

Dedication: The Anglican Calendar.

- 1) *Charles I's Day (30 Jan.).*
- 2) *The nexus between Charles I's Day and Charles II's Day.*
 - a) *General;*
 - b) *Some sites I have visited of interest to Charles I, Charles II, James II, & William III.*
 - c) *Traditional Diocese of Sydney Low Church Evangelicalism, NOT Puritan and semi-Puritan trends from 1970s.*
- 3) *The "Father" Huddleston Saga.*
- 4) *The Test Acts and 1689 Religious Toleration to English & Irish Puritans.*
- 5) *The Restoration in the Scottish Context of the Williamite Settlement.*
- 6) *The Battle of Vinegar Hill (1798 Ireland & 1804 NSW):*
"Rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft" (I Sam. 15:23).
- 7) *Charles II's Day (29 May).*
 - a) *My Baptist Grandmother.*
 - b) *St. Helier.*
 - c) *A General Introduction to Royal Oak Day.*
 - d) *Royal Oak Hotels.*
 - e) *Royal Oak Streets and other place names.*
 - f) *Royal Oak Naval Ships of the Fleet.*
 - g) *Royal Oak Day Sermons.*
 - h) *Royal Oak Day Celebrations.*
 - i) *The London Oak Apple Day Parade.*
 - a) *Preamble on "the Shaver's" repentance;*
 - b) *General on London Oak Apple Day;*
 - c) *KJV translators Daniel Featley et al.*
 - j) *Charles II lands at Dover ☺.*
 - k) *The Restoration Prayer Book of 1662: its language a fruit of the AV.*
 - l) *The Cross as a symbol of Christianity & some stingy Puritans get their bottoms "pinched" on Oak Apple Day.*
 - *m) *Royal Oak Day Dedication.***

1) *Charles I Day (30 Jan.).*

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

When I circumnavigated the globe on my fifth trip to London (Sept. 08-March 09), I returned to Australia from London via North America. From Washington D.C., USA, I went by train over the Potomac River and into the State of Virginia in order to see the Pentagon. The Pentagon is a major USA military Headquarters; and I there inspected the *Pentagon Memorial Park* to the “9/11” (September the 11th, 2001) victims of a Mohammedan terrorist attack. (This was co-coordinated with Mohammedan terrorist attacks against the USA in the States of Pennsylvania and New York.)

In stark contrast to this Mohammedan action against the American State of Virginia, at a time when what became the United States of America was still privileged to be under the Crown, in 1639 King Charles the First most wisely and kindly made a royal decree that the Virginia legislature should meet at least annually. Let us thank God for the Christian care and goodness he showed to his subjects, with such acts as the Petition of Rights, opening up the Royal Post to all in his realm, or granting the Virginia legislature a legal right to meet annually. “The king by judgment establisheth the land” (Prov. 29:4).

In Ps. 105:15 we read, “Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm.” In Scripture, a king was anointed. Thus we read in I Samuel 9:27 and 10:1 of a bad king “Saul,” “Then Samuel took a vial of oil, and poured it upon his head, and kissed him, and said, Is it not because the Lord hath anointed thee to be captain over his inheritance?” And we also read in I Sam. 16:13 of a good king, “Then Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren: and the Spirit of the Lord came upon David from that day forward.” So whether a generally bad king like Saul, or a generally good king like David, a king was anointed; and God here teaches us we must be loyal to the constitutionally established king, whether he is good, bad, or indifferent.

Indeed, so solemn is this commandment from God, that when in II Samuel chapter 1, David learnt that an Amalekite had, upon the request of Saul himself, slain King Saul, we read in verses 14 to 16, “And David said unto him, How wast thou not afraid to stretch forth thine hand to destroy the Lord’s anointed? And David called one of the young men, and said, Go near, and fall upon him. And he smote him that he died. And David said unto him, Thy blood be upon thy head; for thy mouth hath testified against thee, saying, I have slain the Lord’s anointed.” (Even though this was a false claim made by the Amalekite to try and ingratiate himself with David, I Sam. 31:4-6.) You see in I Peter 2:17 we are commanded, “Fear God. Honour the king.” And this was said in New Testament times with respect to some very gruesome and ungodly Roman Emperors indeed. Nevertheless, we are told in Romans 13:1, “the powers that be are ordained of God.” And so even if we have a bad king, like Saul, and even if he were to ask us to kill him, yet we may not do so. For what saith the Scripture in Ps. 105:15? “Touch not mine anointed.” And so we must “Honour the king.”

But the Puritan republican revolutionaries of the 1640s and 1650s, men such as Samuel Rutherford from Scotland and Oliver Cromwell from England, set aside this command. For in conjunction with the writings of Rutherford’s book, *Lex Rex*,

Cromwell not only had King Charles I killed in 1649, but he also attempted, without success, to have Charles II killed in 1651.

In one of my letters published in the *British Church Newspaper* of 15 January 2010, the Editor put the headline, “Cavaliers and Roundheads,” to my words which started with, among other things, my statements, “Like the old-time Cavaliers fighting the Roundheads in the 1640s and 1650s, we modern-time Cavaliers who fight with the pen and not the sword against modern day Roundheads ... are reminded of our Lord’s words, ‘Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition’ ... Mark 7:9 ...,” which I then applied to such passages as Romans 13:1,2, which says that those who “seditiously attack ‘the higher powers’ ... ‘receive’ ‘damnation’.”

Now while the Cavaliers were militarily defeated by Cromwell’s republican Roundheads in the 1640s and 1650s, by the grace of God, *come the third day*, they were back in town with the Restoration of 1660. That is because God can bring victory out of defeat. We read in Revelation 11 of what St. John calls in Revelation 11:4, “the two candlesticks,” that is, the Old and New Testaments; for we read in Psalm 119:105, “Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path.” But in Revelation 11:7 we also read of the Antichrist’s desire to “kill them,” that is, to “kill” God’s Word. And in Revelation 11, it looks, in human terms, as though he has in some way succeeded, for we read in verse 8 that “their dead bodies shall lie in the street of” the place where “our Lord was crucified.” Now while our Lord was crucified in Jerusalem, it was part of the wider Roman Empire which was under the City State of Rome. And so the place where “our Lord was crucified” refers to Rome, and the desire of Papal Rome to kill God’s Word. They did it after the Council of Trent and before the Vatican II Council by claiming only the Latin was Divinely Preserved, not the Byzantine Greek or Greek church writers; and they do it after the Vatican II Council by joining up with the Neo-Alexandrians. But either way, Rome is targeting the Received Text of Holy Scripture, and seeking to “kill” it.

Now we read in Revelation 17:5, that the Roman whore of Babylon is “the mother of harlots.” And so she evidently has some daughter whores under her. These include, e.g., the Eastern Orthodox Churches who in embracing the Second Council of Nicea of 787, embrace the Romish idolatry of veneration and invocation of saints, such as Mariolatry. But we read in II John 7 and 11, that if one bids “God speed” to “an antichrist,” then one becomes a “partaker of his evil deeds.” And it is with deep regret we must admit that many Protestants have now gone into such apostasy, and have become daughters of the Papal Roman whore, by giving their spiritual recognition to Rome in various ways. E.g., we find that the Committee which produced the contemporary neo-Alexandrian’s NU Text was a combination of apostate Protestants such as Bruce Metzger and Kurt Aland, and the Papist, Cardinal Carlo Martini, who as both a Cardinal and a Jesuit, was very much in the Pope’s pocket, and did the Papal Antichrist’s biddings.

And so today, with various apostate Protestants joined up with Papal Rome, it may seem to some that with the triumph of the Neo-Alexandrian School which has

produced the NU Text and other corrupted neo-Alexandrian New Testament texts, and to a much lesser extent also the Majority Text Burgonite School; with such views promulgated in most of the universities and colleges, and among the publishers; it may seem that we of the Neo-Byzantine School who uphold the Received Text of Holy Scripture, have in some ways, been defeated by these forces. In the words of Revelation 11:3,8, it may seem that they have been able to “kill” these “two witnesses” of the Old and New Testaments.

But back of the Received Text is God’s power in the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture, which has remained even in these times in which we neo-Byzantines have in the eyes of many been defeated. For we read in Revelation 11:11, “And after three days and an half the Spirit of life from God entered them, and they stood on their feet; and great fear fell upon them which saw them.” The symbolism here of “three and a half” “days,” clearly to some extent alludes to the power of God seen in Christ’s resurrection after three days. And so on the authority of nothing less than Scripture itself, we can give this gold, rolled, guarantee, to wit, just like the Royalists and Cavaliers were by the grace of God back in town in 1660, so likewise, God will raise up again the Received Text of Holy Scripture. Thus *by the grace of God, come the third day, the Received Text and King James Bible will be back be town!*

I believe in miracles. When the Popish Spanish Armada of 1588 came against the Protestant Kingdoms of England and Ireland, we Protestants looked like we were finished. In purely human terms, it looked like the forces of the Antichrist were going to succeed, and it must be admitted, that in human terms, they were the stronger. But then *by a Divine miracle*, God blew, and the ships of Antichrist were smashed and dashed to pieces on the coasts of northern Ireland. So too, when the English and Irish Puritans, with some assistance from Popish Jesuit “booster rockets,” came against the Crown under Charles I and Charles II, it looked like we were undone. Oliver Cromwell’s Puritan Roundhead armies had emerged victorious over the Royalist Anglican Protestant Cavalier armies; and we were down and out. But then, in accordance with law and involving no illegal acts or taking up of arms, *by a Divine miracle*, God brought about the Restoration of the monarchy in 1660.

And today, when the neo-Alexandrians, and to a lesser extent the Majority Text Burgonites, have largely succeeded in replacing the Received Text of Scripture with their spurious texts, it may seem to many that we are once again looking down the gun barrel at defeat. *But I believe in miracles.* I believe that God, Divinely Inspired the Scriptures, and Divinely Preserved them in the Received Text of Holy Scripture. And I believe that in the end, God will have his way. *It is not my men’s might, it is not by men’s strength, but it’s by the Holy Ghost’s POWER, that the Scriptures stand secure.*

For with the Book of Revelation, the last book of the Bible was writ. And so referring to the completed revelation of the Old and New Testaments, as “the two olive trees, and the two candlesticks standing before the God of the earth,” in Revelation 11:4,5, St. John the Divine then says, “And if any man will hurt them, fire proceedeth out of their mouth, and devoureth their enemies: and if any man will hurt them, he must in

this manner be killed.” Those who attack the Word of God are slain by what St. Paul in Ephesians 6:17 calls, “the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God.” *NOT by men’s might, NOT by men’s strength, but by the Holy Ghost’s POWER.*

We fought the threefold alliance of apostate Protestants, Papists, and those deceived by them, when we fought those in league with Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford, who had the assistance of Jesuits, in the days of the civil war. But another civil war is now a-raging in the Protestant Churches. And that war is over the Received Text of Holy Scripture. And once again we are fighting against an alliance of apostate Protestants, Papists, and those deceived by them. Apostate Protestants like Bruce Metzger and Kurt Aland on the NU Text Committee, and Papists like the Jesuit, Cardinal Martini on the NU Text Committee that has compiled both Nestle-Aland's 27th edition and the United Bible Societies' 4th revised edition.

Back in the civil wars, the Roundheads rejoiced when they drove Charles II out of town. And so likewise, the neo-Alexandrians rejoice when they drive the King James Version and its Received Text out of churches. But let us never forget God’s miraculous action in the Restoration of King Charles II in 1660. And let us never forget the words of Revelation 11, spoken with regard to the “two prophets” of the Old and New Testaments, for we read in Revelation 11:10, “And they of the people and kindreds and tongues and nations shall see their dead bodies three days and an half, and shall not suffer their dead bodies to be put in graves. And they that dwell upon the earth shall rejoice over them, and make merry, and shall send gifts one to another; because these two prophets tormented them that dwelt on the earth.” But let us never forget the words of Revelation 11:11, “And after three days and a half,” “the Spirit of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet.” Men might metaphorically kill the Received Text and the King James Bible; but come the third day, by the power of God, it will be back in town. Thus when we think about the Restoration, facilitated by God’s prior preservation of the King in the Royal Oak at Boscobel in 1651, in the words of Psalm 105:15 “*Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm;*” we should also remember the second part of that verse, with God’s preservation of his “prophets” i.e., the Bible, in the TR.

Since *King Charles I’s Day* was revived as a black letter day more than 30 years ago, it is remembered on 30 January, and so, for example, this year, it was remembered on Sunday 30 January 2011. But before 1859, if *Charles I’s Day* fell on a Sunday it was transferred to Monday the 31st. But the *Church of Ireland’s* Office lacked the solemnity of the *Church of England’s* fast; seen in the following difference at the start of the service. Thus the status of *King Charles I’s Day* as a black letter day in Australia since 1978, approximates *to some extent* the status *Charles I’s Day* had in the *Church of Ireland* before the Union of the United Kingdom creating the *United Church of England and Church of Ireland* from 1801 to 1871. That is because before it became part of the *United Church of England and Church of Ireland* from 1801 to 1871 which used the 1662 *Church of England’s* Book of Common Prayer; the keeping of *King Charles I’s Day* in Ireland under the 1666 *Church of Ireland’s* Book of Common Prayer lacked the element of it being a fast day.

Let the reader note the following comparison between the Office for *King Charles the Martyr's Day* in the 1662 Church of England (1662-1859) and 1666 Church of Ireland (1666-1800) prayer books.

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Church of England's Book of Common Prayer of 1662. (Church of England Office 1662-1800; United Church of England and Church of Ireland Office, 1801-1859).</i></p> | <p><i>Church of Ireland's Book of Common Prayer of 1666. (Church of Ireland Office 1666-1800).</i></p> |
| <p>“A Form of Prayer with Fasting to be used annually on the thirtieth of January, being the day of the martyrdom of blessed King Charles the First; to implore the mercy of God, that neither the guilt of that sacred and innocent blood, nor those other sins, by which God was provoked to deliver up both us and our King into the hands of cruel and unreasonable men, may at any time hereafter be visited upon us or our posterity.”</p> <p>Then the first rubric said, “If this day shall happen to be Sunday, this Form of Prayer shall be used and the Fast kept the next Day following. And upon the Lord’s Day next before the Day to be kept, at Morning Prayer, immediately after the Nicene Creed, notice shall be given for the due observation of the said Day.”</p> <p>And the second rubric said, “The Service of the Day shall be the same with the usual Office for Holy-days in all things; except where it is in this Office otherwise appointed.”</p> | <p>“A Form of Common Prayer to be used upon the 30. day of January being the day of the martyrdom of King Charles the First.”</p> <p>Then the first rubric said, “If this day shall happen to be Sunday, this Form of Service shall be used the next day following.”</p> <p>And the second rubric said, “The Service shall be the same with the usual Office for Holidays in all things, except where it is hereafter otherwise appointed.”</p> |

The absence of the solemnity of the *Church of England's* fast on 30 January in the *Church of Ireland* (before it became part of the *United Church of England and Ireland*

from 1801 to 1871); also appears to have led to a *Church of Ireland* tradition during this time in which though the service was transferred to Monday 31 January if the day fell on a Sunday, the Sunday could still be used as the *Eve of King Charles I's Day* for a *King Charles the Martyr's Day Sermon* since in the absence of a fast, the day was like that of any martyr; in which instance, its transference to 31 January though unnecessary, was presumably done from deferential respect to the English tradition, where it was done because it was a fast day. In this sense, it resembles the fact that since the revival about 30 years ago of *King Charles I's Day* on 30 January, a *King Charles the Martyr's Day* sermon may likewise be preached on a Sunday if the day so falls on a Sunday.

One such instance of a *King Charles the Martyr's Day Sermon* in the Church of Ireland is found in Dean Swift's *King Charles the Martyr's Day Sermon*. Dean Swift, author of the novel, *Gulliver's Travels*, preached a *King Charles the Martyr's Day* sermon at St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, on Sunday 30 January 1726. A major feast day can be remembered from its Eve, even though this is not usually done for a day following Sunday because the general rule is that Sunday takes precedence. Therefore, this was *presumably* a sermon delivered at Evensong on Sunday 30 January 1726¹. (If not, then it means 30 Jan. was used for *King Charles I's Day* on a Sunday, and then the Office of *King Charles the Martyr's Day* was used on Monday 31 Jan i.e., effectively remembering the day twice, which in terms of broader Anglican principles of holy days strikes me as unlikely, even though in much more contemporary times, Anglicans sometimes transfer the main remembrance of a day to the Sunday before or after it because people simply cannot get to a service on any other day.) While this type of thing did not, to the best of my knowledge, occur in England, the absence of the element of it as a Fast Day meant that it could, and seemingly did, occur in the Church of Ireland, although to the best of my knowledge remembering the day when it so fell on Monday 31st January from Evensong on the Sunday was not more generally a normative practice, even in Ireland.

So too, we find that Charles Inglis the son of a *Church of Ireland* clergyman preached, a *King Charles the Martyr's Day Sermon* in New York, on Sunday 30 January, 1780². Was this at two Evensongs e.g., a 3 p.m. and 6 p.m. Evensong? At the time Inglis was part of the *Church of England* in North America, but does this usage of Sunday 30 January as the Eve of Monday 31 January reflect his *Church of Ireland* background?

How widespread was this practice? To date I have been unable to determine answers to these questions. Thus on the limited amount of data that I have been able to gain on this issue, as best I can tell, this practice of a Sunday *King Charles the Martyr's Day Sermon* was limited in scope to those with a *Church of Ireland* connection before

¹ Connolly, S.J., "The Church of Ireland and the Royal Martyr: Regicide and Revolution in Anglican Political Thought c. 1660-c.1745," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Cambridge University Press, Vol. 54, No. 3, July 2003, pp. 484-506, at p. 501.

² See Sermon in Appendix 5 of this Textual Commentary, Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25).

1800, at which time, while the Office was transferred to Monday 31 January when it fell on Sunday 30 January, the absence of the Fast element for the day in the *Church of Ireland* meant that it was to some extent remembered on the Eve of that Day on Sunday 30 January by at least some Ministers in *King Charles the Martyr's Day Sermons*. If this is the correct reconstruction, and possibly it is not, Charles Inglis may simply have done this as a consequence of his *Church of Ireland* background, without consciously realizing that this practice was essentially limited to Ireland.

On the one hand, these conclusions are provisional and may have to be revised at a future time upon receipt of better information. But whether or not that occurs, to the extent that we have two clear instances of Sunday *King Charles the Martyr's Day Sermons*, one in 1726 by Dean Jonathon Swift at Dublin in Ireland, and the other by Charles Inglis, in 1780 at New York in North America, there is some background precedent for the practice of a Sunday *King Charles the Martyr's Day Sermon*. This means there is a precedent which precedes the contemporary revival of *King Charles I's Day* as a black letter day, which may be remembered on a Sunday if it so falls on a Sunday, or remembered on the Sunday before or after 30 January if it falls on a weekday, either in the reading of the notices, or in the Sunday sermon, or both. (Of course, since its revival as a black letter day in 1978, any such emphasis on it is purely optional since black letter days have no necessary religious observance or remembrance, and so some Ministers may choose not to refer to it at all³.)

The status of *King Charles I's Day* as a black letter day in Canada since 1962, in Australia since 1978, and since 1980 in England (where it is also an optional red-letter day), also approximates to some extent the status *Charles I's Day* had from 1660-1662, although it is not identical since from 1660-1662, though it lacked an Office during these years, it was still a day of fasting. Thus the Act 12 Charles II, chapter 30 of 1660, says *Charles I's Day* was “an anniversary day.” It further states: “That the horrid and execrable murder of ... Charles the First, of ever blessed and glorious memory, hath been committed by a party of wretched men, desperately wicked, and hardened in their impiety, who having first plotted and contrived the ruin and destruction of this monarchy, and with it, of the true Reformed Protestant religion, ... found it necessary ... to ... their pernicious and traitorous designs, to throw down all the bulwarks and fences of law, and to subvert the ... constitution of Parliament ...; until at last, upon the thirtieth day of January one thousand six hundred and forty eight, his sacred Majesty was brought unto a scaffold, and there publickly murdered” The Act further declares, “Oliver Cromwell deceased,” and others, “shall by virtue of this Act, be adjudged to be convicted and attainted of high treason.” Of course, before 1750 the new year in England started on Annunciation Day, which is 25 March, hence this 1660 Act refers to Charles I being “murdered” in 1648 rather than 1649, since January 30 is before 25 March.

³ See Sermon in Appendix 5 of Textual Commentary, Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), “With regard to remembering *Charles I's Day*, the rule for *Anglican* Protestants that I adhere to is, ‘Some Do. ... Some Don’t. ... ALL SHOULD!’.”

The Acts of 1660 also states, “by this horrid action,” in which “His Majesty was brought unto a scaffold, and there publickly murdered,” “the Protestant religion hath received the greatest wound and reproach, and the people of England the most unsupportable shame and infamy, that it was possible for the enemies of God and the King to bring upon us, whilst the fanaticke rage of a few miscreants,” i.e., the Puritan revolutionary republicans, “who were as far from being true Protestants, as they were from being true subjects” of King Charles, “stands imputed by our adversaries to the whole nation: we therefore ... renounce, abominate and protest against ... the execrable murder” The Act goes on to say, “every thirtieth day of January, unless it falls ... upon the Lord’s day, and then the day next following, shall be ... observed in all the churches and chapels... of England and Ireland, [and] dominion of Wales, ... and all other ... dominions, as an anniversary day of fasting and humiliation, to implore the mercy of God, that neither the guilt of that sacred and innocent blood, nor those other sins by which God was provoked to deliver up both us and our King into the hands of cruel and unreasonable men, may at any time hereafter be visited upon us or our posterity⁴.”

And so we see that for its first two years, from 1660 to 1662, *Charles I’s Day* had no necessary church service or office on the day, although it is clear from *Samuel Pepys’ Diary* that in 1662 a church service was held which he attended before the prayer book Office was in place. Thus its present status as a black letter day in e.g., Australia from 1978, or a black letter day which is an optional red-letter day in England from 1980, is somewhat semi-analogous with, though certainly not identical to, this earlier status i.e., when it had no Office. Something of this is reflected in *Pepys’ Diary*. Before 1750 England generally used an Annunciation Day Calendar which started the year on 25 March rather than 1 Jan. A convention also arose that for dates between 1 Jan. and 24 March both years would be referred to, and written something like a mathematical fraction, so e.g., a date in this range in the year we would now commonly call “1864” would be written as “186 $\frac{3}{4}$.” Thus in making reference to the following entries in *Pepys’ Diary* when e.g., referring to “1659/60” etc., the meaning of this is that year referred to is “1659” on an Annunciation Day Calendar, but “1660” on the 1 Jan. Calendar we now commonly used. Thus on 30 Jan. 1659/60, Pepys refers at 30 Jan to “the fatal day, now ten years since, His Majesty died.” Then on 30 Jan 1660/61 he refers to January the “30th” as a “Fast day,” saying it was, “The first time that this day hath been yet observed: and Mr. Mills made a most excellent sermon upon ‘Lord forgive us our former iniquities;’ and he refers to his “wife” and others, “seeing of Cromwell, Ireton,

⁴ 12 Car. II, chapter 30, 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. 491-496. So far as it enacted that 30 January be annually kept as *King Charles I’s Day*, or if it fell on a Sunday, then Monday 31 Jan., this Act was repealed in, “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.

and Bradshaw,” after their bodies had been exhumed, “hanged and buried at Tyburne⁵.” On 30 Jan. 166½, before the Act of Uniformity came in, he Pepys says, “30th. Fast-day for the murthering (murdering) of the late King. I went to Church, and Mr. Mills made a good sermon upon David’s words, ‘Who can lay his hands upon the Lord’s anointed and be guiltless?’” (I Sam. 26:9). Then in 1663 after the 1662 Act of Uniformity came in, we read for 30 Jan. 166⅔, that on the “30th. A solemn fast for the King’s murder (murder), and we were forced to keep it more than we would have done, having forgot to take any victuals into the house. I to church in the forenoon, and Mr. Mills made a good sermon upon David’s heart smiting him for cutting off the garments of Saul⁶.” I.e., under the 1662 prayer book rules there are “days of fasting, or abstinence,” and evidently Pepys would have preferred to have kept the lesser discipline of “abstinence” (1662 prayer book) from e.g., certain delicacies, or red meat, or milk in one’s tea (which type of thing may also be done over the period of Lent); but having “forgot to take any victuals into the house,” shops were evidently closed on the day, so he was “forced to keep” the stricter form of “fasting” (1662 prayer book) on the day.

My normative position is to remember *Charles I’s Day* as a black letter day. To the extent that in 2008, I Dedicated Volume 1 of my textual commentaries on this day; or in 2009 I was involved in a more elaborate memory of his martyrdom since it was the 360th anniversary and I was in England where since 1980 it is an optional red-letter day; or in 2010 I was in a church service dedicating the revised Volume 1 of these textual commentaries on *King Charles I’s Day*; or in 2011 because *King Charles I’s Day* fell on a Sunday, and its secondary focus is the Restoration under Charles II, an event being used for the Dedication of this Volume 3 of my textual commentaries, once again, the day has been particularly significant to me as I attended on 30 Jan. 2011 one of four annual 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* service at St. Matthew’s Windsor in western Sydney, it would be fair to say that over the last four years the day has received a higher priority in my thinking than it normally would. But presumably from *King Charles I’s Day* 2012 on, I will be back to my normative position of, in general simply remembering it as a black letter day, although if circumstances so dictate, in a given year it may, for some reason, once again be more significant to me than normal, as it has been to me in 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.

Nevertheless, it is instructive to remember that even when Charles I and Charles II were taken off the Calendar in 1859, they were still to some extent remembered in Anglicanism. E.g., in my copy of 1662 prayer book which was issued with a 1958 Royal Warrant for the Accession Day Service by Elizabeth II, at the beginning of the 39

⁵ Henry Ireton married Bridget daughter of Oliver Cromwell, and later was one of the judges at Charles I’s show-trial. For the others, “2) The nexus between Charles I’s Day and Charles II’s Day,” subsection “a) General,” *supra*.

⁶ *Diary and Correspondence of Samuel Pepys*, F.R.S., Secretary to the Admiralty in the reigns of Charles II and James II; with a Life and Notes by Richard, Lord Braybrooke; in four volumes, Swan Sonnenschein & Co., London, UK, 1890, Vol. 1, pp. 14-15, 159, 274, & 412.

Articles are the words, “Reprinted by command of His Majesty King Charles I with his Royal Declaration prefixed thereunto,” followed by “His Majesty’s Declaration,” that is Charles I’s Declaration. And of course, the 1662 prayer book itself is remembered as a Caroline prayer book from the time of King Charles II, as a Restoration prayer book. This is reflected in the Preface of the 1662 Caroline prayer book which says, “By what undue means, and for what mischievous purposes the use of the liturgy [made “illegal” from 1645 under Cromwell’s revolutionary Puritan republic,] ... came, during the late unhappy confusions, to be discontinued, is ... well known But upon His Majesty’s happy Restoration, it seemed ... the use of the liturgy would also return” It was thus with some appropriateness, that on the 300th anniversary of the 1662 prayer book, the Anglican Church in Canada revived *King Charles the First’s Day* as a black letter day in 1962. Certainly for those who understand Anglican hagiology, the place of Charles I and Charles II is so fundamental, that it is very intelligible that following its ill-thought through removal from the Calendar in 1859, *King Charles I’s Day* would be revived on Anglican Calendars in Canada in 1962, Australia in 1978, and England in 1980.

To the question, “Why remember *Charles I’s Day*?” the answer that I as a Reformed Low Church Evangelical Anglican would give, is very different to the answer that a Puseyite would give. Contrary to the spirit of the Puseyites who badly abuse and misuse this day by promoting the unBiblical, unProtestant, and unAnglican teachings of Puseyism, it would be wrong to conceptualize *King Charles I’s Day* as anti-Puritan *per se*. Certainly it is anti-the English Puritan revolutionaries of Oliver Cromwell, Samuel Rutherford, and others of the Roundhead forces, who seditiously fought against the Royal Cavaliers and other forces of King Charles I and King Charles II. But in doing so, Anglicans from England and Ireland, ultimately formed an alliance after the Restoration with Puritans primarily from Scotland, most of whom were essentially Presbyterian Puritans, even though they operated as Puritans with episcopal church government in the *Episcopal Church of Scotland* after the Restoration till 1689.

From the Reformed and Biblical perspective, the chief reason for remembering *King Charles the First’s Day* on 30 January is the same as the chief reason for remembering *Gunpowder Treason Day* on 5 November. The reason is that we uphold the Biblical teaching against sedition and murder. Thus in the same way that we remember on *Bonfire Day* of 5 November that we reject the Papists’ claim that the Pope of Rome has authority which is higher than the Bible, and through which one can set aside the Biblical injunctions prohibiting “seditions” and “murder” in Galatians 5:20,21, and requiring that, in the words of I Peter 2:17, we “Honour the king;” so likewise we remember on *King Charles I’s Day* of 30 January that we reject the English Puritan revolutionaries claims, found in Rutherford’s *Lex Rex*, that there is a form of “natural law” or reason which is higher than the Bible, and through which one can set aside the Biblical injunctions prohibiting “seditions” and “murder” in Galatians 5:20,21, and requiring that, in the words of I Peter 2:17, we “Honour the king.”

It is also the case that like the one surviving red-letter day with an Office in the 1662 prayer book after 1859, namely, *Accession Day*, which for the contemporary monarch, Elizabeth II is 6 February, the days removed in 1859 were a celebration of

Protestant figures and events. They also focused on the Biblical teaching that we should, “render” “unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s” (Matt. 22:21); “be subject unto the higher powers,” and “render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour” (Rom. 13:1,7); and we should, “Fear God. Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17).

2) *The nexus between Charles I’s Day and Charles II’s Day. a) General; and b) Some sites I have visited of interest to Charles I, Charles II, James II, & William III.*

2a) *General.*

Often I am within religiously conservative *broad* Protestant parameters on various issues, and I am broad-Protestant Evangelical in my embrace of fellow Evangelical Christians of the holy Protestant faith who uphold the teachings of the Protestant Reformation ignited in 1517 and wrought by God under Martin Luther, so that I have embraced such Christians from, for instance, Australia, the United Kingdom, and North America. There is a religious bond between all Evangelicals (see “*I’m an Evangelical – I hope you are too!*”, *supra*). In the words of Philippians 4:21, I “salute every saint in Christ Jesus.” But while I am always within religiously conservative Protestant Christian parameters, I am not always within *broad*-Protestant parameters. This is one such instance. And indeed, there is no such thing as a broad Protestant position on these matters of the 17th century Caroline kings; and anyone who claim there is not being truthful. Rather, at this point Protestant views differ, and I maintain for what I believe the Bible says. Historically, there is a divided hagiology among Protestants on such figures as King Charles I, King Charles II, Oliver Cromwell, and Samuel Rutherford. I am first and foremost a royalist and a loyalist to His Divine Majesty, the Lord God Almighty, one God in a perfect Trinity; and I am as a flow on consequence of that a royalist and a loyalist to the constitutional monarchy of the Crown (Matt. 22:21; Rom. 13:1-9; I Peter 2:17).

The highest liturgical honour that the Anglican Church can pay on her Calendar, to wit, a red-letter day with its own Office granted by Royal Warrant of monarch as the Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Defender of the Faith, has always been exclusively reserved for Protestant figures and events. The four days historically given this honour in the *Church of England* before 1859 were *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* on 5 November, *King Charles the Martyr’s Day* on 30 January, *The King’s Restoration Day* or *Royal Oak Day* on 29 May, and *Accession Day* of a reigning monarch. And since 1859 only *Accession Day* of a reigning monarch has this honour.

It should also be borne in mind that red-letter days with Offices preserve one important element of Protestantism from the Anglican perspective. Thus they do not necessarily represent a general endorsement of the life of those in question. E.g., those Protestants killed in the Irish Massacre of 1641 may, and probably did, include some Protestants whose life and faith were a disgrace to the name of “Protestant,” as well as

some good and godly Protestants. But both groups died alike for being “Protestants” which is the big issue the *Office of Irish Massacre Day* remembered from 1666 to 1800 in the *Church of Ireland’s* 1666 prayer book.

The same is true of the *Office of Accession Day* of a reigning monarch which remains after 1859. E.g., George IV (Regnal Years: 1820-1830; Regency under George III from 1811-1820) proved to be a weak and unreliable king who in violation of *The Ten Commandments*, was both an adulterer (seventh commandment, Exod. 20:14) and drunkard (first & tenth commandments with respect to a lust idol, Exod. 20:3,17; Col. 3:5; cf. “drunkenness” in Rom. 13:13; and n.b., Prov. 31:3-5)⁷. Yet such concerns did not stop good Anglican Protestants from celebrating *Accession Day* on 26 June each year during his reign; for in doing so they were celebrating a constitutionally Protestant monarchy, even though the person holding that office was something less than fully worthy of so great an honour and privilege. Hence when such a monarch is on the throne (see my comments on the heir apparent, Prince Charles, at “3,” “The ‘Father’ Huddleston Saga,” *infra*), then we still have the *Office of Accession Day*; and it becomes our duty to pray God for his repentance; and turning God-ward in faith. This type of understanding of the *Office of Accession Day* both before and after 1859, is also important for understanding some elements of the *Office of the King’s Restoration Day* before 1859, since Charles II was a king who left something to be desired, even though the big thing about *The King’s Restoration Day* or *Royal Oak Day* was the celebration of the reestablishment of a legally Protestant monarchy, in which the monarch was the Supreme Governor of the Established Anglican Church.

To understand that this highest liturgical honour only goes to Protestant figures and events is to understand the importance of these events to traditional Reformed Anglican Protestants such as myself, even though *Papists’ Conspiracy Day*, *King Charles the Martyr’s Day*, and *Restoration or Royal Oak Day* are now remembered in a diminished form, i.e., no longer as red-letter days with their own office granted by a Royal Warrant. Thus *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* continues in the public celebration of Bonfire Day with the fireworks of Bonfire Night throughout England; and the revived black letter day of *King Charles I’s Day* primarily remembers Charles I, and secondarily also remembers Charles II and the Restoration.

Thus in the same way that *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* before 1859, continuing on since 1859 as *Bonfire Day*, has a primary focus on the Gunpowder Treason Plot against James I on 5 November 1605, and a secondary focus on the coming of William III of Orange on 5 November 1688; so likewise *King Charles I’s Day* has a primary focus on the martyrdom of Charles I in 1649, and a secondary focus on the events of the Interregnum such as the royal oak and Restoration under Charles II in 1660. This fact is also enhanced when it is remembered that the day of death of one monarch is the Accession Day of the next monarch, and so the death of Charles I on 30 Jan. 1649 makes this the Accession Day of Charles II; although as a consequence of the unusual events of

7

“George IV,”
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_IV_of_the_United_Kingdom).

Wikipedia

the 1640s and 1650s republic, it was always Charles II's Birthday and Restoration Day of 29 May that was principally used to remember him. Since the removal of *Papists' Conspiracy Day*, *King Charles the Martyr's Day*, and *The King's Restoration Day* (Royal Oak Day) from the Anglican Calendar in 1859; any remembrance on the Anglican Calendar of Charles II is now limited to this connection in the revived black letter day of *King Charles I's Day*, as e.g., revived in Australia in 1978. To some extent, this nexus between the two Caroline kings of the 17th century is captured in the statues of Charles I and Charles II at the Guildhall of Worcester, England, where the famous Battle of Worcester of 1651 occurred. These statues are still decorated with oak leaves on *Royal Oak Day*, and with Christmas decorations at Christmas time, relevant because under Interregnum Ordinances the English Puritans tried to ban Christmas.

This nexus is also seen in the following Collect in the Office for *King Charles the Martyr's Day* (1662-1859) in the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662: "O Lord, our heavenly Father, who didst not punish us as our sins deserved, but hast in the midst of judgment remembered mercy; we acknowledge it thine especial favour, that, though for our many and great provocations, thou didst suffer thine anointed blessed King Charles the First, (as on this day) to fall into the hands of violent and bloodthirsty men, and barbarously to be murdered by them, yet thou didst not leave us for ever, as sheep without a shepherd; but by thy gracious providence didst miraculously preserve the undoubted heir of his Crowns, our then gracious Sovereign King, Charles the Second, from his bloody enemies, hiding him under the shadow of thy wings, until their tyranny was overpast; and didst bring him back, in thy good appointed time, to sit upon the throne of his father; and together with the Royal Family didst restore to us our ancient Government in Church and State. For these thy great and unspeakable mercies we render to thee our most humble and unfeigned thanks; beseeching thee, still to continue thy gracious protection over the whole royal family, and to grant to our gracious sovereign, ..., a long and happy reign over us: so we that are thy people will give thee thanks for ever, and will alway[s] be shewing forth thy praise from generation to generation; through Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour. *Amen.*"

On Friday 30 January 2009, I hung a red rose at the place of the martyrdom of Blessed Charles, some 360 years afore, at the Banqueting House in London⁸. On the Sunday following *King Charles I's Day*, after taking Communion at St. John's Church of England (*Continuing*), South Wimbledon, in London, where the Gospel reading for the 4th Sunday after Epiphany of Rom. 13:1-7 echoed elements of the reading from I Peter 2:13-22 on *Charles I's Day*, *supra*⁹, I again went into the city. The flowers placed by myself and others still adorned the metal gate surrounding the entrance to the Banqueting

⁸ See Textual Commentary, Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), "Dedication: The Anglican Calendar," "*(g) King Charles the First's Day: with Dedication of Revised Volume 1 in 2010;" & Sermon in Appendix 5.

⁹ See my discussion of this nexus between the reading on Epiphany 4 (The Fourth Sunday after Epiphany) and *Charles I's Day* in my Sermon in Appendix 5 of this Textual Commentary, Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25).

House at Whitehall. Over the doorway is a bust of Charles I, and under it the words, “His Majesty King Charles I passed through this hall and out of a window nearby over this tablet to the scaffold in Whitehall where he was beheaded on 30 January 1649.” (The actual window no longer exists due to redesigning.)

I passed by the statue of Charles I in Charing Cross (Trafalgar Square) where I had also been on the previous *Charles I's Day*, and once again the flowers from 30 Jan. 2009 remained there. I then passed down Charles II's Street, London, SW1. On a number of occasions, (I do not say every occasion,) when I have taken photos connected with Charles II it has started to rain, or existing light rain has become heavy rain, or it has started to snow. E.g., in September 2008 when taking photos in western Sydney at the bushlands Reserve near and behind Royal Oak Place, West Pennant Hills, which runs down to Saw Mill Creek, it suddenly and unexpectedly started to rain for a short time. Or when I was at Royal Oak Drive, Alford's Point in south Sydney, where I looked over the beautiful bushlands leading down to Mill Creek (millers from a Mill were important in helping Charles II as he hid around Boscobel, e.g., he used a mill horse,) light rain suddenly became heavy rain as I took photos of some white cockatoos on the ground next to the “Royal Oak Drive” street sign. Such events have acted to remind me how, when Charles II hid in the royal oak at Boscobel, it started to rain; and how this Providential downfall of rain transpiring while Charles II was in the royal oak, helped to preserve him from the Roundhead soldiers looking for him. (Cf. 7e, “Royal Oak Streets and other place names,” *infra*.)

And on this *Epiphany 4 Sunday* following *King Charles I's Day* in 2009, as I walked the streets of London, once again, this happened in Charles II's Street, London. As I took the first photo of the road sign, a light snow fell, and it continued till about the time I reached the end of Charles II's Street. (The following day London experienced the heaviest snow fall in 18 years, bringing its public transport system to a standstill. At first, my feet sank about a foot in soft snow, and the snow took about a week before it had fully cleared.) At the end of Charles II Street I then arrived at St. James's Square, where I looked at the statue of William III of Orange on horseback, which bears the Latin inscription, “Gulielmus (William) III.” This Latin usage of William of Orange's name is of special interest, because whereas English monarchs generally have signed their name in English, e.g., “Charles R[ex]” (both Charles I and Charles II), or “Elizabeth R[egina]” (both Elizabeth I and Elizabeth II), by contrast, William III sometimes signed his name in English as “William R[ex],” and sometimes signed his name in Latin, as “Gulielmus R[ex]”¹⁰. (Since 1689 William III is also remembered on *Papists' Conspiracy Day* or *Bonfire Day*.)

Charles II's Day is the opposite side of the coin to *Charles I's Day*. If one regards King Charles I (Regnal Years: 1625-1649) as a Christian martyr, who suffered unjust death at the hands of Oliver Cromwell's Puritan republican revolutionaries; then

¹⁰ Public Records Office, *English Royal Signatures*, Pamphlets No. 4, Facsimiles [of monarch's signatures] by R.J. Goulden, Her Majesty's Stationary Office, London, UK, 1973, SBN 11 44005520 (British Library Manuscripts Room, MSS 411.7).

one sees in the Restoration of the monarchy under King Charles II (Regnal Years: King *de jure* of the three kingdoms, 1649-1685; King *de facto* of Scotland, 1649-1650/1¹¹; King *de facto* of England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1660-1685), the termination of this bad and sad chapter in the history of the British Isles. In the final analysis, the events of *Charles I's Day* and *Charles II's Day* therefore cannot be conceptually separated, since the one relates to the other. They are the two sides of the one Royalist coin¹².

This nexus is e.g., recognized in the red-letter day Office of King Charles the Martyr found in the 1662 prayer book until 1859. One of the Collects to be said after the prayer for the whole state of Christ's church militant here in earth, at *The Communion Service*, includes the following words. "O Lord, ... thou didst suffer ... blessed King Charles the First ... to fall into the hands of violent and blood-thirsty men, and barbarously to be murdered by them ...; but by thy gracious providence didst miraculously preserve the ... heir of his crowns, ... King Charles the Second, from his bloody enemies, hiding him in the shadow of thy wings, until their tyranny was overpast; and didst bring him back ... to sit upon the throne of his father ... together with the royal family ..." (emphasis mine). This reference to "miraculously" preserving Charles II and "hiding him," though broader than the events of the Royal Oak, nevertheless, clearly includes the story of the Royal Oak, *infra*.

And one of the Collects to be used at Evening Prayer (Evensong) says, "Blessed God, ... who didst permit thy dear servant, ... King Charles the First, to be ... given up to the violent outrages of wicked men, to be ... murdered by them: though we cannot reflect upon so foul an act, but with horror and astonishment; yet do we most gratefully commemorate the glories of thy grace, which then shined forth in thine anointed: whom thou wast pleased, even at the hour of death, to endue with an eminent measure of exemplary patience, meekness, and charity, before the face of his cruel enemies. And albeit thou didst suffer them to proceed to such an height of violence, as to kill him ...;

¹¹ As a consequence of the unwelcome encroachments into Scotland of the invading republican army of Cromwell, Charles II held *de facto* power only in parts of Scotland from the latter half of 1650 through to 1651.

¹² 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 second and third of these which are itemized in the C. of E., (or four in the C. of I.) which were continuing offices, together with the Accession Service which was changed for the reigning monarch as Supreme Governor of the C. of E., (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,) are "II. The Thirtieth Day of January, being the Day kept in Memory of the Martyrdom of King Charles I. III. The twenty-ninth Day of May, being the Day kept in Memory of the Birth and Return of King Charles II."

yet didst thou in great mercy preserve his son, whose right it was, and at length by a wonderful providence bring him back For these thy great mercies we glorify thy name through Jesus Christ our blessed Saviour. Amen" (emphasis mine).

Thus e.g., after the Restoration of 1660, in 1661, King Charles II ordered that Cromwell's body be exhumed, and his skull placed on a public gazing pole at Westminster Hall, next to the Westminster Parliament, where Cromwell's skull remained throughout the further 24 year duration of this Caroline reign. (The bodies were also exhumed and hung at Tyburn of e.g., John Bradshaw, the President of the show-trial court which condemned Charles I; and Thomas Pride of the 1648 "Pride's Purge," who had signed Charles I's death warrant, as was knighted by Cromwell in 1656.) The remainder of Cromwell's body was hung in chains at Tyburn in London's Hyde Park. "For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft" (I Sam. 15:23); those involved in "seditions" and "murders" "shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. 5:20,21); and "Thou shalt put the evil away from among you" (Deut. 17:7).

It is important to also remember that the focus of *The King's Restoration Day* is *not on Charles II in general*, but the Restoration that gave us, e.g., William III of Orange or the present Queen of Australia, Elizabeth II. It is not a day that celebrates the general holiness of Charles II's life in the same way that a red-letter day such as e.g., *St. Matthew's Day* (21 Sept.), *St. Mark's Day* (25 April), or *St. Luke's Day* (18 Oct.), does in the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 with Collects and Readings. Indeed, there were some serious moral blemishes and defects in Charles II's life. Rather, *Charles I's Day* as its secondary focus, or *Charles II's Day* as its primary focus, remembers the reestablishment at the Restoration of a legally Protestant Christian throne, and in this context, the protection by God of the heir, Charles II, in the oak tree at Boscobel in 1651.

For example, from the Biblical perspective, Saul was not a particularly good king. Indeed, he was quite a bad king. E.g., the caption of Psalm 57 says Saul was so jealous of David, that he tried to kill him, and hence David fled from Saul and hid in a cave. But David's response was not one of sedition against Saul, rather in Psalm 57 he prays to God, "Be merciful unto me, O God, be merciful unto me: for my soul trusteth in thee: yea, in the shadow of thy wings will I make my refuge, until these calamities be overpast." We cannot doubt that David had some very legitimate grievances with King Saul. But he also recognized that *two wrongs don't make a right*, and that Saul was still by God's law the lawful king. So too, the English Puritans had some very legitimate grievances against Laud; as indeed did Reformed Anglicans. Archbishop Laud had managed to reactivate a dead-letter Elizabethan statute that had justly fallen into disuse, by which people were fined one shilling for not attending an Anglican Church on Sunday. It was fairly seen by English Puritans as religious persecution. Charles I is to be criticized for not restraining Laud, and for not working with the Parliament to repeal this repressive law. On the basis of e.g., Acts 5:29 and Romans 14, Puritans were within their Christian Biblical rights to practice some form of non-violent civil disobedience, and Puritan parliamentarians were within their rights to exert pressure for the repeal of this dreadful law. *Nevertheless, that does not justify sedition against the Crown!* They should have followed the example of David in Psalm 57. The English Puritans have my

sympathies on this kind of issue against Archbishop Laud, but they do not have my support for the way they went about trying to rectify the situation, by basically arguing that *two wrongs make a right*.

The English Puritans had the powerful lever of the House of Commons in their control. Instead of using it to try and take all power to themselves in a Puritan monopoly that sought to abolish Anglicanism as the Established Church and then rule over e.g., the unwilling Anglican land of England which they tried to force convert to Puritanism very much against its wishes; and instead of the English Puritans abolishing the House of Lords and killing the King; the English Puritans should have acted in keeping with constitutional law. This would have been a much slower, harder process, but it is what they should have done. They were in a powerful position to bargain with the King and House of Lords at many points; and could, over time, have gotten the concessions they justly sought for with regard to Puritan religious tolerance. Instead of trying to make England Puritan, they should have recognized the fundamental Anglicanism of England, and the legitimacy of having the *Church of England* established. They should have worked with Reformed Anglicans like James Ussher of Ireland, and not against both Laudian Anglicans and Reformed Anglicans alike. They should in a long, patient manner, have worked with King Charles to bring about the type of religious freedoms procured in 1689. With the powerful lever of the House of Commons, and public petition to Almighty God in prayer, they could have ultimately gained their own religious freedoms. And if they had done that, the Tests Acts against English Puritans which continued after 1689 would not have been necessary for Puritans, (although they would have remained necessary for Papists,) because the Puritans would not have been glorifying a seditious murderer like Oliver Cromwell, or a political revolutionary like Samuel Rutherford. Intra-Protestant history could have been, and would have been, both different and a lot better for this era. There would not now be the historical hagiological divide that exists between traditional Low Church Evangelical Anglicans such as myself, and so many of those derived from English and Irish (and less commonly Scottish) derived Puritan Churches.

But the problem with the megalomaniacal English Puritans was that they wanted all power in their hands, and they wanted the forced conversion of a most unwilling England to Puritanism. They used their own legitimate grievances as a mechanism to lock in the support of the masses of English and Irish Puritans, and thus as a pretext, for sedition and revolution. As seen by, e.g., the *Solemn League and Covenant*, they wanted to abolish Anglicanism, and completely deny it any religious freedom. Their rhetoric to hoodwink English and Irish Puritans was one of their own grievances; but their political ambitions were far greater. They wanted more than control of just the House of Commons. Their greedy eyes and hearts wanted control *per se*. *Alas, hundreds of years on, many English and Irish Church derived Puritans, and some Scottish Church derived ones, still fail to see the wood from the trees.*

Thus while traditional Reformed Anglicans support the claims of Charles I and Charles II to be king against the Puritan republican, they are not thereby uncritical of them. Indeed, the Office of King Charles the Martyr's Day from 1662 to 1859 gives as

one of the readings, II Samuel 1. In other words, this Office is making the point that King Charles I was to some extent like King Saul, a king who left something to be desired. But it is also making the point, that to murder King Saul was a capital offence, forbidden by God's law (even though the Amalekite's testimony was a fabrication of evidence, I Sam. 31:4-6, false testimony in such an instance was also a capital crime, Deut. 19:15-21); and to act in sedition and murder against King Charles I, was the same. The same is true of the attempted murder of Charles II in 1651. Certainly Charles I's Scottish war in which he tried to impose Anglicanism on an unwilling Scotland was very misguided; and his failure to discipline Laud was absolutely shocking. But so was Saul's conduct in trying to murder David. In the Bible, God does not call us to give our allegiance to perfect men in the office of King. This is clear when one considers some of the New Testament times tyrants Christians were told to "honour." Certainly the holy Apostle, St. Peter, knew all about tyrant kings, when through him the Holy Ghost had him pen the words which are found to this day in the Office of the *Accession Service* of a reigning monarch (most recently issued annually for 6 February by Royal Warrant of Elizabeth II in 1958), "Fear God. Honour the King" (I Peter 2:17).

Thus our basic and fundamental motive is the same for remembering both the Restoration in 1660 and *Accession Day*. It is that we uphold Biblical authority, and thank God for a legally Protestant throne, even if those on that throne sadly do not always live up to the high Protestant ideals of that legally Protestant throne. We uphold Biblical authority against Papists who attack it by their teaching of an infallible Pope who they say can authorize sedition against the Crown and murder, seen in the case of the 1605 gunpowder treason plot of Guy Fawkes and others with the attempted murder of King James I. We uphold Biblical authority against English Puritan revolutionaries who attack it by their teaching of a "natural law" or "reason" which they say can authorize sedition and murder against a so called "tyrant" and thus the Crown, found in the 1649 beheading of King Charles I, and the attempted murder of Charles II in 1651. We uphold the Biblical teachings against "seditions" and "murder" because we are Protestants. We are men of the Infallible Book. We want no so called "higher authority" over its teachings! We will accept no other so called "higher authority" over its teachings!

And so in remembering the Restoration in 1660, we remember that in the end, just as the breath of God blew in 1588, and the Spanish Armada forces of Antichrist were pulverized upon the rocks of northern Ireland; so likewise, by the power of God, the English Puritan's republic of 1642 to 1660 was brought to a close, as it stopped short, never to go again, when the decrepit Puritan, Oliver Cromwell, *died*; for with his death, the whole, ugly, bloodthirsty mess of the English Puritan's republic, effectively *expired*. Under Interregnum rules, Oliver Cromwell selected his successor, which was his eldest son, Richard or Dick Cromwell (Lord Protector 1658-1659). The whole edifice of the republic came crashing down around the ears of this son and successor, who proved to be an exceptionally poor leader, and this idle character is known as "Idle Dick."

In Psalm 37 we read words that might reasonably be applied to Oliver Cromwell, and his ultimate demise followed by the Restoration. David says, "I have seen the

wicked in great power, and spreading himself like a green bay tree. Yet he passed away, and, lo, he was not: yea, I sought him, but he could not be found.” “The salvation of the righteous is of the Lord; he is their strength in the time of trouble. And the Lord shall help them, and deliver them: he shall deliver them from the wicked and save them, because they trust in him” (Ps. 37:35,36,39,40).

One of the propaganda techniques of republicans is to first form a republic, and then to claim that once done, it can never be reversed. But one of the reasons we remember the story of the royal oak, in which the Crown was protected from republican hands in 1651 during the interregnum, and then restored 9 years later in 1660, is because it reminds us that even if in the shorter term we did loose, there can, and indeed ultimately should be, a Restoration of the monarchy.

The Restoration of 1660, celebrated on *Charles II's Day* (29 May), is all about righting a wrong, by the grace of God, as best one can in human terms, that occurred under the rebellion that saw the Christian martyrdom of an Anglican King at the hands of Puritan revolutionaries, remembered on *Charles I's Day* (30 Jan.). There could be no *Charles II's Day* (Restoration), unless there were first the events of *Charles I's Day* (martyrdom of the King). And the sadness of *King Charles the Martyr's Day*, is reversed with the joy of *The King's Restoration Day* (29 May), bringing with it also, the happy memory of the escape from death of Charles II at the Royal Oak in 1651.

Thus, for example, Sir William Blackstone (1723-1780) refers to the “liberty” of Charles II's reign, saying, “the statute of King Charles II, which prescribes a thing seemingly of indifference, (a dress for the dead, who are all ordered to be buried in woolen,) is a law consistent with public liberty; for it encourages the staple trade, on which in great measure depends the universal good of the nation¹³.”

The work of evangelism under the Christian Gospel also benefited from the Restoration. E.g., this is recorded in a book that formerly belong to one of my four-times great grandfathers, Captain John Brabyn (1758-1835) of the New South Wales Corps who arrived in Australia in 1796, who formerly held a pew at St. Matthew's Windsor, and helped sow the Evangelical seeds in the Diocese of Sydney. In Bryan Edwards *History of the West Indies* (1801), we read, “It does not appear that there was any form of civil government established in ... Jamaica before the Restoration; when Colonel D'Oyley, who had then the chief command under ... the Lord Protector, was confirmed in that command by a Commission from King Charles, dated the 13th of February, 1661. His Commission ... directs the Governor to discountenance vice and debauchery, and to encourage Ministers, that Christianity and the Protestant religion, according to the *Church of England*, might have due reverence and exercise amongst them ...¹⁴.”

¹³ I Bl. Com. 126.

¹⁴ Edwards, B., *The History, Civil & Commercial, of the British Colonies in the West Indies*, Printed for John Stockdale, Piccadilly, London, by Luke Hanford, Great Turnstile, Lincoln's-Inn Fields, First Edition 1796, Third Edition, 1801, pp. 287 & 289.

2b) *Some sites I have visited of interest to Charles I, Charles II, James II, & William III.*

Over my five trips to London from 2001 to 2009, I have been privileged to travel around seeing some sites of relevant historical interest. In this section I shall refer to a kaleidoscope of places which reflect some of the issues of the Caroline eras of both Charles I (Regnal Years: 1625-1649) and Charles II (Regnal Years: King *de jure* of the three kingdoms, 1649-1685; King *de facto* of Scotland, 1649-1650/1; King *de facto* of England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1660-1685); as well as a lesser number connected with the Jacobite reign of James II (Regnal Years: 1685-1688), and subsequent Protestant reign of William III (Regnal Years: joint reign with Mary II, 1689-1694; sole reign 1694-1702).

Thus since the Caroline eras of Charles I and Charles II ended with the dangers posed by the Popish Duke, James II; as saved by God with the coming of William III of Orange; I shall also make some lesser references to some places of relevance to James II with his derivative Jacobites, and William III. That is because before 1689, God was thanked in the *Office of Papists' Conspiracy Day* (5 Nov.) for his preservation of the Protestant "religion" from "Popish treachery" in Jacobean times (James I, Regnal Years: 1603-1625) on 5 Nov. 1605; and this sentiment was then further developed and reinforced from 1689 as the same service thanked God for the deliverance from Jacobite times (James II, Regnal Year: 1685-1688) with "King William," who came "to preserve" "our religion" on 5 Nov. 1688. Thus while Charles I in the *Office of King Charles the Martyr's Day* (30 Jan.) and Charles II in the *Office of the King's Restoration Day* (29 May) were remembered as the legitimate monarchs on a legally Protestant throne, neither were regarded as thereby to be beyond a reasonable level of criticism. In particular, like King Solomon who entered mixed marriages to his spiritual harm (I Kgs 11:4,6; Neh. 13:26), both Charles I and Charles II entered mixed marriages with Papists; and such marriages with Papists were later wisely prohibited monarchs under the Williamite Settlement. Thus to capture this contextual balance under which we remember Charles I and Charles II, it is important to also remember the danger to the Protestant throne posed by such unions, seen in the saga of the Popish Duke, James II, and the Jacobites that he spawned; and God's gracious relief from this by the coming of William III of Orange on 5 Nov. 1688 which was thereafter also remembered in the *Office of Papists' Conspiracy Day* (5 Nov.); and thus the prohibition on the Protestant monarch of ever marrying a Papist was a part of this celebration which qualified elements of *Charles I's Day* and *Charles II's Day*.

The good Christian reader should further be mindful of the contextual Anglican balance of, on the one hand, *Papists' Conspiracy Day* (5 Nov.), i.e., opposition to Popish sedition against the Crown, such as found in the Guy Fawkes Gunpowder Plot of 1605 or the conspiracy to put Papists on the throne brought to an end with the removal of James II and his Jacobites by William of Orange in 1688/9; and on the other hand, *King Charles the Martyr's Day* (30 Jan.) and *The King's Restoration Day* (29 May), i.e., opposition to Puritan sedition against the Crown seen in the mainly English and Irish revolutionary

Puritan actions of the 1640s and 1650s. I.e., as part of the Protestant Christian State (Ps. 2:10-12; Isa. 49:22,23), Anglicans upheld the constitutional law of an Anglican Protestant throne against both Papists and Puritans alike, who both sought to strike it down. However, (unlike the semi-Romanist Puseyites and semi-Puseyites who arose from the 19th century,) through reference to the Test Acts and 1689 Act of Toleration, Anglicans are historically more anti-Papist than anti-Puritan, since the 1689 Toleration Act gave their fellow Protestants a religious tolerance not granted to Papists; and with Scotland, where most Puritans had been Royalists, there was an English and Irish Anglican, and Scottish Presbyterian Protestant alliance, that under Christ became from 1689 the bedrock of the Protestant Christian State in the British Isles till the 19th century.

In this section, in general I shall either not cover, or not cover in as much detail, places I have referred to elsewhere in Volumes 1 to 3 of these textual commentaries (e.g., those at “7h” “Royal Oak Day Celebrations,” *infra*; or Lincoln Cathedral in Vol. 2, Preface, “*Robinson & Pierpont’s ... new edition Byzantine Textform ...”). However, I may cover some places in more detail if touched on more briefly elsewhere (e.g., some greater detail on the William of Orange statue at Brixham, *infra*).

The following places were visited on my first trip to London (April 2001-April 02). In May 2001 I visited London Tower. Among other things, I saw the *Chapel of St. Peter ad* (Latin, ‘unto’ = ‘in’) *vincula* (chains) (Acts 12:1-19), which shows a figurine kneeling in prayer (a depiction much hated by 1640s and 1650s Puritan vandals). In the Jewel House, I saw from the Caroline era of Charles I, a 1629 Communion Paten and 1638 Chalice (for Communion wine) and Paten (for Communion bread); and from the Caroline era of Charles II, a 1660 Restoration Baptismal Font and Basin, and a 1681-2 alms-dish (or Offertory plate for the Church Offertory). Black ravens were also kept at the tower, in part to eat the carcasses of those executed there. But after the Great Fire of London in 1666, the ravens were killed or removed from London. However, King Charles II, ordered that six ravens be kept at London Tower, and this tradition has been followed to this day (although the exact number sometimes varies, so that there were seven there in May 2001), and I took a photo of some of them on the ground outside the White Tower.

During the period of *Oak Apple Day* (29 May to 31 May) I was at Salisbury, where among other things I visited Wilton Castle near Salisbury. This is the house / seat of the Earls of Pembroke whose land has historically included Grovely Wood, and this has been connected with *Oak Apple Day* celebrations there. After I took a general photo, the automatic gate opened to let a car out, and so I managed to race up and get a good photo of Wilton Castle. (See “7h” “Royal Oak Day Celebrations,” *infra*). I also saw “The Poultry Cross” in the old marketplace, which is one of four market crosses which formerly stood at Salisbury. Dating from as early as 1335, this sandstone edifice has a cross on top, but it managed to survive the era of the Puritan republic during which time such things were likely to be smashed and broken. Of course, the architecturally beautiful sandstone Salisbury Cathedral is also important, both as a symbol of Anglicanism during the Caroline periods, and by Australian standards, a very large Cathedral indeed.

In December 2001-January 2002 I undertook a Christmas-New Year trip around mainland UK (i.e., England, Wales, & Scotland). I visited York, and as I arrived on the evening of 22 Dec. 2001, for the first time in my life I experienced a snow fall, which meant that when I looked around the city the next day, it was covered in a beautiful white blanket of snow. (Erstwhile, back in Australia, ... bushfires were burning!) Here at Micklegate I read a plaque that said, "During the Siege of York, 1644, Royalists surrendered the city to the ... Republicans. The terms of surrender were generous and city preserved from destruction." And when I went to York Cathedral, I saw stained-glass windows that had been preserved under these treaty terms, including one dating from Norman times of 1120-40 A.D. showing Daniel in the Lion's Den (Dan. 6).

On the misadvice of Archbishop Laud, Charles I had tried to impose Anglicanism on an unwilling Scotland in 1637. In my opinion, Charles I was wrong to do so. From 1637 this led to the rise of Scottish Presbyterian bands, known as "Covenanters," who sought to maintain Presbyterianism in Scotland. Following the Scottish National Covenant of 1638, Anglicanism was rejected by the Scots; and following the ensuing *Bishops' War* of 1639 and *Pacification of Berwick* in 1640, and subsequent defeat of Charles I's army by a Scottish Puritan army, Charles I agreed that the Scots could have their own church assembly and parliament, a commitment which he always honoured. Unfortunately, the same Scottish group then started to advocate the *Solemn League & Covenant* which sought to abolish Anglicanism and impose Puritanism on e.g., an unwilling England, thus replicating the earlier mistake of Laud in trying to impose Anglicanism on Scotland. Such foolishness proved the recipe for much unnecessary bloodshed. At the *Royal Museum of Scotland* in Edinburgh, Scotland, I saw a Communion Paten from Trinity College Church made by Thomas Kirkwood of Edinburgh in 1663-5, which shows a man kneeling to receive Communion. This reflects one of the points of disagreement, since Presbyterians considered one should sit to received Communion. I also saw one of the Covenanters' flags, which had sown on it the words of Exod. 17:15 in the AV, "IEHOVAH-NISSI" (using "I" for "J," meaning, "The Lord is my banner").

In Scotland, I visited Edinburgh Castle. I there saw The Great Hall which was used during the Interregnum from 1650 as a soldiers' barracks by Oliver Cromwell's occupation forces. It was Christmas time, and no doubt to the chagrin of those who support such Puritans anti-Christmas views, this Hall had a Christmas tree in it lit up with electric lights.

At Glasgow in Scotland I found evidences of both those who were favorable about the Restoration under Charles II, and those who were not. On the downside, I saw in the Cathedral crypt a memorial plaque to Scottish Presbyterians who opposed the *Episcopal Church of Scotland* which till 1689 provided Scotland with a Puritan Church that had episcopal church government. I.e., Puritans divided on the issue of church government, with Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Baptists all having different views, and the *Episcopal Church of Scotland* was a further twist in this story as it was set up as a Puritan church with bishops. While most Scots seemed to be happy with this

accommodation, or at least not virulently hostile to it, some of the Presbyterians were, in varying degrees, opposed to it. This memorial plaque is to eight men who were Presbyterians and Covenanters of some form, “who suffered at the cross of Glasgow, for their testimony to the covenants” “betwixt 1666, and 1688.” After which time, the Presbyterian Church became the Established *Church of Scotland* from 1689.

More positively, on the upside I also saw at Glasgow, Provand’s Lordship. This is the oldest house in Glasgow, and dating from 1471, it was originally part of St. Nicholas’s Hospital. Inside is “The Spruce Panel.” These are the *Royal Coat of Arms of King Charles II* on a panel dating from 1680-5. They were brought up from a parish church in England, and are now proudly displayed here.

The Jacobites were for the Popish James II and his descendants, and Williamites were for the Protestant succession. Inverness is regarded as “the capital” of Scottish Highland, and is astride the River Ness (best known in connection with the legend of the Loch Ness monster). At the Inverness Museum in my Dec. 01-Jan. 02 trip, I saw some Jacobite relics e.g., some Jacobite glasses dating from c. 1750. This included a bronze cast death-mask of *The Young Pretender*, Charles Edward (1720-1788), who was both born in and died in, Papal Rome. This Popish Jacobite was the leader of the Jacobite sedition that was finally put down by the Protestants at the *Battle of Culloden* in 1746. At the Tower of London in May 2011, I saw in the White Tower an 18th century execution block, used and probably made for the execution of, the Scottish Jacobite, Simon Fraser in 1747, who was the last person beheaded on Tower Hill.

In June 2001 I visited Hampton Court Palace in London, the site of the famous conference under James I that led to the King James Bible of 1611. The Palace was also used by e.g., William III of Orange, and contains a number of “King William III rooms” preserving artifacts from his era e.g., a study with a desk where he used to give his Royal Assent to Acts of Parliament. The guides there dress in clothes from different relevant eras, and one such group are clothed from the era of William of Orange.

In April 2002, I went out to an OPEN DAY at Windsor Castle in connection with seeing the grave of the recently deceased Queen Mother. I also saw near the Castle, Christopher Wren’s House. A plaque on it says, “This House was designed and lived in by Sir Christopher Wren.” Sir Christopher was the great architect of the Caroline era under Charles II, whose work following the Great Fire of London in 1666 is legendary. It includes e.g., The Monument near London Bridge, and the present St. Paul’s Cathedral.

The following places were visited on my second trip to London (Dec. 2002-July 2003).

I shall further discuss Richard Baxter at my 3rd trip to London, *infra*. I shall deal with the issue of imprisonments and ejections of Puritans following the Restoration through reference to John Bunyan of Bedford and Richard Baxter of Kidderminster respectively. I regard both as saintly men, who unnecessarily suffered in the aftermath

fallout of the *Protestant verses Protestant* conflict of *Anglican Protestants verses English Puritan Protestants* that was part and parcel of the British Civil Wars, Interregnum, and first 30 years of the Restoration. I expect to see both men in heaven.

In Feb. 2003, I went to see the John Bunyan sites at Bedford in England, the authors of *Pilgrim's Progress*. I have never been much attracted to the *Pilgrim's Progress* which is a work of religious allegorical fiction that seeks to convey non-fictional Biblical truths. I prefer the simple straightforward teachings of the gospel as found in the pages of Holy Writ to this elaborate and long-winded tale. In this sense, I simply say, "Give me the Bible, it is sufficient for me." But within Protestantism, different religious traditions may encase the gospel of Christ in different ways, and I am conscious of the fact that *Pilgrim's Progress* is a work much liked and celebrated by Puritans, especially Baptists, of which Bunyan was one. Indeed, I have heard it said that if the old-time Puritan Ministers could have only two books, then one would be the Bible and the other Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*. Thus even as a traditional Anglican Minister might be artistically depicted or characterized as holding a Bible in one hand and a 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* in the other hand, so likewise a traditional Puritan Minister might be artistically depicted or characterized as holding a Bible in one hand and Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* in the other hand. Certainly I think the value that one places on a work like Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* is the type of thing that different Protestants may form different opinions upon, and I recognize the importance of this work to many Puritans who are my fellow Evangelicals, and also to some of my fellow Anglican Evangelicals. So much so, that in recognition of the importance of Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, I visited the Bunyan sites in and around Bedford in Feb. 2003.

Bunyan fell foul of the 1662 Act of Uniformity's penal provisions. While I deeply regret his imprisonment, it must also be candidly said that those Puritans who yelled the loudest included the ones who wanted to do the same type thing to Anglicans under the *Solemn League & Covenant*, and had done so to many Anglicans during the Interregnum. They yelled loudly not because they believed in religious freedom for Protestant Christians, but because they believed in denying religious freedom to Anglican Protestants under the *Solemn League & Covenant* which was adopted under Interregnum Ordinances in 1643 (although some of its roll-on provisions, such as making the prayer book "illegal" in 1645, took longer to be followed through on), and "were sore" because the Anglicans were doing to them, what they had done to the Anglicans during the Interregnum, and still wanted to keep on doing to the Anglicans. A good test that the Christian reader can apply to those Puritans who speak loudly about e.g., the *Lesser Ejection* of between 800-2,000 Puritans after the Restoration, is to see if the person telling them this shows any comparable concerns for the fact that during the Interregnum, after 1643 between five to ten times this number, i.e., between 7,000 and 10,000 Anglican clergymen, school teachers, and others were ejected by the English Puritan regime under the *Greater Ejection* as the provisions of the *Solemn League & Covenant* started to take effect. If they start to talk about using Bunyan as some "symbol of religious freedom" of a "persecuted" person, ask them about whether or not they also want to use King James Bible translator Daniel Featley and Staunton Harold Anglican Church, *infra*, as *symbols of Protestant religious freedom under religious persecution?*

The reality is that for the purposes of their own agenda, a number of them seem to want to use the symbolism of a Puritan being persecuted by Anglicans, but not the symbolism of Anglicans being persecuted by Puritans. If those who omit reference to these type of facts, show no such concern for Anglicans being ejected and denied religious freedom during the Interregnum, then they are at best ignoramuses who are the Puritan pawns in a game they do not even know is being played; and at worst, they are malicious anti-Anglican bigots who are “sore” that the Anglicans did to them from the 1660s to 1689, what they wanted to do to them under the *Solemn League & Covenant*.

Bunyan himself is a somewhat enigmatic figure on the issue of religious tolerance to Protestants, since as far as we know, he lived and thrived under the revolutionary Puritan republic, and never showed any concern for the lack of religious freedom to Anglicans. As enactments of the *Solemn League & Covenant* under Interregnum Ordinances, the Anglican prayer book was made “illegal” from 1645 to 1660, and bishoprics were “abolished” in accordance with the provisions of the *Solemn League & Covenant* calling for the “extirpation of” “Prelacy.” During the British civil wars, in Nov. 1644, Bunyan was mustered under Interregnum Ordinances to join the Roundhead’s army, and sent to reinforce the Newport Pagnell Garrison, and he remained there till July 1647¹⁵. In his autobiography, *Grace Abounding* (1666), Bunyan says that before his conversion somewhere between 1650-1655, he “delighted in all transgression against the law of God,” and in this context, he served as a Roundhead. He says “when I was a soldier, I, with others, were drawn out to go to ... a place to besiege it; but when I was just ready to go, one of the company desired to go ...; to which, when I had consented, he took my place; and coming to the siege, as he stood sentinel, he was shot in the head with a musket bullet, and died. Here ... were judgments and mercy, but neither of them did awaken my soul to righteousness; wherefore I sinned still, and grew more rebellious against God, and careless of mine own salvation¹⁶.” The fact that Bunyan sees in this Roundhead’s death by Cavalier “musket” fire, God’s “judgments” on this Roundhead, and God’s “mercy” in sparing Bunyan, indicates that after his repentance in 1650-55 he came to realize the sinfulness of the Roundhead’s rebellion; and indeed the terminology of THE GREAT REBELLION is arguably alluded to when he says that as a Roundhead he “grew more rebellious.” Thus Bunyan seems to have repented of his sins of “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:20,21) against the Crown (Matt. 22:21; Rom. 13:7; I Peter 2:17). For this we are thankful to God, as this evidences genuineness of repentance and turning to Christ is saving faith.

