

Anglican Perceptions of Lutheranism in Early Hanoverian England

by DANIEL L. BRUNNER

"His present Majesty is not a Lutheran"

In 1714 an author who identified himself only as Philalethes entered the controversy over the religion of the new English Sovereign, George I:

Prince George, Elector of Brunswick, and Prince of Hanover, was a Lutheran, as all the World I believe knows, but our present Sovereign King George is a Defender of the Faith of the Church of England as by Law Established; this is the Religion he is bound by the Act of Settlement to profess, joyn in Communion with, and maintain against all Religions whatsoever that are opposite to it; this, and this only, is the Religion he is bound by his Coronation Oath to preserve. . . . His present Majesty is not a Lutheran, but a Member of the Church of England.¹

The question of the religion of George I was part of a larger debate after the Restoration, and especially after the 1662 Act of Uniformity, over the relationship of the Church of England to continental Protestantism.² At George's accession in 1714 a pamphlet war broke out that would engage no fewer than seven Anglican writers and a score of publications. In this article we will survey the arguments, allowing as much as possible the original pamphleteers to speak for themselves with their colorful, dramatic language. Many of the themes of modern Anglican/Episcopal ecumenical dialogues, especially with Lutherans, are presaged by the early Hanoverian quarrels. In addition, we have the observations a German chaplain highly placed in London with entrée to Anglican leaders lay and clerical, who offers a uniquely Lutheran perspective on the proceedings.

In the highly charged political atmosphere at the onset of the eighteenth century, both Whigs and Tories realized that if the exiled James II would not forsake his Roman Catholicism, Anne was the last of the Stuarts. The Act of Settlement in 1701, largely driven by Tories frustrated over their experience with the Dutch Calvinist Wil-

liam III,³ said that a Hanoverian, who was at least distantly related to the Stuart line, would accede to the English throne after William or Anne. Queen Anne just outlived Electress Sophia, so Prince George of Hanover became King George of England. The 54-year-old Sovereign spoke no English and had minimal interest in English politics and religion. Nonetheless, his biographer states that George I understood the responsibility the house of Hanover had accepted for Protestant succession in England: "Though not of a religious temperament, he held it 'a point of honour' to maintain this succession for himself and his descendants."⁴

George's accession was not a popular one with Tories or in the City: with the prospect of Whig ascendancy, Tory popular unrest began to boil, violence broke out in the streets of London, and Jacobite feelings rose.⁵ Broadside appeared, sarcastically degrading George I and his immoral lifestyle and comparing him to Nero:

George in a publick State of Lewdness lives,
Immures his own, debauches others Wives:
Nero in Masks and Revels spent the Night;
George for the Bus'ness of the Crown unfit,
In Plays, and Balls, and Junkets, do's delight . . .
O Free-born Brittons! since a Tyrant reigns,
Assert your Liberties, shake off your Chains:
Let us in Justice rival ancient Rome;
Let Nero's Vices meet with Nero's Doom,
And speed'ly call King James from Exile Home.⁶

In the face of this Jacobitism and anti-German xenophobia, Whigs countered with anti-Catholic propaganda,⁷ linking High Church Tories with "Popery" and branding anyone opposed to George I an enemy to Protestantism. One prominent latitudinarian decried the fact that

. . . now in England the Highchurchmen reckon 'em all Whigs alike, go they to Church or to Meetings, who approve of the Toleration, who cultivate a friendship with the Dutch, who entertain kind thoughts of the Emperor, who revile not the House of Hanover, and who, in one word, will not declare, or at least act for the Pretender.⁸

Out of this political foment arose the pamphlet clash over the religion of George I. It would not be accurate, however, to categorize

this *mêlée* merely as one between High Church Tories and Low Church Whigs. In a helpful overview, John Findon has delineated four perspectives on the role of episcopacy in the Church of England from 1559 to 1689.⁹ It seems appropriate to broaden his descriptors to include not only episcopacy but also other issues that arose in this conflict. On one side were those who fall into Findon's Dodwellian camp, which states that "the episcopate is the necessary channel of sacramental grace." The logical deduction from the principles of the Nonjuring historian, Henry Dodwell, was that continental Protestant churches were no better than English Nonconformists.¹⁰ In our conflict, this side was represented by Thomas Brett (1667–1744), renowned High Church (later, Nonjuring) controversialist,¹¹ and by two High Churchmen who only identified themselves as Philalethes and a Country School-Boy.¹² Conversely, we find self-described moderates who fit satisfactorily into Findon's Bancroftian view that episcopacy is "ancient and apostolical" but not so divinely prescribed as to be necessary for the Church. This perspective, linked to Richard Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury in the early seventeenth century, is best summarized by Lancelot Andrewes's statement: "To prefer a better is not to condemn a thing."¹³ Among these moderates, who, whether Whig or Tory, were pro-Hanoverian, we find Sir William Dawes (1671–1724), Archbishop of York and one of Queen Anne's last Tory appointments;¹⁴ Theophilus Dorrington (1654–1715), rector of Wittresham in Kent and likely the author who called himself a Gentleman-Commoner of Magdalen College, Oxford;¹⁵ Robert Watts (1683–1726) of St. John's College, Oxford;¹⁶ John Lewis (1675–1747), vicar of St. John the Baptist, Margate;¹⁷ and a Brett opponent who gave himself the pseudonym Ezekiel Standfast. A well-placed observer of the pamphlet fracas was the German, Anthony William Boehm (1673–1722), a student of the celebrated Lutheran Pietist, August Hermann Francke. Boehm was chaplain at the German Lutheran Chapel Royal at St. James's and an active member of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK), one of the prominent Anglican voluntary societies.¹⁸

Because the bulk of the pamphlets appeared in the space of little more than a year, it is complicated to sort them out chronologically. It is easier, and perhaps more useful, to organize them thematically. To that end we have sifted the writings into three issues: liturgy, the-

ology, and episcopacy. Even though the subjects overlap, this approach helps us see the various levels at which the debate was taking place and the complexities surrounding the arrival of a Lutheran Sovereign as the “head” of the Church of England.

