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Traditional Lutheran theology argues that the law of God functions both as a mirror and hammer. The law simultaneously reveals to humans their sinful condition and smashes their pride, thereby preparing them to receive the gospel. Interestingly enough, this theological use of the law as a mirror and a hammer often resembles the discursive use of Martin Luther and Lutheranism among Victorian Britons. Interest in Luther and Lutheranism was sparked by the nineteenth-century conflict between the Ritualist (or Anglo-Catholic) and Evangelical (or Protestant) parties within the Church of England. Indeed, by the turn of the twentieth century, the so-called “Great Church Crisis” had captivated the attention of Parliament, journalists, authors, clergymen, and the man on the street alike. As the two sides fought each other for control of the national church, both attempted to justify their position for or against the introduction of so-called Catholic rituals on the basis of writings by Luther and contemporary Lutheran practice.

However, since neither party was, generally speaking, familiar with the historical Luther or Lutheranism beyond a superficial level, both were free to read their own proclivities into Luther, thereby seeing a reflection of their own theologies and practices in his writings. In fact, Luther came to function as a mirror for both Protestants and Ritualist Anglicans, legitimating their own practices and beliefs because they saw them reflected in Luther. Because both Anglican Ritualists and Evangelicals believed Luther justified their own practices, each party went on to use Lutheranism as a hammer to beat on its opponent. Thus, the sparring parties within the Church of England made similar discursive use of contemporary Scandinavian and German Lutheranism. In short, the conflict among Victorian Anglicans led them to use historical and contemporary Lutheranism both to legitimate their own practice and also as a rhetorical weapon against opponents. The end result
of this use of Luther and Lutheranism was twofold: although Anglicans became interested in ecumenical relations with the wider Lutheran world, they often remained unable to consider Lutheranism on its own terms.

Although some argue that today the English Lutheran has become a mythological creature, somewhat akin to the griffin, this was certainly not the case as the Henrican Reformation unfolded in the 1530s and 1540s. As Alec Ryrie has recently argued, until shortly before Henry VIII’s death in 1547, “the dominant strain of English evangelicalism was broadly Lutheran in doctrine . . .” Many of the most significant evangelical works of the period, including William Marshall’s English primer of 1534, the Matthew Bible of 1537, the “Ten” and “Thirteen Articles,” and the Bishops’ Book, all showed significant Lutheran influence. This is not surprising, since Thomas Cromwell himself harbored Lutheran sympathies and surrounded himself with like-minded officials. Cromwell even authorized the publication of Richard Taverner’s translations of the Augsburg Confession and its Apology in 1536. Despite his seeming interest in the Augustana, Cromwell was not a Lutheran in the confessional sense, although other prominent British evangelicals, like Robert Barnes and Alexander Alesius, were. Indeed, Ryrie concludes that “for a brief period in the early 1540s [Lutherans] were the authentic voice of English reformism.” Nevertheless, this English Lutheran voice was short-lived as Reformed Protestants came to dominance near the very end of Henry’s reign.

Thus, the battle between Lutheran and Reformed Evangelicals for supremacy within the nascent Protestant Church of England waned as the Reformed emerged triumphant by the mid-sixteenth century. Three hundred years later, in the mid-nineteenth century, another religious struggle within the Church of England was just unfolding. This time, the battle was between Ritualist or Catholic-leaning Anglicans and Evangelical Protestant Anglicans, committed to a Reformed interpretation of the English Reformation. The roots of the conflict between Ritualist and Evangelical Anglicans lay in the influential Oxford or Tractarian Movement. John Henry Newman, E. B. Pusey, and John Keble, along with others, spread
their ideas through the publication of ninety *Tracts For Our Times* that outlined an innovative theological program generally following the High Church tradition, which included a renewed emphasis on the visible church, belief in apostolic succession, the model of the early church, and the sacrament of Holy Eucharist. In 1841, Newman argued in his controversial *Tract 90* that the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England did not conflict with Roman Catholic doctrine. Protestant fears about the Romanizing influence of Tractarianism seemed confirmed in 1845 when Newman converted to Roman Catholicism, although Pusey and Keble remained within the Anglican fold. Following the conversions of Newman in 1845 and of Henry Edward Manning in 1850, Protestants generally saw Ritualism, or Anglo-Catholicism, as crypto-Romanism. This fear was further exacerbated by the “Papal Aggression” of 1850. By the late 1850s the connection between Romanism and Ritualism was unquestioned by most Protestants.

To Protestants the most obvious sign of “Romanist” influence within the Church of England was the increasing amount of Catholic ritual performed during services, such as the Elevation of the Host. During the mid-nineteenth century the Ritualist English Church Union (ECU) highlighted six points of Catholicity: the Eastward position, Eucharistic vestments, a mixed chalice, altar lights, unleavened bread, and the use of incense. The introduction of these “points” into Anglican worship often created conflict between supporters of Ritualism and Protestantism, especially since the civil legality of each point was questionable at best.

