent for the history of *Papists' Conspiracy Day* after 1859. I.e., like Cromwell, the secularizing politicians removed the Anglican liturgical service of *Papists' Conspiracy Day*; but like Cromwell, finding themselves unable to suppress *Papists' Conspiracy Day*, *Bonfire Day* survived as a permitted day of public celebrations with its bonfires and fireworks on *Bonfire Night* every 5 November.

Though the religious element had been to some extent removed from 1859, as it had under Cromwell in the 1640s and 1650s, it must be remembered that taking a day off the Calendar does not prevent a private individual from still keeping it. It simply means that the wider Anglican Church does not give it any specific religious recognition. That individuals still kept some religious elements of this day cannot be doubted, as seen, for instance, in the keeping of this day at Lewes, *supra*, where e.g., the traditional banner for the day still reads, "NO POPER," and another banner remembers the 17 Marian martyrs of Lewes who died for their embrace of Protestantism.

The name of King James the First, so strongly connected with *Papists' Conspiracy Day*, was further attacked, with the (English) Revised Version of 1881-5, together with its American revised equivalent, the American Standard Version of 1901, since these introduced an inferior text type to the Received Text of the AV. The religious liberals, with the sympathies of the growing Puseyites, hoped to do what the Papists had not. They hoped to bring down the truth of Protestantism, which at that time had been greatly celebrated for more than a quarter of a millennia in *Church of England* parishes using the Authorized King James Version of 1611, and which annually thanked God for his deliverance every 5th of November on *Papists' Conspiracy Day*. It seems that a hero of the Protestants, King James I, who was so hated by the Papists, was not much liked by the religious liberals either.

King James is an important symbol of God's protection of Protestantism against the gunpowder treason plot of Guy Fawkes and other Papists in 1605. As the "most high and mighty prince," who "by the grace of God," was "King of Great Britain, France, and

¹²⁴ Barnard, C.T., "The Uses of 23 October 1641 & Irish Protestant Celebrations," *The English Historical Review*, Oxford University Press, 1991, pp. 889-920 at p. 892.

Ireland, Defender of the Faith, etc.,” to whom the translators of the King James Version dedicated their splendid work, he is also an important symbol of Protestantism. For as that Dedicatory Preface also says, “the zeal of Your Majesty toward the house of God doth not slack or go backward, but is more kindled,” and “hath given such a blow unto that man of sin, as will not be healed.” “So that if, on the one side, we shall be traduced by Popish persons,” “or if, on the other side, we shall be maligned by self-conceited brethren, who run their own ways, and give liking unto nothing, but what is framed by themselves,” “we may rest secure, supported within by the truth and innocency of a good conscience” “before the Lord, and sustained without by the powerful protection of Your Majesty’s grace and favour.”

When the Authorized King James Version was first published in 1611, its translators celebrated *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* that year in what was only the sixth anniversary since 1605, or the fifth time since 5 November 1606. The Protestant King that the Papists had sought to destroy; had instead, not only by the grace of God survived the gunpowder plot of 1605, but from 1611 now had a Bible named after him. Thus *Papists’ Conspiracy Day*, is at least to some extent also a celebration of the Authorized King James Version of the Bible, which by the grace of God was translated under King James the First, and dedicated to King James some six years after the foiled gunpowder treason plot of 1605. The day known as *Papists’ Conspiracy Day*, or *Gunpowder Treason Day*, or *Bonfire Day*, has historically been celebrated with a bonfire, and so popular has been this element of the celebration, that the day’s night celebrations have continued to be popularly known as *Bonfire Night*.

Good Christian reader, in this Protestant week of hagiology, we have remembered and given thanks to God on the Eve of All Saints’ Day (31 October), for the nailing of blessed Martin Luther’s 95 theses to the door of the Church at Wittenberg Castle, and the start of the Christian Reformation in 1517. We have remembered and given thanks to God on All Saints’ Day (1 November), for such great proto-Protestant saints as e.g., John Huss, and such Protestant saints as e.g., Martin Luther, Philip Melancthon, John Calvin, Thomas Cranmer, and Ulrich Zwingli. Now on Papists’ Conspiracy Day (5 November) we remember God’s preservation of Protestantism in the British Isles in 1605 and 1688. As the sky rockets whirl and twirl and fly sky high over the night-skies of London and elsewhere, lighting up the night sky in exquisite tinsel colours of happiness and celebration for the thwarting of the gunpowder treason plot of Guy Fawkes and his fellow Popish conspirators, who with the aid of Jesuitry had hoped to reintroduce the British Isles to the bondage of justification by works under Roman Catholicism; let us give thanks to God for this great holy day. In the context of this commentary, let us remember in particular the work and labours of that Protestant saint, King James I, under whom, by the grace of God, came the great King James Version of the Bible in 1611.

Papists’ Conspiracy Day
 or *Bonfire Day*.
 Thursday 5 November, 2009
 Mangrove Mountain Union Church,
 New South Wales, Australia.