Nevertheless, as best we know, after his conversion between 1650 and 1655, Bunyan never used his pulpit, which he had some access to before 1655, and an increased access to from 1655 to 1660, to advocate religious tolerance to Anglicans who were being denied religious freedom under the provisions of the *Solemn League & Covenant*.

¹⁵ “Bunyan, John,” *Encyclopedia Britannica* (Multimedia Edition, CD, International Version 1999, Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc. 1994-1999).

¹⁶ Bunyan’s *Grace Abounding to the chief of sinners*, Printed by George Larkin, London, England, 1666, sections 8,13-14.

Certainly he makes no reference to any such sermons when he refers in his autobiography to his preaching; nor does he ever say he is opposed to *both* the lack of religious freedom for Anglicans advocated by English Puritans under the *Solemn League & Covenant*, and also the lack of religious freedom for English Puritans under the Anglican Act of Uniformity (as it was before 1689). Rather, he appears to have only been concerned with the lack of religious freedom to English Puritans under the Act of Uniformity (as it was before 1689). However, to the extent that Bunyan refers with favour to the Anglican clergyman and hagiologist, John Foxe (1516-1587), by citing Foxe's *Acts & Monuments* it might be said that he was not as virulently anti-Anglican as some Puritans might be¹⁷. Therefore, after his conversion from 1650 to 1655, upon becoming a preacher sometime before 1655, with increased preaching activity from 1655 to 1660, Bunyan appears to have been complacent about the denial of religious freedom to Anglicans under the *Solemn League & Covenant*. Hence, while on the one hand, I agree in broad terms with Puritans who criticize Anglican complacency or support for a denial of the 1689 type of religious freedom to Puritans from the 1660s to 1689; on the other hand, if such persons use Bunyan as their "symbol" for such persecution, then it should be qualified by saying that "when the shoe was on the other foot," Bunyan appears to have been complacent about the denial of religious freedom to Anglicans during the Interregnum, both before his 1650-55 conversion when he was a Roundhead, and after his 1650-55 conversion when he became a Baptist preacher at Bedford.

Such complexities and difficulties aside, as I state in Volume 1 of these Textual Commentaries, "Before the *Act of Toleration* in 1689, the innocent Puritan Protestants of England suffered with the guilty, and because of those guilty Puritan Protestants still harbouring sympathies for Cromwell's republic. After 1689, they were still subject to the Test Acts, but had basic religious toleration. One of those arrested for his Puritan Non-Conformity was the Baptist, John Bunyan It is certainly both sad and wrong, that such a man was persecuted by Restoration Anglicans for not attending an Anglican Church on Sundays¹⁸." That is because the Bible urges tolerance on these type of issues (Rom. 14:5,6; Col. 2:16), and we are told, "Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law" (Rom. 13:10).

John Bunyan (1628-1688) sites of Bedford and its environs that I saw in Feb. 2003 include those at Elstow, near Bedford. Elstow was Bunyan's birthplace. In 1628 Bunyan was born in a cottage in the far end of the Elstow parish, close to the hamlet of Horrowden. This cottage no longer stands, but the site of it is marked by a stone erected in the *Festival of Britain* year of 1951. Bunyan's family lived in this area for more than 400 years before his birth. I trekked up from "Bunyan Farm" which is a private road, stating, "Visitors to Bunyan's Birthplace only. Proceed by the side of the brook. Please do not damage the crops." Depending on weather conditions, it can be quite a tricky

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, section 270.

¹⁸ Textual Commentary Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), Preface, "Dedication: The Anglican Calendar," section "c) i) Charles the First's Day (30 Jan), Charles the Second's Day (29 May), & Papists' Conspiracy Day (5 Nov)," subsection, "The removal of religious liberty to Puritans from 1662 to 1689."

trek; and after going over such obstacles as a fence, I came to a stone pillar “to mark the birthplace of JOHN BUNYAN 1628-1688.”

Back at Elstow I saw St. Helena & St. Mary’s *Church of England*. This Anglican Church was restored in 1880, and is the truncated remnant of a once larger monastic church of the 13th century. This church contains the baptismal font where John Bunyan received infant Anglican baptism on 30 Nov. 1628. The door and wicket gate featured in Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress* are here (formerly at church’s north end), and Bunyan’s mother, father, and sister are buried in the Anglican graveyard.

Opposite Elstow Anglican Church is Elstow Green and Moot Hall. Moot Hall, formerly called, “Green House,” was built in the later 15th century as a market-house in connection with the village fairs, and was known to Bunyan. It was used for storing the stalls and other equipment and as a place for hearing disputes arising from the fairs. It is a two-storey brick building, in which the second story protrudes out over the first story, forming a small veranda type covering. A stump of a cross on Elstow Green marks the site where the Annual May Fair used to be held. The value of the May Fair was a point of contention between Anglicans and Puritans. After the Restoration, in addition to dancing around the Maypole and decorating it at the start of May (1 May), this was also done at the end of May (29 May) on *Royal Oak Day*. Here on Elstow Green, the boy Bunyan danced and joined in games of tip-cat (a form of rounders played with a stick rather than a ball¹⁹). Across the road, opposite Elstow Green and Moot Hall, there are a row of Tudor cottages which were restored by the Bedfordshire County Council to look like they did in Bunyan’s time.

Bunyan sites at Bedford itself that I saw included St. John’s Rectory (now used by St. John’s Ambulance), where in the 1650s Bunyan sought spiritual help from the Puritan Baptist Minister, John Gifford, and this Rectory is therefore considered by some interpreters to be the background imagery in *The Pilgrim’s Progress* as the House of the Interpreter where Christian stopped for guidance. I.e., “The Christian went on till he came at the House of the Interpreter ‘Sir,’ said Christian, I was told if I called here you would show me excellent things, such as being a help to me on my journey’.” Bunyan is aid to have worked on part of *Pilgrim’s Progress* here. (Interestingly, the roof contains ceiling beams of the 17th century Lancashire and Yorkshire Rose). I also saw the site of Bunyan’s adult baptism by John Gifford which is marked in a little backwater that runs off the River Great Ouse (south bank of river between Duck Mill Lane car park & Weir Bridge, Bedford).

In Jan. 1661, seven or eight weeks after his arrest for preaching in Samsell, Bunyan was brought before the Magistrates at the Bedford Quarter-Sessions. He was an

¹⁹ Rounders is an old English game, but played in the UK by school children, rather than as a main competitive sport. However, it is an ancestor to baseball, which in the United States of America was modified in the 19th century to become what is now a main American competitive sport. E.g., like baseball, in rounders, after a batsman hits the ball, he runs to three bases, which he can wait at, before going to home base.

independent Non-Conformist Puritan preacher, and under Restoration laws only Anglican preachers were permitted. The specific charge dealt with his non-conformity to Anglicanism, in that he had “abstained from attending Church services” in an Anglican Church. He replied to the charge, “If I were out of prison today, I would preach the gospel again tomorrow, by the help of God.” The Bedford Quarter-Sessions was then held in a building known as the Chapel of Herne. Since demolished, the Town Hall Office which I saw now stands on this site.

The *Swan Hotel* next to the 1813 bridge, *infra*, is a picturesque brick building painted white. It is by the river, upon which I saw a number of white swans swimming. In the 17th century, this *Swan Hotel* had Chambers set aside for judges to use in the town’s county assizes. In Aug. 1661, John Bunyan’s second wife, Elizabeth, pleaded for her husband here at the *Swan Hotel* as his original sentence of three months had already been extended to six months. The presiding judge on a bench of three judges, Matthew Hale, a jurist of great distinction who wrote a series of commentaries on the law of England known as *Hale’s Pleas of the Crown*, was sympathetic to Elizabeth’s petition that Bunyan be called to state his case. But the other two judges, Chester and Twisden, were unsympathetic, and overruled Hale in a 2:1 vote.

The Bedford County Jail (Gaol) no longer exists. But I saw a plaque on the ground marking its former location at the junction of High & Silver Streets. It says, “On this site stood the Bedford County Gaol where John Bunyan was imprisoned for twelve years 1660-1672.” The County Jail stood here till demolished in 1801. All agree that Bunyan served his longer prison sentence from 1660 to 1672 here. During this first imprisonment he worked on writing *Pilgrim’s Progress*. Conditions in this prison are said to have been poor, both in terms of cleanliness and overcrowding. Bunyan was allowed daily visits to this prison from his daughter, Mary, whom brought him meal food.

An 1813 bridge close to the *Swan Hotel* contains a plaque saying, “On the shallow East of the 3rd Pier of the Bridge stood the Stone-House wherein BUNYAN imprisoned 1675-1676 wrote the first part of *Pilgrim’s Progress*. ‘As I slept I dreamed a dream’.” There are two views about the location of this second 1675-6 imprisonment. *View 1* is that of this plaque i.e., is Bunyan served his shorter imprisonment of 1675-6 in the *Town Gaol (Jail)* which was then part of the structure over this bridge. *View 2* is that the “evidence” “supports the view that Bunyan served both of his sentences in the County Gaol [Jail]²⁰.” Whichever of these two views is correct, there is agreement that he was imprisoned in one of these two places in his second shorter 1675-6 imprisonment.

Also of interest I saw Bunyan’s Home at 17 St. Cuthbert’s Street Bedford. A plaque on the house reads, “On this site stood the cottage where JOHN BUNYAN lived from 1655.” This is the site of the cottage that he and his family moved to in 1655 during the Interregnum. At a time when Anglicanism was “illegal” under Interregnum

²⁰ “Bedford John Bunyan” (Tourist Brochure), Bedford Council, Pamphlet Reference: 07/02 from Bedford Tourist Information Centre, 10 St. Paul’s Square, Bedford, MK401SL, England, UK.

Ordinances, the Puritan Preacher, John Gifford of St. John's Church died in the same year of 1655, and Bunyan who was a member of the Congregation was asked to preach more frequently. *There is no evidence that he preached for Anglicans to have religious liberty, who at that same time could be arrested for Puritan non-conformity of worship if they preached in, or attended, an Anglican Church. As far as we know, Bunyan accepted this Solemn League & Covenant enacting Interregnum status quo.* When Bunyan's Cottage was demolished in 1838, Bunyan's *Deed of Gift* was found hidden behind a brick in the chimney corner. Fearing further persecution and the possible seizure of his possessions after the accession of James I, Bunyan had drawn up this document leaving all his estate to his wife, Elizabeth. However, he was not arrested again, and so this documents was not needed. (It is now displayed at the Bunyan Museum.)

I also visited the *Bunyan Meeting Free Church*. After being elected as the Minister of the *Bedford Independent Congregation* following his release after his first imprisonment for Anglican non-conformity, in 1672 Bunyan bought a barn in Mill Street for £50 (fifty pounds) which was then converted to a Puritan meeting place. Following the Act of Toleration in 1689, in 1707 it was replaced by a Puritan Meeting House, and in 1850 the present church building was erected. I saw at this church bronze entrance doors presented to the *Bunyan Meeting Free Church* by the Anglican *Duke of Bedford* (Francis Russell, 9th Duke of Bedford from 1872-1891), in 1876. The doors ten panels depict scenes from Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*. Inside I was interested to see the Communion Table, which was originally three-times longer than it now is, and was the one used by John Bunyan at the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

John Bunyan is now favorably remembered in Bedford. For example, at the *Bedford Central Library* I saw a modern mural sculpture depicting scenes from Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* in the Library foyer. There is also Bunyan's Statue. This bronze statue of John Bunyan stands in St. Peter's Green, High Street Bedford. It is nine feet (or c. 2.75 metres) tall, weighs over three tones, and was sculptured by Sir J.E. Boehm. Around the pedestal are three bronze panels, illustrating different scenes from Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*. This statue of the Puritan, John Bunyan, was presented to the town of Bedford in 1874 by the Anglican *Duke of Bedford* (Francis Russell, 9th Duke of Bedford from 1872-1891).

This same type of favourable memory of Bunyan is also to be found at his birthplace of Elstow. Here I saw the "Bunyan Sports Centre," and the "John Bunyan School."

As for Bunyan's burial place, I inspected this in following month of March 2003, in London. His grave is at Bunhill Fields Cemetery in London and shows his body in effigy lying on top of a white stone grave. At one end an inscription reads, "JOHN BUNYAN, AUTHOR OF THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS, OB^T [= 'he died'²¹] 31st

²¹ This is an abbreviation of Latin, "*obiit* ('he died,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *obeo*)."

AUG^T 1688, Æ^T [= ‘aged’²²] 60.” At the other end an inscription reads that this grave was “restored by public subscription under the presidency of” the well known Evangelical Anglican, “Earl of Shaftesbury” (Anthony Ashley Cooper, 7th Earl of Shaftesbury from 1851-1885) in “May 1862.”

I end this section on John Bunyan by reminding the good Christian reader that Bunyan is one of the foremost examples held up by English Puritans, of the intolerance and persecution that occurred to them under the 1662 Act of Uniformity, before the passing of the 1689 Toleration Act. Thus there is always a necessary political loading that goes with their promotion of Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress*. I am discontent and uneasy at the unChristian way in which the story of John Bunyan’s imprisonment may be decontextualized to whip up an anti-Anglican and anti-1662 Act of Uniformity sentiment, that goes beyond a concern with those provisions rightly removed and modified with the Toleration Acts of 1689. I am concerned with any usage of this story, or that of Baxter, *infra*, that fails to look to the bigger picture of the lesser ejections of the 1660s of Puritans by Anglicans, coming on the tail of the greater ejection of Anglicans by Puritans during the Interregnum. I am concerned at any usage of this story that fails to look to the bigger picture of Puritans during the Interregnum denying religious freedom to Anglicans, making the prayer book “illegal,” and imprisoning men like the King James Bible translator, Daniel Featley *et al.* The fact that during the Interregnum, e.g., an Anglican Theological College such as *Chelsea College* in London, was turned into a prison that jailed Anglican Royalists, was a clear statement that under the *Solemn League & Covenant*, Anglican Schools and Churches were to be closed, and those who opposed the revolutionary Puritan regime could be imprisoned either in them or elsewhere.

Those who willfully do not give this broad overview, and so do not condemn both the religious intolerance of the Puritan regime against Anglicans during the Interregnum under the provisions of the *Solemn League & Covenant* calling for the “extirpation of” “Prelacy” in Scotland, England and Ireland; and also the failure of Anglicans in the 1660s to give the type of religious freedoms granted from 1689 under the Toleration Act; fail to give this broad overview for a reason. And that reason relates to the fact that they are “sore” that the Anglicans did to them up till 1689 what they wanted to do to the Anglicans under the *Solemn League & Covenant*. Such persons are not subject to Biblical teachings such as those of Rom. 14:5 & 6 or Col. 2:16. They do not recognize that the Protestant Gospel, “The just shall live by faith” (Gal. 3:12), requires the recognition that unless a man that is called a brother is willfully unrepentant in some kind of clear and obvious sin (e.g., I Cor. 5:11; 6:9,10; Gal. 5:19-21), all religiously conservative Protestant Christians are to be treated as “brethren,” and “all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another” (Gal. 5:14,15). And so while I am on record as maintaining, “It is certainly both sad and wrong, that such a man” as “John Bunyan” “was persecuted by Restoration Anglicans for not attending an Anglican Church on Sundays,” *supra*, I am also on record for giving this

²² This is an abbreviation of Latin, “*aetatis* (‘of the age [at]’ = ‘aged,’ feminine singular genitive noun, from *aetas*).”

wider context, lest my *love for the brethren* such as the Puritan Protestant Christians, John Bunyan, *supra*, or Richard Baxter, *infra*, be misconstrued and misused by those who show no *love for the brethren* who are Anglican Protestant Christians.

In April 2003 I joined one of “the London Walks” tours to see the old Jewish Quarter of London. (Jews were excluded from being Members of Parliament until 1858.) We went up Jewry Street, EC3. “Jewry” refers to Jews collectively e.g., in John 7:1 we read that “Jesus walked in Galilee: for he would not walk in Jewry, because the Jews sought to kill him.” Sephardic Jews from Spain and Portugal went to Holland because the Dutch Protestants were more tolerant to Jews in Amsterdam. Oliver Cromwell allowed a new group of Jews into England who arrived in 1657. Among other things of interest I saw in the old Jewish Quarter, was the Bevis Marks Synagogue (in Bevis Marks Street). The present synagogue is the longest continuous place of worship in Western Europe, being built in 1701 under William III (Regnal Years: Joint reign with Mary II, 1689-1694; sole reign, 1694-1702). Thus a level of religious freedom consonant with the maintenance of a Protestant Christian State was also afforded to Jews before the sad rise of the secular state in the 19th century.

I have been to Kingston a number of times over a number of trips to London. The fuller name of Kingston in Greater London is Kingston-Upon-Thames. On my fifth trip to London (Sept. 2008-March 2009), when I was living at Morden in Sutton, I went out to Kingston to take some photos in connection with Saxon coronations. Principally, I saw the coronation stone there outside the Guildhall and near the historic Clattern Bridge (which crosses Hogsmill River). It was formerly housed at the Saxon Chapel adjoining the parish church. Here were crowned a number of Saxon kings, Edward the Elder in 900, Athelstan in 925, Edmund in 940, Edred in 946, Edwy in 956, Edward the Martyr in 975, and Etheldred II the Unready in 979. Also at the corner of Ashdowne Rd & Eden Street are ceramic tiles depicting the Saxon kings being crowned. This creates an interesting and important background to the history of royalty in the British Isles. But the more immediately relevant parts of Kingston for the Caroline period are those seen on my second trip to London. This includes Kingston Bridge, which some think Charles I used as an escape route at one stage. And various parts of Kingston in general are important, because it was twice a civil war battleground in 1642, and from 1647 an area occupied by the Roundhead army under General Fairfax. This is significant because World War II British Prime Minister, Sir Winston Churchill records, “Cromwell” had “great difficulty” in getting his upper echelons to consent to King Charles I’s murder, and “Fairfax, no mean person, still Commander-in-Chief, was outraged²³.” (See “7c,” “A General Introduction to Royal Oak Day”).

The following places were visited on my third trip to London (Aug. 2003-April 2004). I undertook a trip around the English Midlands in Oct. 2003.

²³ Churchill, W., *A History of the English-Speaking Peoples*, Cassell & Co., London, UK, 1956, 2nd ed. 1957, Vol. 2, pp. 222-3.

The danger posed by Puritans glorifying Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford from e.g., their pulpits, necessitated the Test Acts continuing operations with respect to English Puritans from 1689 when the Toleration Act gave them a general religious freedom, as did other factors with respect to their stricter operation against Papists. The effect of glorifying Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford in Puritan pulpits is that a latent sentiment for political revolution against a so called “tyrant” exists in these churches, and in suitably skilled hands, even after many generations, it can be fairly quickly brought to the fore, and mobilized into the action of “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:20,21) against the Crown (Matt. 22:21; I Peter 2:17). This fact was writ large when I visited Birmingham in England, after which Birmingham in Alabama, USA, is named. At Birmingham Cathedral I saw a white stone plaque in this Anglican Cathedral which reads:

Near this Place are deposited the Remains
of the Hon.^{ble} PETER OLIVER, L.L.D.
formerly
HIS MAJESTY’S CHIEF JUSTICE
of the Province of *Massachusetts’ Bay*
in *New England*.

In the Year 1776,
on a Dissolution of Government,
He left his native Country,
But in all the consequent Calamities
His Magnanimity remained unshaken,
And (though the Source of his Misfortunes)
Nothing could dissolve his Attachment
to the BRITISH GOVERNMENT,
nor lessen his Love & Loyalty
to his SOVEREIGN,

On *Thursday 13th of Oct.* 1791,
In the true Faith & Hopes of a Christian
He resigned this Life,
Aged 78

I then went on to see Kidderminster. I state in Volume 1 of these Textual Commentaries, “Before the *Act of Toleration* in 1689, the innocent Puritan Protestants of England suffered with the guilty, and because of those guilty Puritan Protestants still harbouring sympathies for Cromwell’s republic. After 1689, they were still subject to the Test Acts, but had basic religious toleration.” One “of those ejected in 1662” was “Richard Baxter.” “The arrest of men like Bunyan, and the ejection of men like ... Baxter, were certainly unhappy events. But I think the ejections from Anglican Churches of ... Baxter, and others were justified as these men were clearly not Anglicans.

But while I support the ejection of non-Anglicans from Anglican pulpits, I do not support the further denial of religious freedom to them on the basis that they were Puritans not Anglicans. I.e., I think they should have been allowed to establish Puritan Churches in the British Isles, and then preach in them²⁴.” Baxter was imprisoned for 18 months from 1685, but dying in 1691, he lived to see the Toleration Act of 1689 which gave him the general freedoms he had earlier sought for.

At Kidderminster I saw the architecturally beautiful sandstone St. Mary’s *Church of England*, which has a high tower at one end. A large statue of the Puritan, Richard Baxter (1615-1691) now stands outside this Anglican church. Baxter had to build five galleries to accommodate his congregation. Though Baxter’s pulpit no longer exists here, it was formerly located at what is now called, “The Baxter Column.” (The old pulpit was thrown out, but then taken up, restored, and placed inside the Kidderminster Unitarian Church.) Baxter’s Communion Table was also removed, and is now housed at the Kidderminster United Reformed Church which celebrates the memory of Baxter by calling itself, “*Baxter United Reformed Church*.” Inside St. Mary’s *Church of England* there is also “Baxter’s Chair,” whose engraved words (sometimes changing “b” to “d” as appropriate) include: “REV. R^D BAXTER born n^r [near²⁵] Shrewsbury in 1615 and died at London in 1691. Chaplain to King Charles II”

I also saw Coventry. A sign on the Anglican Church of St. John the Baptist says (in part), “... Saint John the Baptist in the Diocese of Coventry ... was consecrated ... 1350 ... in 1548 it was given to the Mayor and Corporation. During the Commonwealth (1642-1660) it was used as a prison where Royalist soldiers were ‘sent to Coventry’. It was created a Parish Church ... 1734.” I also saw the two remaining old city gates from the original twelve gates, one is Swansell Gate, completed c. 1440 A.D., and the other is Cook Street Gate, completed c. 1385 A.D. (a photo of the latter may be found at my textual commentary website²⁶.) Charles I and the Royalist Cavaliers were denied their right of admission to Coventry in 1642. Given the known republican sympathies of a number in the area, and the fact that these might resurface after the Restoration of 1660, Charles II wisely ordered that the city wall be demolished in 1662. This order was carried out by the Earl of Northampton, with the broken-up stone being re-cycled for

²⁴ Textual Commentary Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), Preface, “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” section “(c) i) Charles the First’s Day (30 Jan), Charles the Second’s Day (29 May), & Papists’ Conspiracy Day (5 Nov),” subsection, “The removal of religious liberty to Puritans from 1662 to 1689.”

²⁵ Baxter was born at Rowton, Shropshire, near Shrewsbury. This is not to be confused with Rowton, Cheshire, relevant to the *Battle of Rowton Moor* and *King Charles’ Tower* at Chester, *infra*.

²⁶ See this picture with of myself as “a back-packer” on the website in connection with this Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) of my Textual Commentaries at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.

usage in new buildings. (A similar pre-emptive act of wise defence was undertaken by Charles II in the same year at Northampton Castle, *infra*²⁷.)

I also visited Chester, and here saw *King Charles' Tower*. King Charles the First used this tower in connection with the *Battle of Rowton Moor*. The exact connection is of some dispute as some say since one "cannot see Rowton" itself from the tower, Charles I "may have seen ... his ... army" returning "back to the safety of the city after the battle"²⁸ (or on this type of thinking he might have watched his troops going out to the battle). Others say he could and did "watch" elements of "the ensuing battle from a tower in Chester's defences, later known as King Charles' Tower"²⁹. Either way he seems to have in some way used this tower as a military headquarters, and have seen at least some elements of relevance to the *Battle of Rowton Moor* from it e.g., troop movements to, or from, the battle.

Also of relevance to the Restoration era is Chester Cathedral. In this I saw a monument of Bishop John Pearson, a Caroline Restoration *Bishop of Chester* from 1672 to 1686. He took part on the discussion resulting in the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*. Bishop Pearson's most famous work is *Pearson's Exposition of the Creed*, and he is said by some to "have translated" the Apostles' Creed of the 1662 prayer book. But if one compares the 1662 form with the 1559 form, the only difference of substance is at Article 3, where the 1559 form is "which," whereas the 1662 form is "who," for "who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary." Other differences are purely spelling changes, e.g., at Article 10, the 1559 refers to, "The holy catholique Church," whereas the 1662 form refers to "The holy catholic church." Did Bishop Pearson have a hand in these minor changes, and is this the origins of the erroneous tradition that he "translated the creed" for the 1662 BCP? Reflecting the significance of *Pearson's Exposition of the Creed*, his sarcophagus has an effigy of him on top, and around the sarcophagus underneath him are 12 busts of the twelve apostles, and under each apostle is written part of the *Apostles' Creed*.

I also saw Chester Cathedral's *Consistory Court*. Constructed in Caroline times under Charles I (Regnal Years: 1625-1649) in 1636, this is the oldest standing Ecclesiastical Court in England. Till the mid 19th century all ecclesiastical law cases in the Diocese of Chester were tried here. But its jurisdiction is now limited to certain matters relating to the clergy, and the granting of faculties for altering fabrics and furnishings of the parish churches of the Diocese.

²⁷ See "7h) Royal Oak Day Celebrations," at Northampton in Jan. 2009.

²⁸ "Chester Tourist – The Battle of Rowton Moor" (<http://www.chestertourist.com/battleofrwotonmoor.htm>).

²⁹ "Battle of Rowton Heath," *Wikipedia* (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Battle_of_Rowton_Heath); citing Adrian Pettifer's *English Castles: A Guide by Counties*, Boydell & Brewer, 2002 (ISBN 0851157823), p. 15.

I was also interested to see Shrewsbury Castle in Oct. 2003. During the civil war a small force of Puritan Roundheads captured the Castle and town with some bloodshed. After the Restoration, Charles II granted it to Sir Francis Newport in 1663, and it then stayed in private hands till the twentieth century, when it became the property of the Shrewsbury Corporation. The Castle and town having been attacked by the Puritan republican army during the civil war years, it has in more recent times been attacked by Papists. On 25 Aug. 1992 the *Irish Republican Army* (IRA) planted three bombs in Shrewsbury. Two were incendiary devices which exploded in furniture shops and one was a fire bomb that exploded in the Regimental Museum inside Shrewsbury Castle.

I took a further trip to parts of the English Midlands and north Wales in Dec. 2003. This included Norwich Cathedral which is also of some interest. E.g., in 1715, the bells at Norwich Cathedral rang out for the whole of 29 May as Restoration Day (see “7h,” “Royal Oak Day Celebrations,” *infra*). Or the King James Bible translator, Andrew Bing, who under *Solemn League and Covenant* Interregnum Ordinances was “legally” denied the rite of an Anglican burial when he died in 1652, had earlier been an Archdeacon of Norwich Cathedral (see “7h,” “c,” “KJV translators Daniel Featley *et al*,” *infra*).

The following places were visited on my fifth trip to London (Sept. 2008-March 2009). In London I was reminded of the sad way in which like King Solomon (I Kgs 11:1-8; Neh. 13:26), both Charles I and Charles II entered mixed marriages with Roman Catholic wives; and also the happy way that under the Williamite *Act of Settlement* of 1701 (& later *Act of Union*, 1707) this bad practice was stopped; for as interpreted in law by the great common law jurist, Sir William Blackstone, such provisions *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 Protestants³⁰.” In Oct. 08, on the opposite side of the road to St. James’ Palace, (residence of the heir apparent, the Prince of Wales, Prince Charles,) I saw *The Queen’s Chapel*. This has a sign telling of how “the Chapel was completed by 1627 for” the French Roman Catholic “Henrietta Maria, whom Charles I married” in “1625.” After being “used as a barracks from 1642, it was restored as a Chapel upon the marriage of Charles II to” the Portuguese Roman Catholic “Catherine of Braganza in 1662.” The second wife of the Popish James II, the French Papist, “Mary of Modena worshipped here until 1688.” But then comes the good news which is *the light at the end of this tunnel*, “after which it was given over to Reformed Worship by William III” of Orange. *We thank God for this happy ending!*

I undertook a trip around mainland UK (i.e., England, Wales, & Scotland) in October to November 2008. I visited Boscobel House in Shropshire, which is *c.* 3½ miles or *c.* 5.5 kilometres east of Tong; and about 8 miles or 13 kilometres northeast of Wolverhampton. This timber framed building painted white with up and down and sideway brown crossing outer wood boards producing a checkered look, is where Charles II hid in 1651. Its grounds include “son of oak” which was grown from the Royal Oak, Sr., that Charles II hid in. A plaque on this Royal Oak, Jr., says that for Queen

³⁰ Blackstone’s *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, Vol.1, p 217.

Elizabeth's Golden Jubilee (1952-2002), this "The Royal Oak" i.e., Royal Oak, Jr., was designated as "one of fifty great British trees in recognition of its place in the national heritage," i.e., though the successor of the royal oak of 1651, it now bears that name. Furthermore, a sapling was made from this Royal Oak, Jr. for the 1651-1951 Tercentenary, and this Royal Oak III has a plaque on it reading, "Planted September 6th 1951 by the 5th Earl of Bradford to commemorate the Tercentenary of King Charles II's preservation at Boscobel. This was grown from an acorn of The Royal Oak" i.e., Royal Oak, Jr. .

Thus while we still have Royal Oak the Second (Royal Oak, Jr.) and Royal Oak the Third, Royal Oak the First (Royal Oak, Sr.) died in the 18th century. The Diarist, John Evelyn (1620-1706), said in 1706 that he had heard that the, "Famous Oak near White Ladies" had died because of souvenir hunters hacking through it, and in 1712 the traveler, William Stukely (1687-1765) said it was "almost cut away by travelers." And with respect to Royal Oak Jr, he says, "a young thriving plant from one of its acorns" was "close by the side" of Royal Oak Sr.³¹. Hence by convention, when reference is simply made to "the Royal Oak" at Boscobel in a contemporary setting, the reference is to Royal Oak, Jr., also called, "son of oak."

Inside Boscobel House, among other things, I saw the fire-place that Charles II ate lamb at from a sheep taken from the field; a trap-door in the floor, in which Charles II sometimes hid; and a room from which one can look out the lattice windows to see Royal Oak II and Royal Oak III.

At High Ercal (pronounced "Ark-al), near Wolverhampton, I saw where the Royalist Headquarters of Charles II were, in a building dating from 1608, near St. Michael & All Angels' *Church of England*. The high tower of this church was badly damaged and still shows the scars of the civil war, as Roundheads targeted this Anglican bastion. (For the significance of the high tower on Anglican churches, see "7h," "Royal Oak Day Celebrations," *infra*).

With regard to the issue of Popish Jacobite Pretenders seeking to claim the throne from the legitimate heirs starting from the time of William of Orange in 1688/9, on this Oct.-Nov. 2008 trip I also earlier visited Culloden in Scotland., which is near Inverness (where I stayed the night), known as "the capital of the Highlands." At their height, the Jacobite Popish force had all of Scotland, north England, and were within 160 kilometres or 100 miles of London. But their 1745-6 triumphs were reversed by the *Battle of Culloden* (1746), at which time the Crown was kept safe for Protestant Christianity. The *Battle of Culloden* ended the 1745 Papist rebellion against the Protestant Crown by Roman Catholic Jacobite Highlanders. Brave Lord Cumberland directed the British Protestant red-coat forces, which included in their ranks e.g., the Scottish Clan Campbell. This was the last great land battle on British soil.

³¹ Citations in: *Boscobel House & White Ladies Priory*, English Heritage Publication, [undated information booklet I got at Boscobel House in Oct. 08], pp. 27-28.

PROPAGANDA WARNING. The good Christian reader should be warned that ungodly Papists and secularists, who may or may not also be Scottish secessionists, sometimes seek to falsely depict the *Battle of Culloden* as some kind of “England verses Scotland” war, rather than a religious war of British Protestants that included both English and Scots, fighting against Papist Jacobite Scots.

The “Culloden Battlefield” that I inspected in October 2008 is now well set out and marked. One of the plaques reads, “16 April 1746. Many more Jacobite” rebels “than” Protestant defenders of the Crown “died at the Battle of Culloden.” Leanach Cottage, built of stone with a grass-covered roof, still stands on the battlefield, and here the Protestant British red-coat forces engaged with, and bravely advancing pushed back the Papist Scottish Highlander rebels. Further on, a marker shows where “at close range” “ferocious hand-to-hand fighting took place,” in which “around 700 Jacobite” rebels “were killed or wounded” “in just a few minutes of fighting” by gallant Protestant loyalists to the Crown. “The Jacobites” “were then forced back, with catastrophic consequences” to their evil Popish designs to put a Pretender on the throne.

Some stones now marks the mass grave of the Popish rebel Highlanders. The names of the disgraced clans who had persons in them represented among the rebels are here embarrassingly itemized. In the words of Galatians 5:19-21, “Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these;” “seditions” and “murders,” “of the which,” “they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.” And we read in Rom. 11:20, “Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear.” Therefore, as those saved by the grace of God (Eph. 2:5,8,9), let us be careful to uphold the constitutional law that ensures a Protestant succession to the throne of Great Britain (Isa. 49:22,23); let us be careful and diligent to “Fear God. Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17). On the *Battle of Culloden* battlefield, there is also a marker in the “Field” of the gallant Protestant loyalists, both English and Scots, showing “they were buried here.” We thank God for their bravery and sacrifice in fighting for the Protestant liberties of Great Britain, and we thank God for giving them the victory! We pray God for grace, to likewise fight against the enemies of Biblical Protestantism today, as in spiritual rather than temporal battle, we fight against secularists, Papists, and others who seek to attack the wonderful Biblical truths of religiously conservative Protestant Christianity with its Evangelical Gospel message.

I also undertook a Christmas-New Year trip around England in December 2008 to January 2009. I visited Ashburnham in Sussex (East Sussex) where I saw *The Ashburnham Stables & Coach House*. On this estate I also saw St. Peter’s Church. The original St. Peter’s *Church of England* here was destroyed by the Puritan revolutionaries of Cromwell’s republic (1642-1660). According to an uncertain tradition, Charles I worshipped here at one stage in the civil war. But what is certain is that John Ashburnham attended Charles I in his flight from Oxford to Scotland when republican forces closed in on Ashburnham. He was a Cavalier in the royalist army, and fought the Roundheads in the republican army. He also attended King Charles I at the time of his martyrdom on 30 Jan. 1649. After the Restoration in 1660, John Ashburnham rebuilt the

new St. Peter's Church during Charles II's reign in 1665. Inside this church I saw the burial place of this old Cavalier.

I also got a ferry out to the *Isle of Wight* from Portsmouth Harbour on the south coast of England. I there saw *Yarmouth Castle* by the sea-side. This castle was built by Henry VIII (Regnal Years: 1509-1547), and according to local tradition, at one stage it was used by revolutionary republican Puritans to imprison Charles I (Regnal Years: 1625-1649) in. I also inspected *Carisbrooke Castle*. When prisoner here in 1647-1648, Charles rebuffed any possibility of accepting the vile and abominable *Solemn League and Covenant* with its virulent anti-Anglican provisions.

Sir George Carey, a cousin of Queen Elizabeth I (Regnal years 1558-1603), was made Captain of the Isle of Wight in 1582 when Protestant England was close to war with Popish Spain, and he helped to build up the castle's external defences and internal buildings. I walked around its walls and fortifications from the outside, before looking at it inside. Outside, it is built up on a mound, so that it uses a combination of geographical height and fortified walls as its defence. Inside, one can still see the ruins of Carey's House.

Charles I was imprisoned here for 10 months from 1647-8. In 1648, John Burley of Newport made a brave and daring attempt to free the king, but the Roundheads had Charles I under tight lock'n'key, with the result that John Burley was foiled and then hung. The king also made a number of unsuccessful attempts to escape e.g., assisted by his servant, Henry Firebrace, he climbed through a window in his bedchamber, but got stuck in the window's prison bars. I also saw another barred window through which Charles had hoped to make a second escape. In this second attempt, two guards agreed to let him escape for a pretty penny. Charles paid them the money so that they were first enriched from the king's coffers; but when he started to escape through a window they raised the alarm. *Such are the dangers of trusting a Roundhead!*

Inside the building containing the Castle's Museum, I saw an 18th century copy of an original posthumous portrait of Charles I by Edward Bower. Around the king's neck is a gold chain with the insignia of the Garter of St. George. The museum also contains a newsletter telling of the King's escape from Hampton Court in what is now Greater London which said (modernizing some spelling), "It seems His Majesty was gone through the garden, and park, and so away, some think for Scotland, others for [what is now inner] London, some for Jersey, ... some gentlemen passed this night over Kingston Bridge [*supra* & *infra*³²], supposed to be His Majesty, with ... Mr. Ashburnham [see Ashburnham, *supra*]"

The museum also contains letters with secret encodings that Charles I had sent to Edward Worsley as part of his unsuccessful attempt to escape from *Carisbrooke Castle*.

³² See reference to the Kingston bridge both above at the last paragraph on "my second trip to London (Dec. 2002-July 2003)," *supra*; & also at "7c) A General Introduction to Royal Oak Day," *infra*.

Other artifacts included a walking stick, said by an uncertain tradition to have belonged to Charles I; a newsletter of Sept. 1648 giving updates of negotiations between the king and republicans; and armour used by Roundheads and Cavaliers. I also saw King Charles I's Bible and prayer book which was bound together in one volume.

I further saw the Chapel of St. Nicholas whose Eastern window celebrates the Resurrection of Christ. The Chapel was erected from 1899 to 1904/5 as part of the 250th anniversary remembrance of Charles I's martyrdom. At the western end one finds a bust of King Charles I, under which is a crown and the word, "REMEMBER."

Back on the English mainland, I also saw a couple of churches dedicated to God and named in honour of Charles I at Plymouth and Falmouth, as well as one after this trip at Tunbridge Wells³³.

I also visited Worcester arriving there from Gloucester on Christmas Eve (Wed. 24 Dec. 08), and remaining there till St. John the Evangelist's Day (Sat. 27 Dec. 08). (Photos of some Worcester sites I saw in 2008 may be found at my textual commentary website.)³⁴ On Christmas Day I went out and looked over the battlefield site of the Battle of Worcester. Amidst some secularist propaganda, the *Ketch Viewpoint* contains some excellent maps and diagrams of the battle which I found useful. These e.g., show where the Royalist Caroline Scottish army held Powich Bridge till about 3 p.m. .

A large chimney stack now acts as a marker and reference point since it is near Powich Bridge and it remains visible as one moves onto the battlefield. A stone plaque there "Erected by Powich Parish Council" in "Sept. 1992" on the 350th anniversary of the first skirmish (1642-1992) reads, "POWICH BRIDGE, River Teme. During the English Civil Wars ... the first Skirmish on 23.9 [Sept.].1642 and the last major battle on 3.9 [Sept.].1651 took place on and near this ... bridge." And another nearby stone plaque unveiled by a Member of Westminster Parliament on "2-9 [Sept.]-2001" on the Eve of the 350th anniversary of the "Battle of Worcester: on "3-9 [Sept.]-1651" (1651-2001) said, "In memory of the thousands of Scots Highland and Lowland, who fought here far from home so well and so bravely against insuperable odds and gave their lives in devoted loyalty to each other and to their leaders." The High Tower of St. Peter's Powich is very clearly visible from this area of Powich Bridge.

I walked the entire length of the battlefield. On the day I was there, over the site of the main battlefield which ends with a river acting as a natural barrier, I saw sheep quietly grazing. In addition to being able to use this later chimney as a marker for Powich Bridge, at various points one can see the High Tower of St. Peter's *Church of*

³³ See Textual Commentary, Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), "Dedication: The Anglican Calendar," "(*g) King Charles the First's Day: with Dedication of Revised Volume 1 in 2010;" & Sermon in Appendix 5.

³⁴ See pictures on the website in connection with this Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) of my Textual Commentaries at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.

England Powich, which was flying the Flag of St. George and the high tower of Worcester Cathedral. The High Towers of both these churches were Royalist lookouts in the Battle of Worcester (see Worcester Cathedral & Powich Church at “7h” “Royal Oak Day Celebrations,” *infra*).

I visited Worcester Cathedral a number of times over *Christmas Day* (Thurs. 25 Dec. 08) and *St. Stephen’s Day* or *Boxing Day* (Fri. 26 Dec. 08); and I saw this architecturally beautiful building over a river with white swans swimming on the waters upon my return from the battlefield site. Its High Tower was flying the Cross of St. George, which is a red “+” on a white background. St. George who has a black letter day on the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* Calendar for 23 April, is the national saint of England, and as a motif saint his cross is an important symbol of Christianity in England. Since the Union Jack is part of both the Australian Flag and New South Wales State Flag, St. George (like St. Andrew and St. Patrick) is also a motif saint of Christianity in Australia. And inside the Worcester Cathedral I there saw the St. George’s Chapel.

This Cathedral has a Round Chapter, which I first saw from the outside. When I was inside, a Cathedral guide opened the Round Chapter for me, and he advised me it was turned into horse stables by Oliver Cromwell after the Battle of Worcester. However, a more dignified usage of the Chapter House was made by King George III (Regnal Years: 1760-1820), who came to the Three Choirs Festival here (held every three years between Gloucester, Hereford, Worcester, each supplying one choir).

A Cathedral guide lifted up a carpet in the floor in front of the Communion Table, to show me where a Royalist soldier is buried who died of wounds from the Battle of Worcester, namely, William, the second Duke of Hamilton (d. 1651). On the nearby wall is an associated plaque bearing the effigy of the Duke. There is also an effigy of Bishop John Gauden (1605-1662), who died at Worcester, and is pictured holding a book on the mediation of Charles I before his martyrdom, *Eikon Basilike* (Greek, “Royal Image”) of 1649.

The Moore Monument, which features the statuettes of the Moore’s family members, a family who were drapers and clothiers from the time of Elizabeth I (Regnal years 1558-1603), shows images of members of the Moore family who died in Jacobean times (1613) and Caroline times (1633), in which these Anglicans are kneeling in prayer in the classic Anglican manner used at Communion. Thus their forearms are at about 90 degrees to their upper arms, with their fingers pointing out straight on hands pointing slightly upwards. Though this looks like the kneeling at the Communion rails, it should be understood that a Communicant then opens his hands in a cup-shape to “Take and eat” the Communion bread (unlike Papists and some Puseyites who receive it straight in their mouth, and so they do not “Take” it as commanded in Matt. 26:26³⁵), and a

³⁵ Back in the 1980s or 1990s, before St. Andrew’s Cathedral in Sydney was Puritanized under the incumbent very unAnglican semi-Puritan Dean, Philip Jensen, I was told of how someone had come to Communion when it was being distributed by Broughton Knox (1916-1994; formerly Principal of two Evangelical Anglican Colleges,

Communicant also opens his hands to receive “the Cup” when the “Minister ... delivereth” it (*The Communion Service*, 1662 Book of Common Prayer). But the Moore Monument is high up and there is nothing in front of them, i.e., even though this is a Communion rail type of kneeling, the sculpture does not actually show a Communion Table or anything lese in front of them, and so the Puritans left it.

By contrast, not far from this is the monument of Bishop Thornborough which is much lower down, and his hands have been cut off i.e., so as to not show him in prayer, and other vandalism has been done to the effigy of his face, and the wider flowing sleeves of his surplice have been cut back. The Bishop told King Charles I he had outlived several who had expected to succeed him as Bishop of Worcester, “and now I am afraid I shall outlive by bishopric” due to the fear of a coming Puritan takeover. In fact, he died in 1641 before the revolutionary Puritan republicans abolished bishoprics, although they later came and defaced this Bishop’s grave-site during the “unhappy confusions” of the Interregnum (Preface, 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*). He is not the only Bishop of Worcester to have been targeted for his Anglican Protestant faith, for I also saw there the grave and effigy of Nicholas Bullingham, who after the re-establishment of Protestantism under Elizabeth I, was made Bishop of Worcester from 1571-76. Earlier, under the reign of the Popish Queen, Bloody Mary (Regnal Years: 1553-1558), he was made an exile, being one of those “professors of the truth of Christ’s religion” to suffer “discomfort” under “Queen Mary, to the great decay of the due honour of God” (1559 prayer book Act *Primo Elizabethae*, traditionally printed in the front of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*).

There is a sense in which “the civil war still rages” at Worcester in ideological terms rather than terms of any literal physical fighting. Not far from the Cathedral (and The Commandery which I also saw), at a place where the Cathedral’s high tower remains very visible to this day, is a small bridge with a brick wall. On it a plaque erected by “the Cromwell Association” reads that, “The last battle of the civil war was fought at Worcester on 3rd September 1651. ... Near this spot, in the city wall, stood the Sidbury Gate, which was stormed by the ... troops” of “Oliver Cromwell.” Also of a pro-Cromwell stripe, I saw *Cromwell’s Coffee Shop*, which somewhat paradoxically, one must enter by going under the arch of the *Crown Passage Shopping Centre* which bears pictures of the Crown.

But on the Royalists’ side at Worcester, I saw *King Charles’ House* which is where Charles II hid before going to Boscobel, and this contains a shop street sign picture of Charles II. A plaque on it shows a picture of the royal oak with a crown in the middle, surrounded by the initials, “C” (Charles) “R” (“Rex” = “King”), and underneath

Moore Theological College, Sydney, 1959-1985, and George Whitfield College, Cape Town, South Africa, 1989-1992). The communicant came up to the Communion rails and in what might be thought of as a rude gesture, stuck out his tongue i.e., to have the Communion bread put on it. Dr. Knox, no fan of such bizarre Puseyite practices, physically took one of his hands, and putting the bread in it, repeated slowly the relevant words with a stress on “Take,” “Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died” etc. .

the words, “From this house King Charles II escaped his enemies after the Battle of Worcester September 3 1651.” (See also the Guildhall at “7h,” “Royal Oak Day Celebrations,” *infra*). I also saw some Royal Oak Hotels / Restaurants at Worcester (see also “7d,” “Royal Oak Hotels,” *infra*). Thus I saw “The Royal Oak” at Hallow, Worcester, a small white hotel and restaurant, at the time advertising England’s “Traditional Food,” with the “Best of British Menu - 2 Meals £12.00 [12 pounds] All Day – Every Day.” I also saw “The Oak Apple” hotel and restaurant, advertizing a “Christmas ... menu” of “2 courses £10.99 [ten pounds & 99 pence] or “3 courses £13.99.”

Leaving Worcester, I further visited in Dec. 08 – Jan 09, I also saw *Ashby de la Zouch Castle* in Leicestershire. In Sir Walter Scott’s *Ivanhoe* (1819), a scene of Tournament pageantry is set in the Castle’s grounds. A sign outside *Ashby de la Zouch Castle* say it was, “A Royalist stronghold, besieged and slighted” by the Roundheads “in the Civil War ... in 1649.” The remains of this castle are still quite impressive and give an idea of the type of fortifications sometimes used by the Royal Cavaliers.

Also in Leicestershire, I visited Staunton Harold. Here one finds a rare Anglican Church, built when under the 1642-1660 republic it was “illegal” to do so, but on the basis that, “we ought to obey God rather than men” (Acts 6:29), such Anglicans, “not forsaking ... assembling ... together, as the manner of some is” (Heb. 10:25), but giving public “worship” of “God” (I Cor. 14:25), built this church in 1653. Secretly built in what at the time was a secluded area, far from the gaze of Puritans, it stands as *a Protestant symbol of religious freedom against religious persecution*. The inscription above this sandstone church’s door, above which is a high tower, says (modernizing some spellings), “In the year 1653 when all things sacred were throughout this nation either demolished or profaned, Sir Robert Shirley, Baronet, founded this church, whose singular praise it is to have the best things in the worst time, and hoped them in the most calamitous. The righteous shall be had in everlasting remembrance.” (A photo of this may be found at my website.)³⁶ I also saw there e.g., the tomb of Lady Catherine Shirley who died in 1736, the third daughter of Sir Robert Shirley. This church is picturesquely set, surrounded by large green lawns and trees, leading down to a nearby river, upon which some water birds were swimming.

Leicester is remembered as the place where in 1645, the (Baptist) English Puritan, John Bunyan, *supra*, at the time a Roundhead soldier, witnessed the Royalist Cavalier forces of Prince Rupert, overcome and liberate Leicester from the occupying republican Roundheads. (But the victory was later reversed after the Puritans captured Naseby.) I also inspected Leicester Cathedral. Inside, a plaque shows an effigy of King Charles I (martyred 1649) in the middle. Under his effigy it is said this is the burial place of one of Charles I’s pallbearers who “died” in “1656.” (Modernizing some spellings and abbreviations,) “John Whatton of ... Newark near Leicester, an Esquire of the body of the

³⁶ See my website in connection with this Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) of my Textual Commentaries at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com> .

late King Charles, Justice of Peace for this County of Leicester Scripture was his doctrine ... he went to ... the freedoms ... of heaven.”

I arrived at Grantham in Lincolnshire, on a foggy day in freezing conditions with ice over the ground in some, but not all parts, of Grantham. In the fog, I saw a statue with ice on the ground around it, of the great physicist and mathematician, Sir Isaac Newton (1642-1727). As the fog started to lift, I arrived at *The King's School*, Grantham, which is next-door to St. Wulfram's *Church of England*. The old section of the school, which is now a library, was the classroom used by the schoolboy Isaac Newton. A plaque I saw on this building reads, “In this hall of The King's School ISAAC NEWTON was taught 1654-1660” Newton proceeded to Cambridge University in 1661. He was elected to a Fellowship at Trinity College, Cambridge University in 1667, thus submitting to, and passing the Anglican Test Acts introduced under Charles II. Newton is therefore an example of the scientific and mathematical advances that occurred under the Caroline Restoration.

I also visited Peterborough Cathedral in Northamptonshire, where the Puritans did much damage in 1643. E.g., they destroyed a large brass eagle lectern holding the Bible, although I observed that a new one is now there. I also saw Ely Cathedral which before the 18th century was on an island surrounded by water, and known as “one of the seven wonders of the Middle Ages³⁷” (see “7h,” “c,” “KJV translators Daniel Featley *et al*,” *infra*).

On and around Christmas Day 2008, when I was in Worcester Cathedral, *supra*, I saw a plaque (modernizing some spellings) to, “the virtues of the most excellent Prelate D^r. JOHN HOUGH, ... President of Magdalene College Oxon [Oxford]. In the reign of K. JAMES the II^d [Regnal Years: 1685-1688] ... he opposed the rage of Popish superstition & tyranny” (emphasis mine), being ejected as President of Magdalene College at Oxford University by special commissioners of the Popish King, James II, who insisted on a Roman Catholic being appointed. But “in happier times” after the coming of William III of Orange, “he was ... made Bishop of Oxford A.D. 1690;” and “was translated to the See of Lichfield and Coventry A.D. 1699;” and then under George I (Regnal Years: 1714-1727) “to the See of Worcester A.D. 1717 ...” where he remained Bishop till his death in 1743 at the age of 91.

In December '08 I also saw Brixham in Devon. In port at the time was a tall ship, which was a replica of the Golden Hinde that circumnavigated the globe in 1577 and 1588 (even as I was circumnavigating the globe on this 5th trip to London). And with this tall ship and the sea picturesquely behind it, I there saw a statue of King William III

³⁷ The other six vary between commentators, but are on one count: 1) Stonehenge, England (which I saw in May 2001); 2) Mound of Shards / Potsherds (showing the Pharaonic funeral cult with Hellenistic and early imperial Roman influence,) Alexandria, Egypt; 3) Colosseum, Rome (which I saw in Aug. 2001 & March 2002); 4) Hagia Sophia Cathedral, Constantinople (Istanbul); 5) Cluny Abbey, France; & 6) The Leaning Tower of Pisa, Italy (which I saw in March 2002).

of Orange. It was “erected by public subscription and dedicated to the town of Brixham.” Its construction history spans over the colourful fireworks of two *Bonfire Nights*. On the 200th anniversary was the “foundation stone laid 5th NOV^R 1888, by His Excellency Count de Bylandt³⁸,” and on the 201st anniversary it was “unveiled 5th November 1889” under the supervision of the “Chairman of the Committee,” “The Right Hon. Lord Churston³⁹.” The inscription on it reads:

WILLIAM
Prince of Orange,
afterwards
WILLIAM III
King of Great Britain & Ireland,
landed near this spot
5th November 1688
and issued his famous declaration:
“the Liberties of England
and
the Protestant religion
I WILL MAINTAIN.”

In what was my second trip to Bristol⁴⁰, in Queen Square Park I also saw a statue with an inscription saying it was made by “Rysbrach” in “1736.” This statue shows King William III of Orange riding triumphantly on a horse.

Like Sirach, “when I travelled, I saw many things,” for “a man that hath traveled knoweth many things” (Ecclesiasticus / Sirach 34:9,11, *Apocrypha*). And for this I give thanks to God, in the words of the Authorized Version, “Know ye” (Ps. 100:3), or in the words of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*, “Be ye sure” (Ps. 100:3) of this, “that the Lord he is God,” so “go your way into his gates with thanksgiving, and into his courts with praise: be thankful unto him, and speak good of his name” (*Jubilate Deo*, Morning Prayer, Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662).

³⁸ Arthur Maximilan, (German) Count of Bylandt (1821-1891), was a politician who served as an Austrian Minister of Defence.

³⁹ John Yarde Buller (b. 1846), 2nd Baron of Churston, a British peer (d. 1910). He was a soldier who served in the Scots Guard, retiring with the rank of Captain when he succeeded to his grandfather’s titles and estates as Baron Churston in 1871.

⁴⁰ My first trip to Bristol was during my 3rd trip to London (Aug. 03-April 04).

2c) *Traditional Diocese of Sydney Low Church Evangelicalism, NOT
Puritan and semi-Puritan trends from 1970s.*

From the time of Henry VIII the monarch had been Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church (known as “Supreme Head” in England and Ireland “as far as the law of Christ allows,” till this became “Supreme Governor” from Elizabethan times). Dioceses were largely autonomous, so that if corruption occurred in one, it could be isolated and rooted out under the central control of the king (or parliament). The King and Parliament exercised a monitoring role, although this was somewhat reciprocal, in that the Established Church exercised a monitoring role on government. E.g., this was seen with the Established Church’s opposition to the Popish James II (Regnal Years 1685-1688). With the rise of the secular state and titular monarchy in the 19th century, Anglican Dioceses came to be largely confederal. Thus e.g., in Australia, how things are done in the Diocese of Sydney is a manifestation of this Diocesan autonomy inside a largely confederal structure. In many ways it would be more correct to refer to an “Anglican Church of the Diocese of Sydney,” or an “Anglican Church of the Diocese of Armidale” (in New South Wales), etc., rather than an “Anglican Church of Australia,” which is the name of the confederal body (formerly called the “Church of England in Australia”).

Though it has become increasingly hard to get Low Church Evangelical Anglican Services that use the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) in the Diocese of Sydney, something in the right direction may still be found in a relatively small number of churches at *some* services of those churches. I am reminded that the BCP Calendar isolates a small number of the better figures of historical significance to the *Church of England* from the sixth and seventh centuries through to the thirteenth century, during times when in many ways “the lights were dim⁴¹” inside the formally established church (although on the Continent the Waldensians kept a purer gospel alive⁴²). Yet I am also reminded by the Anglican Protestant clergyman and hagiologist, John Foxe (1516-1587), in *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, at the chapter entitled, “Some Particulars of the English Reformation, and the circumstances which preceded it, from the time of Wickliffe to the reign of Mary,” of the work in the 14th century of John Wycliffe (d. 1384), *the Morning Star of the Reformation*, who in more recent times has been most deservedly remembered (together with Silvester) with a black letter day on 31 Dec.⁴³; and flowing from the gospel seed Wycliffe planted, the ongoing godly witness in England of the Lollards up till the

⁴¹ The BCP Calendar has ten broad divisions; see divisions 6 & 7, and parts of 9 for these eras in: Textual Commentaries Vol. 1 (Mat. 1-14), Preface, “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” section “*f) King Charles the First’s Day: with Dedication of Volume 1 in 2008.”

⁴² Bramley-Moore, W., *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, 1563, revised folio edition, 1684, 3rd edition, Cassell, Patter, and Galpin, London, 1867, pp. 56-67 (Waldensians), pp. 67-83 (Waldensian Albigenses).

⁴³ Most justly given a black letter day on Anglican Calendars in Australia (1978) and England (1980).

early 16th century when they became Protestants after the Reformation⁴⁴. I am also reminded of how various Anglicans did what they could in the right direction during the “unhappy confusions” of the 1640s and 1650s Interregnum (The Preface, 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*). It seems that to some extent, we have “gone back to the future.”

Therefore, though all the churches I go to in Sydney are simply, “the best of a bad lot,” to the extent that they have *something in the right direction* I thank God for that which is good in them, since *something is better than nothing*. I tolerate what is bad in them, for I like what is good in them, and am also conscious of the fact that Scripture designates the Church Age in which I live as the “Laodicean” Church Age that commenced in connection with events associated with the American and French Revolutions in the 18th century, and then spread further to more generally engulf remaining parts of the church in the 19th century (Rev. 3:14-22). Within these type of qualifications, two of the churches where I sometimes attend such *Book of Common Prayer* (BCP) services, (even though both of these churches now have mainly non-BCP services⁴⁵), are St. Swithun’s Pymble and St. Philip’s Church Hill (near the Harbour Bridge), a church I used to more regularly attend in the 1980s and 1990s (till a Minister who has now left, started promoting the Billy Graham Crusades).

While bishops are relatively rare in the Anglican Church, and BCP services are increasingly rare in the Diocese of Sydney, it so happens that between BCP services at these two churches, I come across three *Diocese of Sydney* Anglican Bishops, all retired. Bishop Ray Smith, formerly *Bishop of Liverpool* in western Sydney (1993-2001), assists at St. Philip’s Church Hill⁴⁶. And at St. Swithun’s Pymble⁴⁷, Bishop Donald Cameron,

⁴⁴ Bramley-Moore, W., *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs, op. cit.*, pp. 215-227.

⁴⁵ Showing the decline in BCP services, if I look at an old parish bulletin I have from St. Philip’s Church Hill for “Sunday 20th April 1997” as that year’s “Third Sunday After Easter,” it states on the back, “SERVICES AT ST. PHILIP’S are according to the Book of Common Prayer (1662)” (and all readings were from the AV), and these are specified at the front as, “8.00 A.M. HOLY COMMUNION (Every Sunday) 10.00 A.M. HOLY COMMUNION (First, Third and Fifth Sundays) 10.00 A.M. MORNING PRAYER (Second, Fourth Sundays) 5.00 P.M. EVENING PRAYER (Holy Communion Fourth Sunday)” with “WEEK-DAY SERVICES” including “1.10 P.M. WEDNESDAY – HOLY COMMUNION,” and “Services on Festivals, Saints’ and Holy Days as Announced.” But if I look at this year’s “Easter at St. Philip’s York Street Anglican” flyer (which I got at an earlier 1662 BCP service there in 2011,) it advertizes for “Easter Sunday (Apr. 24),” “8.30 am Service ... from the 1662 Book of Common Prayer ... 10:15 am Contemporary Service (with Kid’s Program) 6:00 pm Contemporary Service.” Suffice to say that on Easter Day 2011, I attended their 8.30 am service.

⁴⁶ See my comments at Matt. 25:31, “Principal Textual Discussion.” The Rector, the Reverend Mr. Justin Moffatt, said to me that Bishop Smith’s duty statement is for him to assist on: 1) Matters connected with Book of Common Prayer (1662) Services, and 2) Historical matters connected with St. Philip’s.

formerly *Assistant Bishop Northern Area* of Sydney (1975-1983) and *Bishop of North Sydney* (1983-1990), usually attends and e.g., I heard him preach the sermon at the BCP Evensong Service on Trinity Sunday (18 May) 2008; and he helped conduct the BCP Evensong Service on what in 2011 was both the red-letter day of *The Second Sunday in Lent* (20 March) and the black-letter day of the *Eve of Thomas Cranmer's Day* (21 March); and also often in attendance at St. Swithun's (when he is well enough,) is Bishop Donald Robinson, formerly *Bishop of Parramatta* in western Sydney (1973-1982) and Archbishop of Sydney (1982-1993). Some bishop-interconnection that I was previously unaware of between St. Philip's and Bishop Robinson was made known to me recently when the Rector of St. Philip's Church Hill, Justin Moffatt, told me after a 1662 BCP Service on *The Fourth Sunday in Lent* (Lent 4, Sunday 3 April, 2011), that if he has difficulty locating certain clergy information, such as dates of death of clergymen who were in the Diocese when Bishop Robinson was Archbishop, he will "ring Archbishop Robinson," who he has found will always "know" such things.

A man consecrated as a bishop retains this consecration and thus the title of "Bishop" even after he retires, but he loses the office of bishop he formerly held. Thus upon his retirement, an Archbishop (office) goes back to being simply a Bishop; but in the Diocese of Sydney there is a convention that former Archbishops *might* still be called "Archbishop" as a term of address. Thus e.g., Donald Robinson is referred to variously as "Bishop Robinson" or "Archbishop Robinson." When I have met him at BCP services in his retirement at St. Swithun's Pymble, Archbishop Robinson (whom when I speak to I normally address as "Bishop Robinson" or "Bishop"), told me that as one who had taught on the BCP at Moore College (Vice Principal at Moore Theological College, 1959-1972), he was familiar with, and agreed with the theology in, all three Offices removed in 1859 i.e., *Papists' Conspiracy Day* or *Gunpowder Treason Day* (5 Nov.), *King Charles the Martyr's Day* (30 Jan.), and *Restoration Day* (29 May).

The bishop has told me he was opposed to what Dean Philip Jensen had done in the Cathedral by e.g., removing the elevated Communion Table with associated step for visibility and kneeling, and said to me with regard to the missing Communion Table's fate, "I don't know what they've done to the Communion Table." As a consequence of the semi-Puritan Dean Phillip Jensen's de-Anglicanizing and Puritanizing of the Cathedral, Bishop Robinson told me he now "stays away" from St. Andrew's Cathedral as much as he reasonably can; and I must say, *so do I!* Sadly, this type of semi-Puritan nonsense is much wider than Dean Jensen, as in conjunction with removing the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 and Authorized Version of 1611 under the mischievous name of "contemporary worship services," increasingly from around the 1970s on a semi-Puritan element has hijacked many formerly traditional Low Church Evangelical Anglican Churches, and effectively turned them into Puritan Churches.

⁴⁷ Though there are only four to six *Book of Common Prayer* Sunday services per annum (in practice usually four), all of which are Evensong at 3 pm; there are also some occasional BCP Communion services on weekdays as announced e.g., there was one was held on Thurs. 24 March 2011.

King Charles I's Day which has a primary focus on the martyrdom of King Charles I in 1649, and a secondary focus on the Restoration under King Charles II in 1660, among other things, is meant to remind Anglicans of their Anglican heritage. Alas, this message is lost on a new-breed of Diocese of Sydney clergymen who "have lost the plot" in terms of preaching Christ's Gospel of justification by faith, remaining true to the tenets of the Reformation as good Protestants or Evangelicals, *and then presenting this in terms of an Anglican Church service that is traditional Diocese of Sydney Low Church Evangelical Anglican.* The Anglican Church properly exists to present Evangelical truths *in an Anglican Church tradition* (i.e., Low Church Evangelical Anglican) NOT *in a Puritan Church tradition.* While I embrace my fellow religiously conservative Protestants in other church traditions, such as Puritan derived Protestant Churches, and *as an Evangelical Anglican visitor* sometimes attend their services; by contrast, when I go to an Anglican Church I expect an Anglican Service, not a Puritan Service under the name of "a contemporary worship service." And indeed it must be said, that better Puritan or Puritan derived Protestants known to me e.g., at St. George's *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia* in the inner city of Sydney, or some godly Baptist friends I have known over the years, would also be appalled at what goes on at some of these so called "contemporary worship services."

Thus while in harmony with Articles 17 and 34 of the Anglican 39 Articles, *as a visitor* I sometimes attend better Puritan derived Protestant Churches, and accept as my brethren in Christ all true believers who are religiously conservative Protestant Christians who acknowledge the Gospel of Jesus Christ as recovered at the time of the Reformation under Martin Luther, for which cause I am an Evangelical (see "*I'm an Evangelical – I hope you are too!*", *supra*). Nevertheless, I maintain that the Anglican Church properly exist to represent this Gospel in a religiously conservative Low Church Evangelical form of Anglicanism, such as found in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 and 39 Articles. I thus repudiate religiously liberalism, Puseyism and semi-Puseyism on the one hand; and on the other hand the semi-Puritanism that has come to grip large parts of the Anglican Diocese of Sydney in more recent decades under the name of "Contemporary Worship" services. It seems that important elements of Anglican theology in the VERY PROTESTANT 39 Articles and *Office of Papists' Conspiracy Day* have now been lost by the 19th century arising *semi-Romanist* Puseyites and semi-Puseyites; and important elements of Anglican theology in the VERY ANGLICAN *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 and *Offices of King Charles the Martyr* and *The King's Restoration* have now been lost by the late 20th century arising new breed *semi-Puritans* in the Diocese of Sydney.

On the one hand I commend and uphold the ongoing commitment of the Anglican Diocese of Sydney to the religiously conservative Evangelical Christian recognition and celebration of the Protestant Reformation, in opposition to all forms of Puseyism ("Anglo-Catholics" or "High Church") and semi-Puseyism ("Broad-church," often though not always, vaguely defined, they accept some elements of Puseyism e.g., noddings at the consecrated Communion elements, but not other elements e.g., they do not invoke saints). But on the other hand, I repudiate Puritan or semi-Puritan trends in the Diocese of Sydney that seem to have largely started around the time of, and are to

some extent connected with, the removal of the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) from Diocese of Sydney Anglican Churches, and its replacement with *An Australian Prayer Book* (AAPB) from 1978, and associate removal of the Authorized Version. This was initially encouraged by the AAPB's "Another Order of Service for Prayer and the Hearing of God's Word"⁴⁸, on Sunday evenings in replacement of Evensong; since this allows something very close to a Puritan service. With increasingly liberal interpretations of this, such trends were able to eventually move away from any discernable reference to any prayer book, whether the BCP or AAPB. Having thus created a younger group of semi-Puritans, this was then extended to the main Sunday morning service under such concepts and terminology as a "contemporary worship" "family service."

There has also been an associated removal or movement away from traditional Anglican architecture. I consider the traditional looking Low Church Evangelical Anglican Church is very well designed; and this is the type of church one finds in the Diocese of Sydney at St. Philip's Church Hill, St. Matthew's Windsor, or St. Swithun's Pymble, where I attend 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* Services. When I walk into such a church with e.g., stained-glass windows of Bible scenes from the Gospels at St. Matthew's Windsor, I think it is something like "walking inside a Bible" and being reminded of certain Biblical passages. The pulpit is placed higher up to the side so that all can easily see the Minister preach, and the Lectern is in the middle, or just off-side the middle. This symbolizes the fact that the Word of God is central, and the Minister, to the side of the lectern, preaches FROM the Word and to the AUTHORITY of the Word, not himself⁴⁹. The Communion Table is also elevated, in part so the step allows Communicants to kneel, and in part it is further elevated for greater visibility by the Congregation.

Sad to say, this type of traditional Anglican architecture is being increasingly lost over the last 30 or so years in the Diocese of Sydney, with a new-breed design of Puritan

⁴⁸ *An Australian Prayer Book*, for use together with The Book of Common Prayer, 1662, 1978, The Standing Committee of the General Synod of the Church of England in Australia [name later changed to Anglican Church of Australia], Anglican Information Office, Sydney, 1978, pp. 39-42.

⁴⁹ Puritans traditionally teach the same thing, paradoxically, by putting their pulpit in the middle, saying that the Minister is meant to preach FROM the Word. Though different traditions, both seek to uphold the Protestant teaching of the centrality and authority of the Word for our understanding of God. I once heard an anti-Anglican Puritan Baptist falsely and mischievously claim that Anglican pulpits are off to the side to symbolize that Anglicans do not believe in the centrality of the Word. When I sought to enlighten him as to the meaning of the traditional Low Church Evangelical Anglican architecture, he refused to listen, and did not seem to understand, nor care to know about, the difference between Evangelical Anglicans as opposed to Puseyites and semi-Puseyites. "And the light shineth in the darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not" (John 1:5).

looking churches, sometimes built in the grounds of a traditional Anglican Church. Some simply have moved to the Church Hall for their services. Comments are made of the most negative type about traditional looking Diocese of Sydney Churches, to which words like “intimidating” are gratuitously and wickedly attached by Puritanizing propagandists; and correspondingly positive comments are made about “relaxing” in a Church Hall type service. Among other crazy and bizarre Puritan ideas, they are opposed to architectural elevation, hence for example the absurd Communion table “on wheels” being used in the once Anglican Cathedral by the very unAnglican Dean Philip Jensen. This is “wheeled in,” “wheeled about,” and “wheeled out,” on the same floor level as the pews. In fact, this silly looking contraption with permanently affixed wheels gives an impressionistic look and feel of something like a “meals-on-wheels” type trolley that one might see being pushed around a hospital for invalids unable to get out of their beds. *Perhaps it is to enhance this type of hospital meal-trolley aura that Dean Jensen keeps the communicants sitting like hospital invalids in their pews to take Communion!*

Likewise, elevated pulpits are in varying degrees also disliked by some of these semi-Puritans. Indeed, in this connection, I heard one fool deriding the elevated pulpit, claiming it was so high, to allow the preacher “to spit” at the congregation. This type of rubbish has also seen a number of these Church Hall services, move to such Puritan practices as sitting to receive Communion with the wine in small Puritan glasses. And a number of these most unAnglican Ministers have acquired a bizarre aversion to using red-wine for the Communion, insisting on using a white grape-juice, as they would see it, to emphasize that it is purely symbolic. While I am a sacramental symbolist, I insist that red wine is important for the symbolism of blood! And while as a visitor, I have sometimes taken Communion in better Puritan Churches from such cups while sitting; when I go to an Anglican Church I expect to see the common cup of Anglican tradition, not the small glasses of Puritan tradition!

Indeed, in fairness to my Puritan derived Protestant friends and brethren in Christ of better Puritan Churches, they would agree with *some* of my criticisms. E.g., they would agree that the symbolism of Communion wine requires that it should be red, not white. Or at St. George’s *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia* (derived from the *Free Church of Scotland*), in the inner city of Sydney, which is an Authorized Version and 1650 Caroline Psalter using Church, the pulpit is in Puritan tradition central rather than the Anglican tradition off to the side; but nevertheless, it *an elevated pulpit* of the type now disliked by *some* of the Sydney Diocese semi-Puritans.

The liberal interpretations of Anglican rules in ever increasing parts of the Diocese of Sydney, resulting in even more Puritan type services, are also related to another matter. This movement to semi-Puritan services in the Diocese of Sydney with the AAPB’s “Another Order of Service for Prayer and the Hearing of God’s Word,” was further exacerbated by a certain amount of politicking in which a number of other Dioceses in Australia have moved to ordain women priests, even though this was not approved by the General Synod. Furthermore, they have also introduced another “modern” prayer book, which is *even worse* than the *very bad* AAPB, once again without the approval of the General Synod.

