

PHILIP MELANCHTHON'S INFLUENCE ON ENGLISH THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT
DURING THE EARLY ENGLISH REFORMATION

By

Anja-Leena Laitakari-Pyykkö

A dissertation submitted
In partial fulfillment of the requirements
For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Theology

University of Helsinki
Faculty of Theology
August 2013

Copyright © 2013 by Anja-Leena Laitakari-Pyykkö

To the memory of my beloved husband, Tauno Pyykkö

Abstract

Philip Melanchthon's Influence on English Theological Thought during the Early English Reformation

By

Anja-Leena Laitakari-Pyykkö

This study addresses the theological contribution to the English Reformation of Martin Luther's friend and associate, Philip Melanchthon. The research conveys Melanchthon's mediating influence in disputes between Reformation churches, in particular between the German churches and King Henry VIII from 1534 to 1539. The political background to those events is presented in detail, so that Melanchthon's place in this history can be better understood. This is not a study of Melanchthon's overall theology. In this work, I have shown how the Saxons and the conservative and reform-minded English considered matters of conscience and adiaphora. I explore the German and English unification discussions throughout the negotiations delineated in this dissertation, and what they respectively believed about the Church's authority over these matters during a tumultuous time in European history.

The main focus of this work is adiaphora, or those human traditions and rites that are not necessary to salvation, as noted in Melanchthon's *Confessio Augustana* of 1530, which was translated into English during the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations in 1536. Melanchthon concluded that only rituals divided the Roman Church and the Protestants. The five adiaphora issues are the disputed articles on the power of the bishops, the marriage or celibacy of priests, monastic vows, the Mass, and communion in both kinds in the Lord's Supper—and to which he made a significant contribution. Melanchthon regarded these five as adiaphora (from the Greek ἀδιάφορα, “indifferent things”)—that is, as matters that were not essential to faith or salvation. Although English theologians never used the word adiaphora, they were familiar with the concept, as will be demonstrated in the historical presentation.

These issues are examined within the framework of Scripture and Tradition and the doctrine of justification by faith. The idea of the Scriptures as divine mandate changed the concept of authority in matters of doctrine and practice. From the perspective of both the German Reformers and the reform-minded clergy in England, justification by faith belonged to Scripture and was necessary for salvation. For them, the remainder of Church law (adiaphora), such as ecclesiastical policies, had become secular issues and were not of divine authority. Whereas the Wittenberg Articles were intended as an agreement between the Germans and the English, they did not produce what was hoped for on adiaphora matters, so that the parties could formulate a practice they could defend against the pope's General Council. They did agree on what was

necessary for salvation. The disputed articles in which adiaphora was a question were left open for further negotiations.

The method employed in this study is historical-genetic; that is, the chapters are arranged in chronological order, and Melanchthon's contribution to the English Reformation is viewed in the historical context in which the documents were produced. The chapters begin with the supremacy crisis in England (1534) and end with the Act of Six Articles (1539). Chapters Three, Five, Six, and Twelve are divided into two parts—the first is a historical account, while the second delineates the documents produced during the negotiations.

In other chapters, the author presents the negotiations and their historical background. The doctrine of justification by faith is essential in relation to adiaphora for evaluating Melanchthon's position in his negotiations with the German and English theologians, during the discussions between Catholics and Protestants, in the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations, and within the English Church in the documents produced: the *Advice* of 1534, the Wittenberg Articles of 1536, the Ten Articles of 1536, the Bishops' Book of 1537, the Thirteen Articles of 1538, and the Six Articles of 1539. The major discussion involves Melanchthon's writing of the *Loci Communes* of 1535 as a doctrinal basis for the unification talks. The *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apologia* were translated into English. This is important because many of Melanchthon's concepts acquired somewhat different interpretations as they were translated from Latin into English. The differences in the two texts will be compared to find the degree to which Melanchthon's confessional writings were accepted in England and used by the English Reformers.

Acknowledgments

My interest in Melanchthon started in high school and I would like to acknowledge the education I received from my teacher, Rev. Holger Pohjolan-Pirhonen on church history; the late professor Matti Lauerma on history; and my beloved English teacher, the late Ms. Raina Paimenvuori, who held high standards in the English language. I learnt tolerance and humanistic pursuits from my godparents, the late Professor and Mrs. Erkki Laitakari, who influenced me more than anyone in Christian life with their encouragement and prayers during my formative years.

I owe a debt of appreciation to the late professor Kauko Pirinen, for his vision in including the English Reformation in the curriculum, and his encouragement to pursue the study of early English Reformation documents. Professor Simo Heininen encouraged me to look into Philip Melanchthon's connection to the English Reformation, and referred me to the University of California History Department. I am also indebted to Professor Kaarlo Arffman for his valuable support and kind advice on research questions relating to Melanchthon. I am grateful for the grant awarded by the University of Helsinki to complete the research.

I truly thank the history department of the University of California, Berkeley, for allowing me time to pursue my research. I especially wish to extend my appreciation to Professor Barnes and Professor Brady, who have supported me through the years and advised me at various stages of my study. I am grateful to the library staff of the University of California, especially Dr. Michaelyn Burnette for her advice and encouragement.

It has been an enriching experience to continue as research associate at the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley. I am also grateful to the graduate division for extending my research privileges until completion, and appreciate the support of Dr. Arthur G. Holder, Dean and Vice-President of Academic Affairs. My discussions with Professor Michael Aune and Professor Rebecca Lyman about Melanchthon and the English Reformation have been enlightening. I am thankful to the Dominican School of Philosophy and Theology, especially the late Dr. Hess, who helped me to understand Thomas Aquinas's works and how they influenced Melanchthon and the Reformation. I would like to acknowledge the staff at the Graduate Theological Union Library—Mr. Robert Benedetto, MA, Library Director, Mr. David Stiver, MA, and Ms. Mary Mead, MA, and the reference librarians for their generous assistance in finding manuscripts and sources for my study.

My linguistic training in England by the late Dr. John Karlik and his wife Mrs. Jillian Karlik has been invaluable. The late Dr. F. A. Hudson gave me insight into church life and English theological culture. I would like to thank my beloved parents, the late Lauri and Aili Laitakari, whose contribution has been immense. Their grace, love, and care will always be part of my work, as well as the love of my sisters and brothers who have graciously supported me.

I am very grateful for the personal support of Dr. Kyllikki Tiensuu and her dear husband, Mr. Jari Lampinen, in keeping me connected to Finland through the years, and for their visits to Berkeley. I would like to extend a special thank you to Ms. Inkeri Lappalainen, MA, for her faithful assistance. My numerous friends in California and Finland have graciously and

unselfishly supported and encouraged me through the challenges of many long and arduous years.

My humble adoration to Christ during this beautiful summer season in Berkeley, California.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgments	v
List of Abbreviations	xiii
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: The Crisis of Supremacy	43
Introduction	43
Consolidation of Authority	43
The New Parliamentary Laws	48
Ambassadors Sent to the Continent	52
Melanchthon's Initial Contacts with England	56
Henry VIII Invites Melanchthon to England	57
Melanchthon's Unification Plans	59
Conclusion	62
Chapter 2: Melanchthon on Church Policy	65
Introduction	65
Melanchthon's Views on Church Policy and on Indifferent Matters	65
Conclusion	88
Chapter 3: Melanchthon's Negotiations with the Catholics and Protestants and the <i>Loci Communes</i>	91
Part I: Melanchthon's Negotiations with the Catholics and Protestants	91
Introduction	91
Melanchthon's Plans for England	91
Melanchthon Is Invited to Paris	96
Henry VIII Tries to Prevent Melanchthon from Meeting with Francis I	100
A Brief Analysis of the Preface to the <i>Loci Communes</i>	103
Melanchthon's Disagreement with the Elector	106
Melanchthon's Unification Efforts and the <i>Loci Communes</i>	111
Conclusion	114
Part II: The <i>Loci Communes</i>	116
Introduction	116
Grace and Justification	117

On Human Traditions	123
Ecclesiastical Polity	127
Concerning Ecclesiastical Power	128
Concerning Civil Magistrates and the Dignity of Political Matters	132
Divine, Natural, and Human Laws	134
Conclusion.....	139
Chapter 4: Consolidating the Power of Bishops in the New Order	143
Introduction	143
The English Bishops and the Supremacy Law	144
Religious Houses under the New Order	154
Disobedience and its Consequences.....	155
The Pope’s Brief to Francis, and Henry’s Reaction to It	157
Consequences of Bishop Gardiner’s Response to the Pope’s Letter.....	162
Conclusion.....	164
Chapter 5: Anglo-Lutheran Negotiations and the Wittenberg Articles	167
Part I: Anglo-Lutheran Negotiations.....	167
Introduction	167
English Preparations for the Negotiations.....	167
Preparatory Discussions in Germany	175
Negotiations at Schmalkalden	179
Negotiations at Wittenberg.....	183
Stephen Gardiner’s Response to the Christmas Articles.....	187
Henry’s Response to the Christmas Articles	191
The Result of the Doctrinal Discussions	192
Aftermath of the Negotiations	200
Conclusion.....	202
Part II: The Wittenberg Articles.....	203
Introduction	203
History, Contents, and Transmission	204
Conclusion.....	227
Chapter 6: The English Reaction to the Wittenberg Negotiations.....	229
Introduction	229
Part I: The Conflicting Articles of the English and Latin <i>Confessio Augustana</i> and <i>Apologia</i>	230

Historical Background of the Translation of the <i>Confessio Augustana</i> and <i>Apologia</i>	231
General Themes of the Latin and the English <i>Confessio Augustana</i> and <i>Apologia</i>	233
Part II: Melanchthon’s <i>Confessio Augustana</i> into English (1536).....	238
Part III: Melanchthon’s <i>Apologia</i> into English (1536).....	259
Summary Notes	273
Conclusion.....	277
Chapter 7: The Political Situation during the Genesis of the Articles of Faith of the Church of England	279
Introduction	279
Faith and “Faithlessness”.....	280
Reginald Pole and <i>De Unitate Ecclesiastica</i>	280
The Succession and the General Council	282
The Ten Articles of Faith.....	286
Articles Necessary and Not Necessary to Salvation.....	290
Henry Consolidates His Secular and Ecclesiastical Power	298
Whether the Negotiations in Germany Influenced the Ten Articles	301
Conclusion.....	304
Chapter 8: Rebellion against Henry’s Supremacy in England.....	307
Introduction	307
The Northern Rebellion.....	307
Negotiations with the Rebels’ Demands	309
Reasons for Rebellion.....	312
The Rebels’ Opposition to New Learning.....	314
Henry Establishes His Supremacy in the North of England.....	315
Henry’s Dealings with the Ringleaders and Monasteries.....	316
Conclusion.....	318
Chapter 9: The Search for the Middle Way and the Bishops’ Book.....	321
Introduction	321
The Bishops’ Synod.....	322
The Article on Justification	327
The Adiaphoristic Nature of the Bishops’ Book	333
Conclusion.....	335
Chapter 10: The General Council and Diplomacy between England and the Continental Powers.....	337

Introduction	337
German Opposition to the General Council	337
Melanchthon's Ecclesiastical Views	341
English Opposition to the General Council	342
The Pope Threatens to Depose Henry VIII	347
The Succession and Its Effects on European Diplomacy	348
Conclusion.....	351
Chapter 11: Henry's Domestic Relations.....	355
Introduction	355
The Suppression of the Monasteries and Friaries	355
The Redistribution of the Monasteries' Wealth	359
Consequences for Matters Related to the Dissolution.....	360
Cromwell's Injunctions	360
Official Iconoclasm Replaces Superstition	363
Unity in Religion.....	364
Conclusion.....	366
Chapter 12: Foreign Relations That Led to New Negotiations with the German	
Theologians and the Thirteen Articles	369
Part I: Foreign Relations That Led to New Negotiations with the German Theologians.....	369
Introduction	369
Foreign Politics with Catholic Europe	370
Renewed Attempts to Negotiate with the Germans	373
Anglo-Lutheran Negotiations Resume.....	378
The King's Response to the German Ambassadors	385
Disputed Articles.....	387
The Aftermath of the Negotiations in London	392
Conclusion.....	395
Part II: The Thirteen Articles	397
Introduction	397
History, Contents, and Transmission	397
Article IV: Of Justification [<i>De Justificatio</i>].....	399
Article XI: Of Rites and Ceremonies [<i>De Ritibus Ecclesiasticis</i>].....	403
Article XII: Of Civil Affairs [<i>De Rebus Civilibus</i>]	404
The Remaining Four Articles	407

After the Negotiations: The Pope’s Bull against Henry	411
Conclusion	411
Chapter 13: Religious Unity and the Genesis of the Six Articles	415
Introduction	415
The Papal Bull	415
Melanchthon on the Power of the Church	419
Henry’s Proclamations and Melanchthon’s Response.....	423
Renewed Contacts with the Germans	426
The Act of Six Articles and Its Implications	430
Conclusion	438
Conclusions	441
Bibliography: Sources and Literature	459
Archive Sources.....	459
Printed Sources	459
Interviews	463
Web Sites	463
Literature	463

List of Abbreviations

A 6	Six Articles (1539)
A 10	Ten Articles (1536)
A 13	Thirteen Articles (1538)
Add.Mss.	Additional Manuscripts in BL
ApolE	<i>Apologia</i> in English (1536)
Apoll	<i>Apologia</i> in Latin (1531)
BB	Bishops' Book (1537)
BL	British Library
Burnet	<i>The History of the Reformation of the Church of England, With Collection of Records, and Copious Index. Vol. 4</i> (1843)
CA	<i>Confessio Augustana</i>
CAE	<i>Confessio Augustana</i> in English (1536)
CAL	<i>Confessio Augustana</i> in Latin (1530)
Cleop.	Cleopatra Manuscript
Concilia Magnae	<i>Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae ab anno MCCCL et annum MDXLV. Volumen Tertium Londini MDCCXXXVII</i>
Concordia	<i>Concordia, the Lutheran Confessions</i> (2006)
Concordia Triglotta	<i>Libri symbolici Ecclesiae Lutheranae</i> (1917)
Cott. Libr.	Manuscripts Cleopatra/Harley/Otho/Titus/Vitellius in Cotton Library of BL
Cranmer's Memorials	Strype's <i>Memorials of Thomas Cranmer</i> , Vols. I–II (1853)
Cranmer's Miscellaneous	<i>Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer</i> (1846)
CR	<i>Corpus Reformatorum</i> (1834–1860)
Cromwell's Letters	<i>Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell</i> , Vol. I–II (1902)
Documents	<i>Documents Illustrative of English Church History</i> (1910)
Ecclesiastical History	<i>An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain. Vol. 9.</i> (1852)
Fol.	A folio page of a manuscript

Fols.	Several folio pages of a manuscript
LC	<i>Loci Communes</i> (1535)
Letters of Stephen Gardiner	<i>The Letters of Stephen Gardiner</i> (1933)
Libr.	Library
L&P	<i>Letters and Papers</i> (1534–1539). NA. State Papers Online & the Government of Britain 1509–1714. The Tudors 1509–1603. Online Edition (2010)
LW	<i>Luther's Works</i> , Vol. 55. (1975)
MBW R	<i>Melanchthon's Briefwechsel</i> . Regesten (1531–1539)
MBW T	<i>Melanchthon's Briefwechsel</i> . Texte (1534-1539)
Mss	Manuscript
NA	National Archive of the United Kingdom
Original Letters	<i>Original Letters Illustrative of English History</i> , Vol. III (1846)
Rymer	<i>Rymer Foedera Manuscript</i> (1843)
Strype	<i>Strype Memorials</i> , Vols. 1, 6. (1816)
St.P.	<i>State Papers King Henry the Eight</i> , Vol. I, Pt. 2. (1830)
SP1	<i>State Papers of King Henry the Eight</i> , General Manuscript Series
SP3	<i>Lisle Papers</i> . State Papers of Henry VIII.
SP6	<i>Theological Tracts of King Henry the Eight</i> .
Visitation Articles 1536-1538	<i>Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of Reformation</i> . 1536-1538. Vol. II. Ed. Walter Howard Frere and William McClure Kennedy. 1910.
WA	<i>Weimar Ausgabe</i> (1938)
Wriothesley's Chronicle	<i>A Chronicle of England during the Reigns of the Tudors</i> (1875)
WTA	<i>Wittenberg Articles</i> in German and Latin (1536)

Introduction

The Purpose of the Study

This study addresses the theological contribution to the English Reformation by Martin Luther's friend and associate, Philip Melanchthon. Specifically, I discuss Melanchthon's impact on the negotiations between English and German theologians from 1535 to 1539. The political background to those events is also presented in detail, so that Melanchthon's place in this history can be better understood. The study demonstrates Melanchthon's consistent contribution to English theological thought on the doctrine of adiaphora within the framework of justification by faith, during the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations. The research considers areas that no previous scholar of the English Reformation has discussed as to how Melanchthon influenced English theological thought on the doctrine of adiaphora.

During the negotiations between the English and principalities on the Continent, collections of articles were written, such as the Wittenberg Articles and the Thirteen Articles. These collections convey a mutual exchange of ideas between the Saxon Reformers and Melanchthon. As the author of the *Confessio Augustana* and the Wittenberg Articles, Melanchthon influenced the English Ten Articles and the Bishops' Book, both produced nearly simultaneously during the end of negotiations in 1536 and 1538. This study will demonstrate how Melanchthon's influence was transferred from his writings to the English formularies of faith and how he influenced adiaphora concepts in the disputed articles on which the Catholics and the Protestants failed to agree at Augsburg. The English and German theologians could not agree during the mutual negotiations in Wittenberg and London. As will be seen in subsequent chapters, the negotiations were dependent on various political and confessional exigencies that influenced their progress. I also reveal that the "conservative reaction" in England was not actually such because the Act of Six Articles was not meant to be a comprehensive doctrinal statement. Rather, it was used by the king to enforce unity of religion on those who held opposing views, thus enforcing his supremacy in religion as had been done by the Old Testament kings and former emperors.

In addition to Melanchthon's contribution to English theological thinking on adiaphora issues, I examine how Melanchthon conceded some of his beliefs about doctrine for personal reasons having to do with his desire to mediate among various confessional groups within the Church. From the perspective of both the German Reformers and the reform-minded clergy in England, justification by faith belonged to scriptural authority and was necessary for salvation. For them, the remainder of church law had become secular and was not of divine authority. I explore the idea that the conservative bishops in England, when interpreting the doctrine of justification by faith and adiaphora, still believed in Scripture and Tradition. I also explore suggestions that the push from the German Reformers on these matters created a wider gap between conservative and reform-minded bishops in England. I also look at how King Henry actually wanted to be Catholic in a non-Roman sense: as it was in the early church before there was a pope.

The most recent general study of Melanchthon and the English Reformation is John Schofield's *Philip Melanchthon and the English Reformation* (2006). Schofield's study, which also covers the reign of Elizabeth, examines how Philip Melanchthon enhanced Henry VIII's interest in Lutheranism. Schofield asserts correctly that Henry held strong views of his own regarding matters that Lutherans took to be adiaphora. He states that the Ten Articles were the work of Cromwell, and he adds that the Six Articles represents Henry's opinion on religion. Schofield's premise differs from this writer's viewpoint. I believe that Henry was well aware of the development of all of the articles and will show this over the course of my exposition. I concur with Schofield's statement that Melanchthon's *Loci Communes* influenced the doctrine of justification, as can be seen in the Ten Articles and the Bishops' Book.

This study takes a different approach from that of Schofield. Although it concurs with him on the major points in the articles and agrees as to Melanchthon's influence on them, this study demonstrates that analyzing various confessional viewpoints in the articles would not lead to any conclusion about the doctrine of the English Church; it had adopted influences from various other sources, and the genesis of the articles should be considered within their historical framework. This study examines the development of the doctrine of adiaphora during the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations, demonstrating Melanchthon's consistent contribution to English theological thought with respect to the doctrine of justification by faith. Previous studies have not demonstrated this consistent connection.

This work is not a study of Melanchthon's overall theology. Rather, it focuses on his mediating influence in disputes among local churches at a tumultuous time in European history. The main inquiry is as follows: What was Melanchthon's contribution to English thought during the negotiations from 1534–1539? I address several topics to which Melanchthon made significant contributions: the disputed articles of the power of the bishops, the marriage or celibacy of priests, monastic vows, the Mass, and communion of both kinds in the Lord's Supper. All of these articles are viewed within the framework of the exegesis of Scripture and Tradition and the doctrine of justification by faith. His other statements involve worship and church law.¹

Much of the historical narrative in this dissertation is informed by the correspondence regarding negotiations on these matters between King Henry and the German Reformers, the monarchs and princes within the Continent, and all of their respective theologians and diplomats. Throughout these negotiations, I examine the German and English discussions and what they believed respectively about the church's authority over these matters.

I examine the article on justification by interpreting the disputed articles: the power of bishops, marriage of priests, monastic vows, the Mass, and Communion of both kinds in the Lord's Supper. My intention is to uncover what is necessary for salvation according to the German Reformers and the English reform-minded clergy. Also included are inspections of the articles on veneration of saints and images, as these played an essential role in the changes in the Mass and adiaphora. I then discuss the civil magistracy's relation to the Church authority in articles that address civil affairs, including the Wittenberg Articles of 1536 and the Thirteen

¹ Wilhelm Maurer: *Historical Commentary on the Augsburg Confession*. 1986, p. 19 (hereafter, Maurer 1986).

Articles of 1538, and compare what Melanchthon wrote about these matters in the *Confessio Augustana* of 1530 and the *Loci Communes* of 1535.

A major theme of this research is who possessed authority and how that authority and its exercise affected the church in England and Germany. The articles on the power of the bishops state that the king is the supreme head and has power over the bishops. With Henry's Act of Supremacy and the German Reformation, the pope's divine right became human right. Church authority became secular in the German Reformation Churches, and there came to be a sharper division between the secular and the church. This leads me to ask the following questions. If the pope no longer has divine right, then:

1. What are matters of conscience and what are matters of the church?
2. What did the Germans and the English see as binding on the conscience and what needed to be discussed?
3. What was considered adiaphora and who had the power to make this determination?
4. How did Melanchthon's doctrine of adiaphora change when interpreted within various cultural and ecclesiastical environments?
5. How did adiaphora in the *Confessio Augustana* 1530 and in *Loci Communes* 1535 influence the English Articles?
6. How did the Reformers react to tyrannical laws in the framework of freedom of conscience and Christian liberty?

Significant Historical and Doctrinal Information

Understanding the development of the Reformation requires an understanding of the history of events prior to the sixteenth century. Doctrinal background is presented so an understanding can be achieved as to the doctrinal changes during the Reformation in Germany and England and their interrelationship.

In this chapter, I will review a brief historical account of Melanchthon's life and the development of his ideas about adiaphora, along with the following topics: 1) challenges to the church during the later medieval period to explain how and why the Reformers responded in the early part of the sixteenth century; 2) Scripture and Tradition: The exegetical tradition changed during the Reformation and affected the English and German theologians' interpretation of the divine laws; 3) salvation and sacraments and how the doctrine of justification by faith was the central doctrine and changed the understanding of them; 4) shifting of authority from church to state and how the national churches became more independent from the pope; 5) King Henry, formerly designated Defender of the Faith by the pope, and how Henry's desire to dissolve his marriage to Catherine of Aragon changed his relation to the pope; 6) the radical legislative measures passed by the Reformation Parliament, completing the break with Rome; 7) continental connections, which were of the utmost importance for future negotiations between English and German theologians.

Adiaphora—Indifferent Matters

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, doctrinal and practical church matters were altered drastically as authority transitioned within the church. Consequently, new ideas emerged, and with them, a need for new definitions and avenues for their integration with the church. Various parties discussed what was relevant to the church's confession and which matters had to be left for secular rulers to decide. Since the doctrine of justification by faith had to be interpreted anew by the Reformers, it also affected the definition of law in relation to the individual and, therefore, for the understanding of adiaphora.

Philip Melanchthon wrote the Lutheran understanding of the doctrine of justification in his *Confessio Augustana* and left open the disputed articles related to “things indifferent” for further discussion. Melanchthon wrote that, because of *sola fide* (one is righteous by faith alone without works), a Christian is free from external law, not only judicial and ceremonial, but also moral, where morality has been abrogated. Even though Melanchthon stressed the doctrine that one is righteous as a consequence of faith, he still supported the third use of the law as a practical application of Christian life.

What does adiaphora mean? Verkamp defines it as follows: first, that some actions are indifferent, neither bad nor good, not being commanded or forbidden by God, and may be omitted without fault. Second, certain rites and ceremonies, having been neither commanded nor forbidden by God, may be omitted without fault. Third, a Christian may exercise freedom of choice, for instance, as to what to eat or drink. Fourth, that justification by grace through faith makes all human responses to the Gospel adiaphora.² Verkamp believes that, basing themselves on the unwritten tradition, church authorities could stipulate ceremonies under church law that could become necessary to salvation.³ In this study, the author will demonstrate that the unifying element will be the doctrine of justification in interpreting adiaphora.

The original concept of adiaphora was available to the English Reformers from ancient sources. The Greek word adiaphora (ἀδιάφορα) was originally used by Cynic and Stoic philosophers.⁴ For the Stoics, it denotes conditions in life that are neither virtues nor vices and thus tend toward neither good nor evil. Cynics defined all externals as things that make no difference. All these were things that lay outside the “self,” and had neither positive nor negative value. To the Cynics, man was self-sufficient.⁵

Closely related to Stoic adiaphorism was the position of the great humanist, Erasmus, who accepted the diversity in adiaphoristic matters that was introduced by Protestant Reformers. For him, actions outside of human intention are indifferent or neutral. A Christian tradition of philosophical adiaphora was closely related to Stoic adiaphorism: certain things and actions were indifferent in themselves insofar as their positive or negative value was to be the decisive factor in evaluating their moral quality. The goodness or badness of the human agent—whether his

² Bernard J. Verkamp: *The Limits upon Adiaphoristic Freedom: Luther and Melanchthon*. 1975, pp. 59–61 (hereafter, Verkamp 1975).

³ Verkamp 1975, pp. 62–63.

⁴ The word “adiaphora” is neuter plural referring to the whole set of concepts under discussion. “Adiaphoros” (Latinized as “adiaphorus”) would refer to a singular instance of the concepts.

⁵ Bernard J. Verkamp: *The Indifferent Mean*. 1977, pp. 20–21 (hereafter, Verkamp 1977).

intention was charitable or uncharitable—was also part of the evaluation. Erasmus, as well as the English and Continental Reformers, appreciated this kind of adiaphora, which implicitly criticized the Roman Church.⁶

There was the question of the interpretation of doctrine and practice, which was problematic, as the liturgical forms, rites, and ceremonies were part of church doctrine interwoven with the Catholic liturgical celebration as an ecclesiastical event and had a community dimension when the congregation confessed its faith that the Law of belief is the Law of prayer (*lex orandi–lex credendi*).⁷ The *lex orandi–lex credendi* principle would lead to the problem of how accurately the doctrine could be interpreted from the worship ceremonies.

The medieval synthesis of faith and reason reversed the terms so that divine will was a priority when defining adiaphora, as supported by Marsilius of Padua and William of Ockham. The English Reformers intended to restore balance between the fundamentals and non-fundamentals of Christian religion. Therefore, they reduced ceremonies gradually. Some applied the Erasmian philosophical concept of adiaphora or spoke in terms of scriptural doctrine (as “things permitted”) and defined adiaphora as “neither commanded nor forbidden.”⁸ They also frequently used terminology such as “not necessary to salvation,” implying two things: first, that the ceremony or practice lacked an intrinsic relation to salvation; second, it lacked the necessity of the precept of positive will of the legislator. English adiaphorism was of a more theological kind than on the Continent. As far as God was concerned, “neither forbidden nor commanded” by Scripture lacked necessity of precept and could not be considered necessary to salvation by the church or by civil officials.⁹

Individual thinkers of the later Middle Ages had varying opinions regarding adiaphora. Jean Gerson’s opinion was that all Church precepts and laws were precepts of divine law and binding, but not adiaphora if they were neither commanded nor forbidden by divine law (including Scripture and extra-scriptural revelation). If a ceremony belonged to extra-scriptural revelation, it could be claimed to belong to divine law and thus be binding. The extra-scriptural tradition was part of church law and was used to define matters such as adiaphora.¹⁰

In his *Loci Communes* of 1521, Melancthon argued a deterministic view in his discussion of original sin. He said that from the standpoint of salvation, 1) all human actions are adiaphoristic since salvation is given by faith alone. Conversely, he could argue, 2) that all human actions are evil rather than adiaphoristic, since they proceed from a corrupted man, who will never be fully clean or redeemed. Melancthon observed that work-righteousness resulted from the neglect of the doctrine of justification by the Roman Church, which left the door wide open for people to claim the value of meritorious works. Melancthon states that works, after being justified, are not sin because of faith, but are adiaphoristic as far as justification is concerned. Thus, *sola fide* influences how we understand Christian liberty, social order, love, and peace. Melancthon discussed the abrogation of the law in the Old and New Testaments. In the New Testament, a

⁶ Verkamp 1977, pp. 82, 137, 159, 160–161.

⁷ German Martinez: *Signs of Freedom: Theology of Christian Sacraments*. 2003, pp. 9, 62, 132, 137, 297.

⁸ Verkamp 1977, pp. 25–26, 29.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 40–41.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 44–46.

Christian is free from the law's condemnation and spontaneously does what law requires because of faith.¹¹ The decisive factor determining adiaphora is the divine authority in Scripture. Melanchthon indicated clearly that bishops should not burden consciences with human traditions, but he admitted that, for the sake of charity, one should be willing to endure traditions if they do not obscure faith and do not offend one's neighbor.¹²

Melanchthon also discussed *indifferentia*: permitting violation of human traditions only before "Pharisees," but not in the presence of the weak. After the civil unrest, Melanchthon was forced to exclude civil regulations from the discussion of adiaphora. Melanchthon had used the term in the Visitation Articles in 1527 and in the *Apologia* of the *Confessio Augustana* in 1531. He referred to human practices and ceremonies that could be observed or omitted without sin for the sake of order in the church. Moreover, changes in church practice could not be legislated by civil authorities without the consent of the church; he was reluctant to allow secular control over adiaphora. Of course, this depended on the political situation in the Saxon territories because Melanchthon did not want the Catholic emperor to have authority over adiaphora.

Melanchthon argued that, "The Spirit of God cannot be dependent upon observances or distinctions of places, times, persons or things that have neither been commanded nor forbidden and need not be observed by necessity." These were things permitted, and adiaphora.¹³ In the Wittenberg unrest, Luther argued that outmoded ceremonies not specifically forbidden or commanded by God—even communion in one kind—could remain for the sake of the weak neighbor and good order. Luther asserted that while secular government enjoys jurisdiction, ecclesiastical government does not. He found it necessary to ask princes to organize evangelical churches, and encouraged his followers to respect princes' decisions on ecclesiastical adiaphora.

After the unrest, there was a reason to define the role of civil magistracy in protecting the new doctrine. When sins have been forgiven, consciences are free, but the Roman Church placed an additional burden on consciences and applied merit to such traditions that earned work-righteousness simply by claiming perfection through those works. Melanchthon valued the civil magistracy and advised the following: 1) one need not obey a prince who acts against the new doctrine; 2) one should obey the magistracy because of public welfare; and 3) even a tyrannical magistracy should be obeyed for the sake of love. Then, regarding ecclesiastical magistracy, Melanchthon advised the following: 1) if it teaches according to Scripture it should be obeyed; 2) if it teaches contrary to Scripture it should not be obeyed; 3) it cannot bind consciences because only Scripture can bind consciences; and 4) Episcopal law should not bind consciences, but sometimes tyrannical laws should be endured because of love. Melanchthon then adds two crucial concepts of obedience to civil and ecclesiastical magistracy: 1) Faith is offended when matters are taught against Scripture, and 2) love is offended if one does not help a needy neighbor or disturbs public peace.¹⁴

¹¹ Clyde L. Manschreck: *A Critical Examination of Philip Melanchthon's Doctrine of Adiaphora* (hereafter, Manschreck 1948), pp. 147, 156, 159.

¹² Manschreck 1948, pp. 147, 152, 156, 159.

¹³ Verkamp 1977, pp. 22–27, 52, 142.

¹⁴ Manschreck 1948, pp. 160–162.

He then gives guidance for obedience to civil and ecclesiastical magistracy: 1) divine law is to be obeyed; 2) indifferent matters are never binding; 3) human traditions may be violated if one wishes to demonstrate what Christian liberty is to those whose knowledge is limited; 4) one should not agree with anyone who requires obedience to indifferent traditions; and 5) considering those who do not know the Gospel, love must prevail and human traditions be kept.¹⁵

Melanchthon was conciliatory in the *Confessio Augustana*, saying that one should not be forced to observe abuses in the traditions that the evangelicals had corrected. He claims that lawful civil ordinances are good works of God and should be obeyed, and if they enforce abuses, they have to be endured as a burden. If the traditions force people to think that they merit grace or satisfaction for sins, they obscure grace and righteousness of faith. The traditions are a danger to one's conscience if one thinks that keeping them is necessary to one's salvation. It is one thing to keep traditions for the purpose of discipline in the Church and another to claim justification from them. Ecclesiastical power is distinct from civil power. The former is the ministry of the word and sacraments; other matters are outward observances. The adiaphoristic ceremonies can be kept for the sake of charity if this furthers peace and order, but not for the sake of merit.¹⁶

Melanchthon further elaborated on the relationship of justification by faith and work-righteousness. It is against the rule for bishops not to preach the new doctrine and to continue upholding abuses in human traditions. Melanchthon argues that, before law can be performed, faith must be received. In this way, good works are put in their proper place and faith makes works good, provided that the foundation of the Church is maintained and new doctrine preached. Melanchthon graciously admitted that one may stumble and that those who do will be corrected and forgiven. He stressed that adiaphora should be observed for the sake of love, even though it may put someone in a disadvantaged position. Through Christ's propitiatory sacrifice, doctrine and adiaphora must be kept clean for other reasons such as love, harmony, and orderly worship.¹⁷

Melanchthon's goal was always unity and love among various denominations versus schism or egoism. It was his attitude toward civil powers as well. We are looking at how his concept of adiaphora was applied in various historical situations. Three categories emerge: 1) the civil category, including civil law and how it affected adiaphora; 2) the personal, for instance in Melanchthon's private enterprise with the king of France; and 3) the theological—what concessions Melanchthon accepted during negotiations and how much he conceded in the interpretation of justification by faith.

In achieving his goals, it was very important for Melanchthon to maintain outward unity—to keep the pope's church structure—but he wanted a different meaning for the things that were defined as adiaphora. Manschreck shows that Melanchthon believed that the schism of the Western Church could be resolved by new doctrine, and he argues that Melanchthon's doctrine of adiaphora was static because of the judicial aspect of justification by faith. This poses two dangers in relation to justification by faith: 1) when an action precedes faith, nothing else is

¹⁵ Manschreck 1948, p. 162.

¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 170, 176.

¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 165, 170, 176.

required; 2) abusing faith alone, nothing else matters. The action of faith is seen in good works. For Melancthon, good works sometimes seemed parallel to justification by faith. The distinction is blurred because good works without faith are not good works. Good works represented the ethical sphere of Christian living for Melancthon, and in this context one may ask how far Christian liberty is free.¹⁸ What are good works, and how much are Christians obliged to follow civil obedience?

Somewhat different concepts of adiaphora emerged from the early English humanists and Reformers. Thomas Starkey, an English humanist, asserted that a distinction had to be made between “spiritual” and “political.” The essential matters of faith belong to the former, while the latter had to do with “indifferent matters” of worldly policy. Separating the spiritual and political, Starkey argued that spiritual unity remains “though there be neuter so moche diversitie of worldly policie.” He followed Marsilius of Padua, and concluded that decisions on adiaphora matters should be left to the prince.¹⁹ Verkamp states that Starkey believed that, through legislation, things indifferent could become necessary to salvation and binding on the conscience, whereas Robert Barnes said no: if by God’s commandment it is indifferent, it cannot be changed.²⁰

As not all English Reformers subscribed to the doctrine of *sola fide*, it is important to consider the differences between the views of the English conservatives, the reform-minded clergy, and the German Reformers on adiaphora.²¹ Whiting asserts with considerable evidence that many early English Reformers adopted the Lutheran view on law and the Gospel—*usus civilis* and *usus theologicus* and Melancthon’s concept *tertius usus legis*.²²

Connected closely to the Wittenberg Reformers, Robert Barnes followed much of their concept of adiaphora. He believed that spiritual authority based on Scripture had no right to order temporal matters. He believed firmly in the doctrine of justification by faith and the authority of Scriptures in the “things indifferent.” According to Barnes, adiaphora matters—for instance clerical celibacy, which he regarded as against the teaching of the new doctrine—were not necessary to salvation, though one might obey indifferent matters for the sake of order.²³ Whiting finds that Luther influenced Barnes’ theology with respect to the doctrine of justification by faith, indifferent matters, and the doctrine of ecclesiology. McEntegart finds Robert Barnes was England’s most prominent Lutheran who advised the embassy to Germany. Barnes also employed significant use of Luther’s writings in his works, and was an ecclesiastical and academic advocate of Lutheran thought in England.²⁴

¹⁸ Manschreck 1948, pp. 153–154, 266–267,

¹⁹ Michael S. Whiting: *Luther in English* 2010, pp. 139–140, 143 (hereafter, Whiting 2010).

²⁰ Verkamp 1977, p. 41.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 22–26, 29.

²² Whiting 2010, pp. 9–15.

²³ William Clebsch: *England’s Earliest Protestants 1520–1535*. 1964, pp. 63–64 (hereafter, Clebsch 1964).

²⁴ Rory McEntegart: *Henry VIII and the German Lutherans: A Reassessment*. 2010, p. 39. In *Sister Reformations*. Ed. Dorothea Wendebourg; Carl R. Trueman: *Early English Evangelicals: Three Examples*. 2010, p. 17. In *Sister Reformations*. Ed. Dorothea Wendebourg (hereafter, Trueman 2010); Martin Ohst: *Martyrdom in the German and English Reformation*. 2010, p. 258–259. In *Sister Reformations*. Ed. Dorothea Wendebourg; Whiting 2010, pp. 315–316, 320.

An early evangelical English Protestant, John Frith, understood human depravity and believed in justification by faith in Christ alone and the obligation of the Christian to love his or her neighbor, which reflected Luther's theology of Law and Gospel and the righteousness of justification in Christ by faith alone. In addition, Whiting discerns Luther's influence on Firth's Christology—faith alone.²⁵ As he rejected the church's sacramental teaching, he believed that the liturgical symbols surrounding the Eucharist celebration were theoretically “indifferent” to faith as long as instruction was given about their meaning.²⁶ Clebsch notes that Frith did not follow Melanchthon in distinguishing between ceremonies and practice as essential and non-essential. Clebsch further states that for Frith, ceremonies in themselves were neither good nor bad, but indifferent. In fact, Clebsch concludes that Frith regarded all external religion as indifferent in comparison to the essential doctrine of faith, i.e., a believer walks humbly *coram deo*.²⁷

Melanchthon had support among the reform-minded clergy in England. Other parallels can be drawn between continental and English Reformers. Clebsch describes John Frith, a supporter of Reformation at Oxford, as “the Melanchthon of the English Reformation,” in relation to the doctrine of adiaphora. Clebsch finds Frith's theocentric theology, concentrated on Christology, as the key to his soteriology, ecclesiology, and ethics. Frith taught justification by faith, but not in as mature a way as Melanchthon.²⁸ Sometimes the English humanists' concepts differed so that it is hard to distinguish Luther's supporters. For example, Whiting argues that William Tyndale's *Obedience of a Christian Man* is not in conflict with Luther's law-gospel theology. Whiting argues against Clebsch's view that there was a shift in Tyndale's theology from faith alone to moral law and good works after justification, since Clebsch interprets Tyndale's theology as based on the concept of a divine-human contract. Even though for Tyndale the ceremonial rules of the Old Testament were no longer binding because Christ delivered men, these rules did remain as a guide.²⁹ Whiting agrees with Clebsch that Tyndale shifted toward a legalistic evaluation of the law, but Tyndale had made it clear that true fulfillment of the law comes from faith. Whiting suggests that Tyndale agreed with Luther on Christian liberty as freedom from the burden of the law. Tyndale did not deny the authority of the church or its hermeneutical methods, but sought to emphasize the historical, literary, and rhetorical interpretation of the Scripture in its original languages as a humanist and an admirer of Erasmus. Whiting finds that Tyndale clearly follows Luther's law-gospel theology: repentance, faith alone in Christ for forgiveness, and favor with God resulting in love and submission to God's commandments.³⁰ The question arose regarding whose prerogative it was to legislate adiaphora—whether ecclesiastical or local civil authorities. The English and Continental Reformers admitted that the resolution of the binding force of civil law on adiaphoristic matters was unclear, as was the dividing line between secular and spiritual authority—whether the

²⁵ Whiting 2010, pp. 291, 293.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 304–306.

²⁷ Clebsch 1964, pp. 120, 318.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 78–107, 115–116, 134.

²⁹ Whiting 2010, pp. 223, 233; Clebsch 1964, pp. 154–159, 165–166, 181.

³⁰ Whiting 2010, pp. 177, 183, 210, 221, 241–242; Clebsch 1964, pp. 165–166, 174–175.

discussion referred either to civil or ecclesiastical laws or both, which in turn reflected the relationship between church and state.³¹

For Melancthon, the ethical road is so strong it is difficult to see it separated from doctrine of justification, which makes both of them difficult to interpret. What are the good works, and how much are Christians obliged to follow civil obedience?

Philip Melancthon (1497–1560)

Born Philip Schwartzertdt³² on February 16, 1497, at Bretten, he was named after his father's employer and prince, the Elector of the Palatine, Philip the Upright. His father, George, was an armorer who died early in 1508. His mother's brother, the humanist Johannes Reuchlin, became Philip's patron. Reuchlin inspired Philip with Greek studies and named him "Melancthon" (Schwartz-erde).³³

Melancthon studied at the universities of Heidelberg and Tübingen where he earned both bachelor's and master's degrees. As Frederick the Wise of Saxony was looking for scholars for the newly founded University of Wittenberg, Reuchlin recommended his nephew.³⁴ In 1518, Melancthon was invited by the Elector of Saxony to the newly created professorship in Greek at the University of Wittenberg.³⁵ Melancthon attended the Leipzig debate with John Eck in 1519. The main topic was related to differences in biblical authority, and Melancthon developed his concepts of biblical unity in the context of Luther's theology and his own linguistic theory that made Scripture unique.³⁶

In September 1519, Melancthon earned his Baccalaureus Biblicus degree defending theses on justification and Scriptural authority.³⁷ In Wittenberg during Luther's exile, issues came up regarding the worship ceremonies applicable to new doctrine. In response, Melancthon wrote his most influential *Loci Communes* in 1521, which shows how he defined various scriptural topics; for example the concepts of "grace, sin, law, and Gospel in relation to justification, the Old and New Testaments and Sacraments."³⁸ During the years between 1525 and 1535, he familiarized himself with both the doctrines and the politics of the Catholic Church. As a result, he wrote a second edition of *Loci Communes*, which came out in 1535 and flattered Henry VIII with a dedication.³⁹

Melancthon's more mature position on Christ's righteousness is seen in the Commentary on Colossians of 1527, in which he refutes the demand to use Mosaic laws about civil matters. In the second edition of the Colossians, Melancthon makes a personal attack against Erasmus

³¹ Verkamp 1977, pp. 52, 141.

³² The spelling "Philip Melancthon" will be used in this study (Philipp and Philippe are commonly found variants).

³³ Timothy Wengert: *Philip Melancthon, Speaker of the Reformation* 2010, I, p. 15 (hereafter, Wengert 2010).

³⁴ John R. Schneider: *Philip Melancthon's Rhetorical Construal of Biblical Authority*. 1990, pp. 51–52 (hereafter, Schneider 1990); John Schofield: *Philip Melancthon and the English Reformation*. 2006, p. 9 (hereafter, Schofield 2006).

³⁵ Wengert 2010, I, p. 19; Schofield 2006, p. 9.

³⁶ Schneider 1990, pp. 118–120 Wengert, XII, p. 21.

³⁷ Schneider 1990, p. 130; Schofield 2006, p. 15.

³⁸ Schneider 1990, pp. 206–207; Schofield 2006, p. 17.

³⁹ Wengert 2010, XII, pp. 19, 23.

stating that he added little to what Luther had clarified on the bondage of will. Citing Scripture, Melanchthon distinguished Christ's rule from the duty of earthly authorities; that is, who maintained order and approved Christians serving in magisterial office.⁴⁰

Several scholars agree that Melanchthon had a European-wide reputation and made an impact through his correspondence and theological counsel that established concord and unity of the church.⁴¹ He profoundly changed the way of thinking in the Europe of his day, and has been called the Praeceptor of Early Modern Europe.⁴² In his Instructions of the Visitors to the Preachers, published in 1527, Melanchthon reformed the regulations for churches and set up practical church reforms, presenting the evangelical doctrine of salvation without attacking the Catholic Church.⁴³ Since the church did not have a developed administrative structure, much of it fell into the hands of a secular ruler.⁴⁴ From these reforms, Melanchthon developed the nature of the church: pure confession of the doctrine of the Gospel, use of sacraments according to institution, and ministry of the Gospel.⁴⁵

In 1526, during the first Diet of Speyer, Emperor Charles would hear the Protestants before a Church Council, but for the second Diet of Speyer three years later and instead of the promised concessions, Charles invited the Protestants and Catholics to the Diet of Augsburg April 8, in 1530, hoping to end the Western Christian schism in the Church.⁴⁶

Initially, the purpose of the Diet at Augsburg was to create a united Protestant front to end the disagreements. Melanchthon hoped to unite Protestants and Catholics. In March/April 1530, Melanchthon, Luther, and Justus Jonas Bugenhagen joined the Elector of Saxony at Torgau. Luther had to stay in Coburg, since he was still under an imperial ban. The Torgau articles, written by Melanchthon, later became the second part of his *Confessio Augustana*, published in June 1530. It was the first conscious effort by the Protestants to declare their faith before the emperor and empire.⁴⁷

Melanchthon used the Fourteen Articles of Marburg, with the hope that it would be acceptable to moderate Catholics and would serve as the basis for further negotiations. He presented his formulation, the *Confessio Augustana*, to the emperor on August 25, 1530. As a result, the emperor enforced the Edict of Worms which was protested by the evangelical minority. That same year, the Protestant cities and territories agreed to form an alliance to defend

⁴⁰ Wengert 2010, II, p. 137; III, p. 122; VI, p. 117; IX, p. 44; Schofield 2006, pp. 36–37.

⁴¹ Irene Dingel: *Melanchthon's Paraphrases of the Augsburg Confession, 1534 and 1536, in the Service of the Smalcald League*. In *Philip Melanchthon*. Ed. Irene Dingel, Robert Kolb, Nicole Kuroпка and Timothy J. Wengert. 2012, p. 104 (hereafter, Dingel 2012a).

⁴² Ann Moss: *Truth and Fiction: Melanchthon as Medium for Change*. In *Melanchthon und Europa*. 6/2, 2002, p. 267 (hereafter, Moss 2002).

⁴³ Sachiko Kusakawa: *The Reception of Melanchthon in Sixteenth-Century Cambridge and Oxford*. In *Melanchthon und Europa*. 6/2, 2002, p. 233 (hereafter, Kusakawa 2002); Wengert 2010, I, p. 31; Schofield 2006, pp. 23–24.

⁴⁴ Wengert 2010, I, p. 31; Diarmaid MacCulloch: *Reformation*. 2003, pp. 164–165 (hereafter, MacCulloch 2003).

⁴⁵ Schofield 2006, pp. 29, 43, 51.

⁴⁶ MacCulloch 2003, pp. 172–173. Steven Ozment: *The Age of Reform, 1250–1550*. 1980, pp. 235–236 (hereafter, Ozment 1980).

⁴⁷ Maurer 1986, Introduction, pp. 10–13; Schofield 2006, pp. 43–44.

against possible attack by the emperor. This became the Schmalkaldic League, the most powerful political force in Europe.⁴⁸

Based on Melanchthon's understanding, the law and the gospel are systematically and theologically interconnected, in that they form the basis for the doctrine of justification by faith in the *Confessio Augustana* (1530) and Apology (1531). The Catholic response to the *Confessio Augustana* was read publicly at the Diet of Augsburg on August 3, 1530, in the form of the Confutation. It concentrated on three major disagreements: communion, clerical marriage, and the Mass. When the emperor declared that he accepted the Confutation and advised the Protestants to agree to it as well, this only widened the division between the Catholics and the Protestants.⁴⁹ In the Apology, Melanchthon dealt with his critics with great clarity concerning "the justifying faith opposing the historical one; law and gospel, Christ's righteousness, the assurance of salvation, fulfilling law and Christian charity."⁵⁰

Melanchthon's negotiating skills were apparent during the Diet of Augsburg in 1530 when he led the delegation of Saxon theologians. Melanchthon focused on the articles on abuses to avoid scrutiny of the doctrinal parts of the articles. He supported the most minimal acceptance of the so-called abuses of the Church: communion in both kinds, marriage of priests, private Masses, and monastic vows.⁵¹

The situation was diplomatically difficult for Melanchthon, who presented the evangelical doctrine—recovering writings of the Church Fathers—and asked the emperor to protect it, requesting only minimal consensus for unity. The article on the Church (CA 8) is said to be a diplomatic masterpiece, except for noting the primacy of the pope, if one wishes to interpret it in such a way.⁵²

Melanchthon did not discuss the doctrinal points of the *Confessio Augustana* of 1530, as this, in his mind, was the correct teaching of the Catholic Church. To him only the rituals and the doctrine of justification by faith divided Catholics and Protestants. Thanks to this negotiating tactic, it appeared that Melanchthon made more significant concessions than he actually did. He saw that a stable church could not be established on confessional rhetoric and was a moderate and a conciliator for this particular reason.⁵³

The Catholics asked if the Protestants were willing to restore obedience to bishops who had lost power in their regions. Melanchthon was willing to give the princes power over the churches, and also to consider more episcopal authority. He saw that the church needed polity and a structure. If Catholic bishops were to be restored, they would have to act differently, respecting the teaching of the *Confessio Augustana* on bishops' power, the Eucharist and the issue of married priests. Hence, problems ensued around three questions: If the Canon of the

⁴⁸ MacCulloch 2003, pp. 173–174; Ozment 1980, p. 256–257.

⁴⁹ Rory McEntegart: *Henry VIII, the League of Schmalkalden and the English Reformation*. 2002, p. 12 (hereafter, McEntegart 2002); Kusakawa 2002, p. 234; Schofield 2006, p. 44.

⁵⁰ Schofield 2006, p. 46.

⁵¹ Euan Cameron: *The Possibilities and Limits of Conciliation: Philipp Melanchthon and Inter-Confessional Dialogue in the Sixteenth Century*. 2004, p. 75 (hereafter, Cameron 2004).

⁵² Athina Lexutt: *Verbum Dei iudex. Melanchthon's Kirchenverständnis*. 2006, pp. 32–33. In *Konfrontation und Dialog*. Herausgegeben von Günter Frank und Stephan Meier-Oeser (hereafter, Lexutt 2006).

⁵³ Cameron 2004, pp. 77–78, 83.

Mass was restored, how could the Lutheran interpretation of the Eucharist be retained? Would the Protestants accept a bishop that simulated Protestantism and persecuted it somewhere else, as demanded by the Catholics? Would the Lutherans be forced to agree to receive the Eucharist in one kind?⁵⁴

The German princes, who had signed the *Confessio Augustana*, became more alarmed at the emperor's imposition of what they regarded as an unlawful magistrate, an enemy of their political liberty, and religious beliefs, imposing religion by force. They believed that the estates should have shared sovereignty—*cura religionis*. Charles' brother, Ferdinand of Bohemia and Hungary, gained a third crown as King of the Romans (king of the German territories) in 1531 and, from then on, took care of German affairs for Charles.⁵⁵

On February 27, 1531, the Protestants formed a defensive alliance of princes and cities under the leadership of John Frederick, Elector of Saxony, and Philip the Landgrave of Hesse. The purpose of this political-ecclesiastical alliance was to defend its members against any aggression from the emperor. This alarmed Charles, and he decided to conclude the Peace of Nuremberg between the empire and the Schmalkaldic League in 1532. The Schmalkaldic League operated for fifteen years until it was dissolved in 1547. Its constitution was approved on December 23, 1535, during the time of the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations.⁵⁶

Melanchthon's humanistic philosophy, conciliatory spirit, and increasing fame led to invitations from King Francis I of France and Henry VIII of England to visit their countries in the interest of ecclesiastical reforms as they had made contacts with the Schmalkaldic League. As these kings reformed their churches, they looked to Melanchthon, because of his humanistic connection to these national monarchies. They did so with the intention of establishing unity of the churches in the spirit of unity.⁵⁷

Melanchthon's early connections to Henry were related to Henry's desire for Melanchthon's opinion about his divorce from Catherine of Aragon. Thus Melanchthon acted as a diplomatic representative of Wittenberg. His influence on English theology in regard to adiaphora and related church policy will be discussed in subsequent chapters in the context of the English Reformation. Schofield has demonstrated that Melanchthon was a Reformer in his own right. This is relevant to the analysis of his exchanges with Henry VIII. Henry was looking for continental allies, and was interested in discussions with Melanchthon about faith alone and good works.⁵⁸

The most controversial doctrine among the Protestants was the Lord's Supper. Melanchthon supported Luther's side. Brady notes that the Schwabach Articles, the uncompromising Lutheran statement on the Lord's Supper, reunited the evangelical churches in the north and south of the

⁵⁴ Cameron 2004, pp. 76–77.

⁵⁵ Thomas A. Brady Jr.: *German Histories in the Age of Reformation*. 2009, pp. 208, 219 (hereafter, Brady 2009).

⁵⁶ Brady 2009, p. 220; Thomas A. Brady Jr.: *Communities, Politics and Reformation in Early Modern Europe*, 1998, pp. 109, 119–120 (hereafter, Brady 1998). MacCulloch 2003, p. 174.

⁵⁷ Armin Kohnle: *Philip Melanchthon und die Bündnisverhandlungen mit Frankreich und England 1534 bis 1536*. In *Philip Melanchthon*. Hrsg. Irene Dingel, Armin Kohnle. 2011, pp. 43–44, 47–50 (hereafter, Kohnle 2011); Dingel 2012, p. 105.

⁵⁸ Diarmaid MacCulloch: *Thomas Cranmer*. 1996, pp. 63–66 (hereafter, MacCulloch 1996); Schofield 2006, pp. 53–54; Kohnle 2011, p. 44.

Holy Roman Empire (excluding the Swiss) on this doctrine. The final agreement was not achieved until the Wittenberg Concord of 1536. Melanchthon had the ability to discuss various opinions even with his opponents. For this reason he has been suspected of giving up essential positions of Lutheran theology. From the pope's point of view, the discussion of religious differences should have been handled in a church council, but this became a point of conflict between him and the independent monarchs of Europe.⁵⁹

Recent scholarship suggests that Melanchthon's conciliatory efforts consisted of sound Lutheran doctrine. According to his own estimate, his goal in negotiations was always clarity and frankness. This author concurs with Kohnle that Melanchthon was the one who gave voice to the collective of Wittenberg, and could not evade serving as an advisor in political affairs as "diplomatic external representative" of Wittenberg. His confessional opponents respected him because of his character and humanistic virtues, as well as his willingness to communicate. These attributes, however, could easily be interpreted as weakness, unreliability and inability to hold to an essential position. Conciliatory by nature, Melanchthon made a major effort towards mediation between Protestants and Catholics.⁶⁰

Challenges to the Church

Doctrinal diversity significantly weakened the church's authority, which led to lay participation and further weakened the authority of the pope. This was temporarily halted due to the fight between conciliarists and curialists, which then created the opportunity for secular rulers to have more say in the church. The medieval system of seven sacraments, doctrine of work-righteousness, and centering of worship around the Mass were broken down by the new teaching of the doctrine of salvation.⁶¹ In addition, in discussion on Scripture and Tradition it is important to understand its exegetical interpretation during the Reformation. Tradition was crucial in the life of the church, as the theologians quoted the Church Fathers. There were two ways to understand the Scripture–Church relationship: 1) Scripture was sufficient but for its authority required to be interpreted within the continuing life of the Church. 2) Other than the tradition found in Scripture, there was a second authoritative source—unwritten knowledge that could not be deduced from Scripture. The Reformers set up Scripture against the institutional Church; as they said, Scripture can judge the Church. The scriptural principle known as Scripture alone became the Reformers' authority. The phrase Scripture alone should be understood as the Reformers' conscious desire to oppose tradition, which they saw as a threat to new doctrine or as opposition to the message of salvation in Christ. Verkamp finds that both of these traditions could claim their supporters during the Reformation polemics on the authority of Scripture as interpreted by the church. Melanchthon supported the authority of Scripture alone, as did the evangelical English clergy.⁶²

⁵⁹ Wengert 2010, I, pp. 17–18; Brady 1998, p. 51; MacCulloch 2003, p. 177.