As the nineteenth century progressed, Anglican Ritualism continued to develop in the direction of contemporaneous Roman Catholicism. By the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century the six points had become passé and advanced Ritualists began insisting on prayers for the dead, the Reservation of the Sacrament, the service of Benediction, the use of the rosary, and other Marian devotions — in short, all of Roman Catholic devotional practice without the inconvenience of a pope. Needless to say, Protestants — both evangelical Anglicans and Nonconformists — continued to be outraged by the open display of Catholicism within what they considered to be a Protestant church body.
High Churchmen Embrace Luther

Already by the late 1830s, Tractarians and Ritualists had begun using the worship practices of Martin Luther and contemporary Lutherans to justify their Catholic ceremonial and to argue for its legitimate inclusion within an historically Protestant church body. Devotees of the Oxford Movement and the High-Church ecclesiologists of the "Cambridge Movement" began to pore over early Lutheran church orders and rubrics in order to find similarities between their own preferred practices and those of the Lutherans. The practices of contemporary Scandinavian Lutherans proved to be especially interesting and helpful to Catholic-leaning Anglicans in the mid-nineteenth century. Unlike the German Lutheran churches, the Scandinavian churches had been less wracked by religious warfare and (at least initially) rationalism. As a result, Britons believed that the Church of Sweden in particular represented the purest form of Lutheranism. Anglicans enthusiastically noted that Swedish clergy still referred to themselves as priests and portions of their worship services could be nearly indistinguishable from the Roman Catholic Mass for the uninitiated. According to British observers, Lutheran church services in Scandinavia could feature altar paraments, lit candles, crucifixes, incense, Eucharistic vestments, unleavened wafers, the Eastward Position, and the sign of the cross.

High Churchmen and Ritualists jumped on the example of the Scandinavian churches to demonstrate that a church body could both adhere to Protestant doctrines, like justification by faith alone, and also accept Catholic ceremonial practices. Interest in Scandinavian Lutheranism was such that between 1847 and 1853 the Cambridge Camden Society’s journal, The Ecclesiologist, ran a long series of articles about worship in the Swedish Lutheran Church, including "Swedish Churches and Church Offices" by G. J. R. Gordon, the secretary at the British Legation in Stockholm. In reviewing Gordon’s work, Rev. Beckman, the pastor of St. Clara’s Church in Stockholm, concluded that the Swedish church “has certainly separated itself from Rome and Popery, but not from catholicity … many beautiful customs were retained … with respect to its actual teaching … it stands on a completely Biblical or Protestant, and not
on a Catholic basis.” Of course, the Camden Society was not only interested in Lutheran ceremonial in and of itself. Their articles furthered the argument that if Protestant churches like those in Scandinavia could have Catholic ceremonial, then there could be no reason why the Church of England could not also partake in catholicity of worship.

In the heated environment of the 1850s, the study of Lutheran ritual practice sometimes left the ivory tower and became either a shield to defend one’s own position, or a weapon of attack (or both). In the late 1840s, for example, Bishop Ashurst Turner Gilbert of Chichester began hearing complaints about the activities of John Mason Neale, the Warden of Sackville College in East Grinstead. Although known primarily today for his hymn translations, Neale was infamous among Victorian Protestants for having helped to found both the Cambridge Camden Society (1839) and the Society of St. Margaret (1855), which was an Anglican convent. Giving in to his High-Church proclivities, Neale also outfitted the Sackville College chapel with altar paraments, a cross, and candlesticks, all of which screamed Romanism to Protestant parishioners. As a result, in 1847 Bishop Gilbert inhibited Neale from either preaching or celebrating the Eucharist in his diocese because Neale had turned “the simplicity of the chapel at Sackville College into an imitation of the degrading superstitions of an erroneous church.” Gilbert’s inhibition hinged on his argument that all Protestant churches, including the Church of England, “had specifically rejected Catholic ceremonial and furnishings.” Neale, however, disagreed and argued that while Gilbert was right about “Calvinistic bodies,” it was not true that all Protestants had rejected Catholic ceremonial. He wrote that “Lutherans, as every traveler is aware, not only use crucifixes, but images of saints; deck them with garlands of flowers and burn tapers before them....” Neale could only conclude that Gilbert had “never visited their churches nor read their books.” Gilbert, in any case, was not persuaded and the inhibition remained in place until 1863.

The question of whether or not so-called Catholic ritual was permissible in the historically Protestant Church of England came to a head in 1874 as Parliament debated the Public Worship
Regulation Act (PWRA), which would make it easier to prosecute Ritualist priests for ecclesiastical violations. Ritualist and High Church opponents of the bill again enlisted Lutheranism in their defense. Former Liberal Prime Minister (and devout High Churchman) William Gladstone quickly became one of the primary opponents of the PWRA. In his widely-read 1874 *Contemporary Review* article on “Ritualism and Ritual,” Gladstone argued that:

> If we survey the Christian world, we shall have occasion to observe that ritual does not bear an unvarying relation to doctrine. The most notable proof of this assertion is to be found in the Lutheran communion. It is strongly...Protestant. But in portions...in Denmark, in Sweden, and Norway, even on the inhospitable shores of Iceland, altars, vestments, lights, (if not even incense) are retained: the clergyman is called the priest, and the Communion Office is termed the Mass. But there is no distinction of doctrine whatever between Swedish or Danish, and German Lutherans: nor according to the best authorities, has the chain of Episcopal succession been maintained in those countries.  

Like Gladstone, Conservative politician Beresford Hope believed the example of the Lutheran churches could bring peaceful resolution to Church of England’s worship wars without Parliamentary legislation. After all, if the Protestant Lutheran churches could make use of Catholic ceremonial, why could the Church of England not do the same? After privately circulating among some bishops and other churchmen a booklet entitled *Hints towards Peace in Ceremonial Matters*, Hope published his thoughts more widely.  

While acknowledging both the “increased appreciation of ceremonial and art in the worship of the English Church within the last forty years” and a simultaneous reassertion of the “older spirit of Puritan simplicity,” Hope called for toleration and mutual respect. He then reviewed recent court cases and noted that “…vestments are found not only in the Eastern Churches, but in the Protestant Churches of Scandinavia, and altar-lights in the latter, as well as in the Lutheran and ‘Evangelical’ Churches of Germany...” Although he admitted that he wrote “from the High Church side,” Hope nevertheless called for further negotiations and limits on the demands of both parties. In the end, he remained confident that a *modus vivendi* recognizing both Protestant doctrine and the desire for Catholic...
ceremonial could be reached. In Hope's vision of reconciliation, the Lutheran churches of Scandinavia seemed to provide the best possible model for England.

