

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

The Treasure of the Church

WALTER R. BOUMAN

The Early Success and Gradual Decline of
Lutheranism in England, 1520–1600

BASIL HALL

A Marxist De-Lutheranization
of the German Reformation

DOUGLAS C. STANGE

Brief Studies

Homiletics

Theological Observer

Book Review

Vol. XXXVIII

October 1967

No. 9

The Early Success and Gradual Decline of Lutheranism in England, 1520 — 1600

BASIL HALL

In a new calendar associated with the *Book of Common Prayer* in 1578 there are four days of some interest to those concerned with English attitudes to Lutheranism in the 16th century:

- "February 16 the learned clerk Philip Melanchthon as upon this day was born.
- February 18 Martin Luther the servant of God died as upon this day.
- February 22 Martin Luther his body as upon this day was translated to Witemberg and buried in the chapel of the Castle there.
- October 31 This day in the yeere of our Lord God 1517 and 101 yeeres after y^e death of John Hus, Martin Luther gave his propositions in y^e universitie of Witemberg against y^e Pope's pardons."¹

¹ *Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer Set Forth in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (Parker Society, 1847) 445 and 453.

Basil Hall is University Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History at the University of Cambridge (England) and Nivison Professor of Church History at Westminster College, Cambridge. The accompanying article was originally presented as a lecture at Luther-Tyndale Church in London at a convocation commemorating Martin Luther's posting of the Ninety-five Theses. The article outlines the main areas of Lutheran influence on the English Reformation and suggests reasons why Lutheranism failed to achieve lasting success in England.

But this calendar was an unofficial enterprise intended to oppose the names of "Protestant saints" to those of "Popish saints" in the traditional calendars in Elizabethan use, and it cannot be taken to mean that a deep or ready sympathy existed for Lutheran doctrine and religious practices at that time. In fact it would be difficult to find an Elizabethan writer approving of Lutheran teachings and methods of worship and advocating them apart from those subjects which had become common to Protestantism, including justification by faith.

For example, in the controversy between the Puritan Thomas Cartwright and Archbishop Whitgift, Cartwright, in seeking support for his criticism of the state of the Church of England, cited Peter Martyr:

who upon the tenth chapter of II Book of Kings saith: The Lutherans must take heed lest whilst they cut off many popish errors, they follow Jehu by retaining also many popish things. For they defend still the real presence in the bread of the Supper, and images and vestments, and saith that religion must be wholly reformed to the quick.

Archbishop Whitgift replied:

M. Martyr nameth the popish things which the Lutherans observe to be the real presence, images, all the popish apparel which they used in their mass (for so doth he mean) and this Church [i. e., the Church of England] hath refused.²

² *The Works of John Whitgift* (Parker Society, 1853), III, 549—50.

Again, it is surprising to find Richard Hooker, the carefully irenic apologist of the "Ecclesia Anglicana," writing in his *Second Sermon on Justification, Works, and How the Foundation of Faith Is Overthrown* in 1585 that the Church of Rome in its teachings "in spite of their confessing remission of sins through Christ overthrew the very foundation of faith by consequent: doth not that so likewise which the Lutheran churches do at this day so stiffly and so fiercely maintain?" He then adds: "For mine own part, I dare not hereupon deny the possibility of their salvation, which have been the chiefest instruments of ours albeit they carried to their grave a persuasion so greatly repugnant to the truth."³ The Elizabethan attitude to Lutheranism can also be seen at the popular level in a doggerel rhyme against a Romanist:

Till Luther's time you say that we
 Heard not of Christ: but you shall see
 That we, not you, have heard of him
 As only pardonor of our sinne;
 Thrise happy Luther, and the rest,
 (Except some faults which we detest).⁴

In sum, the majority of Elizabethan Protestant Englishmen, almost without exception, were willing to admire Martin Luther for his stand against the pope, and for his great insight in rediscovering the truth of justification by faith alone, but they believed that he and his followers allowed in the Lutheran churches the development of dangerous doctrines and the

continuation of certain "Popish" practices, which must be totally rejected.

But would an observer of the religious changes among Englishmen in the reign of Henry VIII have been able to predict the probability of this rejection of Lutheranism in the reign of Elizabeth I? Professor A. G. Dickens can go so far as to write, in the epilog to his excellent study, *The English Reformation*, "If Henry had foreseen the ultimate political dangers of Calvinist Protestantism, he might have been prompted to thrust aside his scruples and adopt as his state religion a fully-fledged Lutheranism, with its veneration for the godly prince. Yet whether this step would have exorcized more radical creeds or merely paved the way for their advent, we can only conjecture."⁵ Nevertheless, the more one reflects upon Henry's attitude to Luther himself and his obtuse and ill-informed dislike of Lutheran doctrines, upon his hostility to foreign influences in England, and upon his obtaining all that the doctrine of the godly prince could convey both in fact through his own political action and in theory through the strong advocacy on the one hand of Archbishop Cranmer, who profoundly believed in it, and on the other through the cautious but powerful support of Bishop Gardiner's authoritarian legalism in his *De vera obedientia*, the more one doubts that Henry would have allowed the Church of England to become Lutheran.⁶ It is true that Henry chose Latimer and Cranmer for bishops and

³ *The Works of Richard Hooker*, ed. J. Keble, 3d ed. (1845), III, 503.

⁴ *Select Poetry Chiefly Devotional of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (Parker Society, 1845), II, 288. *An Answer to a Romish Rime Lately Printed*, 1602.

⁵ A. G. Dickens, *The English Reformation* (1964), 328—29.

⁶ P. Janelle, *Obedience in Church and State*, gives a reprint of Bishop Gardiner's *De vera obedientia*. Gardiner's book was printed at Hamburg for presentation to Lutheran princes and divines.

that both of these men were influenced by Lutheran doctrines, especially Cranmer, who had been closely associated at first-hand with German Lutheranism. But neither of them was a wholehearted Lutheran, in the sense of accepting the full range of Lutheran theology. At his trial, in Mary's reign, Cranmer denied that he had ever held the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence. Latimer in a sermon before Edward VI in 1549 said: "Oh Luther when he came into the world first and disputed against the Decretals and the Canon Law, what ado had he! But ye will say peradventure he was deceived in some things. I will not take it upon me to defend him in all points. I will not stand to it that all that he wrote was true."⁷ When Latimer went to his death at the stake in 1553, he was to be burned, as was his younger friend Cranmer, who saw his death agony from the roof of the Oxford prison Bocardo, for denying the Real Presence *transubstantialiter*, and their own belief on the Eucharistic Presence could not be described in terms acceptable to their Lutheran contemporaries. In fact, it would be difficult to determine who in England maintained consistently through his Protestant career and in writing, from Tyndale onwards, the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

This was indeed to be the chief hindrance to the advance of Lutheranism in England. Bishop Hooper wrote to Martin Butzer in June 1548, while Hooper was at Zurich: "Although I readily acknowledge with thankfulness the gifts of God in him who is now no more, yet he was not without his faults. After the dispute with

⁷ *The Works of Hugh Latimer* (Parker Society, 1844), p. 212.