Liturgy

One of the first to welcome the new Sovereign was the Archbishop of York. In a shoddily written pamphlet Dawes first gave a brief biography of Martin Luther, who “was good at every thing, and the wonder of all Mankind,” and the one to whom Anglicans “owe our Deliverance from our blind Obedience to the Church of Rome.”¹⁹ He avoided specific theological discussions, noting only that the two Churches “hold many of the same Doctrines”; instead, he focused on the parallels between the liturgies of the Lutheran Church and the Church of England, concluding that “we vary little from them in the Exercise of our Publick Devotion.” Almost humorously Dawes comments that Lutheran worship is “higher,” as shown by “the use of Trumpets, Drums and Kettle Drums, besides the Organs, which the Zealots in Scotland call a Box of Whistles, and other instruments of Musick.” Furthermore, Lutherans “are not only more abundant in their Ceremonies, but in the Pomp and Splendor of their Churches.”²⁰

Dorrington, encouraged by Dawes’s tract, offered a more detailed survey of the Lutheran liturgy. Even though on the whole he overlooked the places where Lutherans and Anglicans had liturgical differences, the author quite thoroughly (over twenty-five pages) demonstrated commonalities in liturgy, rubrics, and major offices between the two Churches; in summary he stated that he was trying to show “how Parallel and Corresponding the Lutherans of Germany are both in Principles and their Liturgy to the Church of England.”²¹ Indeed, it was significant to moderates that George I had “seriously fallen in with our outward Worship,” modeling that any differences were “inconsiderable.”²² Even though High Church extremists would chastise Dorrington’s work—“the point in Dispute is not whether they have a Liturgy, but whether the Prayers contained in that Liturgy are express’d in such Terms as are agreeable to the Doctrine of our Church”²³—the reality is that both sides understood that

the liturgy differentiated both Lutherans and Anglicans from Dissenters. Indeed, the primary purpose of the Archbishop of York's tract was to respond to the hopes Dissenters were placing in the new King and "to shew how wide a distance there is between the Communion the King has been bred up in and theirs [the Dissenters'], and how little between his and ours."²⁴

Still there could be misunderstandings over whether or not Anglicans could receive Holy Communion in foreign Reformed Churches. One of Robert Watts' most significant contributions to this debate was a letter he included from former chaplains to Electress Sophia of Brunswick, the mother of George I. These chaplains had noticed "the strange Conduct" of some of the English in Germany since the enactment in 1711 of the Tory-driven Occasional Conformity Bill, which had been put forward to thwart Dissenters from taking the Sacrament in the Church of England *occasionally*, simply to meet the criteria for office under the Test Act of 1673 which required those employed in government to receive Communion by Anglican rites only. But the law intended for Nonconformists in England had had profound (and unexpected?) repercussions on Anglicans in Germany: "They think they should commit an unpardonable Sin, should they receive the holy Sacrament from a Minister on this Side the Water." The chaplains expressed their consternation that the law would extend to persons "that profess the Protestant Religion in foreign Countries," thus damaging the solidarity of Protestantism while enhancing Roman Catholicism. Specifically, Electress Sophia herself was heard many times to "lament these Distinctions, which she thought scandalous, and the little Regard which they had in England for the Protestants here." Even though she had "as much Veneration and Respect for the Church of England as any one in the World" and admired the Book of Common Prayer,

... she could not bear that the Worship, Ceremonies, and Liturgies of other Protestant Countries, which so many considerable Persons had formerly seal'd with their Blood, and which still contribute to the Consolation and Edification of so many of the Faithful, should be despis'd.

The two chaplains gave assurances to the Church of England that "whenever we beseech God in our Congregations to advance the Protestant Religion, we do not exclude the Church of England, but

on the contrary we have always, and do still, look upon it as the surest and firmest Bulwark against Popery.”²⁵

Norman Sykes has described the difference of opinion and practice among Anglicans at this time in connection with receiving the sacrament in foreign churches. In general, Anglican leaders welcomed Lutherans to communion in Anglican churches but were more tentative in reciprocating the practice in foreign churches. Nonetheless, during earlier debates over occasional conformity, such churchmen as John Sharp, Gilbert Burnet, and William Wake stated they could willingly and lawfully receive communion in foreign church.²⁶ But Robert Watts’ publication gives evidence that once the Occasional Conformity Bill actually passed, Anglicans on the Continent were at the very least uncertain and apprehensive. Their refusal to commune was not being well received by foreign Protestants; the Church of England was becoming precariously isolated from continental Protestants, by means of a law intended to buttress the established Church against Dissenters in England.

Theology

As a Lutheran in England and with not insignificant Anglican connections, Anthony Boehm received frequent theological queries about the Church of England,²⁷ mostly focused on those issues currently separating Lutherans and Reformed Churches on the Continent: predestination and the presence of Christ in the Sacrament.²⁸ On predestination, Boehm acknowledged that, based on the 39 Articles, Anglican dogma inclined towards the Reformed view. However, he also noted that English theologians were quite open in their interpretations of these articles; often they wound up closer to the Lutheran than the Reformed perspective.²⁹ In fact, even Thomas Brett recognized that Lutherans and Anglicans agreed on the doctrines of grace and predestination, in opposition to Calvinism.³⁰ The same could not be said about the presence of Christ in the Sacrament.