In 1898 ecclesiastical controversy once again hit England in full force when Liberal Leader Sir William Harcourt and Liberal MP Samuel Smith used a parliamentary debate on a church Benefice Bill to raise the question of crypto-Romanism in the Established Church. The rhetoric on both sides became so heated that contemporaries referred to the conflagration as the "Great Church Crisis." Again, the specter of Martin Luther and his theological descendents enlivened the debate between Evangelicals and Ritualists. In 1899, for example, Church Bells correspondent O. Rhodes complained that the Bishop of Liverpool (R. C. Ryle) should have no power to prevent the use of candles and vestments when such things were used by Lutherans, who were the first Protestants. Thus, by the turn of the century, the pro-Ritualist arguments used by elite members of the political establishment like Gladstone seem to have trickled down to the common man on the street, like Mr. Rhodes. For both Gladstone and Rhodes, Lutheran precedent supported an expanded array of ceremonial in the Church of England and served to rebut effectively Evangelical arguments about the inappropriateness of Catholic ritual in a Protestant church.

Other Ritualist sympathizers argued for greater ceremonial not just from the example of contemporary Lutherans, but also from the historical positions of Martin Luther. Had not Luther himself worn Eucharistic vestments and made use of candles, they asked. Others noted that those who claimed to be spiritual descendents of Luther (i.e., Evangelical Protestants) ought to learn from his tolerance in matters of worship. Arthur Machen wrote in The Academy that "Luther, I believe, left the use of vestments, lights, incense, and all such matters as an open question, and vestments and lights at all events are to be seen in Lutheran churches to this day." Machen concluded that the only reason later Protestants had abandoned such trappings was blind anti-Romanism. The debate about what to do with "law-breaking" Ritualist priests heated up further around 1900 when Liberal MPs Harcourt and Smith spearheaded a crusade to pass a Church Discipline Bill, which would have made it easier for
aggrieved parishioners to prosecute Anglo-Catholic pastors. Some, including Bishop Mandell Creighton of London, argued that Luther himself and the other Reformers had once been considered law-breaking priests.\textsuperscript{31} Ironically, the crypto-Catholic Ritualist lawbreakers walked firmly in the footsteps of Martin Luther himself! Hence, claiming to be both loyal Protestant sons of Luther and persecuting those who broke ecclesiastical law was sheer hypocrisy.

**Anglo-Catholics Reject Luther**

Of course, not all Ritualists were willing to acknowledge the Church of England's status as a Protestant body. A not insignificant number adhered to the "branch theory" of ecclesiastical development. This position claimed that the three existing "catholic" churches, the Church of England, the Roman Catholic Church, and the Eastern Orthodox Churches, were each equally legitimate branches of the one true Catholic Church. Anglo-Catholics holding to the branch theory often bristled at the suggestion that either they themselves or the church they served was Protestant. As a result, they did not accept the argument that Catholic ceremonial was acceptable in the Protestant Church of England because it was used in Protestant Lutheran churches. Indeed, they denied the foundational premise! For them, Catholic ceremonial was acceptable in the Church of England precisely because it was a Catholic, not a Protestant, church body. Far from being a role model, Martin Luther was the arch-schismatic who had destroyed the unity of Christendom and created the heretical Protestant sect.\textsuperscript{32} Correctly seeing Martin Luther as a hero of the Evangelical Anglicans, Anglo-Catholics attacked Luther as a way of indirectly attacking their proudly Protestant co-religionists.

The Anglo-Catholic tradition of Luther-bashing can perhaps be traced back to an influential shift in the Tractarian appraisal of the Protestant reformers. The Tractarians initially approved of the continental and English reformers, with Pusey even referring to John Calvin as a "saint" in 1833.\textsuperscript{33} Indeed, the young Pusey, who had been trained in German Protestant theology, considered the German Lutheran churches to be legitimate "branches" of the Catholic church.\textsuperscript{34} However, as Pusey and others, including Keble, began to
lay more emphasis on the importance of the early church they became increasingly critical of the reformers, arguing that those who separated the church from antiquity lacked the Catholic spirit. By 1837 Pusey had drifted away from the generally pro-Lutheran position that had characterized his earlier thinking. He increasingly looked to the Fathers as the primary theological authority, causing him to believe the continental reformers had broken with the Catholic church. Pusey even went so far as to revise a series of baptismal tracts he had written in 1835 in order to make them more accurately reflect his new thinking. In Tract 67, for example, Pusey changed references to Lutheran and Calvinist "churches" to Lutheran and Calvinist "bodies." In the revised Tract, the Lutherans did not have "liturgies;" they now merely held "services." In short, by 1840 Pusey Germanicus had transformed himself into the anti-Lutheran Pusey Patristicus.

John Henry Newman also moved away from the faint praise he had bestowed on the reformers at the beginning of the Oxford Movement in 1833. By the mid-1830s, the anti-Protestant arguments of R. H. Froude and a greater appreciation of the apostolicity of the Church led Newman privately to denounce the English reformers in particular. As Newman’s views on church authority developed, he began to see subjective individualism as the cardinal sin of Protestantism — a sin so mortal that it cut Protestantism off from communion with the Catholic church. By the 1840s Newman had come to loath Martin Luther and his doctrine of justification in particular, seeing it as the root of Protestantism’s cardinal sin.