Zwingli and Oecolampadius about the Supper grew warm, he did violence to many passages of Scripture."⁸ Hooper himself was on this point as on others an adherent of Zurich theology. The Marian martyr John Bradford, before he was burned at Smithfield market in 1555, said under examination in prison: "My faith is not builded on Luther, Zwingli or Oecolampadius on this point [the Real Presence], and indeed to tell you truly, I never read any of their works on this matter."⁹ While from the beginning of the Reformation in England most English Protestants accepted Luther's teaching on justification and works, some to the extent of almost slavishly repeating his words, yet his doctrine of the Lord's Supper made almost all of them uneasy. This hesitation about, and in fact rejection of, Luther's doctrine of the sacraments taken together with the powerful influence of a South German and Zurich-centered Biblicalism containing a moral legalism based on the covenant principle so alien to Luther's doctrinal method, and taken together with Henry's refusal to accept Lutheran formularies and the Lutheran agenda for cleansing abuses in the church, decisively prevented England from becoming a Lutheran land.

The unwillingness of Englishmen to accept Luther's sacramental theology no doubt was due to influences opposed to it from both within England and from abroad. It has been fashionable until a decade or two ago to ignore the continuing effect of Lollardy in England in the 16th century: this antisacerdotal and antisacra-

⁸ *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation* (Parker Society, 1846), First Series, 46.

⁹ *The Writings of John Bradford* (Parker Society, 1848), I, 525.

mental movement was dismissed as negligible or irrelevant, whereas in fact it provided a widespread underground of antipapalism before and after Protestantism entered England from Germany. Lollardy was centered on a literalistic and unscholarly Biblicism affirming obedience to the precepts of the Law and of the Gospel (this is almost inevitable, given the conditions through which the movement survived). Here was a continuity between the Old and New Testaments in the law of God that Luther deliberately set aside, since this emphasis on precepts for obedience would bring in works again by another door. It could be, and surely was, the breeding ground for "covenant" ideas, since a covenant or federal theology soon attracted early English Protestantism — and a covenant theology is always inimical to a sacramental theology. This tendency towards a legalistic Biblicalism that could so readily move into a covenant theology, with its relation of obedience to being elect and "foreknown," was very tenacious in England. Like Lollardy, it was a native of the soil and survived in English non-conformity until well into the 19th century. It is significant that England's "first Lutheran," William Tyndale, was unwilling to adopt Luther's sacramental teaching. Almost from the first, Tyndale was attracted by the principle of the covenant, a requirement of obedience in the contract between God and His people, which Zwingli had set forth at Zurich and which his successors there, especially Bullinger, were to develop.¹⁰ Like Zwingli, Tyndale

affirmed the continuity between Law and Gospel against Luther, who firmly set them in opposition. If English Puritanism, which developed later in the century, may be regarded in its theology as pietism grounded on moral legalism, then its ultimate ancestor is Tyndale. It was through Tyndale's emphasis on the covenant principle that the theology of Zurich developed in England. Again one of the earliest of English Lutherans, Dr. Robert Barnes, the Cambridge Augustinian whom Luther referred to after his martyrdom as "Saint Robert," while he was wholeheartedly Lutheran during his residence at Wittenberg, yet, during the last 10 years of his life, he may well have accommodated his theology to the English situation wherein the covenant principle opposed the influence of Lutheran teaching on the Real Presence.¹¹

The third reason, already suggested, for Lutheranism's failure to become the accepted religion of the English nation was the opposition to it shown by Henry VIII.

¹¹ W. A. Clebsch, in his *England's Earliest Protestants, 1520—1535* (New Haven, 1964), p. 68, believes that Barnes altered his originally wholly Lutheran view of justification by faith alone to allow some measure of justification before the world by works. Also, W. D. J. Cargill Thompson believes that Barnes modified his doctrine of kingship between the two editions of his *Supplication to Henry VIII*; see *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 1960, pp. 133—42.

A modernized reprint of the major part of the *Supplication* with helpful introduction and notes is to be found in N. S. Tjernagel, *The Reformation Essays of Dr. Robert Barnes* (London, 1963). Clebsch draws attention (pp. 81—85) to the Scotsman Patrick Hamilton's *Patrick's Places*. These were an early statement of Lutheran teaching in English in 1529. They were modified in the interests of later English Protestantism by John Foxe in *The Acts and Monuments* and by John Knox in his *History of the Reformation in Scotland*.

¹⁰ *Exposition and Notes of Sundry Portions of the Holy Scriptures*, William Tyndale (Parker Society, 1849), [on the Sermon on the Mount]. Tyndale's positive contribution of Lutheran theology to England will be shown later.

(A comparison of the ecclesiastical situation in England with that of Sweden would be interesting: there was much in common between the aims and methods of the Reformation adopted in the two countries, the point of contrast being that King Gustavus Vasa accepted the major Lutheran doctrines for the Church of Sweden whereas Henry rejected them for England.) Henry's view of his kingdom, his kingship, his supreme headship of the church, combined with his theological conservatism, his refusal to put himself in spiritual or intellectual rutelage to a German friar in Saxony, and his interest in an Erasmusian type of church reform, led him to oppose the development of a Lutheran Church of England. If this is thought to be over-emphatic, then it may be well to consider here the shrewd insight of Luther himself, for he had got the measure of Henry when he wrote, after Robert Barnes was burned in 1540:

When this holy martyr, St. Robert, understood at last that his king (by your leave) Harry of England, had become an enemy of the pope, he returned to England with the hope that he might plant the Gospel in his fatherland; and at last he was successful in entering upon this. . . . But when we had deliberated, at great length and at a great expense to our noble Prince Elector of Saxony, we found in the end that Harry of England had sent his embassy not because he wanted to become evangelical, but in order that we at Wittenberg would agree to his divorce. . . . Harry is pope, and the pope is Henry of England. Dr. Robert Barnes himself often told me: *Rex meus non curat religionem*. Yet he so loved his king and his country that he was ready to endure everything, and always he was striving how to help England. . . . Hope deceived him. For

he always hoped that his king would become good. Among other things, we often disputed why the king should love that abominable title: *Defensor fidei et in terris caput supremum et immediatum post Christum Ecclesiae Anglicanae*. But as this many times was the answer: *Sic volo, sic jubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas*, so that one could see very well by this time that Squire Harry wished to be God and to do what he pleased.¹²

Henry never understood the essential themes of Luther; the doctrine of justification by faith passed him by like words down the wind. Henry had received some theological training alongside his other more liberal and diversified studies but it was theology in a traditional scholastic mold, producing those limitations which can be seen in his *Assertion of the Seven Sacraments* against Luther, in which he did not come to grips with the essential argument of Luther, although it won for him that titular recognition from the pope as *Defensor fidei*, which he desired as a minor weapon in his diplomatic activities. Moreover, Henry had been educated by men interested in the new learning and had many about him at court who were influenced by humanist writings, especially those of Erasmus. Henry's friendship for men as diverse as Thomas More and Thomas Cranmer reflects his and their common interest in the new learning. Some have argued that there were no guiding principles in Henry's pattern of reformation in the Church of England,¹³ but this is to reduce one of the most powerful and astute of princes to being a cipher. Rather, a good case could be made for the

¹² WA LI, 449—50.