The whole battle over the religion of George I had started innocently enough. In 1703 Theophilus Dorrington had translated into English a book written by the distinguished German jurist and historian, Baron Samuel Pufendorf, to help bring about a union in Ger-

many between the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. At the accession of George I, Dorrington had republished the book, hoping "it might be of Use to us in England, to understand and know the Principles and Practices of the Lutheran Churches (which are the true Protestant Churches beyond the Seas) better."³¹ At the same time that Dorrington republished Pufendorf's work, he also issued (anonymously) a poorly researched and hastily written history of the Lutheran Church, filled with inaccuracies.³² After tracing Christian history from creation to Luther, he turned at length to the new King, with words that reeked of a craving for preferment: "All the World knows His Majesty King George to be a Lutheran, which is so much corresponding with the Doctrine of the Church of England, that it is certain of being in a flourishing condition, so long as he and his Royal Posterity shall reign over us." With minimal support (or common sense), he boldly declared "that the Church of England, with the Doctrine of Luther, comes the nearest to the Religion of the primitive Christians of any upon earth."³³ Amazingly, Dorrington's *History* went through three editions, though the ally of Brett who signed his tract, Philaethes, published a rejoinder, in which he thrashed the author's weak history and inept logic, noting that differences in fundamental doctrines between Lutherans and Anglicans (ignored by the *History*) made a union "impracticable, without an absolute Miracle."³⁴

Whatever Dorrington's deep-seated objective in publishing Pufendorf's work, the Nonjuring Brett felt compelled to pen a reply. A correspondent had suggested to Brett that since Lutherans and Anglicans were akin liturgically and since Lutherans hated the Reformed Church as much as Anglicans did Scottish Presbyterians, perhaps the king's subjects in Germany and England could unite under one religion. Such a union was nigh impossible to Brett's thinking, because of particular "irreconcilable" doctrinal differences. Brett noted that Pufendorf proposed the Churches agree in the fundamentals of the faith while exercising toleration in other opinions; but, Brett maintained, "though it be easily said . . . yet, How shall we come at this Agreement?"³⁵ To prove his point Brett devoted twenty pages to two "strange" doctrines within Lutheranism: the ubiquity of the body of Christ and "consubstantiation." In Brett's opinion,

the Church of England believed in two natures inseparable in one person, but not a confusion of substance. The Lutheran “omnipresence” of Christ’s body confuses substance. Since neither Scripture, nor antiquity, nor reason supported ubiquity, it must be “the pure Figment of Luther’s own Brain.” Brett was also confounded by the Lutheran view of “consubstantiation,” a word Brett (unknowingly?) adopted from Reformed critics who pejoratively used the label to conjure up images of transubstantiation. Indeed, Brett compared consubstantiation to transubstantiation, stating that “the Lutherans are, in this Case, as far from the Doctrine of our Church as the Papists.”³⁶ The pseudonymous Philalethes pushed like lines of reasoning. After an extended criticism of both ubiquity and consubstantiation, he weighed transubstantiation against consubstantiation, noting there is “little Difference” between them, and that “the denying of one is in a manner denying both,” since in both they eat and drink “the substantial Body and Blood of Christ” in the Eucharist, but the Roman Catholics say “*in the Elements*” and the Lutherans “*with the Elements*.”³⁷

It was Peter Allix (1641–1717), French Reformed pastor and theologian and the first foreign refugee to undergo “reordination,”³⁸ who recommended to Boehm that a Lutheran respond to Brett’s allegations. Boehm confided to a friend in Germany his fear (usually hidden from Anglican contemporaries) of High Church radicals:

The Tory or High Church party, of whom one believed (and perhaps not quite without reason) that they favored Popery and sought underhandedly to build a bridge for it in England, has now (or at least many in it) suddenly turned around and wants to be regarded as the pillar of Protestantism; however, the poor Lutherans are accused in the ugliest terms and presented to the people in public writings as half-Papists.

Boehm was troubled by how Brett associated Lutherans and Roman Catholics in order to malign the doctrine of consubstantiation. But Boehm would not enter into the dispute; instead, he gave materials to an English moderate priest, who had already written one tract against Brett.³⁹

Robert Watts was undoubtedly that priest; with Boehm’s backing he penned *A Second Review of the Lutheran Principles*.⁴⁰ Watts accused Brett of

... Propagating the Cant that was so much in Fashion four or five Years ago, That the Church is in Danger; that is (as almost every Page of his Libel explains it) 'tis in Danger from the Lutherans now, as it was from the Dissenters before; and I truly believe, from one as much as the other.

He charged Brett with representing the Lutherans as “Enemies” and with insinuating that “his Majesty is no Christian.”⁴¹ Like Boehm, Watts emphasized the importance of moderation, noting that both Lutherans and the Church of England “have too many among them, who place almost all Religion in a mighty zeal for the Circumstances of it; and all Moderation in these Things, can pass for no better than base Neutrality, and a betraying the Cause of the Church.” While admitting that the Lutheran doctrines of consubstantiation and ubiquity diverged from the Anglican view—although “our Church has not nicely defin'd or declar'd for any particular Modus of the Presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament”—he denied that these issues were indispensable to the Christian faith. “Forbearance” in these matters is what is vital:

So that there is no need to dispute so fiercely concerning this Article [Holy Communion], under which is concluded, in the opinion of all Antiquity, an awful Mystery, which cannot be perciev'd [*sic*] by our Senses, and which ought to be consider'd and handled with a kind of Sacred Horror.