Before his conversion to Roman Catholicism, Newman published a series of Lectures on Justification and later reissued them after his conversion without any substantial changes. In his lectures, Newman claimed that Luther’s doctrine of justification by faith alone was the foundation of Protestant religious subjectivism and relativism. Indeed, one of the most distasteful aspects of Victorian Protestantism for Newman and other Anglo and Roman Catholics was its supposed subjectivism. The Catholic tradition and/or episcopacy in Apostolic Succession, combined with a realistic sacramental theology, seemed to them to provide a kind of objectivity and, therefore, a certainty that was missing in Protestantism. In fact, many Catholic apologists
felt that Protestant subjectivism was just a slippery slope into unbelief and atheism. Therefore, Anglo-Catholics in particular felt that the battle against Protestantism in the Church of England was a battle for Christianity itself and the front-line of the battle was Luther's Protestant legacy.

Increasing Tractarian unease surrounding the reformers and especially Luther himself can be seen in the controversy surrounding the creation of an Anglo-Prussian Jerusalem bishopric. In 1841 Prussian and English state officials determined that a Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem would be advantageous to their foreign policy objectives in the Middle East. From the perspective of King Frederick William IV of Prussia, the scheme also had the benefits of encouraging Protestant unity, while from the Anglican perspective it had the benefits of reintroducing the episcopacy into the Evangelical (Union) Church in Prussia. Thus, sacred and profane objectives seemed to coincide and the British and Prussians agreed to consecrate Michael Solomon Alexander as the bishop of the united Church of England and Ireland in Jerusalem. Alexander had the advantage of having been born a Prussian Jew, ordained an Anglican priest, and employed as a professor of Hebrew at King's College in London. Following Alexander, the Prussians and British planned to take turns appointing the bishop.

Most British Evangelicals and moderate High Churchman approved of the scheme, but a handful of Tractarians protested. Pusey and Newman both opposed the bishopric on the grounds that intercommunion with a sectarian body, namely, the Prussian Union Church, would impair the catholicity of the Church of England and damage relations with other Catholic Churches, especially the Eastern Orthodox. Newman, who by 1841 utterly opposed Luther and Lutheranism, sent an open letter to the Bishop of Oxford, protesting that “Lutheranism and Calvinism are heresies, repugnant to Scripture...and anathematised by east as well as west.” The union of the Prussian and English churches in the new bishopric so appalled Newman that William Gladstone even believed it precipitated his conversion to Roman Catholicism. In any case, the Jerusalem episode helped solidify Tractarian and Anglo-Catholic opposition to contemporary Lutheranism and the memory of Luther
himself. If Newman was correct and Luther was the cause of the Protestant heresy, then attacking the foundation could bring down the whole structure. After all, when Catholics looked at Martin Luther, the image they saw reflected back to them was that of their own Evangelical Protestant opponents.

English Protestants were aware of the Tractarian and Anglo-Catholic efforts to undermine Luther’s theological legacy and did their best to fight back. Since most Britons, even many Ritualists, continued to see the Church of England as a Protestant body and Luther himself as a religious hero, one of the best strategies was simply to highlight attacks on Luther by Anglican priests (i.e., by those sworn to uphold the Protestant formularies of the national church) and let public outrage take its course. The *Wesleyan-Methodist Magazine*, for example, ran an article in 1842 that called attention to the “progress of Popery in England.” The Wesleyans complained that the “semi-Papist” character of the Oxford Movement had recently made itself plain to everyone through Tractarian criticism of Luther’s doctrine of justification. The *Wesleyan-Methodist* cited an article in the *British Critic* written by an Anglo-Catholic and disparaging Luther. Regarding the “Lutheran doctrine of justification” the author wondered “Whether any heresy has ever infested the church so hateful and unchristian as this doctrine”? However, it was not necessary to research that question, since “none certainly has ever prevailed so subtle and extensively poisonous.” The Wesleyans correctly saw the attack on Luther as an attack on Protestantism more broadly. But, even more shocking to Protestants than the words of this Anglo-Catholic writer, was the fact that the *British Critic* was an Anglican publication.

Of course, not all High-Churchmen or even self-proclaimed Ritualists would have agreed with the assessment of the *British Critic* author. In fact, many Ritualists made efforts to distance themselves from such denunciations of Luther. For example, the *Church Quarterly Review* was founded in 1875 as an organ of High-Church opinion. After having published several articles denying the Protestantism of the Church of England and attacking Luther, the *Quarterly* editors felt the need to respond. Contrary to the protestations of some Anglo-Catholic writers, the editors argued that the Church of
England was indeed fundamentally Protestant. The Protestant intentions of the English reformers were clear, they argued, from the fact that the Anglican formularies were modeled after the Lutheran Augsburg Confession. Thus, although the High Churchmen of the Quarterly Review appreciated the catholic practices of the universal church, they preferred to adhere to Protestant doctrine, just as the Lutheran churches apparently had.

*Evangelicals Champion Luther*

The Evangelical Protestant wing of the Church of England, however, was not willing to let Luther become a weapon in the armory of Ritualism. Luther, after all, was a celebrated Protestant hero and, to many Evangelicals, the very first Protestant. Indeed, Luther functioned as a symbol of the Anglican Protestant party. As such, most Evangelicals believed that the Ritualist reading of Luther and Lutheran worship could only be a willful misinterpretation. If Luther had allowed Eucharistic vestments and other remnants of Popery, it was only because he was giving the simple and superstitious people time to understand the magnitude of his reforms. The Evangelical Church Association noted that that

> Several correspondents of the Times have been urging that as Luther made use of alters, crucifixes, vestments, lights, eastward position, &c., and as Luther was (beyond all other men) the typical 'Protestant,' no one need object on 'Protestant' grounds to the bringing back all the ritual apparatus which our own English Reformers cast out of the Church of England. But Luther has let us in no sort of doubt as to his real mind on all these questions. His wise tenderness in educating by slow degrees a nation steeped in idolatrous habits was explained by himself...