The Archbishop of Sydney is by virtue of office the Metropolitan of New South Wales. But because in Australia Anglican Dioceses are in practice very largely independent, and operate confederally, this position as Metropolitan Archbishop of New South Wales is purely titular, and gives an Archbishop of Sydney no governing power outside of the Diocese of Sydney. The position of Primate of the Anglican Church of Australia is by election of the other bishops, though once again is titular. Since Sydney is the oldest Diocese, or Primatial See, there was formerly a tradition of electing an Archbishop of Sydney as the Primate at some point of his Archbishopric. But in the associated politicking of women priests, because the Diocese of Sydney has refused to allow such priestesses in the General Synod, no Archbishop of Sydney has been so elected since the retirement of Archbishop Sir Marcus Loane in 1982⁵⁰.

This type of thing, i.e., having both women priests or priestesses and another prayer book, neither of which were approved by the General Synod which requires the consent of Sydney Diocese for such changes, put a lever in the hands of semi-Puritans in the Diocese of Sydney, who effectively said that if other Dioceses would e.g., ordain woman priests contrary to Scripture and the constitution of the Anglican Church of Australia, and use an unapproved prayer book, then they too would disregard Anglican practice and doctrine, in their instance moving to more Puritanized services. I.e., if other Dioceses were like wayward children, “playing up” by moving away from the Biblically Protestant teaching of the 1662 prayer book and 39 Articles with e.g., semi-Romanist Puseyites and semi-Puseyites, unauthorized prayer books, and women priests; then they too would start “playing up” by moving away from the Anglican teaching of the 1662 prayer book in a semi-Puritan direction.

Thus, e.g., with regard to the Final Rubric at *The Communion Service*, if Puseyites and semi-Puseyites are not disciplined for setting aside the prohibition on “adoration” of “the sacramental bread or wine,” with their noddings (semi-Puseyite “Broad-church” and Puseyite Proper “High Church” or “Anglo-Catholics”), or genuflecting at the Communion elements and usage of a Monstrance (a circular-shaped device on a stand with a consecrated piece of Communion bread in it, that idolaters bow down to and adore); then they as semi-Puritans would set aside that part of the Final Rubric requiring “that the Communicants should receive the same kneeling,” which is now done with small Puritan Communion glasses and Communicants sitting at Communion by the very unAnglican Dean Philip Jensen at St. Andrew’s Cathedral. Or since semi-Romanist

⁵⁰ When I was a student at Moore Theological College (part-time 1992-1994), I remember one of the Lecturers referring to how at a General Synod meeting, advocates of women priests from outside the Diocese of Sydney who were in the Synod, had used body stand-over threats as part of their attempted physical intimidation of Diocese of Sydney voters who were against the ordination of women priests. This shows both the ungodly characters of such persons, and also the intensity with which these guerilla thugs hold to their lust idol of feminism, so that to no longer follow the tradition of having a Diocese of Sydney Primate is only “the thin edge of the wedge.”

Puseyites Proper are not disciplined for invocation of saints, contrary to e.g., Article 22 of the 39 Articles; then they as semi-Puritans would set aside red-letter Saints' days and their memory as required in the 1662 BCP. Or semi-Romanist Puseyites and semi-Puseyites make their Cathedrals look more Romish and are not disciplined for this, in which the term "altar" or "high altar" is used, contrary to the 1662 BCP teaching that the Communion Table is "table," and likewise the bread and wine are wrongly said to be part of the "offertory" in order to enhance their consubstantiation teachings putting an over focus on the Communion elements which ultimately leads to their idolatrous adoration; and so the semi-Puritan Dean Philip Jensen now makes St. Andrew's Cathedral in Sydney look more like a Presbyterian Cathedral with no permanent Communion Table, but a "wheel-away" one, in which a point is made of not putting "the Offertory" of the people's "alms" i.e., money in the offertory plate, "upon the holy Table" i.e., the Communion Table (rubric, The Communion Service, 1662 BCP), but rather having it put away somewhere else. This ridiculous type of argument was "justified" under the terminology of "greater diversity," which was gobbledy-gook meaning in practice *getting further and further away from the AV of 1611 and BCP of 1662*.

Hence in 2009, the incumbent Archbishop of Sydney, Peter Jensen (the brother of Dean Philip Jensen), via the "Archbishop of Sydney's Liturgical Panel," started a Diocese of Sydney website misnamed, "Better Gatherings"⁵¹. At the top right of the page, next to a crest of Sydney Diocese are the words, "An initiative of the Anglican Diocese of Sydney". Rather than Mattins or Evensong, one finds such things as "Contemporary Order 1" or "Contemporary Order 2." These contain very little traditional Anglican liturgy, although they include various "options" that can increase or decrease the level of "liturgy." E.g., at "Creed," one can select "n/a" i.e., "not applicable" and have no Creed, or one can select to use either, "Apostles' Creed," "Apostles' Creed (responsive)," "Nicene Creed," "Nicene Creed (responsive)," "Affirmation (composite verses)," "Affirmation (Colossians 1:15-20)," "Affirmation (with all Christians everywhere ...)," "Affirmation (We believe ...)," "Affirmation (Do you believe ...)," "Apostles' Creed (AAPB)," "Nicene Creed (AAPB)," "Apostles' Creed (BCP)," "Nicene Creed (BCP)," (well at least the BCP gets a mention!), "Athanasian Creed," or "An alternative form of the Apostles' Creed" (just in case someone thinks that what went before is not diverse enough!). If one looks at the options for Communion, these include, "The Lord's Supper (new resources)," "Holy Communion (AAPB Second Order)," "The Lord's Supper (BCP 1662)" – well at least it is still "an option"⁵², "The Lord's Supper (BCP 1662 New Format)," or "The Lord's Supper (Sunday Services # 1)."

⁵¹ "Better Gatherings" (<http://www.bettergatherings.com/>).

⁵² To the extent that one can still select various "options" to get a 1662 BCP service; overall this reinforces the fact that the Diocese has become semi-Puritan rather than Puritan Proper, since those in Puritanism Proper would never allow Anglicans the "option" of a 1662 prayer book service, as seen by the fact that the 1559 & 1604 prayer book was made "illegal" from 1645 to 1660 under Interregnum Ordinances. *I thank God for such mercies.*

When I look at this type of thing, I am reminded that one of the initial criticisms made of the 1978 *An Australian Prayer Book* (AAPB) with its multiple “Orders” of service, “for use together with *The Book of Common Prayer, 1662*” (BCP), has in fact now exponentially increased. It is the same basic criticism found in Cranmer’s Preface to the 1549 Edwardian Prayer Book, namely, that before this time, “the manifold changings of the Service,” meant “that to turn the Book only was so hard and intricate a matter, that many times there was more business to find out what should be read, than to read it when it was found out.” If referring to these words in the mid 1980s, the Reverend Mr. Ralph Ogden could say, “compare the similar difficulty of using ... A.A.P.B!⁵³,” and how much more can we say this now!!

Some discussion of this 2009 website and associated Diocesan trends over the last 30 years may be found in (what at the time of the Dedication of this Vol. 3 in June 2011, is) a recent edition in April 2011 of the Diocesan monthly publication, “*Southern Cross*⁵⁴.” Among other things, this documents how “over the past 30 years,” “liturgy” “was largely abandoned in Sydney” Diocese. While it considers that there is a sense in which “Liturgy is back,” this is a somewhat misleading claim since it defines “Liturgy” very loosely, saying, “Many rightly point out that a Christian gathering with no formal prayers or set forms still has a ‘liturgy’ – the pattern of songs, prayers, announcements and preaching that make up the service.” It refers to a threefold process, starting with the time about 30 years ago when amidst “some local variations,” “fundamentally what happened in church was governed by the use of authorised services: the *Book of Common Prayer* (BCP), and, after 1978, *An Australian Prayer Book* (AAPB).” “But,” secondly, quoting the Bishop of South Sydney (one of the Diocesan Auxiliary Bishops under the Archbishop of Sydney), Robert Forsyth, “‘As we moved away from the *Book of Common Prayer* to other forms, people kept moving away from liturgy entirely,’ Bishop Forsyth says.” And now, thirdly, we have the present situation.

The article uses as a typical type of Diocesan Church, “St. Paul’s, Castle Hill.” It says, “A traditional AAPB service runs early on Sunday morning,” then “the 10am family service and the evening service are planned” out on a week by week basis, based around “the week’s Bible readings and sermon notes.” Here a group of persons “plan a ‘contemporary liturgy’” for these two services, that will often include drama, musical items or videos.” Bearing in mind the loose way “liturgy” is used in this article, these are in fact semi-Puritan services. To the extent that a number of such churches still have one “traditional” type “service” from the “AAPB,” it is still possible to get something of a more traditional form of “liturgy.” But it is also notable that very few such Diocesan

⁵³ 1549 Preface reproduced in the Reverend Mr. Ralph Ogden’s Source-Book “*The Anglican Book of Common Prayer, Its Parliamentary Acts, Prefaces, Canons, and 39 Articles of Religion*,” Sydney Australia, c. 1985. This valuable work is further discussed at “*7m) Royal Oak Day Dedication,” *infra*; although the reader may access copies of this 1549 Preface in any of the many prints of that Edwardian prayer book.

⁵⁴ Andrew Robinson’s “Service schmervice: getting liturgy right,” *Southern Cross*, Published by Anglican Media Sydney, Vol. 17, No. 3, April 2011, pp. 14-15.

Churches now have any 1662 BCP services. This *Southern Cross* article ends by saying, “the days of going back to one liturgy are over. The future will be much more flexible” *So much for Anglican “uniformity” of “common prayer,” with an “Authorized” King James Bible “Appointed to be read in Churches” since the “holy Scriptures, as inserted into the Liturgy” are “to be read according to the last Translation” of 1611!*

We thus find that as most Dioceses in Australia have now departed more and more from the 1662 BCP in the direction of semi-Romanism and a General Synod unapproved prayer book adopting various irregularities such as feminist language; the Diocese of Sydney has departed more and more from the 1662 BCP in the direction of semi-Puritanism and General Synod unapproved “alternative” services. What is the common denominator in all of this so called “more flexible” approach? Movement away from the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 and Authorized Version of 1611!

And so it is that “the real winners” of this departure from the confessional standards of Anglicanism are in a sense, “our old opponents,” the Papists and Puritans! The 1662 prayer book reminds us in the 1559 Act *Primo Elizabethae*, that the Romanists are opposed to *the Protestantism* of Cranmer’s prayer book, so that the “Order of Common Service and Prayer ... in the Church of England” as set forth in the 1552 prayer book of “King Edward the Sixth” “was repealed, and taken away ... in the first year of the reign of ... Queen Mary, to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ’s religion;” a fact now lost on the indifferent semi-Romanist Puseyites and semi-Puseyites. And the 1662 prayer book also reminds us in *The Preface* that the Puritans are opposed to *the Anglicanism* of Cranmer’s prayer book, so that “the use of the Liturgy” in the 1559 and 1604 prayer book was under the “usurped powers” of Interregnum Ordinances “repealed” and “discontinued” under those “unhappy confusions” of the 1640s and 1650s; a fact now lost on the indifferent new-breed semi-Puritans in the Diocese of Sydney. Thus we see a departure from the Anglican Protestant confessional standards of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* and 39 Articles in two quite different directions, as Anglicanism is “ripped apart at the seams” by fifth columnist semi-Romanists and semi-Puritans. With regard to the older rise of semi-Romanism in many Anglican Dioceses, and this newer rise of semi-Puritanism in the Sydney Diocese, in terms of what I was taught in *the Diocese of Sydney* to call “the standard” of 1662 prayer book worship, things are now “pretty run down.”

I maintain that a man should do the right thing, even if all those around him are doing the wrong thing. This is, for instance, the example of Holy Noah in antediluvian times (Gen. 6:9; Ezek. 14:14,20). In the words of a worthy maxim, *Two wrongs don’t make a right*; and so the Diocese of Sydney ought not to have allowed semi-Puritanizing of the Diocese on the basis of “greater diversity” in this childishly foolish “tit for tat” departure from Anglican standards as others departed more widely from the true Reformed Anglican tradition of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* and 39 Articles, with such religiously liberal notions as e.g., women priests. Moreover, this type of fundamental issue was nothing new, as the Diocese formerly had to deal with semi-Romanist Dioceses which had departed from the BCP and 39 Articles with the rise of Puseyism from the 19th century. Likewise, the circulation of another “modern” prayer

book without the approval of the General Synod, one which e.g., uses feminist language and changes both the *Nicene & Apostles' Creeds*, for instance, removing the 'offensive' Biblical doctrine of "hell" from the *Apostles' Creed* (Luke 16:23; Acts 2:27,31)⁵⁵, is reminiscent of *The Little Red Prayer Book case* of 1942-1948 when the Puseyite Diocese of Bathurst circulated their own prayer book⁵⁶. But in the final analysis, *Two wrongs don't make a right*; and so I do not consider there is any justification for what has happened in the Diocese of Sydney, which has generally seen the tragic loss of the AV, BCP, and much of its traditional Low Church Evangelical *Anglican* heritage in these unAnglican attitudes and practices.

The AAPB says on its title page that it is intended "for use together with The Book of Common Prayer, 1662." There are only a small number of parts of the AAPB I find of value. Firstly, a small amount of rubric in its "First Form" services *which simply state what had been established practices with the BCP* e.g., before the prayer for the Church militant at Communion, the Minister "may bid special prayers and thanksgivings⁵⁷." Secondly, amidst a majority of very bad Calendar alternative changes I would not agree with, so that the basic Calendar I use is that of the BCP, there are *a small number of added black letter days* I agree with e.g., transferring Benedict from 21 March to 11 July and making 21 March Thomas Cranmer's Day; reviving King Charles I's Day on 30 Jan.; or adding in, e.g., Richard Johnson and the First Christian Service in Australia in 1788 on 3 Feb.; or Basil the Great on 14 June; or the Reformers and Martyrs of the English Reformation, 1555 on 16 Oct. (the date of Ridley and Latimer's martyrdoms at Oxford); or Henry Martyn (1781-1812) the missionary and Bible translator in India and Persia on 19 Oct.⁵⁸. But rather than producing over 600 pages of the AAPB, all that I agree with could be placed on some typed pages glued into the front and / or back opening blank white pages of the 1662 BCP; or produced in a special print edition of the BCP for Australia on a small number of pages before the "Tables and Rules" section. In short, I find most of the AAPB to be undesirable and best jettisoned.

⁵⁵ Article 4 includes the words, referring to Christ, "he descended into hell."

⁵⁶ Judd, S. & Cable, K., *Sydney Anglicans*, With a Foreword by the Most Reverend, Donald Robinson, Archbishop of Sydney [1982-1993], Anglican Information Office, St. Andrew's House, Sydney, 1987, pp. 253-255.

⁵⁷ AAPB, p. 119. "First Form" services in the AAPB are kept relatively close to those in the BCP but are put in a form of "modern English;" whereas other "Forms" are more radically different. Cf. Mr. Ogden's Source-Book at how this is similar to the problems referred to in the 1549 prayer book Preface with regard to "the manifold changing of the service," so "that many times there was more business to found out what should be read, than to read it when it was found out" ("*7m," "Royal Oak Day Dedication," *infra*).

⁵⁸ AAPB, pp. 298-304.

And as for the later semi-Puritan services on the Diocese of Sydney website misnamed, “Better Gatherings,” *supra*, I think they should never have been “launched.” But to the extent that they were, I consider they should “be grounded” ASAP. I think we need to get back to the Book of Common Prayer of 1662 and the Authorized Version of 1611. I take the view that, by the grace of God, we should seek to elevate, ennoble, and raise people UP TO these standards, rather than seeking to lower and debase everything DOWN TO the ignoble standard of the unchurched, poorly educated, “common” man.

However, the AAPB was immediately used to replace the BCP in many Diocesan churches, and then others phased out the BCP over time, using it in less and less services, then occasional services, then removing it altogether. Some Diocese Churches now have an AAPB so called “traditional service” at e.g., 8 am which uses the AAPB fairly closely, and thus is regarded as “traditional” Anglican. This is then followed by an unAnglican “contemporary worship” “family service” which is the main Sunday morning service, and an unAnglican “contemporary worship” evening service often “designed for” teenagers and those in their early 20s. (Although teenagers and those in their early 20s of former generations, together with those of modern generations where the 1662 BCP has been used, have been able to learn and appreciate the BCP and AV.) Others have just the unAnglican “contemporary worship” services. Only a small number of those who have an AAPB so called “traditional service,” ever use the BCP e.g., at St. Matthew’s Windsor this 8.00 a.m. morning service uses the BCP on the fifth Sunday of the month, which is thus four times a year⁵⁹.

⁵⁹ Unfortunately, the standard of BCP worship is not as high as it once was in the small number of Diocese of Sydney Evangelical Churches still so using the BCP for *some* services (there are now no such exclusively BCP Churches). Thus there are certain irregularities here and elsewhere, but I tolerate the bad in them for the sake of getting the good in them. For example, traditional Sydney Diocese Low Church Evangelical Anglican Churches use liturgical colours only for lectern bookmarks and at Communion the Chalice Veil, although a relatively small percentage have also used a pulpit cloth. While the liturgical colours of the Calendar are generally the same for the 1662 BCP and 1978 AAPB Calendars, there are some differences. St. Philip’s Church Hill now leaves the lectern bookmarks off the lectern; and uses the liturgical colour for the Communion Veil of the BCP Calendar at its BCP Communion Services; then changes this over to the liturgical colours of the AAPB Calendar for its AAPB Communion services; whereas St. Matthew’s Windsor sets the colours all day from the AAPB Calendar. Thus on Sunday 30 Jan. 2011, rather than having the liturgical colour of white for “The Fourth Sunday after Epiphany” of the BCP Calendar, St. Matthew’s had the liturgical colour of green for “The Fourth Ordinary Sunday” of the AAPB Calendar. (See picture of this BCP service on the website in connection with this Volume 3 of 30 Jan. 2010 Service with Minister at Lectern showing green bookmarks at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.) “*Oh well ... , at least it’s still an Anglican Calendar’s liturgical colours.*” Of course, when the Office of King Charles the Martyr’s Day was in place before 1859, or in England where Charles I’s Day is an optional red-letter day, the liturgical colour used for the day is red, for the blood of a martyr; although in Australia where Charles I’s Day is only a black-letter day, the liturgical colours of the red-letter day take precedence i.e., on Sunday 30

An unforeseen consequence of the An Australian Prayer Book, 1978, which was intended “for use together with The Book of Common Prayer, 1662,” has thus been the removal altogether of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*, and the de-Anglicanizing and associated semi-Puritanizing of, many Diocese of Sydney Churches. Among other things, this Puritan type of anti-Anglicanism has a phobia about church choirs which have increasingly been removed. E.g., in the 1980s, 1990s, and early 2000s, St. Philip’s Church Hill had a choir, but later in the 2000s it was foolishly and tragically dismissed by such a choir-phobic Rector⁶⁰. Such bad practices have occurred throughout the Diocese, even though in a traditional Low Church Evangelical Diocese of Sydney service, the choir forms part of a procession at the start of the service followed by the Minister (or Ministers), (and if a Bishop is present with the bishop at the end,) and leaves also by a procession followed by the Minister; a feature I am pleased to say that still occurs at the four to six annual BCP Evensong Services at St. Swithun’s Pymble. The rubric of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* says at both Mattins (sung Morning Prayer) and Evensong (sung Evening Prayer) after “The Third Collect, for aid against perils,” that “In Quires [Choirs] and Places where they sing here followeth the Anthem,” so that to willfully abolish church choirs is clearly contrary to the doctrine of the BCP that Anglican Ministers are meant to be upholding. (Cf. the Three Choirs Festival at Worcester attended by George III at “2b,” “Some sites I have visited of interest to Charles I, Charles II, James II, & William III,” under “Christmas-New Year trip around England in December 2008 to January 2009,” *supra*.)

Thus large sections of the Diocese of Sydney are coming to increasingly resemble the *Episcopal Church of Scotland* in the 17th to early 19th centuries (although without that Scottish Puritan Church’s Jacobite sympathies), which had an episcopal form of church government with a fundamentally Puritan church service, albeit one that exhibited a modicum of Anglican liturgical influence with e.g., the *Apostles’ Creed*. (The reader should be aware that the Diocese also contains some semi-Puseyite Churches such as St. James King Street, or Puseyite Churches such as Christchurch St. Lawrence, all of which are a total disgrace to the true Reformed Evangelical Protestant Biblically sound doctrine of the 1662 prayer book and 39 Articles.) While the generally Evangelical Diocese has mercifully retained a commitment to the great Evangelical truths of the Protestant Reformation, it needs to remember its role as *an Anglican Church* and present those great truths in a traditional Diocese of Sydney Low Church Evangelical Anglican church service. In short, its clergy and laity need to remember and do some meditation upon *King Charles I’s Day*, with its primary focus on the martyrdom of King Charles I in 1649, and its secondary focus on the Interregnum and Restoration under King Charles II in 1660, considering, among other things, their Anglican heritage.

Jan. 2011, white (Epiphany 4, BCP Calendar) or green (Ordinary Sunday 4, AAPB Calendar). Thus of the four liturgical colours used, it seems the only one that could definitely not have been used on Sunday 30 Jan. 2011 is the purple of Lent!

⁶⁰ David Mansfield (Rector 2004-2008).

*Those who come to church services because they like to wear jeans to church (jeans were the dress of Hill-Billies, and this element in rock'n'roll was a factor in their usage as a fashion item from about the 1960s, so that they bespeak such love of worldliness, whether or not their wearers consciously know of this connection they clearly exhibit it), hear the blast of electric guitars being strummed, see multi-coloured lights flashing, and be assured that the Authorized Version has been "relegated to a bygone era," are focused on fleshly worldly lusts (Titus 2:12; I John 2:15-17); and the idea that one should pander to such "bastards" (Heb. 12:8) with this type of sentiment badly misfocuses people's minds AWAY FROM the gospel of Christ, for "if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons" (Heb. 12:8). In their place we need sinners who repent, and persons who come to a church because they hear the gospel preached, and so if they come to an Anglican Church they will therefore happily accept a service from the Book of Common Prayer of 1662 and Authorized Version of 1611. We need people who when the question is put to them, "Will ye also go away?" reply by saying of such traditional Low Church Evangelical Anglican Churches that which can only be said of any religiously conservative Evangelical or Protestant Church, namely, "to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life" (John 6:67,68). (See also "*7m," "Royal Oak Day Dedication," *infra*.)*

3) *The "Father" Huddleston Saga.*

On the principles of hagiology evident in the Church of England's *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 and Church of Ireland's *Book of Common Prayer* of 1666, other than *All Saints' Day* which is a general catch-all, red-letter days are reserved for Biblical figures or events from New Testament times, or in the case of the *Church of Ireland* the Protestant red-letter day of *Irish Massacre Day* (23 Oct.) from 1663-1665 and 1801-1859; and any red-letter days with Offices are limited to those from Protestant history e.g., the *Church of Ireland* Protestant red-letter day with its own Office of *Irish Massacre Day* from 1666-1800. Since 1859 the lone surviving such red-letter day with its own Office is *Accession Day* of a reigning monarch, which under the present monarch and Supreme Governor of the *Church of England*, Queen Elizabeth II, is 6 Feb. . This makes the point that Protestant Christianity is Biblical Christianity. Thus those from the era of Protestant history have generally been given an Office (*King Charles I's Day*, *King Charles II's Day*, *Papists' Conspiracy Day*, and *Irish Massacre Day*⁶¹).

⁶¹ The only exception to this was *Irish Massacre Day* (23 Oct.) from 1663-5; and 1801-59, which was a red-letter day without an office, which it additionally had in the Church of Ireland's prayer book of 1666-1800 (after 1800 it used the 1662 Church of England's prayer book as the *United Church of England & Ireland*). By contrast, the other three days with an Office removed in 1859 were found in both books. These were removed in 1859 by Royal Warrant dated 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, (UK) (25 March 1859), repealing 3 Jac. I, chap.1 (England) (5 Nov); 12 Car. II, chap. 14 (England) (29 May); 12 Car. II, chap. 30 (England) (so far as it enacted 30 Jan.); 13 Car. II, chap. 7 (England) (30 Jan., so far as it confirmed this from

Furthermore, this making of Protestant figures with a red letter day, generally with the addition of an Office, is not necessarily done for all, or even most, Protestant figures, any more than making a day a red letter day (i.e., with its own Collect and readings,) is necessarily done for all NT figures e.g., Visitation of the Virgin Mary (Luke 1:39-56), 2 July is a black letter day in the 1662 Calendar. In the *Church of England* the bias for this has always been for a *Supreme Governor of the Church of England*, and this same bias existed in the *Church of Ireland* even though it also had *Irish Massacre Day* which has a more generalist Protestant focus. For instance, the 1578 Notes on *The New Calendar* of the Elizabethan Prayer Book, refer to such notable proto-Protestant and Protestant saints as the proto-Protestant martyr, John Huss (8 July), and Protestant saints, Melancthon (16 Feb.), Luther (18 Feb., 22 Feb., 31 Oct., & 10 Nov), Calvin (27 Aug.), and Zwingli (11 Oct.)⁶². These saints thereby received the approximate equivalent of a normal black-letter day only, although to the extent that some extra detail was given about them on the Calendar, it was a more elaborate type of black-letter day than usual.

We cannot doubt that when the Office of the Restoration was added to the 1662 *Church of England* prayer book in 1664, (and when it was included in the 1666 *Church of Ireland* prayer book,) it was conceptualized as a Protestant holy day. After all, King Charles II was the Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland, and so represented the Restoration of a legally Protestant throne. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that like King Solomon, he had a penchant towards “outlandish women” (Neh. 13:26), in the first place entering a mixed marriage with a Roman Catholic, from which there were no children; and in the second place, entering other immoral unions. Moreover, the end of Charles II’s reign was marked by some unfortunate irregularities and unresolved ambiguities.

The Bible teaches us how such sin and immorality may continue to impact for many generations. E.g., Solomon married “women of the ... Ammonites” (I Kgs 11:1). On inclusive reckoning, Solomon was the *first generation* to feel the impact of this sin (I Kgs 11:1-13). His successor, Rehoboam (I Kgs 11:43), was *the second generation* who came from “Naamah an Ammonitess” (I Kgs 14:21). Now under him, “Judah did evil in the sight of the Lord,” for he worshipped “images,” “and there were also sodomites in the land” (I Kgs 14:22-24). The *third generation* was “Abijam,” “And he walked in all the sins of his father. Nevertheless for David’s sake did the Lord his God give him a lamp in

12 Car. II, chap. 30); 13 Car. II, chap. 11 (England) (29 May, so far as it confirmed this from 12 Car. II, chap. 14); 24 Geo. II, chap. 23 (Great Britain) (5 Nov., 30 Jan., 29 May, so far as it confirmed their observation); 14 & 15 Car. II, Session 4, chapter 1 (Ireland) (29 May); & 14 & 15 Car. II, Session 4, chap. 23 (Ireland) (23 Oct.). (22 Victoria, chapter 2, 25 March 1859; in *A Collection of the Public General Statutes*, passed in the 22nd year of ... H.M. Queen Victoria ..., Printed by Eyre & Spottiswoode, Printers to the Queen, 1859; British Library Social Science Room, BS Ref. 3).

⁶² *The Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth 1559*, With an Historical Introduction by Edward Benham, John Grant, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, 1909, pp. 194-205.

Jerusalem, to set up his son after him, and to establish Jerusalem” (I Kgs 15:1-4). The *fourth generation* was “Asa.” “And” on a personal level, “Asa did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord.” “And he took away the sodomites out of the land, and removed all the idols that his fathers had made” (I Kgs 15:9,11,12). Thus in the first instance, we see “God visiting the iniquities of the father upon the children unto the ... fourth generation” (Deut. 5:9). Nevertheless, in his governing he still showed a weakness for the sins of his ancestors, for the heathen “high places were not removed” (I Kgs 15:14).

The *fifth generation* was “Jehoshaphat” (I Kgs 15:24). On a personal level, “Jehoshaphat” was also found “doing that which was right in they eyes of the Lord: nevertheless” in his governance, still showing a weakness to the sin of his forbears, “the high places were not taken away; for the people offered burnt incense yet in the high places” (I Kgs 22:42,43). The *sixth generation* was “Jehoram” (I Kgs 22:50). “And he walked in the way of the kings of Israel, ... for he had the daughter of Ahab to wife: and he wrought that which was evil in the eyes of the Lord. Howbeit the Lord would not destroy the house of David, because of the covenant that he had made with David, and as he promised to give a light to him and to his sons for ever” (II Chron 21:5-7).

The *seventh generation* was “Ahaziah.” “He also walked in the ways of the house of Ahab: for his mother was his counselor to do wickedly. Wherefore he did evil in the sight of the Lord” (II Chron. 22:1,3,4). The *eighth generation* was “Joash.” “And Joash did right in the sight of the Lord all the days of Jehoida the priest” (II Chron. 24:1,2). But “Joash the king remembered not the kindness which Jehoida ... had done to him, but slew his son” (II Chron 24:22). The *ninth generation* was “Amaziah.” “And the rest of the acts of Amaziah, are they not written in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah?” (II Kgs 14:17,18). Now the apostate “Amazaiah did turn away from following the Lord” (II Chron. 25:27). The *tenth generation* was “Uzziah” (II Chron. 26:1). “And the Ammonites gave gifts to Uzziah” (II Chron. 26:8). And “his heart was lifted up to his destruction: for he transgressed against the Lord his God, and went into the temple of the Lord to burn incense upon the altar of incense” which thing only the priest could do (II Chron. 26:16. Cf. Article 37, Anglican 39 Articles, “we give not to our princes the ministering either of God’s Word, or of the sacraments”). “And” the “priests” “withstood Uzziah the king.” And he was “smitten” by “the Lord.” “And Uzziah the king was a leper unto the day of his death” (II Chron. 26:17-21).

The *eleventh generation* was “Jotham. “And he did that which right in the sight of the Lord ... he entered not into the temple of the Lord” (II Chron. 27:1,2). “He built the high gate of the Lord, and ... the wall of Ophel Moreover he built cities in the mountains ... and in the forests he built castles and towers. He fought also with the king of the Ammonites, and prevailed against them.” “So Jothan became mighty, because he prepared his ways before the Lord his God” (II Chron 27:3-6). We thus see how the original sexual sin of Solomon who married “an Ammonite,” had the effect that none of his descendants did fully and properly “enter into the congregation of the Lord; even to their tenth generation” (Deut. 23:3). “Did not Solomon king of Israel sin by these things? Yet among many nations was there no king like him, who was beloved of his

God, and God made him king over all Israel: nevertheless even him did outlandish women cause to sin” (Neh. 13:26).

So likewise, we cannot doubt that Charles II’s penchant for “outlandish women” (Neh. 13:26), had a bad impact for many generations. For example, it is notable that the present heir to the throne, the son of Queen Elizabeth II, the Prince of Wales, Prince Charles (b. 1948), will if the normal cause of events occurs, when he succeeds to the throne, become King Charles III⁶³. It is clear that he has been deeply influenced by the memory of his predecessor’s name sake, King Charles II. This is e.g., seen in the fact that *he married a woman who was descended from Charles II’s illegitimate children, namely, Lady Diana*⁶⁴. Thus the children of this union will if the normal cause of events occurs, be the first monarchs to be descendants of Charles II⁶⁵. Prince Charles clearly assumed that Princess Diana would therefore accept that like their mutual ancestor, Charles II, he too could be both married and take a mistress.

But Princess Diana made it clear that she would not accept this, and a matrimonial separation occurred. Her concerns about Prince Charles’ adultery do not appear to have sprung from a general commitment to Christian morality and maintenance of Christian standards, as seen by her more general lifestyle. E.g., while alive she was dubbed, “the patron saint of sodomites” because of her charity work with those suffering from the AIDS plague in the UK, which in the UK was contracted primarily from homosexual sodomy, although a much lesser number of intravenous drug users were infected, and a much lesser number again of innocent persons who contracted it in a blood transfusion. Of course, such charity work would have been acceptable if it had been linked with an unambiguous Christian message that those who engage in homosexuality and illegal drug usage need to repent and turn to God. Such Christian charity work could have included

⁶³ King Edward I (Regnal years: 1272-1307), known as “Longshanks” because he was 6 foot 2 inches, became Overlord of Ireland, and conquered Wales. He then appointed his eldest son as the Prince of Wales in 1301. In turn, the title was given to his son, Edward II (Regnal Years: 1307-1327), before he became king. From this time, by long standing tradition, the eldest son and heir apparent to the throne, has usually though not always, been made “Prince of Wales” by the monarch. When a Prince of Wales becomes King, the title falls into disuse till the monarch grants it to the next eldest son. Thus in the normal cause of events, when Prince Charles becomes King Charles III, he will grant the title, “Prince of Wales,” to his eldest son, William.

⁶⁴ The Princess of Wales, Princess Diana (1961-1997), was Lady Diana Spencer before marrying the Prince of Wales, Prince Charles in 1981, divorcing in 1996. On her patrilineal Spencer side, she was descended from Charles II through four of his illegitimate sons, Henry Fitzroy (via the mistress Barbara Villiers), Charles Lennox (via the mistress Louise de Kerovaille), Charles Beauclerk (via the mistress Nell Gwyn), and James Crofts-Scott (via the mistress Lucy Walter).

⁶⁵ Next in line to the throne after Charles is his eldest son via Diana, William (b. 1982).

the message, “Your sin affects other innocent people, look at those who are now infected with AIDS because of a blood transfusion.” But this was certainly not Princess Diana’s message. E.g., she was a good friend of the notoriously bi-sexual rock’n’roll “idol,” Elton John, who later attended her funeral with his sodomite boyfriend.

Princess Diana failed to use her charity work with AIDS sufferers, to more generally raise the question with homosexuals and intravenous drug users, “Why shouldest thou die before thy time?” (Eccl. 7:17). She did not point such persons to the one who said, “I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance” (Matt. 9:13). In the end, the question she failed to pose to others, was posed about herself, “Why shouldest thou die before thy time?” (Eccl. 7:17). Princess Diana died prematurely in a fast car involved in a car-crash, as a consequence of her ungodly life-style in which she walked on the wild side in fleshly lusts. At the time, her friend, the rock’n’roll “idol,” Elton John, released a song about her, which was largely a rehash of another song about the rock’n’roll “idol,” Marilyn Munroe, who sang, “Freedom’s just another word for nothin’ left to lose,” before she overdosed on drugs and committed suicide. The similarity between Marilyn Munroe’s and Princess Diana’s wild and ungodly lives was thus made even more apparent. Of course, the unsaved and unwashed masses, who dote and worship their rock’n’roll idols and are entangled in all manner of ungodly lusts, saw nothing wrong with any of this. “And the people did yet corruptly” (II Chron. 27:2).

But *two wrongs do not make a right*, and Prince Charles ought not to have been married to one woman (Princess Diana), while committing adultery with another. Who was this mistress of Prince Charles whom he then later married? Camilla Parker Bowles, who *also is descended from one of Charles II’s illegitimate children*⁶⁶. We cannot doubt then, that the impact of Charles II’s sin of unchastity, has continued to impact over many generations, and appears to have strongly impressed itself upon the mind of Prince Charles, who being tragically influenced by it, very clearly not only set about to enter sexual relationships with descendants of Charles II’s illegitimate children, but also set about to mimic this horrible behavior when he was married to one of these descendants, Princess Diana, but had another one of them as a mistress, Camilla Parker Bowles.

It is also the case that Charles II *was too sympathetic towards Popery* as seen in the fact that he both married a Roman Catholic, and also refused to give his Assent to

⁶⁶ The Duchess of Cornwall, Camilla (b. 1947), was formerly Mrs. Camilla Parker Bowles. Before her divorce, she was married to the Roman Catholic, Andrew Parker Bowles (1973-1995), by whom she had two children, Tom (b. 1974), a godson of Prince Charles, and Laura (b. 1978), both of whom were raised as Papists. She married the Prince of Wales and Duke of Cornwall, Prince Charles, in 2005 (and uses the title Duchess of Cornwall rather than Princess of Wales, so as to distinguish herself from the title commonly associated in people’s minds with Prince Charles first wife, Diana). Like Princess Diana, Duchess Camilla is descended from Charles II through his illegitimate son, Charles Lennox (via the mistress Louise de Kerovaille).

Bills that would have ensured his Papist brother, James II did not succeed to the throne⁶⁷. I.e., *he was not sufficiently focused on upholding the unique truthfulness of Protestant Christianity*. This same defect also appears in the present Prince Charles, who, at least to date, as a future Supreme Governor of the *Church of England* has not made appropriate efforts to be a *Defender of the Faith* of Protestant Christianity.

We are commanded in Scripture to make “prayers ... for kings, and for all that are in authority” (I Tim. 2:1,2). This must include prayers for Prince Charles, that he heartily repent, and be truly converted as a good Christian man. But even as God worked good for his purposes through the kings in Solomon’s line who wrought evil, so God brings good from the present royal line. Scripture tells us, “there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God” (Rom. 13:1). E.g., while there are sad and bad blemishes upon Charles II’s reign, it was only because of the Restoration of a legally Protestant throne reestablished from the Restoration remembered on *Royal Oak Day*, that in time we could have the godly Protestant king, King William III of Orange.

Thus we recognize that “Solomon king of Israel” “was beloved of his God, and God made him king over all Israel,” while not denying that “him did outlandish women cause to sin” (Neh. 13:26), so that “Solomon did evil in the sight of the Lord, and went not fully after the Lord” (I Kgs 11:7). And likewise we recognize on *Royal Oak Day* that Charles II was beloved of God, and the Lord miraculously preserved him when he hid in the royal oak, and so preserved the royal line; while not denying that “him did outlandish women cause to sin” (Neh. 13:26).

The first issue raised by the “Father” Huddleston saga is the question of “How?” a Roman Catholic priest came to be tolerated at a time when the *Act of Uniformity* of 1662 and connected legislation was operating penalties against Roman Catholicism as a prohibited religion in the Kingdom of England (i.e., England and its Dominion of Wales)? However, there were a number of exemptions made under this Act e.g., to Lutherans. The 1662 Acts says, “the penalties in this Act shall not extent to the foreigners or aliens of the foreign Reformed Churches allowed, or to be allowed” And another exemption applied to a small number of Roman Catholics and their descendants, who had given timely assistance to Charles II in the 1650s following the Battle of Worcester.

The house on the Boscobel Estate was looked after by servants, and this included five Roman Catholic brothers, whose surname is spelt variously as: Pendrell / Pendrill /

⁶⁷ Even without such legislation, James II held a voidable office since he did not e.g., swear allegiance to the 39 Articles, and other matters required by common law as opposed to statue law, as a consequence of the monarch being Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland. Hence in time the Parliament fairly declared his office void on the basis of a *de jure* abdication followed by a *de facto* abdication when he, deserted his post when fleeing London and discarded the Great Seal into the River Thames; with the Parliament inviting the next in line, the Protestants, Mary II and William III of Orange to the throne. Nevertheless, such black letter legislation would have made this an easier legal transition to William and Mary.

Pendril / Penderel. These five brothers were John, George, Richard, William, and Humphrey. They helped Charles II hide from Cromwell's Roundheads following the Battle of Worcester in 1651, and this included Charles II's concealment in one of Boscobel House's "priest-holes" more generally used for concealing a Roman Catholic priest. Charles II went from Boscobel to Moseley, where the Roman Catholic priest, "Father" John Huddleston attended to his bruised and bleeding feet⁶⁸.

When John Penderel bought intelligence that there was a safe place for Charles at Mr. Whitgreave of Mosely's house, Charles rode there on a mill horse. This was the mill-horse of Humphrey Penderel, a miller at Whiteladies. This event is remembered in artwork, being one of a series of painting on Charles "Escape from the Battle of Worcester," in Isaac Fuller's (d. 1672) 1660s oil on canvas painting of Charles II on Humphrey Penderel's mill horse at Boscobel⁶⁹.

After the Restoration, they were summoned by King Charles II to Whitehall on Wed. 13 June 1661, at which time the king thanked them and asked if there was any particular reward that they would now seek for their earlier services. They asked for only thing, to wit, exemption from relevant laws, so as they and their descendants could freely practice the Roman Catholic religion. Charles II and Restoration Anglicans formed the view that they owed these people *a debt of gratitude* which ought to be recognized, with the consequence that these brothers, together with their kinswoman, Mrs. Yates, Mr. Whitgreave, and the Roman Catholic priest, "Father" Huddleston, were all granted an exemption to the laws against the Roman religion; and Charles II additionally granted them and their descendants a special pension⁷⁰.

It should be remembered that Charles II's indubitable defects have been much exaggerated by Puritans⁷¹. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the story frequently put forth by both Papists and Puritans, who have historically claimed that Charles II made a death-bed conversion to Popery. So commonly is this put around by them, that I once

⁶⁸ "Escape of Charles II" *Wikipedia* (though this article contains errors with respect to Charles II at his death-bed, it contains some useful information) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Escape_of_Charles_II).

⁶⁹ The *National Portrait Gallery*, St. Martin's Place, London, WC2H. This picture may be viewed at "National Portrait Gallery," (Gallery reference no: NPG 5250) (<http://www.npg.org.uk/live/search/portrait.asp?LinkID=mp00841&rNo=11&role=sit>).

⁷⁰ Strickland, A., "The Fugitive at Boscobel: Adventures of the Merry Monarch," *Harper's New Monthly Magazine*, Vol. 2, No. 7, Dec. 1850 (22 A4 size internet pages) (<http://www.elfinspell.com/Harpers2Boscobel.html>).

⁷¹ See Textual Commentary Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), Preface, "Dedication: The Anglican Calendar," section "c) i) Charles the First's Day (30 Jan), Charles the Second's Day (29 May), & Papists' Conspiracy Day (5 Nov)," subsection, "Charles II's final years and death."

uncritically accepted it without much thinking about it. But as further discussed in the Preface to Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), after I investigated the facts, I came to the conclusion that this story was possible, though on balance, improbable.

For example, this was “an old story” long preceding Charles II death, so that even at the time of the Restoration in 1660, were published “Certain Letters Evidencing the King’s Steadfastness in the Protestant Religion.” This included e.g., the false claim that Charles II “hath forsaken our” Protestant “Communion, to embrace that of Rome,” and that “his Chaplains near to him,” “are nothing less than Papists.” But in defence of Charles II, it is said by e.g., “Brother” “Drelincourt, Minister of the Church of Paris,” in response to such claims as “Being turned to the Roman Catholick profession,” that they have “ever detested the doctrine of Pope and their Instruments,” and he further says “I see not any ground there is for calling this Prince a Roman Catholick, he making no profession of it; but on the contrary hath rejected all the advantages and all the aides offered to him upon that condition.” It is also maintained by e.g., Richard Baxter, (who though a Chaplain to King Charles II, was later ejected from St. Mary’s *Church of England*, Kidderminster, for Puritanism,) “Let the Bishop of Rome lust” to have it so. “But I pass over all this; for ... this Prince being born, and duly educated in the true religion, never departed from the publick profession of it; no, not even in those places in which he was likely to suffer loss thereby; neither did he disdain to be present at our [Protestant] religious assembly at Roan and Rochel⁷².”

Admittedly though, there is a degree of ambiguity in the evidence, and a degree of inconsistency and ambiguity in the life of Charles II, who showed some of the qualities of a King Solomon with his lack of sexual restraint, and lack of being fully devoted to the Lord (I Kgs 11:5-8); and since he clearly lost his political judgement in the closing years of his life, it is also possible that he lost his religious judgement with regard to his profession of religious faith. If so (*View I*), the reason why Charles II is remembered on 29 May is that he was the legitimate monarch of a legally Protestant throne; and his restoration in 1660 is the opposite side of the coin to recognizing that Charles I was a martyr, and illegally deposed by the Puritan Revolutionaries of the 1640s and 1650s. If Charles II really did convert to Roman Catholicism on his deathbed, then in a Shakespearean type of manner, his lack of sexual restraint proved to be a fatal moral flaw in his character. I.e., like King Solomon, whose “wives turned away his heart after other gods,” so that “Solomon did evil in the sight of the Lord” (I Kgs 11:4,6); Charles II “did evil” in converting to Popery, no doubt to at least some extent, influenced by his poor marriage choice to a Portuguese Papist. If so, God overruled to ensure that this did not happen before his deathbed conversion, and overall the realm stayed safe for Protestantism.

⁷² “Certain Letters Evidencing the King’s Steadfastness in the Protestant Religion: Sent from the Princess of Turenne, and the Ministers of Charenton, to some persons of quality in London,” Printed by Thomas Newcomb for Gabriel Bedell, and Thomas Collins, to be sold at their shop at the Middle Temple Gate in Fleet Street, London, 1660, pp. 20,32,37-38.

We know that God's judgment was seen in Charles II's defeat at Worcester as a punishment for his sins in signing the *Solemn League & Covenant*; although it was mingled with God's mercy in his protection at the royal oak, and subsequent Restoration after he had "learnt his lesson," and no longer supported the *Solemn League & Covenant*. I.e., Charles II should have simply gone into hiding awaiting the ending of the interregnum by God's good pleasure, or fought on with what Cavaliers he could, or cut a deal with the Puritan Scots for Scotland to be Presbyterian, with tolerance to other Protestants; but NOT England and Ireland which were to be left Anglican in their Established Churches, but with religious tolerance to other Protestants. His failure to do this meant he incurred God's chastening judgment at Worcester.

So too, if he really did convert to Popery in harmony with his unlawful signing of the *Treaty of Dover*, then his death at the relatively young age of just 54 years of age, may well have been a similar judgment by God. It was against the legally Protestant and legally Anglican throne for Charles II to sign any agreement to become either a Puritan (*Solemn League & Covenant*) or Papist (*Treaty of Dover*), and there is no evidence that he ever took these unlawful commitments seriously. Rather, he simply signed them to enhance his political power. Nevertheless, it was still wrong for him to sign these documents; and like the earlier unlawful *Solemn League & Covenant*, his signing of this provision in the *Treaty of Dover* was unlawful; and so whether or not he did convert to Popery, we may here see the judgment of God upon him for his having signed this unlawful provision in the *Treaty of Dover*.

And if, perchance, it is true that Charles II converted to Popery on his death-bed, in the words of Willoughby Mynor, "There is a drop of the royal martyr's blood in it"⁷³; because due to the Puritan's revolutionary republic, he was driven as a boy from England into Popish France where crafty and devious Jesuits were able to mind-molest the tender young mind of this fatherless boy, whose Protestant father, Charles I, had been murdered by the revolutionaries⁷⁴. I would certainly agree with Willoughby Mynor with regard to this factor leading to James II's conversion to Popery. Thus in *c. 1717 Royal Oak Day Sermon* preached by Willoughby Mynor, in which he says with reference to the golden calf idol of Exodus 32, "The Israelites, when under any severe calamity, were wont to say, 'There was a grain of the calf in it.' England may also say, 'There is a drop of the royal martyr's blood in it.' For the Restoration, glorious as it was, could not put a stop to the mischievous consequences of the ... rebellion, to which is owing the perversion of the royal offspring to the errors of the *Church of Rome*, in which, IF he has perished, 'twill be, I fear, a heavier account to this nation, than the blood of his father, inasmuch as the loss of a soul bears no proportion with shedding the blood of the body. The driving of

⁷³ Mynors, W., "A Sermon preached May 29. Being the Anniversary of the Restoration of K Charles II," Printed near Stationers Hall, London, ["1715?" estimate date on catalogue; see my comments on the selected date "c. 1717" at "7 g) Royal Oak Day Sermons," *infra*], p. 17; in *Eighteenth Century Collections Online* at Sydney University Library.

⁷⁴ See Sermon in Appendix 5 of this Textual Commentary, Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25).

the Royal Family to beg their bread, into a foreign *Popish* country, inexperienced, tender, unable to withstand the persuasions of an indulgent, tho' superstitious mother, or confute the sophistry of learned *Jesuits*, hath given being to all the calamities wherewith we are to this day distracted. Had not their malice murdered the tender, religious father, he would have instilled better principles into his offspring's breast⁷⁵."

Certainly we cannot doubt that there was a nefarious web of Jesuitry running throughout France. E.g., the Spanish Jesuit Juan de Mariana (1536-1624) taught in Rome, Sicily, AND PARIS. His teachings were regarded as influential in the murder in 1610 of the King of France, Henry IV (Regnal Years of First Bourbon King: 1589-1610)⁷⁶. And all Jesuits were expelled from Popish France in 1762.

There are two views, and Willoughby Mynor says, "IF he has perished" in "the errors of the *Church of Rome*." But with respect to the first view, "if" he has so perished, there is "a drop of the royal martyr's blood in it;" for deprived by the Puritan republican revolutionaries of his father, Charles I, and so left to the unchecked superstitions of his Roman Catholic mother; and driven by the Puritan republican revolutionaries "into a foreign *Popish* country," an environment in which this "inexperienced" and "tender" young man was subjected to what Willoughby Mynors calls, "the sophistry of" "*Jesuits*;" means that if, as supporters of the Puritan republican revolution gleefully like to say, that Charles II did indeed convert to Popery on his deathbed, then there is "a drop of the royal martyr's blood in it." And certainly with respect to his brother, James II, these factors mean, "There's a drop of the royal martyr's blood in it."

Rather than gleefully saying, "We never wanted the Restoration in 1660. We never liked Charles II; and his death-bed conversion to Popery just proves we were right to dislike him;" these English and Irish Puritans should hang their heads in shame and pray, "O God, forgive us for having supported the Puritan republican revolutionaries contrary to thy Word and ordinance. Forgive us for having glorified Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford and the others of their seditious and murderous ilk in our churches and from our pulpits. Forgive us for having supported the murder of King Charles I in 1649, and the associated deprivation of a father for the young and tender Charles II and his brother James II. Forgive us for having supported the murderous Oliver Cromwell who drove both of these young, impressionable, and tender young men, Charles II and James II into exile and so into the arms of a Popish environment, that at least one, James II, to the full extent of becoming a Papist, and the other, Charles II, at least to the extent of marrying a Popish wife, then failed to satisfactorily deal with the

⁷⁵ Mynors, W., "A Sermon preached May 29 [c. 1717], *op. cit.*, p. 17.

⁷⁶ See Textual Commentaries, Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), "Dedication: The Anglican Calendar," "(c) i) Charles the First's Day (30 Jan), Charles the Second's Day (29 May), & Papists' Conspiracy Day (5 Nov)," at "Charles the First," subsection, "Popish Jesuit involvement in Charles I's martyrdom."

difficulties of. O Lord, by glorifying Samuel Rutherford in our pulpits, and in supporting rebellion against King Charles I, we have supported rebellion against thee and thy Word; we have sinned and committed iniquity, and have done wickedly, and have rebelled, departing from thy precepts. Through the atoning merits of Jesus Christ, we seek thy forgiveness, O Lord; for we now see one of the consequences of the antecedent sin of murdering Charles I; for we now see that at least with respect to Charles II's marrying a Popish wife, and also with respect to James II becoming a Papist, that 'there's a drop of the royal martyr's blood in it'."

This should be their response and humble prayer with regard to Charles II and James II, if indeed the first view is correct, and Charles II did in fact convert to Popery on his death-bed; and either way, with regard to Charles II's marrying a Papist, and James II becoming a Papist. But I say, "if" to the first proposition, because the matter of whether or not Charles II did no convert to Popery is open to interpretation; and there is also a second view. And of course, if the alternative view that Charles II is correct, i.e., that he did not convert to Roman Catholicism, and this was a propaganda hoax by James II in cahoots with the Popish priest, "Father" Huddleston, *infra*, then there is still a need for those who have glorified people like Oliver Cromwell to seek God's forgiveness, *supra*.

While I am not dogmatic on the matter, and I once thought the first view about Charles II was correct, whereas I now think the second view is *probably* the better view; my own mind has fluctuated between these two views; and has not been able to entirely settle or resolve with a clear certainty over which of the two views is in fact correct. In the Homily entitled, "Against Rebellion," in Article 35 of the Anglican 39 Articles, Part 6, referring to portions of Revelation chapters 13, 14, and elsewhere, reminds us that "the bishop of Rome" is "the Babylonical beast of Rome." And in further reference to the Papal Antichrist, the Dedicatory Preface to King James in our Authorized Versions reminds us that the Pope is, in the words of II Thess. 2:3, "that man of sin." And in II Thessalonians 2 the Pope is described as coming with "lying wonders," "with all deceivableness," and deceiving those whose "love not the truth," but "believe a lie" (II Thess. 2:9-11). And so we are warned in these passages about the trickery and deceitfulness of Popery.

Thus the second view with regard to the death of Charles II is that the whole story about Charles II's deathbed conversion to Popery was a hoax, put out by the propaganda machine of the Popish Duke, James II, in cahoots with the Popish priest, "Father" Huddleston, in order to try and promote Popery throughout the realm. As to which of these two possibilities is correct, I leave the good reader to consider for himself⁷⁷.

But either way, it is clear that under Charles II, God kept the legally Protestant throne safe for Protestantism up till the time of his death-bed. And it should also be

⁷⁷ See also Textual Commentaries, Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), "Dedication: The Anglican Calendar," "(c) i) Charles the First's Day (30 Jan), Charles the Second's Day (29 May), & Papists' Conspiracy Day (5 Nov)," at "Charles II's final years and death;" and Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25), Appendix 5, Sermon 3.

remembered, that *The King's Restoration Day / Royal Oak Day / Oak Apple Day*, was instituted in the early 1660s, and does not deal with the later life of Charles II, but rather, is focused on his preservation during the interregnum, and Restoration of both himself and the Royal Family in 1660. So the celebration of this day is for the Restoration of the legally Protestant monarchy, which we should thank God we have to this day; and so *Oak Apple Day* should not be misconstrued to mean any necessary endorsement of, anything either Charles II, or any other later monarch did or did not do. We royalists may, within reasonable bounds be critical of later actions of either Charles II or some other monarch that has reigned since 1660; and still celebrate the events of the royal oak by e.g., remembering *King Charles I's Day* and / or *Royal Oak Day*, because we accept the propriety of the big thing, namely, the Restoration of a constitutionally Protestant monarchy. Nevertheless, we do not as the imbalanced critics of Charles I and Charles II, "revile the gods" (Exodus 22:28), i.e., broadly speaking godly "rulers," as opposed to the ungodly rulers (Psalm 82). For of suchlike we read in I Corinthians 6:9,10, "Be not deceived," "revilers" "shall not inherit the kingdom of God."

We Protestants do not believe in infallible bishops, or infallible monarchs, or any other infallible fallen human being or institution, such as the Papists have with their so called, "Infallible Pope." We Protestants believe only in an Infallible Bible, for Christ himself has said in John 10:35, "The Scripture cannot be broken." We believe in a Bible that contains no errors of any kind, because it is the Divinely Inspired and Divinely Preserved Word, of the King of Kings, who is a God that cannot lie. We therefore support the Restoration of the monarchy celebrated as a secondary focus 30 January as *King Charles I's Day* which is also the *Accession Day* of Charles II, or as a primary focus of *Oak Apple Day* on a Saturday 28 May, or on 29 May irrespective of what day of the week that is, or the first / second Thursday in June, in accordance with the words of Romans 13:1-9; and we see *Royal Oak Day* through the spectacles of God's Word which says in I Peter 2:17, "Honour the king." And so we subject all things, including our assessments of any monarchs that have reigned either before or since 1660, to the standards of the Infallible Book, the Holy Bible.

4) *The Test Acts and 1689 Religious Toleration to English & Irish Puritans.*

The *Clarendon Code* consisted of five broad planks. Firstly, the *Corporation Act* of 1661 (13 Car. II. St. 2.c.1) required that no-one could be elected to a government or city corporation unless he had within the previous 12 months taken Communion at a *Church of England* Church. Secondly, the *Act of Uniformity* of 1662 (14 Car. II, c. 4) ejected non-Anglicans from Anglican Churches and Schools. Thirdly the *Conventicle Act* of 1664 (16 Car. II, c. 4) forbade religious assemblies of over 5 people outside the auspices of the *Church of England*. Fourthly, the *Test & Corporation Acts* of 1673 (25 Car. II, c. 2) & 1678 (30 Car. II, St. 2), both of which lasted till 1828, prevented Non-Conformists from holding civil or military offices, or being awarded degrees from Oxbridge Colleges. And fifthly, the *Five Mile Act* of 1665 forbade Non-Conformist Ministers from coming within 5 miles (or c. 8 kilometres) of incorporated towns or places of their former livings; and they were forbidden to teach in schools (repealed in 1812).

There was connected later legislation after the *Clarendon Code* and its modification by the 1689 *Toleration Act* generally of an anti-Papist nature. These were put through by various Parliaments in the three kingdoms of England, Ireland, and Scotland; and from 1707 to 1800 the Kingdom of Great Britain (England and Scotland) and Kingdom of Ireland. The *Education Act* of 1695 was an Act of the English (Westminster) and Irish Parliaments prohibiting Roman Catholics from sending their children abroad to be educated. The *Disarming Act* of 1695 outlawed persons in parts of Scotland from having unauthorized guns, being contextually concerned with Jacobite supporters of the Popish Pretender. The *Marriage Act* of 1697 sought to discourage Papist-Protestant mixed marriages, deeming any persons of such union to be Papists, and subject to all other anti-Papist laws. The *Banishment Act* of 1697 (9 Wm. c. 1) banished Roman Catholic bishops *et al* from Ireland so as to protect the Established *Church of Ireland*. Its longer title was, “An Act for banishing all Papists exercising any Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, and all Regulars of the Popish Clergy out of this Kingdom” of Ireland. The *Registration Act* of 1704 (2 Ann. C. 7), required Roman Catholic priests to register in their local magistrates courts, pay £50 (fifty pounds) good behaviour bond, and stay inside the Irish county they were registered in. If they converted to the *Church of Ireland* this was reduced to £20 (twenty pounds) per annum. Registered Popish priests were required to leave Ireland before 20 July 1704, and if not, they were removed after 24 June 1705. If they returned, they were convicted of High Treason. The longer title of this Irish Acts was, “An Act for Registering the Popish Clergy.” The *Disenfranchising Act* of 1729 (Geo. 11, c. 9) also prohibited Roman Catholics from voting.

There was also the *Occasional Conformity Act* of 1711, (longer title, “An Act for Preserving the Protestant Religion”) (10 Ann. c. 6), which prevented Roman Catholics and other Non-Conformists from taking “occasional” Communion in the *Church of England* to become eligible for public office under the *Corporation & Test Act*. It was wisely repealed in 1719. Thus up to the time of the *Test Acts* repeal in 1828, other than for this relatively short period of 1711 to 1719, more moderate Puritan Protestants could occasionally take Anglican Communion to meet the Test Act requirements⁷⁸.

If one looks at the issues that have historically divided Protestants, like the issue of incest with relevant to Henry VIII’s break with Rome, the issues of the Caroline era would rate as one of the biggest issues in dividing Anglicans and a large number of Puritan derived Protestants. This fact is complicated by the continuing presence of English and Irish (and some Scottish) Puritan Churches derived propaganda that depicts their Puritan views as “the Protestant” ones, and so conceals from their people Anglican Protestant hagiological perspectives such as e.g., regarding King Charles as a martyr. The Puritan republicans adopted the *Solemn League & Covenant* under Interregnum Ordinances on 25 Sept. 1643 (although some roll-on elements of its provisions, such as making the prayer book “illegal” in 1645, took longer to be followed through on). Following the *Greater Ejection* which from 1643 saw between 7,000 and 10,000

⁷⁸

“Penal Law,” *Wikipedia* (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Penal_law#the_Clarendson_Code).

Anglican clergymen, school teachers, and others ejected by the English Puritan regime; there was 800 to 2,000 Puritans ejected in the *Lesser Ejection* of Puritans from Anglican Churches following the Restoration, which depending on the figures used, was less than one-fifth, or less than one-tenth the number ejected by the Puritans. Though precise figures are difficult to get, and so e.g., Ella's figures of 800-2,000 Puritans ejected compare with Wroughton's figures of c. 1700 Puritans ejected, it is clear that in the *Greater Ejection* the English Puritan regime ejected between five to ten times as many Anglicans starting from 1643, as the Anglicans did in the *Lesser Ejection* of Puritans following the Restoration of 1660⁷⁹. Given the usage made of the *Lesser Ejection* in English and Irish Puritan propaganda, these figures are significant.

It is also clear that the Puritans support for the *Solemn League and Covenant* meant that they were wanting to close down the Anglican Church, a fact that makes Puritan complaints about Anglicans' lack of religious tolerance to them look like "sour grapes," for the Anglicans doing to them, what they had wanted to do to the Anglicans; and it also puts the actions of the Restoration Anglicans in a somewhat different light, namely, that of self-defence. The *Solemn League and Covenant*, calling for the "extirpation of" "Prelacy" in Scotland, England and Ireland, and seeking to impose Puritanism was declared an illegal oath in the 1662 English and 1666 Irish *Acts of Uniformity*, and Scripture makes it clear that such unlawful oaths are not binding (I Samuel 25:14-35; Psalm 24:2; Acts 23:18-24). The *Solemn League and Covenant* was also wisely invalidated under the 1661 Scottish Rescissory Act, and this was wisely upheld in the Williamite Settlement with regard to Scotland, *infra*.

Nevertheless, I still consider that the type of religious settlement that occurred in 1689 should have come to England and Ireland much earlier i.e., as part of a Restoration Settlement. The Test Acts were necessary to protect the realm against Puritans wanting to get into government positions, and through the power of Parliament enact the *Solemn League and Covenant*. The Test Acts were clearly necessary with respect to Puritans glorifying Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford, and thus harbouring unBiblical sentiments of sedition and murder against the Crown, since if they could get into Parliament and various power positions, they could from that point of power seek to form a republic on the grounds that this or that monarch was "a tyrant," as occurred in North America with the formation of the USA. However, these Test Acts' provisions were, in my opinion, a sufficient protection, when coupled with the ejection of Puritans from Anglican churches and schools such as occurred in the *Lesser Ejection*. Moreover, after 1689 more moderate Puritans who were prepared to do what Lutheran Protestants had done from the 1660s, and occasionally take Communion at an Anglican Church to meet Test Act requirements, were allowed to hold government positions. This meant they were distancing themselves from the claims of Samuel Rutherford that kneeling to

⁷⁹ See Textual Commentaries Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), "Dedication: The Anglican Calendar," at "a) Preliminary Qualifications & Remarks;" citing Ella, G.M., "Ejection & Rejection," *English Churchman*, (EC 7766), 8 & 15 May 2009, p. 2; & Wroughton, J., *The Routledge Companion to the Stuart Age 1603-1714*, Routledge, Abingdon, Oxford, England, 2006, pp. 34-35.

receive Communion was intrinsic idolatry, and having met this legal requirement, they could then more commonly attend a Puritan Church. This means that at the time of their repeal in the 19th century, the Test Acts were more anti-Papist than anti-Puritan, since the Roman Catholics were never prepared to meet the Test Act requirements.

In Scotland, e.g., the Test Act of 1567 required that a person profess the Reformed faith to hold various government offices. In England and Ireland, the Sacramental Test Acts, commonly called the Test Acts (e.g., 1661 & 1671) required that to hold various government offices, one had to take Communion at an Anglican Church. Following the Toleration Act of 1689 this was administered with grater leniency; so that Puritan Protestants could occasionally so take Communion in order to meet these legal requirements. The Puritan revolution had been ideologically guided by Samuel Rutherford's *Lex Rex*; and those Puritans who after 1689 occasionally took Communion at an Anglican Church had to kneel to do so; so that they necessarily rejected Samuel Rutherford's claims that to kneel in taking Communion was intrinsic idolatry. They thus were clearly prepared to in some way distance themselves from the Puritan Revolutionaries of the 1640s and 1650s.

Hence in any assessment of them, it must be emphasized that by the time of their repeal in the 19th century, the Test Acts were clearly more anti-Papist than anti-Puritan. But they were repealed in the 19th century (e.g., in England in 1828/9, and 1860s and 1870s; in Ireland in 1871; in Scotland in 1889), as the secular state dismantled the Protestant Christian State; in imitation of the type of thing done in the secular state of the United States of America, which said in Article 1 of its "Bill of Rights" (1791) that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;" and Article 6 of its Constitution (1787-1791), that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." This opened the door to e.g., Papists, Jews, witches, Satanists, Deists, agnostics, and atheists. This was then mimicked throughout the British Empire e.g., section 116 of the *Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act* of 1900, says, "The Commonwealth shall not make any law for establishing any religion, or for imposing any religious observance, or for prohibiting the free exercise of any religion, and no religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office or public trust under the Commonwealth."

The *Clarendon Code's* Test & Corporation Acts of 1673 (25 Car. II, c. 2) & 1678 (30 Car. II, St. 2), both of which lasted till 1828, prevented Non-Conformists from holding civil or military offices, or being awarded degrees at Oxbridge Colleges. Under the 1673 Test Act a person was required to say, "I, N [their name], do declare that I do believe that there is not any transubstantiation in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or in the elements of the bread and wine, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever." The retention of such provisions against Papists was wisely argued by the great statesman, and British Prime Minister (1809-1812), Spencer Perceval (1762-1812).

The following 1678 oath (30 Car. II, St. 2) was required to be taken by all Members of Parliament under the *Test Acts*, but following the 1828 repeal of the *Test Acts* it was limited to the monarch till 1910 (who had been required to take it under

section 2 of the *Act of Settlement*, 1701). It specifically shows the type of thing that the American revolutionaries did not want their lawmakers and judges to say when they formed a secular republic; which secularism came to be later adopted in a modified form in the nineteenth century United Kingdom, and thereafter exported to British Empire countries such as Canada and Australia. “I ..., do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess and testify and declare that I do believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever; and that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other Saint, and the sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous. And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration and every part thereof in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation, and without any dispensation already granted me for this purpose by the Pope, or any other authority or person whatsoever, or without any hope of any such dispensation from any person or authority whatsoever, or without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration or any part thereof, although the Pope or any other person or persons or power whatsoever shall dispense with or annul the same or declare that it was null and void from its beginning.”

Though at first a monarch still continued to be required to take this oath at their coronation after it was repealed for Members of Parliament, so that as required under section 2 of the *Act of Settlement*, 1701, every sovereign of Great Britain must “make, subscribe, and audibly repeat” this “Declaration;” in 1910 this was altered to the oath first taken by George V in 1910. Thus the oath a monarch now takes reads simply, “I ..., do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare that *I am a faithful Protestant*, and that I will, *according to the true intent of the enactments to secure the Protestant Succession to the Throne* of my realm, uphold and maintain such enactments to the best of my power⁸⁰.” Of course, this is still a religious test for the monarch who says, “I am a faithful Protestant,” and this is still taken in the context of the monarch being “Supreme Governor of the Church of England” and “Defender of the Faith.” This therefore still contextually means the monarch upholds e.g., Article 22 of the 39 Articles which says, “The Romish doctrine concerning ... images ..., and also invocation of Saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrant of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God;” Article 31 of the 39 Articles which says “the sacrifices of Masses” are “blasphemous;” and the Final Rubric of the Communion Service in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 which rejects both consubstantiation and transubstantiation, and says any “adoration” “unto the sacramental bread or wine,” “or unto any corporeal presence of Christ’s natural flesh and blood,” is “idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians.”

⁸⁰ “Accession Council,” *Wikipedia* (as last modified 21 April 2010) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Accession_Council).

The Test Acts qualified the religious toleration given to Puritan Protestants in England and Ireland from 1689. While the Protestant Christian State had no tolerance for the Papists, whose Pope could at any time purportedly dissolve bonds of allegiance to a Protestant monarch, a fact annually remembered on *Papists' Conspiracy Day* (5 November, with Bonfire Night) with the Gunpowder Treason Plot of Guy Fawkes against King James I in 1605; the Protestant Christian State gave a basic religious freedom to Puritans from 1689. But the glorification of Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford by English and Irish Puritans, meant that if they were allowed to freely hold government offices without first showing a tolerance to Anglicanism seen in them taking Communion at an Anglican Church, or freely become Members of parliament, then there could all too easily be a rerun of the civil war years in which a Puritan Parliament might claim an Anglican monarch was a "tyrant." This danger was annually remembered on *King Charles the Martyr's Day* (30 Jan.) and *The King's Restoration Day of Royal Oak Day* (29 May).

In his mid-eighteenth century classic *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, Sir William Blackstone says, "The Corporation and Test Acts" were "bulwarks" to "better ... secure the Established Church against perils from Non-Conformists of all denominations, infidels, Turks, Jews, heretics, Papists, and sectaries." For "by the former ... no person can be legally elected to any office relating to government of any city or corporation, unless, within a twelve month [period] before he has received the sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the rites of the *Church of England*; and he is also enjoined to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy at the same time that he takes the oath of office⁸¹." And "the Test Act, directs all officers civil and military to take the oaths and make the declaration against transubstantiation, ... [and] to receive the sacraments of the Lord's Supper, according to the usage of the Church of England ...⁸²." And this "permits no persons to be naturalized or restored in blood, but such as undergo a like test: which test having been removed in 1753, in favour of the Jews, was the next session of Parliament restored again with some precipitation⁸³."

In the case of Papists this was because of ideas connected with the Popish doctrine, "not keeping faith with heretics, and deposing or murdering princes excommunicated by ... the See of Rome⁸⁴." It was necessary to uphold the lawful powers of King and Parliament (Rom. 13:1-7) against the claims of "Papists" in "Popery⁸⁵" because of their allegiance to the Pope which allowed e.g., "deposing or murdering princes excommunicated by authority of the See of Rome;" a problem

⁸¹ 4 Bl. Com. 58.

⁸² 4 Bl. Com. 58-59.

⁸³ 4 Bl. Com. 59.

⁸⁴ 4 Bl Com. 58.

⁸⁵ 4 Bl. Com. 53.

heightened by the Jacobites with their “avowed claim of a Popish Pretender to the Crown⁸⁶.” Thus the laws of England held in check “that arbitrary power, so long claimed and so fatally exerted by the Pope, of disposing ... of kingdoms ...⁸⁷.” E.g., there was the case of “one Matthews, a printer” of seditious Jacobite literature, who “was convicted and executed in 1719, for printing a treasonable pamphlet entitled, ‘*vox populi vox Dei*’⁸⁸.”

And of course this type of claim about the “voice of the people” being the “voice of God,” was not limited to Papists, but also found fertile soil among Puritans glorifying the memory of Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford. Thus in the case of Puritan Protestant dissenters, their pro-Cromwell views meant that they could potentially deny “the most rightful heir of the Crown,” even though “this seems to be confounding all notions of right and wrong; and the consequence would be, that when Cromwell had murdered the elder Charles, and usurped the power (though not the name) of king, the people were bound in duty to hinder the son’s Restoration” of Charles II in 1660⁸⁹.

In the case of e.g., Jews, this was because a Protestant Christian State needed to be just that, although it must be said that Jews were regarded as “a special case.” Thus some level of tolerance was given to Jews denied any other non-Christian group. They were e.g., segregated in a Jewish Quarter of London, and forbidden to hold various positions. But if the Protestants had wanted to, they could e.g., have expelled them. But instead, they gave them a basic level of tolerance and legal protection given to no other non-Christian group. Those who like to criticize the Christian state’s treatment of Jews under the Protestant Christian State of England, would do well to remember that they had no inalienable right to be in England, and that we who believe in the Protestant Christian State expect gratitude and thanks from Jews for giving them this status as “a special case;” not criticism from ingrates because we denied them equality. *Among other things, being the only non-Christian group tolerated under the Protestant Christian State, they were e.g., safeguarded from the presence of Mohammedans and heathens.*

From the nineteenth century, the movement to a largely titular and ceremonial monarchy, with the monarch having only reserve powers in a constitutional crisis, meant that an argument could be advanced that the Test Acts against Puritans were no longer necessary as a titular monarch would not in practice be likely to be characterized as a “tyrant.” But when one considers the way, e.g., that the Labor Party Prime Minister, Gough Whitlam (Prime Minister of Australia, 1972-1975), sought to whip up republican sentiment after he was dismissed by the Queen’s representative, the Governor-General, His Excellency Sir John Kerr, because the upper house had withheld supply and he

⁸⁶ 4 Bl. Com. 57.