To deny Communion to the Lutherans would infringe upon “the Principles of Catholick Unity.” Watts drew on Bishop Gilbert Burnet, who was of the opinion that in spite of the wrongness of consubstantiation, it was “only a Point of Speculation,” and did not impact practice.⁴² In his first tract Watts had cited Burnet at length as an archetype of moderation, especially with regard to Holy Communion:

For such . . . is the Moderation of our Church in that Matter, that no positive Definition of the Manner of the Presence [of Christ in the Eucharist] being made, Men of different Sentiment may agree in the same Acts of Worship, without being obliged to declare their Opinion, or being understood to do anything contrary to their several Perswasions.⁴³

Whatever the King's personal opinion of Christ's sacramental presence, he had modeled “preserving a Unity of Communion, notwithstanding a Variety of Opinion.”⁴⁴

Another author who took up the gauntlet against Brett was John Lewis. Setting out the 39 Articles side-by-side with the Augsburg Confession, Lewis tried to show “what agreement there is,” noting that frequently the compilers of the 39 Articles followed, sometimes word-for-word, the Augsburg Confession.⁴⁵ With regard to Holy Communion (AC 10), Lewis argued that neither the Augsburg Confession nor Lutheran professors taught consubstantiation, “Impanation,” or any other physical or local presence, but a “Sacramental Presence,” because something “heavenly” is being conferred. Lewis contended that “there is but little difference” between the Churches and that Lutheran error is “a mere notional one, and which has no Influence on Practice.”⁴⁶

Despite the onslaught of Watts, Lewis, and company, Brett did not stand alone; a Country School Boy came to his defense.⁴⁷ He allowed that Anglicans could join Lutherans in daily worship when visiting a foreign country, but “can never believe that we can joyn with them in the Communion of the Lords Supper.” Lutheran opinion was so different—especially the main “obstacle” of ubiquity and consubstantiation—that, in the language of the prayer book, “we cannot receive the Sacrament in their Churches without eating and drinking our own Damnation.” In his mind two opposing doctrines cannot both be correct: “Either the Lutheran Church is agreeable with ours, or it is not: if it is agreeable with ours, we may go promiscuously to the Churches of either side; for then we are no more two but one Church, and there is an end of the Controversy.” The same was true for George I, who by receiving Communion in the Church of England proved that he was “no longer a Lutheran, but a Member of our Church; unless you would invidiously insinuate, that he halteth between two Opinions.” Finally, in language that would sound strangely familiar to those acquainted with theological disputes on the Continent, the author insisted that the Church of England has “the purest of all Doctrines, and that therefore we cannot admit of any Alterations, or Innovation.”⁴⁸

This emphasis on keeping the doctrine of the Church of England “pure” was taken up again by Brett. He defended his opposition to “the Errors of Lutheranism” on the basis of his ordination promises. When it came to moderation, he emphasized that Lutherans also had

their extremists and pointed to the case of Prince George of Denmark, consort to Queen Anne, and his first Lutheran chaplain, J. W. Mecken. After Prince George communed in the Church of England “in order to qualifie himself to execute the Offices of Generalissimo, Lord High-Admiral,” Mecken, by order of his superiors in Denmark, refused to admit the Prince to the Lutheran sacrament. The Prince was forced to send for a new, less “strait-lac’d” chaplain. Brett produced this story

... as a convincing Argument to prove that the Rigid Lutherans, even to our own Times, though they have lived many Years amongst us, and could not but know that we differed very much from the Calvinists; yet have so abhorred our Communion, as to judge, that whosoever, though but occasionally Communicated with our Church, was ever after unworthy to Communicate with them.⁴⁹

Boehm, who was himself Prince George’s new Lutheran chaplain, was quite aware that any difference between Lutherans and Anglicans would be exaggerated by extremists on both sides, much as had occurred in Germany between Lutheran and Reformed theologians.⁵⁰

Episcopacy

As important as doctrine was to Brett and his comrades in England and to Boehm’s Lutheran correspondents in Germany, both sides of the conflict knew that the central issue at stake from the Anglican perspective was episcopacy, what Brett called the “great controverted Point . . . betwixt them and us.” To Brett, Lutherans have “meer Presbyters” or superintendents, no different than the Presbyterians; therefore, “if we do allow their Ordinations, then we obliquely overthrow the whole Episcopal Church to allow any for lawful Pastors, who are not Episcopally ordain’d.”⁵¹ This High Church position was expounded more clearly and aggressively by Brett’s colleague, a Country School Boy. After a protracted history of episcopacy, he makes reference to the direct line of descent: “None can be esteemed Bishops who are Consecrated by any Body who cannot prove this lineal Descent.” In Germany, insists the author, the jurisdiction of bishops was transferred to princes, so that Lutheran superintendents lost author-

ity. Therefore, “we cannot approve of their Ordinations; for if the Spring is Poyson’d, the Waters issuing thence cannot be Wholesome; and if Superintendents, and Presbyters, who have no Authority, pretend to Ordain, those Ordinations are not valid.” The only way this problem could possibly be overcome would be if Lutherans gave “consent to have their Superintendents Consecrated by our Bishops.” But, of course, Lutherans would never permit it, because “if it is not allow’d that they have true Orders among them, then can they not be accounted Legitimate Bodies: and we cannot allow their Ordinations without not only Unchurching our selves, but acting directly contrary to the known Practice and Injunctions of the Apostles.”⁵² This predicament was theologically and ecclesiologically inescapable for Dodwellian churchmen like Brett and his colleagues. The ordinations of Lutherans and Anglicans were mutually exclusive; if one was deemed valid, the other was *de facto* invalid.