Presumably then, once the German people had been properly educated, Luther intended that they should put away vestments, candles, the sign of the cross, and the like.

Other Evangelicals argued that although the Ritualist and Roman Catholic portrayal of Luther was not a *willful* misinterpretation, it was nevertheless mistaken. This unintentional misinterpretation occurred because non-Protestants were simply unable to understand
Luther correctly, with the tragic result that they misapprehended the Gospel itself.\textsuperscript{56} Julius Charles Hare, the Evangelical Archdeacon of Lewes, fretted about just this problem. He believed that the spread of Newman's Tractarian theology within the Church of England was pulling fellow Anglicans away from Reformation truths and into the arms of Rome.\textsuperscript{57} Indeed, due to Tractarianism and Ritualism, the demonic papal forces Luther had attacked were reviving themselves within the Protestant established church itself: "the dark, terrible power, which Luther assailed and cast down, has been lifting itself up with renewed vigor: Dagon [Catholicism] and been set up again in the very presence of the ark of God [the Protestant Church of England]."\textsuperscript{58} Hare concluded that Ritualists "who are upholding the cause attackt [sic] by Luther, cannot possibly be just to Luther...."\textsuperscript{59} Thus, any non-Protestant slurs against Luther could be discounted due to their necessarily biased nature.

Evangelical Protestants like Hare not only defended Luther, but actively embraced and celebrated him as the champion of their position. In 1883, while the competing Anglican parties continued to battle, the Evangelicals seized on the 400\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of Luther's birth as an opportunity to celebrate Protestantism. Both Anglican and Nonconformist Protestant leaders organized a Luther Commemoration Committee to plan a slate of celebratory events in London.\textsuperscript{60} The events planned by the Committee included special services at around 300 London churches on Sunday, November 11, and a conference to be held on November 12 including papers such as "The Positive Character and Aspects of Protestantism" by Dr. Thomas Pownall Boulbbee, "The Influence of the Reformation on National and Social Life" by Professor Stanley Leathes, and "Romanism — the Parent of Disloyalty, Pauperism, and Crime" by Dr. Verner M. White. Also planned for November 12 was a mass public meeting at Exeter Hall to be chaired by Lord Shaftesbury. On November 13 a children's choir from the German schools of London would perform Luther hymns and Adolf Stöcker, a court preacher in Berlin, would deliver an address.\textsuperscript{61} On November 14 the arch-Evangelical Bishop of Liverpool would meet with Stöcker and other leading Protestants. Meanwhile, beginning on November 12, Exeter Hall would feature "a Protestant Picture Gallery and Museum of
Relics of the Reformation" open to the public and the Committee would provide interested Protestants with Luther books and packets of colored pictures for Sunday School children. The Committee reassured those not living in London that commemorative services and meetings were also being planned for various provincial towns, including Canterbury, Liverpool, Brighton, Exeter, and Sheffield. The Luther Commemoration also included a special exhibit at the Grenville Library of the British Museum. The exhibit included wooden engravings of Luther, several Luther portraits, "the original printed broadsheet, containing the 95 theses against the doctrine of Indulgences," an indulgence sold by Johann Tetzel, a first edition of Luther's German New Testament, a first edition of his complete German Bible, a series of medals, and several historically significant letters, including a letter Luther had written to Thomas Cromwell regarding a visit of Robert Barnes in 1536.

As should be clear from the leading role of Lord Shaftesbury, one of the most significant Victorian Evangelical voices, and the inclusion of academic papers such as "Romanism — the Parent of Disloyalty, Pauperism, and Crime," the Luther Commemoration was celebrating contemporary British Protestantism as much as the life of Martin Luther. In fact, turning back the tide of "Romanism" within the national church was the explicit aim of both Anglican and Non-conformist supporters of the Commemoration events. The Primitive Methodist Magazine, for example, hoped that the Commemoration would "greatly strengthen the Protestant sentiment of this and other lands, and contribute to protect and preserve the privileges and freedom which many seem to think are threatened by the progress of Romanism." Naturally, this made the commemoration highly controversial among High-Church and Ritualist Anglicans. While most High Churchmen probably grumbled and simply ignored the Luther celebrations, some of the more assertive priests actively resisted. For example, Robert Eyton, the curate-in-charge of St. Mary's, Grahamstreet, wrote a letter to the Times questioning the propriety of celebrating Martin Luther given the Reformer's lax morality on the question of marriage. Given the fact that Luther had sanctioned Philip of Hesse's bigamous marriage, Eyton wondered whether it was in the "interests of Christian morality" to celebrate
someone who had made a mockery of holy matrimony. This was an especially clever line of attack, since Evangelicals put special emphasis on the importance of the family as the bedrock of Christian civilization. In fact, one of the main Evangelical arguments against the Ritualist and Roman Catholic practice of auricular confession was that it undermined marriages by making an outsider privy to family secrets. Thus, by claiming Luther was essentially anti-family, Eyton could seemingly demonstrate the hypocrisy of the Evangelical celebrations.