⁸⁷ 4 Bl. Com. 46.

⁸⁸ 4 Bl. Com. 92.

⁸⁹ 4 Bl. Com. 77.

refused to call an election; it seems clear that if a monarch were to use their reserve powers, a Puritan type argument of a “tyrant” might still be advanced under the largely titular and ceremonial monarchy that came into place from the nineteenth century.

Thus while I have some sympathy for the proposition that “the heat was taken out of the issue” with the movement to a largely titular and ceremonial monarchy, I would nevertheless maintain that it still remains possible for the argument of a “tyrant” to be advanced if the monarch, or the monarch’s representative exercises reserve powers in a constitutional or other legal crisis. E.g., the New South Wales State representative of the King, the Governor, His Excellency Sir Philip Game, dismissed the Labor Party Premier of New South Wales in 1932, Jack Lang (NSW Premier 1925-1927; & 1930-1932), when during the Great Depression, Lang acted illegally by refusing to comply with Federal Law requiring the payment of certain revenues; and the economic urgency of the matter meant it could not be left to the courts to slowly resolve. Furthermore, I think it wrong in principle to simply allow the English and Irish Church derived Puritans to think that they can harbour and promote such seditious and murderous sentiments against the Crown with impunity. It should be made clear to them that if e.g., from their pulpits, or in their publications, they glorify men like Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford who set aside the teaching of such Biblical passages as Matt. 22:21; Rom. 13:1-9; & I Peter 2:17, that there will be negative consequences for them both in this life, and in the world to come, for “every one of us shall give account of himself to God” (Rom. 14:12). And once again, it must be said that since the repeal of the Test Acts, English, Irish, and an increased number of Scottish Puritans, have come to produce various publications glorifying Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford.

Hence I think it was wrong in principle to repeal the Test Acts as they existed against English and Irish Puritans, as well as against Papists, without first ensuring alternative adequate safeguards for the protection of the realm from possible sedition i.e., some other form of Test Act. E.g., if a monarch exercised reserve powers in the UK, as e.g., did the NSW State Governor in Australia in 1932, and this was resisted by a secularist UK Prime Minister like Rosebery who was responsible for the Oliver Cromwell statue (see “Impact of Oliver Cromwell on American Revolution & more widely the secular state,” *supra*), then in the same way secularist politicians locked in Puritan and Papist support in the American Revolution, such a Prime Minister might lock in such support for sedition against the Crown, e.g., campaigning for a republic and saying to the Papists and Puritans, “We’ll Disestablish the *Church of England* forever!” E.g., large numbers of Papists from Northern Ireland would no doubt rally to such a call.

The Test Acts were one element that acted to keep in place a Protestant Christian State, and they should not have been removed in favour of a secular state. Of course, it is also true that the rise of Puseyism, semi-Puseyism, and religious liberalism inside the *Church of England* meant that the Anglican Church could no longer credibly present itself as an overall Protestant Church. If we who since that time have become the Low Church Evangelical Anglicans find the Puseyites Proper (“Anglo-Catholics” or “High Church”) and semi-Puseyites (“Broad-church”) to be lacking in a Protestant spirit and appropriately Biblical mind; then our concerns are magnified even more by Puritan

Protestants who dislike usage of the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 even in its Low Church Evangelical form. The bond that exists between fellow Evangelicals may act as a point of union between Evangelical Anglican Protestants such as myself and Evangelicals in Puritan derived Protestant Churches, but no such bond exists with the Puseyites and semi-Puseyites, whose semi-Romanist teachings and practices are rightly spurned by Puritan derived Evangelicals as much as they are by Evangelical Anglicans.

At a spiritual level this meant the Anglican Church was now even more disliked by the Puritans than before this time, even though, paradoxically, to the Puritans seeming short-term benefit with regard to the Test Acts, in its weakened and anaemic state it was more tolerant to many shades of heresy and vice. One element of this included the increasingly apostate Anglican Church “soft-peddling” on the issues of what the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* Litany calls “fornication, and all other deadly sin,” e.g., incest (I Cor. 5:1,11) “fornicators” (I Cor. 6:9) with regard to that type of incest that Henry VIII broke with Rome over (Lev. 20:21; Mark 6:18), found in both marriage with a deceased wife’s sister (or a deceased sister’s husband), permitted in England in 1907, or a man’s deceased brother’s wife (or a woman’s deceased husband’s brother), permitted in England from 1921. And also such “other deadly sin” (Litany, 1662 prayer book) as glorification of the “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:20,21) of e.g., Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford, being the type of thing rightly condemned in Book 2, Homily 21, of the Anglican 39 Articles; with the result that the apostate Anglican Church had a greater tolerance to both Puritans and Papists, against which it no longer wanted the Test Acts. Thus its new-found tolerance came from being *less Biblical not more Biblical*.

Thus the repeal of the Test Acts was part of the replacement of the Protestant Christian State with a secular state; and the de-Protestantizing of large sections of the Anglican Church by Puseyites and semi-Puseyites was part of the same movement; as was the removal in 1859 of the three Offices of *Papists’ Conspiracy Day*, *King Charles the Martyr’s Day*, and *The King’s Restoration Day* (or *Royal Oak Day*). Whether by Papists, Puseyites (by which I also mean semi-Puseyites), Puritans, secularists, or others, it seems the Established Church of England in her pure Protestant form “is forever under attack.” We need godly Evangelical Protestant lawmakers and churchmen to tend to this great garden of the Anglican Church, which I regret to say has become most overgrown with the weeds of indifference, apostasy, heresy, and worldliness. As in all repentance from sin, the submission to God’s Word may in the first instance be painful, but in the end it brings the fruit of what Hebrews 12:10 calls, “holiness.”

Alas, the failure to ensure such Biblical safeguards with the repeal of the Test Acts, has e.g., resulted in a situation where some English and Irish Puritans have produced a flood of so called “Protestant” material since the 19th century glorifying Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford, with which they have sought to also infect the Scottish Presbyterians and others. But whereas Biblical passages such as Matthew 22:21; Romans 13:1-10, Galatians 5:20 & 21, and I Peter 2:17 prohibit such sedition against the Crown, I maintain that such a spirit of sedition within the ranks of Protestantism ought not to be named even once among the saints of God. In maintaining this, I do not seek to please men, many of whom may turn away from traditionalist Low

Church Evangelical Anglicans such as myself when we uphold such Biblical values; but rather, I seek to please God, to whom I pledge my first and paramount allegiance, and to the Divine revelation he has given us in his Infallible and holy Book, the Bible. In this matter, as in all things, I would rather please my one God, than please an innumerable multitude of men.

And likewise with respect to the Papists, we see that under the secular state, the failure of adequate provisions to restrain them, has resulted in a situation in, for instance, Northern Ireland, where large numbers of Papists are not loyal to the Crown, but have been given voting privileges, and may yet seek to use that power to form a republic in Northern Ireland. While I prefer and desire a Protestant Christian state, rather than a secular state; working inside the parameters of a secular state, the correct position with regard to the Papists was succinctly stated by Canon Richard Blakeney (1820-1884), *Church of England Canon of York* (1882-1884). Canon Blakeney held that Roman Catholics should not be able to vote in Ireland, or what would now be Northern Ireland⁹⁰. I.e., one cannot extend voting privileges to those who are not loyal to the Crown. (Cf. the *Disenfranchising Act of 1729, supra.*)

There is also the issue of a duplicity that seems to exist between the professed statement of Rome with regard to political revolution as seen in the so called Liberation Theology of South America, and the actions they are really prepared to take to try and inhibit this type of thing. With Papists, one of the mechanisms historically used for sedition is the Jesuits, who can start pushing such ideas, like e.g., has sometimes occurred with so called “liberation theology” in parts of Central and South America. For example, in El Salvador, the Jesuit, Jon Sobrino taught liberation theology while for many years he was a theologian and lecturer at the Jesuit run *Central American University* in El Salvador. Responding to outside pressure, the Vatican half-heartedly made some criticisms of Sobrino’s teachings in a notification; but as the Roman “Catholic News Service” “USCCB” reported in 2007, a “Jesuit spokesman pointed out, however, that the notification carried no penalties or sanctions,” and was not “an outright condemnation⁹¹.”

But we here also see the devious way that the Jesuits operate, because the reality is that if at the same time one has a wider Communistic movement going on in Central and South America, and somebody like the Jesuit, Jon Sobrino teaching liberation theology in the *Central American University* at El Salvador, with the Roman Church refusing to take any serious disciplinary action against him, then it is not hard for people

⁹⁰ Blakeney R.P., *Popery in its Social Aspect*, George McGibbon, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, [undated, late 19th century], pp. 303-5.

⁹¹ John Thavis’s “Vatican criticizes Jesuit liberation theologian, issues no sanctions,” “Sobrio-Vatican (Second Update) (Corrected) Mar-15-2007,” [*Roman*] *Catholic News Service / USCCB*, 3211 Fourth St NE Washington, D.C., USA, 20017 (<http://www.catholicnews.com/data/stories/cns/0701439.htm>).

to make the Communist revolutionary link in their minds. The Roman Catholic Church made serious efforts to oppose Communism in Europe during the Cold War, but it has not with anything like the same intensity replicated those efforts in Central and South America.

But beyond the issue of inadequate discipline of those involved in so called “liberation theology” in Central and South America, the question must be asked as to why some Popish priests have become involved in revolutionary activities in Central and South America in the first place? Certainly I am not suggesting that all, or even most Roman Catholic priests are involved in revolutionary activities in Central and South America. Rather, I would see four broad groups of Roman Catholic priests. The first two groups have been influenced by the revolutionary ideas of overthrowing a so called “tyrant,” and thus would support the Jesuit teachings of Suarez, Mariana, and Lessius. But among these Jesuits, an additional requirement made by Lessius was that the revolutionaries needed control of the legislature, and that qualification, or at least control of one of the two houses of the legislature, was adopted by Rutherford in his *Lex Rex*. The first group of Papists thus do *not* agree with Lessius’s requirement and so have been prepared to engage in revolutionary activities. But the second group do agree with Lessius’s qualification, and so like Puritans following Rutherford’s *Lex Rex*, they do not engage in revolution because they have not got control of a house of the legislature. The third group do not support revolution and are ideologically opposed to it. The fourth group have not really thought about the matters, are largely non-political, and pose no immediate problems in this area.

And so the immediate danger comes from the first group of Papists who follow in the Jesuitical teachings about revolution taught by Suarez, Mariana, and Lessius, and who do not agree with Lessius on the need to have the legislature on side. But a second danger comes from a group who follow in these same teachings, and while not engaging in revolution because they agree with Lessius with regard to having the legislature on side, nevertheless, may show sympathy towards this first group, while not joining them outright. And so we see the Popish notions derived from Jesuitry of revolution against a so called “tyrant,” still alive and active in parts of Central and South America to this day.

Notably there is an earlier precedent for Jesuitry posing problems of political subversion in Central and South America. In 1767 the King of Spain, Charles III, himself a devout Papist, expelled all the Jesuits from Spain and the Spanish Empire in Central and South America, confiscating their possessions. To consider an example of the type of thing the Jesuits had been doing before the 1767 decree, let us consider Cordoba, which is the second largest city in Argentina. The Jesuits had done the missionary work in this area; but with regard to their political activities, it was found, for example, that the Jesuits had issued secret instructions to exert influence on the politically powerful via the Romish Confessional, and to induce them to come to Jesuit Confessionals where they would be given greater tolerance to various sins. It was further found that the Jesuits of Cordoba had bribed various servants of these same politically powerful people into revealing secrets known to them. Significantly, these were the findings of devout Roman Catholics, who supported the decree expelling Jesuits

from Spain and the Spanish Empire in Central and South America in 1767⁹². While I do not say that in all particulars the activation in modern times of Jesuit ideas for “liberation theology” by some Romish priests in Central and South America are identical with the issues that led to this 1767 Spanish decree, the general matter of subversive activities against governments is broadly similar.

And so whereas some Puritans keep revolutionary ideas alive through the glorification of Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford who endorsed the Jesuit teachings of Suarez, Mariana, and Lessius on overthrowing a so called “tyrant,” the Papists going to these same Jesuit teachings, do the same sort of thing. We saw these two groups coming together during the civil war and associated martyrdom of King Charles I in 1649, and attempted murder of King Charles II in 1651; and we see these two groups coming together again in the American Revolution against King George III in the 1770s, with Papists from Boston uniting with American Puritans, all under Deistic or vaguely defined Theistic American leadership, which exploited the Papist and Puritan belief in overthrowing a so called “tyrant.” And so it was this common Papist and Rutherford identifying Puritan belief, derived from the Jesuit teachings of Suarez, Mariana, and Lessius, that one could set aside such Scriptures as Romans 13:1-10 and engage in sedition against a so called “tyrant” king, that constituted the principal reason for the historic Test Acts against Puritans in England and Ireland, and one of the principal reasons for the historic Test Acts against Papists.

5) *The Restoration in the Scottish Context of the Williamite Settlement.*

Before the Restoration the civil war years are divided into three main war eras. During the *First British Civil War* (1642-1646) the Scottish Presbyterians fought against Charles I. This is dated from the time King Charles raised his Royal standard at Nottingham in England on 22 August 1642. After the 1637 attempt to impose Anglicanism on Scotland, Scottish Presbyterian bands, called “Covenanters,” thereafter sought to maintain Presbyterian doctrine in Scotland. This led to the Scottish National Covenant of 1638 and rejection of Anglicanism by the Scots, which resulted in the *Bishops’ War*. Following the inconclusive *Bishops’ War* of 1639, with the *Pacification of Berwick* in 1640, and then a temporary short war in which Charles I’s Anglican forces were defeated by a Scottish Puritan army, Charles I had agreed to the Scots having their own church assembly and parliament.

In time their views were absorbed into the *Solemn League & Covenant* from 1643. This meant that though the name of “Covenanter” was born in a fight for religious freedom of Presbyterians in Scotland, the *Solemn League & Covenant* changed the name of “Covenanter” to mean one who was opposed to the religious freedom of Anglicans, and sought to impose Puritanism on unwilling Anglican England. This was “a slap in the face to Charles I,” who had by this time agreed to leaving Scotland as Puritan

⁹² “Jesuit Mission of Cordoba, Argentina,” Directed by Goggo Gensch, (French) Television Documentary, screened on *Global Village* with Silvio Riviero, SBS TV, in Sydney, Australia, 2010.

Presbyterian, but was now being told under the *Solemn League & Covenant* that those who had sought and gotten their religious freedom in Scotland, were not in favour of a reciprocal religious freedom for Anglicans in England and Ireland. Matters were also further soured by the Directory in Scotland taking away religious freedom from Anglicans in 1645⁹³. Thus in the connected actions of the First British Civil War (1642-1646), Scotland had sent an army south to fight with the Roundheads against the King.

But in the *Second British Civil War* (1648-1649), an alliance was formed between Presbyterians, Scots, and Royalists, which saw the bulk of Scottish Presbyterians back in the Royalist camp. In the *Third British Civil War* (1649-1651/2), Charles II was in alliance with the Scottish Presbyterians, and to secure this alliance had as an insincere political expedient, signed the *Solemn League and Covenant*; and as part of this pretence had dismissed all the faithful Cavaliers who had followed him into exile. (This seems comparable to his later insincere political expedient of signing the *Treaty of Dover* with its similar unlawful provision about him converting away from Anglicanism to Romanism.) This *Third British Civil War* was very largely then fought between the republican English Puritans and the royalist Scottish Puritans, and though generally regarded as officially ending with the *Battle of Worcester* on 3 September 1651, it actually extended beyond this with the last of the organized royalist Scottish resistance not put down till the surrender of Dunnottar Castle (3 kilometres of 2 miles south of Stonehaven, Scotland,) in May 1652.

Under God, the Restoration was brought about as with the strong royalist support of Puritans in Scotland, and the strong royalist support of Anglicans in England, it became clear that England and Scotland could not be held together without the Protestant Crown. The Restoration saw an unprecedented level of co-operation between the Anglican Crown and Puritans in Scotland which had the united Episcopal-Presbyterian Church of 1660-1688/9. This Church was essentially Puritan of a Presbyterian type in its church services, although it had Episcopal church government. Upholding the Scottish Rescissory Act of 1661 (which among other things declared the *Solemn League and Covenant* invalid,) and having an Established Scottish Puritan Presbyterian Church from 1690 with religious tolerance to other Protestants was the final solution to the religious problems that had beset England and Scotland.

The Scots became for a while Episcopalians, but not Anglicans. Puritans divided on the issue of church government, into Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Baptists. The *Episcopal Church of Scotland* extended this further, since it was Puritan in its church services, but with Episcopal church government. It was an attempt to unify Anglicans and Presbyterians of Scotland in an essentially Puritan church, with a small number of

⁹³ “CHARLES I, Parl. 3, Sess. 5, An Act of the Parliament of the Kingdom of Scotland, approving and establishing the Directory for Publick Worship. At Edinburgh, February 6, 1645.” (Copy with Act in: *Westminster Confession*, With a Foreword by Alexander McPherson, Free Presbyterian Publications, *op. cit.*, pp. 369-394.)

modifications to the church services in the Anglican direction, and an Episcopal form of church government which meant the King could keep control of appointments and so e.g., inhibit those who would practice sedition. It was thus a recognition by Charles II and Restoration Anglican Protestants that Scotland wanted to be, and should be allowed to be, Puritan Protestant. In substance, though not in form, it gave the Scottish Puritan Presbyterians all they had wanted in the *Solemn League and Covenant* other than the “extirpation of” “Prelacy;” but limited this to the Kingdom of Scotland, rather than as wanted in the *Solemn League and Covenant* extending Puritanism to the Kingdoms of England and Ireland where the Anglican Church was Established.

On the one hand, I think the requirements imposed for *Episcopal Church of Scotland* Ministers were reasonable in the context of the times for holding a Ministerial office in the Established *Episcopal Church of Scotland*; but on the other hand, I think any Protestants outside this Established *Episcopal Church of Scotland* should, providing they were prepared to renounce the *Solemn League & Covenant*, and sedition of Cromwell and Rutherford in an oath, have been allowed to freely build or rent churches, assemble, and preach, so that such things should not in my opinion have been illegal, much less a capital offense as under the Popish James II. The real problem was the lack of religious liberty to any of the Reformed Protestant faith who were outside of the Established Church, and in this sense, it is sad and wrong that the religious tolerance of 1689 did not come earlier; but a sticking point was the continued “celebration” of the vicious and nasty *Solemn League & Covenant* which went far beyond legitimate Scottish aspirations to have an Established Puritan Presbyterian Church, and promised to keep alive rancor and civil war with Anglican England.

Let the reader consider, e.g., the glorification of “the celebrated ‘Solemn League and Covenant’,” by Thomas Hamilton, a 19th century Irish Presbyterian⁹⁴. He viciously attacks the Anglican Bishop, Jeremy Taylor for denying religious liberty to Irish Presbyterians after the Restoration⁹⁵, while simultaneously upholding “the celebrated ‘Solemn League and Covenant’⁹⁶,” which would deny religious freedom to Anglicans such as Jeremy Taylor (1613-1667), a man who sought in various ways to minister to Anglicans deprived of clergy during the Interregnum. He ministered to disparate congregations of Anglican Royalists during the Interregnum, and in 1658 was made Chaplain of Edward, the Third Viscount of Conway, in Ulster, Ireland. After the Restoration in 1660 he was made Bishop of Down & Connor in the *Church of Ireland*. Thus on the one hand, Thomas Hamilton criticizes Jeremy Taylor for supporting the Irish Act of Uniformity against Puritans after the Restoration; but on the other hand, he is prepared to “celebrate” the *Solemn League & Covenant* that denied Jeremy Taylor

⁹⁴ Hamilton, T., *History of Presbyterianism in Ireland*, 1887, Ambassador, Belfast, Northern Ireland, UK, 1992 reprint, pp. 28-32. See also Sermon in Appendix 5 of this Textual Commentary, Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25).

⁹⁵ Hamilton’s *History of Presbyterianism in Ireland*, *op. cit.*, pp. 74-75.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 66.

religious liberty during the Interregnum, and if Thomas Hamilton could have his way, would have denied Jeremy Taylor religious liberty after the Restoration.

Thomas Hamilton says, “Charles came to the throne But his professions of regard for Presbyterianism were soon forgotten” etc. . This type of thing by Hamilton, which will “celebrate” the denial of religious freedom to Anglicans under the “the celebrated ‘Solemn League and Covenant’,” while simultaneously criticizing the denial of religious freedom to Presbyterians under the Acts of Uniformity, is typical of the narrow-minded bigotry of the worst elements of English and Irish Puritans. While I would agree with Hamilton on the undesirability of denying Irish Puritans religious freedom under the Acts of Uniformity, and support the later religious tolerance of the Williamite Settlement, anyone who talks of “the celebrated ‘Solemn League and Covenant’” which he says, “pledged all who signed it to” “‘The extirpation of . . . Prelacy’,” i.e., Anglicanism, and who rejoices at how “in 1645” “the use of the Book of Common Prayer” of 1559 & 1604 was “abolished” with “Church government by Sessions, Presbyteries, and General Assemblies being ordained⁹⁷,” is clearly the type of man who was properly restrained by the Irish Test Acts.

Thus when one looks at the way someone like the 19th century Irish Presbyterian, Thomas Hamilton will on the one hand, “celebrate” the denial of religious freedom to Anglicans under “the celebrated ‘Solemn League and Covenant’,” while simultaneously criticizing the fact that Charles II repented of his signing this unlawful oath, and further criticize the denial of religious freedom to Irish Presbyterians in the 1660s, one realizes that the balance of the Williamite Settlement which both gave religious freedom to Puritans as fellow Protestants, but which restrained their influence by the Test Acts, was a very necessary balance. Put bluntly, those of the old Reformed Anglican and Scottish Presbyterian Protestant alliance of the post Williamite Settlement could never work with a man like Thomas Hamilton.

Such divisions continue to this day. I recall in recent years speaking to a Free Presbyterian Elder derived from the *Church of Scotland*⁹⁸, who contrary to the spirit of

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 66.

⁹⁸ A member of the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland* (FPCS), which in 1893 left the *Free Church of Scotland*, which in 1843 left the Established *Church of Scotland*. Given such passages as Matt. 12:1-8 and Mark 2:23-28, in which our Lord says, “The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath” (Mark 2:27), I would also say that the FPCS claim that those who regard usage of public transport on a Sunday as a necessity are to be barred from Communion, is against the spirit of Col. 2:16, “Let no man . . . judge you . . . of the sabbath days.” See my work, “The Roman Pope is the Antichrist,” “Part 1: Prefatory Remarks and Principles,” “Doctrinal principles used in this commentary (Optional Reading),” at “Broad Reformation Protestantism. First and Second Stages of the Reformation,” subsection “5) Sabbatarian Reform,” where I note that the FPCS “has a number of positive orthodox Protestant elements to it, and a number of good people in it. However they have, in my opinion, gone overboard both in the

Col. 2:16, “Let no man ... judge you ... in respect of an holyday;” and the specific teaching of Rom. 14:5,6⁹⁹; had earlier strongly criticized the keeping of Christmas as comparable to Nadab and Abihu who “offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not. And there went out fire from the Lord, and devoured them, and they died” (Lev. 10:1,2). He also referred favourably to Hamilton’s book. He described Charles II as a “vile” man, and claimed that Charles II had “betrayed” Scotland by supporting the *Episcopal Church of Scotland*. This *Episcopal Church of Scotland* up till 1688/9 was not like the attempted imposition of Anglicanism under Laud, since beyond an Episcopal church government structure, it had an essentially Presbyterian type Puritan Church service although included the saying of the *Lord’s Prayer* and *Gloria* (found in the Communion Service of the Anglican Book of Common Prayer of 1662, Free Presbyterians may regard this as “an Anglican imposition” since they only sing psalms), and the *Apostles’ Creed* at Baptism.

When I sought to defend Charles II, albeit without claiming that he was a perfect man or beyond a reasonable level of criticism, this Free Presbyterian then said to me that if what I was saying was correct, then what Hamilton had written were “lies.” Given that e.g., Hamilton fails to recognize that Charles II did the right thing in repenting of his sin in signing the unlawful oath of the *Solemn League and Covenant*; given the fact that the *Episcopal Church of Scotland* had the support of a large number of, though not all, Puritans in Scotland, as the best thing to do under the circumstances in order to create a united Church of Scotland that had checks to ensure royalists were in charge (a more moderate group of Puritans never referred to by Hamilton); and (even though I think the greater religious freedom to Puritans of 1689 should have been granted in the 1660s,) given that Hamilton makes no reference to the fact that the denial of religious freedom to Puritans in England and Ireland was related to the fact that *a king had been murdered* in Charles I in 1649 and *an attempted murder of a second king* had occurred with Charles II in 1651, and these same English and Irish Puritans were still often seeking to glorify

importance they place on the Sabbath, and in the strictness with which they keep it” (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>).

⁹⁹ In its immediate context, Col. 2:16 refers to allowing a liberty for Jewish Christians to keep a form of the Jewish liturgical year as part of their cultural heritage, with its holydays such as “Unleavened Bread” (Acts 20:6) or “Pentecost” (Acts 20:16), or weekly “sabbath days” (Acts 16:13); and for Gentile Christians not to keep these days, indeed, Sunday keeping Gentile Christians (Acts 20:7; I Cor. 16:2) are forbidden to keep the Jewish liturgical year (Gal. 4:10,11). But when one considers the very specific teaching of Rom. 14:5,6, that refers to those in the church who “esteemeth one day above another” as a holy day, and “another” which “esteemeth every day alike” i.e., no holy days (other than the obligatory weekly sabbath, Rom. 7:7; 13:9; see Exod. 20:8-11), one which “regardeth the day” “unto the Lord” and either “eateth to the Lord” in a feast day, or “eateth not to the Lord” in a fast day (Rom. 14:5,6; cf., Mark 2:20); then it is clear that the spirit of Col. 2:16, “Let no man ... judge you ... in respect of an holyday,” teaches a principle that is relevant to the matter of holy days such as Christmas and Easter which are permitted, but not required, under the specific teaching of Rom. 14:5,6.

Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford, *and like Hamilton were wanting to deny religious freedom to Anglicans via the ‘Solemn League and Covenant’*; I think I was right to reply that Charles II “had not betrayed Scotland,” and that Hamilton’s work did indeed contain “lies,” at which point this Free Presbyterian then walked off in an angry huff¹⁰⁰.

In general I see many positive qualities in both this man and his *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland*; but if he is at all representative of it, (and how widely he is I do not know¹⁰¹), then I note that it seems to have succumb to English and Irish Presbyterian views, which are historically at variance with those of the Established *Church of Scotland* with respect to e.g., Oliver Cromwell and the desirability of the Rescissory Act against the *Solemn League & Covenant*. I do not regard this Free Presbyterian Elder as in general a bad man, but I think he is badly misguided on this matter; and he is typical of those Presbyterians derived from the *Church of Scotland* who since the nineteenth century have been increasingly infected with English and Irish Puritan views on Cromwell, and I suspect that “the brains” behind those so “pushing this barrel” in the Scottish context have Scottish secessionist sympathies and aspirations, although I have no positive proof of this suspicion. We thus find that these types of attitudes found in Hamilton’s *History of Presbyterianism in Ireland*, results in a virulent form of anti-Anglicanism of the type that the Established *Church of Scotland* wanted to get away from both from the time of the Restoration, and also as part of the Williamite Settlement. Those who deny the religious freedoms of passages of Scripture such as Rom. 14:5,6, or the sentiment of Col. 2:16; and who promote the *Solemn League &*

¹⁰⁰ Hamilton’s *History of Presbyterianism in Ireland* (1887), reprinted as “An Ambassador Classic” by Ambassador Productions, Belfast, Northern Ireland (1992), is supplied for sale in Australia by the *Sydney Free Presbyterian Bookroom* (in Riverstone Sydney) of the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland*.

¹⁰¹ 2015 update: see my work, *Creation, Not Macroevolution – Mind the Gap* (2014), Vol. 1, Part 1, Chapter 7, section c, subsection iii, subdivision D, heading, “Is it possible to get Hugh Ross’s Day-Age School out of its hot-bed of heresy?,” subheading: Point 1 Illustration. From “Indeed, up until the events of 2012 and 2013, this is broadly how I did understand FPCS” to “FPCS has recently released a new ‘Catechism’ (2013) that among other things glorifies the *Solemn League & Covenant* in Appendix 3, which it says calls for ‘the extirpation of ... Prelacy’ i.e., Anglicanism, describes as ‘fiendish’ the fact ‘King Charles II’ ‘in 1661’ did ‘cause’ this document ‘to be burnt by the hand of the’ ‘hangman’ (Rom. 13:4), and criticizes ‘the infamous Recissory Act’ ‘of King Charles II’ ‘by which’ things the Puritan ‘Church had done’ ‘in the interval between 1638 and the Restoration, had been stigmatised as treasonable and rebellious.’ If this glorification of the *Solemn League & Covenant* calling for ‘the extirpation’ of Anglicanism is not an example of ‘heresies’ that are ‘divisions’ or schisms (I Cor. 11:18,19), then what I ask is?” (citing McGrath, G. {myself}, “Heresies,” *English Churchman* 23 & 30 Aug. 2013 {EC 7878}, p. 2). Thus I have now learnt that this Presbyterian Elder more widely represents FPCS views of schismatic heresy, a fact therefore leading me to a reassessment of the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland* which is more critical of them as promoting “damnable heresies” (II Peter 2:1).

Covenant, “soweth discord among brethren,” which things “doth the Lord hate” (Prov. 6:16,19). By the grace of God, they need to “Repent” (Matt. 4:17).

By contrast, Alex Neil is also a Free Presbyterian Elder derived from the *Church of Scotland*¹⁰². In harmony with the spirit of Col. 2:16, “Let no man ... judge you ... in respect of an holyday;” and the specific teaching of Rom. 14:5,6; Alex recognizes that there is a liberty for Anglican Christians to keep holy days, feast days, fast days, and for Free Presbyterians Christians not to keep such days. He is scheduled to conduct the service dedicating this Volume 3 on *Royal Oak Day*, Thursday 9 June 2011, and he earlier conducted the service for the revised Volume 1 on *King Charles I’s Day* 2010, as well as the service for Volume 2 on *Papists’ Conspiracy Day* 2009. He is a more moderate type of Presbyterian, of the type and kind that Reformed Anglicans were historically able to work with in an Anglican-Scottish Presbyterian Protestant alliance¹⁰³.

Saved Anglican Christians put their primary emphasis on being Protestant or Evangelical or Reformed, and only a secondary emphasis on being Anglican. By contrast, the unsaved ones do the reverse, and put their primary emphasis on being Anglican. Archbishop Laud was like that, which is why he so wasted and damaged the *Church of England*, and sought to impose Anglicanism on Scotland, to these ends, badly misadvising Charles I to enter the Bishops’ War. And since the rise of the secular state in the 19th century, the *Church of England* has been allowed to go to rack’n’ruin with such men in power once again. But if the first golden age of Reformed Anglicanism or Low Church Evangelical Anglicanism is from the mid 16th to 17th centuries; then the second golden age of Reformed Anglicanism or Low Church Evangelical Anglicanism is from the latter part of the 17th century through to the 19th century before the rise of the secular state. And in this second golden age there was a powerful Protestant alliance formed between Anglicans from the *Church of England* and *Church of Ireland*, and Presbyterians from the *Church of Scotland* that was both pro-William III of Orange, and also upheld the Restoration under Charles II against the seditious republican claims of Oliver Cromwell and others. For example, the Scottish Parliament always supported the Rescissory Act of Charles II against various Acts and Ordinances put through from the 1630s up till the Restoration in 1660. So in harmony with Romans 8:28, they saw their Westminster Confession as God bringing something “good” for them out of the bad of the republican era. Thus both English and Irish Anglicans and Scottish Presbyterians, united in their

¹⁰² A member of the *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia* (PCEA), established in 1846 as an Australian church derived from the *Free Church of Scotland* parent church, which in 1843 left the Established *Church of Scotland*.

¹⁰³ For the reasons as to why Alex Neil joined the Free Presbyterian Church (*Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia*) from a Presbyterian background (*Presbyterian Church of Australia*), see Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, “Byzantine Text Bonus for Commentary: Two Sydney University Greek Lectionaries!,” section “*B) Sam Angus of Sydney University: the big heretic,” sub-section “2) Some lives hurt by Angus’s heresies: Four case studies,” at “Case Study 4: Alex Neil, a Presbyterian Elder.”

religiously conservative Protestant Christianity, put God and the Bible first, and so repudiate both the seditious acts of the revolutionary republican Puritans and also repudiate the claims of the pretender Jacobites. Our Protestant unity on the issue of William III is something historically remembered on Bonfire Night in England; and our Protestant unity on the issue of the Restoration under Charles II is something historically remembered in celebration of the Royal Oak, whether by remembrance of a day (e.g., as a secondary focus of *King Charles I's Day*), or some other means.

The historic position of Anglicans and most Church of Scotland Presbyterians considers the monarchy as an institution is bigger than any one monarch, and so maintains that if a king acts in a fundamentally unconstitutional manner, such as James II who repudiated the legally Protestant elements of the monarchy, then such actions constitute an abdication; with the consequence that the king's office is voidable and therefore void if so declared by the legislature to be an abdication and then the next-in-line succeeds, such as occurred with William III and Mary II in 1688 and 1689. Or as with Edward VIII in 1936, a king may abdicate outright. But for such Protestants, *the whole thing must stay inside of constitutional law with a legally Protestant constitutional monarchy*, and so while one monarch may in some rare and unusual circumstances be replaced by another one, the whole thing still stays inside the parameters of constitutional monarchy. *It does not go outside of this to strike down the constitution and make the country a republic.*

6) *The Battle of Vinegar Hill (1798 Ireland & 1804 NSW):*
"Rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft" (I Sam. 15:23).

The issues raised by the 17th century Caroline eras and British civil wars have wider ramifications in more general terms with respect to the issue of whether or not Christians should be involved in political revolutions, or attempted political revolutions. "It is written" (Matt. 4:4,7,10), "For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft" (I Sam. 15:23); and those involved in "witchcraft," "seditions," and "murders," "shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. 5:20,21).

On the one hand, Acts 5:29 says "to obey God rather than man." Thus Christians should disregard laws seeking e.g., to incite men to: murder (Exodus 1:17), the worship of idols (Rev. 13:14-18), or not proclaim the gospel (Acts 16:16-40). But on the other hand, in broad terms, we are to be "subject unto the higher powers" (Rom. 13:1). Thus even when "to obey God rather than man" means e.g., that the Gospel is proclaimed in a land where it is "illegal" to do so, we do not engage in any acts of sedition or murder against the benighted government of that anti-Christian land.

However, setting aside such Biblical principles, historically, either directly or indirectly, the claims of Samuel Rutherford and Oliver Cromwell have been used on a number of occasions to set aside Biblical laws prohibiting sedition and murder, in order

to overthrow a so called “tyrant¹⁰⁴.” Firstly, the claim that King Charles I was a “tyrant,” and resultant sedition against the Crown and murder of the king in 1649. Secondly, the connected sedition against the Crown under King Charles II, leading to his attempted murder in 1651. Thirdly, the 1770s claim of the American Revolutionaries that King George III was a “tyrant.” Fourthly, the 1798 Rebellion in Ireland, which though modeled on the 1776 American Revolution, unlike these first three acts of sedition, this 1798 Rebellion against King George III lacked the support of the legislators; although under Rutherford’s *Lex Rex* principles, only the legislature can take the action of sedition. Nevertheless, when like Rutherford, one announces a philosophy of sedition and murder, one can never know if something like the 1776 American Revolution might not in turn inspire something like the 1798 Irish Rebellion and later 1804 rebellion at Vinegar Hill in Sydney, New South Wales, in which those latter two rebellions lacked any support from legislatures.

The 1798 Irish Rebellion has some special interest to me, because it was used as a model for the 1804 Vinegar Hill Rebellion in New South Wales, and one of my matrilineal four-time great grandfathers, Captain John Brabyn of the New South Wales Corps, helped to put that rebellion down. When the NSW representative of His Majesty King George III, the Governor, His Excellency Philip King, published his thanks for those involved in putting down the 1804 Rebellion, the NSW Corp Army Officer, John Brabyn, was one of a select group singled out for special mention. In the list of “Governors of Tasmania (Including Lieutenant-Governors and Administrators)” produced by the State Parliament of Tasmania in Australia, Captain John Brabyn, Commandant (North) (1808-10) is listed as the sixth Administrator of Tasmania (an office later raised to the rank of Lieutenant-Governor, and then Governor of Tasmania)¹⁰⁵.

John Brabyn was an Evangelical Anglican who helped sow the Evangelical seeds in the Diocese of Sydney¹⁰⁶, and he held the second pew from the eastern front on the far south side of St. Matthew’s Windsor when it was later built; its Foundation Stone being laid in 1817 by the representative of King George III, the Governor of New South Wales, His Excellency Lachlan Macquarie, and then completed in 1820. St. Matthew’s Windsor

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Sermon in Appendix 5 of this Textual Commentary, Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25).

¹⁰⁵ “Governors of Tasmania (Including Lieutenant-Governors and Administrators)” *Tasmanian Parliamentary Library* (http://www.parliament.tas.gov.au/tpl.datasheets/Governors_Table.htm).

¹⁰⁶ Clark, C.M.H., *A History of Australia*, Melbourne University Press, 1963, Vol. 1, pp. 171-3; Pike, D (Editor), *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, Melbourne University Press, 1966,1977, Vol. 1, p. 144 on “Brabyn, John;” McGrath, B.G. (my mother), *The Life and Times of John Brabyn of the New South Wales Corps and his extended family*, Total Print Control, Castle Hill, 1995, pp. 53-6. (Brabyn is one of my matrilineal four times great-grandfather’s, and his sword was handed down to my mother, who comes from a long line of Protestants.)

in western Sydney is Australia's oldest Anglican Church building. It now has only four annual Sunday services from the *Book of Common Prayer*. I dedicated my second Edition of "The Roman Pope is the Antichrist" there following a 1662 Book of Common Prayer Service on the *Eve of All Saints' Day* 2010 (Sunday 31 Oct.); and I again returned to St. Matthew's Windsor in 2011 for 1662 Book of Common Prayer Services on *King Charles I's Day* (Sunday 30 Jan.) and *Royal Oak Day* (Sunday 29 May). (Photos of these events may be found at my website.)¹⁰⁷

In 1798 the Test Acts were in place in both England and Ireland, and this meant that the Puritans were not in the Irish Parliament. While we do not know how many of the Irish Puritans were sympathetic to the 1798 rebellion, we hope not many were, and we can safely conjecture that most of those Puritans so sympathetic to the rebels would have refused to join in the 1798 rebellion because it lacked Rutherford's *Lex Rex* requirement of the legislature's support. Nevertheless, a small and unrepresentative group of Puritans in northern Ireland, and exclusively Papists in southern Ireland, united in a Puritan-Papist alliance, to engage in sedition against the Crown in the reign of George III in 1798, and one of the biggest slaughters of Protestants was at a place called Vinegar Hill in southern Ireland. I refer the interested reader for some of the greater details to my book, *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist*. I there say:

In the north of Ireland the 1798 rebellion was mainly instigated by a minority group of Puritan Protestants against the Anglican Protestant Christian State, albeit with some lesser Roman Catholic support. But in Ulster, northern Ireland, this was confined to the three counties of Antrim, Derry, and Down. Mainly Irish Presbyterian rebels led by Henry McCracken rebelled in County Antrim, and while they briefly occupied most of the county, this rebellion was put down when the King's soldiers advanced into the town of Antrim. Likewise in County Down, rebels were led by Henry Munro (1758-1798), a Scottish Presbyterian. He was a Freemason and member of the *Society of United Irishmen*, an organization supporting revolutionary republicanism which looked with favour on both the American and French Revolutions. Munro's rebels had a short-lived military success at Saintfield, but then in the longest battle of the rebellion, these rebels were put down by the King's forces at Ballynahinch.

Writing in sympathy with the Irish Presbyterian tradition, Thomas Hamilton records that in the north of Ireland, once the insurrection of 1798 was put down, the "head" of "McCracken" was "impaled on Belfast Market House" (formerly on "the corner of High Street and Corn Market"). Thus McCracken's head ultimately shared the same fate as that of Oliver Cromwell, whose head was hung at Westminster Parliament for most of King Charles II's reign. But

¹⁰⁷ See pictures on the website in connection with this Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) of my Textual Commentaries; & final two picture on the website of my work *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist* (2006, 2nd edition 2010); available on the internet via Yahoo and Google at "Gavin McGrath Books," or direct at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.

Hamilton also records that in “the south” of Ireland, the “1798 insurrection” “assumed” “the form of a religious war. Romanism was for the time in the ascendant, and in delirium of fierce joy feasted gluttonously on Protestant blood”,¹⁰⁸.

It is clear from Thomas Hamilton’s account in his *History of Presbyterianism in Ireland* that he has some sympathy for the northern Irish Puritans of the 1798 Rebellion, but paradoxically no such sympathy for the southern Irish Papists of this same 1798 Rebellion. Hamilton does not seem to mind if northern Ireland Puritans kill Anglicans, but he takes a different view when southern Ireland Papists kill Anglican Protestants. For example, in the north, he refers to how “poor McCracken” “was finally taken.” (Compare Hamilton’s usage of the “poor wife” of the Protestant clergyman in the south, *infra*.) Or says that under the Puritan “Henry Munro,” they “courageously stood their ground for some time.” Though he thinks them ultimately “misguided,” the reason seems to be that they “did not see themselves see the ludicrous hopelessness of an enterprise whose supporters were a motley crowd of untrained ploughmen¹⁰⁹.” I.e., they failed to meet Samuel Rutherford’s *Lex Rex* fourth criteria for sedition and murder, namely, that those spearheading the sedition (for Rutherford, the politicians,) must have a reasonable chance of success, and thus Rutherford says the principle of sedition and murder “does no[t] ... oblige a few ones to ... resistance” against a so called tyrant (*Lex Rex*, Question 34, Objection 16:3)¹¹⁰. Thus Hamilton’s criticism on the 1798 Puritan rebels of the north is hardly a satisfactory level of criticism!

But it was in the south of Ireland that the *Battle of Vinegar Hill* was fought in 1798, and here Hamilton adopts quite a different tone. The reason he gives is that, “In the south,” the 1798 rebellion “assumed ... the form of a religious war.” This is a highly selective reading of history by the Irish Puritan, Thomas Hamilton, who seeks to downplay the rebellion of the north by not classifying a Puritan attack on Royalist Anglicans in the north as a religious war, while simultaneously considering a Papist attack on Anglicans and other Protestants in the south, is such “a religious war.” Thus Hamilton continues in his discourse on the south:

¹⁰⁸ Citing Hamilton, T, *op. cit.*, p. 140. *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist* (2006, 2nd edition 2010), *op. cit.*, “Part 3: Convicted Nazi War Criminal, ‘Blessed’ Stepinatz: A special case study of the Antichrist’s sin (II Thess. 2:3): Papal Support and Beatification in 1998 of the Convicted Nazi War Criminal, ‘Blessed’ Cardinal Stepinatz;” “Chapter 9 Connections between Stepinatz’s Cult and Irish Roman Catholic terrorism against British Protestants,” subsection, “A Brief Protestant Hagiology about the Irish before 1922.”

¹⁰⁹ Hamilton, T, *op. cit.*, pp. 139-140.

¹¹⁰ See Textual Commentaries, Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” “c) i) Charles the First’s Day (30 Jan), Charles the Second’s Day (29 May), & Papists’ Conspiracy Day (5 Nov),” at “Charles the First,” subsection, “Popish Jesuit involvement in Charles I’s martyrdom.”

Romanism was for the time in the ascendant, and in delirium of fierce joy feasted gluttonously on Protestant blood. The fury of the outbreak culminated in County Wexford. Under the leadership of a Romish priest, Father Murphy ..., the most horrid atrocities were here perpetrated. ... A Protestant clergyman named Burrows was brutally murdered. His son was mortally wounded, and when seven of his parishioners had been also dispatched, his poor wife was left sitting on the lawn among the bleeding bodies, beside her dead husband, and her dying boy, with her home in flames behind her. Similar brutalities [occurred] day after day A camp was formed at Vinegar Hill, and its record is simply sickening. A country was scoured for miles round, and all the Protestants on whom hands could be laid brought in, and crowded into these buildings. ... [T]hey were brought out in batches to be piked ..., and so every day, like tigers which had tasted blood and could not be satisfied, Father Murphy and the horde of other Romish ruffians whom he had collected, feasted on the slaughter of Protestants, while, to give the proceedings the solemn sanction of Mother Church, twenty priests said Mass at regular intervals in different parts of the camp, and a great tub of holy water was daily blessed, that the murderers might sprinkle themselves with it and go to their work feeling that they had the blessing of the Church in their pious work. It would take too long to tell here all the other horrors of that awful time in the South of Ireland ...¹¹¹.

This 1798 virulently anti-Protestant attack of Papists on Protestants at Vinegar Hill in southern Ireland, inspired the 1804 Irish Rebellion at the place of the same name, Vinegar Hill, in western Sydney, New South Wales. A memorial to that 1804 Battle now stands on Vinegar Hill in the wider area of Castle Hill, and it is on the opposite side of the road to, and between 1 to 2 kilometres, or about a mile away, from the *Royal Oak Grill* restaurant at Rouse Hill, *infra*. It is thus with some obvious appropriateness that I visited this memorial of the 1804 Battle of Vinegar Hill with the sword of one of my matrilineal four-time great grandfathers, Captain John Brabyn, on Saturday 28 May 2011, being the day Royal Oak Day is celebrated at Castleton in England, where it is transferred back to Saturday the 28th of May when 29 May falls on a Sunday; and I then attended a 1662 Book of Common Prayer Service at Captain Brabyn's old church of St. Matthew's Windsor where he lies buried, on Sunday 29 May 2011, which is the day when Royal Oak Day is most commonly remembered, irrespective of what day of the week it falls. And I also earlier attended a 1662 prayer book service at St. Matthew's Windsor on *King Charles I's Day*, Sunday 30 Jan. 2011, whose secondary focus is the interregnum and Restoration in 1660. Of course, when Captain John Brabyn (1758-1835) of the *Royal New South Wales Corps* helped to put down the 1804 *Battle of Vinegar Hill* in western Sydney, and was a parishioner of St. Matthew's Windsor, both *King Charles the Martyr's Day* and *The King's Restoration Day* (or *Royal Oak Day*), were red-letter days with their own Offices in the 1662 Anglican prayer book, by Royal Warrants of King George III (Regnal Years 1760-1820), King George IV (Regnal Years: 1820-1830; Regency under

¹¹¹ Hamilton, T, *op. cit.*, pp. 140-141.

George III from 1811-1820), and King William IV (Regnal Years: 1830-1837). (Photos of these 2011 events may be found at my textual commentary website.)¹¹²

7) *Charles II's Day (29 May).*

- a) *My Baptist Grandmother.*
- b) *St. Helier.*
- c) *A General Introduction to Royal Oak Day.*
- d) *Royal Oak Hotels.*
- e) *Royal Oak Streets and other place names.*
- f) *Royal Oak Naval Ships of the Fleet.*
- g) *Royal Oak Day Sermons.*
- h) *Royal Oak Day Celebrations.*
- i) *The London Oak Apple Day Parade.*
 - a) *Preamble on "the Shaver's" repentance;*
 - b) *General on London Oak Apple Day;*
 - c) *KJV translators Daniel Featley et al.*
- j) *Charles II lands at Dover ☺.*
- k) *The Restoration Prayer Book of 1662: its language a fruit of the AV.*
- l) *The Cross as a symbol of Christianity & some stingy Puritans get their bottoms "pinched" on Oak Apple Day.*
- *m) *Royal Oak Day Dedication.***

7a) *My Baptist Grandmother.*

At section, "7i)a) Preamble on 'the Shaver's' repentance," *infra*, I refer to a Baptist Minister, known as "the Shaver," the Reverend John MacGowan (1726-1780), who gave a *Royal Oak Day Sermon* in London.

One of my patrilineal uncles, David McGrath (b. 1935) of Albury in southern New South Wales on the border with Victoria, has an Authorized Version of the Bible from my Grandma McGrath (i.e., Uncle David's Mother), which he tells me that as a Christian he still reads, and that he prays to God. He said he looked at one of the modern versions some years ago but did not like it, and so stayed with this old King James Bible that formerly belonged to his mother and my grandmother. Thus Grandma McGrath was a King James Bible using Baptist Protestant.

Except for my English patrilineal grandmother, all my relatives came across to Australia in the 1700s or 1800s, starting with Ensign (later Captain) John Brabyn of the New South Wales Corps, who arrived in 1796, *supra*. Because of my English grandmother, Lily McGrath nee Lush, I have a UK ancestry visa which has allowed me

¹¹² See pictures on the website in connection with this Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) of my Textual Commentaries at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.

to live in London, working there in my profession as a school teacher. I have presently done so over five trips totaling about 3½ years between 2001 and 2009¹¹³.

As I have previously mentioned¹¹⁴, Grandma McGrath was a Baptist. She was a World War One (WWI) war-bride, having met my grandfather, an Australian soldier of the First AIF (Australian Imperial Forces) during the war; who then in early 1920 came to Australia after the war to marry my grandfather. My grandfather, Norman McGrath, called and regarded himself as “a Presbyterian.” Nevertheless, in his church attendance he moved between Presbyterian and Anglican Churches. Before being finally buried in an Anglican Church at the age of 97, he had all of his children baptized as babies, some as Anglicans and some as Presbyterians. My father was baptized as an Anglican, raised in Anglican Sunday Schools, and Confirmed while a teenager by an Anglican bishop.

Father tells me the McGrath household of his boyhood was Protestant and anti-Roman Catholic. It seems that in this broad-Protestant McGrath household, the rule was that *one could be any religion one wanted to be, just so long as one was A PROTESTANT Christian*. By contrast, my mother was raised in a specifically Evangelical Anglican Protestant Christian household. Thus both my parents were Anglicans, and they married in an Anglican Church (*Church of England in Australia*, commonly just called “C. of E.” or “Church of England”¹¹⁵), and had both my brother and I baptized as babies in Anglican Churches, and sent us both to Evangelical Anglican C. of E. Sunday Schools (in south-eastern Australia).

In the year 2001, I was in Salisbury and its environs on Tuesday 29 May to Thursday 31 May i.e., for the period on and around, *Royal Oak Day* on its most commonly used date of 29 May. Among other things this included inspecting Stonehenge, a site that Charles II also inspected when he was at Salisbury, following the Battle of Worcester in 1651. On *Royal Oak Day*, 2001, I went from Salisbury to nearby Bowerchalke, in order to see where Grandma McGrath used to live at “The Buddens,” before she was married to my grandfather in Sydney, Australia. It was a beautiful sun-shining day, and there was a cleaner at The Buddens who allowed me to look inside. Among other things, I inspected the local Baptist Church of which she was a member, and also the local Anglican Church, where her father, Thomas Lush, is buried. Notably, both this Puritan Baptist Church, and Holy Trinity Anglican Church, contained World War I (1914-1918) honour rolls referring to “E. Lush” (Baptist Church) or “Edward Lush” (Anglican Church), Grandma’s brother, or my great uncle, also a Baptist, who was killed during WWI.

¹¹³ 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).

¹¹⁴ Commentary Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” section “a) Preliminary Qualifications & Remarks” at paragraph 16.

¹¹⁵ Now called, “Anglican Church of Australia.”

When I had asked for some information on the area, I was directed to a man that everybody said was the local Bowerchalke historian, David Gulliver. He turned out to be a relative of mine (the son of Eileen Gulliver nee Lush, sister of my grandmother), and even had some pictures of my father as a boy. Fairly soon, I was introduced to various relatives, a number of whom had known both my grandfather and grandmother. On another day, before leaving Salisbury, one of these relatives, David Hardiman, an octogenarian, (the son of Alice Lush, sister of my grandmother, Lily Lush,) drove me out to show me the Fovant Badges. These are military badges on a hill, where the WWI Australian soldiers etched the rising sun on the hill. One of the badges now etched on the hill which I recognized was the jimmy badge used for the Signals Corp that my Father was later in. I was told that Bowerchalke was a few miles away behind this hill, and WWI soldiers, such as Grandfather McGrath, used to walk there.

It seems to me that we are able to remember Armistice Day on 11 November each year, without any ongoing animosity to our old World War One enemies of the Germans. We honour the memory of our war dead, and the victory won. But we do not harbor old grudges against contemporary Germans. This message is writ large in both the Puritan (Baptist) and Anglican Churches of Bowerchalke, which remember men like my great uncle, Edward Lush, but which hold no grudges against contemporary Germans.

So likewise, it seems to me that when we remember *Royal Oak Day*, which is a day generally of more memory to we Anglicans than to Puritans, we should nevertheless do so without any ongoing animosity to those derived from English and Irish (or less commonly from the Scottish minority grouping) Puritan Church from the time of our old civil war Puritan enemies of the mid 17th century. We honour the memory of our war dead, and the victory won with the Restoration in 1660. But we do not harbor old grudges against contemporary Protestants in English and Irish Puritan derived Churches. Indeed, we should remember that the bloodless Restoration of the Anglican monarch, was only made possible because Puritans in key governmental positions drew the conclusion that the Anglicans were loyal to the Crown and would never become Puritans *en masse*, and most of the Scottish Puritans were loyal to the Crown, and that without the unifying symbol of the Crown the country could never be pulled together again.

It is with these thoughts in mind, that I celebrate the memory of Royal Oak Day. For Article 10 of the *Apostles' Creed* refers to “the holy catholic (universal) church” (Acts 9:31; Rom. 12:5; Eph. 4:4), and “the communion (fellowship) of saints (believers)” (I John 1:7). I for one, do not doubt that this mystical body of Christ (Eph. 5:22-32), i.e., the universal church, which meets for fellowship in individual local churches (Rom. 12:5; Heb. 10:25; I John 1:7), includes all those who are genuinely saved by the gospel of grace (Rom. 1:16,17; Eph. 2:8,9). To be sure, both Reformed Anglicans and Puritans with whom God has made the covenant of grace, are covered by the same blood of the same Lord, so that in “one body, and one Spirit,” we “are called in one hope.” We hold to “one Lord, one faith, one” spiritual “baptism” i.e., the regeneration symbolized by water baptism, “one God and Father of all” (Eph. 4:4-6; Titus 3:5-7). Amidst our hagiological diversity of opinions over the mid-seventeenth century, let us never forget this our

underpinning Protestant unity as Christians saved by grace, and washed in the blood of the Lamb.

7b) *St. Helier.*

I have lived and worked in London, in the United Kingdom, five times between 2001 and 2009, living at different places in London¹¹⁶. On my fifth trip to London (Sept. 08-March 09), I lived in Love Lane, Morden, Surrey, which is part of Sutton in Greater London. The closest railway station, which I used to walk to and from, is *St. Helier's Railway Station*, and I used to change trains to or from here at the nearby Wimbledon Railway Station. Like other London railway stations, it has the words, "MIND THE GAP" painted on the platform with reference to the gap between the platform and the train. At the Rose Hill shops that I used to go to there is also a "St. Helier Café."

In February 2009, I had an unexpected forced holiday from work as a school teacher for four days (Mon 2 Feb. to Thurs. 5 Feb.) On the *Eve of Richard Johnson's Day*, Monday 2 Feb. 2009, heavy snows came down as I was walking to the train station, and it became clear the trains would not be running that day, and the buses were also cancelled. Disruption to trains and buses meant I could not get to work again till Friday 6 Feb. . But at the time, I did not know that, and I initially thought it would be just the Monday that the public transport would be out. I had been in London on other occasions when it had snowed, but not as heavily as this, and I had never known the public transport to ground to such a halt as this before. The area of both St. Helier's Station and its environs was covered in a beautiful white blanket of snow. I walked around taking photos, including one a snow-man in Love Lane where I lived. For we Australians, snow is very much a photo event which we associate with holidaying, an association that the Londoners do not share.

The name of St. Helier's Railway Station is of some relevance. Saint Helier is the capital of Jersey in the Channel Islands. It is named after Helier, who is also sometimes known by the Latin form of his name, Helerous. A great amount of embellishment was added to the story of Helier during mediaeval times, and we must regard much of what was written about him by the Roman Catholic Bollandist Fathers in *Acta Sanctorum* (Antwerp, Belgium, 1725) as unreliable and inaccurate. It should also be noted, that the sixth century figure of Helier dates to an era before the formation of the Roman Papacy in 607.

As to that which is reliable that we know about Helier, we know very little. But we can certainly date him to the sixth century A.D. . He originally came from Tongres in Belgium, and he was a Christian whose father was a pagan. He came to Jersey as a

¹¹⁶ The places I have lived at in Greater London are: April 2001-April 02 (1st trip; West Croydon, Surrey, CRO); Dec. 02-July 03 (2nd trip; Raynes Park, London, SW20); August 03-April 04 (3rd trip; Raynes Park, London, SW20); Oct. 05-April 06 (4th trip; Sydenham, London, SE26, Oct. 05 – Feb. 06; & Raynes Park, London, SW20, Feb. 06 - April 06); & Sept. 08-March 09 (5th trip; Morden, Surrey, SM4).

monk, where he engaged in missionary work. He was martyred there in 555 A.D., by those whom he was seeking to bring the Christian gospel to. This scant amount of reliable information is certainly enough to reliably tell us that Helier was a Christian missionary who was martyred for his faith in the mid 6th century.

The gospel proclaimed by this 6th century monk (and in other instances on the Continent before the “Holy” Roman Empire was set up in the latter part of the 8th century, or before the 15th century in England or Wales when following Wycliffe’s time the Inquisition came to the Kingdom of England,) is better than no gospel at all (though this is no longer the case after the *Council of Trent* in 1545-63); but when the greater light of apostolic Christianity came which was given a great rebirth with the Protestant Reformation, then there could no longer be a place for monasteries¹¹⁷. Therefore, the Abbey of St. Helier, founded in 1155 on L’Islet (one of the Jersey Islands), was wisely closed by Henry VIII (Regnal Years: 1509-1547), during the more general Closure of Monasteries in the early stages of the English Reformation. But King Henry also wisely retained the Parish Church of St. Helier’s, since it would be wrong to ignore the earlier work of this Christian martyr. St. Helier’s Anglican Church, Jersey, was then more greatly reformed in the truth of the Protestant tradition under the wise religious policies of King Edward VI (Regnal Years: 1547-1553) and Queen Elizabeth I (Regnal years 1558-1603).

During the period of 1551 to 1590, the site of the old St. Helier’s Abbey was fortified and turned into a castle. This then became the Island’s main fortress. It was named after Elizabeth I, as *Elizabeth Castle*, by the Governor of Jersey, Sir Walter Raleigh (Governor: 1600-1603).

During the Civil War, at various times between 1641 and 1648, *Elizabeth Castle*, was the refuge of Lord Clarendon. He was a Minister to King Charles I, and after the Restoration in 1660, he was initially a Minister and close advisor of King Charles II¹¹⁸. Whilst a resident during the 1640s at *Elizabeth Castle*, Lord Clarendon began to write his *History of the Rebellion & Civil Wars in England*¹¹⁹.

Lord Clarendon was with King Charles I in 1645, and he then left the king in order to guard the Prince of Wales, Prince Charles, (the later Charles II), as they journeyed to the safe-haven of *Elizabeth Castle* at Jersey. Later, the Queen arranged for

¹¹⁷ See Textual Commentaries Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” “*f) King Charles the First’s Day: with Dedication of Volume 1 in 2008;” & Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” “1) The Monastic Noviate,” & “2) The Monastic legacy.”

¹¹⁸ Cf. the footnote on Clarendon, South Australia, at “4d) Royal Oak Hotels,” *infra*.

¹¹⁹ See e.g., a reference to Lord Clarendon’s work in Dr. Fothergill’s *Royal Oak Day Sermon* of 29 May 1758 at “7g) Royal Oak Day Sermons,” *infra*.

Charles II to go to Paris; and in 1648, Lord Clarendon also went to Paris in order to join the Queen and Prince Charles. Lord Clarendon was with Prince Charles during most of the Interregnum, and this good Protestant sought to safeguard Charles II's religious education against Popish influences, by ensuring that Charles remained an Anglican *Protestant*. And it must be said, that once all the dust had settled following the effective collapse of the Puritan republic, whilst the Puritan *Protestants* were prepared to invite back the *Protestant* Charles II, there is no way that they would have been prepared to invite back a Papist king.

As Lord Chancellor who oversaw the Restoration, Lord Clarendon also sought generous terms of pardon for most Puritans in the *Act of Oblivion*, but he was overruled in much of his desire by the Parliament. He was made 1st Earl of Clarendon in 1661. His daughter, Anne, married James, Duke of York, in 1660, and two of his grandchildren became monarchs, Mary II (who from 1689-1694 reigned jointly with William III, 1689-1702), and Anne (Regnal Years:1702-1714).

Lord Clarendon was a good Christian man, who had cared for Charles II's soul during the interregnum, protecting him from Popish attempts to convert him to Romanism. But after the Restoration, Lord Clarendon's same concern for Charles II's soul, led him to justly rebuke the king over his unchastity. (Tragically, Charles II had a number of mistresses.) Sadly, Charles II would not listen to Lord Clarendon, who chose to pay the price of losing Charles II's friendship, rather than condone his unchastity. Having upset both King and Parliament, various unsubstantiated allegations were made about him. Lord Clarendon returned to France. Following his death in 1674, he received an Anglican burial at Westminster Abbey.

Notably however, at an earlier time when both Lord Clarendon and Prince Charles were on St. Helier's Island in the 1640s, when it was safe to do so, they both attended church services at St. Helier's Anglican Church, Jersey. But at times, this was not possible. E.g., in 1643 a gun battery was erected by the Puritan republican revolutionaries in the churchyard of St. Helier's, from which they sought to besiege *Elizabeth Castle*. The Anglican Royalists of *Elizabeth Castle* returned fire, but in doing so, regrettably struck part of St. Helier's Church. Indeed, the dents from this fire can still be seen in the granite wall of St. Helier's.

Thus the island of St. Helier in Jersey, together with place names such as St. Helier's Railway Station at Morden, Greater London (which also borders the Greater London suburb of St. Helier), also acts to remind us of the civil war years. In particular, it reminds us that under God, the protective Protestant hand of Lord Clarendon meant St. Helier's was a place for the Protestant nourishment of Charles II's soul at St. Helier's Church; and its *Elizabeth Castle*, was also a safe haven that proved to be an impregnable fortress against the Puritan republican revolutionaries.

Thanks be to God for the witness of the Christian martyr, Helier, in 555. And thanks also be to God for the provision he made at St. Helier's on the Jersey Islands for the safety of Charles II in the 1640s.

7c) *A General Introduction to Royal Oak Day.*

While in the shorter term Oliver Cromwell won the Battle of Worcester in 1651, by virtue of Charles II's escape after successfully hid in the royal oak at Boscobel in England, in the longer term, Cromwell effectively lost the war. The Battle of Worcester thus reminds Christians of how God can bring victory out of defeat. *All glory to God!*

In 1680, Charles II confirmed to the diarist, Samuel Pepys, that when he was hiding in the Royal Oak, one of Cromwell's Puritan republican soldiers passed directly below the tree. This element of the Royal Oak story, has historically been popular. I was in London on *Royal Oak Day* or *Oak Apple Day*, Thursday 29 May, 2003, which was also *Ascension Day* in 2003¹²⁰. Like England in general, London keeps a general background cultural memory of the Royal Oak in various place names. This includes the Royal Oak place names of London, e.g., Royal Oak Hotels.

Royal Oak Day is somewhat unusual in that in addition to its many names, the date used for its memory varies between different traditions. For some nowadays, just *King Charles I's Day* is used, since this has a primary focus on the martyrdom of Charles I, and a secondary focus on the events of the interregnum, royal oak, and Restoration under Charles II. But for those who also specifically remember *Royal Oak Day*, in one tradition found at Castleton in England, if 29 May falls on a Sunday, then *Royal Oak Day* is transferred back to Saturday 28 May; e.g., on Saturday 28 May this year of 2011. Most commonly it is still remembered on the 29th of May irrespective of what day of the week it falls on. And after 1859, the London Royal Oak Day Parade or Oak Apple Day Parade, has been held at the Royal Chelsea Hospital as Founder's Day on either the first or second Thursday of June; e.g., in 2009 it was the first Thursday in June, in 2010 it was the second Thursday in June, and this year of 2011 it is also the second Thursday of June. And as discussed at "7i) The London Oak Apple Day Parade," subsection "b) General on London Oak Apple Day," *infra*, this June date is the one used for the Dedication of this Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) of these Textual Commentaries.

The most common date used for *The King's Restoration Day* or *Royal Oak Day* is 29 May, which was Charles II's Birthday or Nativity, and indeed was remembered as *The King's Birthday* by some royalists during the Interregnum¹²¹. Hence it was commonly

¹²⁰ *The Ascension Day* is always remembered on a Thursday because it is calculated as being 40 days after Easter Sunday (Acts 1:4) on inclusive reckoning (i.e., counting Easter Sunday as Day 1; cf. e.g., John 20:26 where "eight days" is the *First Sunday after Easter* on such inclusive reckoning.) It is a red-letter day in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) i.e., it has its own Collect (Prayer) and readings for Mattins (Dan. 7:9-14; Luke 24:44-53; Psalms: 8,15,21), Evensong (II Kgs 2:1-15; Heb. 4; Psalms: 24,27,108), and Communion (Acts 1:1-11; Mark 16:14-20c).

¹²¹ "An Anniversary Ode, upon The Kings Birth day. May 29. Written for this Yeare 1654, being his 24 yeare. To his Majesty," Printed for Samuel Browne, Hague,

abbreviated on 1662 prayer book Calendars as “Nat. & Ret.” i.e., *Nativity* in 1630 and *Return* (meaning the Restoration) in 1660. For example, in places that I have visited and which are known to me in England, Charles II’s *Nativity and Return* is remembered as *Oak Apple Day* on 29 May at Salisbury; Membury, which has a tradition dating back some hundreds of years of hanging an oak bough on the local Anglican Church on 29 May; and Marsh Gibbon, which has an unbroken tradition of a Royal Oak Day church service on 29 May dating from the 1660s.

Certainly I am not suggesting that I support anything and everything that may occur at various *Oak Apple Day* celebrations. Like for example, Christmas, they may be tarnished by some of the conduct of certain participants. But in a broad and general sense, I support the idea of remembering *Oak Apple Day* at these places, and both here and elsewhere, they do so in the tradition of remembering it on 29 May.

I was at Salisbury for a number of days on and around 29 May 2001, and among other things I visited at that time was the nearby Stonehenge¹²². That is of significance because when Charles II fled from the Roundheads following the Battle of Worcester and events of the royal oak at Boscobel in 1651, he passed through Salisbury and inspected Stonehenge, before going to Dover, and from there to France and Holland until the Restoration of 1660. I also inspected Salisbury Cathedral, of relevance because at the time of the Restoration, on 29 May 1660 in London, the Bishop of Salisbury, (together with the Bishops of Ely, Rochester, and Chichester,) “with divers[e] of the long oppressed orthodox clergy; met in” the “Royal Chapel” at “Westminster, and there also sung” e.g., the “Te Deum,” thanking God for the Restoration¹²³.

In a letter he later sent me¹²⁴, Rod Craddock of Membury (see “7h,” “Royal Oak Day Celebrations,” *infra*) further advised me that John Evelyn’s Diary for 29 May 1661 says (modernizing some spelling), “This was the first anniversary appointed by Act of Parliament to be observed as a day of general Thanksgiving for the miraculous Restoration of His Majesty. Our Vicar [i.e., Church Minister] preaching on Psalm 118:24; requiring us to be thankful & rejoice, as indeed we had cause.” He said that

1654; in *Early English Books Online*, British Library, Reel position: Thomason / 114:E.745[24].

¹²² Matthews, W. (Editor), *Charles II’s Escape from Worcester*, A Collection of Narrative Assembled by Samuel Pepys, G. Bell & Sons, London, 1967, p. 68.

¹²³ “England’s Joy or a Relation of the most remarkable passages, from His Majesty’s arrival at DOVER, to his entrance at WHITEHALL,” Printed by Thomas Creak, London, 1660; reprinted in: An English Garner, *Stuart Tracts 1603-1693*, with an Introduction by C.F. Firth, Archibald Constable & Co., Westminster, 1903, pp. 427-430, at p. 430.

¹²⁴ Letter of Ron Craddock of Membury in Devon, England, to Gavin McGrath (then of Morden, Greater London, UK) 23 Dec. 2008.

before 1859, “in villages throughout Devon, the occasion was celebrated by the choice of the ugliest man in the village being chosen to play Cromwell. He then went about the business of being chief baddie by pouring soot over everyone he caught as he marauded the village. A stop was put to his evil ways by the arrival of the Cavaliers who hounded him out of the village.” He further advised that after 1859, in the 1860s the “Honiton Oak Apple” day celebrations continued, so that records from this time state “29 May ... is always remembered, 5 November, Easter and Christmas are occasions of public rejoicing ...” (citing Farquarson’s *The History of Honiton*, 1868, p. 69). Indeed, Rod Craddock notes “an oak apple day” “branch” is still “put” on “the tower” at “St. Neots, Cornwall,” although “the event fell out of practice” there “during WWII [World War Two]. Sprigs of fresh oak are worn until mid-day.”

He said “in Shropshire (Aston-on-Clun),” that “until 1995, a large black poplar tree standing in the centre of the village ... was permanently decorated with flags suspended from its branches. In that year the tree died, and since a young one grown from its seeds is not yet large enough to carry the flags, they are currently lashed to railings around it. The flags are renewed on May 29th, locally called *Arbour Day*.” (“*Arbour*” refers to a tree, as distinct from a shrub, and *Royal Oak Day* has less commonly been also known as *Arbour Day*.) This “custom began in 1786” in connection with “the wedding of the local squire John Marston. The ceremony is still organized by the Hopesay Parish Council support by an annual fete;” citing Oxford’s *A Dictionary of English Folklore* by J. Simpson & S. Roud. From the same source, Ron Craddock referred to the “oak branches” at the “Guildhall Gates” “in Worcestershire;” and “in Northamptonshire the placing of “oak leaf wreaths around the neck of a statue of Charles [II] in All Saints’ Church.”

Following the Battle of Worcester (1651) in which a Scottish Royalist Puritan army under Charles the Second was defeated by a republican Puritan army under Oliver Cromwell, and Charles II hid in the royal oak tree at Boscobel, royalist Scotland was occupied by Cromwell’s General, George Monck. I.e., these Scottish Puritans whose Acts of parliament recognized King Charles I’s reign until 1649, and then after his death, the reign of King Charles II, never accepted the republic, but had it forced upon them by the military might of Cromwell’s republic¹²⁵.