It fell to John Lewis to offer a moderate interpretation of the state of affairs regarding episcopacy. To allege that Lutheran orders and churches were illegitimate, as Brett had done, meant that he had fallen victim “to the Rashness of some Modern Innovators in the Doctrines of the Church of England.” Lewis quotes from AC 14 and from Melancthon’s *Apology*—“the Church has a right to choose and ordain Ministers”—and summarizes the Lutheran position in this way: “The Power to bind and loose, to excommunicate and to absolve, that is commonly called the Keys of the Church, is given of God, not to one or two, or to some particular Person, but to the whole Church, that is to say, to all the Faithful and Believers in Christ.” Following moderates like Gilbert Burnet, Lewis held that the English compilers of Article 23 were not of the opinion that “Episcopal Ordination is necessary for a legitimate Priest; and that there cannot be a Church without Bishops, who have their Ordination and Succession from the Apostles.” Lewis insisted that Anglican theologians in the past would have recognized the orders of foreign Protestants and would not have believed that the preeminence of bishops was “*Jure Divino*.” In fact, they had emphasized, in Lewis’ opinion, that “the Things which of all other, are most proper to Bishops, are Singularity in Succeeding, and Superiority in Ordain-

ing; and that therefore in the Foreign Reformed Churches, they have the Substance of the Episcopal Office.”⁵³

In reply Brett sought to vindicate himself from charges that he was becoming “Popish.” In the virulent anti-Catholicism of the time, Brett was compelled to distinguish the Anglican doctrine of episcopacy from that of Roman Catholicism; interestingly enough, part of his apology involved citing Lutheran theologian Johann Gerhard’s *Confessio Catholica*. Later in his lengthy defense, he took a swipe at Lewis, accusing him of attempting “to overthrow the Divine Right of Episcopacy, and the Necessity of an Episcopal Commission to the Valid Administration of the Sacraments.”⁵⁴ Quickly Lewis responded, saying that the impact of Brett’s arguments would be “to possess the Nation with an Opinion, that neither the King, nor any of his Royal Family are Christians.” Lewis challenged the idea that government by bishops was *jure divino*, if that implied “a clear, express, and peremptory Command of God in his Word.” Although he granted that “ordinarily and regularly” episcopal ordination is compulsory for valid administration of the Sacraments, a flaw in the commission does not thereby infer a “Nullity” in the performance of the office. Exceptions abound: a person baptized by one not episcopally ordained is received into the Church’s communion without rebaptism “according to the universal Practice of the Christian Church”; and “in Cases of Necessity,” such as in the Lutheran Reformation when bishops fell into heresy, then presbyters could exercise the powers of episcopacy. In Lewis’ mind, foreign Protestants have “all the Essentials of Episcopacy. . . . Some retain both the Thing and the Name, and among others the Thing is retained, though not the Name.” In sum, he quotes John Bramhall, Archbishop of Armagh: “I dare not annul their Orders, nor determine the Invalidity of them, even when administered by Schismatical Presbyters: Much less dare I to condemn all the Orders of the Foreign Reformed Churches.”⁵⁵

What was Boehm’s response to the debate over episcopacy and its relation to the foreign reformed churches? As a Lutheran he disagreed with any notion of episcopacy that could not recognize the orders of non-episcopal ordinations, especially if in so doing the ministry of all other Protestants—English and foreign—was rejected as essentially invalid. The extremes of what he considered High

Churchmanship profoundly frustrated him, although he would only confess his uneasiness to close associates who were not in England. One case Boehm cited recurrently was that of Benjamin Reed, a young man who converted to the Church of England after initial preparation for a Nonconformist ministry; his decision would have gone unnoticed but for the fact that he chose to be re-baptized by an episcopally ordained priest.⁵⁶ The issue of episcopal vis-à-vis Lutheran ordination would be confronted often by Boehm in his seventeen years of ministry in London, as well as by Lutheran chaplains succeeding him.⁵⁷

Conclusion

What conclusions can we draw from this pamphlet controversy over the religion of George I? In all three areas—liturgy, theology, and episcopacy—there was relative concurrence as to the facts or realities when comparing the Church of England with Lutheranism. Liturgically, both sides could acknowledge the wide-ranging parallels in Lutheran and Anglican liturgies and that in any event the Church of England stood closer to Lutheranism than to Presbyterianism. Theologically, while gingerly stepping around German perceptions that Church of England doctrine was more Presbyterian than Lutheran, the Anglican pamphleteers could agree that the Lutheran doctrine of predestination posed no problems, but that its views of ubiquity and consubstantiation (as both sides described it) stood outside the norms of Anglicanism. Ecclesiologically, both sides granted that the Lutheran church lacked what would later be called the historic episcopate; however, it was still disputed whether that fact meant that Lutherans were essentially Presbyterian or if they nonetheless stood closer to Anglicanism than to Nonconformity. If, therefore, the facts were for all intents and purposes not in dispute, it came down to what they meant in the practical reality of a German “Lutheran” acceding to the throne. It was more than a question of High Church vs. Low Church; politics played a significant role. Archbishop Daves, a leader among Hanoverian Tories, supported the new king; therefore, his defense of Lutheranism focused particularly on liturgical agreement while demurring on doctrinal

differences so crucial to other High Churchmen. Brett, on the other hand, unable to support a non-Stuart Sovereign and thereby freed from the need to defend Lutheranism, could (in theory, at least) examine doctrine and the issue of episcopacy unconstrained.