Given the potentially damaging nature of Eyton's charges, the Luther Commemoration Committee was quick to respond. Acting Secretary A. H. Guinness assured readers of the propriety of the celebrations and claimed that Luther's comments on marriage had been made "when he was, by his own admission, 'a most insane Papist.'" Moreover, Guinness shrewdly sought to discredit Eyton in the eyes of Protestant readers by noting that his argument about Luther's view of marriage had come straight from the pages of the Jesuit W. H. Anderdon's pamphlet What Sort of Man was Martin Luther? and the pamphlets Martin Luther; a Popular Lecture and Luther and Justification by Sabine Baring-Gould. Baring-Gould's Martin Luther pamphlet had even been published by the Anglo-Catholic English Church Union.

While Eyton actively attempted to discredit the Protestant/Luther celebrations, others simply refused to aide the commemoration in any way. Most bishops, including the Bishop of London, avoided participation in the events because they saw them as "low-church" celebrations. An infamous spat occurred in early November when the Dean of York, Arthur Perceval Purey-Cust, supposedly refused to permit the Archbishop of York to preach in the York Minister in honor of the Luther Commemoration. The Archbishop of York at this time was William Thomson, an old-line Protestant and prominent supporter of the anti-Ritualist Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874. He also preached at Westminster Abbey as part of the Luther celebrations. When Purey-Cust heard a rumor that Thomson was planning to preach on Luther from the York Minister, he complained that the whole celebration was inappropriate since Luther was not an Englishman and the result would be to stir up animosity against
Nevertheless, Purey-Cust quickly clarified that although he refused to take part in the celebrations, he would not hinder the Archbishop from using the Minster as he saw fit. In fact, Thomson revealed that the whole incident was based on a misunderstanding. He had been asked to preach at St. Michael-le-Belfrey next door to the Minster, not the Minster itself. Nevertheless, Thomson praised the benefits of the Reformation and asserted his right to preach in his own Minster at any time he chose, provided due notice had been given. Although a seemingly minor event based on a misunderstanding, the conflict between the staunchly Protestant Archbishop of York and his High-Church Dean created substantial controversy in Yorkshire.

Another controversy surrounding the Luther Commemoration arose when the Oxford Convocation voted against sending a congratulatory telegram to the German Emperor in honor of Luther's 400th birthday. Oxford University had a deserved reputation for High-Church and even Anglo-Catholic tendencies. As a result, it is not surprising that the Convocation declined to congratulate the German Emperor. The decision, nevertheless, outraged Martin Farquhar Tupper, a popular mid-Victorian poet and author. Claiming that Protestantism was the “keynote” of the English Church and state, Tupper was “shocked and shamed at the insult offered by the too numerous Romanizers among our clergy to the whole Teutonic nation and their Emperor....” Tupper called upon the outvoted “honourable” minority of the Convocation to “repudiate by telegram to the Emperor the wretched treason of that partisan majority, and to offer the warmest congratulations on this occasion from English Oxford to German Luther.” The so-called “honourable” minority apparently agreed with Tupper and did indeed send a telegram to the Emperor celebrating the “great movement originated by the piety, genius, and courage of Martin Luther.” The Times printed a copy of the minority telegram, complete with the attached names of the signers.

Tupper himself played an active role in the Luther celebrations, even writing a carol entitled “Luther” at the request of the Committee. He also delivered an apparently stirring speech at the Westminster Aquarium in which he claimed that had Luther not
existed Englishmen would still be suffering under the Roman Inquisition. The nation would still be “steeped in Stygian ignorance, with the Bible everywhere a forbidden book and the mouth of science gagged, still cringing slaves in the confessional, still both spiritually and politically [under] the thralls of an Italian priest, instead of brave freemen under our English Queen.”

Tupper’s theme would be a common one during the week of Luther celebrations in mid-November. W. E. Forster, for example, presided over a public Luther meeting at St. George’s Hall in Bradford and extolled the freedom that Luther had brought to England. He claimed that Luther had brought to light the truth that a man’s conscience could not be bound by anything, including Popes, priests, councils, or Churches, outside of himself. Although Forster recognized that there were those who hoped England would “disavow” that truth (i.e., the so-called Romanizers), they were indeed sorely mistaken. At this the Protestant crowd burst into loud cheering.

Ecumenical Dialogue between Anglicans and Scandinavian Lutherans

Interestingly, with the exception of a minority of Anglo-Catholics who refused any association whatsoever with Protestantism, nearly all English churchmen saw Luther favorably. The Evangelical crowd at Bradford cheered Luther as a Protestant hero who had liberated the conscience, while Ritualists praised his wisdom in reforming some distasteful aspects of the Roman Church, while maintaining Catholic ceremonial. The fact that Evangelicals and Ritualists fought over who was the true heir of Luther in England made both camps sympathetic to contemporary Lutheranism. This sympathy and interest in Lutheranism lay in the background as late-Victorian and Edwardian Anglicans sought out close relations with the European Lutheran churches.