¹³ For example, compare *The New Cambridge Modern History* (1958), II, 241.

view that the Henrician reformation of the church shows a very close relationship with the Erasmian principles of ecclesiastical reform: the abolition of the jurisdiction of the pope in favor of the direct initiative for reform resting with the Christian prince; the closing of religious houses; the translation of the Bible from the original tongues into the vernacular; the cleansing of certain abuses, for example the excessive number of saints days and holidays and superstitious customs associated with pilgrimages to shrines and other old but unfruitful practices; the promotion of Hebrew and Greek studies and good classical Latinity, leading to a new Biblical theology to displace scholasticism. These and other themes of church reform dear to the Erasmians can all be seen at work in producing the pattern of Henrician Catholicism.¹⁴

It was due to a measure of common ground between Erasmians and Lutherans in Biblical theology that a certain amount of Lutheran teaching infiltrated the devotional and theological literature of the Henrician church. Henry, in part through ignorance of the sources and in part through recognizing the value of the new Biblically grounded theology, did not realize how much Lutheran influence was at work. His sharp criticisms of the "Bishops' Book" (*The Godly and Pious Institution of a Christian Man*, 1537) and his restoration of a more conservative and traditional theology in the "King's Book" (*The Necessary Doctrine and Erudition of a Christian Man*, 1543) may reflect if not a suspicion of the presence of Lutheran influence in

the former then a determination to maintain orthodox fences around the new learning he had known and admired in his youth. Yet, in spite of Henry and in spite of the suspicion and hostility of the men of the old learning, led by Bishop Gardiner, Lutheran influences, both doctrinal and liturgical, were at work in England. Already in 1521 Archbishop Warham had become increasingly alarmed about the number of Lutheran books circulating in England, and he wrote to Wolsey:

Please it your grace to understand that now lately I receyvid letters from the Universitie of Oxford and in those same certayne newes which I am very sorry to here. For I am enformyd that diverse of that Universitie be infectyd with the heresydes of Luther and of others of that sorte having among them a grete nombre of books of the saide perverse doctrine which wer forboden by your graces auctoritie as Legate de latere of the See apostolique, and also by me as Chauncellor of the saide Universitie. . . . But it is a sorrowful thing to see how gredyly inconstaunt men, and specyally inexpert youthe, falleth to new doctrynes be they never so pestilent.¹⁵

There was a bonfire of Lutheran books in London May 12, 1521. When we reflect that Lutheran influence could attain a pulpit in Cambridge in December 1525, through Robert Barnes preaching a sermon that wholeheartedly expounded Lutheran doctrines, then it is not surprising that this together with other examples of the spread of these heresies made in Germany should lead to the issuing, by 1531 or shortly thereafter, of a second list of books for-

¹⁴ Many of these themes of church reform can be seen in Erasmus's *Enchiridion militis Christiani* and are implied behind the mockery of his *Praise of Folly*.

¹⁵ Henry Ellis, *Original Letters, Illustrative of English History*, First Series (1824), I, 239 ff.

bidden in England. Among its 85 titles were 22 by Luther.¹⁶

Latin works from overseas would be confined to scholars like that group of Cambridge men, including Robert Barnes, who met in the White Horse Tavern (which in those days was in a long vanished side street near Queens' College), where they read and discussed Luther's writings. But a wider influence for Lutheran views could be found in the books of private devotion in English called Primers, published for the use of laymen. When George Joye issued the *Ortulus anime* (i. e., *Hortulus animae*) in English in 1530, he used Lutheran sources for some of the prayers, as Dr. Butterworth has shown; for example, the morning prayer and the graces before and after dinner are taken from Luther's *Betbüchlein* and *Kleiner Katechismus* in their Latin version.¹⁷ Also it is plain what lies behind the following extract:

The question

For as myche then as god is the spirite and maye not be ymaged of other wittes: howe shall we knowe hym?

The answer

Faithē and truste fynde hym when we are in perel and shewe hym unto us and yet this faythe to fynde hym must he geve us: for if we gete us a faithē of owre owne

¹⁶ *The Acts and Monuments* of John Foxe, ed. J. Pratt and J. Stoughton (n. d.), IV, 667. Foxe gives the title of this catalog *Libri sectae sive factionis Lutheranae importati ad civitatem London per fautores ejusdem sectae, quorum nomina et auctores sequuntur*, and the date as 1529, but this is probably at least two years too early.

¹⁷ C. C. Butterworth, *The English Primers* (1529—1545), 1953, p. 33. Once again, however, it should be remembered that Joye was not a whole-hearted favorer of Lutheranism; he was Zwinglian in his Eucharistic doctrine, like Tyndale.

fashhoninge wherby we beleve and truste in eny wother thinge then god, then make we us an idole: for it is the faithe and truste only in owre hartes that maketh other [i. e., either] god or ydole.¹⁸

In 1534 appeared another English Primer edited by William Marshall (the first book to be printed in England containing fairly large portions of the Bible in English), which reprinted over half of Joye's version of the *Hortulus*; most of the remainder of the work was a reproduction of writings by Luther without mentioning his name, for example, the Preface is adapted from the *Betbüchlein* of 1522, and later there appear free translations of sermons by Luther on prayer and on the Passion.¹⁹ Another Primer of Marshall—who was bold enough to add at the foot of the title page of his little treatise against the worshipping of images, "I dout not but some popish doctor or pevish proctor wyl grunt at this treatise"—the *Goodly Primer* of 1535, contained "Thoffice of all estates," which showed the characteristic Lutheran theme of *Beruf* as demonstrated by Tyndale.²⁰

But more important, not least because of its fundamental authority and because of its having the widest dissemination, was the Bible in English, beginning with William Tyndale's New Testament which was indebted, among other versions, to Luther's translation and included prefaces and notes reflecting Luther's theology, notably the Preface to Romans, which was almost a direct translation from Luther. The whole Bible, revised and completed on the basis of Tyndale's work, was prepared for publi-

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 108.

cation by Miles Coverdale, and the title declared it to be "faithfully translated out of Douche and Latyn into Englishe" in 1535. "Douche" here refers particularly to the Zurich German translation, which owed much to the Swiss scholars Leo Jud and Pellikan, but also something to Luther's version. The "Matthew" Bible (edited in fact by John Rogers) contained Lutheran themes in some of its many notes and "Prologues." Coverdale not only gave much of his energy to the work of revising and editing an English version of the Bible; he also, among other literary activities, translated Luther's *Der 23st Psalm auf einen Abend über Tisch nach dem Gratias ausgelegt* (1536) in 1537 and a little later issued his *Goostly Psalmes and Spirituale Songs drawn out of the holy Scripture*, which markedly reflect the impact made on him by Luther's own metrical German versions of Psalms and other Biblical passages.²¹ This book of *Goostly Psalmes* was listed among a large number proscribed on Henry's order in 1539, which showed the rising tide of Lutheran literature in translation as well as in the original, that had been flowing into England from the time of the public appearance of Luther as Reformer.