In the end, the accession of George I ushered in a time of moderation. Even before his arrival, established religion in Britain exhibited a certain anomaly: episcopacy was the state religion south of the border (where Presbyterians were Dissenters), but the state of affairs was reversed in Scotland, where the Kirk was established. In such a milieu, the King's Lutheranism was not necessarily extraordinary. Since George was a Lutheran in Hanover, a Presbyterian in Scotland, and an Anglican in England, perhaps, as a 1715 moderate tract expressed it, he could bring all three together, so that "all his Subjects may live in Unity and godly Love; and, pray, why mayn't this be, without an Union (strictly speaking) of National Religions? Fact already, in South and North Britain shews it may; and why not in that and Brunswick too?"⁵⁸ The same author described the King's own "moderate" perspective in these matters. He

... was season'd early with his Principles, as a moderate Lutheran, not without some Tincture from those of the excellent Princess Sophia, his Mother, as a moderate Calvinist; and so was prepared in Court of Conscience, and upon rational Considerations, to fall in with and take a middle and still better Way, in the national Church of England, when having a fit Opportunity for it, and providentially called to be the Defender of its Faith.⁵⁹

With George I, moderation gained a stronghold. Interestingly, both sides at the accession of George I had carefully distinguished foreign Protestants from English Nonconformists. However, the die was cast. When the Occasional Conformity Act was repealed in 1717, tracts began to appear that (predictably) applied arguments used previously on behalf of foreign Protestants to justify the validity of Dissenting ordinations in England: "Our great Churchmen are come off their rigid Notions of Ecclesiastical and Civil Monarchy; or rather they are return'd to the old ones. . . . They are now no longer perswaded that a perpetual Succession of Bishops is essential to the Being of a Church."⁶⁰ Not surprisingly, we find Thomas Brett weighing in, lumping together both Lutherans and Presbyterians:

The Lutherans and Calvinists, who have cast off Episcopacy, and thereby destroyed that Priesthood which was settled by Christ himself, cannot reform their Errors, and return to a perfect Unity with the truly Ancient, Primitive, Catholick and Apostolick Church, without making their Application to Strangers, to restore to them that Episcopal succession of the true Priesthood, which they wilfully rejected.⁶¹

Our purpose in this article has been to document, using primary sources as much as possible, the fallout occasioned by the accession of a German Lutheran to the throne of England and to the head of the Anglican Church. Whatever the issue—liturgy, theology, or ecclesiology (episcopacy)—these Anglican pamphleteers were writing in the face of a new reality. How to interpret the meaning of that reality and the ramifications for Anglican relations with Lutherans and other foreign Protestants was debated then and continues to be a source of disagreement today.⁶² For those whom Boehm deemed extremists—Findon's Dodwellians—doctrinal differences in the Lutheran Eucharist were deviations from the truth and not atypical expressions of the same profound mystery; the lack of the "historic episcopate" within Lutheranism was not seen as an unfortunate historical accident but as a willfully chosen departure from apostolic tradition. To consider a union between the churches was impossible, "without an absolute Miracle." On the other hand, those of the moderate, Bancroftian position took distinctly different interpretations of the issues. The dispute over ubiquity and consubstantiation was not fundamental to the Christian faith; they could uphold the necessity of episcopal ordination in England without invalidating the ordinations of foreign Protestants. Church union between Anglicans and Lutherans, therefore, hinged for moderates not on theology or episcopacy but on the spirit of the two sides, as Lewis explains: "On the whole, I fear indeed an Union betwixt the several Churches may be impracticable, but then I cannot think it to be owing to the Differences there are betwixt the several Churches, so much as to the Tempers of those who preside in them."⁶³

As the relationship of the Anglican/Episcopal community with Lutheranism continues to be explored and to develop, it is worthwhile and illuminating to peruse the arguments and language of the 1714–15 pamphlet fracas. Findon asserts that Anglican writing on

the theology of the Church does not try to set forth “what *ought to be*” but rather “what *has been* established.”⁶⁴ Psychologically, in our age of tolerance and geniality, we may bristle at the stark and uncompromising attitudes of that time; even so, one of the advantages of the categorical nature of the writing is that it brings issues into sharp contrast. Understanding the history of these long-debated issues should curb any superciliousness on the part of contemporary theologians and ecumenists. Indeed, research like this study continues to document the long-standing nature of the complexities and nuances of this debate/dialogue and to highlight the fact that interpretations of that historical data will differ today as they did almost three centuries ago.

NOTES

1. *A Letter to the Author of the History of the Lutheran Church* (London, 1714), 22–23
2. On this relationship, see (among others) Erich Beyreuther, *August Hermann Francke und die Anfänge der okumenschen Bewegung* (Hamburg H Reich Verlag, 1957); Eamon Duffy, “Correspondence Fraternelle, the SPCK, the SPG, and the Churches of Switzerland in the War of Spanish Succession,” In *Reform and Reformation England and the Continent c 1500–c 1750*, ed. Derek Baker Studies in Church History, Subsidia 2 (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979), 251–280, idem., “The Society of [sic] Promoting Christian Knowledge and Europe. The Background to the Founding of the *Christentumsgesellschaft*,” *Pietismus und Neuzeit Ein Jahrbuch zur Geschichte des neueren Protestantismus* 7 (1981) 28–42, A. Tindal Hart, *The Life and Times of John Sharp, Archbishop of York* (London. SPCK, 1949), esp. 262–274, John E Pinnington, “Anglican Openness to Foreign Protestant Churches in the Eighteenth Century,” *Anglican Theological Review* 51 (1969). 133–148; Norman Sykes, *The Church of England and Non-Episcopal Churches in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London. S P C. K , 1949), W.R. Ward, “Power and Piety The Origins of Religious Revival in the Early Eighteenth Century,” *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 63 (1980): 231–252.
3. See George Every, *The High Church Party 1688–1718* (London: S.P.C.K., 1956), 105ff.
4. Ragnhild Hatton, *George I*, new ed. (New Haven, CT Yale University Press, 2001), 166.
5. See Nicholas Rogers, “Popular Protest in Early Hanoverian London,” *Past and Present* 79 (1978). 70–100, idem., “Riot and Popular Jacobitism in Early Hanoverian England,” In *Ideology and Conspiracy Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689–1759*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1982), 70–88; Graham C Gibbs, “English Attitudes towards Hanover and the Hanoverian Succession in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century,” in *England und Hannover*, ed. Adolf M. Birke and Kurt Kluxen (Munich. K.G. Saur, 1986), 33–51
6. *Nero the Second* ([London], [1714?]), Bodleian Library, Oxford, *Rawlinson MSS* (MS. Rawl. D 383, f. 111)

7. See Colin M. Haydon, "Anti-Catholicism in Eighteenth Century England c.1714-c.1780," D.Phil. thesis (University of Oxford, 1985), 33ff; Gibbs, "English Attitudes towards Hanover," 36.