Mid-Victorian interest in Protestant ecumenicalism blossomed under the aegis of the Evangelical Alliance, but High Churchmen became the most enthusiastic supporters of intercommunion with Lutheran churches. High Churchmen holding to the “branch” theory argued that some of the Scandinavian Lutheran churches,
and the Church of Sweden in particular, might also be branches of the one Catholic Church. Common criteria used by most moderate High Churchmen to determine catholicity included belief in the Bible as the Word of God, adherence to the ecumenical creeds, administration of baptism and the Lord’s Supper, and an episcopacy in possession of Apostolic Succession. The Church of Sweden undeniably met at least the first three of these criteria and, by external appearance, it also looked Catholic to most British observers. As we have seen, Englishmen abroad were at pains to record the Catholic ritual and liturgy of the Swedes, which they combined with Evangelical doctrine. G.J. R. Gordon’s detailed description of the Swedish liturgy in the Ecclesiologist argued that the Swedish liturgy should be an “encouragement... to those who would use their endeavours towards promoting ... intercommunion on Catholic principle between our Church and the Swedish establishment...” The Christian Remembrancer noted that the Swedish church had excited considerable curiosity in England because it “not only used a ritual pomp ... but also had preserved the name of bishops, and had some obscure pretension to apostolical succession.” According to the anonymous author,

It seemed ... that a community existed in Europe, bearing an obvious superficial similarity to the Anglican Church, with Bishops, claiming, after a sort, Apostolical succession, and yet separate from Greece and Rome. This gave the Swedish Church at once a superiority in our eyes to other Lutheran communities, whilst, in common with them, its Reformation had retained a great many externals, which the English had laid aside. The Swedish Church had something attractive in its outward aspect, and we not unreasonably expected to find many more points of inward resemblance....

Thus, the Swedes’ seemingly Catholic “High Mass” and episcopacy induced Anglicans to investigate whether the Swedes truly possessed Apostolic Succession, which High Churchmen deemed essential for catholic intercommunion. The debate over the validity of Sweden’s claim to apostolic succession raged within the Anglican church throughout the mid-Victorian period, with scholars such as A. P. Perceval, M. R. Routh, James Pratt and J. A. Nicholson coming down on both sides of the
issue. Several English churchmen wanted to invite Swedish bishops to attend the Lambeth Conference of 1867, but quickly ran afoul of Pusey; it sparked a press war in the *Guardian*, and they were forced to back down. In 1888 and 1897 the Lambeth Conference ordered investigations into the Church of Sweden and the validity of its priestly orders with the goal of preparing the ground for intercommunion. Advanced Anglo-Catholic members of the Society of the Holy Cross (SSC) complained in 1888 that although Scandinavian Lutherans “differed from all other Protestant bodies in retaining Catholic externals, ... the reason why many [Anglicans] had espoused their cause [that of intercommunion with the Lutheran Church of Sweden] was simply on account of ritualism, the wearing the chasuble, and the use of lighted candles.” For members of the SSC, such externals alone could not form the basis of intercommunion since the Lutherans themselves did not claim apostolic succession and, in any case, English Anglo-Catholic scholars had previously deemed their priesthood invalid. Indeed, *fin-de-siècle* Anglo-Catholics well remembered Pusey’s prayer that God “bring utterly to nought all attempts to connect us with the Scandinavia bodies” and their “faith destroying confession of Augsburg.” In fact, for Tractarians and later Anglo-Catholics, the fact that the Church of Sweden might technically meet the fundamental requirements for intercommunion did not matter, since it lacked “anything like the Catholic spirit.” For Anglo-Catholics, the fact that the Church of Sweden had disregarded church authority and lacked the “sacramental principle” meant that it could not be considered a candidate for catholic intercommunion with the Church of England. But, despite such complaints, the Church of England and Church of Sweden recommended pulpit sharing and Eucharistic fellowship in 1909.

Eventually, in 1911, the Church of England formally recognized the validity of the Lutheran orders, although the Church of Sweden still did not claim apostolic succession. The 1909 recommendations, however, were not ratified by the Anglican Communion until 1920 due to the intervening World War. Protests from Anglo-Catholics eventually withered away and the Church of England went on to approve initially limited intercommunion with the Lutheran churches of Sweden, Finland, Estonia, and Latvia. More recently,
the Meissen Common Statement between the Church of England and the Evangelical Church in Germany (1988), the Porvoo Common Statement between the Churches of the England and Ireland and the Nordic and Baltic Lutheran Churches (1992), and the Reuilly Common Statement between the Churches of England and Ireland and the French Lutheran and Reformed Churches (1999) have pulled Anglicanism and Lutheranism even closer together in Northern Europe.100

The Victorian Misunderstanding of Luther

Interestingly enough, the Victorian Anglicans who so embraced Luther and Lutheranism almost uniformly misunderstood Lutheran theology because their interest was not so much in Luther per se as in how Luther and Lutheranism could reinforce their own ecclesiastical positions. As a result, both sides tended to read their own ideas into Luther, and the consequent misinterpretations were widespread. The Evangelical Protestants who claimed Luther tended to especially misunderstand his position on sola Scriptura and the sacraments. Ritualists who sought to bring quasi-Lutheran ceremonial into the Anglican Church also misunderstood Lutheran sacramental theology and the relationship between Lutheran theology and practice. Finally, Roman and very advanced Anglo-Catholics also failed to understand Luther on the sacraments and justification.

Evangelicals often read their own understanding of the relationship between Scripture and tradition back into Luther and the early Lutherans. They especially loved the story of Luther at the Diet of Worms. In the Evangelical version, Luther had announced to the Roman Catholic Emperor that he could not repudiate his writings because his conscience was bound to his own individual interpretation of the Bible. To them, this meant that every man was and ought to be his own interpreter of Scripture. The Bible was the sole rule and norm of faith and there was no need for it to be interpreted within the community of faith according to the regula fidei.101 This, they assumed, was also the view of Luther. Following W. E. Forster's Luther Commemoration speech in Bradford, the public assembly passed a resolution “endorsing Luther's doctrine that it was not only
the right but the duty of every man to exercise his judgment in matters of religion . . ." For Forster and the Bradford assembly, Luther's position was identical with their own.