⁶⁰ Kohnle. 2011, pp. 44–45; Cameron 2004, pp. 73–75.

⁶¹ Richard Rex: *Henry and the English Reformation* 2006, pp. 57–58 (hereafter, Rex 2006); Alister McGrath: *The Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation*. 1987, pp. 2, 4 (hereafter, McGrath 1987).

⁶² Cameron 2012, pp. 94–95, 163, 166, 171; Oberman 1967, pp. 54–55. See McGrath 1987, p. 142; Verkamp 1977, p. 162.

The reduced authority of the pope also affected changes in church authority in England, as Henry became the head of the church. It was during this turmoil in the English Church that Henry became interested in inviting Melanchthon to consult with him.

A discussion of the challenges to the church during the late medieval period will elucidate how the Reformers responded in the early part of the sixteenth century. Some of these challenges are discussed in more depth in the sections on Scripture and Tradition, and Salvation and the Sacrament below. The late medieval Church experienced a period of great creative theological speculation, which led to theological pluralism and various kinds of educational programs in the universities and the church. This theological pluralism led to a crisis of theological authority, while intellectual movements of the Renaissance and scholasticism developed diverse theological opinions to fit this environment of pluralism. The Church did not make attempts to reform any of these diverse opinions.⁶³ Renaissance and humanism both convey that new things happened in church and society in Europe. The term “civic humanism” used the ancient society as model for constructing a form of government, a republic for the common good of the people, which also supported humanist learning.

Ecumenical Councils of the Church representing all Christendom were held by the medieval Western Church. The Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 and the Great Schism (1378–1417), when two parts of Europe had two popes, increased the council’s authority compared to that of the pope. The pluralism within certain doctrinal areas led to a crisis within the Church, as ecclesiastical authority was faced by a lay consciousness. Soon after the ending of the Great Schism at the Council of Constance (1414–1417) (*Haec Sancta Synodus*), obedience was commanded of the popes. Also, the right to meet regularly was propounded (*Frequens* 1417). As the Council’s authority came directly from Christ, the popes were compelled to respect it.⁶⁴ Because lay people had authority, further disagreement ensued and Pius II undermined the conciliarist position. His publication of *Execrabilis* in 1460 did not solve the problems of the conciliar movement. One such problem was determining who had authority to decide theological questions in appeals from the Council itself, which had claimed such authority⁶⁵

Many humanists were critical of the church, especially the priests. The great humanist Erasmus, educated in *devotio moderna*, criticized the monastic system and ceremonies, along with scholastic theology and its superstitious popular piety, on the grounds that spreading these ideas weakened the power of the institutional Church. Erasmus applied his humanist learning to Christian texts and provided critical editions of Christian texts and the New Testament, which became an inspiration to Protestant Reformers.⁶⁶ For example, northern humanism has been regarded as the intellectual origin of the Reformation, as it was interested in the cultural (*bonae litterae*), religious, and political programs aimed at peace. Italian classical scholarship led northern European humanists such as Erasmus to appeal to the New Testament and the Church Fathers as their authoritative sources. This, in turn, reduced the pope’s authority as sole interpreter of the Scriptures. Humanism was a contributing factor to the philological methods

⁶³ MacCulloch 2003, pp. 76–77; McGrath 1987, pp. 2–4, 28.

⁶⁴ MacCulloch 2003, p. 35, 39; Cameron 2012, p. 54–56.

⁶⁵ MacCulloch 2003, p. 39; Cameron 2012, p. 56.

⁶⁶ MacCulloch 2003, pp. 98–99; Cameron 2012, p. 69.

used by the Reformers, even though they formed their hermeneutical interpretation of the texts independently. One may conclude that the Reformers were reliant on the humanist movement while propagating their message of *sola fide*. Melancthon's *Loci Communes* of 1521 was the first systematic theology influenced by classical rhetoric tradition.⁶⁷

Scripture and Tradition

The exegetical tradition changed during the Reformation, affecting the English and German theologians' interpretation of the divine laws. This chapter presents an outline of the medieval period, which used to be characterized as proclaiming that Scripture and Tradition had authority, whereas in the Reformation period, authority was claimed for Scripture alone: by *sola scriptura*, which would mean a break with the tradition of the medieval Church. McGrath challenges the idea that *sola scriptura* only belonged to the Reformation period, stating that there is evidence that Scripture was held forth as the material basis of Christian theology, i.e., that Scripture contained all that was necessary to salvation during the Middle Ages. The question of Scripture and Tradition during the medieval period was much more complex, and understanding their relationship had consequences to the divisions during the Reformation.⁶⁸

Instead of seeking individual forerunners of the Reformation, Oberman suggests looking for phenomena common to the medieval period and the Reformation. One can identify various interpretations of Scripture, Tradition, the doctrine of the church, the doctrine of justification by faith, sacramental theology, and biblical exegesis.⁶⁹ Biblical exegesis applies to the Reformers' claims about biblical authority. For instance, the Augustinian doctrine of sin and grace was the doctrine supported by the Saxon Reformers. Originally, *regula fidei* was established against the Gnostics, and thus all truths necessary to salvation were given in Scripture; the exegesis of Scripture was interpreted in the context of the church. McGrath argues that the pope was the interpreter of Scripture. Citing Oberman, he presents two theories of the relationship between Scripture and Tradition: 1) Tradition I, in which Scripture and Tradition are coterminous and co-inhere; and 2) Tradition II, which includes an extra-scriptural oral tradition as a theological source in addition to Scripture, but where they do not co-inhere. Scholars have seen the disintegration of medieval synthesis in the latter, opposing the Reformers' principle of Scripture alone.⁷⁰

Oberman cites Basil of Caesarea, who traced certain liturgical developments to non-canonical ecclesiastical traditions, either written or oral, that should be treated with respect. Gratian does not mean canon law is divine as it pertains to divine revelation. Canon law drew from Scripture and mores (customary practice or human law), i.e., natural law (immutable, divinely revealed law). The latter was to be revised by the pope, who had no authority to alter divinely revealed truth. The canonists tried to differentiate human from divine in canon law.

⁶⁷ MacCulloch 2003, p. 99; McGrath 1987, pp. 38, 40, 63–64.

⁶⁸ McGrath 1987, pp. 137–139.

⁶⁹ Oberman, Heiko: *Forerunners of the Reformation*. 1967, pp. 35–36, 39, 42 (hereafter, Oberman 1967).

⁷⁰ McGrath 1987, pp. 141–142.

The canonists' approaches have to be considered separately, as theology and law are separate from doctrine and discipline, but sometimes they overlap, as seen when identifying heresy. The pope's role is as arbiter of disputed matters. Thus, it was claimed that Scripture had priority in doctrine, but interpretation of Scripture is left to the pope, and thus he is not a source of extra-scriptural tradition. Theological authority is from Scripture, but in specific restricted matters through the pope and also in the area of ecclesiastical discipline. Oberman believes that the two-source theory is derived from canon law tradition, even though the decretals do not support an extra-scriptural doctrinal source. McGrath claims that Oberman does not separate the permanent truth of doctrine and the provisional ruling of church discipline.⁷¹ There were many who thought, as Oberman does, that many truths that are necessary to salvation are not contained in Scripture, such as the Apostle's creed, the See of Peter being transferred from Antioch to Rome, and the Roman popes succeeding Peter. Biel notes that the time and place of the institution of the sacraments of baptism and confirmation are unknown, and yet we must believe that they were instituted. The idea of "unwritten tradition" tended to be employed in subsidiary areas of Christian theology, e.g., extreme unction, consecration of the chalice, and validity of indulgences. Extra-scriptural tradition was less prominent than expected, and related mainly to liturgical practices and church discipline.⁷²

The new understanding of Scripture as the sole authority for faith and practice in the church replaced the authority of the church to interpret the particular ceremonies inherited from the Middle Ages, which in the new context of the sixteenth-century Reformation needed to be interpreted within the framework of faith and Scripture alone. Many Roman theologians considered Tradition to be a source of revelation in addition to Scripture. There was a shift from understanding the divine authority of church laws, such as extra-scriptural traditions that could bind consciences, to a new understanding of divine law in Scripture that was applied to the interpretation of ceremonies inherited from the medieval church.⁷³ The claim for scriptural authority in matters of faith affected the doctrine of soteriology and brought in a new understanding of the sacraments as a medium of grace.

The medieval interpretation of the traditional ceremonies changed during the Reformation. The ceremonies were to be interpreted in a context of faith and Scripture. Verkamp notes that even though Gerson regarded Scripture as necessary to salvation, he included the extra-scriptural revelation; if any one ceremony belonged to extra-scriptural tradition, it became part of divine law binding consciences. The extra-scriptural tradition became a separate but equal source of revelation alongside of Scripture.⁷⁴

Salvation and Sacraments

The doctrine of justification by faith was the central doctrine from which all other doctrinal statements were derived during the sixteenth century. In this section we will see what the

⁷¹ McGrath 1987, pp. 143–144, 146.

⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 146–147.

⁷³ Verkakmp 1977, pp. 14, 44–45, 49.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 14, 45–46, 49.

church's teaching was on this doctrine and how it later divided the Reformers. In addition we will discuss what kind of role the sacraments and ritual played in the medieval church, to better understand how people's lives were changed when the church's doctrine changed.

Even though the pope was the one who interpreted Scripture, doctrinal pluralism remained and the official teaching of the church was no longer clear. Which doctrines were the official teachings of the church? Which were theological opinions? Clarity on this was particularly essential in the doctrine of justification by faith. The Council of Carthage in 418 had ended the Pelagian controversy. Its doctrine of justification teaches the impotence of human free will unless aided by grace. The Second Council of Orange in 529 rejected the notion that man can take initiative in salvation. While the Council of Orange noted that the *liberum arbitrium* doctrine had weakened, it did not question it and also endorsed Augustine's doctrine of justification. However, during 1529–1546, the Church had not made any magisterial statement on this doctrine, and since the decisions of 529 were not available to theologians of the Middle Ages; they had to rely on the decisions made at Carthage.⁷⁵

Besides the official doctrine, there emerges a variety of schools. The diverse opinions on the theologies of justification by faith emerged as follows: 1) *via antiqua* following Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus. Thomas supported a fourfold *processus* of justification as infusion of grace, free will directed to God through faith, moving away from sin, and remission of sin.⁷⁶ 2) The other medieval movement of *via moderna* understood the relationship between God and man as a covenant, weakening the elements of the *processus*. William Ockham and Jan Gerson claimed that unselfish love or merit (*congruent merit*) in the sacrament of penance was the way a person could be restored to a state of grace. The habit of grace infused by the Holy Spirit led to right actions that would then earn more merit (*condign merit*), which justly saved. Representatives of the *via moderna*, Wessel Gansfort and Johann Pupper von Goch, argued that all human acts were part of the direct action of divine grace; therefore, good works help the human soul for salvation.

The church held its power through preaching the lifelong cycle of sin, absolution, and penance, and forgiveness offered through the church's sacrament of penance to which confession and satisfaction belonged. The church had the power to forgive sins through indulgences. However, when people were persuaded to believe differently about salvation, the church was unable to support the new doctrine, and its authority collapsed. The old system of salvation supported by the church was based on work-righteousness expressed in purgatory and indulgences, and people gradually questioned these as a means to salvation.⁷⁷

In addition, the medieval church gave people structure for their social lives, including the celebration of the seven sacraments, the Mass, and participation in medieval piety expressed non-verbally, but also through listening to preaching. The popular religion in medieval England was visual and involved ritual activity, as shown in the importance of shrines and through pilgrimages. Medieval England was Catholic and religion was part of everyday life with the church at its center. Access to the saving grace of Christ was offered to the members of the

⁷⁵ Alister E. McGrath: *Iustitia Dei. A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*. 1998, pp. 24–25, 73–74 (hereafter, McGrath 1998).

⁷⁶ McGrath 1998, p. 44.

⁷⁷ Rex 2006, 57–59; Cameron 2012, pp. 84–87, 160.

church through baptism and the Eucharist. The Mass was seen as the most efficacious prayer because it was believed that it represented Christ's saving sacrifice on the Cross for sin. The performance of Mass for the dead became common religious practice connected to the doctrine of purgatory.⁷⁸

The center of the service was the Mass liturgy and the adoration of the Host. The Eucharist, the center of the Mass was a re-enactment of the Lord's Supper with sacramental rites and processions. The "pax," an engraved plate passed during the Mass, was a sign of unity among the parishioners. Mass services were said in Latin, a tongue not understood by many parishioners. Ordinary lay people prayed using a common medieval book called the *Prymer*.⁷⁹ Reconciliation was offered through the sacrament of penance and after confessing sins, one received absolution from the priest. Access to the intercession of the saints, through their clothes, images, and bones, gave rise to veneration of images and shrines. The doctrine of the cult of the saints, the sacrifice of the Mass, and purgatory distinguished medieval Catholicism from any other period of Catholicism and Christianity. Private Masses were celebrated for specific "private" intentions. The parish churches were decorated with paintings and carvings and statues, many with catechetical purposes illustrating the seven sacraments, sacred history of the Bible, and lives of saints. The most essential means of instruction was the preaching of sermons.⁸⁰ When all these things were later destroyed, it was as if the lifeblood of the people was drained and so they rebelled.

The Lollards, a group of lay parishioners, opposed the corruption of the medieval Church, the power of the priests, images, pilgrimages, prayers to the saints, and sacraments and advocated a return to Scripture. In this manner they contributed to Protestantism. Dickens sees in them a connection to early Lutherans with their non-hierarchical approach to religion based on Scripture that created an underground receptive environment for the continental Reformers' message.⁸¹ Cameron has demonstrated that the Lollards' ancestry goes back to the fourteenth century, and that they continued to trouble the authorities with their heresies until the eve of the Reformation.⁸²

By the time of the Reformation, there were two religious factions in England. One was the conservative party that wished to keep old ceremonies and doctrine, led by Stephen Gardiner, the Bishop of Winchester (c. 1483–1555). He wanted a separation of royal power from episcopal power.⁸³ Many of the conservative clergy still wholeheartedly regretted the break with Rome. The reform-minded clergy, led by Thomas Cranmer (1489–1556), the Archbishop of Canterbury, wished to reform doctrine, and believed that the king should be the overseer of the episcopacy, since episcopacy came from God and the king.⁸⁴ The conservatives wanted to retain the old

⁷⁸ Rex 2006, pp. 57–59, 63. Cameron 2012, pp. 11–15, 84–87.

⁷⁹ Rex 2006, pp. 62, 69; C. W. Dugmore: *The Mass and the English Reformers*. 1958, pp. 65, 72–75 (hereafter, Dugmore 1958).

⁸⁰ Rex 2006, pp. 57–60, 63.

⁸¹ A. G. Dickens: *The English Reformation* 1991, pp. 56–59 (hereafter, Dickens 1991).

⁸² Cameron 2012, pp. 79–81.

⁸³ Andrew Allan Chibi: *Henry VIII's Bishops* 2003. Biographical Information, p. 297 (hereafter, Chibi 2003); Dugmore 1958, p. 105.

⁸⁴ Chibi 2003, p. 293; Dugmore 1958, p. 106.

Catholic doctrines and ceremonies, but without the pope, since they accepted the supremacy of the king. They also upheld the so-called Scripture and Tradition principle, which looked to Scripture and Tradition as sources of divine authority. The reform-minded clergy wished to proceed with significant doctrinal reforms and upheld the so-called Scripture alone principle, wherein Scripture was the source of divine authority, not Tradition.⁸⁵

Shifting Authority from Church to State

The reforms did not only occur in the Church but also in the national churches that became more independent from the pope and established laws curtailing the Church's authority in their respective countries. The pope led Christendom as a spiritual realm embracing national boundaries that included the whole political map of Europe, with provinces of religious orders that paralleled national boundaries. Each country had nominated cardinal-protectors as a national representative. The Church's power lay in the successful cooperation of the lay ruler. *Præmunire* statutes curtailed the pope's power in England.⁸⁶

Although the medieval English Church had acknowledged the spiritual overlordship and jurisdiction of the pope, English kings had quarreled with popes at various times during the Middle Ages. The Great Statute of *Præmunire* of 1393 had a paralyzing effect on the English clergy during Henry VIII's reign. This statute was enacted against Pope Boniface IX, who threatened to excommunicate bishops who were enforcing ecclesiastical benefices and accepting secular offices, thus threatening the unity of the nation. Even though the pope had to approve the nominations to English sees, the king was able to exercise his veto if he did not approve the nomination. The situation in the German Church was more complicated. In the 1447 'Princes' Concordat, at the end of the Council of Constance (1447), princes made promises to alleviate the offensive intrusion of papal bureaucracy into the revenues of the German Church.⁸⁷

Reforms continued within the Empire. One of the Catholic reformers after the Council of Basel, Nicholas of Cusa (1401–1464), in Book III of his *De Concordantia Catholica*, applied ecclesiastical principles to the Holy Roman Empire. One such example was a conciliar organization in the form of an imperial government council, and he suggested that similar councils be formed to administer the empire's regions, which mirrored the Church provinces and their synods. The Holy Roman Empire was reformed from the fusion of *spiritualia* and *temporalia* in the prince-bishoprics which later formed new states, thus moving from religious authority to temporal rulers, except for the Roman papacy.⁸⁸

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, Catholic Europe was no longer unified. There were various points of views concerning church and state in the later Middle Ages. The popes wanted to subordinate secular to ecclesiastical power, but the royal publicists wished to reverse the

⁸⁵ Dugmore 1958, pp. 105–106; Oberman 1967, pp. 62–65.

⁸⁶ Cameron 2012, pp. 56–59.

⁸⁷ Dickens 1991, pp. 109–110; Kenneth Carleton: *Bishops and Reform in the English Church, 1520–1559*. 2001, p. 7 (hereafter, Carleton 2001). Daniel Eppley: *Defending Royal Supremacy* 2007, p. 5 (hereafter, Eppley 2007); Cameron 2012, pp. 59–60.

⁸⁸ Thomas A. Brady, Jr.: *The Holy Roman Empire's Bishops on the Eve of the Reformation*. 2000, pp. 44–45 (hereafter, Brady 2000).

pope's argument or to at the very least acknowledge the autonomy of both, as supported by Thomas Aquinas. The balance was never achieved but the secular gained superiority in the emergence of the nation-states of Europe. The power struggle within the church—between the authority of the pope and the council—was debated. Separation of church and state became a key idea. The more power the pope claimed, the more the secular rulers opposed it to secure their own powers, and began to support the conciliar movement, insisting that Christ was above the pope's council. First, the opinion was for the council to be completely subordinate to the pope; second, the pope and the council were to share authority, but with the pope having higher authority; third, they would share authority, but the council would have the upper hand; and fourth, the pope should be subordinate to a General Council.⁸⁹

Marsilius of Padua supported the last-mentioned opinion of the division of authority between pope and council. The conciliar movement used Marsilius of Padua's teaching that the church's divine rights come from kings. Formerly applied only to the emperors, they now applied this to kingships. These thoughts manifested in early English literature, in Oxford-educated linguist and theologian William Tyndale's *Obedience of a Christian Man*, which advocated royal authority over the realm and church. Tyndale claimed obedience to God before obedience to the king, and that any royal demands contrary to divine law should not be obeyed.⁹⁰

King Henry, Defender of the Faith

The Catholic Church has a long history in England, and consequently Henry was on good terms with the pope when he and the English clergy affirmed the doctrine of papal primacy.⁹¹ Around that time Henry VIII officially renounced Luther's doctrine of universal priesthood (namely, that laymen are equal to priests) in his published book *An Assertion of Seven Sacraments (Defense of the Seven Sacraments)* for which Pope Clement VII declared Henry Defender of the Faith against Luther's works, which were publicly burnt in London.⁹²

However, Henry's desire to dissolve his marriage to Catherine of Aragon changed his relationship to the pope. Emperor Charles V, Catherine's nephew, was opposed to the annulment (which would have the effect that Henry was never validly married to his brother Arthur's widow, Catherine). When the pope delayed announcing his decision, Henry was angry. His mistress Anne Boleyn took out their anger on Cardinal Wolsey, who was both papal legate and Lord Chancellor. McEntegart asserts that Anne realized that in Cromwell there was a man who would help her succeed in becoming queen, and the two worked in unison. Rex argues that the divorce alone was not the ultimate reason that Protestantism won out over Catholicism in England, but that it prepared the way for evangelical preaching in England.⁹³

Henry also looked for the French king's support. Francis wanted to support the divorce but did not want to antagonize Charles, who opposed the divorce. Henry pressured scholars at the University of Paris to favor his divorce and on July 2, 1530, the Faculty of the University made a

⁸⁹ Ozment 1980, pp. 178–179.

⁹⁰ Eppley 2007, pp. 19–22; Ozment 1980, p. 179.

⁹¹ Rex 2006, p. 24.

⁹² Schofield 2006, p. 14.

⁹³ Rex 2006, pp. 1, 5; McEntegart 2002, pp. 14–15; Dickens 1991, pp. 61–62, 127.

unanimous judgment.⁹⁴ Furthermore, after the resolution of the Diet at Augsburg, the emperor had appealed to both the English and the French kings to ask for a common council to intervene for the benefit of the Catholics. The French answer to the emperor's request was non-committal. At this time, the German Protestants founded the Schmalkaldic League as a defensive league against the emperor. A new phase of Protestant influence began in England, and Henry became interested in the league for personal reasons—divorce from Catherine and possible conflict with Spain. He also needed Protestant support in the proposed papal council.⁹⁵

Reformation Parliament

Henry's divorce proceedings created a situation in England that considerably reduced the clergy's authority and weakened the Church, as the clergy lost their ecclesiastical authority to the king. This process ended with a complete break from Rome, and was a radical change of jurisdiction, revolutionary to many who had served Henry before the break. He needed Thomas Cromwell to push through parliamentary legislation to reform the church. When Thomas More fell from power after only two years as chancellor, Thomas Cromwell, who worked through the Reformation Parliament to revise the relations between church and state, replaced him. Since Henry wanted a church that was securely obedient to him, he had to silence any opposition. Consequently, Cromwell was given the task of subduing the church through Acts of Parliament. The king's commissions under his jurisdiction handled the judicial affairs of the Church. Also, from this time on, the Convocation of Bishops' acceptance of Henry's supremacy was formalized in law, and all future decisions of the Convocation had to be submitted to Parliament for legislation. Thus, power shifted from the Convocation to the king. The clergy's allegiance was to the king instead of the pope.⁹⁶

Thomas Cromwell introduced legislation that weakened the church. The first legislative measure, the Act for Pardon of the Clergy (1531) meant that laity had gained jurisdiction over clergy. With the next legislation, the law of the Supplication of the Commons (1532), the king used lay resentment toward clergy to gain his own ends. Catholic faith was to prevail in spite of abuses, but suggested reforms for the clergy.⁹⁷ The bishops defended themselves against Parliament's accusations in the Reply of the Ordinaries (1532). Eventually the clergy submitted. The Submission of the Clergy (1532) sealed Henry's supremacy over the church. All annates to Rome were temporarily withheld in the Act for the Conditional Restraint of Annates (1532). Any appeals to Rome regarding Henry's divorce meant final legal separation through the Act in Restraint of Appeals (1533). Thus papal authority was swept away and royal supremacy established.⁹⁸

⁹⁴ James K. Farge: *Orthodoxy and Reform in Early Reformation France*. 1985, p. 136 (hereafter, Farge 1985).

⁹⁵ Kohnle 2011, p. 46.

⁹⁶ G. W. Bernard: *The King's Reformation*. 2005, pp. 66, 68–71 (hereafter, Bernard 2005); Carleton 2001, p. 9; Dickens 1991, pp. 142–143; G. R. Elton: *Reform and Reformation England, 1509–1558*. 1977, pp. 150, 154–155 (hereafter, Elton 1977).

⁹⁷ Henry VIII, c. 15. Gerald Bray: *Documents of the English Reformation*. 2004, pp. 42–56 (hereafter, Bray 2004).

⁹⁸ 24 Henry VIII, c. 12; Bray 2004, pp. 57–77; Rex 2006, pp. 9–10, 12.

The Acts gradually weakened the Church until the next move by Cromwell to transfer the authority of the church to lay leadership. The English Church, while part of the Roman Church, followed Roman canon law, and had its own legislative body in each of the provinces, called Convocations, which had elected representatives from chapters and diocesan clergy. Occasionally a papal legate may have convened a national council or diocesan synod, possibly every three years. The Convocations' ordinances were implemented by visitations—an executive process of the medieval Tudor Church.⁹⁹ From now on the king had jurisdiction over both church and state.

Cromwell's episcopal view of his office can be seen in his title of vice-regent. He pushed his agenda through injunctions, enforcing their contents through royal visitations throughout the country, using his commissioners to achieve ecclesiastical uniformity. Cromwell's goal was to revise the canon law including papal decrees. The royal prerogatives were included in the Act of the Submission of the Clergy in 1534, which was sanctioned by Parliament.¹⁰⁰

The king had sole authority to define the church's doctrine through proclamations and acts of Parliament. Henry VIII likened his kingship to the Old Testament model of David's. Henry saw it as the Crown's responsibility to defend the true faith, even by force. This power also gave him diplomatic flexibility to negotiate with other nations and with Catholic powers on the Continent; for instance, with the German Lutherans, Charles V, the Holy Roman Emperor, and Francis I, the King of France.¹⁰¹

Continental Connections

Continental relations were of the utmost importance for future negotiations between the English and German theologians. This section demonstrates that the English theologians were aware of the Reformation on the Continent. England enjoyed continuous diplomatic, commercial, and cultural connections to the Continent. Early in the 1520s, reform teachings spread through books and pamphlets. Discussions were held in Cambridge and London. The first English Lutherans came from Cambridge University, where they liked to congregate at the White Horse Inn, "Little Germany," to read the Bible together and discuss theology under the leadership of Robert Barnes, who later became an intermediary for Henry VIII with the Germans.¹⁰² William Tyndale (c. 1494–1536) presided over one group that included future English Protestants Hugh Latimer (c. 1485–1555), Thomas Cranmer (1489–1556), and Nicholas Shaxton (c. 1485–1556). Tyndale became the most effective mediator and introducer of Lutheran ideas to England. As the groups came to the attention of the official church, they either had to recant or go into exile, or risk worse—as with Tyndale, who was executed in the Low Countries in 1536. Subsequently, Tyndale's English New Testament was printed in Cologne and sent to England.¹⁰³

⁹⁹ Rex 2006, pp. 29–30.

¹⁰⁰ Rex 2006, p. 43.

¹⁰¹ Eppley 2007, pp. 6–8, 10.

¹⁰² Dickens 1991, pp. 91–92; Cameron 2012, p. 284.

¹⁰³ Cameron 2012, p. 284; MacCulloch 1996, p. 25.

Erasmus of Rotterdam, who was inspired by *devotio moderna*, was a well-educated humanist who changed the direction of the history of European religion as he applied his humanist learning to Christian texts. He produced a new edition of the New Testament in 1516, which was an inspiration to Protestant Reformers. Erasmus believed that princes could solve theological disputes and uphold public morality.¹⁰⁴ Many of the continentally educated humanists influenced by Erasmus returned to England. Among them was Robert Barnes, who studied at the University of Louvain and brought humanist ideas to England. He also had close connections to Wittenberg. Whiting quotes E. G. Rupp, stating that Barnes was one of the most significant Lutheran theologians of the English Reformation. Clebsch notes that Barnes was entered into matriculation in the book of the University of Wittenberg on June 20, 1533, as “*D. Antonius Anglus Theologiae Doctor Oxoniensis*.”¹⁰⁵ Even though books written by Luther were banned from England in the 1520s, Philip Melanchthon’s non-theological writings were circulating in the English academic world. Melanchthon influenced the rhetorical school in England, and Bishop Fisher had a copy of Melanchthon’s first rhetorical treatise, *De Rhetorica*, in the 1520s. William Paget was lecturing on Melanchthon’s rhetoric in Cambridge in the later 1530s.¹⁰⁶ As Melanchthon’s influence in England was at its height in the 1530s, his ideas of humanism combined with reform doctrine were certainly a model for Swynnerton.¹⁰⁷

The most influential connection to the Continent, Thomas Cranmer, appointed ambassador to the emperor on the king’s divorce in 1532, initiated connections with the German Protestants on behalf of the English. While in Germany, Cranmer became familiar with the continental Reformation and had learned about Luther and Melanchthon’s opinion on divorce. Henry had sought the opinion of the Swiss reformers, especially one Simon Grynaeus, and also asked the opinion of Philip Melanchthon and Martin Luther.¹⁰⁸ In February 1533, Cranmer was appointed Archbishop of Canterbury, and was still dependent on the authority of Rome. At the same time, he acknowledged his responsibility to the king.

The Methods of the Research

The research was developed from the following original sources: Henry’s State Papers; documents such as *Loci Communes* (in Latin); *Concilium ad Gallos* (in Latin); the Wittenberg Articles (in Latin and German); the Ten Articles; the Bishops’ Book; and the Thirteen Articles (in Latin). These were analyzed in their historical context. In addition, secondary sources were used, experts were interviewed regarding original sources, and visits to Germany and England were made in order to experience how culture influences people’s thoughts and attitudes, and how the different cultures create unique conflicts in their thoughts and beliefs. All these factors influence the interpretation of the resources of this dissertation.

¹⁰⁴ MacCulloch 2003; pp. 98–99, 102–104.

¹⁰⁵ MacCulloch 1996, p. 25; Clebsch 1964, p. 48; Whiting 2010, p. 315; Dickens 1991, pp. 91–92.

¹⁰⁶ Richard Rex, Ed.: *A Reformation Rhetoric Thomas Swynnerton*. 1999, pp. 28–30 (hereafter, Rex, Ed. 1999).

¹⁰⁷ Rex, Ed. 1999, pp. 50–51.

¹⁰⁸ MacCulloch 1996, p. 65; Tjernagel, Neelak Serawlook: *Henry VIII and the Lutherans*. 1965, pp. 88–89 (hereafter, Tjernagel 1965).

The sources used and the comments about them were determined with respect to their historical context, not current perspectives and beliefs. This process has been challenging because the researcher must take on the viewpoints of various historical figures from the sixteenth century and understand the belief system and mechanisms of the Roman Church led by the popes (Clemens V and Paul III). The researcher must also come to understand the claim that the Catholic Church was one before the schism of the East and West. Even though the structure of the church at that time was medieval, Henry VIII viewed it as an early patristic type existing before that schism.

During the sixteenth century, the Roman Church still maintained the practices and doctrines of the medieval church, which was the framework within which the Reformers' thoughts were formed. The English Church was rich in liturgy, which formed the worldview of the ordinary people. When the national monarchs and the German princes wished to overpower the pope and the medieval Church's authority weakened, ideas of Reformation could begin to take hold in England and Continent. While Reformation changes occurred on governmental levels, the communities and parishes continued to practice their old religious habits. The focus of this research was Melancthon's doctrine of adiaphora in the framework of the doctrine of justification by faith, and how he influenced English thought in the documents produced during the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations. The researcher examined the articles on saints closely related to the Mass and the popular culture, in order to observe changes in interpretation of the Mass and the articles.

Key influences in the interpretation of the sources, besides Henry VIII and Philip Melancthon, were Francis I, the King of France; Charles V, the Emperor; the Elector of Saxony; the English reform-minded archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer; conservative Bishop Stephen Gardiner; Vice-Regent Thomas Cromwell; and other bishops and agents of the monarchs. These key players' thoughts changed within their political and ecclesiastical environments.

The sources were analyzed in the following manner: The Latin letters provided information on Melancthon's thoughts. Luther's correspondence yielded information about the inner workings of the German Reformers. The English state papers revealed government's processes, the documents of the English Reformation offered information about Parliament's laws; and convocation records provided information about which ecclesiastical party was strongest at particular times. The documents and decisions made regarding the negotiations of these documents were analyzed using the historical context in which they were created.

As shown below, the sources provided answers to the research questions in the following manner:

1. Sources that conflicted with what this researcher expected: The concept of the doctrine of adiaphora was not clearly presented in any of the sources in terms of the question "What was considered adiaphora and who was to decide?" The doctrines surrounding adiaphora, that is, the doctrine of reconciliation, the concept of the law-gospel, ecclesiastical tradition, and doctrine of church, had to be analyzed. In addition, the researcher had to consider who had the authority in the church and over church laws, and who had the power to promulgate them. Also considered was how Melancthon's doctrine of adiaphora changed when interpreted in different cultural and

ecclesiastical environments, especially the many expressions of the “Church” in various contexts.

2. Sources that were consistent with what this researcher expected: Investigated was how adiaphora in the *Confessio Augustana* of 1530 and in *Loci Communes* 1535 influenced the *Advice*, the Wittenberg Articles, and the English Articles. Textual comparison demonstrated that the English translation of *Confessio Augustana* was, in fact, comparable with the Latin edition. Both of these influenced the English articles in a way that was consistent with the hypothesis.

3. Sources that offered limited information regarding the first two research questions stated above: If we do not consider that Melancthon used the doctrinal part referring to adiaphora matters in the *Confessio Augustana*, then the *Advice* was missing some doctrinal reinforcement. In contrast to the *Advice*, the Wittenberg Articles contained doctrinal reinforcement for conflicting articles. The Ten Articles only included the Creed, Three Sacraments and Justification by Faith, and there was no conflict between the articles. Adiaphora matters were treated under Rites and Ceremonies. The Bishops’ Book had a different format. As a book to be used for education; it included the doctrine of justification and the addition of four sacraments. The adiaphora matters were found elsewhere in the text and named “indifferent things.” The Thirteen Articles had sound doctrinal reinforcement but did not speak to the conflicting articles. The task of resolving such a conflict fell to the king.

There is evidence that the bishops held a private meeting on those issues. In the English articles, it was evident that the king had power over the church, but for the Wittenberg Articles this issue was found in an outside research article called Church Ordinances. For the Thirteen Articles, it was found in the article Ministry of the Word. In the *Advice* it was clear that Melancthon accepted the pope’s authority under human law. The different church laws in Germany and England caused difficulties in interpretation. English Church laws were under the king’s jurisdiction, because he was head of state and church. How the Reformers reacted to tyrannical laws within the framework of conscience and Christian liberty was left to individual bishops to decide in England.

4. Sources that did not provide enough information regarding the doctrine of adiaphora: Since adiaphora references were difficult to find, ecclesiastical culture had to be analyzed in different contexts. The researcher used the concept of adiaphora found in doctrinal statements, exegesis of Scripture, the doctrine of church, concept of the law-gospel, the doctrine of reconciliation, the Mass, even though the doctrine of sacrifice in the Mass was excluded and the central doctrine of justification by faith. The “two-kingdom” doctrine and ecclesiology were examined in the course of analyzing who had the power in the Church to decide on adiaphora matters once the doctrine of justification by faith had been defined and how much Melancthon’s influence on adiaphora was transmitted in the Ten Articles and Bishops’ Book.

Sources did not provide enough information regarding Melancthon’s perception of the changes in the power of the king as civil and ecclesiastical ruler, and how much authority was given to the bishops in various phases of the negotiations. The *Loci Communes*, Wittenberg Articles, Bishops’ Book, and the Thirteen Articles were the sources utilized to assess changes in the concept of the civil magistracy.

This researcher compared various texts by reading each line by corresponding line in order to ascertain the differences in doctrine and practice. The Latin *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia*

were read alongside the English translation of *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia*, and compared line by line in the conflicting articles and for the concept of justification by faith. The *Confessio Augustana* was compared with the *Advice*; the *Advice* and *Confessio Augustana* and *Loci Communes* were compared with the Wittenberg Articles; the Ten Articles were compared with the *Confessio Augustana* and *Loci Communes*; the Bishops' Book was compared with *Loci Communes*; and the Thirteen Articles was compared with the *Confessio Augustana* and *Loci Communes*. There was no complete English version of the *Loci Communes*. But once its most essential articles were translated into English, its contents became more important than the *Confessio Augustana* for use in making comparisons to the English articles.

The goal of the textual comparison was to determine which thoughts were transmitted to the English articles of 1536, 1537, and the Thirteen Articles of 1538. These analyses clarified which of Melancthon's thoughts were transmitted to the various article collections and measured his influence in England during the 1530s.

This researcher discerned Melancthon's influence on the English in adiaphora matters using two methods. The first was by analyzing the surrounding historical events during the period in which the documents were produced, and the second by analyzing Melancthon's thoughts in his written documents.

The newest documents in this research were the original manuscript of the *Loci Communes* of 1535 which was dedicated to Henry VIII and the original manuscript in photocopied form which was used to study the English translation of the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apologia* of the *Confessio Augustana*. These documents combine to form the body of textual evidence that illustrates what was used during the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations.

Original Sources for the Research

The *Loci Communes*

The research questions which apply to the Latin *Loci Communes* of 1535 are: How did adiaphora in the *Confessio Augustana* 1530 and the *Loci Communes* influence the English Articles? What are matters of conscience and what are matters of the church? The unpublished manuscripts of *Loci Communes* at the University of Helsinki, Finland, and at the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley, California, are identical. The unpublished *Loci Communes* at the University of Göttingen, Germany, however, has several minor omissions in the sections on the seventh and eighth of the Ten Commandments.¹⁰⁹ Therefore, throughout this study, I rely on the Berkeley manuscript, which Melancthon dedicated to Henry VIII in 1535.

Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that the *Sententia* of Robert Barnes, one of the English representatives in the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations, is bound together with the Göttingen *Loci Communes*. That unpublished edition was printed in Wittenberg by a Josef Klug, and kept in the monastery of St. Michael in Lüneberg. After the monastery was dissolved, its library was transferred to the Ritterakademie in Lüneberg (an academy for noblemen), founded in 1656.

¹⁰⁹ These sections are entitled *De usu legis Diuinæ* and *De discrimine præceptorum et consiliorum*.

When the academy was dissolved in 1853, all its books and manuscripts were given to the library of the University of Göttingen.¹¹⁰

Some modern scholars have confused a book called *Commonplaces* (1538) with Melancthon's *Loci Communes*. Actually, *Commonplaces* was a propagandistic translation and exposition by Richard Taverner of Erasmus Sarcerius's *Loci Aliquot Communes* (1538). Taverner both expanded and simplified Sarcerius's book for a young audience.

The *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apologia*

In the library at the University of California at Berkeley, there are two microfilm copies of the English translation of the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apologia*, bound in one volume. These microfilm copies are from the original volumes in the British Museum.¹¹¹ In the *Apologia*'s section on the power of the bishops the two copies differed. The results will be presented in Chapter Six.

My primary source for the Latin text of both the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apologia of the Confessio Augustana* is the sixth edition of *Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*. My primary source for the English text of both the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apologia for the Confessio Augustana* is *The confession of the faith of the Germanes exhibited to the most victorious Emperour Charles the V. in the Councell or assemble holden at Augusta the yere of our lorde, 1530. To which is added the Apologie of Melancthon*.

English Source Material

There were several other primary sources for this study.¹¹² The National Archive initially developed a method to match the Letters and Papers' catalogue numbers to the manuscripts, which had no dates. Finally, in 2010 the National Archive published an online version of the Letters and Papers of Henry VIII, an online Edition of the Collection of the State Papers & the Government of Britain, and The Tudors (1509–1603) in 2010. The online version was retrieved at the University of California library. The Letters and Papers, Henry VIII, Foreign and Domestic (1534–1539) are part of the online collection, combining most letters in the catalogue with the manuscript version into one single edition (galeadmin-SPOL@galegroup.com), and contains contemporary documents about all kinds of political and religious events.

The Ten Articles and the Thirteen Articles are contained in Charles Hardwick's *A History of the Articles of Religion*. The Bishops' Book is found in Charles Lloyd's *Formularies of Faith Put Forth by Authority During the Reign of Henry VIII*. The following research questions apply to the English articles: How did adiaphora in the *Confessio Augustana* 1530 and the *Loci Communes* influence the English Articles? How did the doctrine of adiaphora change when interpreted in different cultural and ecclesiastical environments?

¹¹⁰ Interview in June 2004 with Dr. Helmut Rohlfing, Director of Manuscripts and Rare Books at the State University and Library, University of Göttingen, Germany.

¹¹¹ The original volumes are numbered B.M. Ref. No. 1018.17, Order No. 736 and B.M. Ref. 37. C. 9.

¹¹² See the Bibliography for the full citations of these works.

There are a few archive sources from the researcher's visit to the National Archives and the British Museum in England. The major contribution made by these sources is their effect on the researcher's views on the monasteries and the pope's bull against King Henry.

Latin Source Material

Melanchthon's *Briefwechsel Texte* is the main source for the correspondence with Melanchthon and his connections with various individuals, especially Henry VIII, 2006–2007, written in Latin. This is the most modern source on Melanchthon's correspondence and its chronology has been followed. The documents researched answer the following questions: What are matters of conscience and what are matters of church? What did the Germans and the English understand would bind one's conscience? What was identified as adiaphora and who was to decide? Volumes 2 and 3 of the *Corpus Reformatorum* contain the correspondence that I examined between Melanchthon and Henry VIII, and between various English and German representatives during the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations. Even though the *Corpus Reformatorum* is not as up to date as Melanchthon's modern correspondence, it had to be used in some instances, since finding original sources in German archives would have been unreasonably difficult.

Luther's Works refer to the English translation of his *Weimar Ausgabe*. With a few exceptions, whenever I refer to the English edition of Luther's works, I also mention the comparable section in the *Weimar Ausgabe*. The documents researched answer the same questions: What are matters of conscience? What are matters of church? What did the Germans and English understand would bind one's conscience? What were adiaphora and who was to decide?

The Wittenberg Articles are found in the George Mentz edition of the Wittenberg Articles (*Die Wittenberger Artikel von 1536*). In the course of research Gerald Bray published the English and German articles in one single volume of the *Documents of the English Reformation* in 2004. The following two research questions apply to the Wittenberg Articles: What did the Germans and the English see as binding conscience? What was considered adiaphora and who was to decide?

Modern Studies on the English Reformation

The most recent general study of Melanchthon is *Philip Melanchthon and the English Reformation* (2006), John Schofield's historical presentation of Philip Melanchthon's role in England during the reign of Henry VIII. His work, like that of McEntegart, brings to light an important but neglected aspect of early Protestantism in England. The secondary sources in Schofield's work are outdated and he does not sketch Melanchthon's early life adequately, leading one to consider inadequate historiography. Schofield regarded Melanchthon as a humanist Reformer, whose doctrinal position changed over time, and sees Melanchthon articulating his own doctrinal views in the *Loci Communes*. Schofield argues that Henry was wrongly convinced that the doctrine of justification by faith alone abolished good works. Emphasizing good works in Melanchthon's new *Loci Communes*, they are presented as a

necessary consequence of justification. Melanchthon was closer to Henry's position in stressing the importance of human will. Schofield argues that "by so doing, he had removed some of the stumbling blocks that had alienated many Catholic humanists, including Henry, from the Reformation." Thus, Schofield notes that Melanchthon's position on good works was acceptable to Henry VIII. As Schofield discusses the relationship of good works to the articles produced during the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations, he finds that Henry mostly relied on the section on justification by faith in the *Loci Communes* for formulating the English articles, the Ten Articles, and the Bishops' Book. He also analyzes the various points in the Six Articles and considers it to be Henry VIII's own view of the doctrine of the Church of England, whose supreme head he was in doctrinal and jurisdictional matters. Schofield, unlike Bernard, does not appreciate Henry as a theologian and sees (as does McEntegart) Cromwell as the real maker of religious policy. Schofield sees Cromwell trying to bring Lutheranism into England in 1536, whereas Bernard sees Henry manipulating Cromwell for his own purposes.

Henry's view on religion is the main interest of Schofield's study, which also covers the reign of Elizabeth. He examines how Philip Melanchthon enhanced Henry VIII's interest in Lutheranism. His meticulous analysis also examines the articles in order to justify various confessional traces in them, unlike the present study. Schofield asserts correctly that Henry held strong views of his own regarding religion and that the Ten Articles were based on the authorship of Cromwell. Without touching on the Thirteen Articles, Schofield explains the reasons why the conflict arose between Henry and the Lutherans. He shows that the Six Articles represents Henry's opinion on religion, although like McEntegart, Schofield considers Cromwell's views to have had more influence than Henry's on religious reforms. His premise differs from this writer's viewpoint. I believe Henry was well aware of the development of all the articles, and will show this over the course of my exposition.

Henry VIII, the League of Schmalkalden and the English Reformation (2002) by Rory McEntegart, is the most essential study of the relations between England and the Schmalkaldic League. He offers a new approach to understanding Henry's foreign policy. He argues against the previous historiography, which often portrayed the Germans in a disadvantageous position when dealing with Henry, or argued that the Germans were only pawns in Henry's power politics. He also corrects the outlook held by Friedrich Pruser that Henry was interested in negotiating with the Germans during periods of political urgency, thus manipulating them when there was political necessity. On the contrary, he shows how important the religious component was in the negotiations. He discusses the negotiations in a chronological fashion and sees the results in the light of factional politics at court. The starting point is divorce, and McEntegart sees the league as an answer to Henry's foreign politics and as antipapal allies. He sees Cromwell as the true leader of the evangelicals. McEntegart's historiography was based on German archive sources. This has been one of the neglected areas in the study of the English Reformation. McEntegart has set diplomatic and theological details in a fresh framework, in which he recognizes the interrelationships of religion and politics and concentrates on the king's diplomatic relations in the early English Reformation, unlike any other modern-day historian. He agrees with MacCulloch in seeing the radical momentum from the beginning. He also demonstrated the interconnection of the Protestant communities in England with those on the Continent, and how this influenced the English Reformation.

McEntegart claims that the historiography of diplomatic relations shows that determinism is still supported. He offers a different perspective on the Anglo-Schmalkaldic relations and states that religion influenced power politics in them. He also argues against interpretations that the Germans were only pawns in Henry's power politics. After the break with Rome, Henry was the head of the church in England and made the decisions in doctrinal matters. He argues against previous interpretations that Henry was not genuinely interested in Anglo-Schmalkaldic relations—not that he had a primary interest in committing himself to Lutheranism, but that he wished to have them as consultants. With their assistance he would revise his own reform ideas in England and ensure mutual support against the pope's council. McEntegart proposes that from the German point of view, the publication of the Six Articles was due to failed negotiations with the English, but that they also were a traditional conservative reaction.

McEntegart discusses the relationship between the English and the Schmalkaldic League from 1531 through 1547, and supports a factional view of the negotiations between them. His discussion coincides with the timeframe of this study, and brings a new perspective to the historiography. He asserts that the relations between the Schmalkaldic League and the English were not dependent on the fluctuations of European politics. McEntegart argues that Henry was seriously interested in the league and did not approach them only during the time of necessity. He argues that religion was a major factor in the dealings between the king and the league. However, McEntegart's assessment differs from Bernard's in that McEntegart focuses on Cromwell's prominent role in communications between domestic English factions and the league, whereas Bernard centers the communications and the decisions of King Henry. McEntegart astutely points out that the negotiations between the various embassies and between the English and German delegations are evidence that religion played a major role during the negotiations. His approach differs from this author's. This author understands that the framework of the articles can be seen accurately only within the context of the league's political goals reflecting the trends of English foreign policy.

In *The King's Reformation* (2005), George Bernard offers a view opposite to that of McEntegart. He argues that it was not so much Cromwell as the king who led foreign relations with Germany. Even though he criticizes McEntegart's approach to the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations, he includes only a few pages concerning these negotiations, as if demonstrating that for him they were of no importance, but therefore providing no real basis for his criticism of McEntegart. In addition, Bernard argues that he presents a major revision of historiography and overturns long-held interpretations of authors such as Elton concerning factional politics; he also rejects that monasteries were dissolved for financial reasons. He also sees the Act of Six Articles as the result of the king's Erasmian attitude. It was the king who made propositions to the continental powers. Henry used rhetoric that might have been interpreted as Lutheran. Henry's royal supremacy defined his actions at home and abroad. He further asserts that any one opposing his supremacy was to be considered a traitor and eliminated from the kingdom as a dangerous person. His purpose was to purify his church from medieval monastic culture, and to take many of the monastic sites for his church's administration. Therefore, the most dangerous element opposing this aim was the rebellion called the "Pilgrimage of Grace," which demanded the opposite: the restoration of the monasteries. Bernard also offers a viewpoint to the dissolution not found in other scholarly works that it was the Reformation Parliament legislation

that led first to taxation of all clergy and religious houses which in turn led to visitations and eventually to dissolution, rather than it was the government's intention to plunder the monasteries. His views are based on original manuscript readings and their interpretation within the sixteenth century history. Bernard argues against former historians that the English Reformation was driven by a tyrant, the king, and he corrects many previous opinions of the opponents of divorce, Henry's personal religious views, and the connection between rebellion and dissolution. Where McEntegart sees factional politics, Bernard sees Anne Boleyn, Thomas Cranmer, and Thomas Cromwell as functionaries who followed the King's policies. However, the old monastic structure served as a basis for the new jurisdictional diocesan structure of the future cathedral churches. Henry saw the remains of medieval religion as a threat to his jurisdiction as the supreme head of both church and state. On the other hand, the doctrinal development should not be seen in isolation, but as a natural development from the medieval piety in the king's intellectual and theological formation. Bernard claims that the king's views are evident in the doctrinal formulations of the 1530s. This led to answering the research question, what are matters of conscience and what are matters of the church? As Henry had the supreme authority, he decided on doctrinal matters. It also led to answer the research question, what was considered adiaphora and who was to decide, as Henry had sole authority to decide on adiaphora matters in the English Church.

In *Defending Royal Supremacy and Discerning God's Will in Tudor England* (2007), Daniel Eppley discusses the idea of supremacy in Tudor England; this is his newest book concerning the problems of supremacy in Henry's and Elizabeth's reigns. Eppley answers the research question, what is considered adiaphora and who had the power to make the determination. In his study, Eppley limits the analysis to individual thinkers who mostly influenced the defense of royal supremacy in the period from Henry VIII to Elizabeth I. Eppley argues that Christian doctrine and determining God's will posed more of a threat to order and stability during the Tudor reign than in any other period. As King Henry assumed sole control of civil and ecclesiastical authority, it meant in practice that he was the authority in church courts, canon law, taxation, property ownership, visitation, and discipline. The most radical ecclesiastical change was the king defining and defending doctrine and deciding upon orthodox belief. Eppley offers a reason why the king took this responsibility from the bishops by referring to Henry's personal interest in following the image of the Old Testament kings. Using this model gave him the flexibility and power to make religious concords, defend against opposition to his supremacy, and carry out doctrinal innovation.

As Christian faith became compatible with official Tudor politics, it became ever harder to discern what God's will was, as well as the mutual relationship between the king's supremacy and God's will. Eppley presents the consequences when obedience to supremacy failed, such as enforcing obedience, dealing with disobedience, and international embarrassment with foreign embassies. The defenders of royal policies, such as William Tyndale, Thomas Starkey, and Christopher St. German, regarded kingly authority as divinely ordained, but also placed limits on the obedience due a king, showing how to justify legitimate disobedience to worldly authorities and whether consciences should be bound or not bound. Eppley further argued that the royal supremacy did not address the practical hermeneutical issues of how to interpret the relations between God's will and the supremacy. Eppley did note that the community of Christians in

England considered the king in Parliament authorized to pronounce what is God's will, even in adiaphora matters, as the royal governing king had the authority to defend the faith, and thus civil authorities had the power to define doctrine.

However, his book offers the thoughts of the early Tudor humanists on adiaphora in more detail than any other present book on the English Reformation, especially regarding Thomas Starkey's view that indifferent beliefs and practices ought to be regulated by government under human law. Verkamp notes that most of the English adiaphorists did not support Starkey's view. Eppley argues the three English humanists preferred to write about obedience to God instead of royal supremacy. William Tyndale erected royal supremacy on a biblical foundation as obedience to God, even as he stressed the responsibility of a Christian to secure order and unity in the church and nation. Stephen Gardiner, in his *De Vera Obedientia Oratio*, discerned that God's will is outside the royal office. The last section of the Eppley book deals with the English humanist Christopher St. German, who presented two goals specifically intended to defend royal supremacy: validating the authority of the king in Parliament, and encouraging civil authorities to rectify abuses within the Church.

One of the most recent studies is *The English Reformation* (2006), by Richard Rex, whose approach differs from most traditional histories of the English Reformation. Rex clearly presents his thesis of the English Reformation as an act of supremacy among which all of the other themes are intertwined. Its emphasis on the traditional culture and how it was reshaped and replaced by literate culture follows the line taken by Duffy in his book, *The Stripping of the Altars*. The traditional culture remained the framework of society throughout Henry's reign, as he saw himself as Defender of the Faith. Rex's work "seeks to present Henry's Reformation in an analytical fashion"; demonstrate how the church was weakened and became subservient to the politics of the crown; and how the Reformation was an act of the state, with Cromwell guaranteeing not only the divorce, but also the break with Rome. The risk of his approach is to lose the chronological development of historical events. On the other side, it brings sharper focus to issues that were key to the Henrician Reformation, in which laws dictated the adiaphora matters. The first five chapters deal with royal supremacy and divorce, and the nature of the relations between church and crown before and after supremacy. He writes extensively about popular culture and vernacular religious culture in chapters three and four, which demonstrate how his approach is similar to that of Duffy's. In fact, in chapter six, Rex demonstrates how the traditional religion was seen, by Henry's reaction to Lutheran proposals that he turned down after negotiations in London in 1538. Even Henry's actions at first seem to be destroying remnants of traditional culture in closer look Rex argues, he rooted only that which was related to pope's power against his supremacy. Henry destroyed what was left of the medieval monastic system and popular religion, and attempted to re-establish society on the basis of the Word of God, and promote a literate culture in which the English vernacular Bible was a focus for religious uniformity enforced by parliamentary laws. While Henry VIII struggled in the first years of his reign over the issues of supremacy and divorce, fundamental changes in politics and religion occurred as Protestant preaching had gained hold among English clergy. In addition, Henry had to face the domestic threat due to religious division, which could culminate in political division and threaten his supremacy. Rex, unlike Bernard, supports the view that Cranmer and Cromwell worked together to bring evangelical reforms to England. Henry argues

that since his supremacy was based on divine law it also helped guarantee duty to the king. Rex's historiography is different from previous ones in its writing style. The acknowledgment of popular religion is close to Duffy's argument below. It answers the research question: What are matters of conscience and what are matters of church? What was considered adiaphora and who was to decide?

The ideas of revisionist scholarship are presented in Eamon Duffy's *The Stripping of the Altars* (1992). Duffy presents a detailed new picture of traditional religious belief and practice in England. Duffy argues that the Protestant historians of the English Reformation rely on negative assumptions in analyzing the pre-history of the English Reformation and that the pre-Reformation religious culture was successful. He writes of the centrality of the liturgy with its annual cycle of birth and death, fast and festival; key meanings to medieval men and women. He says it is important to accurately understand the medieval fifteenth century that influenced the Reformation, rather than have the critics of the Reformation historians question the medieval background and criticize the Protestant groups that emerged in the beginning of the Reformation. He contends that late medieval Catholicism had a stronghold over the people's imaginations until the Reformation. The themes in the book include "Liturgy, Learning and the Laity," in which he contends that through worship, the laity was able to articulate their experience in the community, and their role and status in belonging to the larger order of the world. He explores how the official teaching of the church was manifested in synods and episcopal acts and handbooks. In "Encountering the Holy," he examines the Mass, the holy communities of the parish and the cult of saints, which gave a sense of community and the sacred within the human community. Duffy emphasizes the centrality of the Mass—not just to theologians, but in the lives of laity as he discusses the vitality in communal life of the cult of the saints, pilgrimages, and religious processions. In "Prayer," he states that this theme was evidenced by the large number of primers circulating among English laity and represented, at best, lay Christianity. In the final theme, "Now and at the Hour of our Death," he examines the deathbed ministry and its beliefs expressed in purgatory and the cult of the dead; and that the cult of the living was central to medieval piety. He says that the Reformation attack on the cult of the dead was an attempt to redefine the boundaries of human community. He believes that any radical changes, even literacy, strengthened old beliefs.