The influence of Lutheranism is even more marked in the doctrinal and liturgical documents of the church of England under Henry and even under Edward, although it is being challenged and outdistanced by the increasingly dominating Swiss theology of Zurich—more marked because these were official documents almost all issued with the full authority of the crown and of the church. The formal doctrinal state-

ments under Henry begin with the Ten Articles of 1536 (the first stage in the journey to the Thirty-nine Articles issued under Elizabeth I and still in use), which were described as "Articles devised by the King's Highest Maiestie to stablyshe Christen quietnes and Unitie amonge us and to avoyde contentious opinions." These articles represent a curious mixing of certain characteristic themes of Lutheranism with traditional Catholicism. They were in two parts, the first doctrinal, concerning relation to the creeds, the sacraments, and Justification, the second ceremonial, and in the former show traces of the Augsburg Confession and possibly the Apology of the Confession by Melanchthon. To Melanchthon they could be written off, not surprisingly, as *confusissime compositum* ("most confusingly put together").²² But not even the English love of compromise, which these articles display in its most tortuous form, could continue to satisfy Archbishop Cranmer. The next step in interpreting the belief of a church that had cast off the papacy but left the English layman puzzled about what doctrinal requirements were laid on him was that book prepared by Archbishop Cranmer and a commission of bishops, *The Institution of a Christian Man* (popularly known as the "Bishops' Book"), which was the nearest approach to full Protestantism in an official publication of the reign of Henry. Here the Melanchthonian definitions that appeared, rather heavily disguised, in the Ten Articles are incorporated and expanded. But more than this, both the Small and Large Catechisms of Luther are used, close parallels occurring in several places. For example, compare the "Bishops' Book":

²¹ H. E. Jacobs, *The Lutheran Movement in England* (1891), pp. 118—24.

²² *Corpus Reformatorum*, III, 1490.

I acknowledge and confess that he suffereth and causeth the sun, the moon, the stars, the day, the night, the air, the fire, the water, the fowls, the fishes, the beasts and all the fruits of the earth to serve me for my profit and my necessity.

with Luther's Large Catechism:

He causes all creatures to serve for the necessities and uses of life — sun, moon and stars in the firmament, day and night, air, fire, water, earth and whatever it bears and produces, bird and fish, beasts, grain and all kinds of produce.

Again, Article V of the Augsburg Confession must surely lie behind the following words in the "Bishops' Book":

To the attaining of which faith, it is also to be noted, that Christ hath instituted and ordained in the world but only two means and instruments, whereof the one is the ministration of his word, and the other is the administration of his sacraments instituted by him; so that it is not possible to attain this faith, but by one, or both of these two means.²³

The degree to which Cranmer had become committed to the doctrine of justification by faith, even to the extent of flatly opposing Henry, who never really grasped what it was about, can be seen in the annotation he made to one of several proposed additions or corrections written by Henry in the margin of the "Bishops' Book":

And I believe also and profess, that he is my very God, my Lord, and my Father, and that I am his servant and his own son by adoption and grace, and* the right inheritor of his kingdom.

Henry wished to add between the "and" and "the" (at the asterisk) the words "As long as I persevere in his precepts and

laws, one of the right inheritors of his kingdom." Cranmer disallowed this addition, which showed Henry's Erasmian Catholic legalism relying upon works, by his annotation:

This book speaketh of the pure Christian faith unfeigned, which is without colour, as well in heart as in mouth. He that hath this faith, converteth from his sin, repenteth him. . . . This is the very pure christian faith and hope, which every good Christian man ought to profess, believe and trust. . . . And as far as the other faith . . . that those which "persevere in God's laws and precepts, so long as they so do, they be the right inheritors of his kingdom," this is not the commendation of a Christian man's faith, but a most certain proposition, which also the devils believe most certainly, and yet they shall never have their sins forgiven by this faith, nor be inheritors of God's kingdom, because they lack the very christian faith, not trusting to the goodness and mercy of God for their own offences.

Cranmer extended himself much further on this theme, because he recognized that Henry's proposed emendations undercut the whole doctrine of saving faith. He was more terse and pointed when Henry wished to add "I doing my duty" to the words "And I believe that by this passion and death of our Savior Jesus Christ . . ."; for he stated flatly:

We may not say that we do our duty. Nevertheless he hath not the right faith in his heart, that hath not a good heart and will do his duty [and refers to the former annotation above]. But no man doth do all his duty, for then he needeth not to have any faith for the remission of his sins.²⁴

²³ Jacobs, p. 109.

²⁴ *Remains of Archbishop Cranmer* (Parker Society, 1846), II, 84, 89.

Henry's need for good diplomatic relations with the Lutheran princes, at a period when he felt threatened by a Catholic alliance, led to prolonged consultations between German and English theologians. It was hoped that these consultations would produce a theological formulation both sides could agree on and one that would meet the demand of the Lutheran princes that they could satisfy their consciences in forming political alliances only if these reflected the confessing of the faith. The result of these discussions was the Thirteen Articles, which, although they were set aside after the breakdown of the negotiations between Henry and the Lutheran princes in 1538 and therefore were never published or sanctioned for use, represent clearly the second stage on the road to the Forty-two Articles under Edward VI and the Thirty-nine Articles under Elizabeth I. Hardwick has shown not only that the Thirteen Articles follow closely the pattern of the Augsburg Confession, including extensive verbal agreement, but also that they formed the basis for the later development of the Articles of Religion, where the same subject matter was required.²⁵ Article VII, however, was not going to reappear later, for it set forth the Lutheran teaching on the Eucharist close to the Augsburg definition and very close to the article on the Eucharist in the conference in Wittenberg in 1536 (the *Repetitio* of Melanchthon brought back by the English commissioners?).

On the Eucharist we constantly believe and teach that in the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord, the body and blood of Christ are truly, substantially, and really

²⁵ C. Hardwick, *A History of the Articles of Religion* (1904), Appendix II.

present under the species of bread and wine: and that under the same species they are truly and really exhibited (presented) and distributed to those who receive the sacrament whether they are good or evil.²⁶

Henry, however, could still bewilder and finally exasperate the Lutherans by accepting gladly and praising a work for the instruction of clergymen by the able Lutheran theologian Erasmus Sarcerius, translated by Richard Taverner in 1538 as *Comon places of Scripture ordrely set forth*, and then in 1539 issuing the Six Articles (the "Whip with Six Strings"), all except possibly the first attacking those who denied traditional Catholic practices already described and rejected by the Lutherans as notorious "abuses" during the discussions in 1538. Melanchthon with unusually vigorous condemnation attacked these articles at length in a letter to Henry, though crediting the bishops, especially Gardiner, with writing them; Luther more bluntly declared that he and his were "glad to be rid of the blasphemers."²⁷

After the death of Henry, Protestantism took a leap forward under his infant son Edward VI and his council. More radical, and more Swiss, theological trends developed, although Archbishop Cranmer remained loyal to a more conservative Protestantism, continuing to use Lutheran

²⁶ Hardwick, p. 266. Jacobs, p. 139, cites the article of the Eucharist from the *Repetitio* from Seckendorf.