In fact, Luther would have almost certainly disagreed vehemently with the Bradford resolution. First, Luther had no conception of "rights" in religion; this would be a later development within Protestantism. Not only that, but Luther even argued that it was the duty of the estate of the state to protect the estate of the church, even if that entailed suppressing public blasphemy. Secondly, Luther disagreed that everyone ought to be his own interpreter of Scripture. According to Luther and the Lutheran Confessions, the public interpretation of the Scriptures belongs solely to the public office of the ministry. Laymen were called to test public interpretations against the Scriptures and call teachers to account, but not to publicly interpret by themselves. Moreover, even the private interpretation of Scripture was to occur within the hermeneutical context of the church and the regula fidei. Thus, Luther (and other Magisterial Reformers like Calvin) would have disagreed with the late-nineteenth century Evangelical position on the interpretation of the Scriptures.

Seeing Luther as the Protestant par-excellence, Evangelicals also often read later Reformed sacramental theology back into Luther, ignoring his sacramental realism. Interestingly enough, moderate High-Churchmen often made this same mistake because it worked to their favor. If Luther held a Protestant doctrine of justification and the sacraments, and if he also maintained Catholic ceremonial, then why could not the Protestant Church of England do the same? The problem, as some High Churchmen did indeed point out, was that Luther emphatically did not hold to a symbolic view of the Lord's Supper. According to the unspoken law of lex orandi, lex credendi, worship practices cannot be divorced from doctrine. Therefore, the Lutheran Divine Service maintained more "Catholic" elements because Lutherans shared with Roman Catholics a belief in the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in Communion, something the majority of Protestants denied. Charles Wordsworth, the Scottish Episcopal Bishop of St. Andrew's, realized this. Why, he asked, were Lutherans able to retain so much Catholic ceremonial?
Simply because the Lutheran standards, however Protestant in other respects, have from the first maintained a doctrine upon the subject of the Eucharist more nearly allied to the doctrine of the Church of Rome than the English Reformers were willing to accept. It was only natural, therefore, that Lutherans should retain more of the ante-Reformation ceremonial than has been allowed hitherto in the Reformed Church of England.107

Thus, the High Church argument that Lutheran practices could be imported into the Church of England without doctrinal reservation was, in fact, inaccurate, unless the Church of England was also willing to formally adopt belief in the Real Presence.

Finally, the advanced Anglo-Catholics and Roman Catholics who attacked Luther on justification and accused him to bringing subjectivism into the Church also usually misunderstood Luther’s theology. This misunderstanding even occurred in great theological minds, such as that of John Henry Newman. This may be due to the fact that despite having criticized Luther in his Lectures on Justification, Newman apparently read very little of Luther’s writings.108 In any case, according to Newman, Luther’s doctrine of justification by faith alone was the root of all later Protestant subjectivism.109 He argued that Luther had “found Christians in bondage to their works and observances; he released them by his doctrine of faith; and he left them in bondage to their feelings.... For the outward signs of grace he substituted inward; for reverence toward the Church contemplation of self.”110 Leaving aside the question of Luther’s influence on later Protestantism, Luther himself stressed that faith was not a feeling and that justification was not dependent on one’s subjective emotional state.111 Moreover, Luther especially loathed those who substituted inward signs of grace for outward. He called them enthusiasts (Schwärmer) and railed against them throughout his life.112 According to Luther,

it must be firmly maintained that God gives no one his Spirit or grace apart from the external Word which goes before. We say this to protect ourselves from the enthusiasts, that is, the ‘spirits’ who boast that they have the Spirit apart from and before contact with the Word.... In short: enthusiasm clings to Adam and his children from the beginning to the end of the world – fed and spread among them as poison by the old dragon. It is the source, power, and might of all the heresies, even that of the papacy and Mohammed. Therefore,
we should and must insist that God does not want to deal with us human beings, except by means of his external Word and sacrament.\textsuperscript{113}

Thus, against the so-called enthusiasts, Luther urged followers to see evidence that God's grace was for them in objective sacraments and preached Word. Newman's error lay in reading later developments in other branches of Protestantism back into Luther himself.

Similar misunderstandings occurred among the Anglo-Catholics. Sabine Baring-Gould famously attacked Luther's doctrine of justification because he believed Luther had taught that "No acts a man can do, however heinous, are sinful to him who is justified."\textsuperscript{114} The logical conclusion for Baring-Gould was that in the Lutheran theological system "Christ died in order to allow us to give way at our pleasure to our bestial inclinations."\textsuperscript{115} On the other hand, "under the Catholic system, morality is binding, and sacraments are necessary, under the Lutheran system neither are of any value whatever."\textsuperscript{116} Contrary to Baring-Gould, although Luther and Lutherans sharply distinguished between justification and what came to be called sanctification, they all believed a justified man could sin, that morality was binding, and that the sacraments were of great value since, as means of grace, they created and preserved faith.

In conclusion, the interest of Victorian Anglicans in Luther and Lutheranism (especially Scandinavian Lutheranism) formed part of the theological backdrop for the twentieth-century ecumenical agreements between the Church of England and various Lutheran bodies. However, this rejuvenated Victorian concern with Luther and Lutheranism tended to facilitate misunderstanding of Lutheran theology. Indeed, it could hardly be otherwise, since interest in Luther usually came not from a sense of scholarly detachment or genuine interest in the subject's thoughts, but rather from a need to use Luther as a prop in the on-going civil war between Anglican Evangelicals and Ritualists. Some Anglicans used Luther as a weapon by co-opting his positions and attacking opponents with them. Others used Luther as a mirror in which they could see their own reflections. Luther's prestige could then legitimate their own opinions. In either case, the result, more often than not, tended to be an Anglican distortion of Lutheranism in the cause of specifically Anglican goals.
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