In the second part of the book, he deals with the attack on the monastic system, which was the center of Catholic religious life in England until the enactment of the Six Articles. The present study deals mainly with the reaction of laypeople to the dismantling of altars and shrines. Duffy's arguments are similar to MacCulloch's in maintaining that the Latin Church was not so corrupt as generally perceived in Protestant historiography. It also contributes to understanding the violent nature of rebellion, the destruction of monasteries, the execution of two English humanists, and the reasons and motivations for them. Duffy's book answers the following research questions: How does the ecclesiastical and cultural environment challenge ideas and their interpretations?

In Diarmaid MacCulloch's *Thomas Cranmer* (1996), the author presents more than twenty years of the life story of the Archbishop of Canterbury, who was the central figure in the reform movements of the 1520s and 1530s in England. The book is written as a historical narrative of the events around Cranmer's position as archbishop and the leader of the reform-minded clergy

who wished to revise the doctrine of the English Church. Even though it is a biography of one man, the narrative throughout the book is interesting and captures for the reader the events surrounding the archbishop, who claimed to support divorce and marriage to Anne Boleyn to promote evangelical reform. He sometimes seemed to be politically clumsy and did not always notice his opponent's viewpoint. When necessary he opposed the king, as seen in the compilation of the Bishops' Book. MacCulloch uses terms such as "traditionalist" for the conservative and "evangelical" for the reform-minded clergy such as Cranmer. He recognizes, as did Duffy, that the reforming party acknowledged the medieval background of the church and that many of the conservative clergy wished to maintain the traditional ceremonies and customs of the medieval precedent. It seems that Cranmer was a mediating influence between the old and new learning, as the conservatives referred to them. Previously, Cranmer held conservative views on religion but his outlook was transformed after his visit to Germany and he began to support evangelical reform.

Cranmer's greatest influence was on the reform-minded clergy and MacCulloch's book addresses a variety of research questions. These include: What are matters of conscience and what are matters of the church? What did the Germans and English understand as binding on the conscience and what needed to be discussed? What was considered adiaphora and who was to decide? How did Melancthon's doctrine of adiaphora change when interpreted in different cultural and ecclesiastical environments? As a biographical historical narrative of a person, several interlineal connections come to play and offer a reader the English Reformation from a perspective of the archbishop, who shaped the doctrine and practice of the Church more than any of his contemporaries, and how he was able to achieve his goals to free the consciences of his clergy with the conservative King Henry. How did the Reformers react to tyrannical laws in the framework of freedom of conscience and Christian liberty? Cranmer was also a central figure when negotiating the articles of faith of the Church of England, and was bold enough to publicly defend his doctrinal views against those of Henry VIII in the Ten Articles and the Bishops' Book. His influence was also seen in the Thirteen Articles when the article on civil authority from the Wittenberg Articles was translated into English.

Diarmaid MacCulloch's *Reformation* (2003) is a recent modern study of the Reformation that discusses both Protestantism and Tridentine Catholicism and places the English Reformation in a larger European context. He states that his historiography tries to avoid emphasizing the insularity of the English Reformation by showing its relationship to mainland movements, both Protestant and Catholic. His work is not only about Reformers and their message, but also helps explain Europe's diversity. The research question that applies here is: How do ecclesiastical and cultural environments challenge ideas and their interpretations? For each topic, MacCulloch extends the geographical map to the whole of Europe—how each phase of the Reformation influenced each location simultaneously in Europe.

The word "Catholic" has various meanings: 1) the whole Christian church founded two thousand years ago; 2) the western half of the church after the split between East and West about one thousand years ago; 3) the part of the church that remained loyal to the pope after the sixteenth century; and 4) the Protestant Christians who opposed the pope. MacCulloch's purpose in writing this book was to explain the divided Europe of the early modern period from 1490 until 1700. The Reformation complicated the world, since all Reformers claimed to create

authentic Christianity. MacCulloch also claims, as does Duffy, that the Latin Church was not as corrupt or ineffective as has been described by the Protestants. MacCulloch points out the minimal religious book—creeds, the Lord’s Prayer, and the Ten Commandments—that was available to ordinary people until the Bible was more available. The Latin inherited by both Catholics and Protestants, even with the upheavals of the Reformation, helps to define European identity, divided though it was. MacCulloch includes English history in the framework of European influences on both Catholics and Protestants. He prefers to use “evangelical” for “Protestant,” as the name was given only to those who supported the reforms of Martin Luther and Ulrich Zwingli at the diet of Speyer in 1529. Later it was a word used in German or imperial politics and had no wider reference. The word “evangelical” was used at the time of the Reformation for the activists who spread the good news of the new doctrine. MacCulloch views Thomas Cromwell as the leader of the evangelical party, with Archbishop Cranmer and Anne Boleyn, whose downfall he orchestrated. He sees how as vice-regent Thomas Cromwell dominated royal policy after the announcement of royal supremacy. The Tudor monarchy destroyed monasticism and eliminated religious culture by attacking shrines. Though his governing was brutally efficient, Cromwell’s position was dependent in the highest measure on the king’s favor in order to protect him against his enemies who opposed his drastic measures.

In *The European Reformation* (2012), the latest book on the Reformation, Euan Cameron sets the English Reformation in its European context as did MacCulloch’s *Reformation*. He traces medieval roots through the end of the sixteenth century, an extended historiographical essay. He agrees with Duffy and Rex that the medieval church was not so decadent as previously thought. He points out the church’s vulnerability as the bureaucratic institution could not respond to its critics. Cameron presents both positive and negative aspects of the Reformation, balancing previous accounts. His book provides answers to the questions: What are the matters of conscience and what are the matters of church? How do the ecclesiastical and cultural environments influence ideas during the Reformation? The book presents wide social, cultural, and intellectual trends throughout the Reformation; hence, it is a history of movements rather than a biography like MacCulloch’s biography of Cranmer, which offers an in-depth analysis of a person and his immediate surroundings. The difference between biographical and general historiography is that the latter is an overview of a wide variety of subjects. The Reformation, according to Cameron, enters history at a time in Latin Christendom in which the Roman papacy was more respected and united by its more centralized church structures than was its close relative, the Eastern Empire. He finds that the Reformation was born from several parallel movements that all had various agendas, led by groups of people unable to either understand or foresee the outcome of the movements, and offers a universal reforming message. The process of change Cameron delineates was the integration of cultural, political, and theological factors. He argues that the sixteenth-century Reformation cannot be equated with any corresponding movements within Catholicism. Cameron names six themes of the Reformation: 1) it was a protest of clergy against their superior, the pope, and his attack on their theology; 2) it was a coalition of religious dissent protests by clergy and lay people; 3) it required a new pattern of belief and worship; 4) it created new institutions for society; 5) it demanded a Christian Commonwealth to serve its priorities; and 6) its ideas helped transfer civil powers to institutions controlled by laity. Cameron’s thematic approach, similar to that of Rex’s, makes it possible to

follow similar themes in all the various Protestant movements and compare their differences and similarities. He does not offer much information on the specific problems of each Protestant group, but presents an excellent overview of the problems before, during, and after the Reformation. Cameron's book offers social, cultural, and intellectual trends and pinpoints the distinctions of thought among the major Reformers. His book is divided into four sections as follows: the medieval institutions; the Reformers' message; the coalescing of the Reformation with politics; and the reshaping of political communities. In Cameron's opinion, the Reformation can only be understood from the medieval world view and the Reformers' rebellion against it.

The Modern Studies on Melanchthon

In *Philip Melanchthon, Speaker of the Reformation* (2010), Timothy J. Wengert presents thirteen essays published during his thirty years of academic work and research. He sees Melanchthon as immersed in humanism and the Reformation, and offers an overview of Melanchthon's essential life and work as an orator and logician of the Reformation from 1522 through 1536. The first section includes the Bible, tradition, and humanity in the church and the world. Wengert examines Melanchthon's biblical work, his use of the Church Fathers, his approach to time and history, and his approach to theology and exegesis. Essential for Melanchthon's theology was a twofold understanding of righteousness: *iustitia civilis* and *iustitia divina*, which shaped his approach to theology, philosophy, anthropology, ecclesiology, the doctrine of the sacraments, and political theology. The second section discusses his interactions with personalities of his time: Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam, Martin Luther, John Calvin, and Emperor Charles V. Wengert concludes by saying "Melanchthon was one of the most creative Reformers of his time, a master of grammar, rhetoric and dialectic—speaker of the Reformation."

The European studies collection on Melanchthon in *Melanchthon und Europe. 2. Teilband Westeuropa* (2002), includes several articles by Melanchthon scholars, including Sachiko Kusukawa's *The Reception of Melanchthon in Sixteenth-Century Cambridge and Oxford*, among others. Kusukawa writes about Melanchthon's failed attempts to enter England and his diplomatic involvement in negotiations with the English theologians. She finds that Melanchthon's reputation in England was based on his qualities as a theologian, and also as a teacher and author of university textbooks. Kusukawa also sketches a brief historical account of the several invitations from King Henry VIII to discuss theology in England at the height of the translation of the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apologia* into English. She also acknowledges the dedication of the *Loci Communes* to Henry VIII and that this was discussed during the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations at Wittenberg.

Sachiko Kusukawa's *Transformation of Natural Philosophy* (1995) provides a new understanding of Melanchthon's natural philosophy, which was built on classical and contemporary faith and demonstrated parallels between faith and classical scholarship. She demonstrates that both knowledge of God and Providence should teach obedience to law to prevent civil disobedience. Her argument concerning Melanchthon's two textbooks, the *Commentarius de anima* and the *Initia doctrinae physicae*, is that Melanchthon's natural philosophy was Lutheran. Kusukawa demonstrates Melanchthon's contribution to the physical

sciences of astronomy, medicine, and physics as doctrines of providence. Melanchthon interpreted Aristotle's *Physics* using Lutheran principles. Law was necessary to establish the message of the gospel and he defends Luther's cause in this manner. She also demonstrates that the evangelical radicalism of the 1520s, in which social doctrines of magisterial Reformers' thoughts developed, helped to expand the Praeceptor's (Melanchthon's) thoughts on law and how he developed the third use of law. Furthermore, she argues that even external causes gave rise to new methods in the natural sciences and that Melanchthon's *Commentarius de anima* established anthropological grounds for his social doctrine. As different understandings of faith lead to different understandings of the church and ministry of worship, so different beliefs lead to different kinds of knowledge, as in Melanchthon's conviction that human reason is so impaired that it is unable to perceive God's revelation.

In *Human Freedom, Christian Righteousness: Philip Melanchthon's Exegetical Dispute with Erasmus Rotterdam* (1998), Timothy J. Wengert discusses the dispute between Melanchthon and Erasmus about humanism and the Reformation in the *De libero arbitrio*. Wengert writes that Melanchthon's admiration of Erasmus had to do with his gifts as a grammarian and linguist, not his theology. He shows that conflict between Melanchthon and Erasmus occurred in exegetical method and use of patristic tradition. The major difference between them was the understanding of human and divine righteousness. Wengert examines the interaction of the two thinkers and how they perceived one another's theology, using Melanchthon's chief exegetical work of the 1520s, the *Scholia* on Colossians, to pinpoint their differences and similarities. The struggle was over actual philological, philosophical, and theological decisions Erasmus made concerning the meaning of the New Testament texts and evangelical doctrine. The document Wengert uses for this analysis is the *Scholia* on Colossians. The discussion in the letter of Paul to Colossians is a debate on free will. Wengert finds that Melanchthon's understanding of justification and free will shifted during his intra-Lutheran disputes with the reform Catholic party in 1530s, and his dispute with John Agricola seen in his book below on "Law and Gospel." The Colossians allowed Melanchthon to investigate topics not otherwise dealt with in Romans, especially the issue of Christian freedom. For Melanchthon, each text was an interconnected argument that would encounter the use of reason by opponents and clarify Scripture, which was central to him as a humanist and Reformer. The book clarifies the research question: What was considered adiaphora? Wengert's exegetical work and Schneider's exegetical analysis of Melanchthon's method for interpreting Scripture demonstrate that the basis for evaluating his doctrinal position on adiaphora is Scripture alone.

In *Law and Gospel: Philip Melanchthon's Debate with John Agricola of Eisleben over Poenitentia* (1997), Timothy J. Wengert address the dispute between Luther's students John Agricola and Philip Melanchthon over the definition of penance related to nature of penance and its relation to sacrament of penance and law. The dispute was over the distinction between law and Gospel. Penitence and law are central issues in theology and divided even Lutherans: Is it a sorrow that God's commandment evokes in a sinner, or that after forgiveness not sinning is the highest form of penitence? Melanchthon opposed John Agricola's proposals and developed the doctrine of the third use of law to explain how law guides Christian living as follows: law coerces, terrifies and requires obedience and so it excludes human works from salvation. He also emphasized good works and the third use of law for Christian living, as opposed to Agricola's

antinomian tendencies. Wengert examines the effects that historical conditions had on Melanchthon's interpretation of justification by faith and his goal of finding a middle way between various negotiating partners. This book answers the research question, what are matters of conscience and what are matters of church? Melanchthon developed accurately the position of law in Christian life, which he further defined in his doctrine of adiaphora and ecclesiology.

In *Philip Melanchthon's Rhetorical Construal of Biblical Authority* (1990), John R. Schneider argues that rhetorical studies formed the context of Melanchthon's theology: Melanchthon applied classical rhetorical analysis to Scripture. Indeed, Schneider called Melanchthon's method the "first systematic hermeneutical foundation of Protestantism." He presents his independent biblical construal, merging dialectic and rhetoric, and also presents Melanchthon's unique thought appropriating Luther's theology on his own terms. Unlike Schofield, who relies on old secondhand literature, Schneider reconstructs the intellectual climate in which Melanchthon developed in Tübingen and Heidelberg. By supporting "Scripture and Tradition," Melanchthon claimed Scripture's divine authority over the church councils. Scripture was the sole standard of doctrine and practice, and also for adiaphora. To Melanchthon, "Tradition" could be interpreted as extra-biblical judgment stemming from an understanding of the literal meaning of Scripture.. He thought biblical authority was more important than the church's Tradition, which according to him had no biblical warrant.

Melanchthon demonstrated the distinction between the biblical *loci morales* on law, sin, and grace, and their counterparts in philosophy, maintaining that biblical concepts of law could not be reconciled with philosophy. Consequently he connected biblical law with *loci* on sin and grace. Its relation to sin and grace—proper knowledge of oneself and God—determined biblical law. Melanchthon called sin, law, and grace *locus didacticus* as a criticism of moral philosophy. A philosophical theory could ponder the imperfections of humans, but the concept of sin was set in contrast to the imperfections of humans, since human nature was not only imperfect and fallen, but also morally evil. The gravity of sin obscured the relationship between law and grace. Melanchthon's soteriological understanding could be summed up in the sentence—"to know Christ is to know his benefits." For Melanchthon the two natures of Christ were not important as long as the benefits were acknowledged.

Melanchthon studied the law by which God enabled men to know their sins. The preaching of the Gospel was the promise of grace. For Melanchthon, biblical doctrine was a rhetorical event as the truth influenced mind and heart, thought, affection, understanding, and action analytically and affectively to reconcile humans by the reality of justification. Wengert and Schneider's exegetical analyses illustrate how Melanchthon used Scripture to base his doctrinal arguments on law-gospel and sin-grace, and how law was to be interpreted in Christian life. Schneider's analysis also depicts the influence of humanistic studies on Melanchthon's use of the rhetorical method in his exegetical work on Scripture. Schneider's approach is chronological; it is hard to determine if he meant it to be a biography of Melanchthon or a study of his theology. His book gives an answer to the research questions, what are matters of conscience and what are matters of church, presenting scriptural authority as a divine guide for conscience.

In *Divine and Human Authority in Reformation Thought* (1997), Ralph Keen argues that Reformation-era social and political thought was theological and set the Reformation apart from its medieval precedents or modern successors. For Catholics, church authority was primary in biblical

interpretation and served to reinforce the divine authority of the church. He discusses the difference between the Reform, Radical, and Romanist interpretations of the Bible. The Radicals regarded the Bible as a normative model; for them, biblical text was the leading authority. To the magisterial Reformers, the Bible was an educational tool. The Romanists held the Bible as both divine and human authority, as the extra-biblical tradition held for hierarchical government and priestly kingship. As secular magistrate, a Christian prince was to protect religion, according to the Reformers. Both the empire and the estates in Germany were legitimate institutions, and if any of the estates resisted the emperor, it was interpreted as resisting evil powers. Keen's analysis answers the research question: What was considered adiaphora and who was to decide? He clarifies the role of authority in deciding adiaphora matters.

During the Reformation, the religious and political were not discrete movements. Theologians were subject to secular order and this secular order was to counsel theologians. According to Keen, all agreed that the ultimate power came from God. Keen warns that in the Reformation context the word "secular" needs to be used with caution and states that all rulers are divinely directed. Keen claims that the "locus" of civil magistracy institutionally represents the "secular" status of the church. The church sees the divine author behind the secular power. The believer recognizes the magistracy as a minister of God and obeys it. Keen offers two political theories: Luther represented the one in which secular authority does not interfere in matters of faith; Melancthon alternatively allows magistracy greater involvement in ecclesiastical affairs. This theory places a higher value on the cooperation of the secular and ecclesiastical, as seen in Eppley's account of the English humanists who defended royal supremacy. According to this theory, the political estate is held as superior to the ecclesiastical, since in this way human institutions serve divine ends. Theologians mediate between the eternal and temporal realms. Therefore, the crucial question in Germany was where to locate divine authority and how to subordinate human authority to it. Thus the ruler has power over the clergy, and is the one whom the clergy obey, while the magistracy is to obey the clergy's power, which comes from God and is dependent on the service of the church. The Reformers had to respond not only to theological questions but to political questions as well; within the human society, they reformed church doctrine and practice. The traditional sources of authority, the Bible and the church, and their respective priorities to each other are seen in the various understandings of their interrelationship during Reformation polemics in interpretation peculiar to the sixteenth century.

The most essential works that focus on adiaphora are Bernard Verkamp's *The Indifferent Mean* (1977) and James L. Jaquette's *Discerning What Counts* (1995). Jaquette discusses Paul's concept of nonessentials. Its interpretation within the socio-literary and philosophical conventions of the Greco-Roman world makes Paul's moral reasoning more understandable. He explains how the Jews and gentiles differed in their definition of community and avoids splitting the two communities. Paul's concern with personal freedom and for the other person is held in balance, maintaining the community's inner cohesion. Jaquette finds that ethnic and social class differences remain adiaphora, as long as boundaries are kept between the Pauline community and larger society, which in turn enhances the internal stability and cohesion of churches and enables the members to express faith in love in their communities. He finds that Paul's concept of adiaphora determines what does count, and that anything that does not count can be said to be

adiaphora. The things that mattered to Paul were 1) Faith, that is, right relationship with God. Believers who receive God's grace and righteousness are justified and reconciled. 2) Freedom in matters in regard to adiaphora—what one's faith permits or does not permit. One has to exercise freedom while considering others in regard to adiaphora. 3) Love matters—faith expressed in love; that is, considering another's well-being to be one's measure of faith. 4) The community of faith matters. Reconciliation brings individuals to a new community in which believers learn to appreciate adiaphora in a right way, in which faith is expressed in love. In doing God's will, believers would find things that do not matter to be adiaphora.

Bernard J. Verkamp focuses on the Anglican *via media* during Henry and Edward's rule and how a Christian was to conduct himself in the realm of ceremonial matters. Bernard aimed to distinguish those observances that were essential to the church and those that were not and who was to decide, and discusses the authority of civil and church legislation over consciences. Even though his approach is systematic, he uses chronology to proceed from one epoch to the next. Sometimes the chronology is hard to follow, when he stops and discusses in depth the matters at hand. It is a history of theology within the framework of English doctrine of adiaphora, understanding events of the early English Reformation from a particular viewpoint of doctrine; adiaphora is key to the outcome of the English Reformation and from this perspective to view Henry VIII's royal supremacy. In addition, he discusses how adiaphora includes the appraisal of liturgical, ethical, and doctrinal matters in relation to Scripture and Tradition, law and gospel, and divine and human law (which was called "indifferent" during Tudor reigns). The adiaphora question in the context of the English Reformation has been studied before, by A. G. Dickens and W. A. Clebsch. The role of early English Reformers such as Robert Barnes, John Frith, William Tyndale, and Hugh Latimer has been addressed by Clebsch. The latest attempt to define adiaphora in the context of Reformation history is Clyde Manschreck's unpublished dissertation, *A Critical Examination of Philip Melancthon's Doctrine of Adiaphora*, from 1948. His work delineates the adiaphora concept used by the German Reformers during the Augsburg and Leipzig interims and is mainly a doctrinal analysis rather than an exposition of the concept of adiaphora within the context of a historical narrative. Verkamp considers doctrinal adiaphorism as key to understanding the early English Reformation and emerging English national identity.

Verkamp finds that adiaphora theory was central in the early English Reformers' thinking and that uniformity and tyrannical laws were interpreted in the framework of adiaphora. He also found that the different Protestant parties owe much to *sola scriptura* for the understanding and identification of their adiaphoristic views, such as superstition versus licentiousness regarding ceremonies. Also they initially reduced not the quantity, but the quality, of ceremonies based on a framework of *sola scriptura* harking back to the primitive church. The early English Reformers such as Tyndale, Frith, Barnes, Latimer, and Cranmer viewed the adiaphora ceremonies as neither commanded nor forbidden, but permitted and not to be considered sources of justification; that is, outside faith everything is indifferent or permitted. Luther and other continental reformers objected to the legalism that led to moral commands and prohibitions. They argued that a genuinely Christian interior disposition of faith and love coincided with biblical commands and prohibitions. Many English reformers who did not subscribe to the doctrine of *sola fideism* limited their application of the term to those matters neither commanded nor forbidden in Scripture. Bernard, in his attempt to discuss adiaphoristic liberty, demonstrates

that if one is unable to show the doctrinal substantiation for a particular adiaphora matter, then charity can be interpreted as moral mandate.

The English clergy was divided on the issue of Scripture and Tradition. Conservative clergy regarded unwritten tradition as necessary to salvation. They believed that it bound consciences. But the English adiaphorists appealed to the sufficiency of Scripture for the ultimate determination of all that is essential to the final goal of Christian life, and that which was not necessary to salvation or the binding on consciences.

The English adiaphorists considered instruction about the adiaphoristic nature of traditional ceremonies more important than their reduction. Christians should not judge one another and should preserve many adiaphoristic ceremonies for the sake of the weak, as a rule of charity for the welfare of the Christian community. Neither pope nor council enjoys any prerogative to dictate universal policy on adiaphora; rather the local (national) church may formulate policy. While Starkey believed that God has left earthly affairs to a Christian prince, adiaphora become necessary to salvation when legislated by common authority. Many of the English adiaphorists did not share Starkey's view. In the end, the definition of adiaphora was left to the state to decide, as seen in Eppley's work. Verkamp and Jaquette's research begins to answer this research question: How did the Reformation react to tyrannical laws within its framework of freedom of conscience and Christian liberty? Jaquette also illustrates how the doctrine of adiaphora changes when interpreted in different cultural and ecclesiastical environments. This analysis can be applied directly to German and English approaches during their negotiations on adiaphora.

Chapter 1:

The Crisis of Supremacy

(January–December 1534)

Introduction

Henry VIII, declaring himself the supreme head of church and state and repudiating the pope's authority over the church, affected the stability of the church not only in England, but throughout Europe. In England, King Henry, not the pope, claimed authority to decide doctrine and practice. In support of his own cause, Henry sought help from others in resisting the pope's authority. He struck an alliance with the German princes whom he knew opposed both the pope and the General Council led by the pope. He had a favorable impression of Melanchthon, who sought to unify the church and who wrote the *Confessio Augustana* in 1530 as an attempt to address adiaphora matters ("things indifferent") related to new doctrine. Henry had plans to invite Melanchthon to England to help in the church reforms. The crucial question was how to consolidate the church's authority—to clarify who had power over the church—in doctrine and practice; that is, who had the power to decide on adiaphora matters in light of the doctrine of justification by faith in England and in Germany. This chapter focuses on how the power of the church changed during the first year of existence of the English Church as a separate entity.

Summarized are the historical and political issues in both England and the Continent that occurred after Henry separated from the Roman Church and proclaimed himself head of the Church of England. Historical and political issues discussed concern who held the ultimate authority—the pope, or the General Council? Specifically, this chapter addresses Henry VIII's movements in seeking an alliance with the German leaders of the Schmalkaldic League, along with Melanchthon's role in his efforts to unify the church, and Henry's inviting Melanchthon to England. Also delineated are matters relating to Henry's divorce from Catherine of Aragon and marriage to Anne Boleyn, the ensuing succession problem, and the political implications between powers on the Continent and the pope. In addition, changes in authority and practice within the Church of England are examined, since the clergy was divided into two parties. The conservative clergy supported the supremacy, but was not willing to change any doctrine or practices of the church, whereas the reform-minded clergy desired further reforms by Henry in accordance with continental principles.

Consolidation of Authority

In declaring supremacy, Henry claimed that the Church of England was part of the universal church in which the pope had no authority. Henry consolidated the state and church and published parliamentary laws that weakened the church and gave him more power. The clergy had to take an oath of subservience to the king. He assured the clergy of the legality of the

transition of authority from pope to king, and convinced them that the declaration of supremacy was based on the decisions of the Convocations of York and Canterbury, and both houses of Parliament, who pronounced him the “Supreme Head on Earth of the Church of England.”¹ Referring to parliamentary authority, Henry defended himself against anyone who suspected the illegality of his proceedings. Henry assured that the convocation, which in fact had no legal authority after the supremacy law was passed, made the decision for the transition of power. The bishops were not all in agreement with the requirement for an oath.² Some willingly accepted the Act of Succession and repudiated the pope’s authority, but wished to retain the Catholic ceremonies; others utterly refused to acknowledge the act, even though they were aware of the punishments attached to it.³

Henry’s marriage to Anne created a threatening situation, not only with the pope but also the emperor, since Princess Mary had become illegitimate under the terms of the Act of Succession, after Henry’s divorce and marriage to Anne Boleyn. Dickens argues that the pope’s refusal to grant a divorce was the only move that could keep antipapal and anticlerical powers in check at that time. He further argues that Henry would have held his realm in some kind of spiritual allegiance to Rome had he obtained the divorce by legal means.⁴

When Pope Clement requested Henry’s presence in Rome, either in person or by proxy, to discuss his quarrels with the pope, Henry felt that the liberties and prerogatives of his country were preferable to the pope’s summons. He also believed that submitting to the “Bishop of Rome’s demands would further damage his dignity.”⁵ Henry’s refusal to meet the pope could be seen as a symbolic separation of the Church of England from the Roman Church.

Consequently, Henry ignored the pope’s overtures and declared himself Supreme Head of the Church of England.⁶ During this time, the political ideas and actions of the English humanists were guided by the king’s chief minister, Thomas Cromwell, in conjunction with the Reformation Parliament, which passed the necessary legislation for a legal separation from Rome.⁷ Dickens states that Cromwell was subjugating the church to the crown through Parliament. His ecclesiastical policy was part of his overall administrative reform.⁸ This author

¹ The Supremacy Act, A.D. 1534. 26 Henry VIII, CAP. 1. *Documents*, No. LV, p. 243–244. The King’s Proclamation for the Abolishing of the Usurped Power of the Pope; Letters of Henry, No. VIII, June 9, 1534/1535, p. 125; L&P VIII, No. 52, p. 18. Elton 1977, pp. 188–189. MacCulloch notes that the Act of Supremacy passed a week after Cranmer had changed his title to “Primate of All England” and “Legate of the Apostolic See, “ which took the place of his previous title of “Metropolitan.” While he appealed to the king to make the change, he lost the legal power of both titles. MacCulloch 1996, p. 129.

² Gardiner to Cromwell, May 5, 1534. Otho C. X, 171; L&P, VII, 610, p. 240. *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, No. 42, p. 56.

³ The First Act of Succession, A.D. 1534, 25 Henry VIII, cap. 22. *Documents*, No. LIV, pp. 241–243.

⁴ Dickens 1991, p. 107.

⁵ Cott. Libr. Vittell. B. 14. Fol. 66; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book II, No. XXX, pp. 451–453; *Cranmer’s Miscellaneous* No. C, pp. 283–284.

⁶ The Supremacy Act, A.D. 1534. 26 Henry VIII, CAP. 1. *Documents*, No. LV, p. 243–244.

⁷ The Ecclesiastical Appointments Act 1534. *Documents*, LII, pp. 201–209; Act Forbidding Papal Dispensations and the Payment of Peter’s Pence, A.D. 1534. *Documents* LIII, pp. 209–232; the First Act of Succession, A.D. 1534. *Documents*, LIV, pp. 232–243; the Supremacy Act 1534. *Documents*, LV, pp. 243–244; the Second Act of Succession 1534. *Documents*, LVI, pp. 244–247; the Treasons Act 1534. *Documents*, LVII, pp. 247–251; Abjuration of Papal Supremacy by the Clergy 1534. *Documents*, LVIII, pp. 251–252; Suffragan Bishop Act 1534. *Documents*, LIX, pp. 252–256; the Appointment of Cromwell as Vicar-General 1534. *Documents*, LX, pp. 256–257.

⁸ Dickens 1991, pp. 141–142.

concurr that the parallel function of Parliament and the convocation in relation to the royal supremacy created many incidents in which the convocation decisions had to be subjected to Parliament. Many of the Reformation statutes transferred authority from the clergy to the king.⁹ The legislation also gave the impression that the whole nation favored the legal changes to church administration.

In Europe, the power of the Roman Church had shifted towards the emperor, a secular power. The same development was seen in England, when Henry adopted the views of the philosophy of Marsilius [Marsiglio] of Padua in the *Defensor Pacis*.¹⁰ Marsilius asserted that bishops and priests were equal, and that the king was sovereign over churchmen and had the right to seize even their temporal goods. According to his teaching, the clergy became subject to state law and all clergy received their offices from a civil ruler.¹¹ All of this did not create radical changes in government administration. Cranmer continued to hold his position as primate of England, until the practical aspects of the supremacy were worked out and Henry declared himself head of the Church of England.

Dickens argues that Cromwell's circle, which included Richard Sampson, Edward Fox, and Thomas Starkey, supported Marsilian doctrine to justify the overthrow of the papacy. Thomas Starkey had studied in Italy under the patronage of Reginald Pole, and used his pen for Cromwell's service. This author concurs with Dickens' argument that it was Thomas Starkey who introduced Melancthon's doctrine of adiaphora to the Church of England.¹² In *An Exhortation to the People*, Starkey writes that the right path falls between ceremonies and rites of the church, and those who deny ceremonies and only hold to Scripture. Here he is probably referring to the Continental Reformers' understanding of Scripture alone.¹³

The transfer of authority in England from the pope to a national church brought about a crisis regarding the English succession. On March 30, 1534, Parliament passed the Act of Succession, which excluded Princess Mary from succeeding to the throne, replacing her position with Anne Boleyn and her children. In addition to swearing that the king was Supreme Head of the Church, the clergy swore that Queen Anne was the lawful Queen of England and that her daughter Elizabeth was legitimate heir.¹⁴ The Act compelled the nation to declare the king primary leader of the state and church.¹⁵

One sees the dramatic change in the church's leadership from the pope to Henry. On March 31, 1534, the resistance of the clergy was subdued as the Convocation of Canterbury, led by the archbishop, rejected papal authority in England by a decisive majority.¹⁶ Thus, the clergy had

⁹ Ibid., p. 143.

¹⁰ *The Reformation in England. Documents of Modern Historical Documents*. Ed. Dorothy Carr & A. G. Dickens. 1967. Introduction, p. 7 (hereafter, Dickens & Carr 1967); Dickens 1991, pp. 107–108.

¹¹ Dickens 1991, pp. 107–108.

¹² Ibid., pp. 195, 204.

¹³ Dickens 1991, p. 203.

¹⁴ The First Act of Succession, A.D. 1534. 25 Henry VIII, cap. 22. *Documents*, No. LIV, pp. 232–235. Elton 1977, pp. 182, 185–186.

¹⁵ The First Act of Succession, A.D. 1534, 25 Henry VIII, cap. 22, *Documents*, No. LIV, pp. 232–243; L&P, 1534, VII, No. 392, p. 164; No. 395, p. 166.

¹⁶ Abjuration of Papal Supremacy by the Clergy, A.D. 1534. *Documents*, No. LVIII, pp. 251–252. Elton 1977, p. 186.

unanimously agreed to the king's proceedings. The new establishment in England was quite different in nature from the German Reformation's "two-kingdom doctrine," as the title "Defender of the Faith" also gave Henry authority over the church's spiritual jurisdiction, which constituted a dramatic break with the past.¹⁷

On May 1, 1534, the Act of Succession was enforced all over England. The new law stipulated severe penalties, stating that anyone hindering or derogating the proceedings of the king's divorce and new marriage would be guilty of high treason, punishable by death, with a loss of sanctuary and property.¹⁸ The succession law did not by itself imply outright repudiation of the pope. But when the oath was annexed to law, it implied that the clergy also repudiated the pope's authority.¹⁹ Rex notes that a commission was established to administer the oath soon after Parliament passed the act on March 30, 1534.²⁰

The king's succession law influenced Henry's relationships with the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, who was Catherine's nephew and Mary's cousin.²¹ The law also influenced the pope, who had made the decision in Catherine's favor.²² Bernard argues that Princess Mary and Queen Catherine refused to accept the new statute, and the idea of renouncing their present titles made Princess Mary ill.²³ Henry sought foreign support for the succession laws, needing either the support of the French king, or an alliance with the German princes.

King Francis I became involved with the General Council in support of Henry's pleas to keep Lady Mary illegitimate in the eyes of Catholic powers, and to refute the pope's divine power of dispensation. In an intercepted letter from Francis to Henry, Francis acknowledged that the pope's dispensation transgressed all laws, both divine and human.²⁴ Francis would not have written this, since he knew that the pope would not have acknowledged Henry's remarriage as legal, and he would want Lady Mary to have succession rights. Cromwell may have devised the letter to keep Mary illegitimate in the eyes of Catholic powers and get Francis' support for the succession law. Henry's pleas with the General Council also fit well with his plans to keep Mary illegitimate.²⁵ Bernard argues that the purpose of these acts was to prevent any retaliation against the king.²⁶

Cargill Thomson characterizes the concept of royal supremacy as follows: the church and commonwealth constitute a single society under the government and its supreme head, and each member of the commonwealth is also a member of the church.²⁷ Parliament represents both

¹⁷ Schofield 2006, pp. 59–60.

¹⁸ The First Act of Succession, A.D. 1534, 25 Henry VIII, cap. 22. *Documents*, No. LIV, pp. 241–243; L&P, VII, No. 392, p. 164; No. 395, p. 166. Elton 1977, pp. 182, 185–186, 188.

¹⁹ L&P, VII, No. 420, p. 177.

²⁰ Rex 2006, p. 13.

²¹ L&P, VII, No. 1013, pp. 386–389.

²² MacCulloch notes that the speed with which the Act in Restraint of Appeals was passed was to make Queen Catherine's appeal to Rome illegal. MacCulloch 1996, p. 89.

²³ Bernard 2005, p. 81.

²⁴ Burnet, Vol. 4, II, [Paper-Office], XXXVI, pp. 461–463.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 463.

²⁶ Bernard 2005, p. 69.

²⁷ W. D. J. Cargill Thompson: *Studies in the Reformation*. Ed. C. W. Dugmore 1980, pp. 182–183 (hereafter, Cargill Thompson 1980).

church and state in dual capacity. He calls the church “politic society.”²⁸ Because parliamentary law was then also church law, its classification changed from canonical to secular. Richard Rex explains that Roman law allowed the emperors to have power in ecclesiastical matters, even though the pope was the head of the church, whereas royal supremacy grants the king both temporal and spiritual jurisdiction over the state and the church.²⁹

The transfer of power from canon law to secular parliamentary law was a drastic change in church and state. Even though church laws and parliamentary laws coincided, they were promulgated by the same agency—Parliament. This became problematic when interpreting church law because Henry was head of the church and had both jurisdictional and spiritual power over church laws and doctrine. In the early stages of reform, it was not always clear to whom he had delegated the authority over doctrine—whether to convocation, archbishop, or lay leader Thomas Cromwell—and in what instances he himself had overridden them. In one instance, Henry delegated his authority to the bishops’ committee, as seen below in Chapter Nine.

The pope had consecrated Thomas Cranmer as archbishop of Canterbury two years earlier.³⁰ Navigating between the new laws of Henry VIII and the pope became a difficult task for Cranmer. Because he had sanctioned Henry’s new marriage, he could expect retaliation from the pope. Hence, Cranmer boldly requested that the pope not take any action against him and his church, and warned that if he did, Cranmer would take the matter to the General Council.³¹ In the early stages of reform, the king’s power over the church was delegated to Cranmer and other bishops. The struggle regarding who had the ultimate authority—the pope or the General Council—continued.

As long as Henry was convinced that the clergy would repudiate the pope’s authority, he was sure that the resolution against the pope would pass in Parliament. It took longer for the northern conservative clergy to accept the change in leadership than in the south; for instance, the mostly Catholic Convocation of York had discussed the possibility of repudiating the pope’s supremacy by May 1534.³² The synodical meeting at York passed the following resolution: “That the Bishop of Rome, in Holy Scripture, does not have any greater jurisdiction in the kingdom of England than any foreign bishop . . . none of them disagreeing.” Nonetheless, Archbishop Lee and his Province of York were frequently accused of Catholic practices and of neglecting to spread the contents of the succession act. The northern province was predominantly Catholic, and these drastic changes occurred more slowly there than in southern parts of England situated closer to the court.³³

²⁸ Cargill Thompson 1980, p. 190.

²⁹ Rex 2006, p. 7.

³⁰ Cranmer was in continental Europe at the time of his appointment as Archbishop of Canterbury and left Mantua on November 16, 1532. MacCulloch 1996, pp. 75–76. Elton notes Henry said to Cranmer that he owed his promotion as Archbishop to Anne Boleyn. Elton 1977, p. 175.

³¹ Cranmer’s Letter is an Appeal to be made in his name. Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P. 234; Burnet Vol. 4, Book II, No. XXIV, p. 441.

³² Abjuration of Papal Supremacy by the Clergy, A.D. 1534. *Documents* LVIII, p. 251.

³³ The Judgment of the Convocation of the Province of York, rejecting the Pope’s Authority; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book II, No. XXVI, p. 444. Elton 1977, p. 186.

On June 9, 1534, after the “King’s Proclamation for the Abolishing of the Usurped Power of the Pope” had been accepted by most of the clergy and universities, it was necessary to declare the contents of the laws to the secular magistrate, to keep order and stability during the change in authority. The king directed the sheriffs to follow the law.³⁴

The New Parliamentary Laws

The church and clergy’s authority was further weakened by the many parliamentary laws enforced during the first year of Henry’s reign that sealed the legal separation from Rome. The Ecclesiastical Appointment Act made the selection of ecclesiastical appointees subject to confirmation by the king and the bishops consecrated by the archbishop.³⁵ In addition, priors were also selected by the king, and only those religious houses that were led by a prior chosen by the king were allowed to stand.³⁶ The Letters Missive directed seven cathedrals which had monastic chapters to elect the people named in the letters.³⁷ This meant that the king’s supremacy—his divine kingship—was equated to obedience to God, having full control over clergy and religious.

The control over vacancies in dioceses changed the demographics. All foreign bishops sent by the pope had to leave the country, and gradually their bishoprics fell into the hands of native English bishops. Cardinal Campeggio was deprived of his bishopric by Act of Parliament in 1534, for example; and the Chancellor of the University of Oxford, John Longland, became Bishop of Lincoln in 1534. Some new bishops were recruited from the monasteries as well. The Bishop of Bangor, John Salcot, who was consecrated April 19, 1534, was a former Abbot of Hyde.³⁸

Cargill Thomson asserts that Henry’s statute of ecclesiastical appointments of 1534 stated that bishops had no superiority over inferior clergy; those offending this statute were liable to the penalties of *praemunire*, since they offended the prerogative of the majesty.³⁹ But the clergy defended themselves and suggested that the same Scripture that guided clergy should guide the king.⁴⁰ It seems that the clergy was ambivalent about where their final authority lay. The supremacy law had deprived them of the right to define doctrine, but still their ministerial duties were unchanged.

³⁴ Abjuration of Papal Supremacy by the Clergy, A.D. 1534, *Documents*, No. LVIII, pp. 251–252. On March 31, the Convocation of Canterbury considered the question of Papal Supremacy, and rejected it by a decisive majority. The Convocation of York discussed the matter on May 5, 1534. The Cambridge decision is dated May 2, and that of Oxford June 27. Abjuration of Papal Supremacy by the Clergy, A.D. 1534, *Documents*, No. LVII, p. 251; The King’s Proclamation for the Abolishing of the Usurped Power of the Pope. *Letters of Henry VIII*, No. VIII, pp. 123–124. Elton 1977, p. 186.

³⁵ The Ecclesiastical Appointments Act. The Absolute Restraint of Annates, Election of Bishops, and Letters Missive Act. 25 Henry VIII, Cap. 20. *Documents*, LII, pp. 201–209. (Short: The Ecclesiastical Appointments Act) 23 Hen. VIII, c. 20. Elton 1977, p. 197.

³⁶ The Ecclesiastical Appointments Act. 25 Henry VIII, Cap. 20. *Documents*, LII, pp. 201–209.

³⁷ The Ecclesiastical Appointments Act. 25 Henry VIII, Cap. 20. *Documents*, LII, p. 206; Act in Absolute Restraint of Annates and Concerning the Election of the Bishops, 1534. (25 Hen. VIII, c. 20). Dickens & Carr 1967, pp. 58–59.

³⁸ *Wriothesley’s Chronicle*, Vol. I, p. 35.

³⁹ Cargill Thompson 1980, p. 121

⁴⁰ Judgment of some bishops concerning the King’s Supremacy. Ex. MSS. D. Stillingfleet; Burnet, Vol. 4. Book III, No. X, p. 100.

New laws could stipulate the clergy's ministry at will. For instance, the clergy was ordered to preach the king's title in every shire every Sunday and high feast day throughout the year. The clergy was asked to rescind the pope's power throughout the year, culminating in an official proclamation.⁴¹ In addition, for one whole year it was stipulated that no one preach either for or against purgatory, the honoring of saints, the marriage of priests, justification by faith, pilgrimages, or miracles. Interestingly, all of these issues, except justification by faith, were related to traditions of the Roman Church and regarded as adiaphora by the German Reformers. The exception related to the *Confessio Augustana*, in which Melancthon had argued that salvation could be achieved by faith alone.⁴² The adiaphora matters were still being negotiated and the clergy was not allowed to expound them.

Henry was afraid of any domestic or foreign influence in doctrine and practice. Hence, issues at hand like pilgrimages or miracles were part of popular religious practice for centuries; however, the clergy was not allowed to preach on any of these controversial matters because it could be interpreted as allegiance to the pope. Henry thought that avoiding controversial issues would prevent the pope's influence, as well as Catholic Europe's intervention, on belief and practice of religion in England. At the same time, the doctrine of justification by faith, Reformation doctrine from the Continent, was also not allowed because Henry wanted to maintain stability in religion by preventing any extreme practices and protecting the country as Defender of the Faith, as will be seen in Chapters Seven and Thirteen.

An act of Parliament redirected payments previously made to the pope to support the king's supremacy, and thus forced the nation to agree with new laws:

Most humbly beseeching your most royal majesty, your obedient and faithful subjects, the Commons of this your present Parliament assembled, by your most dread commandment, that where your subjects of this your realm... by many years past have been, and yet be greatly decayed and impoverished, by such intolerable exactions... to be taken out of this your realm, by the Bishop of Rome, called the pope... For where this your grace's realm recognizing no superior under God, but only your grace, has been and is free from subjection to any man's laws, but only to such as have been devised, made and ordained within this realm. (Statute 25 Hen. VIII. c. 21.)⁴³

The Act Forbidding Papal Dispensations and the Payment of Peter's Pence further limited the archbishop's powers of dispensation in order to prevent any dealings with the Roman court, as stated below:

The said archbishop and his commissary shall not grant any other licence, dispensation, composition, faculty, writing or instrument, in causes unwont and not accustomed to be had or obtained at the Court of Rome, not by any authority thereof, nor by any prelate of this realm, until your grace... determine whether such licences, dispensations, compositions, faculties or other writings... to be dispensed withal or obtained. (Statute 25 Hen. VIII. c. 21.)⁴⁴

⁴¹ Enforcing Statutes Abolishing Papal Authority in England. *Tudor Royal Proclamations*. No. 158, Vol. 1, pp. 230–231; Elton 1977, p. 186.

⁴² *Cranmer's Miscellaneous*, C, p. 283; CAL, 1530, p. 56.

⁴³ Act Forbidding Papal Dispensations and the Payment of Peter's Pence, A.D. 1534. 25 Henry VIII. cap. 21. *Documents*, LIII, pp. 209–210. All payments, dispensations and licenses reverted to the English authorities. Elton 1977, pp. 183, 197; Bray 2004, pp. 94–95.

⁴⁴ Act Forbidding Papal Dispensations and the Payment of Peter's Pence, A.D. 1534. 25 Henry VIII. cap. 21. *Documents*, LIII, pp. 214–215. Bray 2004, p. 97; Elton 1977, pp. 183.

This Act allowed only the king to check institutions (monasteries) which previously were exempt from even episcopal visitations, and to prevent the pope's interference had rescinded Rome's privilege of controlling religious life, as seen below:

Provided always, that the said Archbishop of Canterbury or any other person or persons, shall have no power or authority by reason of this Act, to visit or vex any monasteries... but that redress, visitation and confirmation shall be had by the king's highness.⁴⁵

The clergy became financially burdened by the Act Annexing First Fruits and Tenths to the Crown.⁴⁶ Not only were the first year's profits on new benefices formerly paid to the pope, now due to the crown, but any clergy entering ecclesiastical office, either secular or religious, had to pay a tenth of their income annually.⁴⁷ The Act of Supremacy, which was already recognized by the Convocations of York and Canterbury, was finally passed by Parliament in November 1534. The Act stated:

Yet nevertheless for corroboration and confirmation thereof, and for increase of virtue in Christ's religion within this realm of England and to repress and extirp all errors, heresies and other enormities and abuses heretofore used in the same; be it enacted by authority of this present Parliament, that the king our sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall be taken, accepted and reputed the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England, called *Anglicana Ecclesia*.⁴⁸

At the same time, Parliament also passed the Second Act of Succession,⁴⁹ in which the previous act was further interpreted, along with the Treason Act that protected the new queen and king, and defined the penalty for high treason for any offenses against them: beginning February 1, 1535, any offenders of the law would be punished by death.⁵⁰

Cromwell was behind the parliamentary legislation. He won the position as chief secretary from conservative Bishop Stephen Gardiner.⁵¹ As a result, tension existed between these two. In order to transform the church, Cromwell had to rely on the reforming party with individuals like Edward Fox and Thomas Cranmer. Thus, the council's composition was critical to Henry's success. The council was composed of many aristocratic nobles—such as the Duke of Norfolk—whose beliefs were orthodox; his fellow Duke of Suffolk presided over the council and was related to the king. Thomas Boleyn, lord privy seal and the father of Anne Boleyn was sympathetic to Protestant reforms. Elton finds that since they supported the divorce, it was easy for Henry to use their influence for his purposes. The chaplains of Queen Catherine, many

⁴⁵ Act Forbidding Papal Dispensations and the Payment of Peter's Pence, A.D. 1534. 25 Henry VIII. cap. 21. *Documents*, LIII, pp. 226; Bray 2004, p. 104; Elton 1977, pp. 183.

⁴⁶ Act Annexing First Fruits and Tenths to the Crown, 1534. 26 Hen. VIII, c. 3. *Documents of Modern History*. Dickens & Carr 1967, pp. 65–68 (hereafter, Dickens & Carr 1967).

Carr & Dickens 1967, pp. 65–68; Dickens 1991, p. 144.

⁴⁷ Dickens & Carr 1967, pp. 65–66.

⁴⁸ The Supremacy Act, A.D. 1534, 26 Henry VIII, cap. 1. *Documents*, LV, pp. 243–244. Elton notes that to this act was attached the Treason Act which provided the penal code and two Acts of Attainders for imprisonment of those who refused the oath. Elton 1977, pp. 188–189, speaking of the English constitutional doctrine, asserts that the King had no power to make laws without the consent of his people. Cargill Thompson 1980, p. 160; Dickens 1991, p. 142.

⁴⁹ The Second Act of Succession, A.D. 1534, 26 Henry VIII, cap. 2. *Documents*, LVI, pp. 244–246S.

⁵⁰ The Treasons Act, A.D. 1534, 26 Henry VIII, cap. 13, *Documents*, LVII, pp. 247–251; Dickens 1991, p. 144.

⁵¹ Elton 1977, pp. 118, 136.

belonging to religious orders, formed the opposition to Henry. They were called the Aragonese faction, and the most outspoken of them was John Fisher, the Bishop of Rochester.⁵²

Rex pointed out that “obedience” was a central theme in the propaganda of royal supremacy. The concept repeatedly seen in the texts for the clergy was to preach the “word of God” (written either as “Word of God” or “word of God,” it could also refer to the new doctrine, including the supremacy), which means obedience to the king rather than to the Bishop of Rome. Bernard agrees: Henry equated his royal supremacy with the “word of God,” using Reformation rhetoric. This use of rhetorical language to denounce the papacy and defend royal supremacy reveals a quasi-Protestant religious view.⁵³

The Act in Restraint of Appeals, which had protected Henry’s new marriage from being appealed to Rome a year earlier, had wider consequences, and appeals were made to the king in chancery.⁵⁴ Elton argues that the Act in Restraint of Appeals to Rome is an expression of national autonomy, “that England is an empire containing body politic corporate of all sorts and degrees of people divided in terms and by names of spirituality and temporality.”⁵⁵ The king instead of the pope now made legal decisions. For instance, popular religious practices suspected of showing allegiance to the pope had to be appealed to the king. The king as Defender of the Faith decided what was heresy and what right doctrine was. Rex notes that with his imperial status, Henry denied any superior jurisdiction. Rex agrees with Elton that imperial pretensions, as manifested in parliamentary statutes—the model of the emperor under Roman law—guided Henry’s goals as king.⁵⁶

This author concurs with Rex that the origin of the doctrine of supremacy was complex and the road difficult. Its roots were in conflict with common law and canon law—the fourteenth century conflict with papacy and temporal princes, the Roman law concept of imperial authority, moral and spiritual aspirations of the monarchy—and all this was finally integrated into the image of Old Testament kingship.⁵⁷ The change in authority was confusing, and to reduce confusion among the clergy, Henry requested that the University of Oxford give its opinion of the pope’s power and asked “Whether the Roman Bishop has any greater jurisdiction conferred upon him by God in the Holy Scriptures in this kingdom of England, than any other foreign bishop.” The university’s response was that he did not.⁵⁸ In the crisis produced by the king’s divorce from Catherine, his subsequent marriage to Anne Boleyn, and his repudiation of the pope, Henry turned first to the German Catholic and Protestant princes of Germany.⁵⁹

This author concurs with Bernard, who argues that the purpose of the Reformation acts was practical: they prevented retaliation against Henry, they repudiated papal authority, they were

⁵² Elton 1977, pp. 122, 136.

⁵³ Rex 2006, p. 17; Bernard 2005, pp. 227–241.

⁵⁴ 24 Hen. VIII, c. 12. Act in Restraint of Appeals, 1533. Dickens & Carr 1967, pp. 55–57.

⁵⁵ Elton 1977, p. 177.

⁵⁶ Rex 2006, p. 19.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁵⁸ The Judgement of the University of Oxford, rejecting the Pope’s Authority. *Registrum, sive Epistolae Regum et Magnatum ad Academiam Oxon. Una cum Responsis*. MS. Archiv. A. 117, ad. An. 1534, p. 127. Burnet, Vol. 4, Book II, No. XXVII, pp. 444–445.

⁵⁹ The word “German” is used of people living in “German lands” or in German-speaking lands in this study. It also refers to the German Nation (polity) in the Holy Roman Empire. Brady 2009, p. xv.

propaganda to justify the king's supremacy, they eliminated any opposition, and the king could claim that his policies were endorsed by the nation (since they were made by the authority of Parliament). In addition, they required obedience, and punished those who refused to conform.⁶⁰ In justifying his supremacy, Henry had two goals: to guard against foreign involvement, and to check disobedience by executing punishments attached to the Acts. Rex finds that major constitutional change had occurred, as Cromwell established royal supremacy under the statute law and Parliament was used as a tool to enforce the royal will. He sees how Cromwell advocated parliamentary government leading to absolute monarchy, as Cromwell and the king's council accepted the reform statutes.⁶¹ At the same time, the pope continued to exert his supremacy even in temporal spheres, but the English Church was secure. It gained its autonomy through the liberties of the *Magna Carta*, through the church's autonomous courts, backed by statute laws.⁶²

Henry was determined to implement his understanding of "Defender of the Faith," as modeled on the Old Testament kings. How aware was he of the consequences of secular and ecclesiastical changes caused by his divorce? Was it his goal to formulate the first doctrine of the English Church? Henry adopted the authority of supreme head and took away the authority to define doctrine from the bishops; how his actions affected the course of the Reformation will be discussed further in subsequent chapters.

Ambassadors Sent to the Continent

After the break with Rome, England was a threat both to Catholic France and to the Holy Roman Empire. To Henry, it was most advantageous to maintain neutrality between these two powers and seek support from princes who did not acknowledge the pope's authority. Consequently, Henry struck an alliance with the German Protestant princes, especially John Frederick, the Elector of Saxony, and Philip, the Landgrave of Hesse, who had formed an unsteady defensive coalition against the Catholic emperor, called the Schmalkaldic League.⁶³ Although religion and politics had very different histories in England and Germany, the two countries made steady progress in their relationship in the years between 1534 and 1539, thanks to their common interest in resisting the pope and the General Council. At that time, the council led by the pope was the highest church court for doctrinal and practical questions.⁶⁴ McEntegart argues that religious and political history are bound up with the diplomacy between England and the Schmalkaldic League, and supports the view that factional politics influenced Henry but that he did not let the other Catholic powers manipulate him, or allow their politics to influence him.⁶⁵ In addition, he argues that the negotiations influenced English domestic history more than

⁶⁰ Bernard 2005, pp. 68–71. The writer agrees that the king made the laws in order to safeguard against foreign involvement and punish disobedience.

⁶¹ Rex 2006, pp. 12–13, 28, 135.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁶³ Cromwell to Cranmer. January 5, 1534. Harl. Mss. 6148, f. 81. *Letters of Thomas Cromwell*. Vol. I, No. 66, p. 372. In this study, all foreign names have been Anglicized.

⁶⁴ "General Council" will be capitalized when referring to past and present General Councils.

⁶⁵ McEntegart, 2002, pp. 1–9. In this study, English domestic history will be the framework of the German and English negotiations.