²⁷ *Corpus Reformatorum*, III, 806. G. R. Elton shows well that Thomas Cromwell supported Lutheranism, at least on political grounds. *England Under the Tudors*, 1956, pp. 152—56. See also the useful and thorough article by C. S. Meyer, "Melanchthon, Theologian of Ecumenism," in *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, XVII, 2 (October 1966), pp. 185—207.

sources in both his doctrinal teaching in catechism, homilies, and articles, and also in his remarkable though brief career as a liturgist. In 1548 appeared *Catechismus: that is to say a short Instruction into Christian Religion for the synguler communitie and profyte of childe and yong people, set forth by the moost reverende father in God Thomas Archbysshop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Metropolitan.*

It is difficult to determine whether Cranmer was personally and wholly responsible for the work of translating the Latin catechism of Justus Jonas, who had been at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530 in company with Melancthon. The translation may have been made in part by one of his chaplains set to this task by Cranmer, but it is certain that it was overseen by him and approved for publication under his authority, as the title before the preface of the English edition shows; and in reply later to an attack by Bishop Gardiner, he wrote of "the Catechisme of Germany by me translated into English." There are some minor alterations together with a few additions and deletions, and one major addition of some length attacking "idolatry," that is, worship associated with popular English "famouse and notorious" images such as those of the Virgin at Walsingham and Ipswich and of St. Anne of Buxton. Two points of considerable interest arise, however, concerning the sermons on the three sacraments, which are attached to Jonas' catechism and given in English without addition or deletion: *Baptism; The Authoritie of the Keyes; The Communion or the Lord's Supper.* Here Cranmer is giving to England Lutheran teaching on Absolution as it was held in the 1530s, but also he is authorizing Lutheran doctrine on the Communion,

a fact which Bishop Gardiner in Edward's reign used to embarrass Cranmer by claiming that Cranmer had then taught the Real Presence.²⁸ In replying to Gardiner's claim that the Real Presence had been set forth in this catechism, Cranmer stated that in speaking of receiving with the mouth the body and blood of Christ he was assuming acquaintance with "olde auncient authors" and their "phrase and manner of speech." He added that the Presence was to be understood spiritually and that in any case nothing was said, in the sermon translated, of reserving the sacramental elements. But Cranmer must have been embarrassed by the consequences arising from the publication of the catechism, for Burcher wrote to Bullinger in October 1548 that "the Archbishop of Canterbury has caused a catechism of some Lutheran opinions to be translated and published in our language. This little book has occasioned no little discord, so that fightings have frequently taken place among the common people on account of their variety of opinions, even during the sermons."²⁹ This was not to be the only occasion in which Cranmer's irenic, Biblically grounded, and nondoctrinaire theology would be misrepresented by the obtuse or the partisan.

This catechism is now virtually forgotten as are doctrinal statements like the Ten Articles and the unpublished Thirteen Articles, but one sourcebook for Lutheran influences in England in Cranmer's time still survives and is used wherever Anglicans worship, *The Book of Common Prayer.* This influence, partly ignored or underestimated by certain Anglican liturgical schol-

²⁸ Burton, *Cranmer's Catechism* (1829), pp. vf.

²⁹ Ellis, II, 643.

ars of the later 19th century who were unwilling to accept influences other than Catholic on the English liturgy, needs reappraisal in the light of more recent liturgical studies.³⁰ As long ago as 1895, the American Lutheran scholar, H. E. Jacobs, in his useful book *The Lutheran Movement in England* provided much material, but it is time that this matter should receive a new and thorough investigation, for Jacobs sometimes adduced evidence of a Lutheran influence on the English Prayer Book that could in fact derive from a pre-Reformation source.³¹

First in time came Cranmer's English litany of 1544. Versions of this ancient form of processional prayer used for special occasions of danger, dire need, and penance, as well as during Lent had appeared already in English in the 14th century, and also in Henry's reign, in the Sarum Primer and in Marshall's "Goodly Primer." Marshall's version of 1535 already showed some influence of the litany that Luther had prepared for use at Wittenberg after March 1529, first in Latin and then in German. Then Cranmer issued in May 1544 an English litany under the following description: "An exhortation unto prayer, thought mete by the kinges maiestie and his clergy, to be read to the people in every church afore processyons. Also a Letanie with suffrages to be said or song in the time of the said processyons." Editing and rewording, Cranmer here wove together strands from the English version set out in Marshall's Primer, after excising the

Kyrie eleison and the long list of saints' names, and from Luther's litany in both of its versions, Latin and German.³²

The Lutheran sources are more marked in the Order for Holy Communion in the first *Book of Common Prayer* of 1549, though these sources are almost ignored in Procter and Frere, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer*, where one vague parallel to a Lutheran source is mentioned in a footnote. The exhortation is modeled on that in the *Simplex et pia deliberatio* prepared for Archbishop Hermann of Cologne by Melanchthon and Butzer, which in turn derives from the exhortation in the order of Cassel of 1539. The third exhortation of the order in *The Book of Common Prayer* is derived from the second in the *Pia deliberatio*, which here followed the order of Nürnberg by Volprecht in 1524. The language of the prayer of confession and of the absolution in the new order of Holy Communion also closely resembles that of the confession and absolution in the *Pia deliberatio*. The phrase "Hear what comfortable words" surely reflects the German "Höret den evangelischen tröst" also in the *Pia deliberatio*. Again, the words of administration very probably reflect Luther's insistence in his *Der kleine Katechismus* and elsewhere that the words "given for you," "shed for you," and "for the remission of sins" were fundamental to the right observance of this sacrament. The words of administration of the English order closely resemble those in the order of Schwäbisch Hall prepared by Brenz in 1547. While a similar formula can be found in the manuals, though not the missals, of pre-Reformation

³⁰ Older histories of *The Book of Common Prayer* which reflect this tendency observed are those of F. Procter and W. H. Frere, and of J. H. Blunt.

³¹ J. Dowden, *Further Studies in the Prayer Book* (1908), p. 34.

³² J. Dowden, *The Workmanship of the Prayer Book*, 2d ed., (1902), pp. 152 ff.

England, yet the vital clue for Lutheran influence lies in the words "given . . . shed . . . for thee," a fact ignored or overlooked by Procter and Frere.³³ That Cranmer was familiar with the Lutheran words of administration can be seen from the fact that the catechism of Justus Jonas, referred to above, has a brief section on the importance of the words "given for you" and "shed for you." In the Communion of the sick the rubric requiring some others to communicate with the sick person is taken either from the *Pia deliberatio* or from another Lutheran order, for the requirement is almost universal in the German orders.