¹²⁵ See “Acta (Acts) Parliamentorum (of Parliament) Caroli (of Charles) I (the First)” in “Januarij 1649;” “Acta (Acts) Parliamentorum (of Parliament) Caroli (of Charles) II (the Second)” on “V (5) Februarii (February) MDCXLIX (1649),” with its “PROCLAMATION of Charles the Second king of Great Britain France and Ireland,” ending with “GOD SAVE KING CHARLES THE SECOND;” and what is then a continuation of this after the Restoration with e.g., “Acta (Acts) Parliamentorum (of Parliament) Caroli (of Charles) II (the Second)” on “July XXX (30), MDCLXX (1670).” *The Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland and the Government during the Commonwealth*, Printed by Authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty’s Treasury, 1872, Vol. VI, pp. 124, 150-151 (Charles I, Jan. 1649), 157 (Proclamation of Charles II as King, Feb. 1649); and Part II & Vol. VIII, p. 6 (Charles II, July 1670) (British Library SPR Mic. A150, Volumes VI to VII).

The English disliked much in the republican years. E.g., the Collect for *Twenty-fifth Sunday after Trinity* is used in November on the Sunday before *The First Sunday in Advent*. This Collect starts with the words, “Stir up, we beseech the, O Lord, the wills of thy faithful people,” etc., and has nothing to directly do with Christmas Puddings at all¹²⁶. There was an Anglican Christmas tradition that was still around in increasingly diminished form in the early 1980s when I was in my early 20s. It has now largely died out both due to that fact people buy Christmas Puddings rather than make them, and also due to the usage of alternatives to the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* which no longer use this Collect at this time. But Anglicans used to call this Sunday with the *Trinity 25* Collect (always used as the last Sunday in Trinity irrespective of when Easter’s moveable date was), “Stir up Sunday,” because when they heard this Collect, the words, “Stir up” would remind the ladies that they had to stir the Christmas pudding to get it ready for Christmas time. But Oliver Cromwell banned the eating of Christmas Pudding, with the consequence that there is now a tradition of eating plum pudding on *Royal Oak Day*¹²⁷.

What is sometimes called, “The Eleven Years Tyranny” of the 1649 to 1660 republic, ended when following Cromwell’s death in 1658, his son, Richard (Dick) Cromwell (1658-9), known as, “Idle Dick,” proved a poor leader. Recognizing the strength of Christian royalist sentiment in both predominately Puritan Scotland and predominately Anglican England, Monck then became a key figure in supporting the 1660 Restoration under Charles II, known as, “The Merry Monarch.”

The fact that *Charles II’s Day* is also called *Royal Oak Day*, reminds us that the focus of the day is not on the more general reign of this monarch, but on his preservation so necessary for the later Restoration under him. Like some of the kings of Israel, Charles II’s later reign was a mix of good and bad. On the up side, it included e.g., such positive elements as his Royal Assent to the Bill passed by Parliament in May 1679, known as the *Habeas Corpus Act*. This Act strengthened previous legislation ensuring people were protected from arbitrary detention that lacked proper legal authority. Nevertheless, such good things (or some of his bad things,) are not the real focus of this day. Certainly his preservation following his father’s martyrdom on 30 January 1649, up to his Restoration on 29 May 1660, is part of the focus of this day. The Restoration of the monarchy as an institution is the real idea, and so the sum of the total, is bigger than any of its individual component monarchs. The day may be sometimes called, *Charles II’s Day* or *King Charles II’s Day*, but it is bigger than Charles II, and thanks God for the Restoration of the Royal Family and institution of a legally Protestant constitutional monarchy.

¹²⁶ “Stir up, we beseech the, O Lord, the wills of thy faithful people; that they, plenteously bringing forth the fruit of good works, may of thee be plenteously rewarded; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*”

¹²⁷ “Royal Oak Plum Pudding”
http://www.royaloakday.org.uk/Tradition/plum_pudding.html).

From time to time, false religious teachers arise, and have a hypnotic or mesmerizing effect on great multitudes. Such e.g., is Buddha (Buddhism), Mohammed (Mohammedanism), the Pope of Rome (Roman Catholicism), Oliver Cromwell or Rutherford, Pusey (Puseyites), or Joseph Smith and Brigham Young (Mormonism). Personally, I would consider the teachings of such men no more seriously than the performance of “Bozo the clown.” I thank God I am in no way mesmerized by the likes of e.g., Buddha, Mohammed, the Roman Pope, Oliver Cromwell, Samuel Rutherford, or some “Mezmo the Magician.” Nevertheless, none of us are perfect, and I recognize that some others may be influenced by them. In this context, I consider remembrance of the Royal Oak, whether by Royal Oak Day (29 May), or some other means e.g., restaurants or ships bearing the name, “Royal Oak,” serves a useful function in warning people against the dangers of “seditions,” “murderers,” and “liars” (Gal. 5:20; Rev. 21:8); and the corresponding need to “Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17).

I have twice been in England during May (2001 & 2003), and then experienced the onset of the warmer weather, as heavier full coats come off, and the sun begins to shine more brightly. By English tradition, May is a time of celebration as this warmer weather comes on. Indeed, the phrase, “merry month of May” is found in a number of nursery rhymes and songs (which may have some wording variations in different versions). Hence such nursery rhymes as, “In *the merry month of May*, When green leaves begin to spring, Little lambs do skip all day; Birds do mate and build and sing.” Or Thomas Dekker’s “The Merry Month of May” (1600), “O the month of May, *the merry month of May*; So frolic, so great, so green, so green! O, and then did I unto my true love say, Sweet Peg, thou shalt be my Summer’s Queen.” Or the song, “I was walking down the street one day, in *the very merry month of May*, I was taken by surprise, by the girl with lovely eyes, in *the very merry month of May*.”

The *May Fair* at the beginning of May, gave its name to the London suburb of Mayfair. Like so many others, the name was known to me as boy from when I used to play the game, *Monopoly*, which uses Mayfair in London as one of its place names. On my fifth trip to London (Sept. 08-March 09), I visited this London suburb, near Hyde Park, which contains *St. George’s Garden’s* because they were formerly part of St. George’s Church in Hanover Square. And I also visited the London street, “Mayfair Place,” W1, Westminster, which houses the very English sounding, “Devonshire House.” There is also the suburb of Maypole (out from Sidcup).

As part of this type of celebration, we also find that the most famous flower show in the United Kingdom, is the Chelsea Flower show. This is organized by the *Royal Horticultural Society*, and is held at the *Chelsea Royal Hospital* in London on five days in May. Over the years it has received royal patronage¹²⁸. (See also section 7,i,b “General on London Oak Apple Day,” *infra*.)

128 “Chelsea Flower Show,” *Wikipedia* (May 2010) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chelsea_Flower_Show).

On my first trip to London (April 2001-April 02), I was living in London Rd, West Croydon, and while I generally used the large shopping Centre at Croydon, I sometimes went by bus to Bromley Mall. On one such occasion I witnessed Morris musicians there. While certain Morris (Morrice) musicians have sometimes been connected with certain elements of paganism; others in England have not; and as far as I recall there were no pagan elements present in the Morris musicians I saw. It is known that some Morris Dancers were part of the festivities welcoming Charles II back to England at the time of the Restoration¹²⁹. Interestingly then in the Oak Apple Day celebrations at Membury (near Axminster), in addition to locals playing such parts as “Charles II with Ladies and Gentlemen,” and “Oliver Cromwell,” there are “Flaming Morris Dancers¹³⁰.”

There is also the tradition of the Maypole. Dancing around the Maypole is an English tradition that has now largely, though not entirely, fallen into disuse. E.g., there is still annual Maypole dancing at Chislehurst and Offham in western Kent, Kingsteington, and Lustleigh¹³¹. One form of it is with holding red’n’white ribbons that come down from the top of the Maypole, the colours of the red’n’white flag of St. George, the national saint of England; in which the females dance around in one direction, and the males in the other direction. I spent a relatively short amount of time at one school in London where Maypole dancing is performed by students in May, but this school’s practice is relatively rare.

Despite some unsuccessful attempts to read things into the May Pole, whether by Puritans or others, the evidence such as we have it, is that this was simply a way of people celebrating the fact that the warmer weather was coming on, and so they got outdoors and enjoyed themselves more in it. Hence they could walk around and enjoy the May Fair, and dance around the May Pole, or watch others so dancing around it.

These May celebrations were disliked by the Puritans. Nathaniel Hawthorne captures these type of tensions in his 1837 short story, *The Maypole of Merry Mount*. Set in North America during the time John Endicott (1588-1665), a colonial magistrate and Governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony (1629-1630; 1644-5; 1649-50; 1651-4; 1655-1665), the story is of life under him and his Puritan followers. Though this is

¹²⁹ “England’s Joy or a Relation of the most remarkable passages, from His Majesty’s arrival at DOVER, to his entrance at WHITEHALL,” Printed by Thomas Creak, London, 1660; reprinted in: An English Garner, *Stuart Tracts 1603-1693, op. cit.*, pp. 427-430, at p. 428.

¹³⁰ “Event Schedule for Oak Apple Day Membury Tuesday 29 May 2007,” sent to me in letter of Ron Craddock of Membury in Devon, England, to Gavin McGrath (then of Morden, Greater London, UK) 23 Dec. 2008.

¹³¹ “England Chapter 28,” “A Merrie May,” pp. 295-303, in Hutton, R., *The Stations of the Sun, A History of the Return of the Year in Britain*, Oxford University Press, UK, 1996 (<http://www.books.google.com.au/books?isbn=0198205708...>).

fictional story, it shows the types of things such Puritans might do. In this story, the people of Merry Mount celebrate the marriage of a young man, Edgar, and his wife, Edith. They dance around a May Pole, but their festivities are interrupted by Endicott, and his Puritan followers. Endicott orders the people of Merry Mount to be flogged, though spares the newlyweds¹³².

Due to such Puritan dislike for them, in the republican years of the 1640s and 1650s, they demolished Maypoles. What was reputedly the most popular Maypole in London, stood at the site of the present *St. Mary-le-Strand Church of England*, at the Strand, WC2 (which I saw in Oct. 08), which was completed in 1717 (and located near King's College, London & Somerset House). The Maypole had been erected in 1601, but was demolished by Puritans. What was left of it was removed in 1717 and presented to Sir Isaac Newton to use as the base for a telescope. *No wonder he had such a merry time with astronomy!*

Also, when I visited Elstow, (not far from Bedford,) England, in February 2003, I stood on Elstow Green with historic Moot Hall on it, opposite *St. Helena & St. Mary's Church of England*. On Elstow Green I saw the remains of what was either a stone cross or a stone Maypole that had been cut down by the Puritans, so that only a stump of it remains. Either way, it marks the traditional May Fair site on Elstow Green, and among other things, its destruction reflects Puritan dislike for these May festivities.

After the Restoration, these May Day (1 May) celebrations were sometimes linked with *Royal Oak Day* (29 May) celebrations, so that the Maypole came to be connected with celebrations at both the beginning and end of May. Thus *Royal Oak Day* built on the pre-existing festivity of May which already had a rousing start, by giving the month a rousing end with *Restoration Day*. Charles II had a strong connection with the merry month of May. He had been born in May 1630. Under his reign, from the time of the Restoration Maypoles and Mayfair celebrations were again allowed at the beginning of May. On 8 May 1660, the Parliament publicly proclaimed him king, and requested him to return to the realm. On 26 May 1660, King Charles II landed at Dover. On 29 May 1660, he entered London to be welcomed by the Parliament at Whitehall, and the Restoration was annually celebrated on 29 May in memory of this entry into London. Charles II thus was clearly very strongly associated with this merry month of May, and indeed in keeping with this fact, he is traditionally called, "the merry monarch."

The Calendar of the 1662 prayer book, had for *Charles II's Day*, "CHARLES II. Nat. & Ret." i.e., referring to both his *Nativity* (birth) in 1630 and *Return* in 1660. From 1662 to 1664, the Office was called "King's Birth and Return," i.e., these two words were synonymous with "Nativity and Return" on the Calendar. But from 1664 the revised Office was known as "Restoration of the Royal Family;" although "Nat. & Ret." i.e., *Nativity & Return*, stayed on the Calendar at the front of the 1662 prayer book. The 29th of May was Charles II's birthday, and his birth in 1630 was marked by the appearance of

¹³² "Maypoles and Puritans," in *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 4 (Oct. 1950), pp. 205-207 (Internet Extract).

a day-star around high-noon. In Fuller's *Worthies* (1661), the chronicler, Thomas Fuller (1608-1661), records that Charles II's birth was greeted with "general rejoicing." "The University of Oxford congratulated his birth with printed poems¹³³."

King's are sometimes crowned at specific locations e.g., Kingston in Greater London. On my second trip to London (Dec. 2002-July 2003), when I was living at Raynes Park (near Wimbledon), in February 2003 I went out to Kingston-Upon-Thames and took some photos of an attractive bridge that spans Kingston and Hampton Wick, showing white swans and boats on the Thames River in front of that bridge. Charles I has been thought by some to have possibly used this bridge as an escape route when exiting from Hampton Court¹³⁴. I again went out to Kingston near Royal Oak Day on Thursday the 5th of June 2003 (being exactly midway between Thursday 29 May 03, the traditional Royal Oak Day; and the second Thursday in June, 12 June 03, when the London Oak Apple Day Parade was celebrated that year at Royal Chelsea Hospital). On both instances it was a relatively easy train trip of just three stops from Raynes Park to nearby Kingston.

Kingston was a civil war battleground that twice saw action in 1642. On the first occasion in January, while King Charles I was at Hampton Court Palace, and his Cavaliers at Kingston, the Roundheads occupied Kingston under directions from Richard Onslow. A larger force of Roundheads was then sent under command of James Ramsey to bolster this force. On a second occasion in 1642, Royalist Cavaliers occupied Kingston for a few days en route to Oxford. Upon their withdrawal, the Roundheads moved back in and occupied the area for the rest of civil war. From 1647 one of the Roundhead General's, Thomas Fairfax, had his army stationed at Kingston, and his lodgings were at the Crane Inn in the Market Place. Fairfax deployed his troops in the following year of 1648 for a skirmish at Surbiton¹³⁵. The King's Cavaliers, under the Earl of Holland, advanced towards Kingston; and Lord Francis Villiers, led a gallant Cavalier counter-attack, but he fell on the battlefield when cornered in an orchard not far from the present day Villiers Road.

¹³³ Freeman, J (Editor), *The Worthies of England* - Thomas Fuller, 1661 published posthumously in 1662, George Allen & Unwin, London, England, UK, p. 384.

¹³⁴ See "2b) Some sites I have visited of interest to Charles I, Charles II, James II, & William III," under "... places visited on my second trip to London"

¹³⁵ With regard to Cromwell's murder of Charles I, World War II British Prime Minister, Sir Winston Churchill said of "Cromwell" and the "great difficulty" he had in getting the complicity of his upper echelons to consent to the King's murder, "Fairfax, no mean person, still Commander-in-Chief, was outraged." Cited in Textual Commentaries Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), "Dedication: The Anglican Calendar," section c) i) "Charles the First's Day (30 Jan.), Charles the Second's Day (or Royal Oak Day) (29 May), & Papists' Conspiracy Day (5 Nov.)," subsection, "The immediate events of Charles I's martyrdom."

Local Kingston records from the era state that the occupying Republican Roundheads were unpopular. They would set aside the 8th commandment of the Holy Decalogue, “Thou shalt not steal,” by taking goods from Kingston shop-keepers without paying for them. And they would often “wreak havoc,” “plunder,” “burn,” and “use the church as a stable¹³⁶.”

As the name “Kingston” i.e., *King’s town* indicates, this place is further connected with royalty. For here, outside the Guildhall, and near Clattern Bridge, is a Coronation Stone at which various Saxon kings were crowned¹³⁷. So too, Charles II was crowned at a place of comparable significance in Scotland. For Scone is a traditional place for crowning Scottish kings, although the old Coronation Stone of Scone was moved to London and placed under the Coronation Chair at Westminster Abbey in 1296. Thus e.g., King James I of the King James Bible, the grandfather of Charles II, was crowned at London on the Stone of Scone in Westminster Abbey.

And thus with great appropriateness, the chronicler, Fuller, *supra*, records of Charles II, “He was, on the first of January, 1650, at Scone, crowned King of Scotland; before being invaded by an army under the conduct of Oliver Cromwell.” Significantly, the Scottish Parliament recognized Charles II’s reign from 30 Jan. 1649, proclaiming him both king *de jure* (Legal Latin, “according to law” i.e., “by right”) of the three kingdoms of England (which included the Dominion of Wales), Ireland, and Scotland; and also *de facto* (Legal Latin, “with regard to fact” i.e., “in fact”) *King of the Scots* on 5 Feb. 1649, before his Scottish coronation on 1 Jan 1650. (By contrast, the Puritan revolutionary republican controlled English legislature, passed an Ordinance claiming it was unlawful to so proclaim him as king.) He thus celebrated his 21st birthday on 29 May 1650, as a crowned king.

Following his second defeat, Fuller records that “on the third of September 1651, nigh Worcester,” “search was made after his person, yea a thousand pounds” was offered by Cromwell as “a bait” by which he hoped someone “should betray him.” But the phrase, *every man has his price*, is the phrase of an immoral man who has his price. Some men are honourable, and have *no price* for the practice of evil. Thus, continues Fuller, “God, whose angels were his life-guard, miraculously preserving” Charles II “out of the hands of his enemies, he safely passed over into France to the queen his mother.”

¹³⁶ “The Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames,” “The Civil War in Kingston” (http://www.kingston.gov.uk/browse/leisure/museum/kingston_history/the_civil_war_in_kingston.htm).

¹³⁷ A sign I have seen on the base of this stone (encased in a low fence,) states the Saxon kings were: Edward the Elder, June 900; Athelstan, 4 Sept. 925; Edmund, 840; Edred, 16 Aug. 946; Edwy, Jan. 956; Edward the Martyr, 975; and Etheldred II the Unready, 14 April 979. I have also seen at the corner of Ashdowne Rd & Eden St., a colourful mosaic depicting the coronation of these kings.

Interestingly, Fuller says that “during his continuance beyond the seas, great were the proffers” or offers “tendered unto him” for “forsaking the Protestant religion, but” “such” was “his constancy,” that the Papists “could” not “make” him “warp from his” Protestant “principles.” (This is one of the facts that needs to be taken into account when considering what appears to be the later false claims of James II, that Charles II made a death-bed conversion to Popery). Hence Fuller concludes by saying, “at length” Charles II’s Protestant “piety and patience were rewarded by God, with a happy restitution to his undoubted dominions; and he, after a long and tedious exile, landed at Dover, May 26, 1660, to the great joy of the three kingdoms” of England, Ireland, and Scotland¹³⁸.”

King Charles chose to mark his 30th birthday, by gallantly and triumphantly entering the City of London on 29 May 1660. 29 May thereafter annually became the celebrated *Charles II’s Day*. This is unusual since a monarch’s comparable celebration would normally be on *Accession Day* of a reigning monarch, which for Charles II would be 30 January. Hence in the published *Diary* (1825) of the naval administrator, Samuel Pepys (1603-1703), we read “the 29 of May, the King’s birthday,” is “a day of thanksgiving for our redemption from tyranny and the King’s return to Government, he entering London that day.”

Historical records tell us that on 29 May 1660, thousands of gentlemen rode on horseback, brandishing their swords as King Charles’ escort. Flowers were strewn on the ground in front of him, tapestries hung in the streets, church bells joyously rang out, magistrates and others entitled to wear ceremonial dress came out so clothed, trumpets played music, and thousands upon thousands of people thronged the streets to greet the king. So great was the press of people, that it took King Charles some seven hours, from 2 p.m. to 9 p.m., to make his way through the streets of London. In recording this, an English gentleman and well known author, John Evelyn (1620-1706), says in *Evelyn’s Diary*, “It was the Lord’s doing;” and clearly other agreed with this view¹³⁹.

On the one hand, it must be admitted that the end of Charles II’s reign was marked by some unfortunate irregularities, which have been much exaggerated by Puritans. But on the other hand, as the names, *The King’s Restoration Day*, *Restoration Day*, *Restoration of the Royal Family* (used on the 1664-1859 prayer book office), or *Royal Oak Day* or *Oak Apple Day*, make clear, the focus of *Charles II’s Day* is very much on God’s providential protection of the monarchy, and its Restoration in 1660. The day thus properly focuses on the Restoration in 1660, not Charles II’s later life.

The popular names for *Charles II’s Day* as *Royal Oak Day* or *Oak Apple Day*, focus on the providential protection of Charles II during the civil war. Charles II was defeated by Cromwell at Dunbar, Scotland, in 1650, and then later defeated at Worcester,

¹³⁸ Freeman, J (Editor), Fuller’s *The Worthies of England* (1661), p. 384.

¹³⁹ Chambers, R., *The Book of Days*, in 2 volumes, W & R Chambers, London & Edinburgh, UK, 1862-4, Calendar at 29 May. Some other information on Oak Apple Day is also taken from this work.

England, in 1651. The gleeful Cromwell then organized a massive 40 day man-hunt to capture the 21 year old boy-king, whose birth had been mysteriously marked by the appearance of a day-star. Cromwell's brutal Puritan Republican Revolutionary forces frantically crisscrossed the length and breadth of England to try and capture Charles II at all costs, but to the chagrin of Cromwell's republican forces, Charles slipped through Cromwell's death-net and went into interregnum on the Continent, till his triumphal return in 1660.

The name, *Royal Oak Day*, comes from this period of Cromwell's 40 day dragnet of death. What became known as, "The Royal Oak," is near Boscobel House at Shropshire, in the western Midlands of England. It was the scene of a most remarkable Caroline story. As Cromwell's forces sought Charles II in 1651, Charles hid in a bushy oak forest in Shropshire, while the Puritan Revolutionaries combed all around seeking to find him. This story greatly captured the imagination of the people, and the story of the Royal Oak became part of English and Anglican cultural history in connection with *Charles II's Day*. So much so, that it gave rise to the popular name for the day as *Royal Oak Day* or *Oak Apple Day*. A number of taverns / inns / hotels have used this as their logo; some of which have historically used a picture of an oak tree with a crowned figure sitting amidst the oak's branches, and some Roundhead dragoons searching around. This conforms to the "Memorandum" recorded by the Diarist, Samuel Pepys that, "while we were in this Tree we see soldiers going up and down in the thickest of the Wood, searching for persons escaped, we seeing them now and then peeping out of the Woods¹⁴⁰." Thus e.g., in 1862-4, (some 3-5 years after the day was removed from the Calendar of the prayer book in 1859,) Chambers reports annual celebrations of *Charles II's Day* in various "towns and villages in rural England," and says "the Maypoles are still decorated and danced around on the 29th of this month [of May]." More generally, he says, "The Royal Oak is also a common alehouse sign" in various parts of England, "on which the Merry Monarch is pictured peeping through branches at the Roundheads below¹⁴¹."

On the day, a spray of oak in the hat also came to be sometimes used, as the sign of a loyalist and royalist. Traditional clothing symbols may also include the wearing of oak apples (in certain parts of England oak apples are sometimes called, "shick-shacks," and hence the less common name, *Shick-Shack Day*), or the wearing of sprigs of oak leaves.

As already noted, the inclusion of *Royal Oak Day* at the end of May, built on the pre-existing festivities of May evident in the May Fair, so that the month of May when the warmer weather was coming on in merry old England, would both start (May Fair) and end (Royal Oak Day) with a very merry bang! The May Fair celebrations at the

¹⁴⁰ Matthews, W. (Editor), *Charles II's Escape from Worcester*, A Collection of Narratives Assembled by Samuel Pepys, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

¹⁴¹ Chambers' *Book of Days*, *op. cit.*, Calendar at 29 May. "Oak Apple Day," *Wikipedia* (2008) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oak_Apple_Day).

beginning of May, and the Royal Oak Day celebrations at the end of May, in which flowers were put on the May Pole for both occasions, might involve some fun'n'games, but raising the Maypole could potentially involve some level of hazard. This is seen in the following (fictional) story..

There was an Englishman, an Irishman, and a Scotsman. They all met in London just after the Restoration in the 1660s. The Englishman had been one of the *King's Soldiers* during the civil war and was now an ex-civil war royalist Anglican soldier from the *Church of England*. The Irishman had been one of the *King's Soldiers* during the civil war and was now an ex-civil war royalist Anglican soldier from the *Church of Ireland*. The Scotsman was unrepresentative of the general Royalist sentiment of most Scottish Puritans; and he had supported the mainly English Puritan republican view. He was an ex-republican civil war Puritan soldier, who as a Roundhead had fought against royalist Puritan Scotsman under Charles II at Dunbar, Scotland, in 1650; and he also fought against the Royalist Scottish Puritan army under Charles II at Worcester in 1651.

The three met in the London suburb of Mayfair (near Hyde Park and Buckingham Palace). They gathered together with their children around the Maypole at the start of May in the May Day Fair celebrations. The adults agreed to place hide'n'seek with the children. The two Anglican adults and one Puritan adult, hid inside some large sugar bags. An Anglican child came in and pushed the first bag with an Anglican Englishman inside saying, "Shick-shack, sugar sack," and the adult went, "woof-woof," and thinking it was a dog, the child moved on. He then pushed the second bag containing an Anglican Irishman, saying "Shick-shack, sugar sack," and the adult went, "mee-ow mee -ow," and thinking it was a cat, the child moved on. Then he pushed the third bag, saying "Shick-shack, sugar sack," - and the Puritan Roundhead Scotsman yelled, "apples, apples"

... *Three to four weeks later in the merry month of May*

Near the end of May, some Londoners in the London suburb of Maypole (near Sidcup), decided to renew the flowers on top of the Maypole, for *Royal Oak Day*. Present in the area was an ex-royalist Anglican civil war Cavalier who had fought for, and an ex-republican Puritan civil war Roundhead who had fought for against, Charles I and / or Charles II. "We're goin' have to take the Maypole down, and raise it again with new flowers on top," the town organizer said.

As part of "the fun'n'games of May under the Maypole," the town organizer said to the two, that in order to stop the flowers falling off, he wanted the old Cavalier Anglican to hold onto one side of the top of Maypole with one hand, and the flowers with the other; and so likewise, on the other side of the top Maypole, the ex-Roundhead Puritan. They could then slide down the hoisted Maypole from the top in safety. "Do you think you two are up to it?" "Certainly," said the ex-royalist Anglican soldier. Grumbling, the ex-republican Puritan soldier said, "I don't like *Charles I's Day* or *Charles II's Day*, but I suppose this is part of the price we must pay for having ultimately lost;" and so agreed.

The rest of the townsfolk gathered around to see if the two could do it, as the Maypole was hoisted back into position. But as the Maypole was about three-quarters of the way up, the men hauling it up called out, "It's too heavy, one of you will have to jump off." As both men looked down to the ground, the town organizer called out, "It's a fair way, and the one who jumps will find it painful, but it's not dangerous, you won't permanently injure yourself. ... But there's a fair bit of mud down here, so whoever jumps will probably get pretty dirty."

Understandably, neither man wanted to undergo the pain, or get the mud all over him, and so they argued with each other for a while as to who should jump. Finally, the old Cavalier said, "Let's sing a song for a break." "Great idea!" exclaimed the ex-Roundhead, "I'll gladly agree to that!" Then the old Cavalier said, "Let's start singing, 'If you're a happy old Roundhead and you know it, clap your hands.'" With a big smile on his face, the Roundhead Puritan sang this, and then held out both of his hands as wide as he could in order to clap

7d) *Royal Oak Hotels.*

"The Royal Oak" is the third most common name of pubs / ale-houses / hotels in England. E.g., in London, there are Royal Oak Hotels at Kennington Lane, London SE11; or at Tabbard St, London, SE1.

While I do not support the excess of alcohol consumption which is drunkenness, and other ungodliness that sometimes goes on in such places, nevertheless, not all persons who go to a pub, go to excess, and some pubs are better than others in terms of their general atmosphere. My father's full name is Norman Keith de Mainson McGrath, and the "de Mainson" comes from one of my two-times great grandfathers, Robert de Mainson (1815-1890)¹⁴², who died at Urana, New South Wales, Australia. He was a publican.

An interesting "barmaid" or "wine-woman" appears in the *Sumerian King List*¹⁴³. The principal Sumerian king lists says there were 134 kings from the Flood to the eleventh king of Isin in 2,201 B.C. totaling 28,876 years (although an alternative tablet gives 139 kings and 25,063 years). This yields a Flood date of 31,077 B.C. (or on the alternative tablet, 27,264 B.C.). The king list then says that before the Flood there were ten antediluvian kings from Alorus reigning 120 *sars*, and a *sar* is 3,600 years so this is usually calculated to 432,000 years¹⁴⁴. This figure is usually regarded as unreliable and

¹⁴² Robert de Mainson's daughter, Eliza de Mainson, married Martin McGrath, and their son, Norman McGrath, is my father's father.

¹⁴³ Jacobsen, T., *The Sumerian King List*, Chicago University Press, Illinois, USA, 1939, third impression, 1966.

¹⁴⁴ Bury, J.B. *et al* (Editors), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 1923, 2nd edition, 1924, Vol. 1, pp. 150,152,365.

if solar years are meant it is certainly disallowed by the anthropological data. *But if the ten kings are understood as ten dynasties of kings, and if the pre-flood chronology is understood to be in lunar years rather than solar years, the Sumerian pre-flood dates become more credible.* Notably, a *sar* of 3,600 years is easily divisible by 12 lunar months, making about 300 solar years. Thus 432,000 lunar years is approximately 36,000 solar years or (multiplying 36,000 by 360 and dividing by 365.2442) more precisely 35,483 years and some months. When added to the Sumerian flood date of 31,077 B.C., this would date the first Sumerian king, Alorus, to 66,560 B.C. (or on the alternative flood date tablet, 62,747 B.C.). This is just short of the Persian Gulf's recession in about 68,000 B.C., which I consider is probably connected with the end of the geographically local pre-Adamic flood referred to in the geographically local creation of Eden in six 24 hour days in Gen. 1:2b-2:3.

As an old earth creationist, I stand united with my fellow creationists who uphold creation not macroevolution¹⁴⁵. Like most other historical records we have, the Sumerian King List is non-inspired history. Nevertheless, I think there is a good chance that this Sumerian king list is reliable at least in broad terms¹⁴⁶. It is certainly notable that there is a good correlation between its dates, as interpreted above, and such events as the first known appearances of man in post-flood times, or the recession of the Persian

¹⁴⁵ McGrath, G.B. (myself), "Intelligent Design from an Old Earth Creationist Perspective," *Perspectives on Science & Christian Faith* (PSCF), Vol. 58, No. 3 (Sept. 2006), pp. 252-253; and "The Gap [School View] in [Genesis 1 on] Creation," PSCF, Vol. 59, No. 4 (Dec. 2007), pp. 318-9; McGrath, G.B. (myself), "Old Earth Creationists," *English Churchman* (7779) (6 & 13 Nov. 2009), p. 2; McGrath, G.B. (myself), "Old Earth Creation," *English Churchman* (7782) (18 & 25 Dec. 2009), p. 2; McGrath, G.B. (myself), "Response to John Collins," PSCF, Vol. 63, No. 1 (March 2011), p. 71.

¹⁴⁶ Hebrew genealogies are not necessarily complete. E.g., in Matt. 1:4-6, Nahshon (Naasson) dates from the pre-Conquest period (Num. 1:7; 2:3; 7:12,17; 10:14), Rahab (Rachab) from the Conquest period (Josh. 2:1,3; 6:17,23,25), and Boaz (Booz) and Ruth from the Judges period (Ruth 1:1). This means that a number of generations are omitted over a period of about 400 years. "Ruth" was a "Moabitess" (Ruth 1:22), and it seems that at least ten generations have here been omitted (Deut. 23:2,3). Or in Matt. 1:8, between "Joram" (Jehoram) and "Ozias" (Uzziah), three generations are omitted i.e., Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah (II Kgs 8-15; II Chron. 21-26). Matt. 5 & 11 also fits this pattern as seen in comparison of Gen. 11:12,13 with Luke 3:35,36 (Cainan). If the Hebrew phrase, "And Arphaxad lived five and thirty years, and begat Salah" (Gen. 11:12), in fact means "Arphaxad" "begat" *the forbear of* "Salah," then this same phraseology throughout Gen. 5 & 11 means that *prima facie* there may be other omissions of names, even though context sometimes requires an absence of gaps e.g., there must be an absence of gaps between Shem and Arphaxad, since Arphaxad was born "two years after the flood" (Gen. 11:10); and there is also clearly no gap between Terah and Abraham (Gen. 11:26,27). Likewise, context rules out gaps between Adam and Seth (Gen. 4:25-5:4), and between Lamech and Noah (Gen. 5:28-31).

Gulf shortly before its commencement in antediluvian times. Of course, from the Christian's Biblical perspective, we define man as including a soul and hence tangible spiritual expression (the fantasies by secular anthropologists about red ochre with Mungo Male, *infra*, are supercilious), and this yields us a later date than secular anthropologists, who sometimes refer to non-human satyr beasts as "man" or "human."

I think this Sumerian society existed in an area now under the waters of the Persian Gulf, and that with the flooding of the Persian Gulf progressively at the end of the last ice-age, a number of these earlier civilizations moved up into the now warmer region of Mesopotamia. I thus disagree with the normative secular interpretation which claims that these civilizations just appeared from nowhere in Mesopotamia following the end of the last ice age, i.e., generally from *c.* 8,000 B.C. (with some earlier evidence of some such small scale movements). The discrepancy between the rival Sumerian King Lists illustrates both that perfectly accurate records were not kept by the Sumerians, and also that the approximate dates given in both tablets are fairly close and therefore these rough dates may be said to have been independently corroborated. The discrepancy between the two Sumerian flood dates of 31,077 B.C. and 27,264 B.C. is in the order of about 4,000 years, and applying this both ways, means the Sumerian records indicate a flood date of *c.* 31,000 B.C., +/- 4,000 years.

Within this range of dates from *c.* 27,000 to 35,000 B.C., I would regard the upper end of *c.* 35,000 B.C. as the more likely flood date; given the anthropological evidence for Cro-Magnon being Adamite, and his appearance *c.* 33,000 B.C. . Hence e.g., I regard the robust skeletal group coming to Australia, perhaps as early as 23,000 B.C., are the Adamites that Australoid Australian Aborigines are descended from; and that they did not inter-marry with, but completely replaced the gracile skeletal satyr beasts such as Mungo Male and Mungo Female who date to *c.* 38,000 B.C., and were a non-human (non-Adamite) group of satyr beasts seemingly wiped out by the arrival of the Elamite-Dravidian (Gen. 10:22) derived Australian Aborigines from India about 25,000 years ago.

Interestingly then, in the *Sumerian King List* at either 31,546 years or 32,143 years after the flood, i.e., *c.* 3,000 B.C., we read that, "In Kish, ... a barmaid / wine-woman / female wine seller," became queen for 100 years¹⁴⁷. The antiquity of the publican is thus here attested to.

¹⁴⁷ Jacobsen's *Sumerian King List*, *op. cit.*, p. 105. Given that God divided the world into many racial "families" and "tongues" in Genesis 10 (Gen. 10:5,20,31); the statement of Gen. 11:1 that "the whole earth was of one language," must therefore refer to the local "earth" of a regional world. That world is clearly centered in the Middle East since the story relates to how "Babel" got its name (Gen. 11:9). Therefore Gen. 11:1-9, teaches that a Middle Eastern Semitic group in the general region of Babylon i.e., Mesopotamia, descended from Shem and Arphaxad, speaking a common language, was split into Babylonian and Hebrew (and possibly one or more other local tongues) at the Tower of Babel. It seems to me that the common tongue referred to in Gen. 11:1 must therefore have been Sumerian; and that these events occurred in the 3rd millennium B.C. under Sargon I (Nimrod) at Birs Nimrud. I.e., like Kish (where there was a local flood in

Moreover, the great 1260 day-year prophecy terminates in its greater fulfillment (on inclusive reckoning from 607,) in 1866. This is the era of God's judgment of the Papal states foretold in Dan. 7, where the Pope loses his temporal power from 1860-1870 (although there is a healing of his "deadly wound" in 1929 with the creation of the Vatican-City State, Rev. 13:3). 1866 saw the martyrdom of Protestants at Barletta, Italy, as part of the "dragon" being "wroth with the woman" (Rev. 12:17). Of the five Protestant martyrs, one was the oil and wine merchant, Domenico Croscolicchio. This martyr is one of a select group who form a special focus in the events of the 1860-70 "judgment" (Dan. 7:26), and remind us that while drunkenness is condemned in Holy Scripture, the moderate consumption of alcohol is not.

Interestingly then, a general background cultural memory of "Royal Oak" also occurs in Canada with the Royal Oak Pubs, a chain of ale-houses of this name, mainly in Ottawa. So likewise in Australia. E.g., in the state of my birth, Victoria, in which Prince Charles received some of his education at Geelong Grammar School (Timbertop campus), one finds Royal Oak Hotels (Ballarat Central, Port Fairy, Glen Waverley, Kilmore, Cheltenham, Fitzroy North, & Oakleigh East). Or in South Australia, one finds e.g., at Clarendon (in the Adelaide Hills, c. 30 kilometers or c. 18 miles south of Adelaide), the *Royal Oak Hotel*, whose logo is the Royal Oak tree¹⁴⁸.

I have lived most of his life in the State of New South Wales, and one finds a Sydney inn that for many years I have driven past from time to time on the Windsor Road, now called, "The Mean Fiddler Inn," which was formerly called, "The Royal Oak Inn" (known as the Royal Oak Inn 1846-1858 & 1976-1996) (Corner of Commercial & Windsor Rds, Rouse Hill). As a legacy of when it was the Royal Oak Inn, the Mean Fiddler Inn then had a connected restaurant, known as the Royal Oak Restaurant, however this was closed in mid 2008. But as an ongoing legacy of the name, "Royal Oak," it now has "The Royal Oak Grill" inside its establishment. (The Royal Oak Grill

2,600 B.C. symbolically typing the much earlier Noah's Flood), Birs Nimrud was part of Greater Babylon or "Babel" (Gen. 10:10, 11:9).

¹⁴⁸ This hotel was built in the mid 19th century. Its location at Clarendon, reminds us that under the *Clarendon Code* of 1661-5; 1672 & 1678, there were several Acts passed in England under the 1st Earl of Clarendon, Edward Hyde (1609-1674), depriving Puritans of their religious freedoms. These provisions were relieved by the Toleration Act (1689); although in their revised and softened form, elements of the Clarendon Code, such as the Test Acts first found in the Clarendon Code's *Corporation Act* (1661), forbidding municipal office to those not taking Anglican Communion; remained in place to uphold the Anglican Christian State till the 19th century, when Protestant Christianity in general, and Reformed, Evangelical, and Protestant Anglicanism in particular, ceased to be upheld both inside the Anglican Church, and more widely in the society.

is c. 1.6 km or 1 mile from the 1804 Vinegar Hill Memorial at Castle Hill in Sydney, *supra.*)

“The Royal Oak Grill” is advertised on its main sign outside. The older sandstone part of this establishment dates back to 1826, and the old main door faces the main road, surrounded by white wooden fence. Across the front in large letters, to advertise it from the street, one sees the words “The Mean Fiddler.” If one looks at the veranda side on, outside the old front-door, one sees the sign, painted on both sides with a picture of the Royal Oak with the words, “THE ROYAL OAK Since 1826.” This depiction of the Royal Oak is appropriate given its ongoing connection with the Royal Oak Grill.

On the 350th anniversary of the Restoration (1660-2010), on Saturday 29 May 2010, I visited and later dined at the restaurant known as the *Royal Oak Grill*, at Rouse Hill. I wore in my lapel a twig from one of the oak trees of the Royal Kew Gardens in London, which is where the oak leaves come from for the Oak Apple Day Parade at the Royal Chelsea Hospital. By tradition oak leaves are worn at Royal Oak Day celebrations, but oak leaves die fairly quickly, whereas an oak twig does not. Hence while about half a dozen oak twigs I got from various oak trees at the Royal Kew Gardens in February 2009 are able to survive, by contrast, oak leaves obviously would not. At Kew Gardens I also saw Kew Palace, which was formerly owned by George III, *the King who won Australia*. The gardens also have a glass house, with such ‘strange’ and ‘exotic’ exhibits from the other side of the planet as the Australian *sugar cane*, and the ‘extraordinary’ *swamp lily* from Queensland in Australia. (I hope my sarcasm in the last sentence is understood by a non-Australian reader.) My textual commentary website photos connected with the dedication of this Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) includes reference to the *Royal Oak Grill* on the occasion of the 350th anniversary of the Restoration in 2010.

This year, on Saturday 28 May, I had lunch at the Royal Oak Restaurant at Cessnock, in rural New South Wales in which I wore the traditional oak leaves in my coat lapel. (Photos of this may be found at my website.)¹⁴⁹ That date is in harmony with the tradition found at Castleton in Derbyshire, England, in which *Royal Oak Day* is remembered on 29 May unless in a given year it falls on a Sunday, in which instance it is then transferred back to Saturday the 28th of May. I would not normally so remember it on all these different days, but I have done so this year of 2011 for purposes of relevance to the Dedication of Volume 3 of the Textual Commentaries (Matt. 21-25) on *Royal Oak Day*, in order to highlight these various traditions of Saturday 28 May when 29 May is a Sunday, 29 May irrespective of what date it falls on, and 1st / 2nd Thursday of June.

¹⁴⁹ See pictures on the website in connection with this Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) of my Textual Commentaries; available on the internet via Yahoo and Google at “Gavin McGrath Books,” or direct at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.

Within Sydney there is also the *Royal Oak Hotel*, Church Street, Parramatta (not far from where I live), which I have driven past many times over many years. Established in 1813, it contains a picture of the Royal Oak on its corner (it is a corner pub), reminding us of where Charles II hid, and also a coach, reminding us of his getaway by land. By contrast, the *Royal Oak Hotel*, College Street, Balmain, established in 1881, uses pictures of great sailing boats, reminding us of Charles II flight across the sea to France, and later Holland, and also his return by sea to Dover in 1660.

It must be clearly stated that this type of popular culture remembrance of the Royal Oak in Royal Oak Pubs, is like the popular culture's celebration of e.g., Easter or Bonfire Day. It may be a very worldly, base, and carnal form of what at its heart is actually a Christian event. Just like some people think of Bonfire Day as no more than, "a day to let off some fireworks, or watch some fireworks;" so likewise, some people think of a Royal Oak Hotel simply as a place to engage in such worldly lusts as gluttony, drunkenness, rock'n'roll music, and other worldly vices. The general run-of-the-mill person who goes to a Royal Oak Hotel, like the general run-of-the-mill person who in some worldly way celebrates Christmas Day or Bonfire Day, does not comprehend or understand the true Christian message underpinning these remembrances. Some years ago I knew an Evangelical Protestant involved in "pub ministry." He used to go to such hotels, seeking an opportunity of proclaiming the gospel. I wish such evangelists, and all true Christian evangelists, well.

Thus the memory of the royal oak is usually found in Hotels *exclusively* in their name; and beyond this they would generally be no different to any other hotel. Thus a Hotel or Restaurant bearing the name, "Royal Oak," may be good, bad, or indifferent, with respect to its food, drink, or clientele. Certainly I have had the displeasure of seeing some Royal Oak Hotels whose clientele were shockingly gross, although I have also seen others that were better. So too, Royal Oak Restaurants vary in standard.

As one who has briefly inspected a number of Royal Oak Hotels, e.g., the Royal Oak Hotel in Lidcombe, Sydney (established c. 1884), which seemingly uses one of the ships Charles II's escaped / returned to England on as its logo, it must be frankly admitted that these pubs do not in general internally differ from any other pub. E.g., other than any internal reference to the hotel's name or logo, for instance, some of the glasses of the Royal Oak Hotel at Parramatta contain on them a picture of the Royal Oak, with the words, "Royal Oak Hotel" above this logo, and "Parramatta" underneath it; I have *as a general rule* not seen anything particularly Caroline on the inside of Royal Oak hotels, for instance, a picture of Charles II. Although when I was at Lewes, Sussex, England, for their celebrations on the Eve of Bonfire Day (4 Nov. 2008), and then the Bonfire Night celebrations on Bonfire Day itself (5 Nov., 2008), I saw the Royal Oak Hotel at Lewes, which uses as its outside logo a Caroline picture. Other Royal Oak Hotels I have seen include e.g., one at Sevenoaks (Seven Oaks) in England (Oct. '08).

An exception to this general rule occurred when in October 2008, I inspected the Royal Oak Hotel at Bishop's Wood, Shropshire, England, near Boscobel House where Charles II hid in the oak tree. This pub was generally like any other pub on the inside,

but it had a large framed newspaper sheet, headlined, “Royal Oak Tercentenary,” telling about the 1651-1951 celebrations. This included some associated information about Charles II and his 1651 hiding in the nearby Royal Oak at Boscobel House, which is only about a mile or so from this Royal Oak pub. Likewise, at the Royal Oak Restaurant at Cessnock in rural New South Wales where I had lunch on Saturday 28 May 2011 (in harmony with the Castleton tradition of Royal Oak Day, *supra*); there is a couple of potted oak trees at the garden entrance as a reminder of the royal oak. And inside, as a link to the wider Royal Oak establishments, they also have a photo of an English Royal Oak Hotel and / or Restaurant on the wall from Potton in Bedfordshire (which is about 10 miles or about 16 kilometres eastward from Bedford).

But this type of thing is unusual; and far more commonly, if one sees the outside of such a place called “Royal Oak,” i.e., a “Royal Oak” hotel or restaurant, then one has probably seen all there is to see with respect to the memory of the royal oak at that place. The memory of the royal oak is usually just in the name and logo of the establishment. Thus in general, internally Royal Oak Hotels / Inns / Restaurants, just look like any other hotel / inn / restaurant. Hence e.g., at the Royal Oak, Lidcombe (Sydney), I saw the promotion of gambling vice; and of course, the vice of drunkenness often, *though certainly not always*, is connected with pubs; as is profane language and coarse conversation from the lips of a number of their unsaved patrons. By contrast, I have also seen much better Royal Oak establishments. And the same establishment may experience a certain amount of variation, depending on who is there at a given time.

Though I wish to put the reader under no illusions as to the bad side of many things that occur in many pubs, for all that, if I walk along e.g., the streets of Lidcombe in Sydney, and see the huge sign reading, “ROYAL OAK HOTEL,” I am still reminded of something grand. Tragically, all too many of these pubs are filled with spiritually “dead men’s bones.” But in fairness to them, when I walk the streets of Sydney and see a big sign reading, “ROYAL OAK,” and pictures on their buildings of the Royal Oak (such as at Parramatta, Sydney), or oak leaves (such as at Double Bay, Sydney), or the ship that Charles II escaped or returned in (such as at Lidcombe and Balmain, Sydney), then I have to admit, that they “indeed appear beautiful outward” (Matt. 23:27).

The presence of a number of Royal Oak Hotels in New South Wales, such as the Royal Oak Hotel at Cessnock and the Royal Oak Hotel at Tighes Hill; or in the NSW capital city of Sydney, the Royal Oak Hotel, Bay Street, Double Bay; are *background cultural reminders* of the story of the Royal Oak. And as in England where the Royal Oak is the third most common pub name, one can use this general background cultural reminder evident in these hotel names, as a piece of popular cultural (the unsaved are always with us this side of glorification, and we must do what we can to point them in the right direction), all of which helps keep the important memory of the Royal Oak alive.

In this sense, I maintain that when I see the name, “Royal Oak Hotel,” I see something grand, for I see a public celebration and reminder of the story of the Royal Oak. In this sense, Royal Oak Hotels are something like the more general public celebrations of Christmas Day, Bonfire Day, or St. Valentine’s Day. I.e., they still

bespeak something of great religious Christian truths, even if that speech is to some extent muted by the fact that those involved in a given celebration here or there, are largely, if not entirely, spiritually degenerate or dead. Good Christian reader. Dost thou take issue with me? Hast thou not learnt the Scripture, “I tell you that, if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out” (Luke 19:40)?

7e) *Royal Oak Streets and other place names.*

Royal Oak Restaurants Hotels are not the only general London reminder in place names of the Royal Oak, although they are one e.g., The Royal Oak, Columbia Rd, London, E2 (which when I saw it had a less well refined clientele at the courser end; reminding me of the Royal Oak Hotel at Lidcombe in Sydney, *supra*). Though on the basis of what I saw I would not recommend its services (although clientele may vary from day to day, and perhaps I just saw it on a bad day?), the Royal Oak in Columbia Rd, London, still gives a positive witness in its name, “Royal Oak;” and it is also near St. Leonard’s Shoreditch, an “Oranges and Lemons” Church, i.e., “‘When I get rich,’ said the bells of Shoreditch,” which when I passed it in January 2009 *en route* to seeing the Royal Oak in Columbia Rd, I noticed had a special letter box outside of it for “Oranges and Lemons mail”.

In London, England, there is a general memory made of the royal oak and Charles II evident in other place names. E.g., on the underground or tube line, the *Royal Oak Station* (Hammersmith & City line, London, W2); which when I went through in December 2008 *en route* to London’s nearby Hyde Park, I noticed was also near *Royal Oak House* (Cnr. Westbourne Gardens & Porchester Rd, London W2). Both of these are about 10 minutes walk from Hyde Park.

Of some special interest to me, is The Royal Oak Restaurant and Hotel in Tabard Street, London SE1 (about ½ a mile from London Bridge). Looking at the logo of “The Royal Oak” in January 2009, I saw a young Charles II standing on a branch of an oak tree, looking down around about him, and on the ground some of Cromwell’s republican soldiers searching around to try and find him. Historically, this is a classic picture for Royal Oak Restaurants and Hotels, although it is not now used as much as it once was.

There are also a number of relevant street names e.g., in walking the streets of London I have seen, Oakapple Court, London SE 12; Royal Oak Mews, London, SE1 (near London Bridge and Tower Bridge); Royal Oak Yard, London, SE1 (near St. Mary’s *Church of England*, which has some interesting old notices chiseled into its stonework at the front e.g., “This Church is open for Divine Service on Sunday at 11. The sacrament of the Lord’s Supper is administered on the first Sunday in each month”); and Royal Oak Court, London N1 (Shoreditch) (near St. John the Baptist *Church of England* School); “Charles II Place,” SW3, London; Charles II Street, SW1, London, *supra*.

Likewise in walking and driving around the streets of Sydney, Australia, there are a number of relevant street names I have come across. There is Royal Oak Drive, Alford

Point (south Sydney); and (not far from where I live,) Royal Oak Place, West Pennant Hills (western Sydney) (Sept. '08). Both of these streets border bushland or parkland on one of their sides. From Royal Oak Drive, Alford Point, (which is just a short detour off the main road if one is driving from Sydney to Nowra), there is a public access to adjoining bushlands going down to Mill Creek. In the case of Royal Oak Place, West Pennant Hills, the houses on one side of the adjoining bushland go down to Saw Mill Creek, which then joins Mills Creek. The public access to this bushland is a couple of streets away from Royal Oak Place (on the corner of Grangewood Place & Bron Court). Thus in both instances, these streets are somewhat reminiscent of Charles II's Royal Oak hiding place, including its link with a Mill¹⁵⁰. (Cf. 2, "The nexus between Charles I's Day and Charles II's Day," subsection, a, "General," *supra*.)

7f) *Royal Oak Naval Ships of the Fleet.*

The song of the United Kingdom's *Royal Navy* is well known and has a catchy tune. "Rule Britannia, Britannia rule the waves; for we will never ever ever see defeat."

In memory of the Royal Oak at Boscobel in which Charles II hid from the Puritan republican revolutionary army of Oliver Cromwell after the Battle of Worcester in 1651, seven ships of the Royal Navy have been called H.M.S. (His / Her Majesty's Ship) Royal Oak¹⁵¹. The *H.M.S. Royal Oak* tradition dates from the time of the Restoration under King Charles II.

These seven ships were:

1) *H.M.S. Royal Oak*, a 76 gun ship launched in 1664 under King Charles II (Regnal Years: King *de jure* of the three kingdoms, 1649-1685; King *de facto* of Scotland, 1649-1650/1; King *de facto* of England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1660-1685). Ship lost in battle in 1667.

2) *H.M.S. Royal Oak*, a 70 gun ship launched in 1664 under King Charles II, rebuilt in 1690 under King William III and Queen Mary II (Regnal Years: Joint reign 1689-1694, William sole reign, 1694-1702); rebuilt in 1713 under Queen Anne (Regnal Years: 1702-1714); rebuilt with 64 guns in 1741 under King George II (Regnal Years: 1727-1760). Used as a prison ship, 1756 & 1763. Broken up 1764.

¹⁵⁰ Matthews, W. (Editor), *Charles II's Escape from Worcester*, A Collection of Narrative Assembled by Samuel Pepys, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

¹⁵¹ "HMS Royal Oak," Wikipedia (2008) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/HMS_Royal_Oak) & "HMS Royal Oak (08)," Wikipedia (2008 & 2010) ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/HMS_Royal_Oak_\(08\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/HMS_Royal_Oak_(08))). An eighth 174 gun ship, provisionally to have been named, *HMS Royal Oak*, was then named *H.M.S. Renown* before being launched in 1798.

3) *H.M.S. Royal Oak*, a 74 gun ship launched in 1769 under King George III (Regnal Years: 1760-1820; regency from 1811), the *King who won Australia* and the *King who lost America*. Used as a prison ship, 1796. Renamed *H.M.S. Assistance* in 1805; and broken up 1815.

4) *H.M.S. Royal Oak*, a 74 gun ship launched in 1809 under King George III. On harbour service from 1825. Broken up in 1850.

5) *H.M.S. Royal Oak*, an ironclad frigate, some 3 years after *Royal Oak Day* was removed from the Anglican Calendar in 1859, launched in 1862 under Queen Victoria (Regnal Years: 1837-1901). Sold in 1885.

6) *H.M.S. Royal Oak*, a Royal Sovereign-class battleship, some 33 years after *Royal Oak Day* was removed from the Anglican Calendar in 1859, launched in 1892 under Queen Victoria. Scrapped in 1914.

7) *H.M.S. Royal Oak*, a Revenge-class battleship, some 55 years after *Royal Oak Day* was removed from the Anglican Calendar in 1859, launched on 1 May, 1914, under King George V (Regnal Years: 1910-1936), who also Reviewed London's *Oak Apple Day Parade* two years earlier in 1912. Commissioned in 1916, she first saw action in World War I (1914-1918), at the Battle of Jutland (1916, the largest naval battle of WWI). She was an early casualty of the Second World War (1939-1945), being the first British battleship sunk in World War Two, when while peacefully at anchor at Scarpa Flow in Orkney, Scotland, she was torpedoed and sunk by a Nazi German submarine in October 1939. One of the 375 survivors from the crew of 1,400 men, included the only Australian on board, Lieutenant Commander Cook of the Royal Australian Navy. The wreck of HMS *Royal Oak* is designated as a war grave of WWII.

These seven *H.M.S. Royal Oak* naval ships of the fleet, launched under various monarchs since the time of the Restoration under King Charles II, remind us of the fine and honorable traditions of the Royal Navy. As the "Royal" in "Royal Navy," or the "His Majesty's" or "Her Majesty's" in the name "*H.M.S. Royal Oak*" reminds us, these fine naval traditions are those of a royalist military force.

Of these seven *H.M.S. Royal Oak* naval ships, the most famous has been the Revenge-class battleship, appropriately launched in the month of May. The fact that she was the first naval casualty of World War Two has given her a special place of honour. The fact that her wreckage is now a designated war grave, reminds us that while we hold no contemporary grudges against Germans because of WWII, we of the Allied side still remember our war dead from World War Two e.g., of the 1,400 man crew, some 833, or c. 60% of the crew, were lost when HMS *Royal Oak* was sunk, made up of 24 Officers and 809 sailors who were killed at the time. So likewise, while we hold no contemporary grudges against our fellow Protestants in mainly English and Irish Puritan derived Christian Churches, nevertheless, the name, *H.M.S. Royal Oak*, reminds us that

we still remember our war dead from the civil war; and we thank God for the providential protection of Charles II in the Royal Oak.

Without malice to contemporary Germans, we remember that in World War Two the Allied pilots flying back to England rejoiced to look down and see they had safely reached the white cliffs of Dover. And so too, without malice to mainly contemporary English and Irish derived Puritans in general, and Congregationalists in particular; we remember that God persevered Charles II from Oliver Cromwell's murderous forces as he hid in the oak tree at Boscobel in 1651, and then in 1660 the Restorationists rejoiced to learn that in returning from France, Charles the Second had safely reached those white cliffs of Dover; and the people came out to throw flowers in front of him as he proceeded homeward to his London Palace.

7g) *Royal Oak Day Sermons.*

A general perusal of a dozen and a half Anglican *Royal Oak Day Sermons* over about a hundred years in the 17th and 18th centuries, is of value in better understanding the type of issues that might be dealt with in connection with *The King's Restoration Day* when it had an Office for 29 May in the Anglican Church¹⁵². These *Royal Oak Day Sermons* include such re-occurring themes as: thankfulness to God for the miraculous manner in which Almighty God supernaturally brought about the Restoration in 1660; the evil conduct of the Puritan revolutionary republicans and their tyranny in the 1640s and 1650s; comparable concerns about the dangers posed by Papists; Anglican Protestant hagiology of confessors and martyrs from the era of the Interregnum; and the legal Protestantism of the Restoration throne, sometimes placed in the wider context of monarchs since the Reformation starting with Henry VIII.

Spanning about a hundred years from 1661 to 1758, about three-quarters or *c.* 72% of these eighteen sermons (13/18) were preached before politicians, whether the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London (2/18), or Members of Parliament (9/18 House of Commons; 2/18 House of Lords). Half or 50% of them (9/18) were preached at St. Margaret's Westminster, which since 1614 in the time of King James I of the King James Bible of 1611, has been the church of Members of the House of Commons. These sermons before such important political figures remind us of better times, when godly lawmakers ruling over a white Caucasian / Japhethite (Gen. 9 & 10) Protestant Christian land (Ps. 2:10-12), monitored and benefited from, such things as *Royal Oak Day Sermons*. This was a two-way process between church and state, in which the church also monitored the state. What was the final authority in any dispute between church and state in this Protestant Christian State? God's Infallible Book!

In a sermon preached on Isa. 58:12 at Gloucester Cathedral on 29 May 1661, the Reverend Doctor Wishbourn says that Charles II was, "a prince whom the heavens honoured with a star at his birth This is that single person whom God . . . preserved

¹⁵² I may sometimes modernize spellings and punctuations in these sermons without specifically saying so.

... as the apple of this eye from the hand of that uncircumcised Philistine at Worcester,” with a sidenote identifying this “Philistine” as “Cromwell.” This sermon includes a specific reference to the “Royal Oak.” Dr. Wishbourn says Charles II “is that single person whom rebels abjured and devoted to destruction, but the Lord separated and set apart from the womb to be the repairer of all our breaches in Church and State, the restorer of paths to dwell in. Every one may now repose himself under the shade of this *Royal Oak*, and whereas the common prisons were of late years the ... places for legal subjects, now they may sit secure under their own vines and fig trees. *Dues nobis haec otia fecit*¹⁵³.”

The legal Protestantism of the throne is also referred to, as is Anglican hagiology with regard to Charles I. For Charles II, “bound himself to the mast of a well-grounded resolution, that no Romish sirens could draw him out of the ship of the *Church of England*, in which he was baptized and educated ..., he would be still the *Defender of the Faith*, ... therein following the example of ... his royal father, who to his death maintained the religion of the *Church of England*, and died a martyr, for the same ...¹⁵⁴.”

In 1684, the Dean of Worcester, Dean George Hicks, a Chaplain of Charles II, preaching at Worcester Cathedral and making reference to e.g., Daniel 4, referred to how “God’s Special Providence” used “invisible means,” via “visible, yet ... unlikely means,” so that “His Majesty ... was restored¹⁵⁵.” The wickedness of the Puritan revolutionary

¹⁵³ Latin, “*Dues (God) nobis (us) haec (these) otia (leisures) fecit (he hath made),*” i.e., “God hath made us these leisure” (Virgil, d. 19 B.C.; in *Eclogue* 1:6, written c. 42-37 B.C.). Though contextually Virgil could be referring to any god, the ambiguity of the Latin’s absence of a definite article, is historically exploited by Western Christians so using this type of quote, so as to contextually turn it in a reference to God. Thus in such a quote, one must distinguish the plenary meaning of “*deus*” in the Greco-Roman world of Virgil’s Imperial Rome; from the later Christianized meaning of “*Deus*” in such culturally Christianized and edited citations. For the wider text, see *Virgil’s Eclogues*, The Latin Text with a Verse Translation by Guy Lee, Liverpool Latin Texts (Classical & Medieval), Francis Cairns, School of Classics, Liverpool University, England, UK, 1980, p. 6.

¹⁵⁴ ‘*The Repairer of the Breach, A Sermon Preached at the Cathedral Church of Gloucester, May 29, 1661.* Being the Anniversary of His Majesty’s Birthday, & happy entrance into his imperial City of London. By Thomas Washbourn, D.D., Printed for William Leak, at the sign of the Crown in Fleet Street, between the two Temple Gates, London 1661. (British Library shelf mark: aaa.126.4475.)

¹⁵⁵ *A Sermon Preached at the Cathedral Church of Worcester on the 29th of May, 1684. Being the Anniversary Day of His Majesty’s Birth, & Happy Restoration.* By George Hicks, D.D., Dean of Worcester & Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty. Published jointly at the request of the Mayor & Aldermen of Worcester. Printed by RE for Walter Kettlby, at the Bishops Head in St. Paul’s Churchyard, London, John Jones Book Seller in Worcester, 1684, pp. 17,24,25. (British Library shelf mark: 694.f.5.)

republicans is also sometimes referred to. E.g., in Dean Hicks sermon, reference is also made to the Restoration as “relief, and vindication of oppressed innocence,” which “brings with it the just execution of public vengeance, upon the Nimrods of humans societies, the sons of violence, who live by oppression and prey;” for “God is naturally the Protector of innocent men, and righteous causes” such as the Restoration¹⁵⁶.

Another issue was the propaganda usage of the English Puritan Revolutionaries of the term “Protestant.” This problem remains to this day with mainly English and Irish Puritan derived propaganda seeking to cover the bloodthirsty actions of Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford under the guise of respectability by calling it “Protestant,” and indeed, generally by claiming not simply that it is “*a* Protestant” view, but claiming it “*the* Protestant” view, so as to “lock in” their hoodwinked minions. This is a stock standard technique of English Puritan revolutionary propaganda, which violates the ninth commandment (Exod. 20:16) by cloaking their brand of Puritanism under the much wider and embracing name of “Protestant.”

Consider, e.g., the bigoted anti-Anglican Irish Presbyterian, Thomas Hamilton, who first refers unsympathetically to Charles I’s murder, saying this “arch-persecutor,” “Charles I,” “lost” his “head” “by the axe,” so that “Charles” “died by the hand of the ... executioner” “in January, 1649¹⁵⁷.” But as a Presbyterian, he must then refer to “Pride’s Purge” in which Cromwell, who preferred the Congregational Church over other Puritan Churches, first had to get rid of the Presbyterians in the House of Commons who did not want the king killed, and so Hamilton somewhat begrudgingly has to record, “The Presbyterians of Ireland joined with their co-religionists in England in condemning and protesting this act. They did not hesitate to denounce it in plain terms as a murder¹⁵⁸.” Yet Hamilton’s sentiment is for murder, not only in his unsympathetic treatment of Charles I’s murder at the hand of the “executioner,” *supra*, but also with his immediate comments in his remarks following the “Irish Presbyterians Ministers” regarded Charles I’s death as “murder.” For he then first says, “Whatever our opinion of their rightness or wrongness,” i.e., he first allows for the opposing view that this murder was acceptable; and then he develops this by saying, “we cannot but admire the firmness with which these plain, sober men” i.e., the Puritan revolutionaries, “took their stand upon principle¹⁵⁹.” These men’s “principle” was on Hamilton’s own admission, “murder” of a “king,” and so no Biblically based Christian can “admire” such “men.” Let the reader note the difference in the sentiment of King David who said of King Saul’s murderer, not that he did “admire the firmness with which” he committed “murder” of a “king;” but rather, “How wast thou not afraid to stretch forth thine hand to destroy the Lord’s anointed? And David called one of the young men, and said, Go near, and fall upon him that he

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

¹⁵⁷ Hamilton’s *History of Presbyterianism in Ireland*, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 69-70.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 72.

died” (II Sam. 1:14,15). Having thus moved to one who is prepared to “admire” the way Cromwell *et al* did “murder” Charles I, Hamilton then further says that once “Cromwell ... felt the reins of power securely in his hands,” “he saw that the Presbyterians, though they and he did not agree on many points, were peaceable, well-disposed people not likely to give him much trouble. So the persecutions ceased.” “Thus encouraged, the Presbyterian Church recovered its strength” “in Ireland¹⁶⁰.”

The nineteenth century Irish Puritan Hamilton’s position is bad. But it is not *as bad* as the twentieth century English Puritan Close’s position. I shall not now repeat my treatment of Albert Close, for I have done so in a previous volume in which I refer to “the twentieth century Puritan derived Non-Conformist, Close, who most horribly seeks to justify the regicide of Charles I¹⁶¹.” This type of thing is also seen in the 1660-1859 Act of Parliament establishing 30 January as *King Charles I’s Day*, which says, “by this horrid action,” in which “His Majesty was brought unto a scaffold, and there publicly murdered,” “the Protestant religion hath received the greatest wound and reproach;” and the Puritan revolutionary republicans, “were as far from being true Protestants, as they were from being true subjects” of King Charles¹⁶².

Thus upon this recurring theme, in his 1684 *Royal Oak Day Sermon*, Dean George Hicks of Worcester says concerning such a pretense of the “Protestant Religion” by the Puritan Revolutionaries, “He that pretends religion towards God, and yet makes use of it as a cloak of maliciousness to cover his ... disloyalty to the King, that man’s religion, let him shew so much zeal for preserving the Protestant Religion, is Pharisical and vain¹⁶³.”

The nexus with *Charles I’s Day* is also present; although a broader reference is also made to Anglican Protestant hagiology with the English confessors and martyrs of the era from the *Church of England*. Thus the Dean says, “The faithful Royalists, and their Prince were destitute, afflicted, and tormented The voice of their blood, like that of righteous Abel’s, cried unto him from the ground, nay, *the soul of our Martyred Sovereign* ... cried, like the souls of the martyrs under the altar, ... ‘How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood?’ (Rev. 6:10). And when he

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

¹⁶¹ See Textual Commentary Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” section “(c) i) Charles the First’s Day (30 Jan), Charles the Second’s Day (or Royal Oak Day) (29 May), & Papists’ Conspiracy Day (5 Nov),” subsection, “Five illustrative issues: kneeling at Communion, ‘crucifixes,’ ‘altars,’ candles, & clerical dress.”

¹⁶² 12 Car. II, chapter 30 (1660 A.D.); so far as it enacted *King Charles I’s Day*, repealed in 22 Victoria, chapter 2 (1859 A.D.).

¹⁶³ *A Sermon Preached at the Cathedral Church of Worcester on the 29th of May, 1684*. By George Hicks, *op. cit.*, p. 35

had rested a little while, till the number of his faithful subjects ... of the *Church of England* ... should be slain, were fulfilled, then didst thou, O Lord, to whom vengeance belongeth, shew thyself, then didst thou lift up thyself, O thou judge of the earth. The Lord made himself to be known by the judgments which were executed upon the murderers of our Martyred Sovereign, whom, though they prospered so many years after, to the grief and astonishment of good men, yet vengeance [was] wonderfully pursued ...¹⁶⁴.” “I suppose there are ... to be found among you, the monuments of your former loyalty in the bloody Worcester fight, and I hope you will consider them as martyrs, and confessors, for our English liberties, ... for the king, and ... for the church¹⁶⁵.”

In this same year of 1684, in which Dean George Hicks of Worcester preached the previous sermon; another *Royal Oak Day Sermon* was preached by a Dean on the same day of 29 May 1684, this one by the Dean of Westminster, the Reverend Dr. Sprat, before the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London at the Church of St. Mary-Le-Bow (near St. Paul’s Cathedral), London¹⁶⁶. Dean Sprat referred to the phenomenon of “atheists in religion, to whom nothing was sacred, who made all ... profane¹⁶⁷.” Were not these “monsters in morality, to whom nothing was unlawful, all things common? Republicans in opinion, to whom ... seemed ... the mildest monarchy ... tyranny? Men” of “black designs.” “Men whom rebellion once prosperous had taught to be rebellious.” By contrast, referring to I Peter 2:17, the good Dean says we should, “in Scripture language, ... ‘Honour the King’.” And in addition to the dangers posed by Puritans such as these English Puritan revolutionaries, Dean Sprat further warns “of those impious arts” of “the Jesuits,” and thus the dangers of Romanism¹⁶⁸.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

¹⁶⁶ An “Oranges and Lemons” Church, referred to in the words, “I’m sure I don’t know, said the great bells of Bow.” Burnt down due to Nazi bombing in World War Two, the bell tower was saved, and I have inspected St. Mary-Le-Bow.

¹⁶⁷ With respect to such “atheism” and the revolutionaries, see the associated issue of Deism or a vaguely defined Theism with regard to “they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation” in Rom. 13:2, in “Impact of Oliver Cromwell on American Revolution & more widely the secular state,” *supra*.

¹⁶⁸ *A Sermon Preached before the Right Honourable Sir Henry Tulse, Lord Mayor, and the Court of Aldermen, and the citizens of the City of London, on May the 29th, 1684.* Being the Anniversary Day of His Majesty’s Birth, and happy Restoration to his Kingdoms. By Thomas Spratt, D.D., Dean of Westminster, one of His Majesty’s Chaplains in Ordinary. Printed for Jacob Tonson, at the Judge’s Head in Chancery Lane, near Fleet Street, London, 1684, pp. 34-5, 40, 44. (*Early English Books on Line*, British Library.)

Thankfulness to God for the miraculous element of the Restoration is referred to by the Reverend Doctor Francis Herbut, in a sermon preached before the Members of the House of Commons at St. Margaret's Westminster on 29 May 1701. He said that "since the Age of Miracles ceased ... when the testimony of the Gospel was fully sealed," i.e., after the New Testament was written, "the chief way in which God has been pleased to give extraordinary indications of his power and providence, has been by such 'signs of the times'" (Matt. 16:3) as the "Government" of the Restoration¹⁶⁹.

In a sermon preached at St. Mary's Woolwich in London in 1715, the Reverend Mr. Samuel Asplin, refers to "the Grand Rebellion," as "a rebellion so black, that it not only murdered the Father of this country, ... but it was carried on for well nigh twenty years [1640s and 1650s] by the remorseless rage of a foul ill-bred tyrant, and by a faction that ... whined themselves into ten thousand murders and persecutions. As often as I read over the miserable scene of things in those days of Cromwellism, villainy, and ravage; when hell itself had broke loose, ... I cannot but wonder at the temper of the good old Royalists, when God, by a miraculous turn of Providence, restored them to peace and Kingly Government." And quoting (sometimes freely) Ps. 126:1,2,5, he further says, "Then it was, 'when the Lord turned again the captivity of' our 'Sion.' Our ancestors 'were like' unto 'them that dream.' 'Then said they among the heathen,' that is, those rebels that had harassed and oppressed them, 'the Lord hath done great things for them.' Their mouths were 'filled with laughter, and' their tongues with 'joy'¹⁷⁰."