German history. Bernard has a different view and is convinced that Henry directed his policies alone and did not let factional politics influence his decisions. The idea that Henry's relationship with Germany was dependent on the power struggle between the emperor and Francis has been repudiated as deterministic, like many dominant ideas in English historiography. This author agrees with Bernard, who stresses that Henry directed his own foreign policy.⁶⁶ However, Henry used his agents and bishops on overseas missions to gather information and conduct negotiations. He had to trust their judgment—even when, as will be seen, they did not always act for the king's benefit. Bernard further argues that the principal purpose of the search for German alliances was Henry's break with Rome, not furthering the Protestant Reformation.⁶⁷

Germany was divided into principalities, some Catholic and some Protestant.⁶⁸ Henry VIII sent his agents to Germany, part of which belonged to the Holy Roman Empire, under the leadership of Emperor Charles V. The Reformation movement was strongest in the electorate of Saxony led by Elector John Frederick. He and the Landgrave of Hesse were the leaders of the Schmalkaldic League, a defensive alliance of Protestant princes against the emperor formed in 1531.⁶⁹ Henry's goal was to unite with the principalities that opposed the pope and defended his divorce. It was of the utmost importance that the continental princes knew the situation from Henry's perspective.⁷⁰

Henry was aware of the principles of the German Reformation and he appears to have supported freedom of conscience, as opposed to the church's power to decide individual beliefs. He claimed that conscience overruled the pope's authority in individual matters. Henry justified his new marriage and said that Pope Clement VII had made him "suffer with a scrupulous conscience" and an incestuous marriage to Queen Catherine, rather than believing the judgment of the most famous universities that this marriage was unlawful.⁷¹

Henry's ambassadors were Nicholas Heath and William Paget. Bernard notes that the ambassadors were to visit both Protestant and Catholic princes, while the purpose of the mission was both political and diplomatic.⁷² In a letter to Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, Thomas Cromwell asked for help in instructing Henry's ambassador Nicholas Heath before he met with the king. He wrote:

Requiryng the same with all conveniente celeritie to send vp hither Mr. heth, whome for his Lerning, good gravitie and circumspect [i] on the kynges highness entendeth to send into the parties of Ga[e]rmany in Ambassade to treat ether with the princes of Germany, as well in the kynges great cause of Matrymony As in other causes perteynyng to the Welth of this Realme... concenyng the Auctoryte of the Bisshop of Rome.⁷³

⁶⁶ Bernard 2005, pp. 226, 242, 537–538.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 535.

⁶⁸ McEntegart 2002, p. 13.

⁶⁹ MacCulloch 2003, p. 174; Elton 1977, p. 184; Brady 1998, p. 111.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ Cott. Libr. Vitell. B. 14. Fol. 66; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book II, No. XXX, p. 451. See Bernard 2005, pp. 9–11.

⁷² Bernard 2005, p. 535.

⁷³ Cromwell to Cranmer, January 5, 1534. Harl. MSS. 6148, f. 81; *Letters of Thomas Cromwell*. Vol. 1, No. 66, p. 372; Nicholas Heath was sent with Christopher Mont to the Duke of Bavaria, the Count Palatine, Elector, his two brothers William and Frederick, the Duke [Elector] John of Saxony, the Landgrave of Hesse, the Archbishop of

Heath was to tell the German princes about the king's point of view regarding the change in the power of the "Bishop of Rome."⁷⁴ A diplomatic explanation of his marriage and divorce was the most delicate issue. In January 1534, Henry sent William Paget, one of the clerks of the signet, to the king of Poland and the dukes of Pomerania and Prussia.⁷⁵

Henry used Protestant rhetoric skillfully when appealing to the princes, as seen in his instructions to Paget. He expressed the desire to form an alliance of amity and friendship between himself and the German princes, based on the correct understanding of "God's Word and the justice of his laws, and to put off the yoke of the 'Bishop of Rome.'"⁷⁶ Henry sought advice and assistance from the German princes in reforming his church according to "God's Word" and laws.⁷⁷

Henry's motivation, of course, was to defend his divorce that was supported by parliamentary legislation. To him, this was a legal matter. The German princes were politically under the emperor's rule, but independent in their local principalities and churches, and supported the General Council rather than the pope. Whether Henry was able to achieve mutual trust with the princes is questionable, since their only motivation was to deny the pope's authority.

Henry approached the continental princes with proposals to help them reform their principalities; and at the same time, he wanted to find out if they were willing to make a mutual contract with him against the pope. In his declaration to the princes, Henry made them aware that as independent sovereign principalities, they had the liberty to choose their religious affiliations even though they were under the authority of the emperor.⁷⁸ Henry's appeal to the princes was not only religious but also political, as he made the princes aware of how the politics of the Holy Roman Empire were closely connected to the pope.

Bernard and McEntegart have different opinions as to who (Henry or Cromwell) struck the alliance with the Schmalkaldic League. This author concurs with Bernard who maintains that it was the king, whose personal reasons led him to look, if not for an alliance, at least for support against the pope. McEntegart firmly asserts that it was Cromwell who initiated and led the delegation with the Schmalkaldic Princes.⁷⁹

It was important to demonstrate to the Germans that Henry had followed his conscience in his personal affairs. Hence Paget was instructed to defend the king by saying that the king's conscience as a Christian prince made it clear that the divorce was the right course of action.

Cologne, Travers and Magoune. L&P, VII, No. 21, pp. 10–12; SP 1/82, Fols. 17–37; L&P, VII, No. 147, p. 56. See Bernard, 2005. pp. 533–534; McEntegart 2002, p. 27.

⁷⁴ English documents after the break with Rome called the pope "the Bishop of Rome."

⁷⁵ Instructions given by the Kinges Highnes, to his Trusty and Well-beloved Servant William Pagett, one of the Clearkes of his Signet, whom his Highnes sendeth at this Tyme unto the Kinge of Pole, the Dukes of Pomeray and of Pruce; and to the Cities of Dantiske, Stetin, and Connynburhg, for the Purposes ensueinge. Cott. Libr. Vitell. B. 14. Fol. 66; Burnet, Book II, XXX, pp. 449–454; L&P, VII, No. 137, p. 52; SP 1/82, Fols. 128–129. See McEntegart, 2002. p. 24.

⁷⁶ Bernard regards these statements as Henry's Protestant rhetoric to impress the German princes. Bernard 2005, p. 227, 242. Even though using rhetoric, Henry was interested in reforming papal abuses. See G. W. Bernard: "The Making of Religious Policy, 1533–1546: Henry VIII and the Search for the Middle Way." In *The Historical Journal* 41:2 1998, p. 327 (hereafter, Bernard 1998). G. W. Bernard regards the phrases such as "reform according to God's Word and laws" as rhetoric of Erasmian humanists. Bernard 2005, pp. 225, 535.

⁷⁷ Cott. Libr. Vitell. B. 14. Fol. 66; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book II, No. XXX, pp. 453–454.

⁷⁸ Cott. Libr. Vitell. B. 14. Fol. 66; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book II, No. XXX, p. 450; L&P, VII, No. 148, p. 56.

⁷⁹ See Bernard 2005, p. 535; McEntegart 2002, p. 28.

Based on this argument, Henry thought it was right that the Archbishop of Canterbury granted him a divorce and sanctioned his new marriage to Anne Boleyn.⁸⁰ However, the truth is that Henry, in his supreme authority as head of the church, had delegated authority to the archbishop through parliamentary legislation in order to support his own decision. Paget was to convince the princes that Henry preferred Scripture to the pope's laws, which he regarded as human laws. This new position in relation to the pope became decisive later in his negotiations with the Schmalkaldic League.

The central power struggle between Henry VIII and Pope Clement was over the General Council and who was its leader. Pope Clement rejected Henry's appeal for a divorce and declared him a heretic, since he acted against the pope's authority.⁸¹ The king argued that the General Council should be lawfully convoked and have authority above that of the pope. The Roman Church did not acknowledge the authority of the General Council without the pope's leadership since, in its opinion, only the pope's decrees were binding.⁸² But Paget argued for the king that a true General Council had not been convened since the schism between East and West after the Council of Nicaea in 787.⁸³ Consequently, Henry acknowledged the undivided church as universal. In addition, Henry thought that he had the right to appeal to the General Council and also, as later became evident, that he could convene the council based on his kingly authority—which he considered divine.

In spite of the pope's declaration and the fact that they were under the jurisdiction of the emperor (and consequently the authority of the pope), the German princes took a positive attitude regarding the General Council's authority, and intended to continue their reforms in Germany. Their attitude to the General Council was to Henry's advantage. Henry's broader denial of the pope's authority became the common ground for future discussions between the English and German representatives.

Paget had stressed that the king's desire to form a religious alliance with the Germans was motivated by Scripture, to repair the abuses of the church and to diminish the pope's authority.⁸⁴ Paget's arguments were very similar to what the Lutherans were to agree upon with the French. As Christopher Mont, an ambassador sent to Germany to look for Melanchthon, wrote to Cromwell, the Lutherans had agreed to endure even the primacy of the pope for the sake of concord between churches. The German princes could hardly trust a monarch whose religious views seemed to be confined to his rejection of the pope. How could they be sure that Henry's position was permanent, since his main quest seemed to be his divorce? These considerations complicated Anglo-German relations and Henry's invitation to Melanchthon.⁸⁵

⁸⁰ Cott. Libr. Vittell. B. 14. Fol. 66; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book II, No. XXX, pp. 449–450, 454.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 453.

⁸² It was the Church of Rome's opinion that the pope is the head of the universal church, which is in Rome.

⁸³ Cott. Libr. Vittell. B. 14. Fol. 66; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book II, No. XXX, pp. 454–453.

⁸⁴ L&P, VII, No. 148, p. 56.

⁸⁵ This study will use the terms Anglo-German and Anglo-Lutheran interchangeably. Neither term exactly defines the negotiators and their respective parties, since mostly the negotiations were carried on with members of the Schmalkaldic League. Since this study concentrates on doctrinal negotiations with both the Saxon princes and Wittenberg theologians, the writer prefers to use these terms, considering that at that time neither "Lutheran" nor "Protestant" adequately characterized the Saxon evangelicals. The definition of "Anglo-German" is appropriate during the early contacts with the Germans, since some of the princes were Catholics.

Melanchthon's Initial Contacts with England

Early in his divorce process, the king had requested opinions from various continental evangelical theologians. The English court used the services of the Basel humanist Simon Grynaeus in studying manuscripts. He resided in England and was familiar with the situation there.⁸⁶ Grynaeus had enough material so that other evangelical theologians, like Melanchthon, could offer an opinion on the king's matter.⁸⁷ It is unclear whether Grynaeus looked for only northern German Reformers and then contacted Melanchthon on his own.⁸⁸ In 1534, the king sent a delegation to the Continent. Robert Barnes, who was one of the king's agents, knew the Saxon Reformers because he had graduated from the University of Wittenberg in 1533.⁸⁹ While on the Continent, Barnes became involved in the king's divorce. It is unclear whether he was in contact with Simon Grynaeus, or working on his own to mend relations between Luther and Henry, and providing the latter with opinions from various continental universities. Barnes conveyed Luther's opinion to the king, which at that time was contrary to his.⁹⁰ One may certainly say that an evangelical like Robert Barnes held to the Wittenberg teachings in the sole authority of Scripture in doctrine and practice.⁹¹ Grynaeus saw an obstacle between the Saxon Reformers and the king, for Henry had written the *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum* (An Assertion of Seven Sacraments) in opposition to Luther, against which Luther defended himself.⁹²

On March 1, 1534, Simon Grynaeus wrote to Philip Melanchthon advising him not to go England unless the king himself invited him. If, however, Melanchthon did receive an invitation from the king, Grynaeus strongly encouraged him to go. Grynaeus praised Henry's outstanding qualities and thought that Melanchthon would be inclined more than anyone else to agree with his religious outlook, and therefore that Melanchthon was better suited than any other of the Saxon Reformers to lead further negotiations. Grynaeus assured Melanchthon that the English would surely accept the kind of doctrinal position that Melanchthon represented. At that time, Grynaeus seemed unsure whether the pope's authority had been thrown out of England, but he seemed to have known that the pope's laws had been turned aside.⁹³ Grynaeus probably learned of the details of the dramatic changes in England through his correspondence with Thomas Cranmer. While waiting upon an invitation from England, Melanchthon simultaneously wrote the *Concilium ad Gallos* (herein called *Advice*), directed to French Catholics, having in mind a similar plan for England.⁹⁴ This of course distracted his attention from England and divided his

⁸⁶ WA, VI, p. 176; LW, L, No. 245, p. 28.

⁸⁷ Most modern studies prefer to call the English Protestants and Continental Protestant the "evangelical Reformers." See Rex 2006, pp. 113, 115. This study will use "evangelical" for the English and German Reformers who were closely affiliated with the Wittenberg theologians.

⁸⁸ WA, VI, p. 176; LW, L, No. 245, p. 28.

⁸⁹ LW, L, No. 245, Introduction, p. 30.

⁹⁰ WA, VI, pp. 178–182 (A); pp. 183–188 (B); LW, L, No. 245, pp. 31–40.

⁹¹ Trueman 2010, pp. 23–28; Dorothea Wendebourg: *German Reformers and England*. In *Sister Reformations*. Ed. Dorothea Wendebourg, pp. 112–113, 117 (hereafter, Wendebourg 2010).

⁹² Elton 1977, pp. 75–76.

⁹³ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1413, pp. 55–56.

⁹⁴ Melanchthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, pp. 134–143; *Concilium ad Gallos*, see Dingel, 1998, pp. 110–115.

goal, but in fact the *Advice* helped him when he had to formulate the Wittenberg Articles for the negotiations between the Germans and the English in 1536.

Finally, Grynaeus suggested that Melanchthon write to the king to let him know that he was willing to support him as head of the church in England. Even if Melanchthon were unable to go to England in person, Grynaeus thought that his writings could influence English theology. Grynaeus suggested that Melanchthon inform his superior, Elector John Frederick, of his plans. “Your submission to the authority of your prince would confirm your approval of the king as the Head of his Church,” Grynaeus wrote. Grynaeus was concerned about the divisions in the church, as well as the additional tumults in his fatherland, and felt it was necessary to ask the great humanist Erasmus of Rotterdam his opinion of their mutual plans regarding England.⁹⁵ Henry was familiar with Erasmus’ humanistic writings and appreciated the great scholar. McCulloch notes that Erasmus was furious that Grynaeus had used his visit to England to promote the evangelical cause, and this permanently affected their relationship. Grynaeus was in contact with Cranmer, to whom Barnes had brought the uncompromising opinion of Luther and Melanchthon on the king’s divorce.⁹⁶

Melanchthon was very aware of the changes in the political climate in England. In March 1534, Melanchthon knew that Henry VIII had published the supremacy law against the pope.⁹⁷ Melanchthon considered this a spectacular turn of events.⁹⁸

Henry VIII Invites Melanchthon to England

Henry became interested in the Germans’ religious affiliation and invited doctors from Germany, including Philip Melanchthon, to discuss with English prelates the possibility of eliminating the Mass and whether faith alone, without good works, was sufficient for salvation.⁹⁹ Imperial ambassador Eustace Chapuys was probably aware that Melanchthon had argued precisely this position in his *Confessio Augustana*.¹⁰⁰ The doctrine of justification and its implications for questions related to the doctrine of adiaphora became the central point of Henry’s negotiations with the Germans. Dickens notes that Melanchthon made a distinction between things necessary and “things indifferent,” based on the text of St. Paul in Colossians 2: 16–20, 1 Timothy 4: 1–5; and Galatians 2: 3–5; 5: 13–15.¹⁰¹ Dickens doubts its effectiveness for reunion during the sixteenth century, since under that heading were included fasts, holidays, and even transubstantiation.¹⁰² This author concurs with Dickens and believes that the opposing parties each could use this argument for their own purposes.

Henry’s declaration of his supremacy over the Church of England presented a significant challenge to Melanchthon’s negotiating abilities in Germany. McEntegart points to the inter-

⁹⁵ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1413, pp. 55–56.

⁹⁶ MacCulloch 1996, pp. 64–65.

⁹⁷ Philip Melanchthon to Frederick Myconius, March 12, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1419, p. 63.

⁹⁸ Philip Melanchthon to Georg Spalatin, in the middle of May 1534. MBW T 6, 1438, p. 93.

⁹⁹ L&P, VII, No. 434, p. 182; L&P, VIII, No. 710, p. 276; No. 737, p. 285; No. 874, p. 325; No. 926, p. 356; No. 957, p. 365; No. 1013, p. 388.

¹⁰⁰ CAL, 1530, Article IV, p. 56.

¹⁰¹ Dickens 1991, p. 101.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 102.

relationship between religion and politics during the Henrician Reformation, since after the break with Rome all religious debate was transferred to a political arena. Eppley agrees, and in his view the proclamations and parliamentary acts showed that the authority of the crown and Parliament determined orthodoxy in England.¹⁰³ The German princes were subjects of the emperor; hence, even though Melanchthon had no objection to Henry's supreme authority, the German princes did not have the same powers.

Had he entered the religious discussions in England at this time, Melanchthon would have encountered the doctrinal division within the English clergy, which was based on how each party interpreted Scripture and Tradition. Verkamp argues that the key issue underlying the development of English adiaphorism was the relationship of Scripture and Tradition. Henry, for instance, along with Thomas More and John Fisher, would accept a concept of Tradition in which the ecclesiastical magisterium was equal to Scripture. English conservative thinkers like Reginald Pole, John Stokesley, and Stephen Gardiner agreed that "unwritten tradition and many other matters had been sanctioned by canon law or universal custom as necessary to salvation and binding consciences." But the English adiaphorists appealed to the sufficiency of Scripture for the ultimate determination of all that is essential to the final goal of Christian life. What Scripture has neither commanded nor forbidden must be considered indifferent, permitted, free, and voluntary, they argued.¹⁰⁴

In discussing the relationship of Scripture and Tradition, Cameron speaks of the interpretation of Scripture alone, and interpretation both of Scripture and of extra-scriptural tradition as Scripture and Tradition. In discussing these matters, it is important to understand the exegetical interpretation of Scripture and Tradition during the Reformation. Tradition was crucial in the life of the church, as shown by theologians who quoted the Church Fathers. There were two ways to understand the Scripture-Church relationship. 1) Scripture alone was a sufficient authority; 2) Scripture and Tradition were both stages in the transmission of a single source of truth, and Scripture had a second source as authoritative as itself—unwritten knowledge which could not be deduced from Scripture. The latter view allows practices to develop beyond their customary limits. The Reformers' view on authority became the principle known as *sola Scriptura*.¹⁰⁵ Verkamp finds that both of these traditions could claim their supporters during the Reformation polemics on the authority of Scripture as interpreted by the church. Melanchthon supported the authority of Scripture alone, as did the evangelical English clergy.¹⁰⁶

Henry had formed a favorable opinion of Melanchthon over his divorce and wanted to discuss further religious matters with him in England. At that particular time, the English clergy was divided over the exegesis of the Scripture and the king had announced supremacy laws to weaken the church's authority. How much Melanchthon was aware of the changes and their influence on the bishops is not clearly stated by the sources. Based on Melanchthon's later writings, it seems that he was not aware of how his *Advice* regarding church matters, i.e., in the

¹⁰³ McEntegart, 2002, p. 9; Eppley 2007, p. 7.

¹⁰⁴ Verkamp 1977, p. 162.

¹⁰⁵ Cameron 2012, pp. 94–95, 163.

¹⁰⁶ Cameron 2012, pp. 94–95; Oberman 1967, pp. 54–55. See McGrath 1987, p. 142; Verkamp 1977, p. 162.

doctrine of adiaphora, affected the clergy. The future discussions were convoluted, involving Henry's political motivations, his break with the pope, succession, and acting as Defender of the Faith.

As stated earlier, the Reformation church in England adopted statutory laws that were combined with ecclesiastical laws. The church's jurisdictional and spiritual powers belonged to the king in adiaphora matters. The statutory laws abrogated all previous papal laws on adiaphora matters. The two religious parties understood adiaphora matters differently. The reform-minded clergy, influenced by the Wittenberg Reformers, believed in justification by faith and the sole authority of Scripture in adiaphora matters, such as the ceremonies of the English Church. The conservative clergy followed the old religious practices and believed that Scripture and Tradition had equal authority, and that adiaphora matters were part of divine law sanctioned by parliamentary laws, and binding on consciences. Henry had presented a middle position in adiaphora matters, hoping that kings and bishops would lead conferences to solve these problems which, according to him, were not difficult. He wished to have discussions with Melancthon regarding these issues.

Melancthon's Unification Plans

Around this time, a unified¹⁰⁷ coalition led by the French humanist Guillaume du Bellay de Langey was formed among various continental evangelical theologians who supported unification of the Protestants.¹⁰⁸ The Schmalkaldic League was a power that aroused the interest of European monarchs. A conflict arose between the leaders of the League, Elector John Frederick and Landgrave Philip of Hesse. Brady states that at this time, the league was greatly influenced by Philip of Hesse, who brought many southern free cities to the league and himself became Protestant. According to Brady, when Philip restored Duke Ulrich of Württemberg to power, the elector of Saxony and the free cities in the South oppose him.¹⁰⁹ The elector did not want to provoke the emperor and opposed the political plans of Philip of Hesse; for this, Philip needed the help of France, Bavaria, and Strasbourg.¹¹⁰ In this political turmoil the French invited Bucer and Melancthon to Paris.¹¹¹ It is in this context that the Schmalkaldic League was interested in forming an alliance with Henry VIII, not only to create a political power against the Habsburg Emperor, but also to achieve unity in religion.¹¹² The Schmalkaldic League regarded the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apologia* as its own confession.

¹⁰⁷ The word "ecumenical" or "unified" in this study is used to describe the unification efforts between the various Protestant factions and between Protestants and Catholics.

¹⁰⁸ Heinz Scheible: *Melancthon's ökumenischer Einsatz in Frankreich*. In *Melancthon und Europa* 6/2, 2002, pp. 198–200 (hereafter, Heinz Scheible 2002). Guillaume du Bellay de Langey will be referred to as de Langey, from now on.

¹⁰⁹ Thomas A. Brady Jr.: *Phases and Strategies of the Schmalkaldic League Perspective after 450 years. Communities, Politics and Reformation in Early Modern Europe*. 1998. Brady calls the years 1531–1535 the "South German Phase" of the Schmalkaldic League, pp. 115–116 (hereafter, Brady 1998). Dingel 2012a, p. 107.

¹¹⁰ Brady 1998, pp. 115–116. Martin Greschat: *Philip Melancthon, Theologe, Pädagoge, und Humanist*. 2010, pp. 115–116 (hereafter, Greschat 2010).

¹¹¹ Brady 1998, p. 116.

¹¹² Dingel, Irene: *Melancthon and Western Europe*. 1998, p. 109 (hereafter, Dingel 1998). See Greschat 2010, pp. 115–116.

At that time, Melanchthon was busy with the French king's agents in planning a larger Western political and religious alliance between the Protestants and the Catholics. Simultaneously, the Schmalkaldic League was interested in Henry for political reasons. The French king also showed interest in religious discussions with the Germans in order to weaken the emperor's power. Melanchthon's failure in negotiating with the French Catholics and his confrontation with the elector ultimately turned his attention to England with similar plans. It seems plausible that Melanchthon did not realize how the politics and religion of his time intertwined.

Armin Kohnle argues that the French king, despite his humanist openness to reform but militant Catholic intransigence in interior politics, set his political interests over confessional differences. Francis took advantage of whatever weakened the Habsburgs, even if it meant supporting the Protestants in France. While he helped the Reformation succeed in the Duchy of Württemberg, he later persecuted Protestants in France.¹¹³ Francis probably looked for an alliance with the Saxon Reformers, especially Melanchthon, as a way to weaken the emperor's power.

Melanchthon became involved with the French du Bellay brothers: the younger, Jean du Bellay, Cardinal and Bishop of Paris, had been Francis' ambassador to England when Henry's divorce decision was being made. The older, Guillaume du Bellay de Langey, was busy working to bring about both the political and religious unification of divided Europe.¹¹⁴ Kohnle notes that de Langey had the sincere theological goal of achieving concord with the Protestants.¹¹⁵ Melanchthon and a Strasbourg theologian, Martin Bucer, requested that the Wittenberg theologians write down disputes between the Catholic and Protestant parties concerning church policy. Melanchthon was the key figure in adapting the *Confessio Augustana* to accommodate the doctrinal stances of the various confessional and political groups, and pull two great European monarchs into support of religious unification.¹¹⁶ Irene Dingel notes that the work of Melanchthon, together with the French humanists, not only aimed at religious unification, but put pressure on the pope and the emperor.¹¹⁷ The French king had supported Henry against the pope, and sent his agent de Langey to Germany to promote his politics to the German theologians Melanchthon and Bucer.¹¹⁸ Because the Swiss refused to accept de Langey's proposal, Bucer accepted it and won Melanchthon's support to help unify the differing confessions.¹¹⁹

De Langey's second goal was to prevent the General Council from meeting in order to achieve the desired concord.¹²⁰ How much help de Langey eventually was to Henry, and what his motivation was with the Germans, can be seen in de Langey's subsequent correspondence with Melanchthon.

¹¹³ Kohnle 2011, p. 45.

¹¹⁴ Dingel 1998, pp. 108–110. Dingel 2012a, p. 107.

¹¹⁵ Kohnle 2011, p. 45; Dingel 2012, pp. 107–108.

¹¹⁶ Dingel, 1998, pp. 109–110. Dingel 2012a, p. 107. See Greschat 2010, pp. 115–116.

¹¹⁷ Dingel 1998, pp. 108–110.

¹¹⁸ L&P, VII, No. 253, p. 104. Dingel 1998, pp. 106, 108–109.

¹¹⁹ Dingel 2012a, p. 108.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 107.

In fact, Melanchthon might not have realized that his attempts to unify the Protestant and Catholic princes of Germany would receive a different response when dealing with Catholic France.¹²¹ Dingel notes that Melanchthon responded to de Langey's request regarding questions that needed discussion with the French.¹²²

In his letter to de Langey of August 1, 1534, Melanchthon implies that the king of France had initiated the contact and asked him to write concerning church policy issues in the form of an *Advice*, to which he would reply.¹²³ The initial agreement was to preserve the church's structure and assure the Catholicity of the evangelicals.¹²⁴

Greschat argues that the king of France gave de Langey the task of connecting with the Germans to support their appeal to the council, and was interested in religious discussions with them. It was in this context that Melanchthon and Bucer were invited to Paris.¹²⁵ This author concurs, since it seems that the French king had his own political interests in mind when he contacted the Germans.

Melanchthon laid out his plans for unification and wrote that monarchs should play a leading role in the unification of the church. He believed that reconciliation with the Roman Church was possible and that the principal evangelical doctrine was in agreement with the church's dogma.¹²⁶ Melanchthon asked de Langey to influence the monarchs to bring educated men to negotiate and determine what issues were at stake in the church, and then he would propose an agreeable solution to the many controversies. Melanchthon told de Langey that the articles that the *Advice* he sent would be easy to agree upon, and that he had designed it for that very purpose.¹²⁷

Dingel notes that Melanchthon's opinion on the supremacy of the pope and the hierarchy of bishops in his *Advice* differs from that expressed in the *Confessio Augustana*, Article XXVIII, *De potestate ecclesiastica [Bon der Bischofen Gewalt]*. The article was the most essential concerning adiaphora matters and who had the power to decide them. In his unification efforts, Melanchthon hoped that unity with the pope could be achieved, and accepted the pope's authority by human right. Dingel finds that in the *Advice*, papal power was thus limited by the power granted to the kings to benefit the church.¹²⁸ As bishops should be subservient to the pope, they should be also subservient to the king. When dictating practices in the church, papal authority should neither bind consciences nor oppress right doctrine.¹²⁹ Melanchthon hoped to equate the pope's power with that of the bishops on adiaphora matters.

¹²¹ Ann Moss notes that it is possible that due to the religious crisis in France, Melanchthon's commonplace dialectic texts were taken off the syllabus and substituted by the Catholic Johannes Caesarius' *Dialectica* in 1534. Moss 2002, pp. 259–260. This shows that Melanchthon must not have been in favor with the French theologians.

¹²² Dingel 1998, pp. 106, 108–109.

¹²³ *Concilium ad Gallos*, see Dingel, 1998, pp. 110–115.

¹²⁴ Dingel 2012a, pp. 108–109.

¹²⁵ Greschat 2010, pp. 115–116.

¹²⁵ Greschat 2010, pp. 115–116.

¹²⁶ Dingel 1998, p. 110.

¹²⁷ Melanchthon to de Langey [M. an Guillaume du Bellay, Seigneur de Langey]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1469, pp. 172–173.

¹²⁸ Dingel 2012a, p. 110.

¹²⁹ Dingel, 1998, p. 111.

Melanchthon must not have realized at that time that even though the French supported Henry's divorce, most of the conservative theologians still supported the pope.¹³⁰ Even though Melanchthon had the goal of unification and reconciliation with the Roman Church, it seems that the goals of the Germans and French differed: de Langey's association with the Germans was political, to pressure the pope and the emperor, as Francis wished; yet he cooperated with Melanchthon for the unification of the church against French conservative opposition.

Melanchthon had more comprehensive plans for European monarchs, since he wanted to include England in these discussions. On September 6, 1534, Melanchthon wrote to his friend Joachim Camerarius, a classical scholar who had a moderating influence on Lutheranism in the 1530s, asking whether he should go to England. He had already been invited twice, he said, and was about to receive a third invitation. It is evident that unification plans were at the heart of Melanchthon's concerns, especially the turmoil in the English Church. He revealed to Camerarius that both French and English matters were affecting him strongly.¹³¹

Now I am among the French, now among Britons, now in these travails; if I were my own master, I would prefer to hide myself away in some kind of solitude, than to be involved in such a throng of affairs.¹³²

Henry had hoped that Melanchthon would come, but the divisions between conservative and reform-minded clergy delayed Henry's invitation. Melanchthon said that he would not go to England without the permission of his superior, the elector of Saxony, which was later denied.¹³³

Conclusion

By declaring himself the supreme head of church and state and repudiating the pope's authority over the church, Henry VIII affected the stability of the English Church in relation to the pope. Based on the theory of Marsilius of Padua, the king became the head of the church. Now as one entity, a "politic society," parliamentary laws governed both state and church. Henry's supremacy also changed the relationships among himself, the archbishop, and other bishops; he subdued the bishops and stipulated that they had to preach his supremacy all over the country. This caused a problem in terms of delegation of powers to his archbishop and other bishops, who lost their authority in matters of doctrine and practice. Supremacy was interpreted as Henry having sole authority; but eventually he found it reasonable to delegate it to a lay leader, Thomas Cromwell, who realized the practical applications of this supremacy. The problem of how to interpret church laws ensued, as interpretation of adiaphora matters fell solely to him. The question also arose of how to interpret the doctrine of the Mass, since the pope's canon laws were rescinded but church ceremonies remained the same.

¹³⁰ Irene Dingel notes the pressure from the University of Paris against humanistic ideas. Dingel, 1998, p. 107.

¹³¹ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1489, p. 198. CR II, 1215, pp. 785–786.

¹³² Nunc sum in [Keltois] Κελτοῖς, nunc [ev] ἐν [Bretavois] Βρετανοῖς nunc in his aerumnis. Si meus essem, in quaslibet solitudines me abdere malim, quam in tanta turba negotiorum versari. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1489, p. 198.

¹³³ Melanchthon to Joachim Camerarius. August 31, 1535. MBW R 2: MBW T 6, p. 440; L&P, VII, No. 1013, p. 388.

Henry assumed full authority in doctrinal matters. First, he did not allow clergy to preach any of the controversial issues; namely, adiaphora. Conflict arose between the conservative clergy who supported the supremacy, but were not willing to change any doctrine or practices of the church, and the reform-minded clergy who desired further reforms. They also were divided in how they understood authority in matters of faith and practice. The conservative clergy regarded Scripture and Tradition as of equal authority, but the reform-minded clergy supported Scripture alone as authoritative in both doctrine and practice. Many of the evangelical clergy, like Robert Barnes, held to the Wittenberg teaching of the sole authority of Scripture. To prevent any threat of foreign interference at this critical time, the new laws practically excluded the pope in nominating new bishops, changing the demographics of the church with clergy obedient to the king. The laws also redirected much money previously sent to the pope to the crown.

During the first year of Henry's reign, the question arose as to which matters are of conscience, and which of the church? Henry's divorce became to him a matter of conscience. In consulting the German Reformers, he appealed to them using a vocabulary that he knew was familiar, primarily to gain their support in his divorce struggle with the pope, and secondarily to consult with them concerning their opinions on doctrine and practice.

Henry's supremacy act strained his relationship with the continental powers, as the succession act rendered Princess Mary illegitimate, in order to prevent any Catholic influence on the country. Henry needed allies to defend his actions against the pope, and he sent his ambassadors to the Saxon princes. He formed an alliance with the formidable Schmalkaldic League. Henry gave assurances that his intention was to reform the church, by using Protestant rhetoric "according to God's Word." It was in this situation that Henry considered inviting Melancthon to England. Melancthon offered a positive opinion of Henry's divorce. Henry saw Melancthon as a person with knowledge of the exegetical tradition of the Reformers, who could help him solve the practical conflicts he encountered after his break from Rome—how to organize his church using new principles in doctrine and practice. His major challenge was how to combine opinions of the two major religious parties to solve both doctrinal and adiaphora matters. While Melancthon wanted to discuss church matters with the English king and was connected to other Protestant Reformers in an effort to resolve disagreements, he was distracted by his plans for France.

The interpretation of adiaphora had become problematic in the English Church. When doctrinal matters were sanctioned by Parliament, they became human laws binding consciences, as stated in the first research question. The king's supreme authority in the church will continue to be an important topic throughout this study, since in each phase his decisions and actions influenced the interpretation of adiaphora matters. The parliamentary laws were also church laws, and their interpretation becomes problematic in the discussion of doctrinal and practical matters in the context of adiaphora. The issue of the power of the church will run through all the subsequent chapters—whether the discussion is limited to the king's authority or that of the General Council; whether the General Council was above the pope, or the pope the leader of the General Council; and how much authority did the bishops have. The doctrinal affinity between the reform-minded bishops and the German Reformers will be an important point of discussion, in order to discern their influence, through Melancthon, on the English doctrine of adiaphora. Melancthon's mediating influence on church policy will be discussed in Chapter Two.

Chapter 2:

Melanchthon on Church Policy

(May–October 1534)

Introduction

In this chapter, Melanchthon's ideas on church policy are discussed. Melanchthon wrote articles of advice to the French in the *Advice* with the intention of unifying Catholics and Protestants in church policy. The focus of the *Advice* is on "indifferent matters," such as ecclesiastical policy, human traditions, the Mass, communion in both kinds in the Lord's Supper, monastic vows, celibacy of priests, worship of saints, and the doctrine of justification by faith. Each of these will be discussed at length, including their translations. These articles will also be compared with the corresponding articles of the Latin *Confessio Augustana* of 1530. To orient the reader, the chapter begins with a brief history of the German principalities and the situation in England and France.

Melanchthon's Views on Church Policy and Indifferent Matters

At the same time that developments in England led to the supremacy of the king, the French king seems to have had fairly independent authority as a Catholic monarch, as stated in the Concordat of Bologna of 1516, which secured a deal limiting papal interference in France.¹ It is clear that the independent principalities in German lands and the independent states in France and England gradually gained more authority and became less dependent on the pope. While the German princes were contracted with the Holy Roman Empire and under the emperor's leadership, the bishops in France were more independent in that the king had the right to nominate them. However, many practical matters of church policy inherited from the Roman Church caused disturbances in the national churches at the time. The change in understanding church law and authority effected the interpretation of church policy—i.e., adiaphoristic matters.

Melanchthon saw an opportunity to consolidate the difficult questions of the church's authority and to solve the very tricky question of the interpretation of "indifferent matters," or those church policy questions that, in his opinion, were not necessary for salvation. King Henry had both secular and ecclesiastical authority in England to decide doctrinal and practical matters, including "indifferent matters." In German principalities, Saxon theologians defined the church's doctrinal and practical matters, including "indifferent matters." A secular magistrate, the elector, supported the reforms.

¹ MacCulloch 2003, p. 193.

The difference in interpretation of church law and church policy became controversial during the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations, and Melanchthon intended to settle controversial issues in church policy with the European monarchs in their independent churches. It was Melanchthon's plan to include both French and English monarchs in this discussion. Since Melanchthon had formed a personal relationship with the French king, he began at first clarifying these controversial issues in France,² while expecting an invitation from King Henry. Melanchthon still had hopes that the unity of the church under the leadership of the pope could be saved.³ Greschat argues that Melanchthon's primary intention was to have the church situation and authority improve through discussions of educated and pious men.⁴ Melanchthon's hope to maintain the unity of the old Church under the pope may have not been a realistic goal either for the German or the English churches.

As early as 1534, Melanchthon addressed church policy issues in articles collectively called the *Advice*. Dingel points out that in Melanchthon's opinion, both the French *Advice* and the *Confessio Augustana's* evangelical doctrines were in agreement with the Catholicity of the Church.⁵ She further points out that the *Advice* was intended to become a document of unified Western Europe under the *Confessio Augustana*. Therefore, it is more important to understand Melanchthon's goal in writing the *Advice*. This demand made it necessary for Melanchthon to interpret the doctrine in *Confessio Augustana* and modify it to distinctive situations to attain agreement.⁶ This author agrees with Dingel that the purpose of the *Advice* was to demonstrate agreement between theological opponents.⁷

According to Cameron, Melanchthon made every effort to conciliate between Protestants and Catholics. Cameron asserts that when Melanchthon had been labeled unstable and unreliable, he defended himself with words such as "moderation" and "reasonableness" (*epieikeia*). He relied on frankness and clarity when he spoke on dogma.⁸ Melanchthon's goal of church unity is an important element in his doctrinal statements in *Advice*. He may not have reckoned with political interference in his plans as he was not a politician and did not think in political terms, argues Kohnle. However, at that time there was no theology without politics and no politics without theology, so he could not avoid giving advice on political matters as well.⁹ This author agrees, as will be seen later, that Melanchthon found himself pressed by various political and confessional groups.

Melanchthon presented his thought on adiaphora matters in the text of *Advice* while presenting his private plan to unify the Catholics and Protestants of France. The articles show how far Melanchthon was willing to compromise on adiaphora matters to achieve unity. This researcher was able to discern Melanchthon's influence on the English regarding adiaphora in

² Scheible 2002, pp. 195–210.

³ The article on the Church's policy, the adiaphora in relation to the pope's authority, became foremost in the unification negotiations. Dingel, 1998, pp. 110–111.

⁴ Greschat 2010, p. 115.

⁵ Dingel, 1998, p. 110.

⁶ Dingel 2012a, pp. 105, 108–109.

⁷ Ibid., p. 109.

⁸ Cameron 2004, pp. 73–75.

⁹ Kohnle 2011, p. 43.

two ways: by the outside historical events in which the documents were produced, and through Melanchthon's thoughts expressed in the *Advice* he wrote. The *Advice* is a document produced in a specific historical situation and conveys Melanchthon's inner ideas at that particular time. The text of the *Advice* was compared with another document Melanchthon had devised for the purpose of unifying the German Catholics and Protestants—that is, the *Confessio Augustana* of 1530, which had a larger audience. It was presented to the emperor at the Diet of Augsburg but was not accepted by the Roman Church. The articles in the *Advice* were controversial when compared with those of the *Confessio Augustana*, alterations and modifications to which had been requested by Protestants; i.e., concerning adiaphora, or articles not necessary to salvation. Even though these articles were all related to doctrinal articles of the *Confessio Augustana*, the concern was to eliminate practices that were against the doctrine of justification, especially work-righteousness.

Taking a closer look at the *Advice*, one sees how far Melanchthon was willing to compromise with respect to controversial issues, such as the power of the church, human traditions in indifferent things, justification by faith, the Mass, communion in both kinds in the Lord's Supper, the worship of saints, monastic vows, and the celibacy of priests.¹⁰ One of the disputed articles, "Power of the Church," in *Advice* is called "Power of the Bishop" in the *Confessio Augustana*.¹¹ It was essential to resolve the authority question, since it was closely related to the church's policy—who had the authority to define practical matters in the church? The disputed article, "Power of the Bishop," also became important as far as the church's unity was concerned. The article deals extensively with the power of the pope and his bishops, all of whom had the ultimate authority to decide on the church's policy regarding adiaphora. According to Estes, Melanchthon, in the *Advice*, stressed the church's need for bishops who would ordain and examine those called to ecclesiastical ministry and ensure the correct teaching of doctrine.¹² Melanchthon also saw the need to educate future church leaders who would propagate evangelical doctrine. For Melanchthon, the article on justification by faith was the most essential; he was willing to compromise on all others for unity's sake.

¹⁰ Melanchthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, pp. 134–143. Melanchthon sent his judgment concerning the disputes over Church matters with the Roman Pope to Guillaume du Bellay de Langey. The articles sent to France are in MBW T 6, 1467, pp. 134–143; CR II, No. 1205. The articles used in this study are the originals of Melanchthon's and appear in three forms: (1) Schwebel, (2) Peucer, (3) French. Schwebel's copy has used Codex. Monac is the one true and genuine form, which will be followed in this study. CR II, No. 1205, pp. 741–742. The articles appropriate for this study include: *De Potestate Ecclesiastica*, *De Traditionibus humanis rerum indifferentium*, *de iustificatione*; *de Missa et utraque specie*, *de cultu Sanctorum*, *de votis et coelibatu*. Philip Melanchthon: Advice on how religious controversies might be moderated. August 1, 1534. Mutilated copies of Melanchthon's Articles went from France to England and from England to Germany in 1539. This study will follow Schwebel's edition. The Counsel of Melanchthon was published several times in France. But the text published in France is not even published under his name. Guillaume du Bellay de Langey put it together from counsel, which Melanchthon sent to him. The Academy in Paris repudiated the text handed them by Bellay and also opposed the other articles. The French copy is also included as Argenterio F. in *Corpus Reformatorum*. Melanchthon kept his own copy, but was unwilling to publish it. (Letter to Camerarius, October 1, 1535 CR II, 1222, pp. 791–793.) The initial purpose of the articles was to bring the Pope and the evangelicals to an agreement (per de Langey). MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, pp. 134–143; CR II, 1205, pp. 743–764.

¹¹ CAL 1530, Article XXVIII, pp. 120–135.

¹² James M. Estes: *Peace, Order and the Glory of God*. 2005, p. 174 (hereafter, Estes 2005).

There were others who advocated church unity. Rummel asserts that Erasmus' position reflected a wide range of other positions taken during the reunification in 1530s. The middle party was often characterized as a party of Erasmus, since those advocating concessions in order to gain peace were not popular. Erasmus made five suggestions to bring consensus between Catholics and Protestants: 1) devise a vague vocabulary to satisfy all parties; 2) wait for the General Council to offer suggestions; 3) leave the conflicting issues as they were; 4) that it would be better to maintain *status quo*; and 5) define a compromise.¹³ The last proposal fits Melanchthon best, as seen in his *Advice*.

Melanchthon kept church doctrine and its relation to one's conscience separate from adiaphora matters and who decided them. Melanchthon's hope was that instead of seeing the Reformers as causing upheavals, the pope and the kings should see the disagreements as revealing diseases of the church; in other words, that there were some abuses that should not be covered up and tolerated. Melanchthon agreed that some abuses should be tolerated for the sake of public harmony, but the distinction ought to be made between abuses arising out of stupidity and those that destroy essential articles of doctrine.¹⁴ Melanchthon believed that the abuses in the disputed section of the *Confessio Augustana* should not bind consciences with divine law.

Melanchthon saw the need for compromise in the disputed article "On the Mass." He opposed the notion of work-righteousness, the Masses celebrated for the living and dead, and the sacrificial character of the Mass and its relation to the doctrine of atonement.¹⁵ Based on the Old Testament example, Melanchthon also opposed celibate priests performing the Mass. He demanded that priests be allowed to marry, and believed that papal laws should not bind their consciences.¹⁶ Melanchthon approved monasteries as institutions of learning, but did not accept monastic vows as binding on consciences.¹⁷ The Reformers had demanded communion in both kinds based on Christ's order. This was also closely related to the celebration of the Mass, which allowed only the priests to drink the wine and prohibited it to the congregation.¹⁸

In the articles on the church's unity, Melanchthon claimed that the pope should, in essential matters, allow some leeway for conscience's sake. He claimed that for those wishing reform, it was also necessary to treat the Roman Church with respect for the love of the people.¹⁹ Melanchthon tried to balance both parties. In referring to conscience, he put forth two authorities: Scripture alone, which was supported by the Reformers as an authority in matters of faith and practice, and Scripture and Tradition, which the Catholics supported.²⁰ For them, Scripture and unwritten oral tradition was to be interpreted by the pope and had equal authority.

¹³ Erika Rummel: *Erasmus and the Restoration of Unity in the Church*. 2004, pp. 62–70. In *Conciliation and Confession*. Eds. Howard P. Louthan and Randall C. Zachman (hereafter, Rummel 2004).

¹⁴ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 134. Melanchthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534.

¹⁵ CAL 1530, XXIV pp. 91–95.

¹⁶ CAL 1530, XXIII, pp. 86–91.

¹⁷ CAL 1530, XXVII, pp. 110–119.

¹⁸ CAL 1530, XXII, pp. 85–86.

¹⁹ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 134. Melanchthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534.

²⁰ See discussion on Scripture alone and Scripture and Tradition in Oberman 1967, pp. 54–55, 58–59. McGrath 1987, p. 147.

Melanchthon denied the notion that the Reformers' repudiation of human traditions meant that they were opposing the pope's authority altogether, and stressed mutual respect from all parties in the unification process.

Melanchthon's *Advice* consisted of the disputed points in church policy on human traditions in indifferent matters, on justification, the Mass, vows, celibacy of priests, confession,²¹ and invocation of saints.²² As each article is discussed below, one may see from the *Confessio Augustana* how much Melanchthon was willing to condone for the sake of peace and harmony in the church.

Ecclesiastical Policy

Melanchthon presented his opinion on external matters, church government and certain traditions in the four articles "On the Power of the Roman Pope," "On the Authority of the Bishops," "On the Ordination of Priests," "On Human Traditions in Indifferent Matters," and "On Confession." He believed that these issues should not present great obstacles to an agreement.²³

In the *Advice*, Melanchthon regarded church government as a legal matter, and wrote that many bishops presided over churches in the same way that the Roman pontiff presided over his bishops. Melanchthon accepted the pope's canonical government on terms that it kept its boundaries; i.e., did not oppress true doctrine. Melanchthon stressed that it was necessary that the bishops, who had authority in the churches, should make sure to hand down healthy doctrine, since the church was entrusted to them; it was right to obey them. Furthermore, he wrote, since there was need to make judgments and to oversee the doctrine of priests, the bishops and the Roman pontiff should retain their proper authority. Melanchthon commended the monarchy of the Roman pontiff as a means to propagate right doctrine among many nations.²⁴ He notes further that one might agree to papal supremacy in ecclesiastical policy if it could be established in the other articles as well. The kings could moderate the unjust and excessive power of the Roman pontiff. The pope's human authority excluded expounding new doctrine by the church's divine authority.²⁵

²¹ Confession is not one of the disputed articles of this study, but was one among them. Melanchthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume de Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, pp. 135–136.

Melanchthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume de Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; T 6, 1467, pp. 135–136. Melanchthon recommended retaining confession in churches. He thought that because absolution had been abolished, the doctrine on remission of sins and the power of keys fell into obscurity. Thus, for the sake of discipline, men could be instructed during confession. If men were taught where remission of sins came from, there would be no danger that consciences would be burdened with superstitious enumerations of sin. Neither was the article on "Confession" included in the controversial issues during the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations, but it was a crucial issue between the Catholics and Protestants. The article on the "Invocation of Saints" had some part in the early phase of Anglo-Lutheran negotiations.

²² Melanchthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume de Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, pp. 134–143.

²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 135–136.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 135–136.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 134–135.

Article XVIII of the *Confessio Augustana* states that the power of the keys; i.e., power of the bishop, is the power to preach the new doctrine, remit and retain sins, and administer the sacraments.²⁶

Our teachers hold that according to the Gospel the power of keys or the power of bishops is a power or command of God to preach the Gospel, to remit and retain sins, and to administer the sacraments.²⁷

Article XVIII of the *Confessio Augustana* states further that the ecclesiastical and civil powers are not to be confused. The power of the church is to preach the Gospel and administer the sacraments. Each sphere has its own function and the power of the church should not interfere with the laws of the civil rulers or the form of government, and should be obedient.²⁸

Therefore, ecclesiastical and civil power are not to be confused. The power of the church has its own commission to preach the Gospel and administer the sacraments. Let it not invade the other's function, nor transfer the kingdoms of the world, nor abrogate the laws of civil rulers, nor abolish lawful obedience or contracts, nor prescribe to civil rulers laws about the forms of government that should be established.²⁹

Article XXVIII of the *Confessio Augustana* states that the bishops should not institute ordinances that are in conflict with the Gospel, since the bondage of law is not necessary for justification.³⁰

Inasmuch as ordinances which have been instituted as necessary or instituted with the intention of meriting justification are in conflict with the Gospel, it follows that it is not lawful for bishops to institute such services or require them as necessary. It is necessary to preserve the doctrine of Christian liberty in the churches, namely, that servitude to law is not necessary for justification.³¹

The change seen in the *Advice* is the pope's power over the church, unjust power claiming divine authority, and his interference in the civil realm. However, the document suggests taking away the pope's divine authority over new doctrine, but allowing him to have authority based on human law.

This author agrees with Dingel, who says that Melancthon pointed out that the Reformers did not refute the pope's authority, but tried to explain the disputed matters in light of conscience and according to the worship practice of the church in essential matters.³² As seen above, Melancthon was willing to retain the old structure of authority in the Catholic Church, as long as the evangelical doctrine was not suppressed and consciences were free. This author also agrees with Dingel's finding that papal authority was placed in an adiaphora category and the

²⁶ *Sic autem sentiunt, potestatem clavium seu potestatem episcoporum iuxta evangelium potestatem esse seu mandatum Dei praedicandi evangelii, remittendi et retinendi peccata et administrandi sacramenta.* CAL 1530, p. 121; Grane 1987, pp. 241–242.

²⁷ CAL 1530, XXVIII, p. 121; Leif Grane: *The Augsburg Confession.* 1987, pp. 241–242 (hereafter, Grane 1987).

²⁸ CAL 1530, XXVIII, p. 122; Grane 1987, p. 242.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ CAL 1530, XXVIII, p. 128; Grane 1987, p. 246.

³¹ *Relinquitur igitur, cum ordinationes, institutae tamquam necessariae aut cum opinione promerendae iustificationis, pugnent cum evangelio, quod non liceat episcopis tales cultus instituere, aut tamquam necessarios exigere. Necesse est enim in ecclesiis retineri doctrinam de libertate christiana, quod non sit necessaria servitus legis ad iustificationem.* CAL 1530 XXVIII, p. 128; Grane 1987, p. 246.

³² Dingel, 1998, pp. 110–111.

concession included that the bishops and pope would not abuse their power to suppress right doctrine, but promote it as if there was no disagreement within ecclesiastical power.³³

Scheible notes that Melanchthon accepted the pope's supremacy as long as he did not suppress true doctrine, but opined that his interference in politics should be prevented.³⁴ This author agrees that Melanchthon accepted the pope's authority on human law. Would this have been a realistic goal to present to the pope? Kohnle argues that Melanchthon did not see any possibility that Pope Clement VII would have understood his arguments in the *Advice*.³⁵

Speaking of how Melanchthon saw the unity of the church, Selderhuis finds that according to Melanchthon, it was essential to the church's unity to maintain true doctrine, not the episcopacy. Selderhuis further argues that for Melanchthon, bishops according to God's right (*iure divino*), rank above other servants of the "Word of God" as the church has various grades in the human *politia*.³⁶ Selderhuis notes also that the principle of succession for the bishops is problematic, since Melanchthon held that the unity of the church is not dependent on bishops, but on right doctrine.³⁷ Melanchthon held the synod (a communion of bishops, elders and princes,) as the highest authority in the church, to pass doctrine and be "witness to the truth" to maintain the unity of the church. According to Selderhuis, Melanchthon did not clearly define the term "synod."³⁸ Stupperich names Melanchthon's contribution to the development of the synod as the theoretical grounding of the Protestant synod.³⁹ Selderhuis sees the relationship of church order to church unity as conserving the truth expressed at the Diet of Augsburg. Loss of church unity leads to loss of church order, and results in decay of culture. This is how Melanchthon connects *politia ecclesiastica*, *disciplina ecclesiastica* and *politia temporalis* to each other.⁴⁰ These elements were important for Melanchthon, as seen in his unification efforts against the pope's council.

The contents of "The Power of the Church" are the same as in Article XXVIII of the *Confessio Augustana*. Equating the pope's power to that of a bishop is new in the *Advice*, as is the authorization in Article XXVIII for bishops to define and preach new doctrine and administer the sacraments. Melanchthon must have been thinking of replacing the pope's council and establishing bishops' synods in which doctrinal matters would be decided collaboratively.

Human Traditions in Indifferent Matters

Melanchthon thought that unification would be achieved if agreement were reached about the power of the church to decide "indifferent matters," such as foods, feast days, vestments, and

³³ Dingel 2012a, pp. 109–110.

³⁴ Scheible 2002, pp. 200–202.

³⁵ Kohnle 2011, p. 48.

³⁶ Herman J. Selderhuis: *Melanchthon und das Kirchenrecht*. In *Philipp Melanchthon*. Hrsg. Irene Dingel, Armin Kohnle, Udo Sträter. Leucorea-Studien zur Geschichte der Reformation und der Lutherischen Orthodoxie. 2011, p. 223 (hereafter, Selderhuis 2011).

³⁷ Selderhuis 2011, p. 223.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 223–224.

³⁹ Robert Stupperich: *Kirche und Synode bei Melanchthon*. In *Beiträge zur historischen und systematischen Theologie: Gedenkschrift für Werner Elert*. Hrsg. von Friedrich Hübner; Ernst Kinder; Wilhelm Maurer. Berlin 1955, p. 200; Selderhuis 2011, p. 224.

⁴⁰ Selderhuis 2011, pp. 223–225.

other similar ceremonies. Instead of disputing the “power of the church” itself, Melanchthon recommended replacing the contents of the old church structure. This author agrees with Dingel, who states that Melanchthon believed that in the framework of biblical doctrine there were no obstacles to unity in external matters.⁴¹

In the *Advice*, Melanchthon wrote that agreement should be easily found among the churches regarding “indifferent matters” if there was an agreement on doctrine. It was his hope that his writing about the “indifferent matters” would help other nations also to approve similar doctrinal positions.⁴² His writing was clearly meant for a larger audience than France, and he must have been thinking of England as well.

This author concurs with Verkamp, who finds that the *Confessio Augustana* cautioned that human traditions instituted earlier may not be suitable later, and do not need to be alike everywhere. The true unity of the church is dependent on agreement that the new doctrine is preached and the sacraments administered.⁴³ According to Luther and Melanchthon, some human traditions had to be established for the sake of unity and order, and could serve as teaching tools and thus should be kept. Both Luther and Melanchthon intended to maintain *via media*, to avoid legalism on the one hand and antinomianism on the other.⁴⁴

On Justification by Faith

I compare the article on justification by faith in the *Advice* to Article IV of *Confessio Augustana* in order to evaluate Melanchthon’s position. I use other doctrinal articles from *Confessio Augustana* such as Article VI, on “New Obedience”; Article XVIII, “Free will”; and Article XX, “Faith and Good Works,” in order to clarify Melanchthon’s position on justification in *Advice*.

First, Melanchthon repudiated the scholastic teaching that one can earn remission of sins by the worthiness of one’s works—that is, by fulfilling the law. Melanchthon wrote that the scholastics do not mention faith or trust in Christ for the remission of sin and that most educated men agreed with the doctrines of free will and original sin.⁴⁵

In the *Advice*, Melanchthon wrote that, if the pope or the kings negotiated the controversy over justification, it would be easily settled and benefit the church to have a straightforward doctrine of justification expounded, which would be beneficial for good conscience.⁴⁶

Wherefore, if the pope or the kings themselves were to make efforts to have good and sensible men confer, this controversy over justification could be easily adjudicated and dismissed. It would be of

⁴¹ Dingel 2012a, p. 110.

⁴² Melanchthon’s opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume de Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 135. Kohnle 2011, p. 47. Dingel, 1998, pp. 110–111. Scheible, 2002, pp. 200–201.

⁴³ Verkamp 1975, pp. 73–74.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 71, 73–75.

⁴⁵ Melanchthon’s opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume de Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, pp. 136–137. Dingel, 1998, pp. 111–112; Dingel 2012a, p. 111.