This is not to say that Cranmer followed any order closely, for the originality of his liturgical genius can be seen in his additions to, and contractions of, his various sources. He was resolute, moreover, in suppressing from his order of Holy Communion the elevation, which was retained in several Lutheran orders, including that of the Palatinate introduced by Osiander, Cranmer's wife's uncle. Nevertheless, it is not surprising that Hilles wrote to Bullinger in June 1549 on the new order of Holy Communion: "We have a uniform communion of the eucharist throughout the entire realm, yet after the manner of the Nuremberg books and some of the Saxons. The bishops and magistrates present no obstruction to the Lutherans."³⁴ This statement is not to be understood as approving of the Lutheran influence, rather it deplors it, and within less than three years the powerful pressure group it represents won the removal of Lutheran elements from the order of Holy Communion in the second *Book of Common Prayer*, 1552. Here the

prayer for the departed is removed from the prayer of consecration, and the words of administration are radically altered to something nearer to the position of Bullinger. Largely because of this change the Lutheran influences are almost entirely absent from the order of Holy Communion printed in the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662, which is still in use.³⁵

The order of Baptism of 1549, which today remains largely unaltered in *The Book of Common Prayer*, shows a much more marked influence of the Lutheran orders, for three fourths of this rite is derived from Lutheran sources, especially from the German translation of the *Pia deliberatio*. The exhortation is largely derived from that of Luther in 1523 in his *Taufbüchlein*, which was followed in many of the German church orders. The first prayer at Baptism is taken from Luther, and the collect "Almighty and everlasting God, heavenly Father . . ." is almost wholly a direct translation from the Lutheran prayer. In the order for private Baptism the questions asked follow closely those in the *Pia deliberatio*. Other orders and forms in *The Book of Common Prayer* indicate a Lutheran background: the order of confirmation follows the *Pia deliberatio* very probably in the use of a brief catechism, and the insistence on the Creed, Lord's Prayer, and Ten Commandments in the preparation of the communicant. It is interesting that signing with the sign of the cross, which was retained at Baptism (though omitted at confirmation) together with the words declared at that point, are found in the *Pia*

³³ J. Dowden, *Further Studies*, p. 236.

³⁴ Ellis, *Original Letters*, p. cxxi.

³⁵ It could be added, however, that the Communion of the Sick, which survived in 1662, shows the influence of Lutheran orders. Dowden, *Further Studies in the Prayer Book* (1908), pp. 248 ff.

deliberatio and were to be one of the fundamental grounds of attack on the Prayer Book by the Puritans in the time of Elizabeth I and later as an unreformed popish ceremony.³⁶

Since in the services of Matins and Evensong Cranmer undertook a markedly new approach to Sunday parochial worship, we might expect Lutheran influence here, for there had been a similar development in Protestant Germany. Yet though well aware of the radical revision of breviary hours by Quinones and of the patterns provided by the German orders, Cranmer showed his originality and his liturgical touch at its best in the two offices, and borrowed little from other sources. There are traces, however, of the order of Calenberg and Göttingen, of 1542, in the order of Matins in the first *Book of Common Prayer*, where the arrangement of the service follows a very similar pattern.³⁷ The form of solemnization of matrimony in *The Book of Common Prayer* is still in use and shows plainly the influence of Luther's *Traubüchlein für die einfältigen Pfarrherrn*, for example, the words "Those whom God hath joined together" derive from "Was Gott zusammen gefüget hat, sol kein Mensch scheiden." Again the words "After God's ordinance in the holy estate of matrimony" derive from "nach göttlicher Ordnung zum heiligen Stande der Ehe." Moreover, the words "this company," so often taken to mean no more than those individually present at the ceremony, reflect in fact the German "gemein," meaning the church,

thereby conveying a profounder significance to the statement. The opening address on the nature of Christian marriage (which follows much that is in the Sarum order) contains several phrases echoing the Lutheran orders, especially that of Schwäbisch Hall. In addition, the words "else hereafter forever hold his peace" reflect words used in several Lutheran orders beginning with that of Brandenburg-Nürnberg by Osiander in 1533.³⁸ Finally, the order for the visitation of the sick reflects in its exhortation the Saxon order of 1539 either directly or as mediated through the *Pia deliberatio*; and the anthem in the order for the burial of the dead, *Media vita*, "In the midst of life," contains the words "Suffer us not at our last hour," which have no place in the original Latin sequence and derive (through Coverdale's translation of Luther's version of the sequence "Mitten wir im leben sind") from Luther's own beautiful addition:

Du ewiger Gott,
Lass uns nicht entfallen
Von des rechten Glaubens Trost.³⁹

"A Catechism," which is set in the Prayer Book between the baptismal and confirmation services, follows a pattern that had been established by Brenz beginning with what was given to the child in Baptism and continuing through the Creed, Ten Commandments, and Lord's Prayer, and in some of the explanations on the Commandments appears to echo Luther's Catechism. There is also an influence of Lutheranism in the provision of religious instruction for the people, and this lies in the first *Book of Homilies*, issued in July 1547, containing

³⁶ Dowden, p. 271. It could be added, too, that part of the general confession is derived from the *Pia deliberatio*, Procter and Frere, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer* (1925), p. 488.

³⁷ Dowden, p. 79.

³⁸ Dowden, pp. 283, 284.

³⁹ Dowden, *The Workmanship of the Prayer Book*, 2d ed. (1902), p. 162.

12 homilies. Cranmer himself was responsible for four if not five of these twelve, the third of which, "Of the Salvation of Mankind by Only Christ Our Saviour," is emphasized as being especially important for its teaching on justification by faith in Article XI of the Thirty-nine Articles. Professor Jacobs cites among other less obvious instances the parallelism between Melancthon's *Loci Communes: De Evangelio*: "Justification is given fully, that is, not on account of our worth, yet there must be a ransom for us," and the words of the homily: "Although this justification be free unto us, yet it cometh not so freely unto us, that there is no ransom paid therefor at all."⁴⁰ While verbal similarities, in spite of Professor Jacobs, are much more rare than this citation might suggest, yet this homily as well as "Of the True and Lively Faith" and "On Good Works" certainly reflect how far Cranmer was working from within the same pattern of theology as that created by Luther's great insights on the doctrine of grace.

The *Book of Homilies* is no longer significant in the life of the Church of England, but assent to the Thirty-nine Articles is still required of clergy upon their institution to benefices. The preliminary drafting of the Articles of Religion began in 1551 and was undertaken by Cranmer himself, and after some revision they were issued numbering 42 in 1553. Archbishop Parker revised these to some extent, omitting some articles and adding others, and they were issued in their final form in 1571. Articles I—IV reflect, sometimes verbatim, similar statements in the Augsburg Confession. Article V is very close to the third articles of the Württemberg Confession

(this had been prepared by Brenz in 1551). Articles IX, XI, XVI, XIX, XX, XXVI, XXXVII, and XXXVIII all reflect the Augsburg Confession, and other articles also have words and phrases reflecting its influence, either directly or as it was mediated through the Württemberg Confession. (It is worth noting that what many Anglicans believe to be the moderation and traditionalism of the articles in comparison with continental confessions can be seen also in Lutheran articles and are not therefore peculiarly distinctive of Anglicanism other than in the sense that Archbishop Parker sympathized with that kind of pattern rather than with a more radical one.) Also the Apology of the Augsburg Confession and the Smalcald Articles may be traced here and there in the Thirty-nine Articles. But it should not be overlooked, on the other hand, that four or five of the articles show the rising influence of the Swiss theology before which, from Edward's reign onwards, Lutheranism was very largely retreating in England, and also these few articles represent more the specific impact of Reformed theology than those articles which reflect a Lutheran source, since often enough that source may well have been common ground in Protestantism in general.⁴¹

The amount of Lutheran literature coming into England during Henry's reign has already been referred to above,⁴² but this deserves more detailed attention. The extent of the influence of a Lutheran book imported from Germany, or translated and published in England, is imponderable. How can one tell how many readers a given book would reach? Humphrey Monmouth,

⁴⁰ Jacobs, p. 337.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 341, 342.