As previously discussed¹⁷¹, on 29 May in c. 1717, Willoughby Mynors (b. c. 1690) preached a *Royal Oak Day Sermon* on Ezra 9:13,14. The Sydney University library catalogue gives this an estimated date of "1715?" But the content of this sermon refers to what was then a recent Jacobite Rebellion. Following the *Battle of the Boyne* in 1688, in connection with the Jacobites there was a failed French invasion in 1708, the *Fifteen Rebellion* of 1715, and the 1719 rebellion. (Later came *The Forty-Five Rebellion*

¹⁶⁹ *A Sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons at St. Margaret's Westminster, May the 29th 1701, Being the anniversary for the Restoration of King Charles the Second.* By Francis A. Herbut, D.D., & Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty. Printed for T. Bennet, at the Half-Moon in St. Paul's Churchyard. London, 1701, p. 7. (British Library shelf mark: 694.f.5.)

¹⁷⁰ *A Sermon Preached in the Parish Church of St. Mary Woolwich in Kent* [Woolwich was part of Kent before 1889, when the County of London was formed] *on Sunday May 29 1715.* Being the Day of Thanksgiving, for putting an end to the Great Rebellion; and for the Restoration of the King & the Royal Family. By Samuel Asplin, M.A., Curate of Woolwich. Printed by G. James, for G. Sawbridge at the Three Golden Flower de Luces in Little Britain, London, 1715, pp. 3-5. (British Library shelf mark: 694.f.5.)

¹⁷¹ See "2c," "Traditional Diocese of Sydney Low Church Evangelicalism, NOT Puritan and semi-Puritan trends from 1970s," and "3," "The 'Father' Huddleston Saga," *supra*.

of 1745, put down at the famous *Battle of Culloden* in 1746.) Thus while the Jacobite Rebellion referred to by Willoughby Mynors could *prima facie* be either the 1715 or 1719 rebellion, the fact that he refers to only one, not two, would indicate to me that he preached this sermon after the *Fifteen Rebellion* of 1715, but before a west Scottish Jacobite rebellion of 1719 aided by Spain which collapsed at Glenshiel. The *Fifteen Rebellion* of 1715 started after 29 May 1715, and so I give an approximate date for this sermon as *c.* 1717. It is also clear from e.g., his reference to the Articles of Article 35 of the Anglican 39 Articles as “our Homilies” that he is an Anglican preacher. But what was the location of what he calls, “the house of God”? This is not known, although we know that around this same approximate time he preached a sermon on 15 March 1716 at St. Mary’s *Church of England* at Whitechapel in London¹⁷²; and also one on 10 June 1716 at St. Pancras *Church of England* at Middlesex in London¹⁷³. Did Willoughby Mynors preach this *Royal Oak Day Sermon* at one of these two churches, or elsewhere?

In this *c.* 1717 *Royal Oak Day Sermon*, Willoughby Mynors maintains of Charles II, that “if he has perished” by converting to Popery at his death-bed, then “There is a drop of the royal martyr’s blood in it¹⁷⁴”; because due to the Puritan’s revolutionary republic, he was driven as a boy from England into Popish France where crafty and devious Jesuits were able to mind-molest the tender young mind of this fatherless boy, whose Protestant father, Charles I, had been murdered by the revolutionaries¹⁷⁵. Thus he says, “‘There is a drop of the royal martyr’s blood in it.’ For the Restoration, glorious as it was, could not put a stop to the mischievous consequences of the ... rebellion, to which is owing the perversion of the royal offspring to the errors of the *Church of Rome*, in

¹⁷² *Comfort Under Affliction. A Sermon Preach’d at the Parish Church of S. Mary White-Chappel, on Thursday, March 15, 1715/16* [1715 is the year on an Anglican Annunciation Day Calendar which starts the year on 25 March, whereas 1716 is the year on a 1 Jan. New Year’s Day Calendar]. By Willoughby Mynors. John Morphew, London, 1716. (British Library shelf mark: 1508/1673 or 4475.aa.81). Copy also available online at National Library of Australia, Canberra, ACT. This sermon has been reprinted by Gale Ecco, Print Edition, (ISBN: 1140757741) May 2010 (<http://www.flipkart.com/comfort-under-affliction-sermon-preach-book-1140757741>). St. Mary’s Whitechapel was destroyed in a Nazi German bombing of London in Dec. 1940; and a public park is now on the site of this former church on Whitechapel Road.

¹⁷³ *True Loyalty; or, Non-resistance the only support of monarchy. A Sermon Preach’d at S. Pancras, Middlesex, on Sunday, June 10, 1716.* By Willoughby Mynors, London 1716. (British Library shelf mark: 225.g.5.(5.) or 4475.aa.69.). Copy also available online at National Library of Australia, Canberra, ACT.

¹⁷⁴ *A Sermon Preached May 29, being the Anniversary of the Restoration of K. Charles II.* By Willoughby Mynors, M.A., Printed for the author, and sold by J. Morphew, near Stationer’s Hall, London, p. 17. (*Eighteenth Century Collections Online*, Sydney University Library.)

¹⁷⁵ See Sermon in Appendix 5 of this Textual Commentary, Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25).

which, IF” Charles II “has perished, ’twill be, I fear, a heavier account to this nation, than the blood of his father The driving of the Royal Family to beg their bread, into a foreign *Popish* country, inexperienced, tender, unable to withstand the persuasions of an indulgent, though superstitious mother, or confute the sophistry of learned *Jesuits*, hath given being to all the calamities wherewith we are to this day distracted. Had not their malice murdered the tender, religious father, he would have instilled better principles into his offspring’s breast¹⁷⁶.”

Willoughby Mynors also sees “the score of the Grand Rebellion” of the 1640s and 1650s, manifested in “the late, long, expense, bloody war” with Jacobites. Because “the religion of our King,” James II (Regnal Years: 1685-1688) was thereby “perverted by his forced exile.” He thus sees the problem of the Jacobites as a roll-on consequence from the 1640s and 1650s Puritan “usurpers,” and celebrates the way “the Almighty” “did” “confound the powers of darkness, delivering us from the unnatural rebellion, usurpation, and tyranny of ungodly, cruel men, the united force of schism, atheism, and enthusiasm,” which “fell before our lawful king.” Thus he celebrates the way the “Almighty” “restored to us, and to his undoubted right, our then most gracious Sovereign Lord, King Charles II.”

The issue of Puritans being critical of the Restoration with regard to Charles II recognition that the *Solemn League and Covenant* was an unlawful and thus an unbinding oath¹⁷⁷, and Willoughby Mynors associated support for the Established Anglican Church in England and Ireland, is also referred to in the words, “Let schismatics call him perjured,” though the description of Charles II when an “exil’d [/ exiled] Sovereign” i.e., from England and Ireland when these had been declared republics and Charles II was in Scotland, indicates that the focus is on the Established Anglican Church in England and Ireland (i.e., not the issue of the Episcopal Church of Scotland before the Presbyterian Church was Established in Scotland as part of the Williamite Settlement in 1689). Hence he says, “Thus did God restore, by his glorious instrument, General Monk, all that we had lost. Let [Puritan] schismatics [in England and Ireland] call him perjured, if they will, ’twas his taking the abjuration [against prelacy in the *Solemn League and Covenant*] contrary to his bounden duty and allegiance to his natural, though exil’d [from England and Ireland] Sovereign [in Scotland], that made him perjured [when he agreed to the *Solemn League and Covenant* in Scotland in 1650 & 1651], not his repenting of it [as an unlawful oath], and espousing the Royal Cause [of episcopal church government].”

The ongoing concern in c. 1717 with Puritans in England and Ireland glorifying Oliver Cromwell and the Puritan revolutionaries is also referred to. Hence he further says, “’Tis a melancholy consideration, but too true, that the same principles that

¹⁷⁶ Willoughby Mynors *A Sermon Preached May 29, being the Anniversary of the Restoration of K. Charles II*, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

¹⁷⁷ For an example of this type of thing, see my comments on the 19th century Irish Puritan, Thomas Hamilton, at “5) The Restoration in the Scottish Context of the Williamite Settlement,” *supra*.

fermented the Grand Rebellion, and brought the Royal Martyr to the block, are at this day maintained, his murder justified by many, who by so doing become partakers in his blood: would they not fain [/ gladly] make the principles of sedition and rebellion part of our Constitution and religion That our King must not upon any account be resisted by force, is the doctrine that is the glory of the *Church of England*”

But showing a concomitant concern for such Puritan “principles of sedition and rebellion” also in the “doctrine of Rome,” Willoughby Mynors also makes an application to the Romish Jacobites. He seemingly refers to the *Fifteen Rebellion* of 1715. This was spearheaded under John Erskine, who in Sept. 1715 at Braemar proclaimed that the king was the Popish old Pretender, James Edward, son of James II who had abdicated in 1688. Erskine raised Jacobite clans and the Episcopal Church of Scotland in the north-east, with a total army strength of *c.* 10,000-12,000. His assault force reached Perth, and later engaged the smaller force of the Duke of Argyll, in which the Jacobites were defeated in the *Battle of Sheriffmuir* in Nov. 1715. The old Popish Pretender, James Edward (1688-1766), arrived on Scottish shores in December 1715, but by February 1716 he had to beat a hasty retreat, as both James Edward and John Erskine fled to Popish France, and then *home to Papal Rome*, where the old Popish Pretender conferred on Erskine the Jacobite title of, “*Duca di Mar*”¹⁷⁸. (The two later fell out with each other, and Erskine was no longer on friendly terms with the old Pretender between 1725 and the time of Erskine’s death in 1732.)

Thus against this backdrop, Willoughby Mynors says in his *Royal Oak Day Sermon* of *c.* 1717, that once again “these damnable tenets” earlier found in the Puritan “principles of sedition and rebellion” during the 1640s and 1650s, are “again advanced,” with “doctrine of Rome” Jacobite “rebels barefaced in arms, denying our King’s right, displaying their colours, engaging His Majesty’s loyal Forces, murdering many, laying waste the Country, overwhelming their native land with all the miseries of a civil war.”

Willoughby Mynors further makes specific reference to the Homilies entitled “Against Rebellion” in Book 2, Homily 21, of the Anglican *39 Articles*. He alludes to that part of Article 35 which says, the “Homilies ... contain a godly and wholesome doctrine.” In the 1662-1859 *Office of Papists’ Conspiracy Day* (5 Nov.) which was concerned with Popish conspiracies from both Jacobean times (James I, Regnal Years: 1603-1625) in 1605 and Jacobite times (James II, Regnal Year: 1685-1688) in 1688/9, the rubric at the Communion Service states, “After the Creed, if there be no Sermon, shall be read one of the six Homilies against Rebellion.” So too in the 1662-1859 *Office of King Charles the Martyr’s Day* (30 Jan.) which was concerned with the English Puritan revolutionaries republic, the rubric at the Communion Service states, “After the Nicene Creed, shall be read, instead of the Sermon for that Day the first and second parts of the Homily against Disobedience and wilful Rebellion, set forth by Authority; or the Minister

¹⁷⁸ Italian, “Duke of Mar,” referring to Scotland (although Erskine had received the real title of “Earl of Mar,” before this time from his father’s earldom which he got in 1689). Such Jacobite titles, like the Pretender who issued them where only pretender titles, so that this “*Duca di Mar*” title was never recognized in the British Isles.

who officiates shall preach a Sermon of his own composing upon the same argument.” Thus reference to these Homilies in the 39 Articles carries with it the same contextual loading of concerns about sedition against the Crown coming from either a Puritan source sympathetic to Oliver Cromwell’s republic (1640s & 1650s), or a Papist source sympathetic to Guy Fawkes Gunpowder Plot (1605) or the Jacobite claims against William III of Orange (1688).

Against this backdrop, Willoughby Mynors says, “Let the fanatics who condemn the doctrine of our Homilies, assert the lawfulness of resistance, long for the reviving” of their “old cause, ridicule the Solemnity of this [*King’s Restoration*] Day, justify the proceedings of the Rump Parliament against the King [which after Pride’s Purge in 1648 then set up a show-trial in order to kill Charles I in 1649,], and hereby entail the curse of the royal blood upon themselves and their posterity. But let us, who allow our excellent Homilies to contain a good and wholesome doctrine, detest such hellish principles, boldly assert the absolute illegality of ever resisting by force of arms our lawful Sovereign, [and] condemn all rebellious, lest we become partakers in the sin, and the just vengeance of the Almighty cleave to us”

The miraculous power of God in bringing about the Restoration is also referred to by Willoughby Mynors. “This is the deliverance God wrought for us, to return our hearty thanks and praises to the Throne of Grace for this, we have met together, in the house of God this day, and I trust we have all done it in the sincerity of our souls¹⁷⁹.”

In a sermon preached before the Members of the House of Commons at St. Margaret’s Westminster on 29 May 1717, the Reverend Dr. Andrew Snape said, “artful and designing” Puritan revolutionary “men knew how to work upon” other men’s “discontents, and fill them with groundless fears, till they had raised such a ferment as broke out in treason and actual rebellion, and ... the murder of the Sovereign Thus far did God suffer ... their crime But when that had smarted sufficiently for their perverse folly, ... he restored the former to them by so strange and surprising a turn of Providence, as few histories can parallel ...¹⁸⁰.”

The element of a legally Protestant throne being re-established under Charles II is referred to by Dr. John Middleton, a Lecturer at St. Bride’s *Church of England* in

¹⁷⁹ Willoughby Mynors *A Sermon Preached May 29, being the Anniversary of the Restoration of K. Charles II*, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-23.

¹⁸⁰ *A Sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons, at St. Margaret’s Westminster, on Wednesday the 29th of May, 1717, being the Day of Publick Thanksgiving to Almighty God, for having put an end to the Great Rebellion, by the Restitution of King Charles II, & Royal Family, & Restoration of the Government. By Andrew Snape, D.D., Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty. The Fourth Edition. Printed by Jonah Bowyer at the Rose in Ludgate Street, London, MDCCXVII [1717], pp. 20-1. (British Library shelf mark: 694.f.5.)*

London¹⁸¹, in a sermon preached before the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London at St. Paul's Cathedral, London, in 1730. On the one hand, his definition of the "Protestant cause" as "the negative of Popery" is over simplistic and wrong, since "Protestant" excludes e.g., Jews, who would in some sense see themselves as "the negative of Popery." But on the other hand, Dr. Middleton, celebrates "the Restoration of King Charles II to the throne" in the context of "the reestablishment of our Church and Civil Government upon their true and proper foundations," which he says includes an Established Church "free from the impurities of Popery"¹⁸².

In a sermon preached on Ps. 97:1 before the Members of the House of Commons at St. Margaret's Westminster on 29 May 1732, the Reverend Dr. William George describes "the state of religion in those times of" the "sordid tyrant," Oliver Cromwell, by quoting a 1647 book written by Anglican Ministers in London, entitled, "A Testimony to the Truth of Jesus Christ." This book says that under the Puritan republic, "'instead of' being "'of faith and truth,'" "'we swarm with noisome errors, heresies, and blasphemies';" "'instead of true piety, and the powers of godliness,'" "'the very flood-gates to all impiety and profaneness: instead of submitting to the government of Christ'" these Anglican Ministers living through this time say, "'we walk in a Christless looseness and licentiousness: instead of Reformation, ... we have a Deformation in Religion'." Commenting on this and the martyrdom of Blessed Charles, the Reverend Dr. George comments, "From these complicated calamities did the Lord deliver this afflicted nation, when the time was come that he should have mercy on Sion," as seen in the "Restoration"¹⁸³.

¹⁸¹ The office of Lecturer sadly ceased to exist in the Anglican Church from 1844. 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. E.g., the Reverend John Foxe, author of *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, was a Parish Lecturer at St. Giles' Church of England in London. "St. Bride's" in London (which like St. Giles, and St. Paul's, I have been privileged to inspect,) is a contracted form of "Brigid" or "Bridget" (c. 451-525). Many details of this Irish saint's biography are greatly disputed. She was influenced by the preaching of Christianity during, or just after, the time of St. Patrick (c. 398-461), who died when she was about 10 years old. Either way, St. Patrick's missionary work clearly had an impact on her. She also had a reputation for being charitable towards the poor, and so she reminds us that our devotion to God should include Christian charity to those in need (Matt. 25:34-40).

¹⁸² *A Sermon Preached before the Right Honourable Lord Mayor & Alderman of the City of London, at the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, on Friday May 29, 1730. Being the anniversary of the Restoration of King Charles II. By John Middleton, D.D., Lecturer of St. Bride's London. Printed for J & J Bonwicke, at the Red Lion, in St. Paul's Churchyard, MDCCXXX [1730], pp. 15,16-17,20. (British Library shelf mark: 694.f.5.)*

¹⁸³ *A Sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons at St. Margaret's Westminster on Monday, May 29, 1732. By William George, D.D., Chaplain*

In a sermon preached before the Members of the House of Commons at St. Margaret's Westminster on 29 May 1733, the Reverend Dr. Thomas Rymer, refers to the "vicious claims" exhibiting "a Jewish pride," of "the first authors of our civil wars." He says that these revolutionary Puritans, "on much the same title" as the "the clergy of Rome," claimed "an independency," and like them did "think themselves at liberty ... to renounce all secular power." These revolutionary Puritans were thus like "the clergy of Rome" who "may think they do God service, in disturbing a Protestant Government but what can be said for" such Puritan "Protestant subjects in such cases; when they engage in such corruption, though" claiming "liberty," these "be" a "pompous pretence," for "the consequence must be bondage." In a celebration of the Protestantism of the Crown from the time of the sixteenth century to the Interregnum, and from the time of the Restoration, the Reverend Dr. Rymer further refer to the "defects of liberty" before the English Reformation, "ever since we have been delivered from the inhumanity of Popery," "except for a short interval" (under Bloody Mary). For "the corruptions of Popery are never to be endured by a heart that has been Protestant, but the penalty" in a Roman Catholic land "of not receiving them, is utter destruction¹⁸⁴."

In a sermon preached on Ps. 118:23,24 before the Members of the House of Commons at St. Margaret's Westminster on 29 May 1742, the Reverend Dr. William Webster, says in his Dedication that he commends "the Honourable the House of Commons," "to the Liberties of Europe, and the whole Protestant cause." He draws a parallel between the monarchy "of David" which had "full and undisturbed possession of the throne of Israel and Judah," and that of Charles II as "King of England." "As to the condition of the two monarchs, they were, both, hunted, like partridges, upon the mountains; they were, both, driven for shelter into the Woods, and [in the] most obscure corners of the earth; they were both, marvelously protected by the Divine Providence; they were both forced to take refuge in foreign countries, even among the enemies of the *true Israel of God*; and, both, returned to their own land, and to the enjoyment of their Dominions."

The Reverend Dr. Webster, says Charles II had "blemishes," and also refers to Charles I's "truly Christian and truly Royal virtues and sufferings." He condemns the "wickedness of those infatuated rebels" of the Interregnum, with their "oppressive miseries;" and says that by "a Divine Interposition," there was "the Restoration of our King and Government." Showing the nexus between *Charles I's Day* and *Charles II's Day*, he refers to both "The Service appointed for the 30th of January," and "the Service

in Ordinary to His Majesty. Printed for J. Tonson in the Strand, London, MDCCXXXIII [1732], pp. 7-8. (British Library shelf mark: 694.f.5.)

¹⁸⁴ A Sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons at St. Margaret's Church in Westminster, on May 29, 1733. By Thomas Rymer, D.D., one of the six preachers of the Diocese of Canterbury. Printed for S. Billingsley, at the Judge's Head in Chancery Lane, London, 1733, pp. 11 & 13. (British Library shelf mark: 694.f.5.)

of this Day,” which thankfully “ascribes the Restoration to the over-ruling hand of God, and expressly acknowledges, that ‘God has, in all ages, shewed forth his power and mercy in the miraculous deliverances of his Church, and in the protection of righteous and religious Kings and States, professing his holy and eternal truth’.”

Dr. Webster maintains that “we look into the Bible” to learn of “God’s declarations.” Once again celebrating the Protestantism of the monarchy, he gives a Protestant history, from “the Reformation” which “was begun in Henry the Eighth’s time” (Regnal Years: 1509-1547); as “interrupted in Queen Mary’s” time (Regnal Years: 1553-1558); “but happily, though with difficulty, established by Queen Elizabeth” (Regnal Years: 1558-1603), during which “our ruin seemed, in a human view, so probable” from “Spain” with “their” “Armada,” in which “God” through “Divine Protection triumphed” over this. “In the next reign [James I, Regnal Years: 1603-1625], the discovery of the *Gunpowder Plot* [of Guy Fawkes in 1605,] may be imputed, as it was then, to God.”

Likewise, Dr. Webster refers to the “dreaded usurper,” “a most tyrannical usurper,” in Oliver Cromwell. E.g., “Cromwell” “came into the” “House of Commons” “with an armed force, called the Members a pack of fools and knaves, ordered the Speaker to quit the Chair, and bid them all go.” And Dr. Webster further says “The Restoration [Charles II, Regnal Years: King *de jure* of the three kingdoms, 1649-1685; King *de facto* of Scotland, 1649-1650/1¹⁸⁵; King *de facto* of England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1660-1685] was ... very wonderful; but I would direct your observation particularly to the King’s escape and preservation after the Battle of Worcester” at the royal oak, “and to the state of the nation at the very time when the king was called home. In reading over the narrative of his escape, it is difficult to say, whether you feel most pain from the many dangers which appear unavoidable, or pleasure to find the hand of God leading the King safe through them.. The “historian,” “Echard,” “expresses himself thus: ‘Such were the particulars of the King’s wonderful escape from such ... dangers and difficulties ..., so that he seemed to be all the way guided and guarded by angels from heaven ...’.” He refers to “Cromwell,” who “without authority,” “levied what taxes he pleased in the most arbitrary manner.” He rejects the charge against “the King,” Charles I, in which they “imputed to him,” “Popish principles and designs,” and sees it “as a just judgment upon the nation for the unjust murder of” Archbishop Laud and Charles I, that there was then “the banishment of the Royal Family into Popish countries.” But then “General Monk, the grand human instrument by which God wrought our deliverance, was like all other instruments of Providence,” used by God for the “Restoration.”

However, continues the Reverend Dr. Webster, then came James II (Regnal Years: 1685-1688), from which “we ... may see that a Commonwealth and a Popish Prince are utterly inconsistent with our safety and prosperity.” And so “the Restoration [in 1660 from Puritans] and the Revolution [in 1688 from Papists] may be a caution to

¹⁸⁵ Due to Cromwell’s occupation in parts of Scotland, Charles II held *de facto* power only in parts of Scotland from the latter half of 1650 through to 1651.

future princes and subjects how they [Papists and English Puritans] make attempts upon the liberties of England.” Hence he sees “this” Established “*Church*” of England and English “nation,” as a “great bulwark against its most dangerous enemy, the *Church of Rome*. The seed of the Gospel has been watered with the blood of martyrs and confessors; with noble, with royal blood” i.e., he looks to the protection of the Established Church against both Puritans and Papists alike, but in this regards the “most dangerous enemy” to be “the *Church of Rome*”¹⁸⁶.”

In a sermon preached on Ps. 126:3 before the Members of the House of Commons at St. Margaret’s Westminster on 29 May 1746, the Reverend Dr. James Tunstall, refers to the theme of a legally Protestant throne. Hence he says how, “with a confidence ... equal to the certainty of their convictions, our excellent Reformers, in a dutiful concurrence with the civil power, retrieved the pure light of the Gospel from the long night of superstition, under which it had been miserably obscured; and vindicated Christian liberty from ... [Romish] tyranny With the blessings of heaven upon their important undertaking ... the Protestant faith and worship of the *Church of England*, deservedly called *The Bulwark of the Reformation*, attained both perfection and stability in a reign [of Elizabeth I; Regnal Years:1558-1603] And as in the following reign [of James I; Regnal Years: 1603-1625] they were wonderfully preserved from an unparallel Conspiracy [of Guy Fawkes in 1605], managed by the agents, and approved by the authority of the Romish Church.” “And a succession of Protestant Princes, from whom and from whom only a Protestant Church and nation could expect protection, has ... justified ... highest expectations in maintaining our religion and civil rights ...”¹⁸⁷.”

In a sermon preached on Ps. 47:7 before the Members of the House of Lords at Westminster Abbey on 29 May 1747, the Lord Bishop of Exeter, Bishop George Lavington, distinguished between the exercise of *power* by Cromwell as so called Lord Protector, as opposed to power with lawful *authority*. Thus the Bishop condemned the notion of “mere power” as found in “the mock Protector in the time of the Great Rebellion: who had no manner of right but power.” He said Cromwell had “power ... and hypocrisy: for the sake of which he waded through the blackest crimes of perjury,

¹⁸⁶ *A Sermon Preached before the Honourable the House of Commons, at St. Margaret’s Church, Westminster, on Saturday May 29, 1742.* Being the anniversary of the Restoration of King Charles II. By the Reverend William Webster, D.D., Vicar of Ware and Thundridge in Hertfordshire. Printed for James Crockatt, at the Black Horse near Fleet Bridge, in Fleet Street, London, 1742, Dedication pages & pp. 1-3,5,7-10,12-14,16. (British Library shelf mark: 694.f.5.)

¹⁸⁷ *A Sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons at St. Margaret’s Church in Westminster, on Thursday May 29, 1746.* By James Tunstall, D.D., Chaplain to His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. Printed for J. Rivington in St. Paul’s Churchyard & William Thurlbourn in Cambridge, London, 1746, pp. 12-14,19. (British Library shelf mark: 694.f.5.)

rebellion, and treason, through rivers of blood, and blood Royal, and which he maintained too by the most tyrannical acts and methods of oppression¹⁸⁸.”

And on the same day as Bishop George preached to the House of Lord, *supra*, in a sermon preached on Jer. 31:13 before the Members of the House of Commons at St. Margaret’s Westminster on 29 May 1747, the Prebendary of Westminster, the Reverend Doctor John Hume put a focus on the fact that “we ... as Englishmen” are “Protestants¹⁸⁹.”

A sermon was delivered on 29 May 1753 by a preacher whose name is not recorded, entitled, *Religion the truest loyalty: Protestantism no fanaticism or Judaism*. He refers to Anglican Protestantism as “our holy religion;” and upholds Anglican hagiology, referring to “our sins which brought those miseries upon the righteous head of our martyred Sovereign,” Charles I. He condemns the Interregnum “period” of “a long and bloody rebellion, usurpation, and all the evils attending it,” and celebrates “the re-establishment of our holy religion, together with the restitution of the King and Royal family, and the Restoration of Government, after many years interruption” under Charles II. He also shows thankfulness to God for the miraculous element of the Restoration saying that, “The methods which God took, the instruments he made use of, and the time he chose to bring about the glorious wonderful change, - The Happy, - the speedy Restoration, are all of them together ... undeniable, incontestable proofs of Providential, supernatural deliverance” “Though God [did] suffer us to be evil treated through tyrants, ... yet as the royal Psalmist tells us, and this Day’s deliverance abundantly verifies ..., ... he finally ‘helpeth the poor out of misery, and maketh him households like a flock of sheep’ [Ps. 107:41, Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662] Amen¹⁹⁰.”

In another sermon on 29 May 1753, this one preached on Isa. 32:1,2 before the Members of the House of Commons at St. Margaret’s Westminster, the Reverend Doctor Howard linked the Restoration to the ongoing issue of the protection of the Crown and

¹⁸⁸ *A Sermon Preached before the House of Lords in the Abbey Church of Westminster, on Friday, May 29, 1747. Being the Anniversary of the Restoration of King Charles the Second. By George [Lavington], Lord Bishop of Exeter. Printed for John & Paul Knapton, at the Crown in Ludgate Street, London, 1747, p. 15. (British Library shelf mark: 694.f.5.)*

¹⁸⁹ *A Sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons in the Church of St. Margaret’s Westminster, on the 29th day of May, 1747. Being the anniversary of the Restoration of King Charles the Second. By John Hume, D.D., Prebendary of Westminster, & Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty. Printed for John & Paul Knapton, at the Crown in Ludgate Street, London, 1747. (British Library.)*

¹⁹⁰ *Religion the truest loyalty: Protestantism no fanaticism or Judaism: A Sermon preached May 29, 1753. Printed for the Author, and sold by the Booksellers of London and Westminster, pp. 12,18-19. (Eighteenth Century Collections Online, Sydney University Library.)*

government. He said, “Let the preservation of His Majesty’s sacred person and government, ... be the ... object of our prayers and supplications at the Throne of Grace¹⁹¹.”

Before the union of the three Kingdoms of England, Ireland, and Scotland from 1707 to 1800 as the Kingdom of Great Britain (England & Scotland) and Kingdom of Ireland, and as the United Kingdom from 1801, the Kingdom of England included England’s Dominion of Wales. Hence the *Church of England* was Established in Wales (and was not sadly Disestablished there till 1920 under a 1914 Act). The largest Cathedral in Wales is St. David’s, named after the motif Saint of Wales, David (d. c. 601, given a black letter day on the 1662 prayer book Calendar on 1 March). This Cathedral was damaged during the British civil wars, and then restored. In a sermon preached on Isa. 1:26 before the Members of the House of Lords at Westminster Abbey on 29 May 1758, the Lord Bishop of St. David’s, Bishop Anthony Ellis, spoke of the thankful miraculous “interposition of God for the Restoration,” which “was ... necessary to preserve the safety, the liberty, and the happiness of this Kingdom” of England from the Puritan revolutionaries in 1660. He also spoke of the “danger, that threatened from the Popish Quarter” with the events of 1688, and said “since which event, ... the civil constitution hath been much improved, so a reasonable freedom in matters of religion hath been allowed” under the Toleration Act of 1689. Thus “in consequence” of this Act, “a behavior suited to the character of Christians, and of Protestants, hath taken place between members of the *Church of England* and the Protestant Dissenters” i.e., this was a conciliatory appeal by Bishop Ellis to a spirit of broad Protestantism¹⁹².

On the same day as Bishop Anthony’s sermon to Members of the House of Lords, *supra*, a sermon was also preached on Ps. 122:6-9 before the Members of the House of Commons on 29 May 1758, by Dr. Fothergill, the Principal of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford University. Reflecting Anglican hagiology and identification, Dr. Fothergill refers to the Interregnum condition of the “destitute, *Sons of the Church of England*¹⁹³” i.e., seeing all

¹⁹¹ *A Sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons in the Parish Church of St. Margaret’s Westminster, on Tuesday the 29th day of May, 1753. Being the Anniversary of the Restoration of King Charles II and the Royal Family. By L. Howard, D.D., Rector of St. George, Southwark [in London], and Chaplain to Her Royal Highness the Princess Dowager of Wales. Printed by Edward Owen in Hand Court, Holborn; and sold by J. Dosley, in Pall Mall and E. Withers, at the Seven Stars, near the Temple Gate, London, 1753, p. 14. (British Library.)*

¹⁹² *A Sermon Preached before the House of Lords in the Abbey Church of Westminster, on Friday, May 29, 1758. Being the Anniversary of the Restoration of King Charles II. By Anthony [Ellis], Lord Bishop of St. David’s. Printed by G. Woodfall, at the King’s Arms, Charing Cross, London, 1758, pp. 15 & 16. (British Library.)*

¹⁹³ *The Family Chaplain*, in two volumes, Printed for L. Davis in Holborn & R. Baldwin in Paternoster Row, London 1775, “On the Anniversary of King Charles’s

Anglicans who lived through the Interregnum era as to some extent confessors. This Anglican terminology has some similarities with the afore mentioned 1684 sermon of Dean Sprat of Worcester, who referred to the “dutiful *Sons of the Church of England*¹⁹⁴.” In both instances, “Sons of the Church of England” would be recognizable to Anglicans as the terminology used in *The Preface* of the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 which says, “we have good hope,” that this prayer book “will be ... well accepted and approved by all sober, peaceable, and truly conscientious *Sons of the Church of England*.” It thus acts to refer to an Anglican identity with some special reference to the Restoration Caroline prayer book of 1662, brought in after Interregnum Ordinances declared the 1559 & 1606 Elizabethan and Jacobean prayer book “illegal” in 1645.

In this 1758 *Royal Oak Day Sermon*, Dr. Fothergill refers to Biblical authority for supporting constitutional monarchy by quoting from I Tim. 2:1-3, saying, “We find St. Paul in particular exhorteth Timothy to take care, in the direction of religious offices, ‘that ... supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks’ should ‘be made for all men; for kings, and for all that’ were ‘in authority; that’ they might ‘lead’ ‘quiet and peaceable’ lives ‘in all godliness and honesty.’ And, if such ... were in those days fit and conducive to that end; they must at all other times be proper, and, on solemn occasion of rejoicing for national benefits, peculiarly ‘good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour’¹⁹⁵.”

Dr. Fothergill refers to both the horrors of the Interregnum in the 1640s and 1650s, and in this context quotes from Volume 8 of Lord Chancellor Clarendon’s *History of the Rebellion* in eight volumes. Lord Clarendon (1609-1674) joined the exiled Charles II in the 1650s and became his chief advisor. His daughter, Anne, was James II’s first wife, and so Lord Chancellor Clarendon was the grandfather of both Queen Mary II (Regnal Years: joint reign with William III, 1689-1694) and Queen Anne (Regnal Years: 1702-1714). He is also remembered for the *Clarendon Code* of 1661-5; 1672 & 1678, out of which flowed the Test Acts against English (and Irish) Puritans and Papists till their repeal in the 19th century. For instance, under the 1673 Act (which lasted till 1828) it was required that a person say, “I, N [their name], do declare that I do believe that there is not any transubstantiation in the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, or in the elements of the bread and wine, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever.” Dr. Fothergill also gives thanks to God and man for the miraculous power of God in bringing about the Restoration of 1660.

Restoration.” May 29th, 1758, by Dr. G. Fothergill, Vol. 2, pp. 15-44, at p. 36. (British Library copy).

¹⁹⁴ *Preached at the Cathedral Church of Worcester on the 29th of May, 1684*; by George Hicks, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

¹⁹⁵ *Preached before the House of Commons, May 29th, 1758*; by G. Fothergill, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

This Oxford don says, “When three, once flourishing kingdoms, had long been filled with violence, oppression, perjury, murder, often rendered still more shocking by being perpetrated under the formality of justice and the mark of piety: when those seemingly incompatible evils of anarchy and tyranny, of enthusiasm and profaneness, of bigotry and sacrilege, had for years together, with forces ... been triumphing in the ruin of everything great, the extirpation almost of everything good, in these nations! What power or wisdom less than Infinite could have rescued our country ..., without any fresh effusion of ... blood ... ; all the breaches that had been made in ... its parts being completely repaired, and the Church in particular soon after guarded by such ... securities, as have, under the protection of heaven, preserved her doctrine, worship, and privileges unto this day: - with an harmony ... so marvellous, that in the words of the noble historian [identified in a footnote as “Lord Clarendon’s Hist. 8 vo. vol. last, page 761,”], ‘a man could not but wonder where those people dwelt that had done all the mischief, and kept the king so many years from the comfort and support of such excellent subjects.’ Such a Restoration, ..., what regard soever may be paid to the memory of subordinate instruments, the glory of the whole must ever be reserved for Him, who alone hath ‘the hearts’ of men at his disposal, ‘as the rivers of water’ [Prov. 21:1,2, AV]; who can ‘turn’ their ‘fierceness’ ‘to’ his own ‘praise’ [Ps. 76:10, BCP 1662], and say with authority to the raging of this sea also, ‘Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further: and here shall thy proud waves be stayed’ [Job 38:11, AV]. ‘This’ then being ‘the day, which the Lord hath made,’ well may ‘we rejoice and be glad in it’ [Ps. 118:24, AV]. Let it, however, be remembered, what sort of joy and gladness such a day calls for. ‘When the Lord turned again the captivity of Zion, we were like them that dream’ [Ps. 126:1, AV; Ps. 126 is one of the Psalms appointed in the *Office of King’s Restoration Day*]¹⁹⁶.”

7h) *Royal Oak Day Celebrations.*

Royal Oak Day Celebrations remember the Restoration of 1660 under King Charles II in general, and as part of that, the fact that following the Battle of Worcester in 1651, Charles II hid in an oak tree at Boscobel when Roundheads came looking for him. The name of “Boscobel” in “Boscobel House,” comes from two words in the Latin language of Italian, “*bosco bello*,” meaning “in the midst of fair woods,” and “Boscobel” was so named in early 17th century Jacobean times (James I, Regnal Years: 1603-1625) by Sir Basil Brook¹⁹⁷. Figs of oak are traditionally worn on *Oak Apple Day* or *Royal Oak Day*. These may be worn in e.g., the left-breast side lapel of a man’s suit, or over the right breast (London Oak Apple Parade at the Royal Chelsea), or in hats¹⁹⁸. Though

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 38-39.

¹⁹⁷ Strickland, A., “The Fugitive at Boscobel: Adventures of the Merry Monarch,” *Harper’s New Monthly Magazine*, Vol. 2, No. 7, Dec. 1850 (<http://www.elfinspell.com/Harpers2Boscobel.html>); & “Boscobel Lodge [n.b., 5th letter ‘a’ not ‘o’]” (<http://furtiv.com/pic/node/324>).

¹⁹⁸ Hutton, R., *The Stations of the Sun, A History of the Return of the Year in Britain*, Oxford University Press, UK, 1996, p. 290 (<http://www.books.google.com.au/books?isbn=0198205708...>).

the tradition of hanging oak branches continues in far fewer places than in the past, oak branches were also traditionally hung at various places, such as hotels, or “signs on public houses,¹⁹⁹” or sometimes a train.

The London Oak Apple Day celebrations shall be discussed separately at “7i) The London Oak Apple Day Parade,” *infra*. In discussing *Royal Oak Day* celebrations, *infra*, reference shall be made to a number of different places (Castleton, Great Wishford near Salisbury, & Membury near Axminster), which as part of their *Oak Apple Day* celebrations hang an oak branch from the high tower of the local Anglican Church. The basic reason for this location of an Anglican Church high tower may be understood by inspection of the Battlefield site where the Battle of Worcester occurred in 1651. At Christmas time 2008 I inspected Worcester in England, which is known as “the faithful city.”

The high tower of an Anglican Church was “more than just a pretty picture” for townfolk to look at. Although it was this, and sometimes used to mount an important religious symbol. E.g., Anglican Churches in England may act as the place for a flag pole bearing the Cross of St. George, or in Ireland the Cross of St. Patrick; or in the Diocese of Sydney in Australia, St. Anne’s Top Ryde which has such a high tower as an Anglican architectural legacy, and uses it to mount a large white Christian cross (and has done so for some decades, since it was present when I attended Pre-School there in 1964). So too does St. Philip’s Church Hill, York Street, inner city, near the Harbour Bridge. But such Anglican architecture also points back to a time when such high towers served another function. They were made a high point in the surrounding village or town, and could also be used for the purposes of observation. For example, if there was a fire, an observer could see what was going on from the church tower. But more than this, the tower was a well built, fortified, strong fort. In the context of warfare, military observers and signalmen could watch the battle scene, and send signals. This is all relevant to the civil war era of the 1640s and 1650s, because Royalist Cavaliers knew “the secrets” of how to use Anglican Church towers, which then came under fire from the Puritan Roundheads. Depending on troop strength and readiness, one might defend such a church tower on the church’s internal steps to the tower, in exactly the same way one would defend such a tower in a castle, with sword fights or musket fire on the narrow tower steps. If necessary, Cavalier observers and signalmen were prepared to take their last stand and die, while holding the fort in a Christian Church.

On the battle site at Worcester, the Royalist forces of Charles II used the high towers of both Worcester Cathedral and St. Peter’s Church Powich, as lookout posts over the Worcester Battlefield. Hence I saw and photographed the bullets marks made by the republican Roundheads on the high tower of St. Peter’s Church Powich which was being

¹⁹⁹ Oak Apple Day; citing *Journal of the Arch. Assoc.* [? *Archaeological Association*] 1853, Vol. 8, p. 234 (http://www.royaloakday.org.uk/Tradition/royal_oak_sprigs.html).

held by Caroline royalists. (Photos of this may be found at my website.)²⁰⁰ This gives the propriety to the tradition of hanging an oak branch from the high tower of an Anglican Church on *Royal Oak Day* i.e., it is a prominent spot to hang the oak branch from, but more than this, it is historically also a military fort used as a lookout post in wars such as the British Civil Wars of the 1640s and 1650s between Royalists and Republicans.

On *Oak Apple Day* at Worcester, the statues of Charles I and Charles II at the Guildhall are decked in oak leaves; and participants also wear a sprig of oak. A group dressed up as the Worcester Militia meet the Mayor of Worcester at the Guildhall which is also decorated in oak leaves. Someone dressed up as Charles II thanks the people of Worcester for their faithfulness during the civil war. This costumed group then goes to the Commanderie where people can meet and speak to them during the day²⁰¹. On the day, “City Walks” are set up by various personalities of the era; and this includes “a chance” “for children” “to actually meet the merry monarch – King Charles II²⁰².”

When I visited Worcester at Christmas time 2008 these same statues of King Charles I and King Charles II at the Guildhall, had Christmas decorations all over them. This is also significant and relevant symbolism, because during the Interregnum, under the Puritan republican’s ordinances, many holy days other than Sunday, including Christmas, were banned.

The Castleton Garland Day in Derbyshire, which for 100s of years has remembered the Restoration of Charles II, uses a 3 foot or 1 metre high garland made from a wooden frame with bunches of wild flowers worn by a man who is dressed in Stuart Costume, and riding on a horse known as, “The Garland King.” It is usually celebrated on 29 May; but if that day falls on a Sunday, as it did in e.g., 2011, then the Castleton Garland Day is transferred back to Saturday 28 May²⁰³. On the *Eve of Royal Oak Day*, branches of oak, as well as elm and sycamore, are hung from the church’s high tower. Then on *Royal Oak Day* or *Oak Apple Day*, flowers tied in bunches to form the shape of a beehive with a queen on top are made; and “The Garland King,” rides on horseback through the city, stopping from time to time, until arriving at a Maypole where dancing occurs. Also known as “The May King,” he then rides on to the church where

²⁰⁰ See pictures on the website in connection with this Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) of my Textual Commentaries; available on the internet via Yahoo and Google at “Gavin McGrath Books,” or direct at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com> .

²⁰¹ “Oak Apple Day Royal Oak Day, 29th May” (<http://england-in-particular.info/calendar/c-may.html>).

²⁰² “Events Oak Apple Day,” The Battlefields Trust, Promoting our battlefield heritage (<http://www.battlefieldstrust.com/event.asp?EventID=284>).

²⁰³ “Royal Oak Day 29 May; The Year 2010 marks the 350th anniversary of Royal Oak ... Day,” (<http://www.projectbritain.com/calendar/May/oakday.html>).

the oak branches have been hung the previous evening, and this garland of flowers is then hoisted to the top of the church's high tower, where it remains for one week²⁰⁴.

But the day is most commonly remembered on 29 May, irrespective of which day of the week it falls on. E.g., this occurs at Salisbury. These *Oak Apple Day* celebrations start at Great Wishford in Wiltshire, about 7 miles or 10 kilometres north-west of Salisbury via Wilton. On the morning of the 29th of May, an oak bow is removed from Grovely Wood, and then hung from the local Anglican Church high tower of St. Giles' *Church of England*²⁰⁵. The traditional right of Great Wishford villagers to enter Grovely Wood precedes the time of the Restoration in 1660, for instance, there was a 1603 Charter for this in Jacobean times. But following the Caroline Restoration these two separate celebrations were united into one on *King's Restoration Day* or *Oak Apple Day*²⁰⁶. Hence boughs of oak are cut, "no bigger than a man's forearm," and then "hung above doors and gates and preferably decorated with bulbous new Oak Apples²⁰⁷." Thus those involved in these *Oak Apple Day* celebrations combine *Royal Oak Day* with the memory of their traditional right to collect fire-wood from Grovely Wood, from which they get the *Oak Apple Day* oak bow for the local church; and they then travel to Salisbury Cathedral where they proclaim their pre-Restoration granted liberties to this traditional right of entering Grovely Wood²⁰⁸.

By modern tradition, a bus now takes people from Great Wishford to Salisbury Cathedral on *Oak Apple Day*, and arrives there at 10 a.m., at which time they re-affirm their traditional rights to collect wood from Grovely Wood, which is a royal forest. They then enter Salisbury Cathedral and go up to the Communion Table, where the Anglican Dean of Salisbury welcomes them. After re-affirming their traditional rights to collect wood from Grovely Wood, they then return to Wishford for a *Royal Oak Day* village

²⁰⁴ "Oak Apple Day Royal Oak Day, 29th May" (<http://england-in-particular.info/calendar/c-may.html>).

²⁰⁵ A photo of this architecturally attractive Anglican Church may be found at, "English Churches Photo Gallery by Chris Spacklen at pbase.com" (<http://www.pbase.com/moorland/image/127191504>), or an enlarged picture may be accessed from this same website directly at "St. Giles Church, Great Wishford, Wiltshire" (<http://www.pbase.com/moorland/image/127191504>).

²⁰⁶ George Frampton's *Grovely [Wood]! ... The History of Oak Apple Day in Great Wishford*, Jackson House, York, England, 1992 (British Library copy, shelf mark: YK1994.a.4199), e.g., pp. 4-5.

²⁰⁷ Dike, A., in "Happy Oak Apple Day" "Responses" on 31 May 2010 (<http://www.realwestdorset.co.uk/wordpress/index.php/2010/05/29/happy-oak-apple-day/>)

²⁰⁸ "Oak Apple Day" (http://www.bbc.co.uk/wiltshire/moonraking/folklore_oak_apple.shtml).

procession, afternoon fete, and banquet²⁰⁹. Historical records state that in, e.g., 1845, on “the 29th of May,” people were “getting boughs of oak from Grovely Wood;” and that the custom continued after the loss of the *Office of The King’s Restoration Day* in 1859, for an entry in the local school’s logs for 29 May 1877 says there was, “Low average (attendance). Children gone to the wood for boughs of oak to keep up an old custom²¹⁰.” Through to contemporary times one can see a parade in which some may carry boughs of oak²¹¹; and this includes the historical existence in Great Wishford of the *Oak Apple Club*²¹². Historically Grovely Wood is part of the Earls of Pembroke’s land²¹³; and in harmony with a number of court cases over the centuries, since villagers had their wood rights protected from landowners wanting to use the woods for hunting in 1292, 1318, 1332, there was also a court case in 1825, which followed the events of the Earl of Pembroke having the Manor and Grovely Wood enclosed in 1809, an act which created more economic restrictions thereby worsening the impact of an 1820s economic depression²¹⁴. But a workable understanding has now been achieved between villages and the Lord of the Manor, so that successive Earls of Pembroke have attended these *Oak Apple Day* festivities held at Great Wishford and Salisbury, which following the 1660 Restoration have combined celebrations of the pre-Restoration right of Great Wishford villagers to enter Grovely Wood to collect wood with the post-Restoration practice of getting oak from the woods for *Oak Apple Day*. Hence these *Oak Apple Day* celebrations have been attended by Lord Pembroke in 1892 (d. 1895; 13th Earl of Pembroke), Lord Pembroke (d. 1913; 14th Earl of Pembroke) in 1910; Lord Pembroke in 1930 (d. 1960; 15th Earl of Pembroke); and Lord Pembroke in 1974 (d. 2003; 17th Earl of Pembroke)²¹⁵.

Oak Apple Day celebrations are also held at Marsh Gibbon. I visited Marsh Gibbon in Oxfordshire (near Bicester, in Buckinghamshire & Oxfordshire) in December 2008. Marsh Gibbon also remembers *Oak Apple Day* or *Royal Oak Day* on 29 May.

²⁰⁹ Frampton’s *Grovely [Wood]! ... The History of Oak Apple Day in Great Wishford*, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

²¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 21 (picture of 1987 parade).

²¹² *Ibid.*, p. 22 (picture of Oak Apple Club Members in 1906) & p. 21 (picture of Oak Apple Club Members in 1987 parade).

²¹³ *Ibid.*, e.g., pp. 7,33.

²¹⁴ “History of Great Wishford, Salisbury, UK,” in “Great Wishford, Wiltshire, Community Website – history of the ...” (http://www.greatwishford.co.uk/history_of_greatwishford/history_great_wishford_salisbury.html).

²¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 15,23,26,30.

During the British Civil Wars, Marsh Gibbon was a front-line battleground, and a skirmish occurred in 1645. When the Roundheads attacked the town in 1645, the grounds of the Manor House which is next to the Anglican Church, included most, if not the whole, village of Marsh Gibbon.

Thus the Roundhead's siege works were laid in what was then, but is not now, the grounds of the Manor House. This old stately Manor House was largely built in the sixteenth century, but parts of it go back to the thirteenth century, and its owner invited me inside to see its Lounge Room. I was told that the first owners received it from Henry VIII (Regnal Years: 1509-1547), following the closure of the monasteries, when the king granted it to the Duke of Suffolk, who was one of "the king's favorites." It was thus first lived in by the Duke and Duchess of Suffolk, and the Duchess was a descendant of the poet, Geoffrey Chaucer (d. 1366/7). The Duchess is known to have given revenues from the Manor House to the poor and needy out of Christian charity.

Next to the Manor House is St Mary's *Church of England*. This is a traditional looking Anglican Church with a high tower. I have stood in the field where in the general area of an old barn one can still see where the Puritan Roundheads set up their ground works to attack Marsh Gibbon, with the tower of the Anglican Church next to the Manor House clearly in their sights. I.e., since this high tower acted as a point of fortification in time of war, it is visible from a field I saw which is further down hill, and which is the place where Cromwell's republican revolutionary army, the Roundheads, set up their ground works to attack Marsh Gibbon in 1645.

Inside St. Mary's I saw a memorial plaque to Abigail Barker de Horwood who died in 1712 of small pox, she was a descendant of Robert and Elizabeth Busby - a centuries old oil painting of which couple I had earlier seen in the lounge room of the Manor House. There is also a memorial plaque to "the Reverd [Reverend] Mr. John Dod," a former "Rector of this Church" who "died" in "1698" aged "66 years." Mr. Dod lived through the civil war years, and was one of the Restoration Anglican clergymen.

In broad general terms, of 616 parishes that had money itemized as payments to bell-ringers from the reign of Charles II (Regnal Years: King *de jure* of the three kingdoms, 1649-1685; King *de facto* of Scotland, 1649-1650/1; King *de facto* of England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1660-1685), 233 of these 616 or *c.* 38% of them, rang bells on 29 May. Of 565 such parishes in the time of James II (Regnal Years: 1685-1688), 261 of these or *c.* 46% rang bells on 29 May. Though such itemizations do not exist for later dates, it is known that e.g., in 1715, the bells at Norwich Cathedral rang out for the whole of Restoration Day on 29 May. Or at Exeter in the early 19th century bells were rung and houses decorated with oak on 29 May²¹⁶. Moreover, I am advised by Rod Craddock that in the Derbyshire (Castleton), *Garland Day* celebrations of *Oak Apple Day* records from 1749 to 1897, procured from "church wardens accounts," show its was

²¹⁶ Hutton, R., *The Stations of the Sun*, A History of the Return of the Year in Britain, Oxford University Press, UK, 1996, pp. 289-291 (<http://www.books.google.com.au/books?isbn=0198205708...>).

organized “by the church bell-ringers,” e.g., in 1749 these refer to “an iron rod to hang ye Ringers’ Garland with²¹⁷.” This general background tradition of bell-ringing on *The King’s Restoration Day* or *Oak Apple Day*, may help us better contextualize some elements of the Marsh Gibbon’s *Oak Apple Day*, since it was the five bell-ringers of the local church that against the backdrop of King George III having lost America and won Australia, in 1788 selected this day to be one of enduring importance to Marsh Gibbon.

Inside St Mary’s *Church of England* at Marsh Gibbon, I noted the church bells, and a notice referring to various bell-ringers who had given bells to St. Mary’s, Marsh Gibbon over the centuries, starting from the “16th century,” including e.g., “Richard Chandler” who had given three bells in “1678.” These were of further significance because I later spoke to one of the contemporary organizers of the Marsh Gibbon *Oak Apple Day* celebrations, Roy Lambourne, who when I spoke to him in December 2008 was the current Secretary of the *Marsh Gibbon Friendly Society*, and he said a present bell-ringer at St. Mary’s Edwin Herring, was the Secretary. Roy Lambourne advised me that he was a descendant of Edward Lambourne, one of five bell-ringers in the local church, who in 1788 set up the *Marsh Gibbon Friendly Society*, now based at the *Greyhound Club* which meets at *The Greyhound Inn*. Townsfolk paid in money to an insurance scheme providing sickness benefits, and death benefits to widows. At the time, such Friendly Societies were common in England. The *Marsh Gibbon Friendly Society* chose *Oak Apple Day* as their annual feast day, at a time when in 1788 the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) included in it the red-letter day with Office of *The King’s Restoration* on 29 May. The associated church service and other elements of their *Oak Apple Day* celebrations simply continued after 1859 when the Office of *The King’s Restoration* was removed from the prayer book.

Thus on *Oak Apple Day*, members wear a sprig of oak gotten from local trees. The Manor House has St. Mary’s Church on one side, and a T-junction with *The Plough Inn* on the other side. The *Oak Apple Day* procession starts here at *The Plough Inn*, and since 1880 has included a village band. The procession annually starts at 9 a.m. on 29 May, and marches down past “Cromwell House” in Church Street. According to local tradition, Oliver Cromwell stayed in this house that now bears his name, after he threw up siege works, the remains of which are still visible, and assaulted Marsh Gibbon. The procession then ends at *The Greyhound Inn*. Upon arrival, all members of the *Marsh Gibbon Friendly Society* (which as at Dec. 08 had 160 members) then pay their annual dues. They then all return to St. Mary’s Church for the annual *Oak Apple Day* Church Service. Thus the annual church service continued to be held there on 29 May after 1859, although it no longer uses the Office of *The King’s Restoration* (1662, revised Office of 1664-1859). Significantly, this means that Marsh Gibbon has an unbroken history of an *Oak Apple Day* Church Service dating from the 1660s through to present times. I.e., their *Oak Apple Day* Church Service kept going after the Office of Royal Oak Day was removed from the prayer book in 1859 (although its church service no longer included the usage of the *Office of The King’s Restoration*). The Church Service

²¹⁷ Letter of Ron Craddock of Membury in Devon, England, to Gavin McGrath (then of Morden, Greater London, UK) 23 Dec. 2008.

always includes the singing of “God Save the Queen” (or “God Save the King” if there is a king on the throne). After the Church Service, they then process back again to *The Greyhound Inn* for *Oak Apple Day* celebrations, which include a “loyal toast” to the Queen (or King). These celebrations end at about 3 p.m. .

But much later, starting at about 6 p.m., the band starts playing around the village, and by 8 p.m. many are back at *The Greyhound Inn*, at which time, any new members are admitted. From what I could ascertain, certain things happen at this night-time event that I would not be prepared to condone. Like e.g., Christmas, it may be tarnished with certain sins, for instance, there may be some level of drunkenness among some of the participants. Certainly I would not condone this, for drunkenness is a deadly sin (I Cor. 6:10; Gal. 5:21)²¹⁸. Nevertheless, without condoning this down-side of these night-time events (or any similar down-sides that may or may not occur at any other Oak Apple Day activities anywhere else); on the upside, one can see that there is still much that is commendable about this annual memory of *Oak Apple Day* at Marsh Gibbon in the earlier part of the day. On the basis of what I have been able to ascertain, for those wishing to witness this event for themselves, it would be best to leave town before the night-time events commence.

Wikipedia Encyclopedia (2008) reports that some Oxbridge Halls continue to give a special toast on *Royal Oak Day*; and *Royal Oak Day* happily continues to be annually celebrated in England during the merry month of May at such places as Upton-upon-Severn (Worcestershire), Northampton (Northamptonshire), Aston-on-Clun (Shropshire), Marsh Gibbon (Buckinghamshire, “The Bucks”), Great Wishford (Wiltshire), and Membury (Devon)²¹⁹. There is also “The annual South Downs Way Walk” held at Monarch’s Way, which celebrates Oak Apple Day by a walk from Owslebury to Hambleton, Winchester, Hampshire. After paying an entry fee, this event entails two 10 mile (c. 16 kilometre) walks over two days, includes relevant coach transport from

²¹⁸ One of the prayers of *The Litany* in the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) is, “From fornication, and all other deadly sin ..., *Good Lord, deliver us.*” This idea of “deadly sin” (not to be confused with the same Romish nomenclature,) is that such sins result in physical death (e.g., suicide as self-murder, Gal. 5:21; I John 3:15, Rev. 21:8; so that at *The Order for the Burial of the Dead*, the BCP denies Christian burial to those who “have laid violent hands upon themselves,”) and / or spiritual death where the person is in willfully unrepentant commission of such sin (I Cor. 6:9,10; Gal. 5:19-21; Eph. 5:3-5; Col. 3:5,6; I John 3:15; Rev. 21:8). For instance, both elements were present when Adam ate the apple (Gen. 2 & 3; cf. S. of Sol. 8:5); whereas only the element of physical death was present in the children of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon (Lev. 20:21), since this acted to awaken in the mind of Henry VIII his incestuous sin (cf. Acts 17:30).

²¹⁹ “Oak Apple Day,” *Wikipedia* (2008) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oak_Apple_Day).

Chichester or Arundel in West Sussex, drinks at Warnford, and then afternoon tea at Hambledon²²⁰.

I visited Northampton in Northamptonshire in Jan. 2009, which is one of the places that has *Royal Oak Day* celebrations. The town still remembers Charles II with favour for the time in 1675 when after a fire badly burnt the town, he graciously gave them 1,000 tons of wood from the Whittlewood Royal Forests; and an oak-apple garland is placed on a statue of Charles II there each year on 29 May²²¹.

As I alighted from the train at Northampton, I read a plaque at the railway station which said that it now sits on part of the ruins of a former Castle. The plaque gives a history of the Castle from about “1100” A.D. onwards, including some diagrams, it being finally razed by King Charles II. The Castle had been the site of the trial of Thomas A’ Becket (Thomas Becket) before Henry II (Regnal Years: 1154-1189) in 1164, a former Archbishop of Canterbury (d. 1170). Because the English Puritan revolutionary republican Roundheads held this castle during the 1640s and 1650s, it was disloyal to the Royalist armies of both Charles I and Charles II. Hence after the Restoration in 1660, King Charles II ordered that it be razed to the ground, (a similar pre-emptive act of wise defence was undertaken by Charles II in the same year at Coventry, *supra*²²².) although it had comprehensive ruins until the first railway station was built there in 1879; although the present Northampton Railway Station is a more modern building constructed in the mid 1960s.

Upon leaving the Northampton Railway Station, there is an old sandstone Castle Gate relatively close to the station that came from the old castle, although this “Postern Gate” or side entrance is not in its original position, and is now all that remains of Northampton Castle. Further on, one can still see the signposted “Castle Site,” with associated diagram and brief history, telling of how it was “destroyed in 1662 on the orders of Charles II” because of its use by “the Roundheads during the civil war.” There is now a large mound there with a fence around it, that overlooks Northampton Railway Station (a photo of which may be found at my textual commentary website²²³.) Behind this the mound drops away to form a more private enclosure, and though it is not

²²⁰ “Oak Apple Day on the Monarch’s Way,” at website: <http://www.footprintsofsussex.co.uk> . Cost as at 2010 is £59.50 (fifty-nine pounds & 50 pence, British sterling) per person (<http://www.countryside2010.org.uk/events/oa-apple-day-on-the-monarchs-way/>).

²²¹ “Royal Oak Day 29 May,” (<http://www.projectbritain.com/calendar/May/oakday.html>).

²²² See “2b) Some sites I have visited of interest to Charles I, Charles II, James II, & William III,” at Oct. 2003.

²²³ See this picture on my website in connection with this Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) of my Textual Commentaries at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com> .

an officially designated male toilet, I observed that it was used by “him that pisseth against the wall” (I Kgs 14:10)²²⁴. *Such is the ending of the Roundhead’s Castle!*

More generally in Northampton, I was interested to see *The Church of the Holy Sepulchre*, named after the church of this same name in Jerusalem. It is one of only four round churches in England; St. Sepulchre’s *Church of England* was originally built in the 12th century. I also saw a road sign to “Royal Oak,” the name of an industrial estate in Northamptonshire; as well as “The Royal Oak Hotel” at Flore, Northampshire. This is one of a number of Royal Oak Hotels in Northampshire, and includes a picture of Charles II’s face inside the oak tree that in 1651 he hid in. Nearby at Kislingbury Village in Northampshire, is “Cromwell Cottage” restaurant, which has a picture of a decrepit looking Oliver Cromwell, who after murdering Charles I in 1649, then unsuccessfully sought to murder Charles II in 1651. (Photos of these may be found at my website.)²²⁵

Another of the places that has *Royal Oak Day* celebrations is Membury in Devon, about 4 or 5 miles or 7 or 8 kilometres from Axminster. I was given by one of the annual participants there, a copy of the Autumn 2008, *Membury Mercury* (Established 1986, Issue no 90), which at p. 13 shows about half a dozen photos from the 2008 “Oak Apple Day Parade.” One of these photos may be found at my website.)²²⁶ I spoke to the local historian here, Ron Craddock, in the lounge-room of his Membury house. Earlier in that December 2008, before I left London I had taken some photographs as part of a series I entitled, “Life in Sutton (Greater London),” as a memento of the area I was living in during my fifth trip to London (Sept. 09-March 09) before I returned to Australia; and this included some neon-light Christmas decorations on houses in the street I was living in at Love Lane, Morden, SM4. Among other things this includes the corner house on an adjoining street, Garendon Rd. . It was thus a striking coincidence, that when Ron Craddock asked me where I was living in London, and I told him “Love Lane” in Sutton, he the told me that as a boy he had lived in that adjoining Garendon Street; and among other recollections of the area he then told me about, he said that during World War Two a bomb dropped in the green grass section between the twin roads there, near number 95, which is where I was then living!

²²⁴ The terminology of “him that pisseth against the wall” (I Kgs 14:10; cf. I Sam. 25:22,34; I Kgs 16:11; 21:21; II Kgs 9:8) is Hebraic poetical terminology, which by referring to males through reference to the depiction of human males naturally urinating, in effect refers to *all males* generically, irrespective of their societal status, i.e., “both small & great” (*Geneva Bible*, 1560, sidenote on I Sam. 25:22).

²²⁵ See pictures of Flore, Northampshire, on my website in connection with this Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) of my Textual Commentaries at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.

²²⁶ See pictures on my website in connection with this Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) of my Textual Commentaries at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.

In a letter he later sent me, Rod Craddock advised that the custom of putting an oak apple bough on the church on Oak Apple Day has existed for centuries. He cited, “A History of Membury Church in June 1969 by W. P. Dodgson” which says, “It has been the custom in Membury from time immemorial to hoist an oak bough to the top of the tower on 29 May, in commemoration of the escape of ... King Charles II after the Battle of Worcester in 1651 and his Restoration in 1660. Apart from Cornwall, Membury is the only church in the South West to commemorate ‘Oak-apple Day’ in this fashion²²⁷.”

Building on this pre-existing base of hoisting an oak apple bough on the high tower of Membury Church, wider *Oak Apple Day* Celebrations were revived at Membury by Ron Craddock on Friday 29 May 1998. This reminds us that in the same way that *King Charles I's Day* was revived on the Anglican Calendar in Canada, Australia, and England, more than a hundred years after its removal from the Anglican Calendar in 1859; so likewise, *Royal Oak Day* can be revived following its removal from the Anglican Calendar in 1859. In discussing this, Ron Craddock showed me a copy of the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 that was printed before 1859, and he showed me in it his copy of the *Restoration Day* Service that was removed from the prayer book in 1859. It was clear to me that his support for *Royal Oak Day* included a favourable view he held of this *Office of Oak Apple Day*; and he explained how after 1859 the day's more general celebrations had come to be discontinued at Membury and the surrounding area, until he organized to have them revived at Membury.

Of interest to me at Membury was also the local Anglican Church, St. John the Baptist's *Church of England*. There was a skirmish near the village of Membury in 1646 between the royalist Cavaliers and republican Roundheads. Interregnum ordinances sought to close down Anglican Churches and turn them into Puritan Churches, a fact necessitating the ejection of Puritan Ministers from Anglican Churches in 1662. But during this time of the civil war and interregnum, when Anglican Churches were often dysfunctional, a monument was erected to a Roundhead killed in the 1646 skirmish, and a canon ball from the era was placed on top of this monument. (A photo of this may be found at my website.)²²⁸ A monument showing a man and women kneeling in prayer has also had the hands of this couple removed; and bearing in mind that Roundhead Puritans under Samuel Rutherford's spell considered kneeling at Communion was intrinsic idolatry of the Communion elements, these hands were quite possibly removed by Puritans during this era. (Certainly I have seen similar vandalism by Puritans at Worcester Cathedral.) Thus on the basis of either or both of these facts, it looks like this

²²⁷ Letter of Ron Craddock of Membury in Devon, England, to Gavin McGrath (then of Morden, Greater London, UK) 23 Dec. 2008. This usage of “time immemorial” here is not used in its technical legal sense (i.e., not since 1189 A.D.), but rather to mean “for a long time,” i.e., from the time of the Restoration, or at least, for some centuries.

²²⁸ See picture of Membury, Devon, on my website in connection with this Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) of my Textual Commentaries at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.

Anglican Church was under some level of Puritan scrutiny and control during the Interregnum. If so, it fared better than some other Anglican Churches, e.g., some were demolished, and others used as prisons, or as horse stables.

This Membury *Oak Apple Day Parade* which was revived in 1998, starts outside this Anglican Church on 29 May. This Church has a high tower, and from it is hung an oak branch as part of the annual *Royal Oak Day* celebrations. This element of the *Oak Apple Day* celebrations pre-exists the wider 1998 revival of 29 May celebrations at Membury, being a tradition having gone on for centuries. Villagers gather in costume from the civil war to 1660s era for the parade, and then go in procession along the narrow village road up to the local Post Office. At the Post Office an unhappy looking character is dressed as Oliver Cromwell (even though he died two years before the Restoration); and Cromwell simply stands there as a sad figure, and says nothing. By contrast, a bright looking character dressed as King Charles II makes a speech to those there. After the Charles II speech, the villagers then go to the local hall to socialize, and drink either apple cider or wine.

Ron Craddock told me in December 2008 that he was careful to consult records from Membury and the surrounding areas, so that in reviving wider *Oak Apple Day* celebrations at Membury in the late 20th century, there would be a general conformity with the broad local traditions of it as they had existed before the day's demise from the mid nineteenth century. Thus this fancy-dress element is part of this wider revival. Therefore while at the present, the events of the royal oak are more commonly remembered in place names bearing the name of "Royal Oak," as well as included as part of the secondary focus of *King Charles I's Day*; nevertheless, Membury stands as a reminder to us, that just like *King Charles I's Day* (30 Jan.) was revived on Anglican Calendars, so likewise, *Royal Oak Day* celebrations (29 May) may be revived in a given location. For "where there's a will, there's a way."

- 7i) *The London Oak Apple Day Parade.*
 - a) *Preamble on "the Shaver's" repentance;*
 - b) *General on London Oak Apple Day;*
 - c) *KJV translators Daniel Featley et al.*

7i)a) *Preamble on "the Shaver's" repentance.*

One of the reasons for the Royal Chelsea, founded by Charles II, *infra*, selecting the first or second Thursday in June to celebrate the *London Oak Apple Parade* on their *Founder's Day*, was its proximity to *Charles II's Birth and Return* on 29 May.

The proximity of such a Thursday June date to 29 May was inadvertently highlighted some time before this in a *Royal Oak Day Sermon* by the Reverend Mr. John

MacGowan (1726-1780²²⁹). From a “Presbyterian” background, before his conversion, MacGowan moved from Edinburgh to Durham, and was a most wicked sinner whose sins included the fact that when he was “19, he joined the rebel army of the [Popish Jacobite] Pretender; and fought at [the Battle of] Culloden” in 1746 at Scotland, which ended the *Forty-Five Rebellion*. But “afterwards “he was converted to God, and for a time he stood for” the erroneous Wesleyan Arminian teachings of “Wesley, but” eventually “MacGowan” came to embrace the Reformed truths in the doctrines of grace, and so “was a Calvinist.” He had moved from Durham to Stohton; and then “became the Minister of Devonshire Square Chapel, London²³⁰.”

The *Baptist Encyclopedia* (1881 & 1883), says after he was born in Edinburgh, Scotland, he “was converted among the Wesleyan Methodists, and by them ordained to the Ministry. Discovering the unscriptural character of Arminianism, he left the Methodists and united with the Congregationalists;” but then later became a Baptist. “In 1767, he was ordained pastor of the Devonshire Square Church, London,” where he remained “till his death” in “1780²³¹.”

²²⁹ His years of birth and death come from: “The shaver!: a quaint sermon shewing how the Church treated the founders of Methodism,” National Library of Australia Catalogue (<http://catalogue.nla.gov.au/Record/719590/Cite>).

²³⁰ Acklen, J.T. (Ed.), *Tennessee Records: Bible Records and Marriage Bonds* (2007). A short biography of him is found in this work at p. 30 of “Bible Records – Tombstone Inscriptions,” as “Sent by Miss Jetton,” being a “Copy from the obituary of Eliza McGowan, of Charlottetown, England.” The interest of these USA records to him relates to the fact that, “Peter, the third son of Rev. John MacGowan, ... emigrated to New York,” in “1789” “but afterwards ... to Prince Edward Island,” “and in four years after” “1789,” “he was made Attorney-General of the Province by Gov. Fanning, which office he held up to the time of his death in 1810.” (http://books.google.com.au/books?id=Wnl6p_e51gC&pg=PA30&lpg=PA30&dq=john+Macgowan+shaver&source=bl&ots=mUTGcFMz1H&sig=vuNb7uR5VpxXzwxwmimdeKxNLe8&hl=en&ei=tuF3TeyQMsKHcZXLqY8F&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=3&ved=0CBsQ6AEwAg#v=onepage&q=john%20Macgowan%20shaver&f=false)

²³¹ *The Baptist Encyclopedia*, Edited by William Cathcart, 1881, 2 Volumes, Revised Edition, Louis H. Everts, Philadelphia, USA, 1883. Vol. 2, p. 730, under “M.” (http://books.google.com.au/books?id=9rqeQKBVabAC&pg=PA730&lpg=PA730&dq=devonshire+square+chapel+london+macgowan&source=bl&ots=-KLNOMgCi4&sig=bIIWLIviDagUrwCF2CseDXDV54Y&hl=en&ei=vkl4TYLxKszJcZzThL0E&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=3&ved=0CCEQ6AEwAg#v=onepage&q=devonshire%20square%20chapel%20london%20macgowan&f=false).