⁴⁶ Melanchthon’s opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume de Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, pp. 136–137. Dingel 2012a, p. 111; Dingel, 1998, pp. 111–112; Scheible, 2002, pp. 200–201.

benefit to the church, too, to have a simple and straightforward doctrine of justification expounded. For the matter is essential to good conscience. Furthermore, there are two articles, the one concerning the remission of sins, the other, concerning the worth of good works in those who have now been reconciled.⁴⁷

The first part concerned remission of sins and the change of habits that are necessary for the remission of sins, even though the remission of sins is not dependent on works, but is to be attained by faith and trust in Christ.

In the first part, Melanchthon stated that “repentance and change of habits were necessary in the remission of sins, even though the remission of sins was not dependent on worthiness of repentance or works but through mercy for Christ’s sake obtained by faith, that is trust in Christ.”⁴⁸

Even though good works cannot bring justification, their merit is not obliterated altogether, since they are to be understood in the light of remission of sins. If the remission of sins were dependent on the worth of the repentance, the remission would be uncertain. Good works are important for other reasons too,⁴⁹ as seen in the passage below:

In this interpretation, it is clear that good works are not excluded, but another cause for the remission of sins is being sought that is certain and sufficient. For it is agreed that in true terrors, our good works cannot be set against the wrath and judgment of God. Their merit is not removed here, for we do none of that, but it is so that it should be understood from whence comes certain remission; for if it depended on the worth of our contrition, it would be uncertain.⁵⁰

Regarding the second section concerning the worth of works among those reconciled, Melanchthon wrote that everyone agreed that men fell short of the perfection of the law and were primarily justified by faith. He found that the recognition of faith as enabling justification encourages the believer to perform good works

The second section of the article concerning the value of good works on those reconciled is often softened over time because everyone concedes that men fall far short of the perfection of the law and our opponents agree that men are primarily just, that is accepted by faith, that is, trust in the

⁴⁷ *Quare si pontifex aut ipsi reges darent operam, ut aliqui boni viri et prudentes colloquerentur, facile posset haec controversia de iustificatione diiudicari ac dirimi. Et quidem prodesset ecclesiae extare simplicem et planam doctrinam de iustificatione; res enim est necessaria conscientiiis. Sunt autem duo articuli: Alter est de remissione peccatorum, alter de dignitate bonorum operum seu de meritis in his, qui iam reconciliati sunt.* Melanchthon’s opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume de Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 136.

⁴⁸ *De priore articulo etiam existimo facile posse constitui concordiam, quod in remissione peccatorum necessaria sit contritio et mutatio morum, et tamen remissionem contingere non propter dignitatem nostrae contritionis seu operum, sed tantum per misericordiam propter Christum, quae fide, hoc est fiducia Christi, apprehenditur.* Melanchthon’s opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume de Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, pp. 136–137.

⁴⁹ Melanchthon’s opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume de Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, pp. 136–137.

⁵⁰ *In hac sententia clarum est non excludi bona opera, sed aliam causam remissionis peccatorum queri certam et sufficientem. Constat enim in veris pavoribus non posse opponi bona opera irae ac iudicio dei. Hic meritum non tollitur, quia nos nihil agamus, sed ut intelligatur, quomodo sit certa remissio; si enim penderet ex dignitate contritionis nostrae, fieret incerta.* Melanchthon’s opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume de Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, pp. 136–137.

mercy promised on account of Christ and that this rudiment of law in us is pleasing, not that it fulfills the law, but the person is reconciled in Christ.⁵¹

Preachers should encourage good works as long as the perspective is kept in mind that remission of sins is obtained through faith in Christ. He therefore judged good works and good conscience as necessary, since the Holy Spirit is given in the actual remission of sins; God's works are thus the law of God.⁵² Free will avoids sins and the Holy Spirit helps to avoid such sins. He again equated the Holy Spirit and free will.⁵³

These things are agreed that the justification of good works or a good conscience is necessary, that the Holy Spirit is given in the actual remission of sins, that it is right to mortify the old man and grow into newness of Spirit, that the Holy Spirit does not remain in those who commit mortal sins: that is, acts against conscience and against the law of God. In the same way, that free will accomplishes something in avoiding such sins. In the same way, that one is helped by the Holy Spirit in avoiding such sins.⁵⁴

Article VII of the *Confessio Augustana* on "New Obedience," states that good works are the spontaneous fruit of those being justified and reconciled with God, not that they merit justification for forgiveness of sins, but to bring forth good fruits.⁵⁵ Article XVIII of the *Confessio Augustana* on "Free Will," states that man will have some liberty in affairs concerning civil righteousness, but no power without the Holy Spirit to attain spiritual righteousness, brought into man's heart when the Holy Spirit is received through the Word.⁵⁶

In Article XX of the *Confessio Augustana* on "Faith and Good Works," it seems that Melancthon spoke in a conciliatory tone to bring out the true meaning of faith. Melancthon's emphasis is faith with respect to good works, since the Holy Spirit received by faith re-creates a person and gives him/her ethical powers.⁵⁷ It is clear from the text of *Advice* that Melancthon

⁵¹ *Alter articulus de dignitate bonorum operum in reconciliatis etiam nunc tempore factus est mollior. Quia omnes iam concedunt, quod homines procul absint a perfectione legis, ideo concedunt homines principaliter iustos, id est acceptos, esse fide, hoc est fiducia misericordiae propter Christum. Et quod illa inchoatio legis in nobis placeat, non quia satisfaciatur, sed quia persona est reconciliata Christo.* Melancthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume de Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 137.

⁵² Gregory B. Graybill. *Evangelical Free Will* 2010, pp. 209–210 (hereafter, Graybill 2010). For an opposite view, see Wengert 1997, pp. 201–202.

⁵³ Melancthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW, T 6, 1467, p. 137. Wengert notes that Melancthon's use of free choice aided by the Holy Spirit is active in guarding against such failings as mortal sin is different from his original definition on Colossians of 1534. Wengert 1997, pp. 202–203. John Schneider states that Melancthon used a rhetorical construal of the text to find and elaborate a coherent presentation of biblical doctrine, and gathered examples around the locus of faith to clarify that the main idea of Scripture referred to the promise of grace in Jesus Christ. The biblical doctrine for him was a rhetorical event by which the truth affected mind and heart, thought and affection, understanding and action. See Schneider 1990, p. 233.

⁵⁴ *Illam conveniunt, quod iustitia bonorum operum seu bonae conscientiae sit necessaria, quod spiritus sanctus detur in ipsa remissione peccatorum, quod oporteat mortificari veterem hominem et crescere novitatem spiritus, quod spiritus sanctus non maneat in his, qui committunt mortalia peccata, hoc est facta contra conscientiam et contra legem dei. Item quod liberum arbitrium aliquid agat in cavendis talibus delictis. Item quod adiuvetur a spiritu sancto, ut caveat talia delicta.* Melancthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume de Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 137.

⁵⁵ CAL 1530, IV, p. 60; Grane 1987, pp. 81–82.

⁵⁶ CAL 1530, XVIII, p. 73; Grane 1987, p. 181.

⁵⁷ CAL 1530, XX, pp. 75–76, 80–81; Grane 1987, pp. 194, 202–204.

saw the need to emphasize good works as the consequence—not the cause—of justification, using his typical conciliatory tone.

Article IV of the *Confessio Augustana* on “Justification” defined an extrinsic act, which is outside any human cooperation, merit or work. God reckons the righteousness of Christ to sinners at the same time. God’s righteousness is also intrinsic, in the sense that God reckons the faith of a justified person as righteousness but the person is not justified through faith, but because of Christ. Justification is a gift freely given for Christ’s sake through faith. This righteousness through faith is an imputed righteousness.⁵⁸

Likewise, they teach that human beings cannot be justified before God by their own powers, merits, or works. But they are justified as a gift on account of Christ through faith, when they believe that they are received into grace and that their sins are forgiven on account of Christ, who by his death made satisfaction for our sins. God reckons this faith as justification before him.⁵⁹

The author agrees with Vainio’s assessment that in Article IV of the *Confessio Augustana*, faith is not to be understood as a virtue, but as a faith that apprehends Christ and applies his righteousness to the believer.⁶⁰ According to Mannermaa, justifying faith means participation in God’s essence in Christ.⁶¹

The specific purpose of the *Advice* was intended to be the negotiation of an agreement between Protestants and Catholics to maintain the old church structure and agree on adiaphora matters in the light of the doctrine of justification by faith. Melanchthon’s main goal was to hold onto the doctrinal statements of the *Confessio Augustana* as he stated: “As long we agree to doctrine, all other matters fall into place.” It does not seem that Melanchthon would have presented a new doctrinal statement of his own which was not consistent with his statement of the doctrine of justification by faith of the Article IV of the *Confessio Augustana*. It is most likely that he interpreted Article IV in a way to put more emphasis on good works, as stated above in Article VI “New Obedience,” Article XVIII “Free Will,” and Article XX “Faith and Good Works” of the *Confessio Augustana*. Article VI states:

Our churches also teach that this faith is bound to bring forth good fruits, and that it is necessary to do the good works commanded by God. We must do so because it is God’s will, and not because we rely on such works to merit justification before God. For forgiveness of sins and justification are apprehended by faith, as Christ himself also testifies, “When you have done all these things, say, ‘We are unprofitable servants.’” (Luke 17:10). The same is also taught by the Fathers of the

⁵⁸ CAL 1530, IV, p. 56; Grane 1987, p. 58. Olli-Pekka Vainio: *Justification and Participation in Christ*. 2008, pp. 69–74 (hereafter, Vainio 2008).

⁵⁹ *Item docent, quod homines non possint iustificari coram Deo propriis viribus, meritis aut operibus, sed gratis iustificentur propter Christum per fidem, cum credunt se in gratiam recipi et peccata remitti propter Christum, qui sua morte pro nostris peccatis satisfecit. Hanc fidem imputat Deus pro iustitia coram ipso.* CAL 1530, IV, p. 56.

⁶⁰ This emphasis was clearer in the Swabach and Marburg articles in 1529. Because Luther had composed the Marburg articles, Vainio argues that he would have read the article of justification to understand faith not only as the instrumental but also formal cause of justification. Vainio 2008, p. 70–71. See Vainio’s analysis of Melanchthon’s doctrine of justification, pp. 69–81.

⁶¹ Tuomo Mannermaa: *Christ Present in Faith. Luther’s View of Justification*. Ed. Kirsi Stjerna. 2005, pp. 16–19 (hereafter, Mannermaa 2005).

Ancient Church, for Ambrose says, “it is ordained by God that whoever believes in Christ shall be saved, not through works but through faith alone, and he shall receive forgiveness of sins freely.”⁶²

Melanchthon needed doctrinal reinforcement in order to justify unity on adiaphora matters in light of the doctrine of justification by faith. The concepts used in the doctrine of justification were in their formative stages. Melanchthon’s attempt to unite the Protestants and the Catholics required a conciliatory tone when making doctrinal statements, in order to be acceptable to both parties after the negotiations had broken off at Augsburg in 1530. This author agrees with Dingel that in presenting the doctrine of justification, Melanchthon had other essential doctrines of the *Confessio Augustana* in mind, such as original sin, and free will.⁶³ She finds also that good works result from trust in Christ that produces new obedience, and calls it active righteousness.

As seen with the doctrine of justification, we need to assess if Melanchthon’s position had actually changed from the *Confessio Augustana*. Perhaps there was a new emphasis on good works or the negotiations with the Catholics demanded more flexibility from Melanchthon when introducing the article of justification by faith. In the *Advice*, Melanchthon had divided the article into two parts. The second part consists of the worth of works of those reconciled. The doctrine of justification and good works was a central theme of discussion during the sixteenth century, and even today. Present scholars comment on Melanchthon’s understanding of justification by faith from the systematic and historical point of view, arguing that Melanchthon’s doctrinal position had changed since the *Confessio Augustana* of 1530, since he explicitly spoke of justification and good works.

Dingel also finds that good works result from trust in Christ that produces new obedience and active righteousness.⁶⁴ Melanchthon thought that the dispute over doctrine could be easily resolved if an agreement could be reached on justification by faith, which in his understanding included essential doctrines in the *Confessio Augustana* Melanchthon needed to substantiate in either the *Confessio Augustana* or the *Apologia* when discussing adiaphora issues with the Catholics.⁶⁵

A document produced for purposes of negotiations with various religious parties should not be used to analyze Melanchthon’s doctrinal changes, since the purpose of the *Advice* was to interpret the *Confessio Augustana* for both Protestants and Catholics. As seen from the document, Melanchthon states that he used the doctrines of original sin and free will, which leads one to think that his basic text was *Confessio Augustana*.

As Melanchthon further expounded on the relationship between faith and good works, Dingel points out that Melanchthon’s article on “Justification” in the *Advice* was dependent on the

⁶² *Item docent, quod fides illa debeat bonos fructus parere et quod oporteat bona opera mandata a Deo facere propter voluntatem Dei, non ut confidamus per ea opera iustificationem coram Deo mereri. Nam remissio peccatorum et iustificatio fide apprehenditur, sicut testatur et vox Christi: Cum feceritis haec omnia, dicite, servi inutiles sumus. Idem docent et veteres scriptores ecclesiastici. Ambrosius enim inquit: Hoc constitutum est a Deo, ut qui credit in Christum, salvus sit sine opere, sola fide, gratis accipiens remissionem peccatorum.* CAL 1530, VI, p. 60; Grane 1987, p. 81.

⁶³ Dingel 2012a, p. 110.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 110–111.

Apologia of the Confessio Augustana; this way he was able to expound on good works, good conscience, and new obedience in relation to justification.⁶⁶

Wengert's approach to the *Advice* is to compare Melanchthon's position in the *Scholia* of 1534 (revised from 1527). He affirms that a shift had occurred in Melanchthon's understanding of law, and offers to explain its exegetical and theological causes.⁶⁷ Since Lutherans did not explicitly mention "good works" for those reconciled, Catholics could accuse them of lawlessness. Another factor Wengert mentions was Philip Melanchthon's and John Agricola's dispute on how to apply law in Christian life. From this experience, in 1534 Melanchthon developed the third use of the law from Colossians. Furthermore, Wengert mentions two important events in 1534 that had affected a new formulation of the doctrine of justification. Melanchthon and Brück restarted conversations between the Roman and Lutheran parties after the breakdown at Augsburg in 1530. From the negotiations at Leipzig, Melanchthon sent an agreement on the doctrine of justification to the elector.⁶⁸ The second event that affected Melanchthon was Francis's invitation to the German evangelical princes to build an alliance against the emperor, asking Melanchthon to write his opinion on church policy to de Langey.⁶⁹ Wengert notes that Melanchthon made direct reference to the Leipzig discussion and to an agreement reached there, and rejected scholastic teaching on merit and worthiness of works.⁷⁰

Wengert argues that Melanchthon followed his arguments in the *Scholia* of 1534, when he expounded the doctrine of justification in the *Advice*: remission of sins and the worth of good works, the latter not a cause of such remission. Melanchthon had two themes: "acceptance by faith," that he defines as trust in mercy promised *propter Christum*. He then says that on the one hand, "works are pleasing to God not because they satisfy the law, but because a person is reconciled; on the other, righteousness of good works or of a good conscience is necessary."⁷¹ Wengert points out that the last section of the *Advice* differed from the *Scholia* of 1534. In that section, Melanchthon emphasized that the Holy Spirit is given in the remission of sins, discussed the mortification of the old man and growth in faith. The Holy Spirit does not remain in those who commit mortal sin. Melanchthon then asserted that "free choice," aided by the Holy Spirit, protected us from mortal sins, and introduced *liberum arbitrium* into doing good works.

In addition, Wengert notes that Melanchthon's encounter with Romanists provided a test case for him to define his concepts and method of employing accurate theological language, providing a continual development for Melanchthon. He defined his concepts by way of synthesis: combining a theology of merit with elements from the 1530 Confutation with antinomianism like John Agricola's. In order to eliminate the concept of merit, Melanchthon produced a metaphor for a declaration of forgiveness of sins, "gratis propter Christum." Wengert notes that the law continues in terms of obedience where the function of the third use of law comes into play.⁷²

⁶⁶ Dingel 1998, p. 113.

⁶⁷ Timothy J. Wengert: *Law and Gospel*. 1997, p. 177 (hereafter, Wengert 1997).

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 201–202.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 203–204.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 202.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 202–203.

⁷² Wengert 1997, pp. 204–205.

Vainio also argues that Melanchthon's doctrinal position on justification by faith had changed since 1530. That faith justifies because it apprehends Christ was based on a systematic analysis of Melanchthon's arguments in the *Commentary on Romans* of 1532. He clarifies Melanchthon's concepts more accurately than any other scholar. He defines Melanchthon's shift and his doctrine of reconciliation—the doctrine of justification—as an “extrinsic act of imputation,” in that “God's righteousness means acceptance by God.”⁷³ Vainio considers the difference between Melanchthon and Luther and states their essential difference is “how the apprehension of Christ is considered righteousness?” Vainio then indicates that for Melanchthon, the connection with Christ occurs as participation in the Holy Spirit, “as the apprehension of Christ is an act of intellect, relational act of declaration, forensic doctrine of justification, phase of salvation, not intrinsic renewal of the faculties of mind.”⁷⁴ For Melanchthon, apprehending Christ is the content of the faith. As for Luther, Christ is *iustia formalis*, how it is actualized in a believer.⁷⁵

Graybill also noticed a change in Melanchthon's doctrine of free will in his systematic analysis. Melanchthon's soteriological concept of the justification by faith was shifting during 1532–1535. Graybill finds that Melanchthon incorporated the uniform limited governance of God into his theological system.⁷⁶

The doctrine of good works became more prominent, Maxcey points out; and the principle of causality, the function of works, and the role of faith become important for Melanchthon. Maxcey explains that Melanchthon defined faith as work, and differentiates three types: Christ's passion as a work of satisfaction; faith as an instrumental work; and the fruit of faith as a declaratory work. Furthermore, the work of faith does not merit justification, but faith is the means by which Christ is accepted.⁷⁷ Being accepted by Christ is not dependent on the worthiness of the believer, but is imputed on account of Christ and received by faith.⁷⁸ Maxcey argues that the concept of new obedience, *renovatio*, shows up in the *Commentary on Romans* in 1532. Since one has new life, one must have new obedience, not as a mandate but as a necessity of the effect of realizing that there is new life. Melanchthon then defines faith as an assent and trust in the promise of God, thus establishing the doctrine of righteousness *extra nos*.⁷⁹ Faith fulfills the law in that we are reputed righteous on account of that fact; the law is fulfilled.⁸⁰

Wengert notes that Melanchthon's explanation of free choice aided by the Holy Spirit is active in guarding against such failings as mortal sin. It is different from his original definition in 1534.⁸¹ John Schneider stresses the understanding of Melanchthon's theology in the context of his rhetoric; i.e., *sola gratia* and qualified defense of human freedom. He perceived divine communication as rhetoric; he presented moral realities and persuaded the person to lead a

⁷³ Vainio 2008, p. 77.

⁷⁴ Ibid., pp. 77–78.

⁷⁵ Ibid., pp. 76–77.

⁷⁶ Graybill 2010, pp. 209–210. For the opposite view, see Wengert 1997, pp. 201–202.

⁷⁷ Carol E. Maxcey: *Bona Opera*. 1980, pp. 67, 69–70 (hereafter, Maxcey 1980).

⁷⁸ Maxcey 1980, pp. 74–75.

⁷⁹ Ibid., pp. 82–83.

⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 114.

⁸¹ Wengert 1997, pp. 202–203.

Christian life in practice and follow moral virtues.⁸² It is true from the *Advice* that Melanchthon's flexibility in doctrine is seen in his unification endeavors between Catholics and Protestants. This author agrees with Wengert, who asks why Melanchthon added the very language on free will that could be interpreted as a change in his position. He finds that Melanchthon wanted to demonstrate in the negotiations with the French in 1534 that the Word was lifeless, but the Holy Spirit effected what the will was incapable of doing.⁸³ This author agrees that Melanchthon's doctrinal position should be considered as flexibility in interpreting the doctrine of reconciliation with concepts understandable to various confessional groups.

From the argument of other scholars it is evident that Melanchthon is articulating his new position on justification. None except Wengert and Dingel notice the historical circumstances in which Melanchthon saw it necessary to define a doctrine that would be acceptable to a wide variety of negotiation partners. Possibly the emphasis on good works was to demonstrate to the Catholics and the Reformers that he had not abandoned the old doctrine. He only explained the contents differently; i.e., that good works have a consequential role in the process of justification.

Wengert related the change in Melanchthon's doctrine of justification to a special historical situation and considers the change as an interpretation to convey the message of the *Confessio Augustana* in a new historical situation. As will be seen in the next chapter, part of Melanchthon's view of the doctrine of justification shifted. He planned to compile a comprehensive doctrinal statement to conclude his themes while devising the *Advice*.

Vainio finds that one may perceive Melanchthon's view of justification as relational. On the other hand, relational renewal is closely linked to effectual renewal. Melanchthon explains, according to Vainio, God's love is experienced as consolation and speaks of vivification as joy and peace, along with justification as one of the effects of faith. Thus, the "prerequisite for the affect of justifying faith is the donation of the Spirit." According to Melanchthon, a person being justified does not participate in Christ, but Christ is the object of faith. "Having Christ" for Melanchthon means belief, not participation. Believing means receiving the grace promised in Christ, and connection to Christ occurs in participation in the Holy Spirit. Apprehension of Christ is an act of intellect; i.e., one must trust in the Gospel, which is a matter of will. In his doctrine of justification there is the danger that righteousness of faith and good works are too closely linked.⁸⁴

Vainio argues that in Melanchthon's thinking, the gift of the Holy Spirit and the favor are consequential—given and received at the same time through the Gospel. The gift of the Holy Spirit renews the believer; hence Melanchthon denies that the renewal by the Spirit is part of justification.⁸⁵ He aptly points out that in the doctrine of justification, obedience to the law is tied too closely to renewal, so the law might be seen as a requirement of salvation.⁸⁶

⁸² Schneider 1990, pp. 155–159.

⁸³ Timothy J. Wengert: *Philip Melanchthon and the Origins of the "Three Causes" (1533–1535): An Examination of the Roots of the Controversy over the Freedom of Will*. 2012, pp. 204–205. In *Philip Melanchthon*. Eds. Irene Dingel, Robert Kolb, Nicole Kuroepka, and Timothy J. Wengert (hereafter, Wengert 2012).

⁸⁴ Vainio 2008, pp. 74–81.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 78–80.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

In summary, several scholars agree to the shift in Melanchthon's doctrine of soteriology and the emergence on the emphasis of law and good works in Christian life. While reading the document Melanchthon produced for the negotiations between Catholics and Protestants, one should be cautious in interpreting the doctrine of justification. It does not represent a comprehensive doctrinal stance, but should be seen as a developmental process in which Melanchthon clarified concepts he could safely use in discussing the doctrine of justification by faith with Catholics, without altering the true essence of the doctrine of justification. As Wengert notes, discussions with Catholics offered Melanchthon a testing ground to further clarify his soteriological position, which will be analyzed in Chapter Three on the *Loci Communes*.

On the Mass

In the *Advice*, Melanchthon stated that the article concerning the Mass was the most difficult one on which to find agreement. He recommended that the kings of France and England establish a synod to hold talks on this article, since they should be the ones to decide on the subject. Melanchthon did not feel adequate to advise on this point of the Lord's Supper, since even the Reformers in Germany had not been able to agree on it. Melanchthon considered this an important question to resolve, since this disagreement—more than any other—would prevent the spread of the new doctrine among foreign nations. Melanchthon defended public Masses and acknowledged that if the Germans did not find it necessary to change the ceremony, there was no need to do so.⁸⁷

We, at least, are keeping the customary form, insofar that scarcely any difference can be discerned, and I would hope that the same would be the case in other places. For what is the gain in changing ceremonies where there is no need? For innovation that is not necessary should always be avoided.⁸⁸

Dingel notes that no mention is made of the rejection of transubstantiation. Melanchthon spoke of granting a permission to have the Lord's Supper in both kinds, but did not oppose the use of one kind. This author agrees with Dingel that any suggestion to revise the Lord's Supper from present practice is missing in the *Advice*.⁸⁹

In Article XIV of the *Confessio Augustana*, one may perceive that Melanchthon implicitly appeals in more general terms to the popes, whose obligation it had been to correct the abuses of the Mass. He regarded the use of private Masses for gain as abuse:

Masses were being shamefully profaned and applied to purposes of gain. It is also well known how widely this abuse extends in all the churches, by what manner of men Masses are celebrated only for revenues or stipends... Great dissensions have arisen concerning the Mass. Perhaps the world is being punished for such long continued profanations of the Mass as have been tolerated in the

⁸⁷ Melanchthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 138. Kohnle 2011, p. 47.

⁸⁸ *Nos quidem usitatam formam retinemus adeo, ut vix dissimilitudo ulla agnosci possit. Et optarim idem fieri in aliis locis. Quorsum enim attinet ceremonias mutare, cum non opus est?* Melanchthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 138.

⁸⁹ Dingel 2012a, p. 112.

church for many centuries by the very men who were able to correct them and were under obligation to do so.⁹⁰

Article XXIV of the *Confessio Augustana* also defends the German customs that the Reformers preserved much of in the old church structure. They also maintained traditional rites during the celebration of the Mass:

The Mass is retained among us and is celebrated with the greatest reverence. Almost all the customary ceremonies are also retained, except that German hymns are interspersed here and there among the parts sung in Latin. These are added for the instruction of the people...⁹¹

Even though customary ceremonies have been retained, the conflict remains how to interpret the private Mass. Article XXIV did not exclude private Masses outright. It states that instead of private Masses, that it was a custom to celebrate common Masses rather than private Masses. However, the article is very specific that whatever Mass was celebrated, it should not be for gain, or for the living and dead. This kind of celebration diminishes the very purpose of the Mass. The Mass should assure that salvation comes from justification, which comes from faith and not from the work of celebrating the Mass itself.⁹²

Melanchthon wrote in the *Advice* that if the abuses of the private Masses were corrected, the disputes over them could be mitigated. The abuses as mentioned above were celebrations on behalf of others both living and dead, and that remission of sins is earned for others simply by performance of these Masses.

But we do not hold any private Masses, and there are great disputes over these, occasioned by that great abuse of Masses over the whole world, to which popes for so many centuries now have been turning a blind eye. If these abuses were rectified, perhaps the disputes over the private Masses could be assuaged too. For these abuses are known and blatant: that they pretend that the one's offering is valid on behalf of others: indeed, on behalf of both living and dead, and that remission of sins is earned for others.⁹³

In the *Advice*, Melanchthon also stated that the ancient practice of calling the Mass a "sacrifice" meant that the Mass was celebrated as thanksgiving, and it was not for participants to earn remission of sins for others. Melanchthon claimed that even if the thanksgiving function was kept, he believed that those who insisted on celebrating Masses on behalf of others would not stop. He recommended that the issue of private Masses should be further discussed in a

⁹⁰ *Missae turpiter profanarentur, collatae ad quaestum. Neque enim obscurum est, quam late pateat hic abusus in omnibus templis, a qualibus celebrentur missae tantum propter mercedem aut stipendium, quam multi contra in terdictum canonum celebrent... Fortassis ideo ut daret poenas orbis tam longae profanationis missarum, quam in ecclesia tot saeculis toleraverunt isti, qui emendare et poterant et debebant.* CAL 1530, XXIV, pp. 92–93; Grane 1987, p. 222.

⁹¹ *Retinetur enim missa apud nos et summa reverentia celebratur. Servantur et usitatae caerimoniae fere omnes, praeterquam quod latinis cantionibus admiscuntur alicubi germanicae, quae additae sunt ad docendum populum.* CAL 1530, XXIV, p. 91; Grane 1987, p. 221.

⁹² CAL 1530, XXIV, pp. 92–94; Grane 1987, pp. 222–224.

⁹³ *Sed privatas missas nullas habemus. Et de his sunt magnae disputationes, quibus praebuit occasionem ingens ille abusus missarum per totum orbem terrarum, ad quem tot iam seculis pontifices connivent. Emendatis his abusibus fortasse disputationes de privata missa etiam mitigarentur. Sunt autem hi abusus noti ac manifesti: quod fingunt oblationem illam valere pro aliis, et quidem pro vivis et mortuis, ac mereri aliis remissionem peccatorum.* Melanchthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 138.

synod and that in the meantime, no one should be compelled to attend private Masses, since the old Church had not held private Masses, and the Greeks did not hold them now.⁹⁴

Furthermore, in the *Advice*, Melanchthon would have accepted even the use of a private Mass if it were celebrated for its proper use—that is, to exercise faith and thanksgiving during the ceremony itself, as the ancients did, but exclude the idea that it would earn remission of sins.⁹⁵

The use of the Mass as merit for one's salvation was the most critical abuse, in Melanchthon's opinion, as stated in Article XXIV of the *Confessio Augustana*:

The opinion that increased private Masses to infinity was that Christ had by his passion made satisfaction for original sin... From this came the common opinion that the Mass is a work which by its very performance takes away the sins of the living and the dead.⁹⁶

In summary, Melanchthon neither accepted the private Masses that were used for gain, nor the sacrificial character related to their use. He would have accepted their use as a means to exercise faith and offer thanksgiving for the gift of salvation. Article XXIV of the *Confessio Augustana* agrees. However, Melanchthon included private Masses to be celebrated in like manner as long as the abuses were eliminated. XXIV of the *Confessio Augustana* did not include the compromise regarding private Masses as stated in the *Advice*.

Communion in Both Kinds

In the *Advice*, Melanchthon hoped that the old customs and rites could be restored. He also hoped that the pope would take the initiative and remove the prohibition on the practice of communion in both kinds and let it be free, so that one side would not condemn the other.⁹⁷

We see that lately the uproar over communion in both kinds has been renewed. For the people are upset when the institution of Christ and the old rites of the church are taken away. And even if some excuse is sought for those who practice communion in one kind, those uproars do not abate, and in these uproars the consciences of some are at risk. Furthermore, the pope could easily heal these problems with no disadvantage at all, if he were to remove the prohibition and leave the usage free, and stipulated that neither side should condemn the other. This freedom would be most conducive to peace, and would do no harm to any kind of men. And this whole matter is in the hand of the pope, since it is agreed that prohibitions pertain only to human law. Perhaps many other controversies would be mitigated too, if the pope would concede something to the people in this cause. For the people care especially for this ceremony and, since it is an external matter, diversity of practice easily breeds uproar.⁹⁸

⁹⁴ Melanchthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, pp. 138–139.

⁹⁵ Melanchthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 139.

⁹⁶ *Accessit opinio, quae auxit privatas missas in infinitum, videlicet quod Christus sua passione satisfecerit pro peccato originis ... Hinc manavit publica opinio, quod missa sit opus delens peccata vivorum et mortuorum ex opere operato.* CAL 1530, XXIV, p. 93; Grane 1987, pp. 222–223.

⁹⁷ See Dingel, 1998, pp. 113–114; Scheible, 2002, pp. 200–201.

⁹⁸ *De utraque specie sacramenti videmus subinde tumultus renovatos esse. Movetur enim populus, cum allegatur institutio Christi et vetus ritus ecclesiae. Et ut maxime queratur aliqua excusatio utentium una specie, tamen non desinunt illi tumultus. Et in his tumultibus etiam conscientiae aliquorum periclitantur. Porro facile mederi his incommodis pontifex sine detrimento ullo posset, si sublata prohibitione relinqueret usum liberum et constitueret, ne qua pars alteram damnaret. Haec libertas plurimum ad tranquillitatem conduceret et nihil noceret ulli generi*

Melanchthon pointed out that the prohibition of communion in one kind is human law, and thus a matter of adiaphora.⁹⁹ Communion was an essential part of the Mass ceremony and related to the doctrine of atonement of Christ's sacrifice. The pope's ordinance prohibited communion in both kinds, while the Reformers claimed the opposite, that it was Christ's ordinance. According to the pope, ecclesiastical law that stipulated communion in one kind was binding on consciences and could not be adiaphora in a real sense. But the Reformers, who regarded divine law in Scripture as authority, interpreted human practices as adiaphora, including the celebration of communion in one kind in the Lord's Supper. Melanchthon thought that both practices should be allowed to exist during the transitional period of the church's reforms.

Article XXII of the *Confessio Augustana* is explicit in celebrating communion in both kinds and does not allow the choice in practice as stated below:

In the sacrament of the Lord's Supper both kinds are given to laymen because this usage has the command of the Lord in Matt. 26:27, "Drink of it, all of you." Christ has here manifestly commanded with reference to the cup that all should drink of it... This custom has been adopted not only in defiance of the Scriptures but also in contradiction to ancient canons and the example of the church.¹⁰⁰

In the unification discussions during the transitional period, Melanchthon allowed both practices to remain. This allowance on Melanchthon's part was probably because the question was unclear in nascent Reformation churches, whose members had previously belonged to the Roman Church. Hence he allowed leeway to the Catholics during the negotiations.

The major difference between the two documents was in communion in both kinds in the Lord's Supper. Melanchthon acknowledged that all Reformers had not agreed to Article XXII of the *Confessio Augustana*, which explicitly maintains that communion in both kinds is Christ's ordinance that is being negotiated. Melanchthon regarded the practice of one kind as human tradition. He indicated that the pope could alter and return to the ancient custom of the church, which Melanchthon believed was a practice of communion in both kinds. Melanchthon was willing to condone the practice of either kind during the transitional period of Reformation. Melanchthon's compromise regarding communion in the Lord's Supper is an interpretation of the doctrine of Article XXII of the *Confessio Augustana*.

hominum. Et tota haec res est pontifici in manu, quia constat prohibitionem tantum esse iuris humani. Fortassis etiam aliae multae controversiae fierent mitiores, si pontifex in hac causa aliquid populo concederet. Nam hanc ceremoniam populus maxime curat, et quia est res externa, dissimilitudo in usu facile parit tumultus. Melanchthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 139.

⁹⁹ Melanchthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 139.

¹⁰⁰ *Laicis datur utraque species sacramenti in coena Domini, quia hic mos habet mandatum Domini Matth. 26: Bibite ex hoc omnes. Ubi manifeste praecipit Christus de poculo, ut omnes bibant... Haec vero consuetudo non solum contra scripturam sed etiam contra veteres canones et exemplum ecclesiae recepta est.* CAL 1530, XXII, pp. 85–86; Grane 1987, pp. 215–216.

Invocation of Saints

In the *Advice*, Melanchthon states that as long as we keep in mind that we honor Christ as our mediator, saints can be imitated and honored. In the past, since Christ's role had been obscured, the abuses in the worship of saints prevailed.¹⁰¹

For there exist promises concerning Christ, that it is for the sake of Christ that we are heard. Up to now, these have been remarkably obscured through the abuses in the worship of saints, and trust owed to Christ had been transferred to the saints.¹⁰²

Referring to Scripture, Article XXI of the *Confessio Augustana* states that one should imitate the saints' faith and good works but not pray to them and seek their help—Christ is the only mediator, propitiator, high priest, and intercessor.¹⁰³ Article XXI of the *Confessio Augustana* reflects Melanchthon's position in his *Advice*.

In the *Advice*, Melanchthon noted that earlier in old prayers, the prayer of invocation was made to God instead of saints. He recommended that a concession to this old custom be made and equated the saints praying for us just as pious men pray for the universal church.

Finally, if it seems right to retain any intercession at all on account of received custom, even though it is dangerous, learned men could consult on this too, whether such a form of prayer should be established for the public, which is in the old church prayers, where the invocation is made to God, not to the saints... For it is certain that the saints in heaven pray for the whole church in common, just as in life pious men pray for the universal church.¹⁰⁴

This author agrees with Dingel, who finds that Melanchthon made any misunderstanding clear that veneration of saints will lead to abuses, and that Melanchthon agrees with Article XXI of the *Confessio Augustana* that the saints should only serve as an example to a Christian, hoping that veneration would be discontinued.¹⁰⁵

Article XXI of the *Confessio Augustana* also speaks of the abuses that have caused dissension in the churches on veneration of saints. These abuses were seen in the rites of the Mass as stated below:

¹⁰¹ Scheible agrees that Melanchthon accepted that the intercession of saints was possible, as in the early Church, as long as Christ's mediating role remained clear. See Scheible, 2002, p. 201.

¹⁰² *Extant autem promissiones de Christo, quod propter Christum exaudiamur. Haec hactenus miris modis obscurata sunt per abusum in cultu sanctorum, et fiducia debita Christo in sanctos translata est.* Melanchthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 140.

¹⁰³ *De cultu sanctorum docent, quod memoria sanctorum proponi potest, ut imitemur fidem eorum et bona opera... Sed scriptura non docet invocare sanctos seu petere auxilium a sanctis, quia unum Christum nobis proponit mediatorem, propitiarium, pontificem et intercessorem.* CAL 1530, XXI, p. 83b; Grane 1987, p. 205.

¹⁰⁴ *Postremo si omnino intercessio aliqua propter receptam consuetudinem videretur retinenda esse, etsi est periculosa, tamen de ea deliberare docti possent: an talis forma intercessionis constituenda esset in publico, quae est in veteribus ecclesiae orationibus, ubi invocatio fit ad deum, non ad sanctos... Certum est enim sanctos in caelo orare pro tota ecclesia in commune, sicut et in hac vita homines pii orant pro universa ecclesia.* Melanchthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 140.

¹⁰⁵ Dingel 2012a, pp. 113–114.

The whole dissension is concerned with a certain few abuses... It has been a common complaint that certain abuses were connected with ordinary rites.¹⁰⁶

Melanchthon firmly believed that when both parties have reached consensus on the essential doctrine of justification, the abuses of the worship of saints would cease.¹⁰⁷

And indeed, in this article there seems to be almost no need for any new discussion or decision: there is only need for a certain moderate negligence on the part of those in power. If pure doctrine has been restored in other articles, in the same way, the abuses that have occurred up to now in the worship of saints will collapse by themselves.¹⁰⁸

Since Article XXI belongs to the doctrinal part of the *Confessio Augustana*, there was only need to clarify the rites in which Christ's honor as mediator was affirmed.

In summary, Article XXI of the *Confessio Augustana* is more explicit that only certain rites related to honoring the saints should be clarified. The article speaks of the abuses that have caused dissension in celebration of certain rites, not that it would affect the doctrine of salvation. Melanchthon explicitly condemns the doctrine of work-righteousness as one of the abuses. For him the veneration of saints is one of the indifferent rites. His position in the *Advice* is a compromise. Since veneration of saints is not supported by any doctrine in Article XXI of the *Confessio Augustana*, Melanchthon would rather have the rite discontinued.

On Vows

In the *Advice*, Melanchthon states that the monasteries were kept as schools under the pope's authority in the past. He did not believe that the monastic foundation should be destroyed, but he also thought that the matter ought to be decided by the pope.¹⁰⁹

This article holds no subtle controversy either, but the whole matter is in the hands of the pope. For there is no need to destroy the monastic foundation... With time, those monasteries could be converted into schools by papal and royal authority.¹¹⁰

Article XXVII of the *Confessio Augustana* agrees that the monastic foundation was rightly used for its educational goal, which was profitable to the church. However, the article also reveals that a controversy existed since the monks asserted that the monastic lifestyle merits grace and righteousness and a state of perfection, as stated below:

¹⁰⁶ *Tota dissensio est de paucis quibusdam abusibus... Publica querela fuit abusus quosdam in vulgaribus ritibus haerere.* CAL 1530, XXI, pp. 83c–83d; Grane 1987, p. 206.

¹⁰⁷ Melanchthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, pp. 139–140. Dingel 2012, p. 111.

¹⁰⁸ *Et quidem in hoc articulo propemodum nihil opus videtur ulla nova disputatione aut constitutione. Tantum opus est quadam moderata dissimulatione potestatum, si in aliis articulis pura doctrina restituta fuerit. Ita enim abusus, qui fuerunt hactenus in cultu sanctorum, per sese ruerent.* Melanchthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 141.

¹⁰⁹ Scheible, 2002, p. 201.

¹¹⁰ *Neque hic articulus habet aliquam subtilem controversiam, sed tota res pontifici in manu est. Non enim opus est monasteria funditus delere... Haec monasteria possent autoritate pontificis et regum cum tempore converti in scholas.* Melanchthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 141.

Formerly there had been schools of the Holy Scripture and other branches of learning which were profitable to the church, and pastors and bishops were taken from them... Then, they came in order to learn. Now, they pretend that this kind of life was instituted to merit grace and righteousness... In fact, they assert that it is a state of perfection.¹¹¹

In the *Advice*, Melanchthon notes that monasteries should promote good conscience, and not cause any harm. The pope could stop the scandals of monastic life, as long as the monks remaining in the monasteries would hold on to pure doctrine and indifferent rites without superstition. Melanchthon stressed that in order to promote peace and healing of the church, only impious practices in monasteries should be condemned, not education and learning. Melanchthon states that the pope should make dispensation so that no one would be kept in a monastery against his will.¹¹²

But since we are talking about the current situation, the pope could calm the current uproars over the monastic life if he dispensed with the whole subject of vows in this way: that no one unwilling should be kept in the monasteries. This dispensation would be without debasement of rank, without significant loss of face, and would free the church from many scandals and sins... For as it is rightly said, a vow ought not to be a bond of iniquity and likewise, monasteries ought to promote good conscience, not harm it... And then those who remain in the monasteries, if they hold to pure doctrine, could hold their own rites and customs that are indifferent without superstition.¹¹³

This author agrees with Dingel who states that Melanchthon would let monasteries stay as long as the monks practice rites and rules as adiaphora without any superstition.¹¹⁴

Article XXVII of the *Confessio Augustana* agrees that historically the pope had granted dispensations from the obligation of vows and was against such vows that were not voluntary. It states that scandals were created when boys and girls were thrust into monasteries, causing snares to their consciences.

If the obligation of vows could not be changed for any reason at all the Roman pontiffs would not have granted dispensations... However, we read that they [the popes] often granted dispensation from vows... Such rigor displeased many good men before our time when they saw that girls and boys were thrust into monasteries for their maintenance and saw how poorly this plan turned out, what scandals were created, what snares were placed on consciences.¹¹⁵

¹¹¹ *Olim erant scholae sacrarum litterarum et aliarum disciplinarum, quae sunt utiles ecclesiae, et sumebantur inde pastores et episcopi... Olim ad discendum conveniebant; nunc fingunt institutum esse vitae genus ad promerendam gratiam et iustitiam, immo praedicant, esse statum perfectionis....* CAL 1530, XVII, p. 112; Grane 1987, p. 235.

¹¹² Melanchthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, pp. 141–142.

¹¹³ *Sed quoniam de praesentibus temporibus loquimur, pontifex sedare praesentes tumultus de vita monastica ita posset: si de votis in genere dispensaret in hunc modum, ne quis invitus in monasteriis teneretur. Haec dispensatio sine detrimento ordinum, sine insigni mutatione publica fieret et liberaret ecclesiam a multis scandalis et peccatis... Nam ut recte dicitur: votum non debet esse vinculum iniquitatis, ita monasteria debent prodesse conscientiis, non nocere... Ceterum illi, qui in monasteriis manerent, si haberent puram doctrinam, possent ritibus et institutis suis uti tamquam adiaphoris, sine superstitione.* Melanchthon's opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 141.

¹¹⁴ Dingel 2012a, p. 111.

¹¹⁵ *Quodsi obligatio votorum nullas haberet causas, cur mutari possit, nec romani pontifices dispensassent... Ideo saepe de votis dispensasse leguntur... Hic rigor displicuit multis bonis viris ante haec tempora, qui videbant puellas et adolescentes in monasteria detrudi propter victum, videbant, quam infeliciter succederet hoc consilium, quae scandala pareret, quos laqueos conscientiis iniiceret.* CAL 1530, XXVII, pp. 110–111, 114–115; Grane 1987, pp. 234–236.

Article XXVII of the *Confessio Augustana* states in negative terms what Melanchthon stated in a more positive light in the *Advice*—omitting the phrase in the *Advice* that monasteries could stay as long as they held onto “indifferent rites, without superstition.” Both documents agree that monasteries should remain for educational purposes.

In summary, Article XXVII of the *Confessio Augustana* condemns a monastic lifestyle in which the monks claim merits of righteousness and a state of perfection. The *Advice* leaves this unsaid, but adds that religious practices should be a matter of indifference, and both texts agree that monasteries should be kept for educational purposes. The *Advice* adds that monasteries should be kept “under the pope’s authority.” Melanchthon stressed that in order to promote peace and healing of the Church, only impious practices in monasteries should be condemned, not education and learning, which indicated a compromise for the purpose of unity.

On the Celibacy of Priests

In the *Advice*, Melanchthon held that the law of celibacy was not suitable for the majority of priests. The pope was aware of how few priests were chaste and that only the celibate clergy were awarded the highest offices by the pope. Melanchthon felt that the pope needed to make a decision on this issue, since universal celibacy was not a realistic goal for priests and the pope could decide it.¹¹⁶

There is no need for a long discussion concerning the marriage of priests. For it is agreed that the whole matter is in the hand of the pope. And we see how few there are truly chaste... However, the reasoning can be adduced that only the celibate are admitted to the highest offices... But the matter speaks for itself: the law of celibacy is not suitable for the great majority of priests. This, too, should be considered by the pope and the kings; whether celibacy is a worthy matter for them to fight over so violently that they are unwilling to establish agreement unless universal celibacy is restored.¹¹⁷

This author agrees with Dingel, who points out that the goal of the reform on celibacy or any other abuses was not to overturn the Church’s structure. The goal was to organize the church to have Christian freedom in the spirit of the Gospel. Therefore, Melanchthon appealed to the pope and church to eliminate abuses and reach a common understanding with the temporal powers, who were willing to rid the church from existing abuses and agree to the marriage of priests.¹¹⁸

Article XXIII of the *Confessio Augustana* agrees on marriage for priests, referring to the assertion that no law or vow can alter creation, as stated below:

¹¹⁶ Melanchthon’s opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 142.

¹¹⁷ *De sacerdotum coniugio nihil opus est longa disputatione. Constat enim eam rem pontifici totam in manu esse. Et videmus, quam pauci sint vere casti... Sed posset iniri ratio, ut ad summas dignitates tantum celibes admitterentur. Sed “res loquitur ipsa” legem de celibatu non esse aptam tantae multitudini sacerdotum... Considerandum est hoc quoque pontifici et regibus: an res digna sit celibatus, de qua adeo vehementer dimicent, ut nolint concordiam constituere, nisi in totum restituto celibatu.* Melanchthon’s opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 142.

¹¹⁸ Dingel 2012a, p. 112.

Moreover, it is not humanly possible to alter creation without a singular gift and act of God. Therefore those who are not suited for celibacy ought to marry, for no law of man and no vow can remove a commandment of God and an institution of God.¹¹⁹

Article XXIII of the *Confessio Augustana* offers a rationale in favor of marriage: that it is God's ordinance which humans cannot alter, and experience has shown how much suffering celibacy has caused. The article then conveys why celibacy is not suitable for all priests. It defended the ancient church practice in which priests were married, and stated that God instituted marriage as a remedy against human infirmity.¹²⁰

In summary, in Melanchthon's opinion the pope should allow the marriage of priests. Article XXIII of the *Confessio Augustana* supported marriage as an ancient practice. Melanchthon presented the doctrine of two kingdoms, in which civil matters, such as marriage and other human traditions would not belong to divine jurisdiction and therefore, as far as the church was concerned, were adiaphora. According to Melanchthon the goal of universal celibacy was no longer realistic.

Conclusion

Melanchthon's shift on the doctrine of justification by faith is seen from the *Confessio Augustana* to the *Advice*. In the latter, Melanchthon's purpose was to formulate adiaphora matters to be acceptable to Catholics in the light of the doctrine of justification by faith, with the goal of unifying Catholics and Protestants in church policy. Adiaphora matters in the *Advice* were not reinforced by doctrine, except those of original sin, free will, and justification by faith. The *Advice* does not offer doctrinal statements that would indicate his position on the practice of celibacy, the Mass, vows, or the power of the church, although he did not explicitly state that he substantiated the doctrine of the *Confessio Augustana* for the other adiaphora articles. He wrote the *Advice* with the intention of using it for negotiations between Catholics and Protestants. Melanchthon's purpose in writing the *Advice* was to help others to understand the Reformers' stance, and to offer rationales to moderate the controversies. "If anyone has better advice, I will yield," he wrote.¹²¹ Melanchthon's diplomacy is demonstrated by his ability to include in the discussion his understanding of other doctrines—such as Christology, ecclesiology, the exegetical tradition of Scripture, and pneumatology—when discussing matters related to justification by faith in the context of adiaphora. All these other doctrines elucidate the differences and similarities so that the negotiating parties could reach agreement in understanding justification by faith in a larger context. Melanchthon, nevertheless, wanted to keep the doctrine of the *Confessio Augustana*, especially its central doctrine on justification, as the basis for interpreting adiaphora. It is also noteworthy that the unification discussions with the Reformers and the Roman Catholic Church dealt with the question of the authority of Scripture in external matters and with the authority of the ecclesiastical laws of the Roman Church.

¹¹⁹ *Nec est humanae potestatis, sine singulari dono et opere Dei, creationem mutare. Igitur qui non sunt idonei ad caelibatum, debent contrahere matrimonium. Nam mandatum Dei et ordinationem Dei nulla lex humana, nullum votum tollere potest.* CAL 1530, XXIII, p. 87; Grane 1987, pp. 217–218.

¹²⁰ CAL 1530, XXIII, pp. 87–89; Grane 1987, pp. 217–219.

¹²¹ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 143.

Melanchthon was willing to bend in the adiaphora matters, and recognize the pope's final authority; he even suggested that the pope could make decisions on non-essential matters. Melanchthon had plans to help the churches find common ground, especially in matters that could only be solved if the churches discussed them with each other. He concluded that agreements in doctrine and compromise in adiaphora matters would be possible. Melanchthon did not intend to alter the old structure of the church, but rather insert new contents. This attitude influenced his adiaphora position in the *Advice*.

As Melanchthon presented the doctrine of justification by faith, it seems as if he altered it, adding the second part about "good works" and interpreted justification in this light. A few scholars see a shift in Melanchthon's doctrine. Some scholars argue that this was a change of position from Melanchthon's previous works in the commentaries on Romans and Colossians. He did not wish to alter the core doctrine of the *Confessio Augustana*. One should consider Melanchthon's shift in doctrine as a way of interpreting the *Confessio Augustana* on ecclesiastical policy.

Melanchthon claimed that human right should give bishops equal authority with the pope. Melanchthon replaced the church's divine authority with the new doctrine that the Reformers taught. It was the bishops' task to teach the new doctrine and they should have the necessary authority. He did not object to the pope's canonical government, as long as it did not repress the Reformers' teaching of the new doctrine.

One has to come to the conclusion that Melanchthon's emphasis on good works was intended to demonstrate to the Catholics that the Reformers had not abandoned the old doctrine, but explained the contents differently; that is, that good works have a consequential role in the process of justification. The *Advice* has to be considered not as a binding statement, but rather an interpretation of Article IV of the *Confessio Augustana* in the particular historical situation. He accepted private Masses as long as their abuses were eliminated. He replaced the sacrificial concept of the Mass and recommended that the Mass should be celebrated as thanksgiving. In the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, Melanchthon did not demand changing the communion rite, but allowed flexibility in maintaining the old structure. Melanchthon was willing to condone the practice of either kind during the transitional period of the Reformation. However, because of ambiguity regarding communion and no mention of a doctrinal statement on the sacrament, one could interpret that he upheld transubstantiation. Melanchthon's compromise in the Lord's Supper went beyond the doctrine expressed in Article XXII of the *Confessio Augustana*.

Regarding the invocation of saints treated in both Article XXII of the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Advice*, Melanchthon hoped to have the practice discontinued if the church was unable to eliminate the abuses. When consensus was reached on doctrine, especially the doctrine of work-righteousness, the abuses of the worship of saints would disappear. Many old rites could remain as long as the doctrine of justification by faith was agreed upon. Melanchthon was diplomatic, recommending that the pope could solve the rest of the controversial adiaphora matters. He knew that celibacy was no longer realistic. He did not touch upon the issue of the merits or state of perfection that the monks claimed, but instead gave a positive evaluation on monasteries, with which the pope could promote healing of the church. Melanchthon's essential goal was preventing those practices that were outright against Scripture, against one's conscience, and were not reinforced by the doctrine of justification.

Melanchthon's motivation was to reconcile both parties and keep the old church structure. In the adiaphora articles in the *Advice*, he did not attack the old customs outright, but clarified what in his opinion were abuses and hoped that the pope could mediate on the adiaphora matters with the other bishops, and that adiaphora matters would not bind consciences. Melanchthon's goal of achieving unity will be the topic of the next chapter.

Chapter 3:
Melanchthon's Negotiations with the Catholics and
Protestants,
and the Loci Communes

(January 1535–December 1535)

The first part of this chapter will deal with Melanchthon's unification goals within the Reformation Churches based on the *Loci Communes* of 1535. The second part of this chapter deals with the *Loci Communes* of 1535 on church policy and adiaphora matters.

Part I: Melanchthon's Negotiations with the Catholics and Protestants

Introduction

Melanchthon's *Loci Communes* was the basis for the future negotiations with the English king. He had two goals: to unite Protestants and Catholics, and to consolidate church policy issues with the secular kings. Unity could be reached if both kings, Henry VIII and Francis I, could agree on church policy issues as discussed in the previous year. Melanchthon still hoped that Catholics and Protestants could find common ground on the adiaphora matters. We find in this chapter that Melanchthon had sent his *Loci Communes* to Henry with the intent that it be used in Anglo-Lutheran negotiations as a basis for doctrinal and practical discussions. Henry must have been influenced by Melanchthon's writings because he responded by sending ambassadors to Germany to negotiate with Melanchthon. Because of his interest in unifying the churches, Melanchthon also negotiated with the Catholic king of France and as a consequence he became caught up in French politics, receiving invitations from various parties, each pulling him in different directions.

Melanchthon's Plans for England

The correspondence between Melanchthon and the English theologian Robert Barnes, who had studied at Wittenberg, reveals that the reform-minded clergy had a different perspective than Melanchthon as to why Henry might benefit from Melanchthon's connection to England. Simon Grynaeus had encouraged Melanchthon to write to the king about his theological opinions and wait for an invitation. This seemed an opportune time for Melanchthon to initiate contact with the king of England.

In March 1534, Simon Grynaeus had contacted Melanchthon, recommending he either travel to England in person or write his theological opinions to the king of England.¹ Grynaeus cautioned Melanchthon about two things if he traveled: to gain the permission of his superior the elector, and to have an invitation from Henry VIII.² Melanchthon did not have the elector's permission.³ By this time, Melanchthon had received a second invitation.⁴ A year later, Robert Barnes suggested that Henry would benefit from Lutheran connections⁵ and wrote to Melanchthon from Hamburg about the events in England.⁶ He let Melanchthon know that the king was seeking the support of both Catholic and Protestant princes in his quarrel with the pope, and had sent his agents to the German princes.⁷

Barnes relayed a message to Melanchthon from Paget that the king would invite him at the earliest opportunity if he had any indication of Melanchthon's willingness to come.⁸ Henry thought that Melanchthon would have a good understanding of the religious situation in England.⁹ Even though he had delivered his *Advice* to the French in August 1534, the subsequent events in Paris had made him hesitant to pursue French goals, so he turned to the English and expected the king's invitation.

Melanchthon had become convinced of the prospect of reforms in England. He concluded: "I am expecting a letter from Britain any day now; once I have received it, you and I will have to think seriously about it."¹⁰ It seems that Melanchthon was prepared to involve himself in the situation in the English Church. In addition, English and French affairs were very much on Melanchthon's mind when he wrote to his friend Joachim Camerarius on January 10, 1535, "If you hear anything about the purpose of Caesar's [the Emperor's] preparations, give us a sign." Many believed that the French [Gallic] war was going to be resumed.¹¹

Barnes did not give a good report of the pope to Melanchthon. He sent a report to the princes the pope's injuries and slanders of the king. Barnes described the pope as a "sly deceitful, worthless, wicked, unjust, evil man, traitor and enemy of humankind; a pest and a bane of all

¹ Simon Grynaeus to Philip Melanchthon [Simon Grynaeus an M.], March 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1413, pp. 55–56.

² Ibid., p. 55.