8. [John Toland], *The Grand Mystery Laid Open* (London, 1714), 13; cf. Pinnington, "Anglican Openness to Foreign Protestant Churches," 139f.

9. John Findon, "Developments in the Understanding and Practice of Episcopacy in the Church of England," In *Visible Unity and the Ministry of Oversight*, [ed. Colin Podmore] (London: Church Publishing House, 1997), 79-92.

10. *Ibid.*, 90.

11. Until 1714, Brett was rector of Betshanger and Ruckinge in Kent. On the accession of George I, he refused to take the oaths and was thereupon accepted as a Nonjuror, owing allegiance only to the rightful heirs of James II, Catholic though they be; two years later Brett became a Nonjuring bishop. See Robert D. Cornwall, "Brett, Thomas," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (hereafter, *Oxford DNB*), ed. H.C.G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), vii.503-04.

12. Philalethes and the Country School Boy may have been the same person. We know they were not pseudonyms for Brett. Either or both could have been John Johnson (1662-1725), an Anglican vicar with Nonjuring sympathies, who was a friend of Brett and also lived in Kent, where he was known as "Johnson of Cranbrook." In 1714 he engaged in a lively pamphlet debate with John Lewis (see footnote 17 below) over Johnson's work on the Eucharist. See Robert D. Cornwall, "Johnson, John," *Oxford DNB*, xxx.276; John Johnson, *The Unbloody Sacrifice, and Altar, Unvail'd and Supported* (London, 1714); John Lewis, *The Bread and Wine in the Holy Eucharist not a Proper, Maternal, Propitiatory Sacrifice* (London, 1714).

13. Findon, "Developments in the Understanding and Practice of Episcopacy," 86, 90.

14. Dawes was considered a moderate Tory and acted as a leader of the Hanoverian Tories before and after George's accession. See Stuart Handley, "Dawes, Sir William," *Oxford DNB*, xv.531-33.

15. Dorrington, son of a Nonconformist father, first intended to preach among the Presbyterians. He became unsettled and eventually took Anglican orders, becoming an opponent of Dissenters in the process. He entered Magdalen College, Oxford, in 1686 and was granted an M.A. in 1711. See Jim Sprivey, "Dorrington, Theophilus," *Oxford DNB*, xvi.584-85.

16. According to Hearne, Watts was distrusted by Nonjurors as a friend of Dissenters and "a Son of a Profess'd Presbyterian." (Charles E. Noble, ed., *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne*, 11 vols. [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1885-1921], 21 Apr. 1708 [ii.103])

17. Lewis, later master of Eastbridge Hospital in Canterbury, considered himself one of the "Moderate Divines" of the Church of England; as such he held a series of debates with Thomas Brett and John Johnson, clergy in Kent with Nonjuring proclivities. See Scott Mandelbrote, "Lewis, John," *Oxford DNB*, xxxiii.624-25.

18. On Boehm, see Arno Sames, *Anton Wilhelm Bohme (1673-1722). Studien zum okumenischen Denken und Handeln eines halleischen Pietisten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990); Daniel L. Brunner, *Halle Pietists in England. Anthony William Boehm and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993); *idem.*, "Boehm, Anthony William," *Oxford DNB*, vi.421-22.

19. Archbishop of York [Sir William Dawes], *An Exact Account of King George's Religion* (London, 1714), 3; cf. Pinnington, "Anglican Openness to Foreign Protestant Churches," 140n24.