John MacGowan's *nom de plume* was variously either "Pasquin Shaveblock" or "the Shaver"²³². His works include e.g., "The Shaver's new sermon for the fast day: respectfully inscribed to the Rev[erend] and laborious clergy of the Church of England," which was still in print years after his death in 1780, with prints of it in 1795 & 1796 with Editorial changes²³³. In "The Shaver's New Sermon for the Fast Day" (1795 reprint)²³⁴, an Editor has evidently added a "1795" "Dedication" and some other material from a post 1780 era referring to the French Revolution. This means I do not know which parts are MacGowan's, and which are those of the later Editor. But in broad terms, the idea of a "shaver" in this sermon is one of who gives judgment, so that the AV's reading of Ezekiel 5:1, "Son of man, take thee a sharp knife, take thee a barber's razor," becomes the sermon text, "Son of man, take unto thee – a Barber's Razor." Hence reference is made to e.g., "clerical shavers" in "the old prophets." Or "the old Reformers" of the Protestant Reformation, are said to "have shaved the 'old whore of Babylon'," i.e., the Roman Church (Rev. 17). He refers to metaphorically wearing his "shaving cloth" and having "carefully ... lathered" someone, saying "I mean the block." Thus he seems to mean by a "Shaveblock" which he uses as his surname *nom de plume* the head or face of someone that he shaves. A "Pasquin" (Latin, *Pasquillus*) refers to a battered Hellenistic style statue from the 3rd century B.C., discovered in Rome in 1501; and made famous in the 16th century when Cardinal Carafa draped this marble statue in a toga and decorated it for *St. Mark's Day* (25 April). From this came the words, "pasquil" and "pasquinade," referring to an anonymous satirical work. Thus in his *nom de plume*, "Pasquin Shaveblock," the "Pasquin" seemingly indicates that he is an anonymous writer, holding up certain vices to ridicule; and the "Shaveblock" seemingly indicates that like the "barber's razor" of Ezek. 5:1, he is giving a judgmental "shave" to certain persons. Hence his broader designation of himself as, "the Shaver."

Interestingly, in this "Shaver's new sermon for the Fast Day," some passing reference is made to "thousands of half-pay officers, Chelsea ... pensioners," i.e., those at the Royal Chelsea Hospital. Criticism is made in the same breath of those opposed to "God" and "the King," as well as condemnation of the "sons of Belial" – presumably

²³² See "The Reverend John Macgowan" who "published several books under pseudonyms," i.e., "The Shaver" and "Pasquin Shaveblock;" this website also include a portrait of "The Shaver" done by the Engraver, Richard Houston, from the original painting by J. Russel. (http://www.grosvenorprints.com/stock.php?pageNum_rs_stock=1&totalRows_rs_stock=26&engraver=Houston%2C+Richard&WADbSearch1=Submit).

²³³ See 10 editions at *Open Library* e.g., 1795, printed by W. Taylor, sold by J. Parsons & G. Ribau; or 1796 for Griffiths & Rhees; (http://openlibrary.org/works/OL215841W/The_Shaver's_new_sermon_for_the_fast_day).

²³⁴ "The Shaver's New Sermon for the Fast Day," The Fourth Edition, Printed by W. Taylor, Blackfriars, London, 1795. (Eighteenth Century Collections Online at National Library of Australia, Canberra, ACT, <http://www.nla.gov.au>.)

meaning the regicides who killed Charles I (i.e., on the basis of context this appears to manifest a culturally understood connotation of the late 18th century connected with this terminology's use in the *Office of King Charles the Martyr* for those who murdered the king), and "members of corresponding societies: Painites [Thomas Paine, who in 1775 argued that the North Americans should engage in sedition against the Crown, which those forming the USA did in 1776], Jacobins [i.e., Jacobites], and Republicans."

This "Shaver's new sermon for the Fast Day" is referred to on the cover page of another sermon of his, which says, "Pasquin Shaveblock flattereth himself that since his *Fast Sermon* hath been so favourably received, as to require five editions in three months, it will not offend the Rev. Clergy, or the public, that he now offers them a Thanksgiving Discourse"

The title of this other "Thanksgiving Discourse" sermon is self explanatory. "*Church and King: A THANKSGIVING SERMON, for May 29. Written in defence of our HAPPY CONSTITUTION, in CHURCH and STATE, with forcible arguments against the Toleration of heretics and Schismatics. By PASQUIN SHAVEBLOCK, Esq., Shaver Extraordinary.*" His sermon text was Ecclesiasticus (or Sirach) 49:1 (Apocrypha)²³⁵. This Royal Oak Day Sermon of Friday 29 May, says "On Thursday June 4, [it] will be published." Though undated, it was published in London, and so may in all probability be dated to the time of his Ministry in London from 1767 to 1780. 29 May fell on a Friday, and 4 June fell on a Thursday, three times during these years, in 1767, 1772, and 1778, so it was probably preached in one of these three years²³⁶. Given that the reference is made on the title page to the "Shaver's new sermon for the Fast Day" going through "five editions in three months," and this refers to "Painites" following Thomas Paine's seditious and murderous advise in favour of the American Revolution of 1776, this *prima facie* places the date of the Shaver's 29 May sermon at 1778. But since I do not know all differences introduced by the 1795 Editor of the "Shaver's new sermon for the Fast Day," I cannot be sure if the reference to "Painites" is from the Shaver or his Editor, so I must leave the matter at either 1767, 1772, or 1778, with the qualification that if an older copy of the "Shaver's new sermon for the Fast Day," is made known to me, it *might* be possible to fix the date for his Royal Oak Day Sermon at Friday 29 May 1778. If so, it was preached just two years before his death.

²³⁵ "The remembrance of Josias is like the composition of the perfume that is made by the art of the apothecary: it is sweet as honey in all mouths, and as musick at a banquet of wine" (Sirach 49:1, Apocrypha). Cf. II Kgs 22:1,2; II Chron. 34:1,2.

²³⁶ *Church and King: a Thanksgiving Sermon, for May 29. Written in defence of our happy constitution, in Church and State, with forcible arguments against the toleration of heretics and shismatics. By Pasquin Shaveblock, Esq., Shaver Extradordinary.* Printed by W. Taylor, Blackfriars; sold by J. Parsons, Paternoster Row & G. Riebau, No. 439 Strand. (*Eighteenth Century Collections Online* at Sydney University Library, title page only.)

John MacGowan's fondness for being called "the Shaver," is here evident in the title, "Shaver Extraordinary," or as we would now say, *Shaver Extraordinaire!* The "Shaver" went from being an unconverted and unsaved man nominally in Scottish Presbyterian, who engaged in "seditions" (Gal. 5:20) against the Crown (Matt. 22:21; I Peter 2:17); to being a saved man who passed through the errors of Wesleyan Arminianism and into the holy Reformed faith, first as a Congregationalist, and then as a Baptist. As a Baptist Minister, he came to the point where he would give "A Thanksgiving Sermon" on *Royal Oak Day*, 29 May, for the "Happy Constitution, in Church and State," which recognized and honoured the king, who at that time was George III (Regnal Years 1760-1820). Such a transformation was a fruit of his being, "born again" (John 3:7).

We thank God that the "Shaver" came to put aside the "seditions" (Gal. 5:20) of his unsaved life, and as a good Christian man, came to "Honour the King" on *Royal Oak Day*; having condemned the Jacobites that he formerly followed in the folly of his youthful sins (Ps. 25:7) in his "Shaver's new sermon for the Fast Day." In doing so, he reminds us that those who might formerly glorify sedition against the Crown, can by the grace of God *sometimes* be reclaimed, if they repent of this sin. (This seems to be more the case with "followers" further down the line, than the organizers "up the top," who can be repeatedly seen to "receive to themselves damnation," Rom. 13:2, and become Deists, vaguely defined Theists, or atheists.)

Like the London *Oak Apple Day Parade*, "the Shaver," celebrated *Oak Apple Day* in London. Another interesting element of this sermon by "the Shaver," John MacGowan, is that he moved to ensure that his sermon preached on Friday 29 May, would be printed quickly, in less than a week, on Thursday 4 June. That fact reminds us that the first Thursday in June is not long after 29 May. That is also noteworthy, because when the Royal Chelsea Hospital in London selected the first or second Thursday of June to be the date that they would celebrate *Royal Oak Day* or *Oak Apple Day* on, one of their reasons for doing so was its proximity to 29 May.

7i)b) General on London Oak Apple Day.

2011 is the 360th anniversary year of God's protection of Charles II as he hid in the royal oak following the Battle of Worcester in 1651. There is an annual London celebration of *Royal Oak Day* in the *Oak Apple Day Parade* of *Founder's Day* at the Royal Chelsea Hospital variously each year on the first or second Thursday of June. In 2011 it is the second Thursday in June, 9 June 2011, and for a number of reasons I have selected the London *Oak Apple Day Parade* Thursday date in June to dedicate my Textual Commentary Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) in 2011 over the other possible 2011 dates of: Sunday 30 January – on the basis that these events are a secondary focus of *King Charles I's Day*; or alternative *Royal Oak Day* dates of Saturday 28 May or Sunday 29 May. These reasons include the fact that at the time of the Restoration in 1660, King Charles II traveled from Dover to this final destination of London, entering London on 29

May 1660. Therefore, both then and now, the capital city of London is an important symbol of *Oak Apple Day* celebrations. Another reason is the ongoing royal patronage given to these London celebrations, which has continued since the removal of *King's Restoration Day* or *Royal Oak Day* as a State day from the Anglican Calendar in 1859. This royal patronage is evident both in the name of the *Royal Chelsea Hospital* which was established by a Royal Warrant of Charles II in 1681; and also in the fact that various members of the Royal Family have acted as reviewing Officer for its *Oak Apple Day Parade*, including a number of reigning monarchs, such as the present monarch, Queen Elizabeth II. And another reason for selecting this Thursday date, relates to one of the King James Bible's translators, Daniel Featley. This is the 400th anniversary year of the King James Bible (1611-2011)²³⁷, and Daniel Featley was made a confessor under the tyranny of the revolutionary Puritan republican, being released on bail shortly before his death at *Chelsea College*, where before its closure by the Puritans, he had earlier been made Provost by Charles I. The grounds of the former *Chelsea College* now form part of the grounds of the Royal Chelsea Hospital's *College Court*. Thus there is a historical linkage between the holy confessor, Daniel Featley, and this institution, upon whose grounds are held London's annual *Oak Apple Day Parade*.

Interestingly, there is a film record of *Royal Oak Day* celebrations here at Chelsea Royal Hospital during World War One (1914-1918)²³⁸. Chelsea Royal Hospital, Royal Hospital Road, London, SW3, was founded in 1681 and 1682 by King Charles II for the "succour and relief of veterans broken by age and war"²³⁹. Nowadays the word "hospital" has come to acquire the meaning of an institution caring for the sick. But the word formerly had a broader meaning. The English word, "Hospital," comes from the late Latin, *hospitale*, meaning a "guest-house," or "inn." Hence it meant in the Old French of the mid 13th century, a "hostel," and in 15th century English, a "charitable

²³⁷ I received an e-mail dated "Friday, 6 May 2011" of the "York Street News" which came from Justin Moffatt, the Rector of St. Philip's Anglican Church York Street, City of Sydney, where I sometimes attend 1662 Book of Common Prayer Services. The "York Street News" said, "... this week the King James Version of the Bible turns 400. It is a good time to consider the Bible: its role in our lives, and in the life of our society. Why do people love it? Why do people hate it? What is God achieving in the Bible? ... The Bible itself says (in the King James Version): 'For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.' (Hebrews 4:12)." A click on page at the e-mail's words "turns 400" says, "Happy Birthday KJV" which turns "400 years old on May 2."

²³⁸ "Oak Apple Day," *Wikipedia* (2008) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oak_Apple_Day). *Wikipedia* refers to a film clip of Colonel Lytton visiting Chelsea pensioners on Royal Oak Day, 1915 (Topical Budget 197-1: Oak Apple Day, 1915, British Film Institute, www.screenonline.org.uk/fil/is/728813/).

²³⁹ "About the Royal Hospital Chelsea," <http://chelsea-pensioners.co.uk>.

institution to house and maintain the needy.” Thus a “hospital” could historically be an almshouse for the poor, or a hostel, or a school such as a former London school which was known as *Christ’s Hospital*. It relates to the Latin word, *hospitalitas*, and Old French word, *hospitalis*, from which we get our English word, “hospitality.”

Thus Royal Chelsea Hospital stands as a monument to the Christian charity of Charles II, for our Lord said, “I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink, I was a stranger, and ye took me in: ... I was sick, and ye visited me Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me” (Matt. 25:34-36,40).

The Royal Hospital at Chelsea provides retirement living for retired soldiers. It contains a museum, and the hospital is daily open to the public for inspection, and indeed I have been privileged to visit it on a number of occasions. By long-standing tradition, the hospital celebrates *Royal Oak Day* annually. While this was originally done in connection with the state day of *Royal Oak Day* or *Oak Apple Day* on 29 May, after this ceased to be a state day in 1859, it was decided to retain the *Oak Apple Day Parade* and celebrations as the *Founder’s Day* of the Hospital founded by Charles II in 1681 and 1682. However, they then decided to exploit the fact that they were no longer bound by a legal requirement to observe this day on 29 May. Hence the Assistance Curator of the Museum at the Royal Chelsea, Tom Metcalfe, said a decision was made to hold their London Oak Apple Day celebrations at the Royal Chelsea Hospital “on the first / second Thursday in June to, ‘regularise a more permanent date and not change the day every year’.” It was so “decided by the Commissioners of the Royal Hospital Chelsea at a Commissioners Meeting,” thus making it “the 1st or 2nd Thursday of June, whichever date was nearest and most convenient to the 29th May taking into consideration other commitments. The reasons stated were that this would give people time to travel to the event (maybe traveling great distances by horse and carriage over two or three days or more) and that it was most likely that good weather could be expected in June²⁴⁰.”

It should be remembered that Royal Oak Day remembers both the Nativity and Restoration of Charles II. On the 1662 prayer book calendar, until 1859 this was written as either “CHARLES II. Nat. [= “Nativity”] & Ret. [= “Return”]” or “Charles II Nat. & R.” meaning, “Nativity and Return.” This was then written out in full at the section entitled, “Certain Solemn Days, for which particular Services are appointed” (which since 1859 is now put in the singular as, “A Solemn Day, for which a particular Service is appointed,” for Accession Day of a reigning monarch,) which then included, “III. The twenty-ninth Day of May, being the Day kept in Memory of the Birth and Return of King Charles II.” Indeed, from 1662 to 1664, the Office was called “King’s Birth and Return,” so that these two words were synonymous with “Nativity and Return” on the Calendar. But from 1664 the Office was revised and known variously as e.g.,

²⁴⁰ Email reply to myself of Tom Metcalfe, entitled “Founders Day questions,” Assistant Curator, Royal Chelsea Hospital, 14 June, 2010; and Email reply of Tom Metcalfe, entitled, “Oak Apple Day – Founders Day Royal Hospital Chelsea,” of 6 Jan. 2011.

“Restoration of the Royal Family” or “The King’s Restoration Day.” Hence the day has always remembered both the birth and restoration of Charles II. Indeed, the day of his birth, 29 May 1630, was marked by the appearance of a shining day-star high in the sky around high-noon. This was taken to be a sign that God was in some way singling out Charles II for something special, and indicating his favour upon him. And so it is, that in Fuller’s *Worthies* (1661), the chronicler, Thomas Fuller (d. 1661), records that Charles II’s birth was greeted with “general rejoicing;” and that Oxford University went so far as to “congratulate” “his birth with” “poems²⁴¹.” The fact that one element of *Oak Apple Day* remembers Charles II’s birth on 29 May 1630 is relevant when considering the Royal Chelsea’s contemporary tradition of keeping it on either the first or second Thursday of June.

Notably, this decision to move the memory of Charles II birthday to a date in June, is part of a wider movement to transfer the celebration of monarch’s birthdays to June, in order to standardize such matters in a month of what is generally better weather in England. In England, by convention the Official celebration of the monarch’s birthday has increasingly come to be transferred to June for this reason of better weather; although in Canada the tradition is to make in May, since Victoria Day, 24 May, which was Queen Victoria’s birthday has been made the Official Birthday for monarchs. In eastern Australia a similar June convention has come to be adopted, not because of weather issues, indeed it is the cooler weather in Australia, but because the Australian autumn (20/21 March - 21/22 June) and winter (21/22 June – 22/23 Sept.) is generally mild relative to the colder weather in England, there are no serious weather problems with celebrating the monarch’s birthday in June; and so in a June month general synchronization with the English tradition where it is kept on one of the first three Saturdays of June, usually the first or second Saturday, eastern Australia has also come to celebrate the monarch’s Birthday on a Monday in June (although in Western Australia it is in Sept./ Oct.²⁴²).

This general practice was evident in the nineteenth century. George III’s Birthday (Regnal Years: 1760-1820) was in 4 June; and since this fell in the May / June period of the better weather in England, this day was used. But his successor, George IV (Regnal Years: 1820-1830; Regency under George III from 1811-1820), retained 4 June as *King’s Birthday* for himself; and in turn, William IV (Regnal Years: 1830-1837), also kept 4 June as *King’s Birthday*. Because Victoria (Regnal Years: 1837-1901) was born on 24 May her birthday fell in the May / June period of the better weather in England, and so 24 May was used. Then came Edward VII (Regnal Years 1901-1910) who was born on 9 November, but the Official King’s Birthday was moved to the summer in the hope of good weather. In England this was in June, but in Canada the tradition of using a former monarch’s birthday (used by George IV and William IV, *supra*), was invoked to

²⁴¹ Freeman, J (Editor), Fuller’s *The Worthies of England* (1661), p. 384.

²⁴² In the State of Western Australia, e.g., Queen’s Birthday in 2010 was Mon. 27 Sept; whereas that year in eastern Australia it was on Mon. 14 June; and in 2011, in Western Australia it is on Mon. 3 Oct; whereas in eastern Australia it is on Mon. 13 June.

use 24 May, the date of Edward VII's predecessor, Victoria. George V (Regnal Years: 1910-1936) was born on 3 June, and so this date fell in the May / June period and was used unless it fell on a Sunday, in which instance it was transferred to Monday 4 June (something like the 1662-1859 Office of King Charles the Martyr's Day transferred *King Charles I's Day* to Monday 31 Jan. if it fell on Sunday 30 Jan.). Edward VIII (Regnal Year: 1936) was born on 23 June, and so this date fell in the May / June period and so was used in 1936. George VI (Regnal Years 1936-1952) was born on 14 Dec., and so his birthday was transferred to a Thursday in June. Queen Elizabeth was born on 21 April 1926, and so Queen's Birthday was transferred to June. For the first seven years of her reign, this was on the second Thursday in June; but was then changed²⁴³.

Thus in England the transference of a reigning monarch's birthday has always been to June, although a late May birthday has not been so transferred; and both George VI for all his reign, and Elizabeth II for her first seven years, used a Thursday in June. On the one hand, given that Charles II's Birthday was on 29 May, it might, like Victoria's which fell on 24 May, have been left on the basis that it was in this May / June period. But on the other hand, there was the additional issue of wanting to standardize the London *Oak Apple Day Parade* to a specific day, i.e., the first or second Thursday of June; and thus making it like the King's Birthday of George VI which was always transferred to a Thursday in June, or like the present Queen's Birthday in England which is on one of the first three Saturdays in June; or like the present Queen's Birthday in eastern Australia which is on a Monday long-weekend in June e.g., Monday 11 June 2007, Monday 9 June 2008, Monday 8 June 2009, Monday 14 June 2010, or Monday 13 June 2011. Hence one can see that this tradition of using the first or second Thursday in June for Charles II's Birth and Restoration at the London Oak Apple Day Parade is inside the parameters of this wider broad tradition.

In the 2003 "Official Guide" of "The Royal Chelsea Hospital" which I got on one of my visits to the Royal Chelsea in London, we read at the section on "Ceremonies," "The Royal Hospital Founder's Day is held on a day close to May 29th. This is the birthday of Charles II, as well as the date of the Restoration in 1660. It is known as Oak Apple Day. The Parade is held on the first or second Thursday of June when the Pensioners are usually reviewed by a member of the Royal Family. During the course of the celebratory day, the recently re-gilded statue of Charles II in Figure Court is decked in oak leaves and all participants in the Parade and spectators wear sprigs of oak leaves to commemorate the King's escape from the Parliamentary forces after the battle of Worcester in 1651²⁴⁴."

²⁴³ "Golden Gate Genealogy Forum," "Victoria Day" in Canada (<http://www.genealogyforum.com/gfaol/resource/Canada/Victoria.htm>); & "Windsor marks Queen's birthday with gun salute," British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) (http://news.bbc.co.uk/local/berkshire/hi/people_and_places/history/newsid_8632000/8632810.stm).

²⁴⁴ Richard Pailthorpe & Jon Nuttall, "Official Guide" of "The Royal Chelsea Hospital," Produced and published by Heritage House Group, Heritage House, Lodge

As the name, “Royal Chelsea” indicates, Royal Chelsea Hospital enjoys royal patronage, and has done so since King Charles II’s Royal Warrant of 1681 to build the Royal Hospital²⁴⁵. Thus in general terms, it has received the royal patronage of every subsequent monarch after Charles II, for example, James II (Regnal Years: 1685-1688), William III & Mary II (Regnal Years: Mary II, 1689-1694; William III, 1689-1702), Anne (Regnal Years: 1702-1714), George I (Regnal Years: 1714-1727), George II (Regnal Years: 1727-1760), George III (Regnal Years: 1760-1820), George IV (Regnal Years: 1820-1830; Regency under George III from 1811-1820), William IV (Regnal Years: 1820-1837), and Victoria (Regnal Years: 1837-1901). Thus the London Oak Apple Day celebrations have been celebrated under a general royal patronage of the monarch to this day.

In specific terms, the *Oak Apple Day Parade* occurs in *Figure Court* where a statue of King Charles II is shrouded in oak leaves; and those who attend these celebrations also wear sprigs of oak leaves. And as part of Queen Elizabeth II’s Golden Jubilee celebrations (1952-2002), the statue of King Charles II was re-gilded. In 2002 the Queen also presented the Royal Hospital with its colours of the Sovereign’s Mace.

The London Oak Apple Day celebrations are the most militarily and ceremonially impressive and important ones held for this day anywhere in the world²⁴⁶. They have had various members of the Royal Family as the Reviewing Officer. Members of the Royal Family were sometimes the Reviewing Officer before 1977, and since 1977 the Reviewing Officer has not always been a member of the Royal Family (e.g., it was not so in 1979). But since the heir apparent, Prince Charles in 1977, there has been the formalization of a general, though not absolute, tradition, that the Reviewing Officer will generally be a Member of the Royal Family. E.g., among reigning monarchs, the London Oak Apple Day Parade was Reviewed by King Edward VII (Regnal Years: 1901 to 1910) in 1909; King George V (Regnal Years: 1910 to 1936) in 1912; King George VI (Regnal Years: 1936 to 1952), in 1942; and Queen Elizabeth II (Regnal Years: since 1952) in 1962, 1975, 1982, and 2006.

Other members of the Royal Family include the contemporary heir apparent, Prince Charles, who was Reviewing Officer in 1977, 1983, 1992, 1999, and 2005. Or the King’s consort, Queen Alexandria in 1908; the King’s consort, Queen Elizabeth,

Lane, Derby, England, UK, 2003, p. 54. (Copy purchased at the Book Shop of Royal Chelsea Hospital, London, UK.)

²⁴⁵ *Ibid*, p. 8 (Royal Warrant of 22 Dec. 1681).

²⁴⁶ Members of the general public may apply for a ticket to attend the London Oak Apple Day Parade, but due to limited space their names are then placed in a ballot system, and so only a relatively small number are selected to attend.

jointly with King George VI in 1942²⁴⁷; or the Queen's consort, Phillip Duke of Edinburgh in 1978.

Thus in the section on "Royalty" we read that "Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II has reviewed the In-Pensioners on Founder's Day on four occasions. Reviewing Officers have been members of the Royal Family in every year since 1980²⁴⁸" (although this is not an absolute rule). This year of 2011 it is Prince Harry²⁴⁹. Hence, e.g., in Ronald Allison's 2002 book, *The Queen*, there is a picture of the Queen at the Founder's Day Parade in 1962, in which one can see oak leaves on the uniform of the old soldier she is talking to²⁵⁰.

Royalty certainly sometimes attended and acted as Reviewing Officer of the London Oak Apple Day Parade before the rise of this 1977 general tradition of a member of the Royal Family usually reviewing it; and non-royal persons have sometimes acted as the Reviewing Officer since 1977. But the rise of this post 1977 *Oak Apple Day* tradition, also corresponds in broad terms with the revival of *King Charles I's Day* in Australia in 1978, and in England in 1980. Thus since 1977 this has been made the general rule, e.g., the Reviewing Officer on the second Thursday in June, 2010, the 350th anniversary of the Restoration in 1660, on 10 June 2010 was His Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester, Prince Richard, a first cousin of Queen Elizabeth II.

Or the Reviewing Officer on the first Thursday in June, 2008, was Her Royal Highness, Princess Anne. Now with regard to Princess Anne, I have a special interest because my father, a retired army officer, was in the Royal Australian Corps of Signals; and Princess Anne was made the ceremonial Colonel-in-Chief of that Corps. Thus e.g., in 1986 my father and mother were invited to attend a Ceremonial Parade at the School of Signals at Simpson Barracks in Victoria, at which the Princess Anne Banner was presented to the Royal Australian Corps of Signals by His Excellency, the Governor-General of Australia. And so it is of some particular interest to me that I saw in the *Museum* of the Royal Chelsea Hospital in London, a certificate signed by the Princess

²⁴⁷ Email reply to myself of J. Morgan (Protocol Officer, Royal Chelsea Hospital, 11 March 2010); Email reply to myself of Tom Metcalfe (Chelsea Pensioners organization, on referral from L. Mayes, Royal Chelsea Hospital Operations Co-ordinator, 14 June 2010).

²⁴⁸ Pailthorpe's & Nuttall's "Official Guide" of "The Royal Chelsea Hospital," *op. cit.*, p. 60.

²⁴⁹ Email reply to myself from C. Mason (Archivist of the Royal Chelsea Hospital) on referral (for another matter) from T. Metcalfe (13 Jan. 2011).

²⁵⁰ The 1962 inspection by the Queen included some Boer War veterans in the Oak Apple Day Parade (Ronald Allison's *The Queen, 50 Years – A Celebration*, Grafton, Harper-Collins Publishers, London, 2002, p. 63, picture of Queen with Royal Chelsea Pensioners; ISBN 0 00 7650051).

Anne, stating that she was the Reviewing Officer at the London Oak Apple Day Parade on Thursday the 5th of June, 2008.

Charles II's escape in 1651 involved his presence near Salisbury, from about 6 October to 14 October 1651, where he daily visited Stonehenge. He was also assisted by Dr. HENCHMAN of Salisbury Cathedral²⁵¹. And in the merry month of May, I visited the areas of Stonehenge and Salisbury on *Oak Apple Day* (29 May) and the following two days (30 & 31 May) of 2001, in the 350th anniversary year of Charles II's protection at the royal oak, and escape to Dover via Salisbury and Stonehenge (1651-2001). In a thematic complement to this earlier *Royal Oak Day* visit to Salisbury and its environs in 2001, during the same period of the year as 6 to 14 October 1651, which is when Charles II was at Salisbury and visited Stonehenge, specifically, on Saturday 11 October 2008, I visited the *Royal Chelsea Hospital* in Royal Hospital Road, London, SW3, to take a number of photos; although I also returned to take some further photos on the Saturday seven weeks later at the end of November.

I will now take the interested reader on a "Cook's tour" of some of the sites I saw in October and November 2008.

In the graveyard, written with a small "E" over a "Y" meaning "THE," I there saw the gravestone of the first person buried at the Royal Chelsea Hospital, whose gravestone reads, "... Simon Box ... a soldier [who] served King Charles the First [,] King Charles the Second ... and King William [the Third of Orange] and Mary [the Second] ... deceased the 6th of April ... 1692." Other tombstones included e.g., one born about the same time as Charles II, "Here lyeth [lieth] the body of Capt[ain]. John Ransey who departed this life ... 1696 in the 66[th] year"

I also inspected *Figure Court* which is so named after *the figure* of the golden statue of Charles II. (A photo of this Caroline statue may be found at my website.)²⁵² This artistically shows Charles II as a Roman general, holding the baton of imperial authority. (More generally, this broad artistic tradition of Imperial Roman imagery is also reflected in the fact that George IV, was the last king of the British Isles to be shown wearing a Roman style laurel wreath on coins²⁵³.) It was presented to Charles II in 1682 by Tobias Rustat, a long-time retainer, and moved to the Royal Chelsea after Charles II's death in 1685. Originally gilded, it was then bronzed in 1782, but then re-gilded to commemorate the Golden Jubilee of Queen Elizabeth II in 2002 (1952-2002).

²⁵¹ "Escape of Charles II" *Wikipedia* (though this article contains errors, *supra*, it contains some useful information) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Escape_of_Charles_II).

²⁵² See my website in connection with this Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) of my Textual Commentaries at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.

²⁵³ Regnal Years: 1820-1830; Regency under George III from 1811-1820.

I also here saw a Latin inscription written in large gold letters on a white painted background on the front of the covered veranda in *Figure Court* which goes for the whole length of the veranda. It reads, “*In (For) subsidium (the help) et (and) levamen (the alleviation) senio (of aged) belloque (bello / ‘war’ + que / ‘and’) fractorum (‘fractured’ / ‘weakened’ [men.]) Condidit (It was built / founded) Carolus ([by] Charles) Secundus (the Second [;]) Auxit (It was enlarged) Jacobus ([by] James) Secundus (the Second [;]) perfecere ([and] it was completed) Gulielmus ([by] William) et (and) Maria (Mary [;]) Rex (King) et (and) Regina (Queen [;]) anno (in the year) Domini (‘of the Lord’ or ‘of [our] Lord’ [;]) MDCXCII (1692);” i.e., “For the help and the alleviation of aged and war weakened men. It was founded by Charles the Second. It was enlarged by James the Second; and it was completed by William and Mary, King and Queen, in the year of our Lord, 1692.” It is here in *Figure Court* that the annual *Oak Apple Day Parade* is held.*

In front of *Figure Court* some old artillery cannons are lined-up, together with some 36 inch (c. 91.5 centimetres) big black mullet mortars. These include two Howitzer guns captured at the *Battle of Waterloo* which saw Napoleon’s defeat in 1815.

I also inspected the grounds of the North Front around the Octagon Porch with tall white colonnades, and the statute of an old soldier holding up his stick²⁵⁴. It was unveiled in 2000 A.D. to commemorate the millennium in the bi-millennium year of Christ’s Birth (even though we now know that Christ was born c. 4 B.C.), and so is now known as the *Millennium Statue*. The background to this statue is the *Battle of Edgehill* in 1642²⁵⁵. This was the first pitched battle of the *First British Civil Wars*, fought in southern Warwickshire in England. This battle between c. 12,400 Royalist Cavaliers and c. 15,000 Roundheads proved to be inconclusive, with both sides having a casualty list of about 500 dead, and 1,500 wounded. In the Royalist forces, the centre was led into battle by Sergeant Major-General Jacob Astley, 1st Baron Astley of Reading (1579-1652). His Battle-Prayer before the *Battle of Edgehill* has become famous as *The Soldier’s Prayer*, “O Lord, thou knowest how busy I must be this day. If I forget thee, do not forget me.” Against this backdrop, the *Millennium Statue*, designed by Philip Jackson, includes on its base a form of these words of Jacob Astley’s Christian prayer.

I also saw *College Court*. This is so named because the Royal Chelsea Hospital’s southern area is built on the foundations of the *Chelsea College* building. This is where the King James Bible translator and holy confessor, Daniel Featley, died in 1645; shortly after being let out of prison on bail, from the revolutionary Puritan regime’s imprisonment of him for his Anglicanism and Royalism in which he gave a Biblical

²⁵⁴ Commissioned Officers may carry a “swagger stick,” whereas Warrant Officers and more generally senior Non-Commissioned Officers may carry a “pace stick” (although a Regimental Sergeant-Major might also carry a “swagger stick”).

²⁵⁵ See “Battle of Edgehill,” *Wikipedia* (Feb. 2011) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Battle_of_Edgehill); and “Jacob Astley, 1st Baron Astley of Reading” (Oct. 2010) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jacob_Astley,_1st_Baron_Astley_of_Reading).

witness to, “Fear God. Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17), and “Render ... unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s” (Matt. 22:21). (The anti-Anglican *Solemn League & Covenant* was adopted under English Puritan revolutionary Interregnum Ordinances in 1643; although some of its roll-on provisions came in later Ordinances, such as the Interregnum Ordinance making the Anglican prayer book “illegal” from 1645.) There was also a school in *College Court* for old soldiers’ daughters from 1729 to 1862, and during this time, the girls provided the Chapel Choir.

Inside the buildings of the *Royal Chelsea*, when I went to see the Chapel in October the door was locked, but I got a zoom up picture of some of its interior through the keyhole (whose shape forms part of this picture), which includes the baptismal font. But upon my return in Nov. 08 it was open, and so I was then photographed at the baptismal font with an old soldier on Chapel duty, Warrant Officer (WO1) Suttle, whose medals included the *Long Service and Good Conduct Medal* (which my Father also has). Work on the Chapel started in 1681 under Charles II, and was completed in 1687. It is a work of Sir Christopher Wren, and the Chapel’s woodwork e.g., the wainscoting and pews, is original from the 17th century. The Chapel contains the *Royal Coat of Arms* (historically *Church of England* churches were legally required to have this on display). Above the Communion Table is a painting on the dome shaped ceiling of *Christ’s Second Coming & Day of Final Judgment* (painted by Sebastian Ricci, assisted by his nephew, Mark, in 1714).

Other sites of interest I saw included *The Great Hall*. This has a painting of Charles II on a white horse, begun by Antonio Verrio and finished by Henry Cooke c. 1690. Sadly, this otherwise elegant portrait, is marred by the presence of two depictions of females with bear-breasts. I do not accept that because something is “artwork” it therefore is not pornographic. Pictures or statues of sexual immorality and perversity come from both ancient times, mediaeval times, and like this one, from later times. *They are wicked and immoral and no attempt should be made to justify them.* In my opinion a suitably qualified artist should be employed to cover these feminine breasts; and his name should then be added to the list as one the painters of this portrait, who put on it “some necessary and excellent finishing touches.”

Coming off *Light Horse Court*, I also saw the Chelsea Royal Hospital’s *Museum*. Museum signs read e.g., “Founder’s Day at the Royal Hospital, also known as Oak Apple Day commemorates the birthday of our founder, King Charles II and his restoration to the throne.” “After the Battle of Worcester in 1651, Charles hid in an oak tree to escape capture by Cromwell’s soldiers. On the anniversary of his birthday (29 May) the Royal Hospital holds a festival to commemorate these events.” “The statue of our Founder in Figure Court is shrouded in oak leaves and all In-Pensioners on Parade and spectators wear sprigs of oak leaves.” Amidst the words on these signs are various pictures of *Oak Apple Day* e.g., one of the Queen Mother walking along rows of soldiers²⁵⁶, with a

²⁵⁶ Queen Elizabeth (d. 2002), the mother of the present Queen Elizabeth II (Regnal Years: from 1952), and the consort of King George VI (Regnal Years: 1936-1952).

caption, “Founder’s Day, 1991. The Queen Mother meets the Pensioners;” or one of Field Marshall Lord Carver from Oak Apple Day 1979. Pictures and captions were also on display of Reviewing Officers in “1937,” “Queen Mary;” “1942,” “HM [His Majesty] King George VI and Queen Elizabeth;” “1978,” “HRH [His Royal Highness] The Duke of Edinburgh;” “1982,” “Her Majesty the Queen;” or “1992,” with “Prince Charles.”

Of some interest is also the “Parade Chair,” a gift from the Royal Chelsea to Elizabeth II on the occasion of her 50th Jubilee in 2002. This chair is used for the trooping of the colour, held at the end of June. On the back of this chair is the Crest of Chelsea Royal Hospital, *surrounded by oak leaves*, remembering and representing the royal oak at Boscobel in which Charles II hid from Roundheads in 1651.

7i)c) KJV translators Daniel Featley et al.

There is a hagiological divide within Protestantism on the Caroline eras. My hagiology for the era is that of a traditional Low Church Evangelical Anglican who upholds the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* and 39 Articles. The King James Bible translators were royalist Anglicans. Most of them died before the time of the Interregnum. For example, when I inspected Worcester Cathedral in Dec. 2008, I there saw an elaborate sarcophagus with full body effigy over the grave of Richard Eades, Dean of Worcester from 1597 to 1604. A royal Chaplain to Elizabeth I (Regnal Years: 1558-1603) from 1589, and a royal chaplain to James I (Regnal Years: 1603-1625) from 1603, Dean Eades was invited to join the group of King James Bible translators. But he died in 1604 before the work really got under way. However, the last three of the King James Bible translators to die, all died after the adoption under English Puritan revolutionary Interregnum Ordinances of the virulently anti-Anglican *Solemn League & Covenant* in 1643. Thus all three died under varying levels of persecution from the revolutionary Puritan republican regime of the 1640s and 1650s²⁵⁷, and so may be fairly deemed to be holy confessors. (The *Act of Uniformity* of 1662 declared the *Solemn League & Covenant* to be “an unlawful Oath ... of this Kingdom” of England.)

Andrew Bing²⁵⁸, a Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge University, who had been a sub-dean of York Cathedral in 1606, and Archdeacon of Norwich Cathedral, two architecturally very beautiful Anglican Cathedrals known to me, lived through the horrors and tyrannies of the Interregnum in which he learnt of the Puritan revolutionary republicans’ murder most foul of his king, King Charles the Martyr in 1649. This King James Bible translator died under the “unhappy confusions²⁵⁹” and “tyranny²⁶⁰” of the

²⁵⁷ See Sermon in Appendix 5 of this Textual Commentary, Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25).

²⁵⁸ “Bing” or “Byng” or “Binge.” See “Andrew Bing” *Wikipedia* (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Andrew_Bing).

²⁵⁹ Preface, *Book of Common Prayer* (1662).

revolutionary Puritan republic's *Solemn League and Covenant*, and was under Interregnum Ordinances “legally” denied the rite of an Anglican burial when he died in 1652, as the Elizabethan and Jacobean Anglican prayer book of 1559 and 1604 had been declared “illegal” in 1645 (as a roll-on Ordinance flowing from the earlier 1643 Interregnum Ordinance adoption of the *Solemn League and Covenant*). Of relevance to this era, in December 2008 I inspected an Anglican Church that had been secretly built and completed the year after Andrew Bing's death in 1653 at Staunton Harold, Leicestershire, in England. The inscription above the church door says it was built “when all things sacred were throughout this nation either demolished or profaned.” (A photo of this may be found at my website.)²⁶¹

Another King James' translator, John Boyce (Bois) died on Sunday 14 January 1644. Under the Puritan revolutionaries vile and unlawful oath known as the *Solemn League and Covenant* as adopted the year before under Interregnum Ordinances, which *Solemn League and Covenant* was later declared an illegal oath under the 1662 English and 1666 Irish Acts of Uniformity, and removed under the 1661 Scottish Rescissory Act, Sunday the 14th of January 1644 was the first Sunday set by the Puritan regime for the closure of Ely Cathedral, another architecturally beautiful Cathedral known to me. John Boyce was a senior Prebendary of Ely, and Ely Cathedral conducted Anglican Church Services. He knew in his mind, that this coming Sunday the doors of that Cathedral would be shut tight to Anglicans under Puritan Interregnum Ordinances²⁶².

Perhaps he looked longingly out a window towards Ely Cathedral, which before the 18th century was surrounded by water and so on an island, and known as “one of the seven wonders of the Middle Ages;” and perhaps he then looked lovingly down at his Anglican prayer book of 1559 & 1604, which was a symbol of Protestantism over the Popery of Bloody Mary; but which this time had been brought down not by the Papists, but by the Puritans. As that Sunday approached, that first Sunday on which John Boyce knew that under the cruelties of the *Solemn League and Covenant*, the Puritan regime would bolt fast the door of Ely Cathedral to all Anglicans, perhaps it was the stress of this nearby event on him, that broke his heart. For on that very Sunday, he did lay down and die, and the angels of God came and carried the soul of this Anglican King James Bible translator home to his heavenly rest, where the Puritan Revolutionaries could no longer hurt him.

²⁶⁰ Collect in Office for *King Charles the Martyr's Day*, Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662-1859.

²⁶¹ See my website in connection with this Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) of my Textual Commentaries at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com> .

²⁶² Halliham, C.P., “John Bois, Authorized Version translator,” *Trinitarian Bible Society Quarterly Record*, Jan-March 2011, No. 594, pp. 29 & 31. “Andrew Bing” *Wikipedia* (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Andrew_Bing).

Certainly this type of view has formed part of the traditional hagiology of Anglicanism. For example, a contemporary of the Reverend Mr. John Boyce, the Reverend Mr. Anthony Walker, who received a Master of Arts degree from St. John's College, Cambridge University, and was Rector of Fyfield in Essex, wrote a biography on, "The Life of ... Mr. John Bois, ... one of the translators of the [King James] Bible, ... and senior Prebendary of Ely; who died 14 Jan. 1643²⁶³." Among other things we here read, "The day before he died, he would by all means be removed into the place where his wife departed. In which room ... he went, though in a troublesome time" i.e., that of Puritan republic Ordinances, "yet on the day of rest," i.e., the Sabbath of Sunday, "unto his rest, from amongst men of war" i.e., the revolutionary Puritans republicans, "a man of peace, unto the God of Peace: upon the first Sunday after he and others, the doors" of Anglican Churches "being shut," under *Solemn League & Covenant* derived Ordinances, in which Anglicans "were prohibited to praise God in the choir of men: to praise him in that choir, the gates whereof shall not be shut, Rev. 21:15, *as if God would not suffer such a saint one sabbath day to be excluded the heavenly Jerusalem, or the type of it on earth, the [Anglican] church*" (emphasis mine).

A postscript to this story on John Boyce of Ely, is the fact that at the time of the Restoration, on 29 May 1660 in London, the Bishop of Ely, (together with the Bishops of Salisbury, Rochester, and Chichester,) "with divers[e] of the long oppressed orthodox clergy; met in" the "Royal Chapel" at "Westminster, and there also sung" e.g., the "*Te Deum*²⁶⁴," thanking God for the Restoration²⁶⁵.

²⁶³ In Allen, W (Translator & Editor), *Translating For King James*, Being a true copy of the only notes made by a translator of King James's Bible, the Authorized Version, as the *Final Committee of Review* revised the translation of Romans through Revelation at Stationers' Hall in London in 1610-1611: taken by the Reverend John Bois, Rector of Boxworth, Prebendary of Ely, Scholar & Fellow of St. John's College in Cambridge, and there Chief Lecturer in Greek for some ten years, ... through a copy made by the hand of William Fulman, clergyman, ... who upon his death, in sixteen hundred and eighty eight, bequeathed to Corpus Christi, Oxford, ... this copy of ... Bois's notes. Allen Lane The Penguin Press, London, UK, 1970, pp. 127-152 (with some modernization of the text).

²⁶⁴ The short title of the *Te* (Latin, thee) *Deum* ([O] God) *Laudamus* (we praise) i.e., the opening words, "We praise thee, O God," of the ancient Christian hymn now found at Morning Prayer (Mattins) in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662).

²⁶⁵ "England's Joy or a Relation of the most remarkable passages, from His Majesty's arrival at DOVER, to his entrance at WHITEHALL," Printed by Thomas Creak, London, 1660; reprinted in: An English Garner, *Stuart Tracts 1603-1693, op. cit.*, pp. 427-430, at p. 430.

And the third of the last three of the King James Bible translators to die, was the Anglican, Daniel Featley²⁶⁶. His books included, for instance, “Antichrist Unmasked,” relevant given that the Dedicatory Preface of the King James Bible refers to the Pope in the words of II Thessalonians 2:3 as “that man of sin.” Daniel Featley had been offered, but had not accepted the Chair of Divinity at Leiden (Leyden) in Holland, a city where later dwelt the neo-Byzantine Elzevirs of Leiden. In November 1643, Puritan soldiers of the first civil war put Daniel Featley in some danger in a harassing action burning down his barns and stables, breaking open his Anglican church, smashing the church windows, pulling down the baptismal font where infants were baptized with *the sign of the cross* made on their foreheads which thing the Puritans opposed; and then putting to the torch the Communion rails in his church for the Puritans did not believe in kneeling to receive Communion. For example, the Final Rubric of the Communion Service in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662, refers to extremist Puritans such as Samuel Rutherford as in “malice and obstinacy” who have “misconstrued and depraved” the Anglican practice of kneeling to receive Communion which “may not be adored;” “for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians.” But Daniel Featley himself had slipped through their net.

Then in February 1643, while he was conducting an Anglican Church Service at Lambeth Church in London, five Puritan soldiers sought to enter and murder him. But in the ensuing kaffuffle, while two Anglican worshippers of the church were murdered, Daniel Featley himself once again slipped through their net, managing to dodge the intruders, and by the grace of God, get away. Seemingly rounding some revenge for having been previously foiled, in March 1643, King James Bible translator, Daniel Featley, was then ejected from his Anglican Church under Puritan Ordinances. But initially, he bounced back for the third time, by managing to get that ejection rescinded on a legal technicality. But then, when Daniel Featley spoke to the Westminster Assembly in which he defended episcopal church government, denounced the alienation of Anglican Church property, and refused to give his assent to the *Solemn League and Covenant*; he was very clearly once again in the Puritans’ target sights. And being as he was a Chaplain of King Charles the First, was also not the kind of thing well received by the republican Puritans. But then Daniel Featley basically “brought the roof down” at the Westminster Assembly, when he announced that he was withdrawing from that body. That was because the King had sent him a message telling him to do so; and so now this King James Bible translator, Daniel Featley, was even more in the angry Puritans’ disfavor, as they once again set their target sights on him.

Placed under close surveillance, it was discovered that that he was in correspondence with His Grace, Archbishop James Ussher of Ireland; and also in correspondence with His Majesty King Charles I at Oxford. Given that he was a

²⁶⁶ Known variously by the Christian name of Daniel or Richard, and the surname of Featley / Fairclowe / Fairclough (he was a son of John Fairclough). Hallihan, C. P., “Who were the learned men of the 1604-11 Translation Committees? Part II,” *Trinitarian Bible Society Quarterly Record*, April-June 2011, No. 595, pp. 21-27 at p. 21. (Warning: this article contains some pro-Puritan and anti-Anglican material.)

chaplain of King Charles the First, such correspondence with the King could hardly be described as a “startling revelation;” although the Puritans apparently thought themselves *very smart* for detecting the fact that this very Anglican clergyman was in communications with *an Anglican Archbishop*, James Ussher, and *an Anglican King* whose Chaplain he was. Hence the King James Bible translator, Daniel Featley, was then imprisoned by the Puritans at Lord Petre’s House in Aldersgate Street in London. While a prison inmate, though he was quite ill and suffering in his imprisonment, he further angered the Puritans when in January 1644, he wrote a book defending Anglicanism, including the prayer book and 39 Articles, against Puritanism. After 18 months of jail, Daniel Featley was extremely ill, and the pallor of death hung over him. The weak and sickly Daniel Featley then managed to get out of jail on bail, and lived at *Chelsea College*; but he died shortly later in April 1645 at the age of 63. He was then buried in the Chancel of Lambeth Church in London.

His final residence of *Chelsea College* had been a Theological School founded in 1610 by James the First of the King James Bible. But *Chelsea College* was closed during the civil war era, and used to house royalist prisoners in. However, after the Restoration of Charles II in 1660, that site became the site of the Chelsea Royal Hospital, a retirement home for old soldiers; which continues to keep Royal Oak Day as its Founder’s Day to this very day. The southern range of it is built on the foundation of the *Chelsea College* building. When visiting *College Court*, I saw a well maintained and spacious lawn court, with a small number of well tended trees, and a central garden in the middle of it, all encircled by a road. Its buildings follow the design of the *Hotel des Invalides*. Its southern range, built upon the foundations of the old building of *Chelsea College* was designed to provide the Infirmary and Surgery. It acted as a school for the daughter of old soldiers from 1729 to 1862, at which time they were drawn upon to form a Girls’ Choir for the Chapel. During the Napoleonic wars its Infirmary was taken over for serving soldiers, and ill In-Pensioners were treated in a temporary facility above the Great Hall. This block is now used for staff accommodation²⁶⁷.

In walking in *College Court*, as I have been privileged to do, one is walking where a King James Bible translator, and a holy confessor, persecuted by the Puritans, Daniel Featley walked. One is walking where a saint of God has trod, and so in Dedicating this Volume 3 of my textual commentaries on the date *Oak Apple Day* is kept at this institution, which this year is the second Thursday in June, 9 June 2011; I wish, in this 400th anniversary year of the King James Bible, to also honour the name and memory of this holy confessor, persecuted for his Royalist Anglican commitment to the Bible (Matt. 22:21; Rom. 13:1-9; I Peter 2:17).

Thus for the purposes of this Dedication, I have selected the London *Oak Apple Day Parade* Thursday date in June for multiple reasons. These include the fact that after Charles II’s ship had safely reached the white cliffs of Dover in 1660, the people came out to throw flowers in front of him, as he proceeded homeward to London. Therefore

²⁶⁷ Pailthorpe’s & Nuttall’s “Official Guide” of “The Royal Chelsea Hospital,” *op. cit.*, p. 31.

as the capital city, both then and now, London is an important symbol for Royal Oak Day celebrations. Another reason is the royal patronage given to these London celebrations, both by virtue of the fact that they are at the *Royal Chelsea Hospital* established by a Royal Warrant of Charles II in 1681; and also the ongoing royal patronage of the London Oak Apple Day Parade by various members of the Royal Family on the Founder's Day of that institution, as reviewing Officer, including a number of reigning monarchs, such as the present monarch, Queen Elizabeth II. And another reason for selecting this Thursday date which in 2011 is the second Thursday of June, 9 June 2011, it that in this 400th anniversary year of the King James Bible, one of its translators, Daniel Featley, who was a confessor under the tyranny of the Puritan republican revolutionaries, was released on bail shortly before his death at *Chelsea College*, and the grounds on which the former *Chelsea College* stood now form part of the grounds of the Royal Chelsea Hospital's *College Court*. Thus there is a linkage between the holy confessor, Daniel Featley, and this institution, where he was appointed Provost by Charles I before its closure by the revolutionary Puritan regime, and upon whose grounds are held London's annual *Oak Apple Day Parade* on the first or second Thursday of June.

7j) *Charles II lands at Dover* ☺.

On 26 May 1660, King Charles II landed at Dover. Three days later, he entered London in great triumph, so that 29 May was thereafter celebrated as *Restoration Day* (short title; longer title, e.g., *Restoration of the Royal Family Day* or *The King's Restoration Day*).

In Jan. 2002, I was privileged to visit Dover in the County of Kent. Dover is in the south-east of England, and on the coast. I there inspected an ancient Roman lighthouse from the first century A.D. i.e., New Testament times; St. Mary's Anglican Church (originally built before the Norman Conquest, c. 1,000 A.D.); Dover Castle, which has a 12th century keep (the inner part of a castle), dating to c. 1181-8; and a 13th century gate and wall. From the truly picturesque scenery looking along the beach towards the castle which is elevated on a mountain top, one can see Dover Castle and the renowned, "white cliffs of Dover."

The *white cliffs of Dover* were a famous World War Two (WWII) landmark (1939-45), since Royal Air Force and other allied pilots returning to home bases in the United Kingdom, would breathe a sigh of relief, and thereafter breathe easy, once they saw those long awaited, *white cliffs of Dover*. That is because they knew that they were, to a very large extent, home again, safe'n'sound; and that even if they got shot down or something went wrong, they could *probably* parachute to safety. (Although the danger of being killed by an enemy fighter plane still represented a relatively low, but real, risk.)

When I visited Dover in 2002, it still had an aura of WWII memories. Over a doorway of Dover Castle is a sign, "Entrance to Secret Wartime tunnels," and these lead to the "World War II Underground Hospital and Operations Headquarters." Moreover, on Dover Beach, is a *Dunkirk Marker*, reminding people of the movement of troops and equipment from Dunkirk in France to the safety of Dover in England during WWII.

There is also a memorial formed from material taken from a long-range Nazi German gun, which recorded on it 84 strikes against Dover during WWII. This war trophy was presented to Dover by the British Legion.

Standing in the Dover Lighthouse area, I took a long-shot photograph of the beach and bay area. As I consider the place played by Dover in WWII, I am reminded of the fact that we white Christian Australians, white Christian Americans, and others on the Allied side, still remember our WWII war dead, and are grateful to God for the Allied victory over Nazi Germany. *Lest we forget.* Nevertheless, we do so without any hatred of our contemporary fellow white Christians in Germany. So likewise, I consider we should remember our royalist civil war dead, and be grateful to God for the Restoration of the Anglican monarch, King Charles II, *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland*, who landed at Dover in May 1660. *Lest we forget.* But in doing so, we should hold no hatred of contemporary (mainly English and Irish) Puritan derived Protestants.

I maintain that all good Protestant Christians, whether Anglican or Puritan, are washed in the same blood of the same Lord Jesus. We are justified freely by the same grace of God, through faith in the same atoning blood of Christ, who gave himself for our sins, in a vicarious substitutional atonement. We recognize the same authoritative Bible. We religiously conservative Protestant Christians proclaim the same threefold Reformation Motto, “*sola fide, sola gratia, sola Scriptura*” (Latin, “faith alone, grace alone, Scripture alone”); or if it is expanded to its fivefold form, also adding “*solo Christo* (Latin, ‘Christ alone’)” and “*Soli Deo Gloria* (Latin, ‘Glory to God Alone’).” We uphold the same *Apostles’ Creed*. We worship the same Trinity in unity, and unity in Trinity. We broadly submit to the same *Ten Commandments* (notwithstanding our differences of interpretation with regard to some of them). We pray the same *Lord’s Prayer*. Let not this, our unity in Christ, be forgot, amidst our hagiological differences over Charles I and Charles II. Let us not so elevate our differences, that they should be a bar to fellowship between us, for we are all one in Christ, and Christ is all in all.

In this context, I am pleased to report that when I visited Scotland in December 2001, I saw Provand’s Lordship in Glasgow. Dating from 1471 A.D., this is the oldest house in Glasgow, and was originally part of St. Nicholas’s Hospital; although it is now a museum. Inside this museum, I saw “The Spruce Panel.” This shows the Royal Coat of Arms of King Charles II. Dating from 1680-1685, it came from a *Church of England* parish church in England, when after the Reformation, formerly by law, every church was required to display the monarch’s Royal Coat of Arms, and in many churches it was placed in the Chancel. Presbyterian Scotland’s Parliament had declared Charles II king after the death of Charles I in 1649; crowned him at Scone in 1650; and supplied him with troops in his fight against Cromwell’s republicans at the Battles of Dunbar in Scotland (1650) and Worcester in England (1651). This “Spruce Panel” at Glasgow was thus a royalist statement of loyalty to the Crown, and recognition of the Restoration in 1660 under King Charles the Second.

7k) *The Restoration Prayer Book of 1662: its language a fruit of the AV.*

Like Shakespeare's plays, the King James Version of 1611 was written in an educated English, but one which the common man could, with relatively little effort, learn and understand. It thus used the literary style endorsed in the Old Testament in which Hebrew speakers had to learn the similar, though slightly different Aramaic, in order to understand parts of e.g., Ezra and Daniel, as well as master certain poetical techniques to understand other sections of Scripture. This is quite different to the literary style of the New Testament which uses a "common" or "Koine" Greek. While the OT and NT thus present translators with two quite different options that have been sanctioned by God himself, for English speakers it was the OT style option that won out for a multiplicity of reasons, including the need to render the "you" singular as "thee," "thou," and "thy," and "you" plural as "you," "ye," and "your," since this distinction is so found in the underpinning tongues of the OT and NT, and for the Protestant *accuracy of translation* is a paramount consideration. Thus even in its day, the King James Version used what by 1611 was archaic English²⁶⁸.

Thus as seen in the 1611 AV, the teaching of English speaking Protestants was *not* that the Bible should be *in the common tongue of the people*, but rather, *in a tongue that the common man could understand* (Article 24, Anglican 39 Articles). Thus the King James Bible was part of a process which under God sought to elevate and ennoble man through Christianity, and so stands in contradistinction to the "modern" versions which seek to debase the better persons in the church by a downgrade of language, and leave what are known variously as "new converts" or "unchurched persons" languishing in elements of their carnality and baseness. As with so many other areas of life, the "modern" "English as she's spoken, mate," versions remind us that, "the scum has floated to the top of the water."

In this context, I think the Congregational Protestant, Martyn Lloyd Jones (d. 1981) was quite right to defend the AV in 1961, against what at the time was the *Revised Version* of 1881-5 (the earlier English form of the later *American Standard Version* of 1901), the *Revised Standard Version* of 1946 & 1952²⁶⁹, and the *New English Bible* of that same year of 1961²⁷⁰. Speaking at an *Evangelical Alliance* meeting at the Royal Albert Hall in London, UK, in the 350th anniversary year of the AV (1611-1961), he set about "to remember and commemorate the printing of the Authorized Version of the Bible in 1611," and "to call back ... people ... to the Bible." Among other things, he attacked "the devastating Higher Critical movement, so called, which began in Germany around the 1830s It was claimed that this Book," the Bible, "must be regarded as every other book, and examined in the same way as every other book is examined."

²⁶⁸ See Textual Commentaries Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), Preface, section "8) AV stylistic matters: Anglicization of Words, formal & dynamic equivalence."

²⁶⁹ Later revised again in the 1971 RSV, then superseded by the *New Revised Standard Version* of 1989, and *English Standard Version* of 2001.

²⁷⁰ NT 1961; NT, OT, & Apocrypha, 1971; then superseded by the *Revised English Bible* of 1989.

Martyn Lloyd Jones further declared, “we are told,” that the Bible “must be put in such simple terms that anybody taking it up and reading it is going to understand all about it. My friends, this is nothing but sheer nonsense! *What we must do is to educate the masses of the people UP to the Bible, not bring the Bible DOWN to their level.* One of the greatest troubles in life today is that everything is being brought down to the same level; everything is being cheapened. The common man is made the standard and the authority; he decides everything, and everything has got to be brought down to him; everywhere standards are coming down and down. Are we to do this with the Word of God? I say, No! What has always happened in the past has been this: an ignorant, illiterate people ... coming to salvation, have been educated UP to the Book and have begun to understand it, and to glory in it, and to praise God for it. I am here to say that we need to do the same at this present time. *What we need, therefore, is not to replace the Authorized Version We need rather to train people up to the standard and the language and the dignity and the glory of the ... Authorized Version.*”

Martyn Lloyd Jones further said, “I am here to suggest that we ought to protest against the dropping of great words like ‘propitiation’ and ‘redemption’ which are very essential to a true understanding of our gospel.” After referring to “the error of the Revised Version” of 1881-5, he made specific reference to “this new version” of that year’s 1961 *New English Bible* (NEB) New Testament. He went on to say, “let me quote to you an Archbishop of the Anglican Communion, the Very Rev[erend] Philip Harrington who is the Anglican Archbishop of Quebec” in Canada, “a learned, scholarly man and the author of two massive volumes on the early Christian church. This is how he writes” “this year on the New English Bible”: “‘The intelligent reader will find much of it that is helpful and illuminating, *but he must keep his old Authorized Version by his side in order to find out what the apostles or prophets actually said, if that is what he wants to know.*’ I am free to confess that I came nearer to becoming an Anglican when I read that than ever in my life²⁷¹.”

It is significant that the King James Version of 1611 retained language that was archaic in its day, in order to more accurately render the Word of God with need to render the “you” singular as “thee,” “thou,” and “thy,” and “you” plural as “you,” “ye,” and “your;” although in doing so, it also gave honour to the Protestant martyr, William Tyndale, whose work is evident in between 60% and 80% of the King James Bible. *But as an outgrowth of a Biblically centred Christianity*, the practice arose to surround this with such linguistic supports as using “thee” and “thou” in prayer to God; hymnals that used similar language, e.g., the hymn, “How Great Thou Art²⁷²,” (note the assonance on

²⁷¹ Lloyd-Jones, D.M., *Knowing The Times*, Addresses Delivered on Various Occasions 1942-1977, *op. cit.*, chapter 8, “How Can We See a Return to the Bible?,” pp. 106-117, at pp. 106,107,110,112,113 (italicized emphasis mine).

²⁷² The name of the hymn, “How great thou art,” is found in the Refrain, “Then sings my souls, my Saviour God to thee, How great thou art, How great thou art!; Then sings my souls, my Saviour God to thee, How great thou art, How great thou art!” It is based on an 1885 Swedish poem by the Lutheran, Carl Boberg (1859-1940). First

“How” and “Thou,” and the end-letter alliteration of “t” on “Great” and “Art,” which uses the English language to enhance a God focus in the echoing “Thou Art;” and which would be totally lost in a flat-falling modernization to, “How Great You Are”); or Psalters that used similar language e.g., the 1650 Presbyterian Caroline Psalter. In this context, the Book of Common Prayer of 1662 used similar language to the AV *as a fruit of the fact that it was an outgrowth of the King James Bible*. Of course, in doing so, it also gave honour to the Protestant martyr, Thomas Cranmer, whose work is essentially preserved in it.

Thus whereas the 1662 Book of Common Prayer started with a Bible of 1611 that was translated for Protestant accuracy, and as an outgrowth of this produced a compatible prayer book; by contrast, the modern prayer books start with a desire to “dumb down” everything to the lowest common denominator, as they replicate debased “new” Bible versions of the same low-life philosophy. Well may it be said of both, “Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ” (Col. 2:8).

The higher quality Anglican prayer books that are essentially composed by the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, are sometimes referred to through reference to the reigning monarch of their time. Thus Cranmer’s prayer books of 1549 and 1552 are known as the Edwardian prayer books after Edward VI (Regnal Years: 1547-1553) e.g., one might refer to “the Edwardian prayer book of 1552.” Cranmer died as a Marian martyr for his Protestant faith in 1556 under the Popish Queen, Bloody Mary (Regnal Years: 1553-1558). A revision of Cranmer’s 1552 prayer book

translated into English in 1925 by E. Gustav Johnson; the more popular version is the 1949 one of Stuart Hine (1899-1989), who had a Salvation Army background, but became a Methodist, though he was also strongly influenced by the teachings of the Baptist, Charles Spurgeon (d. 1892). Hine added the present third verse (“And when I think that God, his Son not sparing, Sent him to die, I scarce can take it in; That on the cross, my burden gladly bearing, He bled and died, to take away my sin”); and present fourth and final verse (“When Christ shall come, with shouts of acclamation, And take me home, what joy shall fill my heart!; Then I shall bow in humble adoration, And there proclaim, my God how great thou art!”). Per Eph. 5:19 and Col. 3:16, I am happy to sing e.g., the Canticle, “Benedicite [Latin, “Bless ye”], Omnia [all] Opera [works]” (from the opening words, “O all ye works of the Lord, bless ye the Lord,”) at Mattins in the 1662 BCP which comes from the Apocrypha, without thereby necessarily endorsing anything else in the Apocrypha, which are certainly not Divinely Inspired writings (Article 6, 39 Articles). Likewise, I am happy to sing the song, “How Great Thou art,” without thereby necessarily endorsing anything else in the theology of those responsible for its present English form, e.g., Carl Boberg was a Lutheran, and I reject Lutheran sacramentalism (i.e., consubstantiation, baptismal regeneration, and the Lutheran Church canon law created “sacrament” of voluntary auricular confession) in favour of a symbolistic view of the two sacraments of Baptism and Communion (with no so called “third sacrament” of voluntary auricular confession); and Hine was a Methodist, and I reject Wesleyan Arminianism in favour of a Reformed (Calvinist) theology.

was then produced in 1559 under Elizabeth I (Regnal Years: 1558-1603), known as the Elizabethan prayer book. Once again undergoing some revisions in 1604 under King James I (Regnal Years: 1603-1625) of the King James Bible, this is the Elizabethan and Jacobean prayer book of 1559 & 1604 that was made “illegal” under the Puritan republic from 1645, although the anti-Anglican *Solemn League & Covenant* had been adopted under Interregnum Ordinances two years earlier in 1643. Then after the Restoration, with some revisions, Cranmer’s prayer book was produced in 1662 under Charles II (Regnal Years: King *de jure* of the three kingdoms, 1649-1685; King *de facto* of Scotland, 1649-1650/1²⁷³; King *de facto* of England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1660-1685), and this is the Caroline prayer book of 1662.

All these prayer books clearly exhibit the work of Thomas Cranmer, whose basic liturgy is preserved throughout them. Hence when I was in England on my first trip to London (April 2001-April 2002) I was living at West Croydon. Not far away was the old Croydon Palace, and in July 2001 was one of the rare times that it was open for public inspection. Though it is now an Anglican Girls’ School, it was before 1780 the summer home of Archbishops of Canterbury, and thus so used in Thomas Cranmer’s time (Archbishop of Canterbury: 1533-1556). Among other things, as the sun shone down and we walked in the gardens, the guide pointed to a building which has retained its original white lattice windows and old style red bricks. It was two storeys high, and he pointed to the top floor window, referring to this as “the Queen’s Room,” where on a number of occasions Queen Elizabeth I stayed. Underneath this, on the ground floor, he pointed to a room called “Cranmer’s Library,” where he said Cranmer wrote some of “the Book of Common Prayer.” Contextually, in Anglican terminology, to simply refer to “the Book of Common Prayer” now means the 1662 Caroline prayer book, since this preserves the earlier work of Cranmer’s Edwardian prayer book of 1552.

Thus, e.g., Sir Garfield Barwick (1903-1997) who as Commonwealth Attorney-General of Australia in the Menzies Government put together the *Barwick Act* (Matrimonial Causes Act, 1959-1975, Commonwealth of Australia), spoke to me about how he used the Caroline prayer book of 1662 in that process. Sir Garfield could fairly refer to it as “Cranmer’s *Book of Common Prayer*” since the modifications and revisions of the 1662 prayer book still retain most of Cranmer’s work from the 1552 prayer. Thus in a 1991 interview in Sydney, Sir Garfield who at the time was a retired Chief Justice of the High Court of Australia, said to me: “Cranmer’s marriage service is marvelous because it expresses so clearly the purpose of marriage. If you take the words - they are beautifully written. Cranmer’s *Book of Common Prayer* is a beautiful bit of English and you there see the obligations of the parents, and the need to comfort one another, and the need to raise children, and the need to nurture children. So I had that in my mind, of

²⁷³ As a consequence of the unwelcome encroachments into Scotland of the invading republican army of Cromwell, Charles II held *de facto* power only in parts of Scotland from the latter half of 1650 through to 1651. Though the last organized royalist resistance in Scotland came with the surrender of Dunnottar Castle in May 1652, Charles II had left the British Isles at Dover in October 1651, having effectively lost any *de facto* control of Scotland following his defeat at the *Battle of Worcester* in Sept. 1651.

course, and if you call that an ideology, I would accept that.” Myself: “So for the *consortium vitae*, you used the *Book of Common Prayer*, the service for the ‘Solemnization of Marriage’ or ‘Matrimony’?” Sir Garfield: “Yes. ...²⁷⁴.”

The Edwardian prayer book of 1552 was a symbol of Protestantism. Hence it was much hated by the Popish Queen, Bloody Mary. Thus the Elizabethan prayer book of 1559 which was essentially Cranmer’s prayer book of 1552, became an important symbol of Protestantism following the many martyrs and confessors of Bloody Mary’s reign. Hence the Act *Primo Elizabethae* which introduced this prayer book in the first Regnal year of Elizabeth I says, “Where at the death of our late Sovereign Lord King Edward the Sixth, there remained ... The Book of Common Prayer ... in the Church of England of ... King Edward the Sixth, ... the which was repealed, and taken away ... in the first year of the reign of ... Queen Mary, to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ’s religion: be it therefore enacted ... that the said ... repeal ... shall be void and of none effect, ... and that the said Book with the Order of Service, ... with ... alterations and additions therein ... shall stand and be, from and after the ... Feast of the Nativity of St. John Baptist”

This reference “to the great decay of the due honour of God,” under “Queen Mary,” “and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ’s religion” is a broad reference to the Marian Confessors and Marian martyrs, and clearly endorses Protestantism over Popery. Contextually included in this number is Thomas Cranmer, who was then martyred for his Protestant faith. Because the 1559 Elizabethan prayer book was such a symbol of Protestantism, this 1559 Act *Primo Elizabethae* has traditionally been printed at the front of the 1662 Caroline prayer book (even though some more recent editions have sadly omitted it). This makes the point that this great symbol of Protestantism, was again revived following the time it was taken away by the Puritans in the 1640s and 1650s. Hence the Marian Confessors and Martyrs are traditionally remembered in the 1662 prayer book at this point.

Given that the 1559 prayer book is traditionally regarded as a symbol of Protestantism, a symbol of “the truth of Christ’s religion” against the Popery of Bloody Mary, *The Preface* of the 1662 prayer book builds on this when it first refers to “princes of blessed memory since the Reformation.” It then refers to the interregnum followed by the Restoration of 1660, saying, “By what undue means, and for what mischievous purposes the use of the Liturgy ... came, during the late unhappy confusions, to be discontinued, is too well known to the world, and we are not willing here to remember.

²⁷⁴ INTERVIEW WITH SIR GARFIELD BARWICK and Gavin Basil MCGRATH (Myself) on Tuesday 12 February 1991 at SYDNEY, Australia. Transcript as modified and approved by Sir Garfield. The *consortium vitae* refers to the important common things in the life association of a marriage e.g., love (Eph. 5:29), companionship (Gen. 2:20), marital services (Prov. 31:13-15; Gen. 3:16; Titus 2:5), and sexual relations (I Cor. 7:2).

But ... upon His Majesty's happy Restoration, it seemed probable, that, amongst other things, the use of the Liturgy also would return”

And so the point is this, that from the Anglican perspective, the prayer book is a symbol of *Protestantism*, a remembrance of the Marian confessors and martyrs, as it “was repealed, and taken away ... in the first year of the reign of ... Queen Mary, to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ's religion,” and restored as *a symbol of Protestantism* under the Act *Primo Elizabethae* in 1559. It is a symbol of “several princes of blessed memory since the Reformation.” And so its discontinuance during the interregnum, when it was made “illegal” in 1645, is therefore an English Puritan attack on this symbol of Protestantism, comparable in type to the Popish attack on this symbol of Protestantism under Bloody Mary. And conversely, its “return” with the 1662 prayer book “upon His Majesty's happy Restoration” in 1660, is thus the return of a symbol of Protestantism. And so to understand this, is to understand that the Restoration in 1660 of a legally Protestant monarch with the return of the great symbol of Anglican Protestantism, the Reformed prayer book compiled chiefly by the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, is a celebration of the Protestantism of the Anglican Church.

The Preface in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 specifically refers to “the reigns of several princes of blessed memory since the Reformation” who had revised the “forms of Divine Worship, and the Rites and Ceremonies” i.e., various forms of Cranmer's work. Contextually this celebration of “the Reformation” refers to work on Cranmer's basic prayer book as well as the Homilies of the 39 Articles under Edward VI who reigned from 1547-1553, Elizabeth I who reigned from 1558 to 1603, and James I who reigned from 1603 to 1624 i.e., there were some minimalist amendments to the Homilies of the 39 Articles read in Divine Worship, and their last form was published by authority under James I in 1623²⁷⁵. The First book of Homilies in Article 35 of the 39 *Articles*, had been preserved under the reign of Blood Mary with “the owners cherishing them as relics of that first brief period of freedom to the Gospel, and often as memorials of its Confessors and Martyrs”²⁷⁶. Thus the inclusion of the two books of Homilies in the 39 Articles under Elizabeth I; and their usage at a clergyman's discretion in Divine Worship in place of a sermon, not only gave a clear Protestant theology from the pulpit, but with reference to the First Book of Homilies, also a memorial significance to the Marian Confessors and Martyrs. *Hence while as a Protestant I am a great advocate of the King James Bible of 1611, as an Anglican Protestant I am also a great supporter of the Book of Common Prayer of 1662 and 39 Articles.*

There are two red-letter days in the 1662 BCP which though pre-dating the Reformation, have historically been connected with Protestant hagiology (and remain in

²⁷⁵ Griffiths, J., (Editor), *The Two Books of Homilies*, Oxford, UK, 1859, p. xxxviii.

²⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. xii.

the BCP after 1859), as a consequence of significant events to Protestants that occurred upon these days. These are *All Saints' Day* (1 Nov.) since 1517, and *St. Bartholomew's Day* (24 Aug.) since 1572.

All Saints' Day (1 Nov.) is a red-letter day, and *The Eve of All Saints' Day* traditionally remembers the Reformation ignited by Martin Luther when he nailed his 95 Theses to the Door of Wittenberg Church on *The Eve of All Saints' Day* 1517. Sometimes referred to as “Reformation Day,” this means that reference to the Reformation may be made in e.g., an *All Saints' Day sermon* through reference to this tradition for *The Eve of All Saints' Day*; although in more recent times, if either *The Eve of All Saints' Day* or *All Saints' Day* does not fall on a Sunday, this memory has sometimes been transferred to a nearby Sunday and so sometimes called, “Reformation Sunday.”

St. Bartholomew's Day (24 Aug.) acquired a strong Protestant association as a consequence of the infamous, *St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre* of 1572. As recorded in *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, at the chapter entitled, “A Brief Relation of the Horrible Massacre in France, A.D. 1572²⁷⁷,” this massacre of Protestants by Papists is very much part of Protestant hagiology. This is therefore relevant to the statement in the 1662 Act of Uniformity that “upon some Lord's day before the Feast of St. Bartholomew [24 August] ... in the year of our Lord God One thousand six hundred sixty and two,” every Minister of an Anglican Church, shall “declare his unfeigned assent and consent to the use of” the 1662 prayer book. This usage of the “Feast of St. Bartholomew” remembering the Apostle, Saint Bartholomew (e.g., Matt. 10:3; Acts 1:13,14), thus acted to enhance the memory of Protestants suffering for their faith. This was clearly relevant since this Anglican prayer book of 1662, which included in it the 1559 Act of *Primo Elizabethae*, remembering Cranmer's Protestant prayer book of 1559 as a symbol of “the truth of Christ's religion” against the Popery of Bloody Mary; was likewise, *the reintroduction of this same basic symbol of Protestantism*. Hence using *St. Bartholomew's Day* in 1662, is appropriate since it is remembered as a day when Protestants were made confessors and martyrs for their faith at the hands of Papists in 1572; just like Anglican Protestants had been made confessors and martyrs for their faith at the hands of Puritans during the 1640s and 1650s Interregnum.

The Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 and associated 39 Articles, is an unapologetic defence of the fundamental teachings of the Protestant Reformation. It upholds the fundamental Protestant teachings of the three great doctors of the Reformation, Martin Luther (d. 1546), John Calvin (d. 1564), and Thomas Cranmer (m. 1556); although these three men did not agree with each other in all areas. For example, the doctrine of justification by faith alone in Articles 9, 10, and 11 of the 39 Articles, upholds the Reformation teaching of Martin Luther, for instance, Article 11 says, “We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings” Or the doctrines of grace

²⁷⁷

Bramley-Moore, W., *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, *op. cit.*, pp. 126-134.

found in Articles 10 and 17, uphold the teachings of John Calvin, for instance, Article 10 refers to enabling, with “the grace of God by Christ preventing (coming before) us,” since the “condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith, and calling upon God” i.e., *Total Depravity*.

And the statement of Article 34 that “nothing be ordained against God’s Word,” upholds the Reformation teaching of the absolute authority of the Bible; and Article 22 upholds such Reformation teachings as Christ alone as our only mediator, and repudiates the “Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, worshiping, and adoration, as well of images as of reliques, and also invocation of saints,” describing these as “a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.” And the associated liturgy of the 1662 prayer book, upholds the Protestant work of Thomas Cranmer. The standards of the 1662 Caroline prayer book and 39 Articles are *Anglican Protestant* rather than *Puritan Protestant*; but most importantly, they are *Protestant* and uphold the Reformation. All and any attempts to diminish or deny this Protestantism; or in more modern times under the apostasies of Puseyism, semi-Puseyism, or religious liberalism, are dishonest; and in the words of Revelation 21:8, “all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone.” Well may we say in reciting the Ten Commandments of the Communion Service, “Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.” “Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.”

And so through reference to the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) and Anglican 39 Articles, we cannot doubt this very Protestant Confession of faith upholds the Reformation Motto: *sola fide* which is Latin meaning “faith alone,” *sola gratia* which is Latin meaning “grace alone,” and *sola Scriptura* which is Latin meaning “Scripture alone.” We thank God for his Biblical gospel of “grace” which is found in such passages as, e.g., Romans 4:16, “It is of faith, that it might be by grace;” Galatians 1:6, “the grace of Christ;” Galatians 2:16, “by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified;” Galatians 3:11, “The just shall live by faith;” and Ephesians 2:5,8,9, “Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved),” “For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast.” For Christ died in our place, and for our sins, and rose again the third day. Our salvation was procured by Christ’s substitutionary and vicarious atonement, dying in our place and for our sins, when he *suffered for our salvation* at Calvary; and God offers us the “gift” of salvation and eternal life by his “grace,” i.e., by his unmerited favour alone, which is accepted by faith alone.

Significantly, the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* “Preface” also states that “portions of holy Scripture” “are now ordered to be read according to the last translation.” Thus the King James Version of 1611 was thereby made “the Authorized Version.” This means that the Restoration Caroline prayer book of 1662 includes in its celebration of “several princes of blessed memory since the Reformation,” the one referred to in the Dedicatory Preface of the King James Version as, “the most high and mighty prince, James.” Let us join in this celebration of “the Reformation” found in the

Preface of the 1662 Restoration Caroline prayer book, and thank God for his protection of Queen Elizabeth the First from the Papist forces of Antichrist that sought to destroy the work of the Reformation with the Spanish Armada of 1588; let us thank God for his protection of King James from the Papists' conspiracy of the Guy Fawkes Gunpowder Plot to blow up the Protestant King and Protestant Parliament in 1605; let us thank God for giving Charles I the grace to die a martyr's death in 1649; and let us thank God for protecting Charles II in the royal oak in 1651, and bringing about the Restoration in 1660. Let us thank God for the clarity and accuracy of that wonderful English translation of the Bible dedicated to James I in 1611; and made the Authorized by the 1662 Caroline prayer book; let us thank God for the *Saint James Version!*

And so on *Royal Oak Day* we remember that God protected King Charles II as he hid in that royal oak tree at Boscobel; and the Roundhead soldiers ran around, perplexed and puzzled, frustrated and fuming, as to just where their intended target might be. Thus the God who blinded the men of Sodom so they could not find the door to Lot's house; also blinded these bloodthirsty Roundheads, so that they could look, but not see, nor find, Charles II. And so we remember this safe deliverance of King Charles II, which was an important component to the 1660 Restoration of Charles II and the Royal Family, and in 1662 that great symbol of Protestantism, Cranmer's prayer book, *Praise be to God!* In the words of the *Gloria Patri* found in the Caroline prayer book of 1662, "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son: and to the Holy Ghost; as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen"²⁷⁸.

71) *The Cross as a symbol of Christianity & some stingy Puritans get their bottoms "pinched" on Oak Apple Day.*

The holy Apostle, St. Paul says, "But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world" (Gal. 6:14). These type of Scriptures, help us better understand why the cross is such an enduring, important, and wonderful symbol of the Christian faith.

This sentiment is also captured in that wonderful 20th century hymn of George Bennard, "On a hill far away, stood an old rugged cross, the emblem of suffering and shame; And I love that old cross, where the dearest and best, for a world of lost sinners was slain" (Verse 1). "So I'll cherish the old rugged cross, Till my trophies at last I lay down; I will cling to the old rugged cross, and exchange it someday for a crown" (Refrain). "To the old rugged cross, I will ever be true, its shame and reproach gladly bear, Then he'll call me someday, to my home far away, where his glory forever I'll share" (Verse 4). "So I'll cherish the old rugged cross, Till my trophies at last I lay down; I will cling to the old rugged cross, and exchange it someday for a crown" (Refrain).

²⁷⁸ The Latin short title, "*Gloria (Glory) Patri* ([be] to the Father)," comes from the opening words of this *Lesser Doxology* which is said after the Psalms and some Hymns in the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662).

However, I now turn to an unpleasant matter with respect to those who denigrate the Christian symbol of the cross, claiming it is “an idol” or “pagan” symbol. In Volume 1 of these Textual Commentaries (Matt. 1-14), I made reference to the sad fact that some Puritans continue to show an unhealthy level of anti-Anglicanism. E.g., Puritans were historically opposed to the Anglican usage of the *sign of the cross* in baptism. I recognize and accept their *bona fide* religious right to not use the *sign of the cross* in their baptisms. But in modern historical times, we find a Puritan derived Presbyterian Church, the *Presbyterian Reformed Church of Australia* (PRC), amending its *Westminster Confession* 28:2 in 1973, so as to say, “whosoever presumes in baptism to use” “crossing,” “accuses the perfect institution of Christ Jesus of imperfection and causes it to be no sacrament, for it was void of all such inventions devised by men” in “Mt 3:11; Jn 1:33; Mt 28:19,20” i.e., the claim that Anglicans are unbaptized²⁷⁹.

Anglicans consider “that the Sign of the Cross used in Baptism is no part of the substance of that Sacrament,” and “doth neither add anything to the virtue and perfection of Baptism, nor being omitted doth detract any thing from the effect and substance of it.” For “the use of the Sign of the Cross in Baptism” “in the Church of England,” is “purged from all Popish superstition and error” (Canon 30, 1603 *Ecclesiastical Canons, infra*). Anglicans historically consider that a church tradition may be used if it has been found to be useful and good, providing “nothing is ordained against God’s Word” (Article 34, 39 Articles); whereas Presbyterians historically use the “Regulatory Principle” in which they look for a specific warrant in Scripture to do something. But while Anglicans therefore historically used the *sign of the cross* at baptism and Presbyterians did not, the historic Presbyterianism of the *Church of Scotland* did not then additionally claim that usage of the *sign of the cross* invalidated Anglican baptisms.

Some Puritans go even further, blasphemously claiming that *the sign of the cross* at baptism is “the mark of beast” in Rev. 13²⁸⁰. While I can accept that there are some good men in these churches who have been badly deceived by this type of thinking, I cannot accept that those holding such views should expect me, or any Reformed Anglican, to treat their views with anything but righteous contempt and holy disgust. The teaching that the Roman Pope is the Antichrist is in my opinion properly understood

²⁷⁹ As stated in volume 1, the PRC views on the *sign of the cross* are not in harmony with historic Presbyterianism. *Westminster Confession* 28:2 (PRC 1973 amendment) (*Westminster Confession of Faith, With Amendments by the Presbyterian Reformed Church of Australia, second PRC edition 1999, Covenanter Press, Lithgow, N.S.W., Australia*).

²⁸⁰ Porcelli, B., *The Antichrist*, Protestant Truth Society, London, UK, 4th Edition Revised, 1929, pp. 102-4; Windburn, R., Appendix 3 in *Francis Turretin’s Seventh Disputation: Whether it can be proven the Pope of Rome is the Antichrist, c. 1661, 1848 Edinburgh edition translation, reprinted: Protestant Reformation Publication, Forestville, California, USA, 1999, pp. 122-4; Sadler, I.A., *Mystery, Babylon the Great*, Cromwell Press, Wiltshire, U.K., 1999, p. 283.*

by the Protestant Historical School of Interpretation²⁸¹. But the type of interpretation used by Hislop, in which anti-Romanism in developed into anti-Anglicanism, in my opinion constitutes pseudo-historicism, and is not to be confused with historicism.

I for one, regard as quite ludicrous, the proposition that godly men such as e.g., the Protestant Marian martyrs, William Tyndale, Thomas Cranmer, Nicholas Ridley, or Hugh Latimer, died unbaptized because the *sign of the cross* was made on their foreheads at baptism. Worse still, I regard it as a horrible blasphemy, to suggest that these type of godly men not only received, but actually administered, “the mark of the beast,” because they baptized people using the *sign of the cross* on their foreheads. Certainly I recognize that not all e.g., Presbyterians or Baptists, agree with these extremist Puritans. I have known good and godly Presbyterians and Baptists who do not share such views, and I have Presbyterian relatives (both Presbyterian Church and Free Presbyterian Church²⁸²) and Baptist relatives. But I entirely reject the associated type of nonsense argued by such extremist Puritans as e.g., the Free Presbyterian, Alexander Hislop, or the Strict Baptist, Ian Sadler, which wickedly claim that the cross is a pagan symbol and not a Christian symbol²⁸³.

²⁸¹ See my work *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist* (2006, 2nd edition 2010), With a Foreword by the Reverend Sam McKay, Secretary of the Protestant Truth Society (1996-2004), Appendix: “The Mark of the Beast - 666.” Available on the internet via Yahoo and Google at “Gavin McGrath Books,” or direct at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>; and also my sermon, “Exposition of I & II Thessalonians 2/3: Roman Catholic Pope is Antichrist,” Mangrove Mountain Union Church, N.S.W., Australia, Thursday 10 February, 2011; recording at <http://www.sermonaudio.com/kingjamesbible>; printed copy at Textual Commentaries Volume 3, “Appendix 8: A Sermons Bonus.”

²⁸² “Free Presbyterian Church” describes a broad religious tradition (like “Baptist” or “Anglican”). Different Free Presbyterian churches include e.g., the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland* (established 1893) and *Free Church of Scotland (Continuing)* (established 2000). My Free Presbyterian Church relatives are in the *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia* (established 1846), which is derived from the *Free Church of Scotland* (established 1843).

²⁸³ Sadler, I.A., *Mystery, Babylon the Great*, Cromwell Press, Wiltshire, U.K., 1999, pp. 75-7; citing Hislop’s *The Two Babylons*, pp. 197,198,201. Sadler further endorses Hislop’s ridiculous, and indeed blasphemous claim, that the letters “I.H.S.” i.e., “Jesus Humanity’s Saviour” in Latin, “*Iesus Hominum Salvator*,” in fact refer to the ancient “Egyptian” “system of idolatry,” with its three pagan gods, “Isis, Horus, Seb” (*Ibid.*, p. 65; citing Hislop, *op. cit.*, p. 164). While this is contextually referring to a Roman Catholic usage, it is easily cross-referable to Anglicans, who also use these letters on e.g., bookmarks. They are e.g., visible behind the golden cross on the Communion Table of St. Matthew’s Windsor in western Sydney. These letters mean “Jesus’ Humanity’s Saviour,” *supra*; and also mean “Jesus” since “IHS” are the first three initials of “Jesus” in *Greek*, i.e., “IHSOYS (*Iesous*),” and in ecclesiastical *Latin* this Greek derived abbreviation is sometimes used. Furthermore, at St. Matthew’s Windsor the “I”

I maintain the view of Article 20 of the Anglican *39 Articles*, that practices such as using *the sign of the cross* at baptism are not contrary to Scripture, and so valid if a church finds them good and useful. I see in this practice elements of the rich symbolism of Rom. 6:3-11, “Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?” “For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection: knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him” (Rom. 6:3,5,6a).

The cross is a great and wonderful symbol of the Christian faith, used since the time of Constantine the Great. This fact is remembered in the Anglican Calendar of the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)*, which has as black letter days, 3 May, *Invention (Discovery) of the Cross*, and also 14 September, *Holy Cross Day*.

While not to be venerated as in Popery, this is the only relic ever found from NT times that may well be genuine; although the Popish claims of superstitious “miracles from God” associated with its discovery and subsequent history, may be reasonably rejected. The cross found by Helena, the mother of Constantine, in the fourth century A.D., went missing in medieval times. It remains unclear if the cross “rediscovered” in 1492 and now on display at the *Church of the Holy Cross*, Rome, is in fact the piece of “the true cross” sent by Helena to Rome.

Thus there are two relevant black letter days on the Calendar of the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662, *Invention (Discovery) of the Cross* and *Holy Cross Day*.

Invention (Discovery) of the Cross (3 May). This day remembers two things. Firstly, that in the 4th century, the Empress Helena, the mother of Constantine the Great, went to Jerusalem, and there discovered the cross at the site of what is now the Church of the Resurrection. It is possible that this was a cross put there *much later* by Christians as a symbol of Christ’s death and resurrection, or it is possible that this was actually Christ’s cross. *We just do not know*. Either way, it marks an important point in the usage of the cross as a Christian symbol. The cross found by Helena was divided into three pieces. One part was sent to Constantinople, and in about the 8th century was lost by so gross a negligence, that no-one is sure exactly when it was lost, or what happened to it (some

is crossed at the top so it doubles as a Christian cross, and this is the contextual indicator that in this instance, “I.H.S.” also means, Latin, “*In Hac [cruce] Salus*,” that is, “In this [cross] is salvation,” and Latin, “*In Hoc Signo [vinces]*,” that is, “In this sign [thou shalt conquer].” To the left are two columns on the eastern wall, the first one the Lord’s Prayer, and the second one The Ten Commandments (Commandments I-IV); and to the right are two columns on the eastern wall, the first one The Ten Commandments (Commandments VI-X), and the second one the Apostles’ Creed. (See internet web-site title page photographs, last photograph, of my *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist* (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>)).

speculate it was foolishly taken into battle). One part remained at Jerusalem (lost by foolish Crusaders in the late 12th century). Another piece was sent to Rome and later lost. The second thing this day remembers is that since the time of Constantine, the cross has clearly come to prominent usage as a Christian symbol.

Holy Cross Day (14 Sept.). This celebrates three things. Firstly, the exhibition of the cross at the church built in Jerusalem by the dowager empress, Helena, where the Church of the Resurrection now stands. Secondly, the recovery of this cross from the Persians in 629 by Emperor Heraclius. (Later lost by gallivanting reckless Crusaders, whose foolish and stupidly superstitious beliefs led them to carry it into battle.) Thirdly, it reminds Christians of the true meaning behind the symbol of the cross, with respect to Christ's vicarious atoning death for the sins of mankind, and his resurrection on the third day.

Thus Reformed Anglicanism has historically recognized and used the cross as a Christian symbol. E.g., the monarch, who is *Supreme Governor of the Church of England*, historically has had a cross on the top of the royal crown.

But "stingy Puritans" have sometimes vandalized various crosses, claiming they were "idols." For example, in November 2008 I visited Banbury Cross at Oxfordshire in England. It was destroyed by Puritans during the reign of Queen Elizabeth I (Regnal Years: 1558-1603) in 1602; and was rebuilt in 1859 for the marriage of Queen Victoria's eldest daughter. Hence it includes a statue of Queen Victoria (Regnal Years: 1837-1901). A statue of Edward VII was later added (Regnal Years: 1901-1910); and it was finally completed when in 1914 there was also had added to it a statue of King George V (Regnal years: 1910-1936) in commemoration of his coronation in 1911.

Diagonally opposite this new Banbury Cross is a statue of a woman sitting on a horse in the lady-like posture of side-saddle. Around this horse are the words of the Nursery Rhyme, "Ride a cock horse to Banbury Cross, To see a fine lady upon a white horse; With bells on her fingers and bells on her toes; She shall have music wherever she goes."

The issue of Puritan Protestant, as opposed to Luther Protestant or Anglican Protestant views on the moderate consumption alcohol, also raised questions of "stingy Puritans" in the era of American Prohibition from 1920 to 1933 in the USA. At this point, Puritans who in many, though not in all instances, have been alcohol prohibitionists, resemble Mohammedans who are also forbidden to drink alcohol, for Mohammed said, "concerning" the consumption of "wine," that it "is great sin" (*Koran*, Sura 2:216)²⁸⁴. To some extent this issue is reflected in Anglican-Puritan terms in the fact that so many Hotels are called "Royal Oak;" although it must also be admitted that

²⁸⁴ *The Koran*, translated by J.M. Rodwell, 1861, 2nd ed. 1876, With an Introduction by G. Margoliouth, 1909, reprint Dent & Sons, Everyman's Library, London, UK, 1974, p. 361.

many of these have at various times sadly become places of drunkenness and other ungodliness that I would not condone.

Another area in which the spirit of the “stingy Puritans” sometimes lived on was found in the fact that when it was formerly a more widely celebrated day, certain of them refused to celebrate *Royal Oak Day* on 29 May. Hence, though this tradition has now died out, *Oak Apple Day* was formerly known by such colloquial names as “pinch-bottom day,” because school children would pinch the bottoms of such “stingy Puritan” school students who would not remember the day by wearing oak leaves (which were easily available as seen by the fact most of them did so wear oak leaves).

Thus e.g., the story goes of one who “was travelling from Crewe to Runcorn on the 29th May [1889]. There were six girls in the carriages with me all wearing oak leaves and two of them carrying bundles of nettles. On being asked what the nettles were for, they said, ‘To beat those who have no oak’.” Against this type of backdrop, there arose a fairly short-lived practice in which republicans sometimes wore nettles instead of oak leaves, and called 29 May “Nettle Day”,²⁸⁵.

But between 1860 and 1960, except for East Anglia and the counties bordering London and Wales, there are records of childish antics against other children who did not wear figs of oak on *Oak Apple Day*. This included e.g., pelting eggs or dirt, pinching, spitting, and hair-pulling. Whatever one thinks of these school student pranks, they appear to have had the effect of indicating to school boys and school girls that a failure to celebrate *Oak Apple Day* was a serious matter!²⁸⁶

Such facts remind us, that amidst a number of good Puritans, there are still some “stingy Puritans” around. In this context, as promised in Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14)²⁸⁷, I now make reference to a certain (fictional jocular) story about a Puritan Scotsman in America.

There was an Englishman, an Irishman, and a Scotsman. They were three clergymen, a Reformed Low Church Evangelical Anglican Irishman, the Reverend William Patricks, who was named “William” after King William of Orange, a *Supreme Governor of the Church of Ireland*. A Reformed Low Church Evangelical Anglican

285 Oak Apple Day
(http://www.royaloakday.org.uk/Tradition/royal_oak_sprigs.html).

²⁸⁶ Hutton, R., *The Stations of the Sun*, A History of the Return of the Year in Britain, Oxford University Press, UK, 1996, pp. 289-291 (<http://www.books.google.com.au/books?isbn=0198205708...>).

²⁸⁷ See Textual Commentary Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” “a) Preliminary Qualifications & Remarks,” at footnote on “Strict Baptists;” & Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25), at “5) The Restoration in the Scottish Context of the Williamite Settlement,” with respect to Hamilton’s *History of Presbyterianism in Ireland* (1887).

Englishman, the Reverend Charles Georges, who was named “Charles” after King Charles the Martyr, a *Supreme Governor of the Church of England*. And a Puritan Scotsman, the Reverend Oliver Hislop, who was named “Oliver,” after Oliver Cromwell.

Oliver Hislop had recently written a book entitled, “THE ERROR OF THE OLD WILLIAMITE SETTLEMENT ANGLICAN-PRESBYTERIAN ALLIANCE, With an Appendix on why the ‘sign of cross’ at baptism invalidates Anglican baptisms, and is an administration of ‘the mark of the beast’.” In this book he claimed the post 1690 Anglican-Protestant alliance between English and Irish Anglicans and Scottish Presbyterians in favour of a Protestant Christian State, and against the seditious desires of Papists, Jacobite Episcopalians from Scotland, and Oliver Cromwell glorifying Puritans from England and Ireland, was an “error.” He claimed that it was an “error” for the 1690 Scottish Parliament to base its legislation of the 1592 Act for the Establishment of a Presbyterian *Church of Scotland*, in which it upheld the 1638-1660 Rescissory Act of Charles II against treasonable and rebellious actions. In describing the Williamite Settlement as “defective,” and hankering after a glorification of the “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:21) of Oliver Cromwell, he thus *trampled upon the Word of God and spat in the face of Almighty God* under whom the great Anglican-Protestant alliance of the post 1689 period had been much blessed to the advancement of Protestant truth before its unwarranted and unwise dismantling by secularists in the 19th century. He thus sought to destroy the old Anglican-Presbyterian Protestant Alliance, and in its place to build a bridge between Scottish Presbyterians on the one hand, and Irish and English Puritans on the other hand, in which the “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:21) of Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford would be glorified, as together they would trample upon the Word of God which says, “Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers,” “and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation” (Rom. 13:1,2). Oliver Hislop thus attacked the historic Presbyterianism of the Established *Church of Scotland*; which though considering God had made “all things worked together for good” (Rom. 8:28) with their Westminster Confession, nevertheless, simultaneously put a distance between themselves and the sedition against the Crown of Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford²⁸⁸.

The *Englishman, Irishman, and Scotsman* all went on a 12 month clergyman exchange programme to western USA. The two Anglican clergymen went to the same Anglican Church (which was outside the Anglican Communion i.e., not ECUSA). The

²⁸⁸ On the one hand I have known some good and godly Free Presbyterians who would not be sympathetic to sedition. But on the other hand, in its early years, following the death of its first Moderator (1843), Thomas Chalmers (1780-1847), the *Free Church of Scotland* came under some bad influences as seen in elements of its 1851 “Act and Declaration anent the Publication of the Subordinate Standards and other Authoritative Documents of the Free Church of Scotland,” which gave vent to the ungodly impulses of men like Alexander Hislop. See e.g., McPherson, A. (Editor), A Committee Appointed by the Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, *History of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland* (1893-1970), Publications Committee in the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, [dated to 1973/4 in the Preface,] pp. 369-370.

Puritan Church was next door to the Anglican Church. Both churches were on an Indian Reserve, with exclusively American Indian congregations, being originally set up in missionary conditions. As they arrived on the Indian Reserve, they were all greeted by the Red Indians with the words, “HOW, pale face²⁸⁹.”

In the hope of attracting Red Indian converts, the Puritan Church, using an American colloquialism for “Indians,” which was, “Ingins” (“Injins”) first called itself, “Ingins;” but then later developing the colloquialism further, to try and make it sound “more informal,” the Puritan church had come to be known as “Ingies.” However, when the Anglican Church proved to be more successful in gaining converts than did “Ingies,” the Puritan Church decided to give itself “a Saint’s name,” in order to “be more competitive with the Anglicans,” and so they decided on the name, “St. Ingies.” But when the stingy Puritans had the painter putting on “ST. INGIES” over the outside doorway of their church, the painter said, “You know, to save paint, if I leave out that full stop after the “ST”, I could save you 5 cents. “Well that’s a good idea,” said the stingy Puritans, and so “in order to save paint,” the painter did not “put the full-stop after the “T” on “ST.” Moreover, not being familiar with how Saint’s names operated, the Puritan painter they employed wrongly thought one was meant to run the letters together. Hence the name they painted onto their church read, “STINGIES.” Thus both the Puritans and others had come to refer to their Puritan church as, “Stingies.”

At this time, to their horror, the three clergymen were now living through an unexpected 2 to 3 week plague of ants that had infested the Indian Reserve, but which was now mercifully coming to an end. They thus had to hold Sunday services amidst an infestation of ants.

It was Sunday the 27th of January. In the sermon at the Anglican Church, a reference was made by the Reverend Charles Georges, to the fact that in the British Isles where he and the Reverend William Patricks both came from, and also some other Commonwealth countries, Anglicans marked the 30th of January, which was the Wednesday in the forthcoming week, as *King Charles the First’s Day*. He also mentioned that his own Christian name, Charles, had been given to him as a baptismal name in honour of the said King Charles the Martyr. After the sermon in the Anglican Church, some ants crawled over the Communion Table and into two large or generous looking silver chalices of Communion wine. The Anglican Irish clergyman, William Patricks, and the Anglican English clergyman, Charles Georges, equipped for just such

²⁸⁹ “How,” is a greeting attributed to American Indians, and meaning, “Hi” or “Hello.” The usage of “pale” in “pale face” for a white (Caucasian) person; like the usage of “red” for a brown (Mongoloid Indian) person, is the same type of colouration usage of these terms that one finds in Rev. 6, where a “red” “horse” (Rev. 6:4) means a brown horse (like a red cow), and “a pale horse” (Rev. 6:8), means a white horse (like Shakespeare’s usage of “hands as pale as milk,” in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, 5:1:345; cf. Shakespeare’s “fingers ... white as milk,” *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, Act 4, Gower, ante-Scene 1, line 22).

an exigency, both pulled pears of tweezers out of their pockets, surgically removed the ants, and continued the Communion Service with Anglican dignity and decency.

Erstwhile, next door at the Puritan Church, “Stingies,” Oliver Hislop was preaching a sermon. He was speaking about, “Why the greater number of my fellow Scottish Puritans were wrong to be royalists during the civil war,” and “why” he “thought the general English Puritan view which favoured Cromwell was the one that” he “accepted.” He was further preaching on “why the *sign of the cross* invalidates Anglican baptisms, so that they are really unbaptized.” He was talking about, “why *the cross* and therefore the *sign of the cross* in an Anglican baptism is idolatrous,” and “why *the sign of the cross* at baptism is a pagan symbol, not a Christian symbol.” Oliver Hislop was further claiming, “for which reason, when one sees the letters ‘IHS’ in an Anglican Church, while they will tell you this stands for the Latin words, ‘Jesus Hominum Salvator,’ meaning, ‘Jesus Humanity’s Saviour,’ in fact this is just a ruse to throw you off. Secretly, the Anglicans are really worshipping the ancient Egyptian pagan gods, ‘Isis, Horus, and Seb,’ which is what they really mean by ‘IHS’.”

But Oliver Hislop’s sermon at “Stingies” Puritan Church was disrupted at this point, when some ants were seen on the Communion Table. On the table were a large number of rather small looking glass cups for the Communion grape-juice. There was also a much larger bottle from which the Communion grape-juice had been poured. Its label read:

* * * * *

* **GRAPE JUICE** (Non-alcoholic) *

* Our aim is to be: *

* **Strict Puritan Sabbatarians;** *

* **Tenacious Prohibitionists;** *

* **Involved as** *

* **New World Guides; and** *

* **Good Puritan** *

* **Yankees.** *

* Our derivative acronym: **STINGY.** *

* Our associated motto: “**Be STINGY.**” *

* **Produced by the Puritan Push Company.** *

* ***1920-1933 American Prohibitionist Vintage.***

* * * * *

Hislop now left the pulpit in order to stop the ants. But as he did, he saw one ant crawling into one of the rather small looking glasses. Hislop now grabbed the ant with his fingers, and holding it up in the air over the glass, yelled out loudly, “SPIT THAT BONNY GRAPE JUICE OUT!!! SPIT IT OUT LADDIE!!! SPIT IT OUT!!!”

***7m) Royal Oak Day Dedication.**

I was Confirmed in the Diocese of Sydney in 1980 by the Bishop of Parramatta (western Sydney), Donald Robinson (later Archbishop of Sydney)²⁹⁰. I have some general memories of how in the Confirmation classes the Minister talked about the Protestant Marian martyrs in connection with the words of *Primo Elizabethae* in the BCP referring to “the reign of ... Queen Mary, to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ’s religion;” and of him referring to how the Puritans had vandalized Anglican churches; as well as some favourable references to what had been ‘put back on’ the Australian Calendar in 1978 i.e., *King Charles I’s Day* (30 Jan.) was ‘put back on’ from the 1662 Calendar, and there was also some wider discussion of that matter around this time²⁹¹.

²⁹⁰ My Confirmation Certificate says in part (italics indicating handwriting), “THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN AUSTRALIA *The Right Reverend DWB Robinson* CONFIRMED *Gavin Basil McGrath St. Mary’s Toongabbie 23rd November 1980 ...*” However, in Australia what was commonly known as “the C. of E.” or “Church of England,” has since changed its name to the “Anglican Church of Australia.”

²⁹¹ E.g., Sinden says at “January” “30. Charles, King of England (1600-1649)” on the Australian Calendar since 1978, “The 1662 BCP provided a special service for this day (removed in 1859) As King, Charles was ... a staunch defender of the Church of England. His high sense of religious principle and unfeigned faith in God were seen most clearly in the quiet dignity with which he faced death” (Gilbert Sinden’s “Times & Seasons,” Anglican Information Press, St. Andrew’s House, Sydney Square, N.S.W., Australia, 1980, Printed in 1980 by Ambassador Press, Sydney, pp. 56,61). I am ambivalent about this book which I purchased in the early 1980s; there is much in it that I would disagree with; amidst some useful information, such as that I have here quoted.

And when I was a regular parishioner at St. Phillip's Church Hill, near the Harbour Bridge, one of the occasional Honorary Assistant Ministers, who was sometimes there and sometimes not there on a Sunday, was a retired clergyman, the Reverend Mr. Ralph Ogden. At that time (but sadly not for some time now), this was a strictly 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* and 1611 *Authorized Version only* church. I estimate Mr. Ogden would have been at least a septuagenarian, and possibly older. Yet he was remarkably fit. I recall that when he came to the church to assist in the services, he used to ride a push-bike to and from church. Both Mr. Ogden and I had a common interest in New Testament Greek, and we sometimes used to discuss NT Greek matters.

But Mr. Ogden also compiled a Source-Book (c. 1985) on the 1662 prayer book and Anglican history. He entitled his source-book, "The Anglican Book of Common Prayer, Its Parliamentary Acts, Prefaces, Canons, and 39 Articles of Religion." It could be photocopied and distributed; a copy of which, bearing the handwritten date, "1985," I am pleased to say, came my way, via another retired clergyman who was an Honorary Assistant Minister of St. Philip's, the Reverend Mr. Norman Fox (d. 1992).

This *very Anglican* booklet taught about the civil war years from "The Preface" of the 1662 prayer book, which refers to the "mischievous purposes" by which "the use of the Liturgy" "came during the" "unhappy confusions" of the republican years "to be discontinued," and how "upon His Majesty's happy Restoration" "the use of the Liturgy" "return[ed]." And that booklet also taught from the same 1662 BCP Preface that the words, "such portions of holy Scripture, as are inserted into the Liturgy ... are now ordered to be read according to the last Translation," made the King James Version the Authorized Version.

Among other things, Mr. Ogden's Source-Book (c. 1985) contained e.g., the 1603 *Ecclesiastical Canons*. E.g., Canon 30 entitled, "The lawful use of the cross in Baptism explained," says e.g., "although the Jews ... derided ... the Christians, for preaching and believing in him who was crucified upon the Cross; yet all, both Apostles and Christians, ... rejoiced and triumphed in it." Thus "the honour and dignity of the cross begat a revered estimation even in the Apostles' times ... of the Sign of the Cross, which the Christians ... after used in ... their actions; thereby making an outward shew and profession, even to the astonishment of the Jews, that they were not ashamed to acknowledge ... their Lord and Saviour, who died for them upon the Cross." "And this use of the Sign of the Cross in Baptism was held in the primitive Church, as well by the Greeks and the Latins, with one consent and great applause ... evident by many testimonies of the ancient Fathers." Though "in process of time the Sign of the Cross was greatly abused in the Church of Rome, especially after that corruption of Popery had once possessed it. But the abuse of a thing doth not take away the lawful use of it." For "the Church of England, since the abolishing of Popery, hath ever held and taught ... that the Sign of the Cross used in Baptism is no part of the substance of that Sacrament," and "doth neither add anything to the virtue and perfection of Baptism, nor being omitted doth detract any thing from the effect and substance of it." For "the use of the Sign of the Cross in Baptism" "in the Church of England," is "purged from all Popish superstition and error."

Or Canon 80, was produced in 1603 which was eight years before the King James Version of 1611, at a time when *The Great Bible* of 1539 translated by Injunction of King Henry VIII (Regnal Years: 1509-1547) also known as *Cranmer's Bible* was still in use; as was the Elizabethan prayer book of 1559. Thus Canon 80, entitled, "The Great Bible, and Book of Common Prayer, to be had in every Church," says that "every Church" was to "provide the Book of Common Prayer" of 1559, and "if any parishes be yet unfurnished of the Bible" of 1539, "or of the Books of Homilies," then they were to be "provide[d]."

Mr. Ogden's Source-Book (c. 1985) also contains the "Table of Kindred and Affinity" used in the Diocese of Sydney before 1982, and in the *Church of England* before 1946. Known as *Parker's Table* because it was drawn up by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Matthew Parker in 1563 (Archbishop of Canterbury: 1559-1575), this table contains the Biblically correct prohibited degrees of consanguinity and affinity. (These same prohibited degrees are also found in the Presbyterian's *Westminster Confession* 24:4.) Understanding *Parker's Table*, which has been wickedly taken away from the Anglican Church in both England and Australia, is most important for understanding that King Henry VIII's break with Rome was on the basis of Biblical authority (Lev. 20:21; Mark 6:18) NOT Papal authority allowing a "dispensation" for incest.

Also included in the Reverend Ogden's Source-Book, was a copy of the 1559 Act of *Primo Elizabethae* in which he dates as "1553," the time of when the Edwardian prayer book "was repealed, and taken away ... in ... the reign of ... Queen Mary, to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ's religion." Commenting on the 1559 Act's penalties he says, "the more severe penalties under this Act were for actual hostile violence, which all parties recognized as treasonable rebellion, and which did, 90 years later [i.e., in the 1640s]; issue in full scale civil war. In practice the [1559] Act was very leniently enforced during most of Elizabeth's ... reign. All she asked was political loyalty from her 'loving subjects'. And compare these penalties with the burning alive of 375 men and women (on purely religious charges) during the 5 years of her sister Mary's reign."

He also includes a copy of the 1662 Act of Uniformity (formerly published at the front of 1662 prayer books,) and Preface to the Caroline Prayer Book of 1662 (still published with 1662 prayer books). Mr. Ogden also made some notes on "the reign of Charles II," "the civil war" / "Cromwellian interlude," and other matters. E.g., he says of the 1662 Act "XIV Caroli II," "the reign of Charles II is here counted from the death of Charles I and ignores the Cromwellian interlude." This 1662 Act includes the "Declaration, or Acknowledgment ... to be subscribed" to, namely, "... I do declare, That I do hold there lies no obligation upon me, or any other person, from the Oath, commonly called *The Solemn League and Covenant*, to endeavor any change, or alteration of government in Church or State; and the same was in itself an unlawful Oath ... of this Kingdom'." At the end of this Act Mr. Ogden says, "The 1662 Book of Common Prayer remains the 'official' book in the Anglican Church of Australia. 'An Australian Prayer Book' (A.A.P.B.), in its Preface, states that it is not a replacement of the old Book, but

merely supplements it.” Certainly in practice, in those days at St. Philip’s we used ONLY the 1662 Book of Common Prayer in ALL services, and NEVER the AAPB of 1978 (a situation that has since sadly changed both here and elsewhere). Hence in the section of Mr. Ogden’s *Source-Book* replicating the 1549 prayer book Preface, at the words referring to “the number and hardness of the” old “rules,” “and the manifold changing of the service,” so “that many times there was more business to found out what should be read, than to read it when it was found out,” he says in a reference to the multiple orders of service etc. of the AAPB, “compare the similar difficulties of using” the “A.A.P.B!”²⁹²

Or Mr. Ogden says of the 1662 prayer book’s preface, “This Preface is most moderate and reasonable, considering that it followed immediately after the Civil War & the Puritan and Cromwellian governments, when for ... years ... the use of the Prayer-Book was totally forbidden For ... 18 years the Episcopate was declared abolished & its functions forbidden. The Westminster Confession (still the official standard of Presbyterian doctrine) was drawn up at this time ... [the Puritans] intending it as a permanent replacement of the Anglican doctrine and practice.”

Commenting on the reference to the “unhappy confusions” of the Interregnum, he says this refers to “the Civil War, and the Cromwellian military government.” At the Canons Ecclesiastical of 1603, of Canon 3, “The Church of England, a true and Apostolick Church,” he says this was written “against the Roman critics.” And of Canon 4, “Impugners of the publick Worship of God, established in the Church of England, censured,” he says this was written “against Puritan critics.” Concerning Canon 7, “Impugners of the Government of the Church of England by Archbishops, Bishops, &c. censured,” Mr. Ogden says this was written, “Against Presbyterian critics.” Concerning Canon 9, “Authors of Schism in the Church of England censured,” the Reverend Mr. Ogden says this was written “Against Independent critics.” He further says that, “The Civil War Parliament was mostly Presbyterian. Cromwell & his New Model Army were ‘Independents’ i.e., Congregationalists or Baptists etc.”

Amidst these, and other notations of Mr. Ogden, this 1980s booklet which was written by one Honorary Assistant at St. Philip’s, the Reverend Mr. Ogden, and distributed to me by another Honorary Assistant at St. Philip’s, the Reverend Mr. Fox, is valuable and useful for showing how such matters as e.g., Protestant hagiology of the Marian Martyrs (p. 1 on the 1559 Act of Elizabeth I, Ogden’s *Source-Book*); the King James Bible as “the Authorized Version” (p. 15 on “The Preface” of the 1662 prayer book, Ogden’s *Source-Book*); or “the death of Charles I,” “unhappy troubles” of “the Civil War,” and “the reign of Charles II” (all at p. 5 on the 1662 Act of Uniformity, Ogden’s *Source-Book*), were taught through reference to Anglican documents in general,

²⁹² AAPB, p. 119. “First Form” services in the AAPB are kept relatively close to those in the BCP but are put in a form of “modern English;” whereas other “Forms” are more radically different. Cf. “2c,” “Traditional Diocese of Sydney Low Church Evangelicalism, NOT Puritan and semi-Puritan trends from 1970s,” *supra*.

and the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* in particular. This type of factor is also relevant for understanding how people who attend Anglican Churches have become increasingly detached from their Anglican heritage in the Diocese of Sydney with the sad and bad general demise of the 1662 prayer book. Alas, corresponding with the rise of *An Australian Prayer Book* of 1978 and various “modern” translations of the Bible, there has been a *radical* de-Anglicanization of the Diocese of Sydney and associated semi-Puritanization of it, so that the greater part of my fellow-Evangelicals in it would no longer use, or be familiar with, either the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 or Authorized Version of 1611. In saying this, I in no way shape or form, wish to be thought to be countenancing either semi-Puseyism or Puseyism, but simply the *traditional* Low Church Evangelical form of Anglicanism, which continued on the historic form of Anglican Protestantism after the bad and sad rise of semi-Puseyism, Puseyism, and religious liberalism in the 19th century. (See also “2c,” “Traditional Diocese of Sydney Low Church Evangelicalism, NOT Puritan and semi-Puritan trends from 1970s,” *supra*.)

This Volume 3 of my Textual Commentaries on Matt. 21-25 of the Received Text of the Authorized Version is dedicated to God on *The King’s Restoration Day* or *Royal Oak Day* 2011. *Royal Oak Day* reminds us of our appropriate thankfulness to God for the miraculous manner of the Restoration in 1660 with “His Majesty’s happy Restoration” (Preface, *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662); following the “unhappy confusions” of the Interregnum (Preface, *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662). *Royal Oak Day* reminds us of comparable concerns about the dangers posed by Papists, and how by the time of the 1660 Restoration the Anglican Church had been shielded and nurtured “in the reigns of several princes of blessed memory since the Reformation” (Preface, *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662). For not only was the Reformation prayer book “use of the liturgy” “discontinued” during the Interregnum (Preface, *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662), but likewise, the “Order of Common Service and Prayer ... in the Church of England, ... was repealed, and taken away ... in the first year of the reign of ... Queen Mary, to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ’s religion” (Act *Primo Elizabethae*, printed at the front of the *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662). *Royal Oak Day* reminds us of the Anglican Protestant hagiology of confessors and martyrs from the era of the Interregnum; such as the royal martyr, King Charles I, remembered in the 1662 prayer book since the 39 Articles contain “His Majesty’s Declaration” as “reprinted by command of His Majesty King Charles I with his Royal Declaration prefixed thereunto.” And the Caroline prayer book, being brought in under King Charles II, necessarily also reminds us that before “His Majesty’s happy Restoration,” the preceding “unhappy confusions” of the Interregnum (Preface, *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662) included those of the events connected with the Battle of Worcester and royal oak in 1651.

Moreover, as seen in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 and 39 Articles of Religion, *Royal Oak Day* reminds us of the legal Protestantism of the Restoration throne, as “in the reigns of several princes of blessed memory since the Reformation” (Preface, *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662), these Protestant teachings of Cranmer’s prayer book, and the 39 Articles were fostered. E.g., the 1662 prayer book makes the King James Version of 1611 the Authorized Version, saying, “such portions of

holy Scripture, as are inserted into the Liturgy, ... are now ordered to be read according to the last translation” (Preface, *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662). And in the Dedicatory Preface of the Authorized Version, “To the most high and mighty prince, James, by the grace of God, King of Great Britain, ... and Ireland, Defender of the Faith,” we are reminded “of that bright and occidental star, Queen Elizabeth of most happy memory” (Dedicatory Preface of the *King James Version*, 1611), who after “Queen Mary, to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ’s religion,” had “repealed, and taken away” the Reformation “Order of Common Service and Prayer” brought out under “King Edward the Sixth,” made this action of “Queen Mary” to “be void and of none effect,” so “that the said Book with the Order of Service, ... with ... alterations and additions therein ... shall stand ... ” (Act *Primo Elizabethae*, printed at front of the *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662).

Furthermore, we are also reminded in the Dedicatory Preface of the King James Version, that it was said that “the zeal of” King James I “toward the house of God doth not slack or go backward, but is more and more kindled, manifesting itself ... in Christendom, by writing in defence of the truth.” For instance, in his “Epistle to the whole church militant,” known as “A paraphrase upon the Revelation of the Apostle S. John,” James declared that Revelation 13 refers to “the Pope’s arising: his description, his rising caused by the ruin of the fourth monarchy of the Roman Empire: the rising of the false and Papistical Church; her description; her conformity with her monarch the Pope.” And so he says in Rev. 15, “The faithful praiseth God for the Pope’s destruction and their deliverance²⁹³.” Hence James “hath given such a blow unto *that man of sin*, as will not be healed” (II Thess. 2:3) (Dedicatory Preface of the *King James Version*, 1611); something also seen in his status as “Defender of the Faith” (Dedicatory Preface of the *King James Version*, 1611), since as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England*, “The King’s Majesty hath the chief power in ... England, and other his Dominions,” and so it “is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction.” Hence, “The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in ... England” (Article 37, *39 Articles*).

And this Dedicatory Preface of the Authorized Version further says of James I, that “every day at home, by religious and learned discourse, by frequenting the house of God, by hearing the Word preached, by cherishing the teachers thereof, by caring for the Church,” he was “as a most tender and loving nursing father” (Isa. 49:22,23). Under whose paternalism came forth the “labours” of the King James Bible, “so that if, on the one side, we shall be traduced by Popish persons at home or abroad, who therefore will malign us, because we are poor instruments to make God’s holy truth to be yet more and more known unto the people, whom they desire still to keep in ignorance and darkness; or if, on the other side, we shall be maligned by self-conceited brethren, who run their own

²⁹³ James I, *A Paraphrase Upon the Revelation*, in *Workes [Works]*, pp. 39,47,57; modernizing some words; cited in my work, *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist* (2006, 2nd edition 2010) (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>), at “Part 2: The Antichrist Revealed,” “Chapter 19: Historical Protestant recognition of the Pope as the Antichrist.”

way, and give liking unto nothing, but what is framed by themselves, and hammered on their anvil; we may rest secure, supported within by the truth and innocency of a good conscience, ... having walked the ways of simplicity and integrity ... before the Lord; and sustained without by the powerful protection of Your Majesty's grace and favour ...” (Dedicatory Preface of the *King James Version*, 1611).

Yet though these important and valuable truths of *Royal Oak Day* are to be found in the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662, 39 Articles, and Authorized Version of 1611, we sadly live in a day and age where these great documents of Protestantism are under attack. So much so, that I now find I must attend a variety of different churches, in order to get over time those elements of Evangelical Gospel truth that one could once get in any Low Church Evangelical Anglican Church. Hence from time to time, I go as an Evangelical Anglican visitor to some of the better Puritan derived churches which uphold the Evangelical truths of the Reformation, and which use the Authorized King James Version. And I go to a small number of Evangelical Anglican Churches which still use the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 in some of their services. I go, one might say, “to the best of a bad lot” of churches, all of which have something of what I believe in them, but none of which are what they once were in the better days of Protestant Christianity.

There are three possible dates upon which I might have made this Dedication of Volume 3 of my Textual Commentaries on the holy Gospel of Saint Matthew, chapters 21 to 25. By one tradition, when as occurs this year of 2011, the 29th of May falls on a Sunday, it is transferred back to Saturday 28 May. And indeed, on Saturday 28 May 2011, I had lunch in rural New South Wales at the Royal Oak Restaurant at Cessnock, west of Newcastle.

Or most commonly, it is remembered on 29 May irrespective of what day of the week it falls on, and indeed, on *Royal Oak Day*, Sunday 29 May 2011, I attended St. Matthew's Anglican Church at Windsor in western Sydney, for what was one of their four annual 1662 prayer book services; having attended another such BCP service earlier in this year on *King Charles I's Day*, Sunday 30 Jan. 2011, the secondary focus of which is on the events of the Interregnum and the Restoration. Matters of interest to me there included the following artifacts; and the interested reader will find relevant 2011 photos of these things at my textual commentary website²⁹⁴.

The Church building of St. Matthew's. The two oldest parishes in Australia are St. Philip's Church Hill and St. John's Parramatta, both formed in Sydney in what is now the Diocese of Sydney in 1802. But the present church buildings for both of these Anglican parishes are from later times in the 19th century. Thus while it is not the oldest Anglican parish in Australia, coming from the Georgian times of George III (Regnal Years: 1760-1820) and George IV (Regnal Years: 1820-1830; Regency under George III

²⁹⁴ See St. Matthew's Windsor pictures on the website in connection with this Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) of my Textual Commentaries at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.

from 1811-1820), the Church of St. Matthew's Windsor is the oldest Anglican church building in Australia. Built between 1817 and 1820, with some final finishing touches added in 1821, the foundation was laid in 1817 by the New South Wales representative of the Crown in Australia, Governor Lachlan Macquarie. This foundation stone was laid during the reign of King George III, "the king who won Australia & the king who lost America." Over the south-side entrance to the church there is also an inscription saying the church was erected in 1820 in the reign of "GR" i.e., George King (Rex).

Display Cabinets at the back (west-side) of the church. These include a copy of "A Service of Celebration and Thanksgiving to mark the 175th Anniversary of the Laying of the Foundation Stone by Governor Lachlan Macquarie, Sunday 11th October, 1992 ... in the presence of His Excellency Rear Admiral Peter Sinclair ..., Governor of NSW" His Excellency Peter Sinclair was the State representative in New South Wales of Queen Elizabeth II (Regnal Years: since 1952). (See 1817 Foundation Stone, *supra*.) There are also two Authorized King James Versions from Georgian times in two display cabinets, which thus parallel the reigns of the two kings in the era of the church's construction during Georgian times from 1817 to 1820/1. One is printed in 1763 during the reign of King George III (Regnal Years: 1760-1820). The other is dated 1821, and local church tradition says it was sent out by King George IV (Regnal Years: 1820-1830; Regency under George III from 1811-1820), and thereafter used as the Church's pulpit Bible. A sign on this 1821 copy of the AV says, "the old Georgian Bible passed out" of usage in church services at St. Matthew's in "1936." There is also an 1858 print of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer containing the three Offices removed in 1859.

The Sunday School Banner. Traditional Evangelical Anglican Sunday Schools have some level of local variation among them with regard to their interaction with the main Sunday Church Service. E.g., in the Diocese of Sydney, when I was a Sunday School student at St. Stephen's Penrith (where I won Sunday School prizes in 1967 & 1968²⁹⁵), we would sit in the main body of the church for the first 10-15 minutes and sing a song like, "Since the Lord saved me, I'm as happy as can be, my cup's full and running over." This included e.g., a song I recall in which the people in pews on one side of the aisle would sing of Christ's water, "What never thirst again?" with the other side replying, "No never thirst again" (twice), then joining together, "And whosoe'er shall drink of me, shall never ever thirst again." We would then go out to the Church Hall for the rest of the Sunday School, and a normal Church Service would then proceed in the Church. By contrast, in the Diocese of Sydney, when I was at St. Columb's West Ryde (where I won Sunday School prizes in 1964 & 1965²⁹⁶), and St. Philip's Eastwood (where

²⁹⁵ In 1967 – Constance Savery's *Danny & the Alabaster Box*, Pickering & Inglis, London, 1937, reprint 1960; & in 1968 – Christopher Wright's *The Timpitters' Mine*, Victory Press (Evangelical Publishers), London & Eastbourne, England, 1966.

²⁹⁶ Prizes undated, one year Ward Lock's *My First Reading Book of Bible Stories - New Testament*, A. Quick & Co., Clackton-on-Sea, Essex, 1961; the other year, Mary Alice Jones' *Friends of Jesus*, Rand McNally & Co., Chicago, USA, 1964.

I won Sunday School prizes in 1971 & 1972²⁹⁷), we would always just go straight into the Church Hall. But at such churches, there may be an annual Sunday School Church Service where all parents are invited and (with some local variation among different churches,) e.g., Sunday School students sing a song, or enact a Biblical story; and the Minister may give out annual Sunday School prizes. As one who supports the traditional Protestant institution of the Sunday School, I thank God for the witness of this old Sunday School Banner at St. Matthew's Windsor.

The Governor-General Banner of Lord Casey (Governor-General 1965-1969). The Governor-General is the Federal representative of the Crown. The Officer Training Unit, Scheyville (pronounced "Skyville"), was raised in April 1963 to train National Service men as junior regimental officers during the time of the Vietnam War. The Australian army graduation church services were held quarterly at St. Matthew's from Dec. 1965 to April 1973, and the cabinet in the north-east corner of the church commemorates the unit and is a memorial to the fallen. The Governor-General Banner presented to the Unit by Lord Casey in 1967 was laid up in the Church in April 1973 and rests in the north-east corner of the Chancel²⁹⁸. While working control of the military is in the hand of the Federal Government, the Governor-General holds the ceremonial honour of being Commander-in-Chief of the Military Forces.

The Royal Visit of the Queen. Elizabeth II visited this church on 30 April 1970, in what was the Bi-Centennial Year celebrations of Captain Cook's discovery of eastern Australia in 1770. A photograph of the Queen at this time marks the occasion in the Church.

Stained-glass windows with Authorized Version quotes. There are a number of stained-glass windows at St. Matthew's Windsor which have quotes from the AV on them. The general, though not absolute rule in Anglican tradition, is for stained-glass windows to depict Bible scenes from the four Gospels that focus on Jesus. Where a stained-glass window is not of a Gospel scene, it is most commonly "a one-off" window of a Saint in that Church or Chapel which is named after a Saint not found in the Gospels, whether a NT figure e.g., St. Paul, or an extra-Biblical figure e.g., St. George. Less commonly again, a stained-glass window may be of something else. St. Matthew's Windsor conforms to this general tradition in the stained-glass windows found in the main body of the church on its northern and southern walls. Thus while one of Joseph of

²⁹⁷ In 1971 – Ellen Jane MacLeod's *Adventures on the Lazy 'N'*, Pickering & Inglis, London, 1957, reprint 1969; and in 1972 *Bridge Over the River Kwai* (the only Sunday School book prize I ever lost, I am not sure of its publication or other details).

²⁹⁸ When I lived at Ermington in western Sydney from late 1970 to late 1972, my father was stationed at the nearby 5 Signal Regiment, Dundas. At that time a number of young Scheyville Unit Officers, generally 2nd Lieutenants, used to attend functions at the Dundas Officers' Mess which my parents were also at. (This army base has since been vacated by 5 Signal Regiment, and has become the Headquarters for the 8th Brigade of the Australian Army Reserve, Timor Barracks, Dundas.)

Arimathaea with the body of Jesus lacks any specific Bible quote (Matt. 27:57-60; Mark 15:43-46; Luke 23:50-53; John 19:38-42); others have Authorized Version quotes. Thus with relevant pictures from the respective Gospel that the AV quote is from, one such window has, “Repent ye for the kingdom of heaven is at hand” (Matt. 3:2; cf. Matt. 4:17); another has, “Follow me” (window of “Matthew” leaving “the receipt of custom” office, Matt. 9:9; cf. Luke 5:27), another has, “Not my will but thine be done” (Luke 22:42); another has, “Why seek ye the living among the dead” (Luke 24:5); another has, “though he were dead yet shall he live” (John 11:25); and yet another has, “God is a Spirit” “worship him in spirit and in truth” (John 4:24).

And the third possible day upon which I might have made this Dedication of Volume 3 of my Textual Commentaries on Matt. 21-25 is that of the London *Oak Apple Day* celebrations, which is held variously on the first or second Thursday in June, being this year held on the second Thursday, 9 June 2011. Of these three possibilities, Saturday 28 May 2011, Sunday 29 May 2011, and Thursday 9 June 2011, I have selected Thursday 9 June.

My reasons for this selection of Thurs. 9 June 2011 include three salient facts. Firstly, at the time of the King’s Restoration in 1660, Charles II traveled from Dover to this final destination of London, entering London on 29 May 1660; and thus London is an important symbol of *Oak Apple Day* celebrations. Secondly, the venue of the London *Oak Apple Day* celebrations is the Chelsea *Royal Hospital*, a retirement home for army personnel, and it has received a general royal patronage from all monarchs since the time of its founding by Charles II in 1681 and 1682. It has also received a specific royal patronage from various members of the royal family who have acted as Reviewing Officer at the London *Oak Apple Day Parade* held there at its Figure Court. This includes a number of reigning monarchs since the removal of the day from the Anglican Calendar in 1859, namely, King Edward VII (Regnal Years: 1901 to 1910) in 1909; King George V (Regnal Years: 1910 to 1936) in 1912; King George VI (Regnal Years: 1936 to 1952), in 1942; and Queen Elizabeth II (Regnal Years: since 1952) in 1962, 1975, 1982, and 2006.

Thirdly, 2011 is the 400th anniversary year of the King James Bible. This is being celebrated in various places²⁹⁹. E.g., I am the graduate of three tertiary institutions; and one of these is the *Diocese of Sydney* Evangelical Anglican, *Moore Theological College* in Sydney. The Library display case at Moore College varies from

²⁹⁹ For instance, the *Trinitarian Bible Society* has had “Authorized Version 1611-2011 Commemorative Meetings” by Paul Rowland, a member of the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland* & General Secretary of TBS, at both Hampton Court in London, England, UK, on Sat. 15 Jan., and also at Westminster Baptist Church in London, England, UK, on Sat. 22 Jan. (*English Churchman* [an Anglican newspaper], EC 7808, 17 & 24 Dec. 2010, p. 5); and TBS has had “special events” for “the 400th anniversary of the Authorized Version” at e.g., Ballymena *Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster*, Northern Ireland, UK, on 15 March 2011 (<http://www.trinitarianbiblesociety.org/>).

time to time (e.g., it had a display I saw in 2006 for the 450th anniversary of Thomas Cranmer's martyrdom). But this year it is featuring the "400th anniversary of the King James translation," which, for instance, on the top shelf shows facsimile editions of Tyndale's Pentateuch (1530), Matthew's Bible (1537), and the Geneva Bible (1560), which culminated in the King James Version (1611). (A photo of the display case in 2011 may be found at my website.)³⁰⁰ I will also be attending parts of an associated *King James Bible Conference* held at Moore Theological College on Thurs. 7 July 2011.

One of the holy confessors who suffered under the Interregnum for his Royalist Anglicanism was the King James Bible translator, Daniel Featley. Two other King James Bible translators also lived under, and died under, the unhappy confusions and tyranny of the Interregnum, Andrew Bing in 1652, forbidden an Anglican burial under *Solemn League and Covenant* Interregnum Ordinances; and John Boyce in 1644, who died on the first day of being locked out of Anglican Churches under *Solemn League and Covenant* Interregnum Ordinances. Cruelly imprisoned by the revolutionary Puritan regime for some 18 months, Daniel Featley was extremely ill and let out on bail shortly before his death at *Chelsea College* in 1645 aged 63. The present Royal Chelsea Hospital's southern area is now built over the foundations of the old *Chelsea College* building; and so there is a linkage between the confessor, Daniel Featley, and this institution, where he was appointed Provost by Charles I before the closure of this Anglican Theological College by the Puritan revolutionaries, and upon whose grounds are held London's annual *Oak Apple Day Parade*. Hence in this 400th anniversary year of the King James Bible (1611-2011), I wish to honour the names of all three of these King James Bible translators; and I do so through a special reference to the holy confessor, Daniel Featley.

I am conscious of the fact that Protestant hagiology is sometimes divided on a sectarian basis, and my reference to an Anglican martyr such as King Charles I, or Anglican confessors such as Andrew Bing, John Boyce, and Daniel Featley, unavoidably touches upon issues of this hagiological divide. There is no such thing as a workable "broad Protestant view" of the Royalist-Republican civil war years and Interregnum. Broadly speaking, there are three possible positions. Either one is a Caroline royalist, and if so, usually an Anglican or a Presbyterian of the majority derived group in the Church of Scotland (even though these two groups have some further diverse perspectives). Or one is a Puritan from an English or Irish derived Puritan Church (or less probably a Scottish Puritan Church,) who by the grace of God has repudiated the earlier pro-Cromwell position of that church. Or one is a pro-Cromwell and pro-Rutherford republican Puritan, and derived from an English or Irish derived Puritan Church (or less probably a Scottish Puritan Church).

With respect to this latter group, I note that they personally have not engaged in "seditions" and "murders" (Gal. 5:20,21) against the Crown (Matt. 22:21; I Peter 2:17).

³⁰⁰ See pictures on the website in connection with this Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) of my Textual Commentaries at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.

If they had been asked by the Puritan regime to e.g., “imprison that Royalist Anglican, Daniel Featley, you know, the one who helped translate that Anglican Bible for that Anglican King James;” or told to “cut the head of that *Supreme Governor of the Church of England*, King Charles, you know, the one who wears a Christian cross on his Crown and says you have to ‘Honour’ him as ‘the king’ because the Bible says to;” they hopefully would have declined to do so, and suddenly realizing their error, repented to God in prayer for having ever supported these political revolutionaries contrary to e.g., Matt. 22:21 & Rom. 13:1-9. A number of these pro-Cromwell and pro-Rutherford republican Puritans, derived from English or Irish Puritan Churches (or less commonly from a Scottish Puritan Church), have simply not thought the thing through. Rather, they unthinkingly just continue on in an established normativity in their church of “hollerin’ for Oliver Cromwell, Samuel Rutherford, and the Roundheads.” I do not say that these things excuse them entirely, and at the very least they will still be called to account for their sin of ignorance via negligence (Lev. 4:27; II Chron. 29:11; Luke 2:48,49; John 2:3,4), when they “appear before the judgment seat of Christ” (II Cor. 5:10).

Under the circumstances, some choose to avoid discussion of these Caroline periods altogether. Anglicans regard King Charles I as a Christian martyr, who gave a witness of his Christian faith e.g., on the execution scaffold, when he was unjustly killed by Oliver Cromwell’s Puritan republican revolutionaries in 1649; and correspondingly look with relief and happiness upon the Restoration under King Charles II in 1660. By contrast, a number of Puritans regard Puritan republican revolutionaries like Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford as “great” men. On the one hand, a number of Puritans are anti-Charles II. But on the other hand, to the extent that the Restoration of 1660 was brought about with the support of key Puritans working with Anglicans, and Charles II always had some support among some Puritans, *Charles II’s Day* or *Royal Oak Day* also has the potential to celebrate some unifying themes.

Whatever hagiological differences we Anglicans may have with various Puritans or Puritan derived Protestants over this era, I recognize many godly Puritan Protestants, both historically and now, as my brethren in Christ, and expect to see them in heaven. As a Reformed Evangelical Anglican Protestant, I have enjoyed sweet fellowship with a number of Puritan Protestants in the gospel of Christ, and do not doubt that they are saved men, regenerated by the power of the Holy Ghost, and upholding the authority of the Bible and doctrines of grace recovered by Martin Luther (1483-1546) at the time of the Reformation, and also thereafter set forth by John Calvin (1509-1564). I pray God that we Protestant Christians might never again be so disunited as to set about to kill one another on the battlefield.

It should be remembered that Anglican and Puritan hagiology is generally united before and after the unhappy events of the civil war years and Interregnum. It is also briefly united in general, though not absolute terms, during this time on elements of Irish Massacre Day, 1641. Moreover, with respect to the hagiological divide between us on these Caroline matters, I think a number of important qualifications must be made. In the first place, there were some royalist Presbyterian Puritans in Scotland, and these men fought bravely with Charles II against Cromwell, following the martyrdom of Charles I.

I.e., Scottish Presbyterians were divided between majority royalists and a small minority of republicans. Thus certainly not all Puritans supported Cromwell's Puritan republican revolution against the Anglican Crown.

In the second place, under God's guidance, it was Puritans themselves who set about to dismantle the republic after Cromwell's death in 1658, and facilitate the bloodless Restoration of Charles II in 1660. Hence not all Puritans were anti-Restoration, and indeed a number of Puritans supported the Restoration in 1660. Therefore, even though unlike predominantly Puritan Scotland, England was predominantly Anglican, there would have been *some* English Puritans who threw flowers on the ground in front of King Charles II on 29 May 1660.

And in the third place, while the Calendar of the 1662 prayer book refers to "K. Cha. II" i.e., *King Charles II's Day*, the red-letter Office for this day bears an alternative name, "Restoration of the Royal Family." Here the emphasis is not just on Charles II, but all "the Royal Family." It was only because the Royal Family was so Restored, that e.g., King William of Orange was able to succeed to the throne in 1689. King William III was the grandson of King Charles I³⁰¹, and William III is celebrated on *Papists' Conspiracy Day*. Thus considering these matters, at least some Puritans historically also celebrated Royal Oak Day.

Hence bearing in mind e.g., the history of the royalist Puritans from Scotland who fought for Charles II against Cromwell's republican forces, and the important role played by so many key Puritans in the Restoration of King Charles II in 1660, it seems to me,

³⁰¹ Charles I's eldest daughter was Mary (b. 1631). She became Princess of Orange when she married Prince Henry of Orange on 2 May 1641. She embarked *from Dover*, and within a few days land safely in Holland. A messenger came to her in Holland, bringing her news of her father's martyrdom in 1649. The following year, while she was eight months pregnant, more bad news came to her with her consort's death on 8 October, 1650. The following month, on 14 November, she gave birth to William of Orange, who became King William III of the three kingdoms of England (which includes England & Wales), Ireland, and Scotland. William III was married to Mary II (through whom he succeeded to the throne) in 1677. Mary was the daughter of James II, son of Charles I. Thus William III and Mary II were first cousins, with the common grandfather of Charles I. While all who accept Biblical authority agree that first cousins were allowed to marry in Bible times; the matter of whether or not first cousins should now marry has historically led to disagreement. Some oppose it on eugenic reasons, considering genetic decay since Biblical times has occurred, now making it unwise, whereas others disagree and consider man's genes are the same now as in Bible times as reference is made to an average age of 70 or 80 (Ps. 90:10). Both sides agree the Biblical incest laws of Lev. 18 & 20 allow first cousins to marry, so that if they are to be prohibited, it must be on the basis of natural law (reason). Moreover, all agree that the law at the time of the marriage between William and Mary did not prohibit such marriages and so it was undoubtedly valid. But Mary was unable to have children from this marriage; and so her sister, Anne, succeeded to the throne after William III's death.

that Anglicans and Puritans *should* be able to jointly rejoice in the Restoration, and there can be no doubt that historically representatives from both groups of Protestants have done so. Nevertheless, for Puritan derived Protestants, the issue of Charles II has historically been a matter of some internal disagreement. For those of English and Irish derived Puritan Churches, this had been complicated by the anti-Puritan ejections and lack of religious freedom for Puritans under the Acts of Uniformity of 1662 (Kingdom of England: England & Wales) and 1666 (Kingdom of Ireland); although the fact that many in these same Puritan Churches were expecting and wanting the *Solemn League & Covenant* to prohibit Anglicanism is not generally mentioned by such persons. But for we Anglicans, the matter is different. Historically, we have made a hagiological decision to embrace the Restoration under King Charles II. We remember Charles II, “warts and all” e.g., via the 1662 prayer book. For whilst it is true that human imperfections are evident in e.g., the Biblical kings David and Solomon, and also e.g., King Charles II, for no man is perfect, except Christ, nevertheless, “the king by judgment establisheth the land” (Prov. 29:4), and “the king himself is served by the field” (Eccl. 5:9). By the grace of God, we “Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king” (I Peter 2:17).

Notwithstanding my Low Church Evangelical Anglicanism, I regard the saving truths of the Reformation, safeguarded in more recent centuries by the inter-Protestant denominational Evangelical movement, as *the precious pearl*, and traditional Low Church Evangelical Anglicanism as simply an oyster encasing of that pearl, and I allow that its Gospel can have other encasings. In saying this, I recognize that in some quarters, the Evangelical movement now exhibits the same type of sad apostasy that first necessitated its rise e.g., the ecumenical compromise with Roman Catholics and Eastern Orthodox, who proclaim “another gospel” than “The just shall live by faith” (Gal. 1:6-8; 3:11); and also engage in gross forms of “idolatry” (Gal. 5:19-21), e.g., Mariolatry, or the idolatries connected with the transubstantiation heresy. But it is to the true *Sons of the Reformation*, the true Evangelicals that I refer to with favour. (See “*I’m an Evangelical – I hope you are too!*”, *supra*).

Among true Evangelicals, I consider the differences between the Low Church Anglican liturgical tradition of the 1662 prayer book and Puritan derived Churches, to have a New Testament precedent *something like* this. On the one hand, the Jewish wing of the NT church in describing its local church as a “synagogue” (Jas. 2:1; cf. 1:1; Greek “*sunagogen*” (‘assembly,’ AV, or ‘synagogue,’ feminine singular accusative noun, from *sunagoge*,” rendered “synagogue” in e.g., Matt. 12:9 & Mark 1:21), might be safely said to have had some form of Christianized Jewish synagogue liturgy, a fact further supported by their usage of temple worship in e.g., Acts 21. And on the other hand, the Gentiles meeting in house churches (II John 1,10) would have probably had something approximating a Puritan Church. The tolerance urged in passages such as Rom. 14:5,6 and Col. 2:16, in my opinion facilitated the legitimate rise over time of both broad traditions i.e., both a liturgical church tradition and a non-liturgical church tradition, within the pale of Gentile Protestantism. I thus endorse Article 34 of the Anglican 39 Articles, that “it is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly like, for at all times they have been divers[e], and may be changed according to

the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying."

This third volume of the Textual Commentary on Matt. 21-25, is thus dedicated to Almighty God on *Royal Oak Day*, Thursday 9 June 2011. This year *Oak Apple Day* in 2011 is the 360th anniversary of the events of the royal oak in 1651. And so this third volume of the textual commentaries in support of the Authorized King James Version and Received Text; is dedicated to Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, one God in a perfect Trinity, in special memory of the Restoration under the merry monarch, King Charles II. And in doing so it is to be hoped that the good Christian reader, has recently enjoyed a very merry month of May.

*Nativity & Return of Charles II; or
The King's Restoration Day; or
King Charles II's Day; or
Restoration of the Royal Family Day; or
Royal Oak Day; or Oak Apple Day.
Thursday 9 June 2011, being the day
officially designated in 2011 for the
annual London Oak Apple Day Parade
held at the Chelsea Royal Hospital.
Mangrove Mountain Union Church,
New South Wales, Australia.*