³ L&P, VIII, No. 710, p. 276; No. 737, p. 285; No. 874, p. 325; No. 926, p. 356; No. 957, p. 365; No. 1013, p. 388.

⁴ Philip Melanchthon to Joachim Camerarius [Melanchthon an Joachim Camerarius], March 9, 1534. MBW T 6, 1417, p. 62. Kusakawa, 2002, p. 235.

⁵ L&P, VII, No. 970, pp. 373–374; Tjernagel, 1965, pp. 133, 142; Kusakawa 2002, p. 235.

⁶ Robert Barnes to Philip Melanchthon [Robert Barnes an M.], February 16, 1535. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, No. 1542, pp. 304–307. WA, VI, No. 1861, p. 177; LW, L, No. 245, p. 30. Even though Barnes brought Luther's opinion to the king the timing is incorrect in LW No. 245, p. 30. Barnes was still in Hamburg when he sent his letter to Melanchthon. MBW R 2; MBW, 1542, p. 306.

⁷ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1542, p. 305. McEntegart notes that the Germans, being occupied with a major military enterprise, had little time to discuss diplomatic complications with Henry's ambassadors, at that time. McEntegart 2002, p. 24.

⁸ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1542, p. 305.

⁹ L&P, VIII, No. 957, p. 365; No. 1013, p. 388.

¹⁰ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1525, pp. 275–276; CR II, 1240, p. 822. See Kusakawa 2002, p. 235.

¹¹ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1525, pp. 275–276; CR II, 1240, p. 822. See Kusakawa 2002, p. 253.

religion and piety.”¹² But by this time the king’s ambassadors must have influenced several of the continental princes in support of the king in order to convince Melanchthon of Henry’s new authority in the Church of England.

In furthering the king’s mission, Barnes asked Melanchthon’s opinion of the pope, but had not realized that Melanchthon had already accepted the pope’s supremacy based on human, not divine, law. Barnes also asked Melanchthon to respond with his understanding of the tragedy between the king and the pope.¹³ Barnes’s letter, which he had also forwarded to the elector and the landgrave, had two aims: 1) to bring the pope back to order, i.e., to call a future council, if the pope should decide to excommunicate Henry; and 2) to invite princes with any complaints against the pope to send their ambassadors to the king, as well as anyone who had supported the papist faith but now wished to enter into a treaty with the evangelicals and their protectors.¹⁴ Barnes included a written copy of the nine articles against the pope.¹⁵ Barnes was soliciting support for King Henry from the Saxon Reformers.

It was important for Barnes to convince the king that he was on Henry’s side on the question of authority. In the articles he forwarded to the Saxon Reformers, one can see that reform-minded clergy¹⁶ supported the General Council’s authority above the pope’s. In addition, the influence of the reform-minded clergy, who supported the exegetical authority of Scripture over that of papal decrees, is clear. The support of Scripture alone or of Scripture and Tradition became a point of division in their subsequent negotiations between the English and the Germans. The English also resorted to the General Council’s authority against that of the pope’s in Henry’s divorce and in their interpretation of Scripture.

Barnes again exhorted Melanchthon to respond to the king if Henry were to ask for Melanchthon’s help in this difficult situation with the pope. Barnes promised to forward any letters from Melanchthon to Cromwell.¹⁷ It seemed that Barnes was eager to arrange Melanchthon’s trip to England on his own without the king’s knowledge, possibly to get

¹² Robert Barnes to Philip Melanchthon [Robert Barnes an M.], February 16, 1635, MBW R 2; MBW, T 6, No. 1542, p. 305. Even though Paget must have left the previous year, Barnes brought the information to Melanchthon in the letter of February 16, 1535. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1542, pp. 304–307.

¹³ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1542, p. 305.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 304–305.

¹⁵ 1. To marry the wife of a dead brother without children is prohibited by divine and natural law. 2. Against the divine prohibitions, the dispensation of the Roman Pope or of anyone else is downright invalid and null. 3. The Roman Bishop has no more authority than any other bishop according to the sacred scriptures. 4. The office of each bishop is entrusted to him by God, to teach the law of God to everyone entrusted to his care and to admonish, make known, argue and reform and work over in every way those who live contrary to the same, and each bishop ought not to yield any authority, not even to the Roman Pope, but “should resist in his face,” according to the law of Paul, until whoever goes wrong has come back to sanity. 5. According to that authority that has been acquired by the Roman Pope from mankind, an excuser is to be admitted in every lofty matter, even in the Roman Council House. 6. The sacred general council, legitimately gathered, is higher than all Episcopal, or, as they say, papal power, by the approval of the council of Basel. 7. It is allowed and lawful for any Christian to call on the Roman Pope for a general council. 8. After calling the Roman Pope to a general council, the Roman Pope ought to do or attempt nothing in prejudice of the one appealing; if he does this, it will be in vain and null. 9. The sentence of excommunication borne by the Roman Pope after an appeal interposed by the one legitimately calling for a general council is by its own right null. MBW, T 6, 1542, pp. 306–307.

¹⁶ Robert Barnes also calls those Reformers who are against the pope “evangelical.” The present writer uses “evangelical” of those English theologians who had close connections to German Reformers or had studied at Wittenberg. See MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1542, p. 305.

¹⁷ Robert Barnes to Philip Melanchthon, February 16, 1535, MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1542, p. 306.

Melanchthon to boost Barnes's reputation with the king, which had suffered since he had brought Luther's unfavorable message to Henry a few years earlier. Barnes seems to have tried to mediate between Luther and Melanchthon in relation to their different opinions on Henry's divorce.

Melanchthon wrote to Joachim on March 11, 1535 that England was open to new religious doctrine.¹⁸ Melanchthon then referred to Barnes, who said that the king did not care about the affairs of the church, but no cruelty had fallen on those who wanted doctrinal reform.¹⁹ In spite of Barnes's view, Melanchthon saw hope for the future and lamented the lack of efforts for new doctrine which he thought was "pure, simple and without sophistry."²⁰ It seems Barnes did not have much hope for doctrinal reforms in England, since Barnes himself was more concerned about his own position in relation to the king and trying to convince the king that he was an ardent supporter of royal supremacy.

Melanchthon closed his letter to Camerarius with a note that he was currently reworking his *Apologia* and *Loci Communes*²¹ and requested that Camerarius write an epigram to be prefixed to the *Apologia* and, if convenient, also one for the *Loci Communes*.²² The new edition of *Loci Communes* was an important element in Melanchthon's efforts to heal the divided church.²³ It is evident that he planned to use his condensed doctrinal statement in any future unification negotiations to clarify his positions on church doctrine and practice. That Melanchthon considered interpreting the doctrine of justification within the context of all other doctrines, and not in isolation, shows his concern for consensus within the church.

Melanchthon clearly hoped to have Henry lead discussions of controversial doctrine and asked him to be a patron of his works, most likely the new edition of *Loci Communes* that was designed to be used in unification discussions. Having discussed the English matters with his friend Camerarius, Melanchthon wrote to Henry VIII on March 13, 1536. First, Melanchthon praised Henry's humanistic qualities regarding justice and moderation, affirming that it would benefit his state, and hoping that he would bring authority to the situation in the church and state.²⁴ Second, Melanchthon expressed the belief that the care of the universal church was divinely entrusted to the king. In order to bring authority to religious controversies and

¹⁸ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1551, pp. 322–323. See Kusakawa, 2002, p. 235.

¹⁹ Robert Barnes was also called "Antony" by the Saxon theologians. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1551, p. 322; CR, II, 1263, p. 861.

²⁰ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1551, p. 322; CR, II, 1263, p. 861.

²¹ Melanchthon was just compiling his second edition of *Loci Communes* 1535. Commonplace-books were an instrument used by Melanchthon and other humanists like Erasmus. They gave tools to communities literate in Latin taught by the humanists for arguments quite different from the medieval method of *quaestio*. The commonplace-book was probably most essential for structuring Renaissance thought in Western Europe. Melanchthon not only structured the manuals for Lutheran schools: one may detect his influence in Catholic territories adjacent to Lutheran lands also. Moss 2002, pp. 259–260.

²² MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1551, p. 323; CR II, 1263, pp. 860–861. Meyer notes that after 1531 Melanchthon's emphasis in his writings was on the unity and the universality of the Church, which can be seen in documents written for ecumenical purposes. Carl S. Meyer: "Melanchthon, Theologian of Ecumenism." In *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*. XVII:2. 1966, pp. 195–199 (hereafter, Meyer 1966).

²³ *Loci Communes* refers to Melanchthon's systematic theology compiled as a commonplace-book, first published in 1521 [and 1535]; it was the direct product of Melanchthon's rhetorical and dialectical method. See Moss 2002, pp. 260–261.

²⁴ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1552, pp. 325–327; CR II, 1264, pp. 861–864.

discussions of doctrine, Melanchthon asked Henry to become the patron of all his study and work, thinking that the king would influence moderation in other monarchies and prevent division in the universal church.²⁵ Melanchthon clearly saw an opportunity to continue church unification discussions with Henry.

However, in his letter to Henry, Melanchthon did not discuss the pope's authority as Barnes had hoped, and in doing so upheld his acceptance of Henry as supreme head of the church. Melanchthon's refusal to discuss the pope's authority meant he passed on the opportunity to maintain acceptance of Henry as the supreme head of the church. Instead, he said in his letter that he had responded to Barnes's proposals but would have preferred a communal discussion.²⁶ It was Melanchthon's belief that religious controversies could be mitigated by Henry if he, too, would consult other scholars about the clear, simple form of doctrine. He stressed that it was the king's responsibility to take care of religious matters.²⁷

At about the same time, in March 1535, Melanchthon sent a letter to Henry, which became the preface to the *Loci Communes*.²⁸ Although he indicated again, in a very diplomatic way, his disapproval of the treatment of religious men in England,²⁹ his main point was that he supported Henry as head of the nation and the church.³⁰ He also informed Henry that he had plans to dedicate the *Loci Communes* to him.³¹

Melanchthon believed that the bishops' assemblies would be the best way to solve conflicting points. Melanchthon may not have realized that the bishops' authority in England was totally dependent on the king. Melanchthon asked Henry to consider his doctrine directly from *Loci Communes*, and suggested to Henry that a body of learned men, in a synod including bishops and princes, should determine any disputed points.³²

It was clear from Melanchthon's letters that he had definite plans and wished to help reform the English Church. At the same time, the king's agents drew him into different directions. It was objectionable for Melanchthon to discuss with Robert Barnes the negative impact of the pope, since Melanchthon had just defined a document in which he accepted the pope's authority

²⁵ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1552, p. 327. Thomas Meyer notes that Melanchthon's writings repeatedly refer to the universality of the Church. He explains what he means by writing in "Melanchthon as Theologian of Ecumenism," that Melanchthon embraced concern for catholicity and the unity of the Church. Meyer 1966, p. 195.

²⁶ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1552, p. 327; CR, II, 1264, p. 864.

²⁷ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1552, pp. 325–327; CR, II, 1264, pp. 861–864.

²⁸ Timothy Wengert sees the preface to the *Loci Communes* as a final dispute with Erasmus. "Famous Last Words: The Final Epistolary Exchange between Erasmus of Rotterdam and Philip Melanchthon in 1536," Wengert 2010, XII, pp. 18–38.

²⁹ The condemnation of the religious men in England must have been a general remark. In "Famous Last Words: The Final Epistolary Exchange between Erasmus of Rotterdam and Philip Melanchthon in 1536," Wengert 2010, XII, p. 19, Wengert has proved with considerable evidence that Melanchthon would have not known of Thomas More's execution in March 1535, but in August. See MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1616, p. 440; CR II, 1309, pp. 918–919.

³⁰ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1555, pp. 338–339. MBW sets the date of this letter to March 1535, different from the date in *Corpus Reformatorum* of August 1535. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1555, p. 339; CR, II, No. 1311, pp. 928; LC, 1535, Fols. 3R, 4R, 7L, 7R, 8R; L&P, IX, No. 223, p. 74. Estes sees the preface as a summary of Melanchthon's mature position on the office of magistrate. Estes 2005, pp. 119–128.

³¹ Melanchthon dedicated *Loci Communes* to Henry VIII in August 1535. Wengert sees the dedication to Henry as an echo of Erasmus' own patronage of humanists. It also reflected the negotiations between England and Saxony in which Melanchthon had a major part. "Famous Last Words: The Final Epistolary Exchange between Erasmus of Rotterdam and Philip Melanchthon in 1536," Wengert 2010, XII, p. 23.

³² MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1555, pp. 335, 336, 338; CR, II, No. 1311, p. 924; L&P, IX, No. 223, p. 74.

by human law. One can understand Barnes's motivation by reading Melanchthon's response to his letter. In his correspondence with Henry, Melanchthon accepted Henry's supremacy, at least in theory, but did not have an understanding as to how it worked in practice. He had completed his *Loci Communes* and intended to dedicate it to Henry. All this speaks of his serious plans for England.

MacCulloch argues that Melanchthon was the only Continental Reformer in whom Henry VIII showed genuine interest as a humanist scholar who sought the "middle way," as did Henry, who considered it a solution for his church.³³ The present author concurs, since Melanchthon saw that church policy problems would be solved by discussions of monarchs on indifferent matters.

While reciprocal correspondence between Henry VIII and Melanchthon took place, Melanchthon's thoughts were distracted by an invitation from France. At the end of April 1535, in a letter to Frederick Myconius, a pastor in Gotha, Melanchthon wrote that he would like to speak with him face-to-face about trips to England and France.³⁴ Melanchthon had been in touch with the French a year earlier, when he sent his *Advice* on church practices to Francis's agent Guillaume du Bellay de Langey.³⁵ He must have felt that, since *Loci Communes* was finalized, he would be equipped to lead negotiations either with the English or the French.

Melanchthon Is Invited to Paris

Melanchthon hoped to unify the Catholic and Protestant churches. Any positive response Melanchthon would receive on his *Advice* would kindle these hopes. On April 23, 1535, Melanchthon wrote to his friend Johannes Sturm, who resided in Paris, a preliminary inquiry about the situation in Paris and whether it was worthwhile for Melanchthon to consider a trip. His chief motivation for such a trip was "what is best for the French Church and for peace in France?"³⁶ Melanchthon also wondered whether the *Advice* he sent to France in August 1534, would be approved.³⁷

Regarding this matter Kohnle argues that Melanchthon had to make the most difficult decision of his life. On the one hand, he saw the opportunity to support his brothers in need in France; on the other hand, the chance of a theological agreement was small and he saw the danger of being misused for a theological compromise with regard to the upcoming council. However, Melanchthon decided to accept the invitation.³⁸

Melanchthon finished his letter to Sturm by advocating a National Bishops' assembly to discuss the controversial matters.³⁹ On the same day, Melanchthon also wrote Jean du Bellay, Bishop of Paris, brother of the king's agent, de Langey, deploring the dangers of the present church led by the pope. Melanchthon appealed to him not only because of the French church, but

³³ MacCulloch 1996, p. 137.

³⁴ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1570, pp. 368–369; CR, II, No. 1271, pp. 871–872.

³⁵ Melanchthon to de Langey [M. an Guillaume du Bellay, Segneur de Langey]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1469, pp. 172–173.

³⁶ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1564, pp. 352–354; CR, II, No. 1275, pp. 375–376.

³⁷ Melanchthon's expert report to Ulrich Geiger for Guillaume du Bellay [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, No. 1467, pp. 143–153.

³⁸ Kohnle 2011, p. 48.

³⁹ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1564, pp. 352–354; CR, II, No. 1275, pp. 375–376.

also for the universal church. Melanchthon suggested cooperation to calm fanatical spirits and wrong opinions with a doctrine that was well defined under the authority of the bishops.⁴⁰ The purpose of his letter was to suggest that an agreement could be reached. His letter is evidence that Melanchthon wished to have unification talks with the French Catholics.

Melanchthon found himself pulled in two different directions: he was actively pursuing the French mission and he was also thinking of England's reforms, but was apprehensive. At the beginning of May 1535, Melanchthon wrote to his associate George Spalatin about his expectations of the reforms in England and mentioned a "brilliant light" that he called "meteoron," a portent that, based on Melanchthon's interpretation of natural philosophy, "precedes a destructive drought."⁴¹ He must have been thinking not only of the future Reformation in England but also the opposition to the new doctrine.

Melanchthon may have also been thinking of his trip to France and meeting with Strasbourg Reformers, who were known to be interested in unification endeavors with other Protestants. They were probably more sympathetic than other Reformers to Melanchthon's plans for France. On May 9, 1535, Melanchthon revealed his long-held goals in a discussion of the French visit in a letter to Martin Bucer, the Strasbourg Reformer.⁴² He wrote that if he could bring the truth to the French, he would not refuse to go.

Complicating Melanchthon's plans to establish a national coalition of bishops on church policy, however, were the various rumors about the pope's plans to convoke a council. Melanchthon would prefer to convince the French Catholics to unite and reconcile with various confessions on church policy. The threat of the synod came up in Melanchthon's correspondence with Joachim Camerarius in March 1535, when Melanchthon wrote that the emperor was preparing his army against those who would not obey his order to attend the synod.⁴³ Melanchthon still hoped that unity would be accomplished without such a council, and hoped to have the king of England confer with the Saxon Reformers to come up with a common strategy for the pope's council in the event they were forced to attend.

Melanchthon also discussed his plans in a letter of May 21, 1535 to Joachim Camerarius.⁴⁴ Again he wrote to Camerarius asking him to read letters he had received from France that made him suspect that the future (papal) synod might convene in the city of Trent.⁴⁵ Melanchthon mentioned that someone who came from Italy knew that a synod had been declared and that secret letters had been sent. He did not believe that this report could be trusted, but he still asked Camerarius if he knew anything about it.⁴⁶

⁴⁰ Melanchthon to Jean du Bellay [M. an Jean du Bellay, Bf. von Paris]. April 23, 1535. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1563, pp. 349–350.

⁴¹ Philip Melanchthon to George Spalatin. May 1535. CR II, No. 1272, p. 872.

⁴² Philip Melanchthon to Martin Bucer. May 9, 1535. CR II, No. 1274, p. 873.

⁴³ The Reformers call the General Council interchangeably either "council" or "synod." When they call it a "synod" the name alludes either to their hope for a free "council" or a national bishops' "council" led by the princes or kings.

⁴⁴ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1574, p. 373; CR II, No. 1276, p. 877.

⁴⁵ Melanchthon must be referring to the pope's General Council.

⁴⁶ Philip Melanchthon to Joachim Camerarius [Melanchthon. an Joachim Camerarius]. May 22, 1535. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1575, p. 374; CR II, No. 1277, 878.

Melanchthon aimed to establish national synods in the Christian states to deal with the threat of the pope's council, to which the German Reformers also objected. Melanchthon's position was somewhere between that of the various confessional lines, as he attempted to make up his mind as to which offer—England or France—would best suit his goals for church unity.

Richard Rex has argued that classical models inspired the humanistic ideal of the republic or “commonwealth,” and that the state was idealized and Christianized through such models. A common feature of Renaissance humanism was the belief that religion was essential to the well being of the state.⁴⁷ His ideal of the classical model of a state is evidenced in his plans for the unification of the French or English state and church. For this very purpose, it was an important goal for Melanchthon to design a mutually acceptable church policy that would unite different religious parties within the churches.

It seems that Melanchthon was about to give up on his plans for France, even when the French king himself had invited him. On the one hand, Melanchthon realized that there was a threat and a real possibility that the emperor would convoke a synod. On the other hand, Francis was unwilling to have any political alliance with the Saxon Reformers.

The French earnestly wanted Melanchthon to come to France, as evidenced by a letter from de Langey's brother, the Bishop of Paris, Jean du Bellay, on June 27, 1535.⁴⁸ In light of Melanchthon's goal to create a Christian state that would live in peace and harmony,⁴⁹ de Langey assured him that if he came, the king of France and other theologians would welcome and support him in hopes that disagreements would be settled.⁵⁰

In a letter of June 28, 1535, King Francis referred to Melanchthon's discussion with Jean du Bellay⁵¹ and invited Melanchthon to arrive “at the earliest possible,” either as private person or representing the German people, to discuss uniting doctrine to achieve harmony in church policy with the French theologians.⁵² Francis I knew that Melanchthon had sent the *Advice* to be used in future negotiations.⁵³ Francis I assured Melanchthon that he would privately support Germany but would publicly support universal peace.⁵⁴ It seems that Melanchthon's enterprise was important to Francis, who regarded himself as the first person ever to attempt to create harmony in church policy. But he was very cautious from a political standpoint; Francis would not commit himself to any political alliance with the Saxon Reformers. Kusakawa points out that arrangements for Melanchthon's arrival in France had advanced to the point that the French expected him to arrive shortly.⁵⁵

⁴⁷ Richard Rex: *The Role of English Humanists in the Reformation up to 1559*. 1999, pp. 36–37 (hereafter, Rex 1999).

⁴⁸ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1578, p. 379; CR II, No. 1280, pp. 880–881.

⁴⁹ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1563, pp. 349–350; CR II, No. 1268, pp. 868–870.

⁵⁰ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1578, p. 379; CR II, No. 1280, pp. 880–881.

⁵¹ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1579, pp. 382–383; CR II, No. 1279, 880; MBW T 6, 1578, p. 379; CR II, No. 1280, pp. 880–881.

⁵² MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1579, p. 383; CR II, 1279, p. 880.

⁵³ Melanchthon to de Langey [Melanchthon an Guillaume du Bellay, Seigneur de Langey]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1469, pp. 172–173.

⁵⁴ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1579, p. 383; CR II, 1279, p. 880.

⁵⁵ Sachiko Kusakawa, relying on State Papers, writes that de Langey's relative Lord de LaFosse had sent money to Germany to bring Melanchthon to France and that Francis also had sent Melanchthon a safe-conduct, a gold chain, and money. Kusakawa, 2002, p. 235.

Melanchthon must have felt in the middle of various political factions as he wrote to Joachim Camerarius on July 8, 1535, expressing concern about the “enemies of pious learning” and fearing that men opposed to evangelical doctrine would stir up the emperor against the evangelical territorial princes and their support for reform in their lands.⁵⁶ This must have made Melanchthon cautious in dealing with another Catholic king—that is, Francis.

Melanchthon’s evangelical associates were unable to know what each party’s motivation was, as they had received information secondhand. Melanchthon’s friends saw only the opportunity the invitation would present for an evangelical coalition, which might have been unrealistic considering the treatment of the Protestants hardly a year earlier. On July 9, 1535, Johannes Sturm wrote Melanchthon, encouraging him to come to Paris. De Langey had confirmed to Sturm that Francis agreed with Melanchthon’s doctrine and had assured him that the meeting would be only an initial consultation.⁵⁷ Melanchthon’s humanistic associates, Sturm and Bucer, saw the French mission as an opportunity for them to establish an evangelical coalition in a Catholic country.

This author sees the French mission as a continuation of the discussions of 1534, when Melanchthon designed the first document for European unification—the *Advice*. Melanchthon was pressed by various political and religious agents and confessional groups in different directions, and he was unsure himself what action to take. Melanchthon’s agents had secondhand information that was not accurate. He planned to visit France as a private citizen, thinking that he could slip out of his post at the University. The interference in his plans came from two different players—King Henry and the elector, as seen below.

De Langey was not always straightforward in his message, making remarks that were not founded on facts. On July 16, 1535, de Langey wrote that King Francis I would send instructions for his arrival in France.⁵⁸ The French must have been aware that Melanchthon was hesitant to travel to France, concerned about their conflicting messages, and that Henry wanted to change Melanchthon’s mind and bring him to England.⁵⁹ De Langey assured Melanchthon that the punishments of Protestants in France had been mitigated and wrote he should honor the king’s personal invitation.⁶⁰

In that letter, de Langey also acknowledged that the king had received Melanchthon’s *Advice*.⁶¹ Assuring Melanchthon that most men would agree with him, he added a few comments of his own. It is evident that Melanchthon’s *Advice* had been altered from its original composition. It seemed from the letter that de Langey had read Melanchthon’s letter.

⁵⁶ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1584, p. 392; CR II, 1281, p. 882.

⁵⁷ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1585, pp. 393–397. Johannes Sturm did not have firsthand knowledge of Melanchthon’s “Articles”; only what de Langey had told him.

⁵⁸ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1587, p. 399; CR II, No. 1283, p. 888.

⁵⁹ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P. 330; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. XLII, pp. 468–469; L&P, VIII, No. 1062, p. 418.

⁶⁰ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1587, p. 399; CR II, 1283, pp. 886–889.

⁶¹ Melanchthon’s articles sent to France in August 1534. Melanchthon to Langey [M. an Guillaume du Bellay, Seigneur de Langey]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1469, pp. 172–173.

Henry VIII Tries to Prevent Melanchthon from Meeting with Francis I

From Henry's perspective, the German princes—his only supporters on the Continent—must not form an alliance with Catholic France. Henry needed the princes' support, since he had angered the pope and Francis with the pamphlet written by Gardiner. Henry was concerned that Melanchthon was trying to make peace with his archenemy, the pope. One can understand how dangerous the situation felt to Henry. The prospect of the pope's council further increased Henry's apprehension.

This author concurs with McEntegart that Melanchthon's invitation to France alarmed the English, in case Melanchthon would talk about religious peace (with Henry's enemy). Henry also feared a Franco-German agreement, which would leave Henry isolated, and therefore he sent an embassy to the Continent to divert Melanchthon's trip to France.⁶²

It is not clearly stated how Henry learned of Melanchthon's trip to France, but his trip had to be prevented. For that reason, Henry chose Robert Barnes, a person with close ties to the Saxon Reformers. At this time Henry had another matter to explain to the Germans and the French—was Gardiner's letter responding to the pope's letter against Henry sent to him by Francis (discussed in Chapter Four). This political maneuvering with the pope also influenced Henry's decision to send his agents to Germany.

In July 1535, Henry sent the English Reformer Robert Barnes to Germany. It was important for Henry to commission Barnes for the trip, as he was well acquainted with the Saxon Reformers, especially Melanchthon. The instructions signed by the Duke of Norfolk and Sir George Boleyn, Lord of Rochford, stated that Barnes was to meet Melanchthon in Germany and try to prevent him from going to France by telling him how Francis persecuted anyone who opposed the pope. Barnes was to urge Melanchthon to go to England instead, where he would receive a good reception, "shewing as well the Conformitie of his Opinion and Doctrine here, as the Nobiltie and Verttues of the King's Majestie with the good Entertaynement which undoubtedly he shall have here at his Graces Hands."⁶³

It was of the utmost importance to send Barnes to Germany to prevent Melanchthon's mission to France, and he left without instructions from the archbishop.⁶⁴ If Barnes could not meet Melanchthon in Germany, his mission would be to persuade the German princes to support

⁶² McEntegart 2002, pp. 26–27.

⁶³ Instructions for Sending Barnes, and Others to Germany. July 1535 [?] Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P. 330; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. XLII, pp. 468–469; L&P, VIII, No. 1062, p. 418.

He [Barnes] shall arrive with the said Princes of Germany, the King's Pleasure is, He shall (on his Grace's Behalf) as well perswade them to persist and continue in their former good Opinion, concerning the Denial of the Bishop of Rome's Usurped Autoritie, declaring their own Honour, Reputation and Suretie, to depende thereupon; and that they now may better mayntain their said Just Opinion therein then ever they might, having the King's Majestie (One of the most Noble and Puissant Princes of the World) of like Opinion and Judgment with them; who having proceeded therein by great Advice ... of the great and famous Clerks in Christendome, will in no wise relent, vary, or alter in that Behalf. Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P. 330; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. XLII, p. 468.

Kusukawa notes that Barnes took the credit for preventing Melanchthon's trip to France and inviting him to England. Kusukawa, 2002, p. 236. See Tjernagel 1965, p. 144; McEntegart 2002, pp. 27, 74, 236.

⁶⁴ Tjernagel 1965, p. 145.

Henry, since they had also denied the pope's authority, and had trusted Henry's judgment on his marriage question against the pope.⁶⁵

Robert Barnes wrote to Melanchthon from Hamburg sometime in the middle of August 1535, asking him to stay in Germany until he had a chance to speak with him, since the whole University of Wittenberg had moved to Jena.⁶⁶ Barnes's mission to contact Melanchthon was a calculated effort on Henry's part to assure that he would gain Saxon support for his divorce and Fisher's execution.

Henry had sent his ambassadors to Germany, and at the same time the king asked Cromwell to dispatch his agents to France in the hope of strengthening his position with the pope through the Catholic king. This would also secure the diversion of Melanchthon's trip from France to England. At the same time, Cromwell secretly sent Christopher Mont and Simon Heynes to France to see Sir John Wallop, the English ambassador, with orders to pretend that the king did not send them. Mont and Heynes were to leave for France without the instructions "of Bishope of Canterbury" that would be given to them on their way to Germany by Henry's ambassadors to Germany, Edward Fox (the Bishop of Hereford) and Nicholas Heath (the Archdeacon of Stafford).⁶⁷ If they saw Melanchthon in France, they were to persuade him to come to England and show him the same copies of sermons as Barnes had.⁶⁸ If Melanchthon was not in France, they were to forward the sermons to Wallop in case he knew of some articles published in France defending the pope's supremacy, which the king of France intended to send to Germany. In addition, they were to remind Francis of the old friendly promises to support Henry's cause and reproach him for now being willing to stir the Germans to an opposite opinion.⁶⁹ It is evident that the English knew of Melanchthon's *Advice*, but their information was not accurate, since they believed that the *Advice* supported the pope's supremacy. It was of the utmost importance for the ambassadors to prevent French involvement with the Schmalkaldic princes, Henry's only support on the Continent.

Again, it was not stated how Melanchthon's *Advice* was sent to England and how they knew of its contents. Henry's foreign agents were sent all over Europe, and it is probable that his conservative ambassador Gardiner must have been aware of the *Advice*. But the English had no accurate knowledge that Melanchthon supported the pope's supremacy. This was not good news

⁶⁵ Instructions for Sending Barnes, and Others to Germany. July 1535 [?] Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P. 330; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. XLII, pp. 468–469; L&P, VIII, No. 1062, p. 418.

⁶⁶ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1604, p. 417. Tjernagel 1965, p. 146.

⁶⁷ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P. 330; Burnet Vol. 4, No. XLII, pp. 468–469; Cromwell's Letter to Wallop, August 23, 1535; *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. 1, No. 113, pp. 416–420; L&P, 1535, VIII, No. 1062, p. 419.

⁶⁸ "Book of Dean of the Chaple and as many Bishop's [Thomas Cranmer's] sermons as you have." Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P. 330; Burnet Vol. 4, No. XLII, p. 468.

⁶⁹ Instructions for Sending Barnes, and Others to Germany. July 1535 [?] Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P. 330; Burnet Vol. 4, No. XLII, pp. 468–469. And in case they shall (by him, or otherwise) lerne and know that Melanchton [Melanchthon] is there arryved; then his Grace woll, that the said Haynes and Mount shall (in such sort as they be not much noted) reasorte unto him; And for the desuading of the sorte unto him: And for the desuading o the Contynuance there, or the Alteration of his Opinion, and the Alluring of him hither, to use suche Reasons and Persuasions as he before written, with suche other as they canne further devise for that Purpose. To the which Haynes and Mount, the King's Pleasure is, ye shall delyver like Copies of the said Dean's Book, and Bishop's Sermons [Thomas Cranmer] to be shewed unto the said Melancthon, [Melanchthon] or otherwise used, as may be most expedient for the Achievement of the King's Purpose in that Behalfe. Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P. 330; Burnet Vol. 4, No. XLII, p. 468.

to Henry and may have been an additional reason why he sent for Melanchthon to come to England, as well as to prevent French involvement with the Schmalkaldic princes. Henry succeeded in preventing Melanchthon's trip to France, diverting his trip to Germany, sending his agents to Germany, and covering his bases in France.

Bernard refutes McEntegart's assumption that Cromwell was instructing the ambassadors who went to Germany and France to prevent Melanchthon's trip to France by diverting him to England. While it was important to the king to meet Melanchthon, it was not so much Cromwell's interest. Henry must have designed the whole scheme, instructing Cromwell. This author concurs with Bernard and Kusakawa that the king wanted to have Melanchthon come to England to consult on the matters of his divorce and doctrinal purity.⁷⁰

On August 8, 1535, Mont and Heynes informed Henry that they had not seen Melanchthon in France, and based on Wallop's letter to the king, Cromwell assumed that Melanchthon was not likely to be sent to France. Initially, the Saxon Reformers had asked Francis to be the arbitrator between themselves and the pope. De Langey, the French king's agent, asked Melanchthon to change the contents of the *Advice*. Henry's agents Mont and Heynes thought that de Langey went to Germany so that the Saxon Reformers and the French would prevent the council.⁷¹ Henry sent his agents to prevent France's involvement; whereas the French were hoping that Melanchthon would change his *Advice* and come to France.⁷² Mont knew that de Langey had requested Melanchthon to alter his *Advice* to make the pope supreme.⁷³

On the political level, the Saxon Reformers wished to ask Francis to be the arbitrator between themselves and the pope, and this was why de Langey came to Germany.⁷⁴ It seems that the real purpose of de Langey's mission in Germany was to prevent the meeting of the General Council, which the emperor had appealed to the Lutherans to accept. De Langey himself had added one article to Melanchthon's *Advice*, which was "How to restrain the pope's power."⁷⁵ This was the opposite of what Mont thought should be the direction of its alteration.

⁷⁰ Bernard 2005, pp. 536–537; McEntegart 2002, p. 27; See Kusakawa 2002, p. 235 and Tjernagel 1965, p. 147.

⁷¹ L&P, IX, No. 54, pp. 15–16; SP 1/95, Fols. 50–51; L&P IX, No. 281, pp. 93–94.

⁷² Melanchthon sent his judgment concerning the disputes over church matters with the Roman pope to Guillaume de Bellay Langey. The Articles sent to France are in MBW T 6, 1467, pp. 134–143; CR II, No. 1205. The Articles used in this study are the originals and appear in three forms: (1) Schwebel, (2) Peucer, (3) French. Schwebel's copy follows Codex. Monac, the one true and genuine form, and will be followed in this study. CR II, No. 1205, pp. 741–742. The Articles appropriate for this study include: *De Potestate Ecclesiastica*, *De Traditionibus humanis rerum indifferentium*, *de iustificatione*; *de Missa et utraque specie*, *de cultu Sanctorum*, *de votis et coelibatu*. Philip Melanchthon: "Advice on how religious controversies might be moderated." August 1, 1535. (Mutilated copies of Melanchthon's articles went from France to England and from England to Germany in 1539. The Counsel of Melanchthon was published several times in France. But Melanchthon is not the author of the text published in France, even though it was published under his name. Guillaume du Bellay de Langey put it together from counsel which Melanchthon sent to him. The Academy in Paris repudiated the counsel of the text handed them by du Bellay, and also opposed the other articles. The French copy is also included as Argenterio F. in *Corpus Reformatorum*. Melanchthon kept his own copy, but was unwilling to publish it. (Letter to Camerarius, October 1, 1535 CR II, 1222, pp. 791–793.) The initial purpose of the Articles was to bring the pope and the evangelicals to an agreement (per Langey). The Order of the Academy of Paris repudiated the text and the articles. MBW, T 6, 1467, pp. 134–143; CR, II, 1205, pp. 743–764.

⁷³ L&P, IX, No. 281, p. 94.

⁷⁴ L&P, IX, No. 54, pp. 15–16; SP 1/95, Fols 50–51; L&P, IX, No. 281, pp. 93–94.

⁷⁵ L&P, IX, No. 54, pp. 15–16; SP 1/95, Fols. 50–51.

Melanchthon had agreed with de Langey's proposal that a free synod of bishops should replace the pope's council. Melanchthon did not believe that Henry's intention was to abolish the bishops' powers when he became the head of the church. He may not have had a clear picture of the events transpiring in England, and how the bishops became dependent on the supremacy law. The bishops' synod was not a possibility at that time either, since it was up to the king to call for it.

Melanchthon must have realized from Barnes's mission that Henry was not impressed by his French contacts. Melanchthon did not want to lose his good connection with Henry, having asked him to be patron of his literary work in March 1535.⁷⁶ He informed Henry that he had sent him the *Loci Communes*⁷⁷ through Alexander Alesius, a Scot associated with the Saxon Reformers. Melanchthon asked Henry to tell Alesius any impressions he had about the book.⁷⁸

It seems that English agents had apprehended Melanchthon. He also had been asked to change the contents of the *Advice*. All these events made him realize that he had to mend his contact with Henry; hence he planned (already in March) to dedicate his *Loci Communes* to Henry. In the preface, he recommended Henry as head of the church, but left unsaid that Henry was also head of the state, since it would have made clear to Melanchthon the problem with the doctrinal reform. Instead, Melanchthon accepted Henry as king with the authority to define doctrinal disputes and hoped that *Loci Communes* would help Henry in doing so.

The literary contact with the king was of the utmost importance for Melanchthon. On the same date, August 17, 1535, to secure the acceptance of his *Loci Communes*, Melanchthon also wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury. He recommended Alesius to Cranmer as a longstanding friend: "He is setting out for Britain to show his Royal Majesty something I have written, and I told him to show a copy to you." Melanchthon asked for Cranmer's help in securing Alesius' access to the king.⁷⁹

A Brief Analysis of the Preface to the *Loci Communes*

In the preface to the *Loci Communes*,⁸⁰ Melanchthon wrote that he was presenting to Henry the main topics of Christian doctrine so that the book could have a positive impact on church practices in England:

⁷⁶ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1552, pp. 325–327; CR II, 1264, pp. 861–864. See Kusakawa 2002, p. 236. The mission to bring *Loci Communes* to Henry VIII became an important link between England and Germany. Gotthelf Wiedermann: "Alexander Alesius' Lectures on the Psalms at Cambridge, 1536." In *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 37/1, 1986, pp. 15–17 (hereafter, Wiedermann 1986).

⁷⁷ Meyer notes that the concept of universality of the Church appears in Melanchthon's writings during 1531–1539; in the new edition of *Loci Communes* 1535. Meyer 1966, pp. 196–197. MacCulloch 1996, pp. 190–191.

⁷⁸ Melanchthon to King Henry VIII of England [Melanchthon an Kg. Heinrich VIII. von England]. August 17, 1535. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1607, pp. 423–424; CR, II, No. 1310, pp. 919–920.

⁷⁹ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1606, p. 421; CR, II, No. 1312, pp. 930–931.

⁸⁰ Timothy Wengert sees the preface to *Loci Communes* of 1535 as an offensive document for Erasmus. Wengert outlines this exchange as a culmination of previous encounters between Erasmus of Rotterdam and Philip Melanchthon: first in Leipzig 1519 and in Melanchthon's *Loci Communes* 1521; second defending Luther when Erasmus attacked the bondage of the will in Melanchthon's edition to the letter of Colossians in 1527/1528. Melanchthon criticized Erasmus' exegetical method. Melanchthon's sharpest criticism was in his outline to Romans in 1529/1530 against Origenists. Furthermore, Wengert notes that compared to Melanchthon's other prefaces that of the *Loci Communes* of 1535, has the most complicated Latin style; it may have contained a subtle answer to

I have gathered in a method of logical order the principal topics of Christian doctrine fostering piety to be useful in the life of pious practices and in the sermons taught in church. I explain the best faith and simplicity without vain sophistry. I do not like disputations which only disturb consciences but do not teach.⁸¹

In Melanchthon's view, a single individual could not resolve the pernicious disagreements in the church. Instead, he recommended that there should be synods wherein the best ecclesiastical minds could debate all the key points and longstanding disputes, and establish a lasting doctrinal consensus that would be beneficial to everyone, both now and in the future.⁸²

He was at pains to emphasize the importance and benefit of the king's involvement in making this happen by citing the central position the church has in the tranquility of any kingdom. He suggested that the wiser the king,⁸³ the more likely he was to be involved in the church and to be concerned to ensure a peaceful and united church for his own time and for posterity.⁸⁴

Distancing himself from academic argumentation, Melanchthon instead focused on religion and faith. Melanchthon confined himself to familiar language, for the most part, to keep the discussion clear. He suggested that this was not the place for doctrinal discussion, which could be found elsewhere in his works.⁸⁵ He pointed out that a brief glance at editorial debates over textual transmission would demonstrate that people do not always recognize the structure of the matter under debate or of the text they are working on.⁸⁶

In typical style, Melanchthon used humanistic humility in comparing himself to "commonplace sculptors" and "potters of minor works" in his comparison of theology with liberal arts—the structural elements of economics and architecture.⁸⁷ Thus, rather than rejecting liberal education as incompatible with Christian doctrine, he said that it not only beautifies doctrine but also aids in clarity of understanding.⁸⁸ Melanchthon also described himself as one possessed of infirm abilities, compared with the excellent mental powers of others.⁸⁹

Erasmus' charges in 1519. "Famous Last Words: The Final Epistolary Exchange between Erasmus of Rotterdam and Philip Melanchthon in 1536," Wengert 2010, XII, pp. 20–22, 24, 26. Estes 2005, pp. 119–121.

⁸¹ LC, 1535, Fols. 3R, 4L. The preface to *Loci Communes*, the rare book in the Graduate Theological Union library collection in Berkeley, California, is the same as the one published in MBW T 6, 1555. Melanchthon wrote the *Loci Communes* in March 1535, and dedicated the *Loci Communes* to Henry VIII, on August 17, 1535. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1555, pp. 338–339; LC 1535, Fols. 1–8.

⁸² LC 1535, Fol. 5R; MBW T 6, 1555, p. 339; "Famous Last Words: The Final Epistolary Exchange between Erasmus of Rotterdam and Philip Melanchthon in 1536," Wengert 2010, XII, p. 27. "Therefore, since there is so much both difficulty and danger in putting together a method, it has often occurred to me that it should not be the work of a single individual, but of a synod. In a synod, the most learned and excellent men can diligently make judgment, after deliberation in common over all those articles concerning which controversies often arise and there is even some disagreement among the ancients, and can publish a clear and completer doctrine of religion." LC 1535, Fol. 3L, R; MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1555, p. 335.

⁸³ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1555, pp. 338–339; LC 1535, Fols. 3R, 7R, 8L; Timothy Wengert notes the role of princes furthering theology. "Famous Last Words: The Final Epistolary Exchange between Erasmus of Rotterdam and Philip Melanchthon in 1536," Wengert 2010, XII, p. 24.

⁸⁴ LC 1535, Fols. 3R, 4R, 5R.

⁸⁵ LC 1535, Fol. 5R.

⁸⁶ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1555, p. 339. Wengert 2010, XII, p. 28.

⁸⁷ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1555, p. 336. Wengert 2010, XII, p. 27.

⁸⁸ LC 1535, Fol. 6 L; Wengert 2010, XII, pp. 23–29.

⁸⁹ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1555, p. 339. Wengert 2010, XII, p. 28.

Melanchthon stressed the importance of not confusing doctrine with other disciplines and wrote against the Anabaptists and others that refused proper education.⁹⁰ One may see that Melanchthon's purpose was to support evangelical Christians and doctrinal reform in England.

Melanchthon praised Henry for the breadth of his learning, and noted especially the absence of persecution of those who "strive for the purer ecclesiastical doctrine" in his realm, contrasting this with some of the slaughter that had taken place elsewhere. He takes this as recognition on Henry's part that there are indeed some abuses in need of correction.⁹¹

He closed by affirming his veneration of the "Universal (*Catholica*) Church of Christ" and his sincere willingness to be overruled by the better judgment of those wiser than himself. It is in this spirit that he invited Henry to judge his writing, trusting that he would do so freely and fairly, recognizing Melanchthon's commitment to peace and agreement in the church.⁹²

Melanchthon brought up another reason why it seemed auspicious to send this text out into the world under Henry's auspices. Appealing to the authority of Isaiah, he cited the responsibility of kings to protect those who are working to propagate true doctrine.⁹³ Melanchthon accepted that Henry was the Supreme Head of the Church of England. Therefore, in Melanchthon's mind, it was up to the king to resolve controversial doctrinal issues as well as civil disputes. "Pious kings," he wrote, "are also nurturers of the church."⁹⁴ The king is the protector of the pious against unjust severity as they propagate the right doctrine."⁹⁵ Melanchthon hoped that his text would enable Henry to form his own judgments, both concerning Melanchthon himself and all the doctrinal issues with which he was engaged.⁹⁶ Estes sees the preface as Melanchthon presenting his mature position on the office of magistrate; Melanchthon praises Henry's justice, care for peace, his greatness and zeal for true religion, his clemency and

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ LC 1535, Fol. 8 L; MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1555, p. 339. I have no doubt that Your Majesty wishes the best of counsel to be taken both for the glory of Christ and the peace of the church, and often deeply ponders over remedies for this dissension. To this end, it is clearly useful to see not only the texts of those men who deform our case with the most unjust slanders, which not only some impudent men of the lowest account do, but also some others that go forth on this stage with a costume of great seriousness and a mask of wisdom. It would be more fitting for these men to bestow their authority, not on harming good men and inflaming the cruelty of emperors, but rather to adorning the glory of Christ, curing the ills of the church rightly and inclining the minds of princes to Christian gentleness. For it is a most disgraceful thing for great men to practice sycophancy under pretext of seriousness. What they are doing is to cover over received abuses and skillfully deprave those things that our men piously and usefully advise. LC 1535, Fol. 8 L; MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1555, p. 339.

⁹² LC 1535, Fol. 8L; MBW T 6, 1555, p. 340. Wengert 2010, XII, p. 28. With all my heart, I venerate the Catholic Church of Christ and embrace all its decisions with all zeal. And I never wish in any way to dissent from the judgments of the good and learned men in the church. Therefore, I present the collection of mine to your Majesty, not as patron, if I err in any way, but as a judge in the most serious controversies, since I considered that your judgment would be right because of your doctrine and free and fair because of the high status of your royal majesty. And so I pray that Your Majesty will not unwillingly accept my text for this reason. In it, I hope, he will see both that I have engaged with matters useful to piety and that I am most desirous of peace and agreement in the church. LC 1535, Fol. 8 L; MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1555, p. 340.

⁹³ Wengert 2010, XII, pp. 24, 27.

⁹⁴ LC 1535, 7R. The Prophet Isaiah, when he prophesies that pious 'Kings' would be 'tutors' of the Church, as he put it, demands that Kings should protect the pious against unjustified ferocity so that they can take care that right doctrine be propagated. What titles, what trophies are more to be wished for, by great and wise Kings, than that this sweetest name be ascribed to them with a heavenly voice, that they should be called the tutors of the church of Christ? LC 1535, 7R; MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1555, p. 339.

⁹⁵ LC 1535, Fol. 7R; MBW T 6, 1555, p. 339; Wengert 2010, XII, pp. 24, 27.

⁹⁶ LC 1535, Fols. 7L, R.

goodness.⁹⁷ Furthermore he argues that Melanchthon's citing the text of Isaiah (49:23), became his teaching on the duty of magistrates toward the church: protect the true doctrine and transmit it to posterity.⁹⁸

Melanchthon's Disagreement with the Elector

The prevention of the pope's General Council or creation of a common strategy became the common ground for future negotiations between Henry's ambassadors and the Schmalkaldic League. De Langey argued that in place of the General Council, each nation could decide church policy issues in a national synod. The emperor wanted to hold the General Council for two reasons: first to discuss the legitimacy of the king of England's second marriage; and second, the king's supremacy law, in which he had abrogated the pope's authority.⁹⁹ Instead, de Langey proposed that France, England, and Germany each hold their own council, and hoped that the pope would accept his plan.¹⁰⁰

The Saxon Reformers had asked that Francis mediate between them and the pope, and de Langey initially came to Germany for that reason. Melanchthon may have been caught between the political and theological implications. If Melanchthon had known that Francis' interest in doctrine was not genuine, would he have ever considered a trip to France?¹⁰¹ This time Melanchthon stated another reason, which was to help end the persecution of non-Catholics in France. One wonders how the knowledge of the execution of two prominent Catholics in England influenced Melanchthon.¹⁰²

Melanchthon had made a decision to travel to France for missionary purposes as a private citizen, but his petition to travel created the deepest crisis in his relationship with the elector, who denied the trip.¹⁰³

Melanchthon must have seen an opportunity to safeguard his *Advice*, since on August 15, 1535, he petitioned the Elector John Frederick to allow him to go to France for two to three months.¹⁰⁴ Melanchthon wanted to spread right doctrine to other nations and their rulers, and to condemn wrong doctrine.¹⁰⁵ He would only go if he could be of help in ending the king's persecution of non-Catholics in France. Melanchthon thought that his going to France would

⁹⁷ Estes 2005, pp. 119–120.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 120–121.

⁹⁹ L&P, IX, No.281, pp. 93–94; SP 1/96, Fols. 78–79; L&P IX, No. 337, p. 113; SP 1/96, Fols. 123–124.

¹⁰⁰ L&P, IX, No. No. 54, pp. 15–16, SP 1/95, Fols. 50–51; L&P IX, No. 281, p. 93; SP 1/96, Fols. 78–80.

¹⁰¹ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1585, pp. 393–397. Johannes Sturm did not have firsthand knowledge of

Melanchthon's *Advice* only what de Langey had told him

¹⁰² St. P. Vol. I, Pt. 2, pp. 431–432; L&P, VIII, No. 867, pp. 340–341; SP6/7, Fols. 5, 10. Kusakawa 2002, p. 237.

¹⁰³ Kohnle 2011, pp. 48–49.

¹⁰⁴ MBW R 2; MBW, T 6, 1603, pp. 416–417; CR II, 1302, p. 905. I nevertheless let the matter be delivered in subservience to your Highness and ask that your Royal Highness would graciously consider the matter, and if it might be thought of as not harmful, to allow me most graciously two or at the longest three months for my own Person. I have spoken with D. Caspar Cruciger, who will in the meantime have that much more industry and work in Jena. For that purpose I have ordered through others the lessons for the youth, also the lessons of M. Francisci, and place all such things for the reflection of Your Royal Majesty. God keep Your Royal Majesty graciously at all times. MBW, T 6, 1603, pp. 416–417; CR II, 1302, p. 905.

¹⁰⁵ MBW R 2; MBW, T 6, 1603, p. 416; CR II, 1302, p. 902. (CR dates later on August 18, 1535).

benefit both the French king and the elector.¹⁰⁶ The elector had a different opinion of the French relationship to the Germans. Greschat argues that the goals of the French king were only political, to increase difficulties for the emperor, when Francis invited Protestant theologians to France.¹⁰⁷

The elector consulted other theologians, on August 15–16, 1535, before giving his counsel to Melanchthon, and conveyed his advice in a letter to Gregory Brück, his Chancellor, asking him to make an effort to prevent the trip, with a drastic statement: “For we are at once decided on that, and must we at the same time completely distance ourselves from Philippus, so that he should not travel without our permission and good will.”¹⁰⁸ The elector did not recommend Melanchthon’s trip, as it would cause disadvantage to the business of the electorate and was politically unwise, as the elector himself was subject to the emperor. He did not trust Melanchthon. The elector’s letter to Brück concluded with a list of reasons forbidding the trip: Melanchthon’s position was irreplaceable and a schism might result. The French would not be interested in the new doctrine, but would sense that Melanchthon’s mind could be changed and try to “educate” him further. Erasmus’s humanistic supporters would seduce him rather than be interested in the new church doctrine and practice. The elector also feared that Melanchthon would support the false English marriage.¹⁰⁹

This discussion may have been Luther’s appeal on behalf of Melanchthon, since on August 17, 1535, John Frederick wrote to Melanchthon that he was unable to send a letter from the king of France to him at Wittenberg, but would send it to him in Jena. The elector asked Melanchthon to show the letter to Luther for his honest opinion.¹¹⁰ The elector offered to write to the king of France on Melanchthon’s behalf to help excuse Melanchthon’s trip. Justus Jonas had translated the elector’s letter to the king of France into Latin, in which the elector had added that Martin Luther was also against Melanchthon going to France.¹¹¹ Greschat writes that Melanchthon composed the letter in which the French invitation was respectfully turned down.¹¹²

The next day, on August 18, Melanchthon wrote to Justus Jonas stating that he would not go to France because the elector had been unwilling to let him travel there, and the French would probably interpret this denial as cheating them of his promised visit.¹¹³

Kohnle lists the reasons for the elector’s denial as the upcoming approximation to Habsburg, Melanchthon’s compromise in doctrine and that the French were not interested in doctrine, and that Melanchthon had conceded doctrinal points in his *Advice* which might conflict with the

¹⁰⁶ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1603, pp. 415–416; CR II, No. 1302, p. 904.

¹⁰⁷ Greschat 2010, p. 116.

¹⁰⁸ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1605, pp. 419–420; CR II, 1304, pp. 908–910.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1608, p. 424; CR, II, 1300, pp. 902–903.

¹¹¹ This remark may refer to the fact that the elector believed that the case was closed, which may include his belief that Luther and Melanchthon had agreed with his decision. But the case was reopened by Melanchthon and Luther, who both sent letters to the elector, since Luther supported Melanchthon’s trip. It is possible that the elector had then sent Dr. Brück to Wittenberg to pressure both of them to withdraw their second petitions, in order for the elector to make his final denial of Melanchthon’s trip. See Excursus LW, L, No. 259, pp. 88–91. Eds. Gottfried G. Krodel & Helmut T. Lehmann.

¹¹² Greschat 2010, p. 116. There may have been a second appeal from Melanchthon and Luther. See Excursus LW, L, No. 259, pp. 88–91. Eds. Gottfried G. Krodel & Helmut T. Lehmann.

¹¹³ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1609, p. 425.

doctrine of *Confessio Augustana*. Melanchthon was not obedient to God's authority, negotiating with the enemy of the emperor without informing the elector.¹¹⁴ This author agrees with Kohnle's assessment that Melanchthon's interference in the elector's foreign politics was not seen as favorable from the elector's point of view. Even though Melanchthon had sincere goals in mind to benefit the churches, he failed to assess the situation from the elector's point of view.

The situation was most favorable to Henry's political plans. He needed Francis' support against the pope. Henry also defended his accusation that Francis was executing Protestants. Five days later, on August 23, 1535, Henry requested that Mont try to persuade de Langey to divert Melanchthon's trip to England. According to Kusukawa, Henry's purpose was to halt the action of the French envoys headed by Langey.¹¹⁵ In addition, Henry pointed out that Francis had no business judging the executions of More and Fisher, claiming that it was better to punish traitors than persecute subjects who spoke against the Bishop of Rome, as Francis had done. While Henry blamed Francis for believing tales of the execution,¹¹⁶ he wanted the English ambassador Wallop to carefully find out the French king's reaction to the executions of More and Fisher.¹¹⁷ Henry still had reason to suspect that the injury caused to the pope's supremacy might isolate him not only from the pope but also from the rest of Europe.

This author finds it clear that Henry's political plans were at stake in trying to divert Melanchthon's trip to England. Henry was aware that his actions in England had injured the pope's reputation. He defended Francis in order to get his support, persuaded his agents to prevent de Langey's mission to Germany (who then would have sole control of his relations with the Schmalkaldic princes), and defended the execution of religious men in England to prevent any misconception of his actions and to gain continental support.

It is possible that the elector assumed Melanchthon's case was closed and that Luther had agreed to his decision to prevent Melanchthon's trip. However, Luther supported Melanchthon's trip, and appealed to the elector soon after the first denial.¹¹⁸ On August 24, 1535, the elector wrote to Melanchthon (in the name of Martin Luther), to exhort him not to go to France. He wrote that Melanchthon should by now have received their counsel concerning the trip. In this letter, the elector criticized Melanchthon for not letting him know of his plans ahead of time.¹¹⁹ He pointed out their relationship and what Melanchthon owed to his superior:

¹¹⁴ Kohnle 2011, pp. 48–49.

¹¹⁵ Sachiko Kusukawa writes that Henry wished to halt the French envoys headed by de Langey. Kusukawa 2002, p. 235.

¹¹⁶ A Letter of Cromwell to the King's Ambassador in France, full of Expostulations. Ex MS Rymeri; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book II, No. XXXV, p. 461; L&P, IX, No. 157, pp. 45–46.

¹¹⁷ A Letter of Cromwell's to the King's Ambassador in France, full of Expostulations. MS Rymeri; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book II, No. XXXV, pp. 460–461; Cromwell, Vol. 1, No. 113, pp. 417, 419.