- 20 Dawes, *Exact Account of King George's Religion*, 6–7
- 21 [Theophilus Dorrington?], *The Lutheran Liturgy* (London, 1715), 26f, cf Gibbs, "English Attitudes towards Hanover," 37
- 22 Ezekiel Standfast [pseud.], *A Letter of Advice to Thomas Brett* (London, 1715), 33
- 23 *An Answer to Two Letters to the Lord Viscount Townshend* (London, 1715), 7
- 24 Dawes, *Exact Account of King George's Religion*, 2
- 25 La Bergerie and M Noltemius to ?, Hanover, 6 Aug 1714, In R[obert] W[atts], *Two Letters to the Lord Viscount Townshend* (London, 1714), 7–11
- 26 Sykes, *Church of England and Non-Episcopal Churches*, 29–34
- 27 Boehm wrote a history of Reformation in England that was published posthumously *Anton Wilhelm Bohmens Acht Bucher von der Reformation Der Kirche In England, Und was von dem 1526ten Jahre an, unter Henrico VIII und folgenden Konigen bis zu Caroli II Regierung* (Altona, 1734)
- 28 Boehm dealt at length with these two issues in "Send-Schreiben an einem Freund in Deutschland," 14 Nov 1717, In *Anton Wilhelm Bohmens Samtliche Erbauliche Schriften*, 3 vols (Altona, 1731–33), II 341–476
- 29 Boehm to Neubauer, London, 23 Nov 1714, In *Anton Wilhelm Bohmens Erbauliche Briefe* (Altona/Flensburg, 1737), 380
- 30 Thomas Brett, *A Review of the Lutheran Principles* (London, 1714), 41
- 31 Advertisement to Samuel Pufendorf, *A View of the Lutheran Principles*, trans Theophilus Dorrington (London, 1714), A2–A3 The work was originally published as *The Divine Feudal Law* (London, 1703)
- 32 [Theophilus Dorrington?], *The History of the Lutheran Church* (London, [1714]) Although Dorrington's authorship is not certain, the catalogue in the library of Magdalen College, Oxford, attributes probable authorship to him As an example of the tract's inaccuracies, it says (p 32f) that Catholics divide the Ten Commandments improperly, while Lutherans and Anglicans number them correctly
- 33 *Ibid*, 25, 32
- 34 *Letter to the Author of the History of the Lutheran Church*, 26
- 35 Brett, *Review of the Lutheran Principles*, 9–19
- 36 *Ibid*, 22–41
- 37 *Letter to the Author of the History of the Lutheran Church*, 37f
- 38 After being invited to England by Bishop Burnet at the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, Peter Allix established a French congregation in London that conformed to the Anglican rites He maintained relationships with continental Protestants, including Boehm and the Pietists He wrote the Preface for the publication in England of A H Francke's *Manuductio Ad Lectionem Scripturae Sacrae* (London, 1706) that Boehm edited See Vivienne Larmime, "Allix, Peter [Pierre]," *Oxford DNB*, 1 869–71, Boehm to Francke, London, 7 Sept 1702 & 22 May 1706, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt in Halle/Saale, Abt Archiv der Franckeschen Stiftungen (C 229 70.72), J B Wigers to Francke, London, 8 Apr 1702, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz Handschriftenabteilung, Berlin, *Nachlaß A H Francke* (30 XI 449f), Boehm to Urlsperger, London, 14 Jan 1710, In *Erbauliche Briefe*, 69f
- 39 Boehm to [Samuel] Urlsberger, London, 26 Nov 1714, In *Erbauliche Briefe*, 383–85
- 40 [Robert Watts], *A Second Review of the Lutheran Principles* (London, 1714), 17f, 33, cites the Prefaces of both A H Francke's *Pietas Hallensis* and Johann Arndt's *True Chris-*

tianity. Boehm translated both works into English and wrote both prefaces. Watts had apparently already published *Two Letters to . . . the Lord Viscount Townshend*.

41. [Watts], *Second Review of the Lutheran Principles*, 5–6.
42. *Ibid.*, 15, 37, 39–40.
43. W[atts], *Two Letters to . . . the Lord Viscount Townshend*, 15f.
44. [Watts], *Second Review of the Lutheran Principles*, 30.
45. [John Lewis], *The Agreement of the Lutheran Churches with the Church of England* (London, 1715), 1–13; cf. Bernard M.G. Reardon, "The Thirty-Nine Articles and the Augsburg Confession," *Lutheran Quarterly* 3 (1989): 91–106.
46. [Lewis], *Agreement of the Lutheran Churches*, 16–17.
47. *Answer to Two Letters to . . . the Lord Viscount Townshend*.
48. *Ibid.*, 8, 12, 17–18.
49. Thomas Brett, *A Review of the Lutheran Principles*, 2nd edition (London, 1714), 44ff.
50. Boehm, "Send-Schreiben," In *Erbauliche Schriften*, ii.453–63. Interestingly enough, Boehm was never ordained; a second chaplain was procured solely for administering the Sacrament while Boehm maintained a preaching ministry. See Brunner, *Halle Pietists in England*, 51–52.
51. Brett, *Review of Lutheran Principles*, 15, 17.
52. *Answer to Two Letters to . . . the Lord Viscount Townshend*, 28–37.
53. [Lewis], *Agreement of the Lutheran Churches*, 19–23.
54. Thomas Brett, *Dr. Brett's Vindication of Himself* (London, 1715), 25f, 70.
55. John Lewis, *An Answer to some Exceptions in Dr. Brett's late Vindication* (London, 1715), 6, 10–13.
56. See Boehm, "Send-Schreiben," In *Erbauliche Schriften*, ii.461ff; Boehm to Urlsperger, London, 29 Jan. 1714, and to Mr. S. in Pennsylvania, London, 18 Aug. 1714, In *Erbauliche Briefe*, 318f, 365ff; [John Withers], *A Caveat against the New Sect of Anabaptists, Lately sprung up at Exon* (London, 1714); Benjamin Reed, *A Reply to a Pamphlet entituled, A Caveat against the New Sect of Anabaptists* (Exon, 1714); Hubert Stogdon, *A Defence of the Caveat against the New Sect of Anabaptists, &c. In Answer to Mr. Reed's Reply* (Exon, 1714); Benjamin Reed, *A Defence of the Reply to the Caveat, &c. In Answer to Mr. Stogdon* (Exon, 1715).
57. For example, see Brunner, *Halle Pietists in England*, 64–65, 114–16, 122–28.
58. Ezekiel Standfast, *Letter of Advice to Thomas Brett*, 61.
59. *Ibid.*, 28f; cf. Hatton, *George I*, 47.
60. *The Church of England's Apology For the Principles of the Present Dissenters* (London, 1718), 35; cf. Hatton, *George I*, 289.
61. Thomas Brett, *The Divine Right of Episcopacy* (London, 1718), 193.
62. To illustrate, for two opposing Anglican scholarly understandings of the implications of the 1662 Act of Uniformity for continental Protestants, see Norman Sykes, "The Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," In *The English Church and the Continent*, ed. C.R. Dodwell (London: The Faith Press Ltd, 1959), 90, and Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Anglican Ordinal: Its History and Development from the Reformation to the Present Day* (London: S.P.C.K., 1971), 95.
63. [Lewis], *Agreement of the Lutheran Churches with the Church of England*, 48.
64. Findon, "Developments in the Understanding and Practice of Episcopacy," 80.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.