⁴² *Supra*, p. 581 ff.

a London draper and alderman "noted as well for his piety as his wealth," had "articles mynystred against" him in November 1537: "thow hast had or bought divers and many Books, Treaties, and Works of the said Martyn Luther, and other of his detestable sect . . . thou art named and reputed to be avancer and a Favourer of the said Martyn Luther, his Heresies and detestable Opinions, and one of the same Sect."⁴³ How many came to read Luther for the first time through visiting Monmouth's house? The number of occasions on which Lutheran books are quoted or named in correspondence, heresy trials, sermons, and other English theological literature, lists of condemned books, would be a complicated study in itself. No more can be done here than draw attention to book titles from Germany, and to the English translations of some of these during the years in which these books were prominent and indicate their characteristic subject matter. A list of prohibited books, one of several after 1526, was entitled *Libri sectae sive factionis Lutheranae importati ad civitatem London per fautores ejusdem sectae* (probably dating from 1531 or a little later), included Luther's Latin catechism, *De libertate Christiana*, *De bonis operibus*, *De votis monasticis*, the commentary on Galatians, and other works with some of his letters. In this list also were works by Bugenhagen, Urbanus Rhegius, Melancthon, Agricola, and Brenz, but Zwinglian and South German writers are also found in it, Oecolampadius, Pellikan, Butzer, Francis Lambert, and Zwingli himself.⁴⁴ English translations of Lutheran literature

had begun with Tyndale from 1528 and earlier in *The Parable of a Wicked Mammon*, and the Prologue to the Epistle to the Romans issued in Tyndale's New Testament and taken from Luther's own Prologue, and by 1536 the Augsburg Confession had been translated with the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, by Richard Taverner. *The dysclosyng of the canon of the popysh Masse, with a sermon annexed unto it, of ye famous clerk of worthy memory D. Marten Luther, by me Hans Hitprycke* (1548?) shows Luther being used as a propellant for an English rocket against "popery."

It is interesting that Luther's sacramental theology is avoided in English versions of his works and that in the reign of Elizabeth I the translations from Luther are from his Biblical expositions (and even these are modified by the omission of passages where his sacramental teaching appears)⁴⁵ and ignore his earlier explosive treatises, which would by then be considered old weapons unsuited to post-Tridentine controversial needs. Melancthon's confessional writings in English have been mentioned already, and also some of his minor treatises appeared in English, including *A godlye treatyse of prayer* (1553?) translated by John Bradford, who was soon to be burned under Mary. Moreover, a list of translations from other Lutheran authors could be compiled, including Brenz, Osiander, Sarcerius, Rhegius, but these mostly appeared in Henry's time; hardly any Lutheran author is translated under Elizabeth I save Luther and Me-

⁴³ J. Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials* (1721), I, 317, 318.

⁴⁴ Foxe, IV, 667.

⁴⁵ For example, see P. S. Watson, *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians by Martin Luther* (1953), pp. 3, 4, 473, where he shows the deletions and adjustments made in Luther's text.

lanchthon, and these titles begin to disappear after 1585.

A question that is almost wholly ignored by those who write on English ecclesiastical history under the first two Stuarts is the degree to which Lutheranism, after the pattern of Melanchthon's disciples, resembled certain emphases made by the Laudians. Was this resemblance fortuitous, did like causes produce like effects in parts of Germany as in England, or was there an influence of the followers of Melanchthon even though indirectly? Arminianism in Holland, especially as seen in Grotius, represented the revival of certain emphases made by Erasmus long before, which were not far from the hearts of Melanchthon and some of his later followers, even as they were attractive to the Laudians. The note so often sounded by Erasmus and Melanchthon and others of that generation can be heard again in Richard Mountague, who in his *Apello Caesarem* (1626), written three years before he became bishop of Chichester, wrote: "(forsaking Protestant scholastic divinity) . . . I betooke myself to Scripture, the Rule of Faith, interpreted by Antiquity, the best Expositor of Faith and applier of that Rule: holding it a point of discretion, to draw water, as neere as I could, to the wellhead, and to spare labour in vaine, in running further off to cisternes and lakes."⁴⁶ Calixt in Germany, an admiring disciple of Melanchthon's teachings, held views similar to this principle of Mountague and opposed the orthodoxy of Calov with an appeal to the Melanchthonian ideal of the *Consensus quinquesaecularis*, which was also so attractive to the Laudians. When reading the works of the

"Laudian divines" of the Stuart Church of England, how often one is reminded of Melanchthon's "synergism," his irenic attitude to Roman Catholic liturgical ceremonial and things that could be described as "adiaphora," his emphasis on patristic studies and the consensus of the fathers with the concurrent appeal to the first five centuries of the church as guiding principles for the church. Nevertheless, these matters are not sufficient to suggest the direct though delayed influences of Melanchthon; the Laudians could well arrive at similar conclusions by an independent though parallel route and, moreover, they gave less heed to the Melanchthonian insistence on the *sensus proprius* of Scripture as the norm by which all else is to be studied. In any case the revival of Lutheranism in the Stuart Church of England was already long an impossibility: by Laud's time Lutheranism was a dead issue. The Anglican insistence on episcopalianism would not appeal to the majority of Lutherans (indeed, to none, if it were to be understood as meaning that orthodoxy depended on historical succession), and much less still would Lutheran scholasticism appeal to either Laudians or Puritans who recoiled from it with indifference or dislike.

But had there been no chance, before Puritanism arose and Laudianism developed later in opposition to it, that England might have looked again with sympathy towards the Lutherans when Elizabeth I began to reign? It is worth remembering that Elizabeth as a girl had read Melanchthon's *Loci communes* (the edition of 1538 was dedicated to her father). It is sometimes suggested that Elizabeth differed from her subjects in having Lutheran sympathies. This suggestion derives largely, if not exclu-

⁴⁶ Richard Mountague, *Apello Caesarem* (1625), pp. 11, 12.

sively, from her statement to the Spanish ambassador in 1559 at the time of the Elizabethan Settlement of Religion that she wished "the Augustanean Confession" to be maintained in her realm and then added "it would not be the Augustanean Confession but something else like it, and that she differed very little from us [that is, the Roman Catholics] as she believed that God was in the Sacrament of the Eucharist and only dissented from three or four things in the Mass"⁴⁷ (He was not the only Spanish ambassador to be obtuse in matters of Protestant religion; many of their statements on religious matters under the Tudors are misleading or ill-stated. Did he not realize, too, that many Protestants could say as much as the Queen did on the Mass?) Her statement is sometimes dismissed as diplomatic double-talk, but why should it not be taken as a simple statement of fact? Her words reflect the moderate reform views of her youth when she had translated at the age of eleven "The Mirror of a Sinful Soul" by the French princess Marguerite of Angoulême, where as all her life she was uninfluenced by the Swiss and Genevan theology of the great majority of her subjects — in fact, she utterly detested it since she recognized in it, with an insight lacking in most of her bishops, a potential hostility to her royal prerogative in religion, an incipient republicanism, and consequent rebellion. The Lutheran authority of the Godly Prince was fundamental to her conception of her duty and her calling.