¹¹⁸ This remark may refer to the fact that the elector believed that the case was closed, which may include his belief that Luther and Melanchthon had agreed with his decision. But the case was reopened by Melanchthon and Luther who both sent letters to the elector, since Luther supported Melanchthon's trip. It is possible that the elector then sent Dr. Brück to Wittenberg to pressure both of them to withdraw their second petitions, in order for the elector make his final denial of Melanchthon's trip. See Excursus LW, L, No. 259, pp. 88–91. Eds. Gottfried G. Krodel & Helmut T. Lehmann.

¹¹⁹ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1610, pp. 426–428; CR II, 1305, pp. 910–913. Sachiko Kusukawa notes that Melanchthon not traveling to France would give reason for the English to expect Melanchthon's trip to England. Kusukawa 2002, p. 236.

You might, however, easily consider what you are owing to us, as your superior ordained by God... which would have been due to us therein, since you well know how France stands against the Imperial Majesty and Royal Eminence in Hungary and Bohemia.

As the main point of his letter, he mentioned the *Confessio Augustana's* doctrine and pointed to doctrinal reduction in the *Advice* destined for France, which would incur scorn if used in place of the new doctrine they defended. He then left Melanchthon to his conscience to decide the matter.¹²⁰ One can interpret the postscript as an order from Melanchthon's superior, the elector:

And in the case that you thus are interrupted in your journey into France, as we expect, so we enclose herewith writing to send on to the King of France, a copy for you to be found enclosed; you will know to ascribe it further to his Royal Majesty.¹²¹

From the elector's point of view, secular magistracy should be obeyed in religious discussions. He also wanted to maintain the sound doctrinal statement published in Augsburg in 1530 and not to deviate, as this was the doctrine the Saxon Reformers defended against the emperor. The elector stressed his superiority over Melanchthon and his dependence on the emperor.

On August 28, 1535, Melanchthon wrote to Johannes Sturm in Paris that he had unsuccessfully applied the greatest efforts "so that the Prince would give me permission to leave," and that he had explained to de Langey that the elector was cautious, for fear that Melanchthon would be either less emphatic or too persistent compared to some other theologians. He also stressed that "old errors" needed to be amended and that he had been able to moderate many things to help the church strive for unity with all its strength. He felt that he had been able to keep the disagreements within reasonable limits, which had brought him rough treatment both at home and abroad. However, he was willing to remain true to his conscience and through this experience, show even more equanimity than before.¹²² It is interesting to note that Reformation Church policy emerged on two different levels: obedience to magistracy and obedience to individual conscience in matters of faith.

Melanchthon needed to differentiate between matters of obedience to magistracy and matters of conscience. The elector was adamant that Reformers should not have deviated from the doctrine of *Confessio Augustana* and that Melanchthon had reduced doctrinal points in the *Advice*. The elector must have referred to communion, which Melanchthon left in either one or two kinds in practice, without stating the doctrinal basis for both kinds. He was concerned about the effects on foreign relations with the emperor, as schism would ensue and Melanchthon might be seduced to French thinking easily, and then betray the course of Reformation. From Melanchthon's point of view, the denial meant that he felt the elector's hostility to his unification plans, but admitted that he might be persecuted there and that his compromises angered the elector. Clearly the political matters, in regard to the emperor, must have been very much on his agenda, as he could not permit anyone outside the empire to lead foreign politics but him. It also demonstrated how politics and religion were intertwined at that time.

¹²⁰ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1610, pp. 426–428; CR II, 1305, pp. 910–913.

¹²¹ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1610, p. 428; CR II, 1305, p. 913.

¹²² MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1613, p. 436; CR II, 1308, p. 917.

On the same day, Melanchthon told de Langey that the elector had said he could not go to France because the elector had plans to see Ferdinand at the same time.¹²³ Melanchthon wanted to give de Langey the real reason, which was the clause in his *Advice* “On communion in both kinds” that said “having removed the prohibition” after it was to be ratified, so that “neither side should condemn the other.” Melanchthon stated that he wrote on other controversial issues less emphatically, but felt that the elector interpreted one clause, “that neither side should condemn the other,” as if it were a crime.¹²⁴ In other words, Melanchthon is saying both customs should be acceptable.

Furthermore, the things he had said about ecclesiastical power in a respectful manner were interpreted as if Melanchthon had betrayed the whole cause of the Reformation, since the elector thought that his article “On ecclesiastical power” was harmful both to the elector and to the Reformation. Melanchthon continued to give the French hope that he would come, but this was unrealistic.¹²⁵

At the same time, Melanchthon also wrote to the king of France.¹²⁶ After commending Francis as the “most powerful Christian king and France surpasses all the kingdoms of the whole world,”¹²⁷ he politely let the king know that his trip to France was delayed, but that he still planned to come in order to offer help to the “most beautiful and sacred order of the church.”¹²⁸ Melanchthon had commended Henry in the same way, using powerful Renaissance rhetoric, but did not elaborate on the reasons, since the elector had written to Francis.¹²⁹

Melanchthon had his personal reasons to consider. Three days later, on August 31, 1535, Melanchthon finally confessed, in a letter to Camerarius, that he felt he would be in great danger if he went to France, and mentioned the fate of Thomas More in England. He would only go there with the elector’s permission.¹³⁰ Melanchthon revealed his inner struggles, since he interpreted the elector’s response as hostility towards his plans, and wondered if rumors had influenced him.¹³¹

Melanchthon took the elector’s denial personally, as revealed in his letters to his colleagues. He suspected that his compromising outlook in doctrinal matters had angered the elector, when he left “communion in both kinds” open for interpretation. He even felt the elector had abused his power by preventing his travel either as a private person or representing the electorate. It seems that Melanchthon still wished to find out if his *Advice* on church policy had been accepted in France. He must have had doubts of acceptance by a Catholic country of his plans for the unification of Catholics and Protestants. It was Melanchthon’s eagerness rather than French

¹²³ Philip Melanchthon to du Bellay [Melanchthon an du Bellay am französischen Hof]. August 28, 1535. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1611, pp. 428–431.

¹²⁴ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1611, pp. 429–430. Kohnle 2011, p. 49.

¹²⁵ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1611, p. 430.

¹²⁶ Philip Melanchthon to King Francis I, of France [Melanchthon an Kg. Franz I. von Frankreich]. August 28, 1535. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1612, pp. 433–434.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 433.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 434.

¹²⁹ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1605, pp. 419–420; CR II, 1304, pp. 907–908; MBW R 2; MBW, T 6, 1610, p. 428; CR II, 1305, pp. 912–913.

¹³⁰ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1616, p. 440; CR II, 1309, pp. 918–919.

¹³¹ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1616, pp. 440–441. See Kusakawa 2002, p. 236.

willingness to condone his proposals. He had to repair his mistake on both sides when he tried to travel without the elector's permission. In the end, Melanchthon wanted to be free to travel to France.¹³²

Melanchthon's Unification Efforts and the *Loci Communes*

Melanchthon's preparation of *Loci Communes* at the time that he clarified his unification goals for discussions with either France or England must be interpreted as a powerful intention to establish a Christian state under the leadership of princes conforming to the doctrine presented in it, especially in controversial issues of church policy. He stressed the necessity of having a firm doctrinal consensus, so that practical matters would fall into place.

Melanchthon did not agree with the elector's position, and was more concerned with the possible consequences that his failed unification efforts might bring to Germany. On October 4, 1535, Melanchthon disclosed to his friend Joachim Camerarius that he had been invited to England, first by letters and now by the ambassadors. He wrote to Camerarius that he adjusted his plans for the good of the state. He noted that he had tried to reconcile his differences with the French, and for that purpose had compiled the *Advice* sent to France.¹³³ Since the French project had failed, Melanchthon thought about its political implications for Germany, and concluded that the French continued to uphold papal authority and intended to create disorder to incite the emperor to become involved in the German wars.¹³⁴ Melanchthon must have been disappointed by the elector's refusal, and felt that his intentions had been for the good of the electorate. But the elector's refusal had to do with political exigencies that Melanchthon must have realized in the end.

Melanchthon seems to have gotten over this disappointment, and his relationship with the elector seems to have been resolved, on the evidence of his letter to Frederick Myconius on October 4, 1535: "Friendships ought to be immortal; enemies mortal," he wrote.¹³⁵

On that date, Melanchthon also wrote to Christopher Mont, stating that the pope had established a new tyranny by unfairly treating priests who had married. Melanchthon discussed at some length the *Advice* he had designed in 1534 and sent to France, which he thought had been mutilated. He made it clear to Mont that his initial purpose in writing the *Advice* was to accept the primacy of the bishop of Rome according to human law. But he really believed that the kings should judge church doctrine instead of the "Bishop of Rome," whose tyranny is in opposition to new doctrine. Therefore, Melanchthon recommended the king of England, as superior to other kings in knowledge, a better judge of doctrine, and who could establish the reformation of those abuses.¹³⁶ Melanchthon's quite lengthy letter to Mont proves his eagerness to show the English his aim of propagating new doctrine. At the end of the letter, Melanchthon mentioned that he had not gone to France because the French only wanted his presence to

¹³² MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1616, pp. 440–441; See Kusakawa 2002, p. 235.

¹³³ See Dingel 1998, pp. 110–111.

¹³⁴ Melanchthon to Joachim Camerarius [Melanchthon an Joachim Camerarius in Tübingen]. October 4, 1535. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1638, p. 468; CR II, 1339, pp. 951–952; L&P, IX, No. 546, p. 180.

¹³⁵ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1641, p. 473; CR II, 1337, pp. 949–950.

¹³⁶ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1640, pp. 471–473. Kusakawa 2002, p. 237.

prevent persecution of the Protestants. Melanchthon ended his letter to Mont by making him aware that Alexander Alesius had brought Henry Melanchthon's *Loci Communes*.¹³⁷ He added that the recent executions in England did not diminish Melanchthon's high esteem of Henry as head of the English Church, and Melanchthon hoped that he could contribute to church reform in England.¹³⁸ At the beginning of October, Henry wrote a thank-you letter to Melanchthon for the letters that had been brought to him by Alexander Alesius. The king also thanked Melanchthon for dedicating the *Loci Communes* to him and offered to support his goals regarding Christian doctrine.¹³⁹ In fact, there is evidence that Henry rewarded Melanchthon with 300 crowns.¹⁴⁰

Melanchthon told Camerarius of his continuing work for the English through his correspondence, and through the embassy. He mentioned that he would send Camerarius a copy of his *Advice* ["Articles"] that he had sent to France. Melanchthon's *Advice* had been corrupted in transmission. After debating the matter with several of his colleagues and friends, Melanchthon had risen above his personal disappointment.¹⁴¹ Nonetheless, Melanchthon was concerned about the emperor's synod and its location, and about not having achieved consensus between either Catholics or Protestants on doctrinal and practical matters, as he had hoped for.

Melanchthon wrote to Heresbach about the recent disputes over his unification endeavors. He mentioned that the *Advice* intended to preserve church policy in France, but had been taken out of context and its contents mutilated from their original form.¹⁴² Melanchthon said that he would rather work with those eager to have common agreement in the church, and he was looking forward to the negotiations with the English embassy at Wittenberg.¹⁴³

It is clear from the year's events that one essential reason for Melanchthon to compile *Loci Communes* was to have his doctrine clearly stated as he planned future unification negotiations, first in France and then in England. When writing to his friend Joachim Camerarius in March 1535, Melanchthon implied that he was redoing *Loci Communes* in the hopes of establishing a doctrine that was explicated purely, simply, and "without sophistry."¹⁴⁴

Melanchthon, recovering from the unexpected disappointment of not being allowed to travel to France and of having his *Advice* intended for discussion with the Paris scholars mutilated and plucked out of context, wrote a letter to Henry VIII on December 1, 1535 (in answer to Henry's thank-you letter for the *Loci Communes*, on October 1, 1535), full of optimism for propagating reform in England: "Your Royal Majesty's letter has entirely confirmed this my hope."

¹³⁷ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1640, pp. 471–472.

¹³⁸ St. P. Vo. I, Pt. 2, pp. 431–432; L&P, VIII, No. 867, pp. 340–341; SP6/7, Fols. 5, 10. Kusakawa 2002, p. 237.

¹³⁹ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1637, pp. 465–466; CR II, 1335, p. 947.

¹⁴⁰ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1637, p. 468; CR II No. 1335, pp. 947–948. In Henry's day, prior to 1534 when the value of coins was devalued by approximately 6 percent, a crown contained 42.163 grams, or 1.5 ounces, of gold. At the rate of \$800 per ounce of gold, as of November 28, 2007, a crown would be worth \$1,200 today. Thus, 300 crowns would be worth \$360,000, or £195,652 at the exchange rate of \$1.84 per £1. The source for Henry's currency is *British Coins Before the Florin, Compared to French Coins of the Ancien Régime*, retrieved on November 28, 2007, from <http://www.friesian.com/coins.htm/>. Kusakawa points out that Henry's gift was brought to Melanchthon by the English ambassadors in December 1535. Kusakawa, 2002, pp. 236–237.

¹⁴¹ Melanchthon to Joachim Camerarius [Melanchthon an Joachim Camerarius]. October 4, 1535. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1638, p. 468.

¹⁴² Melanchthon to Konrad Heresbach [Melanchthon an Konrad Heresbach in Düsseldorf?]. November 1535. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1667, pp. 513–514.

¹⁴³ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1667, p. 514.

¹⁴⁴ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1551, pp. 322–323.

Melanchthon thanked Henry for the monetary gift and rejoiced that Henry had not rejected his writings.¹⁴⁵ He hoped that a “great moment had been brought to adorn the glory of Christ, and to call other kings to moderation, kings whose anger had raged without limit against those eager for pure teaching.”¹⁴⁶

Later in the letter, Melanchthon praised Henry for understanding the state of the “Universal Church of Christ:” “How worthy [it is] of the greatest heroes, to propagate the true religion, and to heal public vices.” He made another excellent recommendation of Alexander Alesius, who had mediated between Melanchthon and Henry VIII, and who was lecturing at Cambridge.¹⁴⁷ Alesius was to be an important link in England between the German Reformers, especially Melanchthon, and the English reform-minded clergy. He supported the humanist exegetical tradition of Scripture alone.

On December 11, 1535, Melanchthon wrote to Martin Bucer and Jacob Sturm in Strasbourg that Luther had helped Melanchthon make corrections to the *Advice* and that he would send the amended version to England, and hoped to unify the church in England with the right kind of doctrine. While he had given the *Advice* to others, he did not want it published. Instead, anyone who wished to understand doctrine could read his *Loci Communes*.¹⁴⁸ It seems that Melanchthon was more convinced that his *Loci Communes* would best serve as a doctrinal basis for the unification negotiations.

In the end, the *Loci Communes* became the tool for future negotiations between the German Reformers and the English ambassadors, who arrived in Germany and had with them the *Loci Communes* that Melanchthon dedicated and donated to Henry only a few months ago. Melanchthon was convinced that there must be a firm doctrinal foundation for any future negotiations with different confessional parties.

His plan to use *Loci Communes* for the future discussions paid off when he received Luther’s support and amendment to the articles that he intended to send to England. There were two purposes in Melanchthon’s mind: to have common doctrinal ground for the council, and to form an evangelical coalition under the leadership of the kings, to convene a synod to consider the church’s policy. This was the same intention that he held in the articles for France, which he now sent in a modified form to England.¹⁴⁹

The English ambassadors were in Germany to begin religious negotiations with the elector’s theologians. At the same time, Melanchthon was planning to send the revised form of the *Advice* to England, possibly directly to the king. One may wonder how much the dispute between the elector and Melanchthon influenced him to divert his attention from communal discussions with the English embassy and instead correspond directly with the English king, who had responded positively to the *Loci Communes*. This author asserts that the altercation between Melanchthon and the elector may have impacted the future Anglo-Lutheran negotiations, since Melanchthon had to rely on the elector’s leadership in these negotiations.

¹⁴⁵ Kusakawa notes that the monetary gift was brought to Melanchthon by the English embassy. Kusakawa, 2002, p. 237.

¹⁴⁶ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1668, p. 515; CR II, 1360, p. 996.

¹⁴⁷ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1668, p. 516; CR II, 1368, pp. 996–998. See Wiedermann 1986, p. 17.

¹⁴⁸ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1675, pp. 530–531.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid.

Melanchthon's attempts to unify the Roman Church and the Protestant churches failed, because various political factions came into play. However, the permanent result of his unification attempts was the revised *Loci Communes* of 1535. Melanchthon thought that it would serve as a doctrinal foundation for any future negotiations either among the different Protestants or between the Protestants and Catholics on adiaphora matters.

Conclusion

The elector's denial of Melanchthon's request to travel to France shows how he was pressed between political and religious factions and his own unification goals. He was pulled in different directions, not always realizing the motivations of various individuals or the politics of the agents who often acted on the orders of their superiors. Melanchthon may not have realized that he intervened in high-level politics between the elector's relationship with the Holy Roman Empire and its effect on territorial princes who were to protect the nascent Reformation religion against Catholic powers surrounding their territories.

The topics for negotiations that Melanchthon wished to stress were: obedience to magistracy and obedience to individual conscience. The main disagreement between Melanchthon and the elector was the practice of communion in both kinds. The elector indicated that Melanchthon was too conciliatory when he argued that both customs should be acceptable and neither side should condemn the other, and considered this a deviation from the *Confessio Augustana*. Melanchthon did not agree with the elector's position and was more concerned with what consequences his failed unification efforts might bring to Germany than with the elector's political exigencies. Initially, Melanchthon believed it possible to reach agreement between Catholics and Protestants and to consolidate church policy issues with the secular kings. Since this approach was not successful, Melanchthon's interest turned to England to discuss the same issues with the English king and use his *Loci Communes* for those negotiations.

Henry and Melanchthon had a mutual understanding on the church policy reforms needed. As Melanchthon became aware of the prospect of reforms in England, he was convinced that the new edition of *Loci Communes* should be used to heal the divided church. Melanchthon's plans for England were interrupted due to pressure from French politics, Saxon politics with the emperor, and discussions with Protestant and Catholic confessional groups. Melanchthon decided that he would use the revised *Loci Communes*, a more pure doctrine, for future negotiations with England because the French theologians had mutilated his proposed *Advice*. Henry invited Melanchthon to England several times and sent ambassadors to Germany to negotiate with him. Henry's interference in politics for his own personal reasons opened up a new possibility for future negotiations with Melanchthon, and how Melanchthon would influence the English Church on the doctrine of adiaphora.

Melanchthon's attempts to unify the Roman Church and the Protestant Churches failed because various political factions came into play. However, the permanent result of his unification attempts was the revised *Loci Communes* of 1535. Melanchthon thought that it would serve as a doctrinal foundation for any future negotiations either among the different Protestants or between the Protestants and Catholics on adiaphora matters.

The *Loci Communes* became the most essential document for negotiations between the German and English theologians. This doctrinal document offers a clear background to church policy matters and the doctrine of adiaphora. Melancthon's position had changed from the time he wrote the *Confessio Augustana* of 1530, and he tried to formulate the doctrine of justification by faith so that the Catholic and Protestant Churches would understand his doctrine and unite.

Part II: Melanchthon's *Loci Communes*
(1535)

Introduction

In this chapter, aspects of Melanchthon's revision of *Loci Communes* written in 1535 are discussed in detail. Examined closely are the following: grace and justification; human traditions; ecclesiastical polity; ecclesiastical power; civil magistrates and the dignity of political matters, and divine and human laws.

Melanchthon's doctrine on the division of the law and grace and his view of Christian life are shown in this exegetical document *Loci Communes*. He stated that the theological use of law drives a sinner to Christ—that is, through divine righteousness. Human righteousness concerns our lives when we deal with things of this world.¹⁵⁰ This clear distinction of the divine and human in their respective spheres can be seen in the way that Melanchthon handles such issues as ecclesiastical policy and civil magistracy. The chapters addressing those issues reveal the importance of the second use of law in Melanchthon's thinking on political office.

In the preface to the *Loci Communes*,¹⁵¹ Melanchthon wrote that he is presenting to Henry the main topics of Christian doctrine so that the book could have a positive impact on church practices in England.¹⁵²

Melanchthon cited the writings of the Apostles as his authority, which he calls the doctrine of the Catholic Church, or *Ecclesia Catholica*:

My only intent was to collect the necessary parts of the doctrine of the Catholic Church of Christ, which is handed down in the words of the apostolic letters and the accepted writers.¹⁵³

¹⁵⁰ Wengert 2010, I, pp. 20–23.

¹⁵¹ The preface to the *Loci Communes* Melanchthon eventually dedicated to Henry VIII is the same which he wrote to Henry in March 1535. The *Loci Communes* used in this study is the original *Loci Communes* dedicated to Henry VIII in the rare book collection of the Graduate Theological Union Library in Berkeley, California. The special preface is addressed to Henry VIII and dedicated to him on August 17, 1535. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1555, pp. 338–339; LC 1535, Fols. 1–8.

¹⁵² LC, 1535, Fols. 3R, 4L. However, there is no new example to inform the methods of Christian doctrine. For among the Greeks John Damascene and among us Peter Lombard left writings of such a kind that this one thing brought them the greatest gratitude and celebrity: the fact that their methods are zealously sought after. Therefore, we see them placed among the highest class of writers. Before them there were such books: the interpretations of Cyprian and of others, on Creed. Some have skillfully collected Augustine's thoughts from his individual articles into a book called (*De Fide ad Petrum*), *Concerning Faith, to Peter*. There is also an old manuscript by Origen called (*Περὶ ἀρχῶν*) *On Beginnings*. He gave it this title because he organizes the most essential passages of Christian doctrine in a certain order there and attempts to explicate them. Also, Paul in his letter to the Romans brings to light a kind of method, addressing most acutely the cause of sin, the use of law, and the blessing of Christ—the special nature of Christ's blessing and how we may achieve remission of sins and reconciliation. In the beginning, the Creeds were also founded on this plan, namely that there exist a brief summary of Christian doctrine, in order that the people might be able to see and understand in it the passages necessary for faith just as though they were laid out all together on a tablet and for this alone is a means of teaching usefully. For this reason, I am not an originator of any new method in the Church. LC 1535, Fols. 2L, 2R; MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1555, pp. 333–334.

¹⁵³ LC, 1535, Fol. 5L.

Instead of relying on the pope for the interpretation of doctrine, Melanchthon preferred to have assemblies of bishops, called synods, deliberate the controversial issues on the authority of ancient writings. Melanchthon believed that when agreement was reached on doctrinal issues, there would be peace among the various churches.¹⁵⁴

The *Loci Communes* is a document compiled during Melanchthon's early contacts with Henry and was dedicated to him. It is a document of the events written in 1535 and consists of the thoughts Melanchthon wanted to transmit to the English king for the purpose of mutual negotiations on church policy and adiaphora issues.

Grace and Justification

Melanchthon's understanding of justification—that is, of being accepted by Christ—was based on his interpretation of the writings of the Apostle Paul, especially *Romans*. The term *justification* came from the ancient Roman judicial system, in which the accused who were absolved were pronounced “just” (Latin, *iustus*). Because Melanchthon believed that no one is capable of fulfilling human, let alone divine laws, he concluded that justification does not come from one's good works, but rather from the freely given grace of Christ.¹⁵⁵ His concept of justification is called forensic justification; this term was used when the Roman people justified Scipio, who had been accused of crime by the tribune. In the theological sense, those who accept the juridical (forensic) announcement of forgiveness of sins, a favorable verdict, are declared just. Melanchthon was referring to forgiveness of sins and reconciliation with God by faith, as one divine act.¹⁵⁶

Strehle finds that Melanchthon's term “forensic justification” came from Catholic exegetical tradition in the 1530s. The concept of “*acceptilatio*” means “release of debt provided just as if the obligation was paid,” denoting “just as if we had not sinned and God imputes to us what Christ had done just as if we had fulfilled the law.” Strehle finds that Melanchthon also included the term “acceptation,” known from the Nominalist tradition, that God in his divine will accepted what was not acceptable.¹⁵⁷ He claims that Melanchthon's concept of forensic justification is the Nominalist's concept of the doctrine of God and his absolute will. For Melanchthon, the dilemma lay between Anselm's theory of atonement and Ockham's doctrine of justification. While Melanchthon used phrases such as “remission of sins,” “acceptation of God,” and “imputation of righteousness,” he referred to the work of Christ (*propter Christum*) as if Christ's obedience is imputed to us to reconcile the demands of divine justice, separated from any quality

¹⁵⁴ LC, 1535, Fol. 3R.

¹⁵⁵ LC, 1535, Fol. 7R; Lowell Green: *How Melanchthon Helped Luther Discover the Gospel*. 1980, pp. 201, 226 (hereafter, Green 1980).

¹⁵⁶ *Iustificatio significat remissionem peccatorum & reconciliationem seu acceptationem personae ad uitam aeternam. Nam Ebraeis iustificare est forense uerbum, ut dicam populus Romanus iustificauit Scipionem accusatum a Tribunis, id est absoluit, seu iustum pronunciauit.* LC, 1535, Fol. 167L.

[Justification signifies remission of sins and reconciliation or acceptance of the person to eternal life. For to justify is a forensic word among the Hebrews, so that when I say “the Roman people justified Scipio when he was accused by the tribunes,” that signifies that they absolved him, or pronounced him “just.”]

¹⁵⁷ Stephen Strehle: *The Catholic Roots of the Protestant Gospel: Encounter Between the Middle Ages and Reformation*. 1995, pp. 66–67, 69 (hereafter, Strehle 1995).

produced by grace and unrelated to the gift of the Holy Spirit. In other words, what we did not do, Christ did as if we had done it, notes Strehle.¹⁵⁸

In the *Loci Communes*, Melancthon stressed that because of faith in Christ, we freely receive forgiveness and are reconciled with God. Good works are not the cause of justification but rather the consequence of it.¹⁵⁹ It is the promise of the Holy Spirit through faith that makes faith itself separate from knowledge. Forgiveness is granted to a terrified sinner because of Christ, not because of worthiness, contrition, or other works. It is a result of the inner motion of the soul, the renewal that Melancthon called regeneration.¹⁶⁰ Melancthon stressed that justification by faith is solely God's work, which freely accepts a penitent sinner and contrite believer in Christ into eternal life.¹⁶¹

Melancthon wrote that along with justifying faith, there will be other "fruits of the Spirit," including a "new kind of virtue," or a gift of grace. The presence of grace, in his opinion, is evidence that the believer has received the free gift of Christ, or mercy promised through Christ. He also spoke of the Holy Spirit as a helper in divine action.¹⁶² Schneider concludes that Christian righteousness is a divinely given affection for good that one does voluntarily. After a person's mind comprehends justification, his or her heart is changed through the work of the Holy Spirit and, on some level, it is a psychological process in which new affections for good are being created.¹⁶³

¹⁵⁸ Strehle 1995, p. 72.

¹⁵⁹ *Restat igitur ut colligamus testimonia huius sententiæ, quod gratis propter Christum fide, non propter dignitatem nostrorum operum, consequamur remissionem peccatorum et reconciliationem.* LC, 1535, Fol. 181L.

[Therefore, it remains for us to gather the witnesses of this opinion, that we freely achieve remission of sins and reconciliation, not because of the worth of our works, but by faith because of Christ.]

¹⁶⁰ *Et ut hæc sint planiora, addam amplius, cum, hoc modo corda fide erigantur, concipiunt Spiritum sanctum, sicut Paulus docet, ad Galatas 3, ut promissionem Spiritus accipiamus per fidem. Non igitur de ociosa aliqua noticia loquimur. Et errant imperiti, qui somniant remissionem peccatorum ita contingere ociosis, sine aliquot uero animi motu, sine certamine, sine fiducia consolante animos. Et quia Spiritus sanctus affert, ut postea dicam, in illa consolatione nouam uitam, nouos motus, ideo hæc renouatio, uocatur regeneratio, & sequi debet noua obedientia.* LC, 1535, Fols. 179R, 181L.

[And so that these things might be even clearer, I will add further that, when hearts are confirmed by faith in this way, they take up the Holy Spirit, just as Paul teaches in Galatians 3, so that we receive the promise of the spirit through faith. Thus, this is not any kind of idle knowledge that we are talking about. And unskilled folks are in error, when they dream that remission of sins accrues to the idle in this way, without any true of movement of the spirit, without effort, without the consolation of faith for their souls. And since, as I will tell later, the Holy Spirit brings new life and new impulses with that consolation, this renovation is thus called renewal and regeneration, and new obedience ought to follow.]

¹⁶¹ *Iustificatio significat remissionem peccatorum & reconciliationem seu acceptationem personæ ad uitam æternam.* LC, 1535, Fol 167L.

[Justification signifies remission of sins and reconciliation or acceptance of the person to eternal life.]

¹⁶² *Oportere in piis existere non tantum fidem, sed etiam alios fructus Spiritus, ut postea dicemus.*

[Not only faith, but also other fruits of the spirit ought to exist among the pious, as we will discuss later.]

Manschreck notes that sin for Melancthon was depraved affection, motion of the heart against God's law. Manschreck 1948, p. 145.

Gratia significat gratuitam acceptationem, seu misericordiam, propter Christum promissam. Paulus addit, donum per gratiam. Id uocat donationem Spiritus sancti & uitæ æternæ. Etsi autem interdum gratia quoq; significat auxilium Spiritus sancti, seu actionem diuinam. LC, 1535, 171L.

[Grace signifies the free acceptance or mercy promised because of Christ. Paul adds a gift through grace. He calls it the gift of the Holy Spirit and of eternal life. Moreover, however, grace also sometimes signifies the aid of the Holy Spirit, or divine action.]

¹⁶³ Schneider 1990, pp. 140–141.

Melanchthon's concept of justification in the *Loci Communes* was modified from that of Article IV of the *Confessio Augustana*, which stresses justification "without works." In the *Loci Communes*, Melanchthon stressed good works as the consequence of justification, which he called "new obedience."¹⁶⁴ Cameron explains that "good works" and "new obedience" are part of Christian life, but do not contribute to justification, and says Melanchthon used these terms as a means to facilitate discussions with various confessional groups.¹⁶⁵ Schofield notes that Melanchthon's emphasis on good works and free will was a change in his doctrine of justification. Good works were included to protect the liberty of the new doctrine, but also to make it more acceptable to Henry. Even though good works are a consequence of justification, not a condition for it, this was a new emphasis in Melanchthon's position.¹⁶⁶ This author thinks that even though Melanchthon used the term "good works" explicitly in discussion with Catholics and Protestants, he considered "good works" in Christian life as a consequence of justification, as stated in the *Loci Communes* of 1535. This was a point that was especially appreciated by Henry, since, as head of the Church of England, he could transfer this concept to his people's obligation to obey him.

This author thinks that Melanchthon's changed beliefs showed characteristics of the fourfold *processus iustificationis* related by Thomas Aquinas.¹⁶⁷ The process includes the infusion of grace, the movement of free will directed towards God through faith; the movement of free will directed against sin; and finally, the remission of sin.¹⁶⁸ It seems that Melanchthon modified the structure in order to implement the forensic nature of justification, adding free will to the process. Thus the distinction between justification and regeneration is hardly noticeable.

Melanchthon's forensic understanding of justification has been blamed for ruining Luther's insight into the sanative power of Christ's righteousness. Wengert claims that Luther and Melanchthon were both committed to a single-minded forensic understanding of justification, with their commonalities and differences: As Melanchthon emphasized the promise ("forensic" equals declaration of forgiveness granted because of Christ), Luther concentrated on Christ himself and faith in him, not as a giver, but a gift. Their mutual approach united them against those who would turn Christ inward—in the search for qualities worked by the Holy Spirit—or outward—to the law or Christ's extrinsic work. Instead, they concentrated on the idea that Christ and the promise of righteousness in him provides the true object of faith. These ideas developed in their mutual conversations when responding to critics.¹⁶⁹

In the following section the author discusses the secondary opinions on Melanchthon's position of the relationship of justification and good works. Wengert notes that the Lutheran reading of Augustine made sense to Melanchthon, because the true meaning of the teaching is combined with the definition of an activity of law that terrifies and gospel that consoles, as seen

¹⁶⁴ *Iustificentur propter Christum per fidem, cum credunt se in gratiam recipi et peccata remitti propter Christum.* CAL, 1530, IV, p. 76. [They may be justified through faith because of Christ, because they believe that they are received into grace and that their sins are remitted because of Christ.]

¹⁶⁵ Cameron 2004, p. 78. See also Schofield 2006, p. 61.

¹⁶⁶ Schofield 2006, pp. 61–63.

¹⁶⁷ McGrath 1998, pp. 41, 82.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

¹⁶⁹ Wengert 2010, X, pp. 74, 76–77.

in the doctrine of justification by faith. In this sense, Melanchthon could accept the *Catholicae Ecclesiae Consensus* in spite of his opponents who turned faith to mere knowledge when they misread Augustine.¹⁷⁰

While speaking of the importance of good works in order to give them a consequential role, as Maxcey argues, Melanchthon developed further his understanding of natural law in relation to Christian living. Freed from the curse of the law, natural or moral law still directs man to obedience before God. Melanchthon equated the unified role of the Decalogue with a moral mandate.¹⁷¹ Once a person is imputed righteous because of Christ, any merit is excluded. Melanchthon still upheld moral mandates, from which he interpreted good works.¹⁷² Maintaining the Decalogue as moral mandate is related to Melanchthon's understanding of natural law. Consequently, it was necessary to apply the third use of law in order to justify renewal in the Christian life. Methuen explains that Melanchthon's interest in philosophy reflects his thinking regarding law. Natural law encompasses both moral philosophy and the Decalogue, and as Melanchthon explained, is innate in all humans as the image of God.¹⁷³

Green divides Melanchthon's theology into three phases as they correspond to events that made him adjust his teaching to address new problems. The first phase extended until the publication of the *Confessio Augustana* in 1530; the second phase can be seen beginning with his lectures on Romans in 1532, in which the forensic nature of justification is evident; and the third phase with the Osiandrian controversy.¹⁷⁴ For Melanchthon it was important that righteousness was given by faith, forgiveness because of Christ's merits. Green claims that forgiveness and imputation of righteousness were two steps in Melanchthon's forensic understanding of justification by faith.¹⁷⁵ This order is even clearer in his *Loci Communes* of 1535. It is the condemnation of the law that forces sinners to God to receive forensic acquittal, as Green explains. Green argues that Luther accepted the forensic nature of justification, but he emphasized its connection with the atonement of Christ, faith, and life of the believer.¹⁷⁶

Scholars are in agreement that Melanchthon's doctrinal position on justification shifted. The reason for the shift in Melanchthon's understanding of justification by faith can be traced to the negotiations he led with Catholics and Protestants in 1530, in Leipzig and France. Melanchthon needed to design a statement that would not deviate from Article IV of the *Confessio Augustana*, but at the same time would moderate the doctrine of justification to include good works, to be understood by both Catholics and Protestants. Melanchthon intended to lay out his position in the *Loci Communes* of 1535, designed for use in future unification negotiations.

Even though the reason for Melanchthon's shift was to mediate church policy issues between Catholics and Protestants, the changes are noted by both historians and systematic theologians.

¹⁷⁰ Wengert 2010, IV, p. 262.

¹⁷¹ Maxcey 1980, pp. 171, 172–173.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 174.

¹⁷³ Charlotte Methuen: "Lex Naturae and Ordo Naturae in the thought of Philip Melanchthon" 2000, pp. 111–113. In *Reformation and Renaissance Review: Journal of the Society for Reformation Studies* 3 (hereafter, Methuen 2000).

¹⁷⁴ Green 1980, p. 213.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 226.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 227, 241.

Their assessments present different aspects of the change, such as Melanchthon's understanding of free will, the forensic nature of justification, imputation, and good works. The present author agrees with Wengert, who finds that Melanchthon's argument on free will in *Loci Communes* is not a change in his position, but should be understood in its historical context of the negotiations with the French in 1534. In his discussions with the French, Melanchthon presented two points: the Word was efficacious through the Holy Spirit, and effected what the will was incapable of doing.¹⁷⁷

The following two scholars offer a systematic analysis of Melanchthon's doctrine of justification. Vainio interprets Melanchthon's doctrinal change from the perspective of his commentary on Romans of 1532. He asserts that Melanchthon defined the doctrine of justification "as an extrinsic act of imputation," and represents a forensic doctrine of justification.¹⁷⁸ His emphasis is on a relational aspect of justification, and he sees justifying faith and donation of the Holy Spirit as consequential.¹⁷⁹ Vainio points to the differences between Luther and Melanchthon, arguing that whereas the latter "speaks generally of the contents of faith, the former speaks how it is actualized in the believer."¹⁸⁰ Vainio explains how Melanchthon's emphasis on good works has to be understood from his theory of the will, which emphasized affectual renewal, and Vainio interprets justification as parallel with it. He argues that there is the danger that righteousness of faith and good works were closely combined.¹⁸¹

Graybill notes that Melanchthon introduced God's uniform limited governance into his overall theological system, and therefore Melanchthon's argument for free will in the *Loci Communes* of 1535 was even stronger than in the commentary on Romans of 1532. Melanchthon refuted any Pelagian, scholastic, or Roman Catholic notions of free will and supported the term evangelical free will, incorporating free human choices into his soteriology. Graybill further argues that justification required the Word, the Holy Spirit, and human will. Furthermore, he writes that one responds simultaneously to the action of the will with the Spirit. The will had to assent to the Spirit, or forensic justification could not occur.¹⁸² Graybill notes that Melanchthon taught that human will consisted in the freedom to accept or reject the gift of salvation in Jesus Christ after hearing the Spirit-inspired Word.¹⁸³ Graybill presents a systematic analysis of Melanchthon's soteriology and the changes to his doctrinal position since 1532. While this author believes Graybill is correct to note changes in Melanchthon's doctrine, he does not explain whether the changes were due to Melanchthon's modifying his plans in order to unite Catholics and Protestants and reach an agreement on church policy, or whether he presented his original doctrinal position.

This author agrees with Jaquette, who finds that the doctrine of reconciliation is essential for defining adiaphora—that is, right relationship with God—and says that, as a result, faith is

¹⁷⁷ Wengert 2012, pp. 204–205.

¹⁷⁸ Vainio 2008, pp. 77–78.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 80.

¹⁸² Graybill 2010, pp. 210, 215, 221–222.

¹⁸³ Graybill 2010, p. 223. See Wengert 1997, pp. 201–202.

expressed in love for one's neighbor.¹⁸⁴ Similarly, Manschreck's viewpoint considers good works from an adiaphoristic point of view. He finds that because of faith, works that follow justification are not credited against sin. Good works are adiaphoristic as far as justification is concerned.¹⁸⁵ Manschreck notes that observing human traditions, rites, and ceremonies in faith might be considered good, not on their own account, but because of faith. For Melancthon, papal traditions should be tolerated as an injury and endured for the sake of love.¹⁸⁶ As far as good works are concerned, Wengert emphasizes that after Melancthon's dispute with John Agricola regarding the addition of the two uses (civil and theological) of law in his *Scholia* on Colossians in 1527, he added the third use of law in the third edition of Colossians (1534).¹⁸⁷

According to Wengert, Melancthon equated "good works" with good conscience or "obedience of faith," maintaining balance between faith and works. The emphasis is on faith alone; that the believer is made righteous as Christ satisfied God's wrath, and the Father pronounced (declared) her/him righteous, not because of any worthiness of works but because of Christ.¹⁸⁸

The third use of law belongs to the righteous to practice obedience, but does not threaten and at the same time excludes human works from salvation. It is closely related to Melancthon's understanding of the forensic declaration of justification. The law has lost its accusatory voice, but reveals the remnants of sin and the will of God. Conscience that is made good by God's gracious declaration must use the law to please God and for this purpose the third use of law was established by Melancthon.¹⁸⁹ Melancthon's experience with the negotiations with the Catholics and the French made it necessary for him to formulate a doctrine that would bring various parties close to each other. His doctrine of justification should be seen in the light of other doctrines he wrote in the *Loci Communes*. His goal was to use old structures and define new formulations acceptable to various confessional groups.

Pannenberg interprets the third use of law as moral renewal, and explains the differences between Luther and Melancthon on the doctrine of justification. He finds that Luther followed Augustine's doctrine of justification in the fellowship of Christ through faith, whereas Melancthon's "forensic" concept of justification inclined to supplement justification with moral renewal.¹⁹⁰ Melancthon had changed during the 1530s. He stressed "good works" (third use of law) as necessary, not as a consequence of justification, but for civil life.

It is worth noting Pannenberg's emphasis that combining soteriology and Christology is the action of the triune God in reconciliation: The Son and the Spirit cooperated in the act of reconciliation. As the Son offering himself for reconciliation and the Son being offered by the Father are one event, so we are to see the work of the exalted Christ and our own as different

¹⁸⁴ James L. Jaquette: *Discerning What Counts*. 1995, pp. 215–216, 219 (hereafter, Jaquette 1995).

¹⁸⁵ Manschreck 1948, p. 147.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 153, 156.

¹⁸⁷ Timothy J. Wengert: *Philip Melancthon on Human and Divine Freedom*. 2000, p. 263 (hereafter, Wengert 2000). Wengert has written more extensively on freedom of will on his dispute with Erasmus of Rotterdam. Timothy J. Wengert: *Human Freedom and Christian Righteousness*. 1998, pp. 7-16; Furthermore, Wengert writes of the origins of the third use of law in *Law and Gospel*. 1997, pp. 177-210.

¹⁸⁸ Wengert 1997, pp. 200, 205.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 196.

¹⁹⁰ Wolfhart Pannenberg: *Systematic Theology*. 1998, Vol. 3, p. 215.

aspects of the same divine action of reconciliation. There are three distinct centers of action within God, since the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are the three distinct beings and actions of God. Through baptism, believers join the body of Christ, which is a pneumatic reality. Through the Holy Spirit we are made recipients of the resurrection, which continues through the apostolic ministry of preaching, and repentance. The Spirit completes reconciliation through faith, so that we can accept our finite existence in Jesus Christ and have filial union through Christ with God.¹⁹¹ This author concurs that integrating justification into a larger doctrinal context is crucial when discussing the doctrine of justification, in order to find common ground in the doctrine of soteriology.

Seifrid presents a similar point of view to Pannenberg and discusses the significant changes Melancthon went through in his thinking between 1530 and 1534. Melancthon interpreted justification as “reputed righteous,” and using forensic terms, narrows the concept and insists on the necessity of good works.¹⁹² Quoting Stephen Strehle, who makes a negative assessment of Melancthon’s understanding of imputation, he took a position between Anselm’s atonement and Ockham’s voluntarist doctrine of justification.¹⁹³ The point of departure between Luther and Melancthon differs, in that the former speaks of Christ’s presence because of faith; the latter understands justification as a human response, and the benefits of the past transaction on the cross are mediated by faith.¹⁹⁴

In the present discussion of imputation, Carson says that in addition to linking the imputation of the righteousness of Christ with the proper understanding of justification, it is also linked with Christ’s passive and active obedience; the former to his expiation, enduring the penalty; the latter to Christ’s obedience to law, fulfilling the demand of the law.¹⁹⁵ The question of imputation in the discussion of justification by various confessional churches is essential, since one needs to understand what the words mean in each particular confessional context.

Melancthon firmly believed that in his doctrine he transmitted the consensus of the true Catholic Church based on the Apostles. He did not intend to change his doctrinal position. The claimed changes in his doctrine of justification and free will had to be interpreted in a specific historical situation. Melancthon intended to uphold the old church structure as much as possible and explain new doctrine based in the old structure.

On Human Traditions

Melancthon used the term “human traditions” to denote ceremonies that the church had instituted, in which Scripture gives no specific instructions. He grouped these traditions into three categories: (a) those not required by Scripture; (b) those involving order in the church; and

¹⁹¹ Wolfhart Pannenberg: *Systematic Theology*. 1994, vol. 2, pp. 437, 439, 443, 450.

¹⁹² Mark A. Seifrid: *Luther, Melancthon and Paul on the Question of Imputation*. In *Justification: What’s at Stake in Current Debates*. 2004, pp. 141–142 (hereafter, Seifrid).

¹⁹³ Strehle 1995, p. 72; Seifrid 2004, pp. 142–143.

¹⁹⁴ Seifrid 2004, pp. 143–144.

¹⁹⁵ D. A. Carson 2004, *The Vindication of Imputation*. In *Justification: What’s at Stake in the Current Debates*, 2004, p. 77. W. G. T. Shedd: *A History of Christian Doctrine*. 2 vols, 2: 341.

(c) erroneous opinions. Last, he spoke of charity and Christian liberty in relation to various customs and traditions in the church.

Those Not Required by Scripture

Melanchthon's argument was that God's Word is recorded in Scripture, and so it is Scripture, not papal laws, which is the ultimate authority on doctrinal and ceremonial matters. Furthermore, Scripture excuses men from any ceremonies and traditions that are not necessary to salvation, such as celibacy among priests when imposed on those not suited to it.¹⁹⁶

Those Involving Order in the Church

According to Melanchthon, traditions exist in the church that by nature are "indifferent," in the philosophical sense of being neither good nor evil, and in the theological sense, neither commanded nor forbidden. Although such traditions have nothing to do with the remission of sins, they are lawful if their purpose has to do with governing church affairs, such as assigning days of the week on which to worship or fast, and deciding which songs to sing during worship services.¹⁹⁷ Melanchthon reasoned that bishops and ministers should decide church rules. These rules govern all church ceremonies, for men cannot be ruled without ceremonies. Melanchthon believed that Christ's message would be delivered to people through these ceremonies. But care must be taken that people use common sense concerning these traditions, not develop superstitions about them or believe that God requires them, and that through them, they can earn forgiveness of sins. In fact, Melanchthon believed that people should not feel guilty if they omitted these ceremonies, for they can be omitted without sin.¹⁹⁸

¹⁹⁶ *Primum est earum quæ præcipiunt aliquid fieri aperte contra mandata Dei, ut sunt traditiones de abusu missarum, uel impiis cultibus sanctorum. Aut præcipiunt aliquid, quod sine peccato non potest præstari, qualis est traditio de coelibatu, cum his imponitur qui non sunt ad coelibatum idonei.* LC, 1535, Fol. 361R.

[The first of those traditions is the one that instructs that something should be done that is openly against the commandments of God, like the traditions of the abuse of the mass, or the impious worship of saints. Or else, they mandate something that cannot be accomplished without sin, like, for example, the tradition of celibacy when it is imposed upon those who are not suited to celibacy.]

¹⁹⁷ *Secundum genus est traditionum de rebus sua natura adiaphora, ut de feriis, ieiuniis, uestitu, in his considerandi sunt fines. Si enim finis est politicus, licitæ sunt, ut cum feriæ instituuntur aut seruantur, non quod ipsum opus mereatur remissionem peccatorum, aut sit iusticia & cultus, id est, cuius finis proximus sit, quod Deus requirat id opus tanquam honorem & non propter alias causas. Sed finis esse debet proximus, ordinis causa.* LC, 1535, Fol. 363L.

[The second kind of tradition is that which concerns things that are indifferent in nature, like holidays, fasts, and garments. In these, the purposes must be considered. For if the purpose is political, they are lawful, as when feast days are established or observed, not because the observation itself earns remission of sins or so that there be justification and worship: that is, that the most express goal of them is that God requires this observance just for the sake of honor and not for other reasons. But the most express purpose ought to be for the sake of order.]

¹⁹⁸ *Habent enim auctoritatem ordinandi ceremonias hoc fine, ut ordine gerantur res in publico ecclesiae coetu... Sed hae ordinationes non debent supersticiose intelligi, non enim sunt iusticiae seu cultus necessarii ad iusticiam, sed sunt re ipsa res adiaphorai, quae extra scandali casum omitti possunt, sine peccato.* LC, 1535, Fol. 365R.

[For they have authority of establishing ceremonies for this purpose, that things might be carried out in order in the public gathering of the church... But these ordinations ought not to be understood superstitiously, for they are not justice or cult necessary for justice, but they are in fact things indifferent which may be omitted without sin, except in cases of temptation.]

Erroneous Opinions

Melanchthon stressed the necessity of eradicating five major erroneous opinions related to human traditions that are by nature adiaphora.¹⁹⁹ In the following statements, Melanchthon defines the doctrine of adiaphora as he understood it in the *Loci Communes* of 1535. In writing this, it seems that Melanchthon was considering the unification negotiations, and wanted to make the most inclusive statement on adiaphora that would be acceptable to Protestants and Catholics alike.

The first error was the belief that human beings merit remission of sins by their good works. This belief denigrates the honor of Christ by transferring his power to traditions. Only Christ can remit one's sins, and only when one believes in him, not when one observes traditions.²⁰⁰

The second error was the belief that following traditions will lead to perfection, instead of the belief that only obedience to Christ can achieve that.²⁰¹

The third error was the belief that Mosaic ceremonies, as set forth in Leviticus, were on the same level as the ceremonies established during the early days of the church. This belief, Melanchthon argues, led people to think that Christianity only involved performing superficial practices, which again denigrates the honor of Christ. Instead, faith in Christ involves spirituality and justice.²⁰²

The fourth error was the belief in superstitions established by certain bishops, referring to the power of the pope and his bishops, who regarded their laws as above the Gospel and hence justified ceremonies based on tradition, not Scripture.²⁰³

¹⁹⁹ *Tertium genus est traditionum in quibus res adiaphoræ præcipiuntur, sed cum impiis aut perniciosis opinionibus. Multæ autem falsæ opiniones adduntur traditionibus. Prima et Pharisæica opinio est, quod homines mereantur remissionem peccatorum his operibus, seu quod sint iusticia Christiana, seu quod Deus requirat hæc opera non propter politicum finem, sed tantum ut tali honore afficiatur.* LC, 1535, Fol. 365R.

[The third kind of tradition is that in which indifferent things are prescribed, but with impious and harmful opinions attached. For there are many false opinions attached to the traditions. The first is the Pharisaic opinion that men deserve remission of sins by these works, or that Christian justification obtains, or that God demands these works not for political purpose but only so that he might be swayed by this kind of honor.]

²⁰⁰ *Hanc opinionem reprehendit Christus...Et obruitur doctrina de fide, cum transferunt homines beneficium Christi in has traditiones.* LC, 1535, Fol. 365R.

[Christ condemned this opinion ... And the doctrine of faith is destroyed, when men transfer the blessing of Christ to these traditions.]

²⁰¹ *Secundus error qui hæret in traditionibus ex priore natus est, finxerunt traditiones illas esse perfectionem.* LC, 1535, Fol. 367L.

[The second error which attaches to traditions is born of the first. They pretend that these traditions themselves are perfection.]

²⁰² *Quia enim uidebant in lege Moisi multum fuisse ceremoniarum, somniabant etiam Euangelii tempore similes ceremonias esse oportere, & affingebant fidem sine illis ceremoniis inutilem esse, & homines propter ceremonias esse iustos, ita imaginabantur Christianissimum esse huiusmodi externam politiam sicut fuit Leuitica.* LC, 1535, Fol. 367L.

[Because they saw that there were many ceremonies in the law of Moses, they imagined that in the time of the gospel too there should be similar ceremonies, and invented the idea that faith was useless without these ceremonies, and that men are justified because of ceremonies, so that they came to imagine that the most Christian thing was an external organization of this kind, like there was in Leviticus.]

²⁰³ *Quartus error est de potestate Episcoporum, qui traditiones condunt per superstitionem & defendunt errores quos recitauit.* LC, 1535, Fol. 367R.

[The fourth error concerns the power of bishops, who establish traditions out of superstition and defend the errors that I have enumerated.]

Finally, the fifth error was in the many uses of ceremonies that had sprung up from differences of opinion, and had tortured consciences and caused discord in the church.²⁰⁴

Melanchthon suggested changes in the understanding of human traditions, and that the new doctrine is the ultimate authority when deciding adiaphora matters. Thus, ceremonies that are neither commanded nor forbidden should be kept for order's sake. He made clear any misunderstanding of adiaphora matters, thus safeguarding freedom of conscience, and that Christian liberty should prevail in relationship with one's neighbor.

Charity and Christian Liberty

Regarding adiaphora, Melanchthon stated that Christians should not fight over inconsequential matters, but should be charitable toward one another. To minimize differences and nurture good will in the church, he recommended retaining as many as possible of the old ceremonies.²⁰⁵

However, since salvation does not depend on observing "indifferent" things, Melanchthon stressed what he calls "Christian liberty," by which he meant not feeling guilty if one personally did not follow "indifferent" old traditions, including those of the ancient Jews and many medieval customs of the Roman Church.²⁰⁶

Manschreck argues that, according to Melanchthon, a Christian in his liberty may or may not use judicial or ceremonial laws, since they are external matters, but the Decalogue pertains to the heart, one's inward affections.²⁰⁷ Jaquette, in his study on Paul, speaks of freedom as one thing that mattered to Paul—to exercise freedom in regard to adiaphora. The doctrine of reconciliation, that is, right relationship with God and concern for one's neighbor's freedom, is essential for defining adiaphora. This author concurs with Jaquette's view on Christian liberty.²⁰⁸

Verkamp argues that Christian liberty has different dimensions, and that the commandments and prohibitions of the New Testament guide a Christian in deciding for himself or herself what

²⁰⁴ *Quintus error oritur ex opinione necessitatis, Conscientiæ male cruciantur.* LC, 1535, Fol. 367R.

[The fifth error arises from the belief in fate; consciences are cruelly tortured.]

²⁰⁵ *Necesse est autem abiicere malas opiniones ipsi uero mores rerum indifferentium retineri possunt, & earum usum moderari caritas debet. Satius est autem conciliare et alere mutuum beneuolentiam in Ecclesia.* LC, 1535, Fol. 369L.

[However, while it is necessary to do away with evil opinions, the customs themselves in indifferent matters can be kept, and charity ought to temper their usage. For it is more satisfactory to make reconciliations and to nurture mutual goodwill in the church.]

²⁰⁶ *Porro necesse est in Ecclesia retinere hanc doctrinam de libertate, quod traditiones neq; sint iusticia coram Deo, neq; sit peccatum eas omittere extra casum scandali, Idq; probant haec testimonia. Colossen.2..... In libertate qua Christus uos uocauit state, & ne iterum iugo seruitutis subiiciamini, uetat enim onerare conscientias hac opinione, quod traditiones humanæ ita necessariae sint, sicut Iudeos oportebat seruare suas ceremonias. Hanc libertatem neque debent neque possunt abrogare pastores, est enim ordinatio diuina.* LC, 1535, Fols. 369R, 369L.

[Furthermore, it is necessary to retain this doctrine of liberty in the church, because neither do the traditions constitute justification before God, nor is it a sin to omit them, except in the case of temptation. This testimony supports this: Colossians 2... "Stand firm in the liberty to which Christ has called you, and do not be subjected to the yoke of servitude again"—for he (Paul) is forbidding that consciences should be burdened by this opinion, that human traditions are so necessary in the way that the Jews thought it necessary to observe their ceremonies. Priests should not and cannot do away with this liberty, for it is a divine ordinance.]

²⁰⁷ Manschreck 1948, pp. 156, 158–159.

²⁰⁸ Jaquette 1995, pp. 215–216, 218–219.

is best in a given situation for his/her neighbor. Verkamp concludes that adiaphora need to be defined within the limits of charity.²⁰⁹ Wengert points out that the Christian is free from sin and the ceremonial laws of Moses, and that human traditions cannot condemn nor justify her/him.²¹⁰

Ecclesiastical Polity

Ecclesiastical polity encompasses questions related to adiaphora, “things indifferent” and neither necessary to salvation nor binding on consciences, but done in order to preserve good order in the church.

Melanchthon divided ecclesiastical polity into two categories: (a) divinely ordained ministry, which included preaching the Gospel and administering the sacraments; and (b) the order of the church that is ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

The purpose of discipline and human regulations, Melanchthon argued, is to preserve the Word in the church through human regulations, which are public, external laws, instituted to maintain discipline and tranquility in the church and to serve and preserve the ministry.²¹¹

Falling back on his medical training, Melanchthon compared preserving the Gospel to preserving an unborn fetus. As the veins nourish the fetus, he said (not knowing that he meant the arteries), so the Gospel feeds and regenerates the pious. Thus, he concluded, ecclesiastical polity is like the chorion (the outer membrane enclosing the embryo), feeding believers with life-giving blood. However, if the chorion ruptures, the fetus cannot be nourished and will be stillborn. In the same way, if ecclesiastical polity is removed, the congregation will die.²¹²

Melanchthon enumerated the main dangers to ecclesiastical polity. If order is broken, he said, true doctrine cannot be preached, and then the church cannot nourish its members. These dangers can be brought about either by unjust laws or impious preaching, both of which weaken ecclesiastical polity like an abscess. When these vices are corrected, Melanchthon concluded, we should love one another and preserve useful practices, as Paul said, so that “all things be done decently and in order” (I Corinthians 14: 40.)