Moreover, in spite of her saying that she would have preferred something like the conservative theology of the Augsburg Confession, and in spite of her liking for

that more elaborate ceremonial of church worship which Lutherans also approved, Elizabeth had no intention whatever of bringing forward Lutheran doctrine and practices in such a way that the Church of England would be associated in men's minds with Lutheran Scandinavia or North Germany. Elizabeth, like her father, put first her sovereignty, which included her status as supreme governor of the Church of England. She was never troubled in conscience like Elector John of Saxony, who in Luther's time feared, under the Gospel, to exercise princely rule both in church and state.⁴⁸ That Elizabeth robustly set aside such scruples can be seen in her formidable though brief letter to Dr. Cox, Bishop of Ely, in 1573 when he had opposed her desire to hand over to Sir Christopher Hatton the palace and garden in Holborn belonging to the see of Ely:

Proud Prelate,

You know what you were before I made you what you are now. If you do not immediately comply with my request, I will unfrock you, by God.

Elizabeth⁴⁹

Poor Cox was not in fact so proud a prelate, but he was left in no doubt on the authority of the Godly Prince in England. This firm control — no one at home or

⁴⁸ Article "Johann der Beständige," *Realencyclopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 3d ed., IX, 240—41.

⁴⁹ *The Letters of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. G. B. Harrison (1935), p. 120 (this letter to Cox is dated 1573). A sympathetic consideration of Elizabeth's religious views and of her attitude to contemporary religious affairs is given in C. S. Meyer's *Elizabeth I and the Religious Settlement of 1559* (St. Louis, 1960). This work also contains an examination of the degree of influence of Lutheranism in the early years of Elizabeth I.

⁴⁷ M. A. S. Hume, *Calendar of State Papers, Spanish, Elizabeth* (1892), I, 61—62.

abroad failed to see that "she intended princely to rule" — Elizabeth exercised over all her subjects, including the clergy, as an Englishwoman over Englishmen, a nation then more given to xenophobia than nowadays. She wanted no alliances with foreign powers who could entangle her political initiative; nor would she tolerate her subjects seeking to foster such alliances even on the grounds of religion. She clearly wanted what that same Dr. Cox desired in the congregation of English refugees at Frankfurt in Mary's reign, "the face of an English church." This meant that Elizabeth opposed not only the influence of Rome, Zurich, or Geneva but also that of Wittenberg. Political alliances went with confessional relations. Because of this fundamental fact Lutheranism could never hope to achieve in England what it achieved, for example, in Sweden. None of the Tudors from the time of Henry VIII would accept putting the state of England, and this included the Church of England, under the authority or guiding influence of a continental power and continental church, save Mary, whose alliance with Spain and reintroduction of papal authority were detested in England by Protestants and who made even Catholics uneasy because she was making England an entail of Spanish politics. The attempt by presbyterianizing Puritans from 1570 onwards to bring the Church of England into line with the Reformed churches of Switzerland, France, and the Palatinate, however much it was favored by many in the church, the House of Commons, and even in the Privy Council, was rudely shattered by Elizabeth, supported by the bishops whom she regarded as her right arm in governing the church, not merely because she disliked anything to do

with Geneva, but also because it would have weakened her policy of noncommitment in international affairs.⁵⁰

Would it be an accurate generalization to say that Luther's theological insights, other than those associated with the doctrine of grace, were left without a witness in England under Elizabeth and afterwards? Not really: but some may wish to point to the curious case of Richard Cheney, Bishop of Gloucester from 1562, cited by the Catholic historian Philip Hughes, as "the solitary Lutheran" among the Elizabethan bishops.⁵¹ The basis for his statement lies in Camden's description of Cheney, mediated through Strype, as "most addicted to Luther, both in respect, I suppose, of the doctrine of the presence, as also for the retaining of old customs, as crucifixes and pictures of saints in the churches, and such like."⁵² But this could well mean that Cheney was conservative in religion following the pattern implicit in the first *Book of Common Prayer* of 1549. Also it is known that he disliked the views and proceedings of Bishop Hooper, his predecessor at Gloucester, who was certainly a Zwinglian; and Strype affirms that Cheney held "that no doctrine could be shewn that had universally deceived an

⁵⁰ It was from Geneva that John Knox had attacked "the monstrous regiment of women," the rule of Mary Stuart and Mary Tudor. He led a revolution in arms against his sovereign in Scotland. Elizabeth neither forgave nor forgot this fact. For her view of the political dangers inherent in presbyterianizing Puritanism see her letter to James VI of Scotland, *Letters of Queen Elizabeth and King James VI of Scotland*, ed. John Bruce (Camden Society, 1849), p. 63.

⁵¹ P. Hughes, *The Reformation in England*, III, 46.

⁵² J. Strype, *Annals of the Reformation*, 2d ed. (1725), I, 281.

oecumenical council. And on this he built his real presence in the sacrament: because this was the ancient faith. . . ."⁵³ This makes a conservative Henrician of Cheney and shows no ground for assuming a Lutheran theology of the Presence as being attractive to him. That he was not a secret upholder of Tridentine Catholicism may be seen by the fact that he risked dissenting from the articles concerning Transubstantiation agreed on by Convocation in 1553, at the opening of Mary's reign.⁵⁴

Perhaps other more positive and tangible evidence of Lutheran influences could be found in Elizabeth's reign, for example, in the work of the martyrologist John Foxe, who not only wrote a commendatory preface to an English translation of one of Luther's sermons (*A Commentary upon the Fifteenth Psalm*, 1577) but also, and this fact is too little realized, was indebted to Luther's apocalyptic view of Christian history and also the periodization characteristic of Melancthonian historiography in the earlier sections of his *Acts and Monuments*. Nevertheless, Foxe was markedly Swiss in his theology as a whole. In any case, a few

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 282, 283.

⁵⁴ P. Heylin, *Ecclesia Restaurata, or The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, ed. G. C. Robinson (1849), II, 387.

allusive swallows do not make a Lutheran summer. After Elizabeth's reign Englishmen regarded Lutheranism as part of the perspective of history and not as a living influence presenting a valid option in religious belief and practice. It is known that Captain Henry Bell endured imprisonment with more ease through translating Luther's Table Talk, and that John Wesley was profoundly moved at hearing Luther's Preface to Romans at a meeting in Aldersgate Street in London, and that Julius Hare wrote vigorously *The Vindication of Luther Against His Recent English Assailants* in 1855. But even if one were to include the great affection for "A Safe Stronghold Our God Is Still," these facts present no revival of Lutheranism in England. That a revival is possible would not be denied; there are today a number of Lutherans in England, but that they can build on old foundations is doubtful, for those foundations are long buried or built over by other more enduring structures of English design. It is to be hoped, nevertheless, that these new Lutherans of England will restore to English religious life something at least of the profound insights of one of the most creative theologians in the history of the church.

Cambridge, England