²⁰⁹ Verkamp 1975, pp. 63–64.

²¹⁰ Wengert 1997, pp. 196–197.

²¹¹ *Duae autem sunt partes politiae Ecclesiasticae. Altera est ministerium diuinitus ordinatum, altera est constituta Ecclesiae auctoritate.... Conseruanda est autem altera pars...necessaria Ecclesiae ad disciplinam & tranquillitatem, quia cum ministerium diuinitus ordinatum, debeat esse publicum externum, opus est aliquibus humanis ordinationibus. Has, quia seruiunt ministerio diuinitus instituto, & prosunt ad disciplinam et tranquillitatem, etiam debemus amare & conseruare.* LC, 1535, Fols. 459L, 459R, 461L.

[Moreover, there are two parts to ecclesiastical polity. The one is divinely ordained ministry; the other is established by the authority of the church... The second part is to be preserved... necessary to the church for the sake of discipline and peace, because since a divinely ordained ministry ought to be public and external, there is need for some human ordinances. Because these protect divinely ordained ministry and are beneficial for discipline and peace, we, too, ought to love and protect them.]

²¹² *Cum igitur uenae alant foetum, imago sunt ministerii diuinitus ordinate. Nam Euangelio regenerantur et aluntur pii, chorion significant politiam Ecclesiasticam ab Ecclesia institutam.* LC, 1535, Fols. 461L, 461R.

[So, when the veins nourish the fetus, they are the image of divinely ordained ministry. For the pious are renewed and nourished by the gospel. The chorion represents the ecclesiastical polity established by the church.]

Concerning Ecclesiastical Power

One of the most important questions during the negotiations between the German and English theologians concerned ecclesiastical power and its relationship to the magistrate. The questions were: 1) which laws defined ecclesiastical power? and 2) how did they relate to secular power? The Saxons were subjects of the Catholic Emperor, but constituted independent electoral principalities in the Holy Roman Empire. The Saxon Reformation Church was emerging under the new leadership of ministers and theologians under the secular rule of the Elector of Saxony. Melanchthon based his view on Aristotle in his *Commentary on Some Books of Aristotle's Politics*,²¹³ in support of a territorial church system and in order to resolve any conflict between Reformation and classical political thought. Keen sees Melanchthon accepting that Reformation thought and classical political thought were complementary, and argues that conflict arises only if secular and ecclesiastical jurisdictions are confused. Melanchthon did not demand the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire, but hoped that right reason and right relation—inseparability—would prevail, and that spiritual and temporal spheres would realign. Charles V remained the legitimate Holy Roman Emperor, and his support for Catholicism remained a concern for the Reformers.²¹⁴ In this *Commentary*, Melanchthon discussed the difference between politics and new doctrine for the secular realm. He judged the revolutionary movements of his time, making the criticism that they overstepped their area of authority by contradicting laws and forms of government to which Christians should conform themselves.²¹⁵ The intention of Melanchthon's discussion was to undermine the Holy Roman Empire to the benefit of the electoral system, and to demonstrate that obedience to the empire's authority was illegitimate, since it supported papal power (i.e., episcopal power) over temporal affairs. He acknowledged the electoral system, and did not attack the secular Holy Roman Empire itself, which he saw as the guardian of the territorial princes.²¹⁶

Wengert points out that in his concept of history, Melanchthon integrated the church into the history of the world, and expounded his theology of the basic distinction between human and divine righteousness—the preserving order (human righteousness), and God's forgiveness in anticipation of the world to come (divine righteousness). On the one hand, this meant that political history demonstrated God's providential care for humanity in establishing various monarchies to guard human society. On the other hand, God had preserved the church from tyrants and heretical teachings. Melanchthon saw a struggle between truth and its distortion. Because of these two kinds of righteousness, there was a battle between the forces of chaos and good order. As injustice in a secular realm meant persecution for the church, so also upholding justice meant protection for the church by godly princes.²¹⁷

²¹³ Aristotelian political thought is most fully addressed in Melanchthon's 1530 *Commentary on Some Books of Aristotle's Politics*. Ralph Keen: *Divine and Human Authority in Reformation Thought*. 1997, p. 198 (hereafter, Keen 1997).

²¹⁴ Keen 1997, pp. 198, 211–212.

²¹⁵ Nicole Kuroпка: *Philip Melanchthon and Aristotle*. 2012a, p. 27. In *Philip Melanchthon*. Eds. Irene Dingel, Robert Kolb, Nicole Kuroпка and Timothy J. Wengert.

²¹⁶ Keen 1997, p. 210.

²¹⁷ Wengert 2010, V, pp. 18–19.

Selderhuis discusses the role of discipline in Melanchthon's concept of the church. According to Selderhuis, doctrine, sacrament, and discipline are connected to the power of the church—i.e., the key, so that the key and power become one and the same thing—the magistracy has the sword and the church the key, based on divine power and including excommunication. Selderhuis also finds that Melanchthon wanted the church to exercise discipline, and recommended a church team to ensure things would happen in legitimate ways, and that decisions would not be in the hands of a single person.²¹⁸

Melanchthon developed his ecclesiology depending on a particular historical situation. Lexutt finds that what he called the Catholic Church was not the Roman Church. The *ecclesia invisibilis* is hidden in the *ecclesia visibilis* and is legitimized there as communion of saints. Every church community in which the Word and sacraments are used is a church, because the church is known for pure doctrine.²¹⁹

The English Reformation Church was under the leadership of Henry VIII, who was both head of the church and head of state; the clergy had been deprived of their ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Melanchthon firmly believed that good and godly princes could protect and advance the Reformation. The Saxons had two secular magistrates: the emperor and the elector. This difference in leadership complicated the interpretation of their respective approaches to the negotiations, and the interpretation of these results. The king in England had sole ecclesiastical authority to nominate bishops and define doctrine and practice. In Saxony and other territories in which the Reformation spread, church ordinances defined the limits of ecclesiastical ministry. Bishops in Catholic territories were still under the pope's jurisdiction. The secular magistracy was acting as “emergency bishop” in the Reformation territories.

Concerning Keys

Melanchthon used keys to symbolize ecclesiastical administration, drawing an analogy between running a church and running a household. Following Scripture, he divided ecclesiastical administration into ministry, which includes preaching the Gospel and administering the sacraments, and jurisdiction, which includes making legal judgments based on the words of Christ.

The power of the church, Melanchthon argued, derives from Christ and is not tyrannical—unlike the situation envisaged by the pope and the Anabaptists, who used the power of the sword, thereby debasing their ecclesiastical power into earthly power.²²⁰

²¹⁸ Selderhuis 2011, p. 220.

²¹⁹ Lexutt 2006, pp. 43–44.

²²⁰ *Claves significant domesticam aliquam administrationem. Cumque Euangelium sit quasi œconomica quædam administratio, nec coherceat ui corporali, sed tantum uerbis, nomine clauium utimur in significanda ecclesiastica administratione. Idem igitur significant potestas ecclesiastica clauis. Est autem uetus partitio admodum commode quæ partitur ecclesiasticam potestatem, in potestatem ordinis & iurisdictionis.... Deinde Iurisdictio non habet potestatem ui corporali coherendi, sed tantum uerbis coheret, hoc est, excommunicat sicut Christus docuit Matth. 18. Sit tibi uel ut ethnicus, non iubet apostolos ut gladio cohæreant.... Quod Christus in passione spinis coronatur, producitur deridendus in regia purpura, significatum est fore, ut spreto uero regno spirituali, hoc est oppresso Euangelio, constituatur aliud mundanum regnum prætextu potestatis ecclesiasticæ, sicut quidem indocti scripserunt Romanum pontificem iure diuino esse dominum regnorum mundi. Et anabaptistæ & similes qui ui & armis conantur*

Selderhuis agrees with Melanchthon's concept of the church. He stresses the fact that Melanchthon's view of the church was vertical: a visible reality with norms, rules, rights, and duties; and the rules of the church are spiritual, which Melanchthon called *Politia Ecclesiastica*: God gave rules such as the priesthood of all believers, the reign of Christ through doctrine, sacraments, and discipline, which Melanchthon called the ministry. The human side of the church, the *Gubernatio Ecclesiastica*, involves the church's leadership,²²¹ which Melanchthon called jurisdiction, and included the role of discipline in it in the *Loci Communes* of 1535.²²²

On Errors

Wycliffe, Melanchthon contended, erred when he spoke against ownership of property and when he failed to distinguish duties from offices. If Wycliffe's ideas had been followed, the church would have become a mendicant order without any possessions, since it would be unable to hold any private property. As for duties and offices, Melanchthon stressed that ministers could simultaneously govern their personal families and minister to their churches, so long as they performed their duties correctly.²²³

On Obedience

Melanchthon argued, based on Scripture, that obedience to the ministers and administrators of the church by the members of the congregation is obedience to the Gospel itself.²²⁴

propagare doctrinam suam, transformant potestatem ecclesiasticam in mundanam, & Christum spinis coronant. LC, 1535, Fols. 341R, 343L.

[Keys signify some kind of household administration. And since the gospel is a kind of economic administration, and does not compel by physical force but only by words, we use the title of "keys" to signify church administration. In the same way, the keys signify ecclesiastical power. Furthermore, there is an ancient separation that is quite convenient, which divides ecclesiastical power into the power of order and that of jurisdiction... Jurisdiction, then, does not have the power of compelling by physical force, but compels only by words: that is, it excommunicates, just as Christ taught (Matthew 18): "May you be considered as if a heathen"—he does not bid the apostles to compel with the sword... Because Christ in his passion was crowned with thorns, and presented in royal purple to be mocked, the interpretation is that when the true spiritual kingdom is disdained, that is, when the gospel is oppressed, another earthly kingdom will be established under the pretext of ecclesiastical power, just as some unlearned men have in fact written that the Roman pope is the lord of the kingdoms of the world by divine right. And the Anabaptists and those like them who try to propagate their doctrine by force of arms, transform ecclesiastical power into earthly power and crown Christ with thorns.]

²²¹ Selderhuis 2011, p. 214.

²²² LC, 1535, Fols. 341R, 343L.

²²³ *Sunt alii errores. Vuiclef contendit ministris ecclesiarum non licere proprium & diuicias tenere, hic non discernit officia seu potestates, sed discernit opes. Nos docemus officia discernenda esse, interim tamen licet cuilibet ministro ecclesiastico uti politicis rebus... sicut licet pastori ecclesiae simul esse patrem familias.* LC, 1535, Fol. 343 R.

[There are other errors. Wycliffe contends that ministers of the church may not have property and wealth; he does not distinguish official functions and capacities, but distinguishes wealth. We teach that official functions are to be distinguished, but in the meantime, every church minister is allowed to make use of political things... just as the priest of a church can be the father of a family at the same time.]

²²⁴ *Sicut uerbo Dei, ita ministris docentibus uerbum Dei quod ad ministerium attinet debetur obedientia, sicut praecipit scriptura.... Debetur eis etiam obedientia in Iurisdictione, quam habent iuxta Euangelium, uidelicet in cognitione criminum, in audiendis testibus, in legitima excommunicatione.* LC, 1535, Fols. 345L, 345R.

[Obedience is owed to the ministers who teach the word of God that pertains to their ministry, just as it is to the word of God itself, as scripture teaches... Obedience is due to them (the ministers) in their jurisdiction too, which

As far as ceremonies are concerned, Melanchthon argued that the administrators of the church have the authority to establish ceremonies for order within the church. But these ceremonies are “things indifferent” (adiaphora), so they may be omitted without fear of committing a sin. Thus, bishops have no right to burden the consciences of church members by insisting on following old traditions.²²⁵ On the one hand, Melanchthon safeguarded the Gospel, which replaced harsh canon laws as divine ordinances promulgated by the papacy. On the other hand, Melanchthon insisted on the distinction between secular and ecclesiastical spheres, and civil and ecclesiastical offices, as legitimate and essential to one’s calling.

Concerning Vocations and Ordinations

For the rules concerning the ordination of ministers of the church, Melanchthon followed Scripture, the Church Fathers, and the Synod of Nicaea (325 A.D.). In the New Testament, ministers and bishops were ordained by neighboring ministers and bishops. After the Synod of Nicaea, their congregations elected ministers and bishops. This custom was also followed by the Church Fathers, among whom Melanchthon named Cyprian, Augustine, and Ambrose.²²⁶

Impious Teachers

Since the church administers the Gospel, builds the body of Christ for the instruction of the congregation, and maintains pure doctrine, Melanchthon stated that its mandate is to elect good teachers and reject impious ones.²²⁷

they hold in accordance with the gospel, that is, in the apprehension of crimes, in hearing witnesses, and in legitimate excommunication.]

²²⁵ *Habent enim auctoritatem ordinandi ceremonias hoc fine, ut ordine gerantur res in publico ecclesiae coetu... Sed hae ordinationes non debent superstitiose intelligi, non enim sunt iusticiae seu cultus necessarii ad iusticiam, sed sunt re ipsa res adiaphorai, quae extra scandalum casum omitti possunt sine peccato... nec habent episcopi ius magis onerandi conscientias suis traditionibus.* LC, 1535, Fol. 345R.

[For they have the authority to establish ceremonies to this end, that matters can be attended to in an orderly manner in the public gathering of the church... But these ordinances ought not to be understood superstitiously, for they do not justify, nor are they acts of worship necessary to justification, but by their very nature they are indifferent things, which can be omitted without sin except in the case of temptation... and the bishops do not have the right to burden consciences further by their traditions.]

²²⁶ *Ideo ad electionem ministrorum accessit ueteri more auctoritas Ecclesiae, hoc est eorum quibus Ecclesia eam rem commisisset. Historiae & decreta testantur hunc fuisse morem. Populus eligebat, postea accessit auctoritas uicini episcopi, qui approbabat electum.... Verba sunt haec in decreto Nicenae synodi, quod extat in tripartita historia li. [?] pagina 325. Idem exempla in historiis ostendunt, ut in uita Ambrosii legitur, populum fuisse congregatum ad eligendum episcopum, atq; ibi ab omnibus electum & expetitur esse Ambrosium.* LC, 1535, Fols. 345L, 349L.

[Therefore, the authority of the church applies to the election of ministers in the old style, that is, (the election) of those to whom the church has entrusted that office. Histories and decrees bear witness that this was the custom. The people made their choice; after that the authority of the nearest bishop applied, to approve their choice... These are the words in the decree of the Nicene synod, as they stand in the tripartite history, book [?], page 325. Examples in the histories show the same thing: for example, it can be read in the life of Ambrose that the people were gathered together to select a bishop, and that there Ambrose was selected and sought out from among all of them.]

²²⁷ *Cum igitur habeat ecclesia mandatum reiiciendi impios doctores, habet etiam mandatum eligendi bonos doctores, quia clauis pertinent ad Ecclesiam, iuxta hunc ipsum locum.... Vbi igitur est uera Ecclesia, ibi necesse est ius esse eligendi ministros. Vera autem Ecclesia est, quae habet purum uerbum Dei iuxta illud.... Regnum Dei non uenit cum obseruatione. Item ubicumque duo sunt in nomine meo congregati, ibi sum in medio eorum.* LC, 1535, Fols. 349R, 351L.

Selderhuis summarizes Melanchthon's concept of the essentials of church governance in five points: 1) correct doctrine; 2) use of sacrament; 3) obedience to ministers; 4) correct order through spiritual jurisdiction; and 5) instruction in schools. Selderhuis points out that Melanchthon's concept of church law was derived from his clarifying his own understanding of the essence of church.²²⁸ The congruence between the church and the political community was essential in Melanchthon's thinking. As there are ranks in the secular sphere distinguishing princes and their subordinates, so also in the church. But the function of ranks in the latter is related to their task, rather than their position.²²⁹

Ecclesiastical power is quite opposite to the tyrannical power of the sword. It is related to ministry and external regulations for the preservation of the essence of the church and its ministry of the Word. Distinction must be made between the ecclesiastical and secular realms. The political and church community, however, should work together for the preservation of the essence of the church.

Concerning Civil Magistrates and the Dignity of Political Matters²³⁰

Melanchthon differentiated between the spiritual function of the church and secular political life.²³¹ He bases the function of civil magistrates on the law of nature, which judges both good and bad works. Both natural and civil law, he argued, are equal.²³² Melanchthon praised obedience to civil law, referring to Paul's teaching that one must obey not only outwardly but also in mind and will.²³³ Civil law, according to Melanchthon, maintains discipline and piety by its rules and laws.

[Therefore, while the Church has an imperative to reject impious teachers, it also has an imperative to select good teachers, because the keys relate to the Church, according to this very passage... Therefore, where there is a true Church, there must be the right to select ministers there. Furthermore, the true Church is the one which holds the pure word of God according to that text... "The kingdom of God does not come through observance." In the same way, "wherever there are two gathered together in my name, there I am in the midst of them."]

²²⁸ Selderhuis 2011, p. 215.

²²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 223, 225.

²³⁰ *De magistratibus civilibus et dignitate rerum politicarum*. LC 1535, Fols. 435–457.

²³¹ *Euangelium docet de quadam spirituali & aeterna iusticia in corde, nec abolet interim in uita corporali oeconomiam aut politiam, sed docet oeconomiam et omnes politias ratione constitutas, bonas ordinationes Dei esse*. LC, 1535, Fol. 435L.

[The gospel teaches a certain spiritual and eternal justice in the heart, but in the meanwhile it does not do away with economy and organization in physical life, but teaches that economy and all organizations that are reasonably established, are good ordinances of God.]

²³² *Iam quae sint bona, quae sint mala opera iudicat ratio naturalis seu Lex naturae & Magistratus*. LC, 1535, Fol. 447R.

[Now which are good and which are bad works is decided by the magistrate and natural reason or Law of nature.]

²³³ *Deinde studium obedientiae maius in nobis esse debet, cum intelligimus haud dubie poenas Deo daturus esse eos qui non obediunt, ut maxime putent se Magistratum iracundiam clu? [elu] uros esse. Deinde Paulus non solum de externis officiis, seu obedientia externa concionatur, sed etiam de animi iudicio ac uoluntate*. LC, 1535, Fol. 451 L.

[Therefore the pursuit of obedience ought to be greater in us, when we understand that those who do not obey will be punished by God without any doubt, even if they think that they can escape the wrath of the magistrates. Thus, Paul does not only preach about external duties or external obedience, but also about the judgment and will of the mind.]

At the same time, it teaches knowledge of God.²³⁴ Melanchthon also believed that civil law should prevent impious practices and doctrines and punish heretics.²³⁵ He essentially assented to Henry's practice of using statutory laws (acts of parliament) to put religious persons on trial and using secular courts to punish heretics.²³⁶

Melanchthon stated that every vocation is as good as any other, and each serves God.²³⁷ He equated public peace with good governors, a belief that would have been appreciated by Henry VIII, and encouraged people to pray for governors, so that religion and discipline would remain for the glory of God and ensure public safety.²³⁸

Selderhuis agrees with Melanchthon's concept that secular authority and the church have the same origin—divine right—for their mutual existence; the authority uses the sword according to God's will and the church uses doctrine, sacraments and discipline to bring people into right relationship with God.²³⁹ Estes notes that the article on magistracy in *Loci Communes* of 1535 is six times as long as the one in *Loci Communes* of 1521, and that this became the standard Lutheran teaching on magistracy. Melanchthon no longer took it for granted that 1) the secular authority is obliged to uphold true religion and fight against error; 2) God has commanded the secular rulers to establish and maintain true religion and remove abuses; and 3) the goal of the secular ruler is to achieve peace and order. Furthermore, Estes argues that for Melanchthon, the magistracy is an extension of human righteousness and divine ordinance, established by God. Therefore, the Gospel does not destroy domestic economy, and regards a secular vocation as good works. A Christian may serve in civil office and the Gospel commands that this should be so to preserve it; it is a mortal sin to disobey. By way of limitation, the authority of kings is limited by divine and natural law and the laws of each state.²⁴⁰

²³⁴ *Magistratus curare debent, ut pace bene utantur homines non ad luxum, libidines, & cætera uitia, sed regendi sunt mores legibus & disciplina. Item instituendi sunt homines ad pietatem & agnitionem Dei.* LC, 1535, Fol. 445L.

[Magistrates ought to take care that men make good use of peace not for extravagance, pleasures, and the other vices, but so that their conduct is ruled by laws and discipline. In the same way, men should be instructed in piety and acknowledgment of God.]

²³⁵ Melanchthon's approach to history shows his characters either supporting good laws and the true church or committed to injustice and persecution. He, however, stressed that God is above history and history is preserved in the church. Wengert 2010, V, pp. 20–21.

²³⁶ *Debent igitur Magistratus prohibere impios cultus & impiorum dogmatum professionem, debent punire hæreticos.* LC, 1535, Fol. 457L.

[Therefore, magistrates ought to prevent impious cults and the declaration of impious dogmas. They ought to punish heretics.]

²³⁷ *Secunda Regula est: Opera uite oeconomicae & politicae, quæ quisque pro sua uocatione facit, sunt bona opera & in piis sunt ueri cultus Dei, sunt enim opera a Deo præcepta.* LC, 1535, Fol. 435R.

[This is the second rule. The works of the economic and political life, whichever each man does according to his own vocation, are good works and among the pious, are true acts of worship of God, for they are works prompted by God.]

²³⁸ *Postremo addendus est & hic honos, precari, uidelicet, pro magistratibus petere, ut Deus pacem concedat rebus pub. & conseruet religionem & disciplinam, seruet bonos Principes, & gubernet eorum mentes ad gloriam De & salutem pub.* LC, 1535, Fol. 451R.

[Finally, this honor must be added too, to pray, that is, to seek for the magistrates that God grant peace to the states and preserve religion and discipline, that he preserve good princes and govern their minds to the glory of God and the public salvation.]

²³⁹ Selderhuis 2011, p. 215.

²⁴⁰ Estes 2005, pp. 93–94, 122–128.

Estes claims that Melanchthon understood that *politia* (commonwealth or state) is a Christian entity and has a religious nature, and the prince is its leader. The prince, in his two roles as a prince and as an individual, had an obligation to establish religion. Melanchthon defended *cura religionis* in *Loci Communes* 1535, emphasizing that the primary goal of a ruler is the glory of God and the salvation of souls, and the secular ruler's responsibility is to maintain true religion and remove abuses.²⁴¹

Kohnle argues that secular authority acts as guardian of “two tables of Law” regarding external discipline, such as defending religion against idolatry, blasphemy, and erroneous doctrine. According to Melanchthon, political decisions also need to include the will of God since his authority is the voice of the Decalogue. Laws are established based on natural law, enforcing religious laws and protecting obedient citizens. Melanchthon understood that Protestant doctrine would be preserved only if the external order were maintained.²⁴² Estes, Kohnle, and Selderhuis agree that Melanchthon kept the secular and the spiritual spheres separate but maintained that the origin of both was the same—divine. This author concurs with Selderhuis who remarks that Luther stressed the two-kingdom doctrine of the human and divine, while Melanchthon was more concerned with the unity of divine action and the church preaching right doctrine.²⁴³

Selderhuis argues that, according to Melanchthon, the church is important to the political community whose duty is to conserve religion. Authority of the church is limited to obedience, in that the church has a right to refer to God's commandments; and when the community does not obey, the church may object since the community is the highest member of the church, protecting it from injustice.²⁴⁴ This author concurs that his argument agrees with Melanchthon's *Loci Communes* of 1535.

Favorable to Henry VIII was Melanchthon's belief that kings were able to understand divine laws and so could preserve peace and justice, not only in their nations but also around the world.²⁴⁵ Thus Melanchthon supported the idea that the good governor defended right doctrine, and as seen in his preface to Henry, Melanchthon supported Henry as head of the church. The civil magistracy's duty is to defend the church from impious practices and punish heretics, as well as preserve right doctrine.

Divine, Natural, and Human Laws

Laws, said Melanchthon, were given to men to help them distinguish right from wrong. “The Law of God requires total obedience to God and condemns those who do not follow this obedience,” Melanchthon wrote in *Loci Communes*.” He divided all laws into three kinds:

²⁴¹ James M. Estes: “The Role of Godly Magistrates in the Church: Melanchthon as Luther's Interpreter and Collaborator.” In *Church History* 67:3. 1998, pp. 467–468, 476 (hereafter, Estes 1998).

²⁴² Kohnle 2011, p. 44.

²⁴³ Selderhuis 2011, p. 215.

²⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 220–221.

²⁴⁵ *Deus ornat Reges honore nominis sui. Ego dixi dii estis, uidelicet, ut sciant sui officii esse, ut res diuinas intelligant & conseruent in mundo religionem, iusticiam, pacem, disciplinam.* LC, 1535, Fol. 457R.

[God adorns kings with the honor of his name. “I have said you are gods”: that is, so that they might know that it is part of their duty to understand divine affairs and to protect religion, peace, and discipline in the world.]

divine, natural, and human laws.²⁴⁶ As far as justification by faith is concerned, judicial, ceremonial, and moral law have been abrogated; the Christian is free. Verkamp asks, is this freedom adiaphoristic freedom? He continues by stating that the sixteenth-century Reformers, including Melanchthon, defined adiaphora as a thing “permitted” or “free,” because it has been neither commanded nor prohibited. Certain things were commanded and certain things forbidden. There is a limit to freedom, since the second part of freedom is service to one’s neighbor. This service is not a work of the law but of grace, says Verkamp. A person of faith may write his/her own laws in accordance with the situation in which he/she finds himself/herself.²⁴⁷

Verkamp also finds that Melanchthon believes that because a person is simultaneously righteous and a sinner, the theological aspects of the law also include its civil function. This author agrees with Verkamp that even a Christian should take seriously the directives (commands, precepts) of divine law in order to work out his/her love for another, but those directives do not bind consciences. Melanchthon expressed this more explicitly as the “third function of the law.”²⁴⁸ Verkamp further argues that the prohibitions of Scripture do not cover every aspect of Christian life and, in this context, were not prescribed by Scripture; Luther and Melanchthon regarded those things as adiaphoristic, neither commanded nor forbidden in Scripture, i.e., not sources of justification. There were areas in which a Christian could exercise freedom of choice, for example when to partake of this or that food, whether to marry or not to marry.²⁴⁹

Divine Law²⁵⁰

God’s laws, said Melanchthon, were revealed in the Mosaic laws of the Old Testament and the Gospel of the New Testament. The Mosaic laws governed morality (as in the Ten Commandments), ceremonies (as in *Leviticus*), and justice (as in marriage laws and contracts). The Gospel laws covered the fulfillment of the Mosaic laws by Christ.²⁵¹ In fact all laws for Melanchthon belong to God’s law, which includes divine, natural and human laws.

Divine law has three functions, according to Melanchthon: (a) it sets forth our duties to God and to each other; (b) it terrifies our conscience, thus motivating us to do right; and (c) it gives us faith to do good works, not for salvation, but as a result of it. Melanchthon called this third function “beginning obedience” (*inchoata obedientia*).²⁵²

²⁴⁶ LC, 1535, Fols. 103R, 105L, 119R.

²⁴⁷ Paul Althaus: *The Ethics of Martin Luther*, translated by R. C. Schultz (Philadelphia, 1972), pp. 30–32, in Bernard J. Verkamp 1975, pp. 55–57.

²⁴⁸ Verkamp 1975, pp. 58–59.

²⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 59–60.

²⁵⁰ *Lex Dei* (God’s law) is composed of divine law, (moral, judicial, and ceremonial), natural law, and human law. Of all the divine laws, moral laws are perpetually binding. Methuen discusses the complex interaction between natural law, moral law, and the Decalogue on the one hand, and moral philosophy on the other. In *Loci Communes* 1535 Melanchthon allocates to *lex divina* the matters that belong to *lex Dei*, explaining the difference between human law, philosophy, and the law of God. See Methuen 2000, p. 116.

²⁵¹ LC, 1535, Fols. 103R, 105L, 107R.

²⁵² *Tertium officium legis in his qui sunt fide iusti, est ut doceat eos de bonis operibus, quæ nam opera Deo placeant & præcipiat certa opera in quibus obedientiam erga Deum exerceant. Etsi nos liberi sumus, a lege quod ad*

As stated above, Melanchthon divided God's law (*lex Dei*) into three parts: divine, natural and human laws. Divine law he divided again into three parts, of which *leges morales* he regarded as binding and indicates its close relation to natural law and the Decalogue on the one hand and moral philosophy on the other. Under divine law Melanchthon referred to law revealed in Scripture. According to Melanchthon law revealed what perfect obedience to God should be although it can only be partially fulfilled because of the Fall. The Decalogue is the unchanging part of divine law and shows the principles of natural law.²⁵³

Selderhuis argues that the congregation itself should determine the rules and regulations of the church, since Melanchthon regarded the church as a school in which the teaching of the third use of law became possible. Even though Melanchthon stressed Luther's teaching *simul iustus et peccator*, he connects the transforming rediscovery of Christian freedom with the continuous value of divine law. From this connection, duty arises, since all believers are sinners needing guidance and encouragement.²⁵⁴ Since teaching of the third use of law and obedience to civil laws took precedence over the efficacious presence of Christ in the believer, the teaching of Christian freedom may have been pushed to the background.

In his section on law, Melanchthon explained the law in a theological sense and set God's law as revelation and Divine law in a theological sense, and that the third use of law was to do good works as a consequence of justification.

Natural Law

The laws of nature, Melanchthon argued, are the will of God written in nature. Therefore, natural law is divine, yet belongs to all people at all times. Philosophy, he reasoned, helps us to understand duties that relate to morality and civil society, but because it raises doubts in our minds about the existence of God, it fails to adequately interpret natural law. For example, philosophy cannot explain the truths of the heart, such as how a sinner can be declared just because of Christ's fulfillment of the law.²⁵⁵ The Gospel does not contradict natural law or civil

iustificacionem attinet, tamen quod ad obedientiam attinet, man et [manet] Lex. Nam iustificatos necesse est obedire Deo. Et quidem incipiunt aliqua ex parte facere legem. Et placet illa inchoata obedientia, propterea quia personæ placent propter Christum. LC, 1535, Fols. 135R, 137L.

[The third role of the law among those who are justified by faith is that it should teach them about good works, which are the works that please God, and should indicate specific works in which they might practice obedience toward God. Although we are free from the law as far as it relates to justification, nonetheless the law stands, because it relates to obedience. For it is necessary for those who are justified to obey God. And indeed, in some ways, they begin to fulfill the law. And that beginning obedience is pleasing, because the persons are pleasing on account of Christ.]

²⁵³ Methuen 2000, pp. 116, 117–118.

²⁵⁴ Selderhuis 2011, pp. 217–218.

²⁵⁵ *Lex tantum requirat civilia opera, non accuset naturam vitiosam, quod legi satisfiat per hanc diligentiam humanam, quod sint iusti propter opera, & si interim corda plena sunt dubitatione & aliis vitiosis affectibus. Hoc uelum tolli docet per Christum, cum uidelicet agnoscimus, nos esse reos iræ Dei, nec posse satisfacere legi Dei, ac quaerimus misericordiam, & statuimus nos pronuciari iustos propter Christum.* LC, 1535, Fols. 103L, 103R.

[The law should only require civil works, it should not accuse a vicious nature that it should fulfill the law through this human diligence, as if they would be justified because of their works, even if in the meantime their hearts are full of hesitation and other pernicious afflictions. It teaches that this veil is lifted through Christ: that is, when we recognize that we are defendants before the wrath of God, and are unable to satisfy the law of God, and seek mercy, and decide to proclaim ourselves justified because of Christ.]

order. Political order cannot be abolished, according to Melanchthon, because civil law is part of natural law.²⁵⁶

Methuen writes that Melanchthon wished to unite theology and philosophy into a coherent system of thought. For Melanchthon, natural and moral philosophy and providential theology were related in a progression of sciences. Natural law is a central part of his ethical thought. In teaching philosophy with education, Methuen stresses the necessity of ethics. Natural law is also central to Melanchthon's theology and his interest in teaching natural philosophy. His interest in teaching philosophy can be seen in his interest in the ethical framework of the Gospel. The order of nature played a central part in Melanchthon's understanding of the law. His interest in philosophy reflected his thinking regarding law—natural law, Melanchthon explained, encompasses both moral philosophy and the Decalogue, and is innate in all humans as the image of God.²⁵⁷

Sachiko Kusakawa finds that for Melanchthon, natural philosophy was knowledge of law in the sense that it formed the theoretical basis for his moral philosophy and civil obedience. It also taught self-knowledge and the greatness of the Creator. Thus, Melanchthon transformed natural philosophy into civic value and demonstrated that it was an essential characteristic of an obedient Christian.²⁵⁸ Both writers acknowledge Melanchthon's use of natural philosophy, but Kusakawa points out that in Melanchthon's thinking natural philosophy became Lutheran. Melanchthon used his philosophical outlook to integrate it into Lutheran principles.

Kusakawa writes that Melanchthon transformed the traditional natural philosophy into a Lutheran one, while he interpreted classical and contemporary authors using Lutheran principles and made it an integral part of his pedagogical program, for which he used his humanistic skills as he read the Bible as a Lutheran.²⁵⁹

The third use of law is central to understanding Melanchthon's soteriology. Even though he stressed justification by faith given freely to a penitent sinner, his demand for "good works" as a consequence of justification can easily be interpreted as a condition. Methuen's discussion of natural philosophy in Melanchthon's theology sheds light on his soteriology and puts it in the in right perspective.

Methuen rightly notes from the *Loci Communes* of both 1521 and 1535 that Melanchthon wanted to demonstrate that the church's teaching of the Decalogue was comparable to the moral laws of philosophers. Melanchthon argued that natural law is innate in the human mind, and connects this to the parallel drawn between natural law and moral law on the one hand, and the Decalogue and moral philosophy on the other, so that the *leges morales* and the Decalogue can be seen as having essential features in common. The Decalogue was formulated as a consequence of humans having been created in God's image (even though this likeness is

²⁵⁶ *Ego uero saepe iam dixi Euangelio non aboleri legem naturæ & politicas ordinationes.... Nam illa ipsa ordinatio est legis naturæ, uidelicet, ut sint magistratus.* LC, 1535, Fol. 141L.

[Indeed, I have often said that it is not the place of the gospel to do away with the law of nature and political ordinances... For that very ordinance is part of the law of nature, as are the magistrates, indeed.]

²⁵⁷ Methuen 2000, pp. 111–113.

²⁵⁸ Sachiko Kusakawa: *The Transformation of Natural Philosophy*. 1995, pp. 201–202 (hereafter, Kusakawa 1995).

²⁵⁹ Kusakawa 1995, pp. 4–6.

obscured by the Fall), and therefore shows the principle of natural law. Melanchthon makes a distinction between the action of human will and the *lex natura* innate and inescapable in human souls, and maps that distinction into moral philosophy on the one hand (needed to moderate the action of will), and the *leges morales* on the other. Innate knowledge of God is part of natural law and a basic apprehension of God's order in the world and society. Methuen clearly affirms that Melanchthon owed his legal understanding to medieval scholasticism, and rightly calls him the "Lutheran scholastic."²⁶⁰

Wengert notes that even though the accusation of law is taken away, the knowledge of natural law remains, which teaches the righteous to live a corporeal life sanctified by the Holy Spirit. Melanchthon uses language reminiscent of the threefold division of penance in the threefold division of law.²⁶¹ This writer agrees that Melanchthon again implements new forms into old structures in his division of law.

Melanchthon relied heavily on ancient philosophers, such as Plato and the Stoics, but also on medieval scholasticism and Augustinian theistic understanding of *lex aeterna*. While Augustine described the unity of multiple things, Aquinas presented a hierarchy of eternal laws in which other laws have their respective places. The scholastic understanding of *lex aeterna* is seen in Melanchthon's theological understanding of the knowledge of the natural world. He restricts the divine law to biblical expressions.²⁶²

Human Law

According to Melanchthon, human laws require and prohibit external acts, and ethics govern people's internal motivations and affections, as well as their social order.²⁶³ Philosophy requires not only ruling over external members, but also moderation of one's affections. Philosophy may give direction to right ethics by bringing nature into conformity with the law of God, which nature naturally opposes.²⁶⁴

It was the belief that the law of God could be fulfilled by external works such as monastic vows, clerical celibacy, and the worship of saints that set the medieval church and the Reformation churches on decisively different paths. The concept of justification by faith freely given by Christ and the new interpretation of Scripture, changed the concept of "works" for salvation and modified the structure and contents of the medieval church. The concept of divine law as opposed to human law also made a difference in how adiaphora matters were to be interpreted based on Scriptural principles.

²⁶⁰ Methuen, 2000, pp. 113, 116, 118. See Graybill 2010, pp. 210, 215, 221–222.

²⁶¹ Wengert 1997, p. 197.

²⁶² Methuen, 2000, pp. 111, 123–124.

²⁶³ Methuen, 2000, p. 116. Manschreck notes that Melanchthon included pontifical laws and human laws since they also were adiaphora and added any commands or rules outside of Scripture to this category. Manschreck 1948, pp. 150–151.

²⁶⁴ *Leges humanæ tantum requirunt aut prohibent externa facta. Philosophia requirit amplius quiddam, uidelicet diligentiam non solum externis membris continendis, sed etiam in affectibus flectendis ad certam moderationem & æquabilitatem, seu suauitatem.* LC 1535, Fols. 99R, 101L.

[Human laws only require or forbid external actions. Philosophy requires something more: that is, diligence not only in containing one's external parts, but also in turning one's impulses to a sure moderation and equilibrium, or gentleness.]

Melanchthon must have had the evangelical clergy in mind when he wrote to Henry, using subtle language to appeal to the king to reform his church on the Reformation principle of Scripture alone. Melanchthon clearly accepted Henry's supremacy, referring to the Old Testament kings who destroyed abuses, protected the nation from idolatry, and promoted true doctrinal change. Since it was the king's duty to defend doctrine and practice, including adiaphora matters, Melanchthon appealed to him.

Even though Melanchthon accepted Henry's supremacy, he hoped to have Christian kings lead discussions on the adiaphora matters in national bishops' conferences. Melanchthon therefore explained his views on church policy and its relation to secular magistracy in his view on the justification by faith article. Melanchthon's statement in the *Loci Communes* defined the new doctrine on the basis of which adiaphora matters should be interpreted in the church. As we will see in the next chapter, Henry took the power to define doctrine from the bishops in England.

Conclusion

Melanchthon's purpose in writing the *Loci Communes* of 1535 was to find the most inclusive way of stating his thoughts on church policy: on the power of the church and human traditions on adiaphora, and how church policy relates to civil magistracy. It was also the duty of the civil magistracy to defend the church from impious practices and punish heretics, as well as preserve right doctrine. Melanchthon supported the idea that governors should defend right doctrine in their realms. One of the most important questions during the negotiations between the German and English theologians concerned ecclesiastical power and its relationship to the magistracy. As seen in this chapter, justification by faith alone was the basis on which Melanchthon established what other matters are essential when speaking of faith and good works—these being a consequence, not cause, of justification by faith. In the doctrine of justification by faith in *Loci Communes* of 1535, Melanchthon departed from the *Confessio Augustana* of 1530. It is possible that this development occurred with the intention that the Catholic and Protestant Churches would understand his doctrine and hence unite. Confessional churches is essential, since one needs to understand what the words mean in the particular confessional context. Melanchthon firmly believed that in his doctrine he transmitted the consensus of the true Catholic Church, based on the Apostles. He did not intend to change his doctrinal position. The changes in his doctrine of justification and free will had to be interpreted in a specific historical situation. Melanchthon intended to uphold the old church structure as much as possible, and explain new doctrine based on the old structure. Combining justification into a larger doctrinal context is crucial to finding common ground in the doctrine of soteriology. Similarly, the "renewal" aspect was more important than anything else in Melanchthon's doctrine, which scholars have discussed as the relationship of good works to justification. Melanchthon states that, along with justifying faith, there will be other "fruits of the Spirit," including a "new kind of virtue," or a gift of grace. The presence of grace, in his opinion, is evidence that the believer has received the free gift of Christ or mercy promised through Christ. He also speaks of the Holy Spirit as a helper of the divine.

Two positions are held by scholars who relate the doctrine of justification by faith to the doctrine of adiaphora. Manschreck's viewpoint considers good works from an adiaphoristic point of view. He finds that works following justification are not credited against sin because of faith. Good works are adiaphoristic as far as justification is concerned. Jaquette finds that the doctrine of reconciliation is essential for defining adiaphora—that is, right relationship with God—and says that as a result, faith is expressed in love for one's neighbor. When looked at from an adiaphoristic point of view, Melanchthon's interpretation of good works has much clearer meaning, as the fruit of love towards one neighbor.

All scholars on Melanchthon's doctrine of justification agree that Melanchthon shifted in his exposition of the doctrine in the 1530s. Most scholars discuss good works in relation to the doctrine of justification, and agree that for Melanchthon they had a consequential role. All agree that Melanchthon presented a forensic nature of justification in the *Loci Communes* of 1535. Seifrid agreed with Pannenberg's assessment that Melanchthon interprets justification as "reputed righteous" and using forensic terms, narrows the concept and insists on the necessity of good works. Melanchthon's modification of his doctrinal concepts when discussing the doctrine of justification by faith added the Trinitarian dimension to the doctrine of justification. Vainio asserts that Melanchthon defines the doctrine of justification "as an extrinsic act of imputation," and represents the forensic doctrine of justification as excluding the renewal of the mind. His emphasis is on a relational aspect of justification, and he sees justifying faith and donation of the Holy Spirit as consequential. Strehle, who makes a negative assessment of Melanchthon's understanding of his concept of imputation, states that Melanchthon took a position between Anselm's atonement and Ockham's voluntarist doctrine of justification. The point of departure between Luther and Melanchthon differs in that the former speaks of Christ's presence because of faith, the latter thinks of justification as a human response and the benefits of the past transaction on the Cross are mediated by faith. While speaking of the importance of good works in order to give them a consequential role, as Maxcey argues, Melanchthon developed further his understanding of natural law in relation to Christian living. Freed from the curse of the law, natural or moral law still directs man to obedience before God, as seen in his division of law. Melanchthon equates the unified role of the Decalogue with a moral mandate. Once man is imputed righteous because of Christ, any merit is excluded. Natural law encompasses both moral philosophy and the Decalogue. Natural law, Melanchthon explained, is innate in all humans as the image of God.

Consequently, it was necessary to apply the third use of law in order to justify renewal in Christian life. He states that the theological use of law drives a sinner to Christ—that is, through divine righteousness, whereas human righteousness addresses our lives when we deal with things of this world. This clear distinction of the divine and human in their respective spheres can be seen in the way that Melanchthon handles such issues as ecclesiastical policy and civil magistracy. The third use of law is central in understanding Melanchthon's soteriology. Even though he stressed that justification by faith was given freely to a penitent sinner, his opponent can easily interpret his demand for "good works" as a consequence of justification can easily be interpreted as a condition. Good works should be understood from the perspective of Melanchthon's understanding of natural law, as he added the third use of law for the purpose of explaining the law's implications for Christian living.

To find a middle way of understanding Melanchthon's position, Wengert claims that Luther and Melanchthon committed to a single-minded forensic understanding of justification. As Melanchthon emphasized the promise (forensic=declaration of forgiveness granted because of Christ), Luther concentrated on Christ himself and faith in him as a gift. Their mutual approach united them against those who would turn Christ inward—in search for qualities worked by the Holy Spirit—or outward—to the law or Christ's extrinsic work. Instead, they concentrated on the idea that Christ and the promise of righteousness in him provides the true object for faith. Wengert emphasizes that, after Melanchthon's dispute with John Agricola, he added the third use of law—in addition to the two uses (civil and theological)—in the third edition on Colossians 1534. Melanchthon called this third function "beginning obedience" (*inchoata obedientia*). Natural law encompasses both moral philosophy and the Decalogue. Natural law, Melanchthon explained, is innate in all humans as the image of God. Melanchthon argues that natural law is innate in the human mind and connects this to the parallel drawn between natural law and moral law and to the Decalogue and moral philosophy. Pannenberg interprets the third use of law as moral renewal, and explains the difference in the doctrine of justification between Luther and Melanchthon. He finds that Luther followed Augustine's doctrine of justification in the fellowship with Christ through faith, whereas the "forensic" concept of justification inclined Melanchthon to supplement justification with moral renewal. It is worth noting Pannenberg's view in emphasizing soteriology and Christology as the action of the triune God in reconciliation.

Melanchthon also expanded his understanding of the civil magistracy from that of *Loci Communes* of 1521. He makes clear the separation of the two spheres: civil and ecclesiastical. However, it was important to note that the civil magistracy for him was of divine origin, and, therefore he could support the King of England's claim for his position, head of the state and church, as being of divine origin. Natural law and civil law were of the same origin and princes were to protect religion. Obedience was an important element in Melanchthon's understanding of civil magistracy, which according to him was the voice of the Decalogue.

In the church polity, bishops should not burden consciences; divine law in Scripture replaces canon law as authority, and there will be no confusion of secular and ecclesiastical. When speaking of human traditions, Melanchthon stated that the authority of Scripture defines human traditions: they are meant to maintain order in the church, the bishops have the authority to define them, and omitting them should not burden consciences. He then stated five errors on the question of adiaphora: 1) that human beings merit remission of sins by their good works, so that the honor due to Christ is transferred to traditions; 2) belief that following traditions will lead to perfection, instead of the belief that only obedience to Christ can achieve this; 3) belief that Mosaic ceremonies as set forth in Leviticus were on the same level as the ceremonies established during the early days of the church; 4) belief in superstitions established by certain bishops, referring to the power of the pope and his bishops who regarded their laws as above the new doctrine; and 5) the multiple uses of ceremonies that had sprung up from differences of opinion, tortured consciences, and had caused discord in the church. Melanchthon suggested changes in understanding human traditions and that the new doctrine is the ultimate authority when deciding adiaphora matters. Thus, ceremonies that are neither commanded nor forbidden should be kept for order's sake. When it came to adiaphora, Melanchthon stated that Christians should not fight

over inconsequential matters, but should be charitable toward one another. To minimize differences and nurture good will in the church, he recommends retaining as many of the old ceremonies as possible. He made clear any misunderstanding of adiaphora matters, thus safeguarding the freedom of conscience and Christian liberty that should prevail in relationship with one's neighbor. However, since salvation does not depend on observing "indifferent" things, Melanchthon stressed what he called "Christian liberty," by which he meant not feeling guilty if one personally did not follow "indifferent" old traditions, including those of the ancient Jews and many medieval customs of the Roman Church. Melanchthon believed that in adiaphora matters one should exercise freedom and good will towards one's neighbor. Based on what is stated above regarding adiaphora, Melanchthon's opinion was clear that consciences cannot be bound by anything other than divine law; as stated in research question three, the authority of Scripture defines human traditions.

Melanchthon's understanding of the doctrine of justification had shifted from the *Confessio Augustana*, seen in the *Loci Communes* as including more emphasis on the quality of Christian life involving the third use of law. His shift was due to his experience negotiating with the Catholics in order to make the central doctrine more acceptable to their viewpoints. From the doctrine of justification by faith, Melanchthon was able to compromise on adiaphora matters when discussing church policy issues. Melanchthon had compromised on essential points to the degree that made the elector concerned about his deviation from the doctrine of the *Confessio Augustana*. In addition, Melanchthon was rebuked by the elector for his interference in the elector's foreign politics, and impeding his relations to the emperor. Melanchthon tried to assure the elector that he followed the old church structure and that during the transition period the old customs should remain for conscience's sake.

Melanchthon's experience in negotiating with the Catholics and the French made it necessary for him to formulate a doctrine that would bring various parties close to each other. His doctrine of justification should be seen in the light of other doctrines he wrote in the *Loci Communes*. His goal was to use old structures and define new formulations acceptable to various confessional groups.

In the next chapter, we will discuss what the English bishops' positions were within the English Church, and how the conservative and reform-minded bishops related to Melanchthon's ideas on the power of the church and human traditions related to civil magistracy.

Chapter 4:

Consolidating the Power of Bishops in the New Order

(January 1535–January 1536)

Introduction

The previous chapter comprised a detailed look at Melanchthon's *Loci Communes*, written in 1535 for the purpose of providing doctrinal statements that could be used in negotiations with the English. Melanchthon's intention was to find the most inclusive way of stating his thoughts on church policy, interpreting the doctrine of justification by faith to various confessional parties. It is possible that this development occurred so that the Reformation churches would understand the central doctrine of justification by faith and would unite, and that he presented his new doctrinal position for that very purpose. The intent of this dissertation is, in part, to look at the shifts in authority and determine who had that authority in the period between 1534 and 1535.

Chapter Four shifts from discussion of doctrine to look at the consolidation of the bishops' power in the new order in England that came about after the Act of Supremacy passed in Parliament in 1534, as well as the political implications thereof. A struggle for control occurred in England because statutory law replaced canon law. As ecclesiastical laws were now laws needing acceptance by Parliament, the Church of Rome lost its power. Various conflicts of authority show how difficult it was to interpret the supremacy law in practice. The English bishops were divided into two parties: the conservative clergy who supported supremacy and wished to retain the old doctrine and ceremonies, and the reform-minded clergy who wished to reform doctrine along the lines of the continental Reformers. As a consequence, even the most conservative bishops in England no longer accepted papal curialism, and papal supporters became enemies of the monarchy. After the Act of Supremacy passed, the practical aspects of the supremacy laws had to be implemented throughout England. Henry gave Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, the task of instructing the bishops to preach publicly from their pulpits about the new supremacy and succession laws. Henry also delegated the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of both spiritual and temporal matters to vice-regent Thomas Cromwell. Under Cromwell, lay commissioners made visitations to the dioceses to ensure that the necessary changes had been made.¹ The change was drastic, since the king delegated his supremacy in the church not to the archbishop, as would be expected, but to a lay leader. In theory, Cromwell had authority from the king even to define doctrine. The supremacy changed the position of the

¹ The Archbishop of Canterbury's Mandate, to inhibit the Provincial Bishops to exercise any Jurisdiction during the King's Visitation. September 18, 1535. Regist. Stokesley, Fol. 47. XXI, *Ecclesiastical History*, pp. 123–124; Note on the Appointment of Cromwell as Vicar-General. His appointment may have occurred in the middle of December 1534. *Documents*, No. LX, pp. 250–251. Cargill Thompson 1980, p. 122.

bishops in the church and their tasks had to be redefined. The English Church claimed that it belonged to the “universal church” without the pope. As in the case of Cardinal Fisher, King Henry’s laws were to become the pope’s canonical laws.

This chapter discusses the power of the church and human traditions in relation to the civil magistrate in the manner laid out in Melancthon’s *Loci Communes*. In this chapter, it is also demonstrated how Henry used his bishops as pawns for various goals to prevent any Catholic intrusion. For instance, Gardiner, who was the most ardently conservative bishop, was given the task of writing against the pope and for Henry, claiming that the king’s law was above the pope’s canonical laws. Gardiner’s letter is described in detail, as well as the reactions of Emperor Charles and the pope.

The English Bishops and the Supremacy Law

At the start of the Reformation, England comprised two archbishoprics: Canterbury and York. Each province consisted of twenty-one dioceses and each diocese was divided into one or more archdeaconries (sixty before the Reformation); each archdeaconry was divided into deaneries, the unit for episcopal visitation. Deaneries were composed of parishes, or the basic administrative units of the church. Monasteries and religious houses were outside of episcopal jurisdiction. Cathedral chapters and other collegiate churches were the bishop’s responsibility. Religious orders organized into provinces were not part of the ecclesiastical map.²

With the Reformation, the diocesan administration remained mostly the same, but in supporting the laws of succession and supremacy, the bishops affirmed that they no longer supported the pope’s involvement in their ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Consequently, they lost their legal jurisdictional authority over the king. The true difference was that the king replaced the pope as head of the English Church. The bishops lost their jurisdictional power and thereby, the church was weakened.

Both church and state’s legal jurisdiction came under one person, the king. Even though the pope’s jurisdiction in ecclesiastical matters came after that of the king, one sees the difference in the way the two supremacies proceeded. Formerly, the bishops’ episcopal authority had come from the pope; now, a secular prince had acquired both temporal and spiritual powers.³ Therefore, the bishops became both citizens of the state and subject to its laws, and at the same time they were servants of the church and under the jurisdiction of the king in both secular and ecclesiastical matters. A secular prince now defined the bishops’ ecclesiastical doctrine and practice.

Conservative bishops were replaced by the king with bishops who wholeheartedly supported the supremacy laws. The king was more cautious with the bishops whom he suspected of supporting the pope’s supremacy. These included John Fisher and Thomas More. But they soon

² Rex 2006, pp. 28–29.

³ Erastian theories were supported by the conservative clergy and Marsilio’s *Defensor Pacis* was published by Thomas Cromwell. Erastian(ism) means that the church should be led and subordinated to the secular power, as expressed by the Swiss theologian Thomas Erastus (1524–1583). See Introduction in Dickens & Carr 1967, p. 7, 166. Kenneth Carleton: *Bishops and Reform in the English Church, 1520–1559*, 2001, pp. 9–10 (hereafter, Carleton 2001).

were found guilty of treason refusing obedience. The most conservative bishops had to bring to the king their former bulls and clear their service books of any traces of mentioning the pope. Soon not only did the king have power over the church, but he also appointed a lay leader over the spiritual and temporal affairs of the church. The most conservative bishops were in constant fear of the accusation of *praemunire* when they differed from Henry's domestic legislation over the church. Parliament's legislative power over the church was the measure used to make the clergy obey the king's laws. There was a constant struggle between the conservative and reform-minded parties regarding how far the reforms could go in doctrinal and adiaphora matters. The conservative clergy wished to keep the doctrine as it had been, but without the pope. The reform-minded clergy wished to reform doctrine according to continental principles. The clergy's ministerial duties remained but they lost the right to define doctrine. That right now belonged to the king. The liturgy remained as before, but the change was in how each interpreted its message of *lex orandi—lex credendi*.

The extent of the bishops' allegiance to the king differed depending on which party they represented. Archbishops Thomas Cranmer and Edward Lee at the Convocation of Canterbury and York, along with bishops and priests in various dioceses, had declared that they would repudiate the pope's authority.⁴ Consequently, the "Bishop of Rome" (the pope)⁵ had no more jurisdiction in England than any other foreign bishop. For example, the Archbishop of York wrote to the king:

Supreme Hed In Yerthe of the Church of England, and also by the Clergie of the said Convocations, it is avowed, that the Bishop of Rome by Gods Lawe hathe no more Jurisdiction within this Realme than any other Foreigne Bishope; and therefore ordre taken by your Highe Courte of Parliament, by the Consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and the Commons in the same assembled, as well for the Unitynge and Knitinge of your sayde Style and Title of Supreme Hed to your Imperiall "As by your Highe Courte of Parliment is declared the Crowne, as for the Abolishmement of the saide Bishope of Rome's Autoritie and Jurisdiction, yet I nevertheless, nodre remembring my Consent given to the same, by my Subscription and Profession, signed with my Hande, and sealed with my Seal, have not done my dewe Endeavorment to teache the same, nor cause to be taught within my Diocese and Province."⁶

The bishops became servants of the crown and Henry could move them from one diocese to another to protect his Supremacy. He was watched by the most conservative bishops—Stephen Gardiner (c.1483–1555), Bishop of Winchester; Cuthbert Tunstall (1474–1559), Bishop of Durham; and Edward Lee (1482–1544), the Archbishop of York.⁷ They had held high positions

⁴ Abjuration of Papal Supremacy by the Clergy, A.D. 1534. June 2, 1534. *Documents*, No. LVIII, pp. 251–252; The King's Proclamation for the Abolishing of the Usurped Power of the Pope. June 9, 1534/5. *Letters of Henry VIII*, No. VIII, pp. 123–125. The dates are different in the two documents.

⁵ Since the Supremacy Act of 1534, the pope was called the "Bishop of Rome," rejecting his pretensions in England by placing him on a level with all other bishops. Bernard 2005, p. 70.

⁶ A Letter of the Archbishop of York's, setting forth his Zeal in the King's Service, and against the Pope's Authority. June 25, 1535. Cott. Libr., Cleop. E. 6. P. 236; Burnet, Book II, No. XXXIV, p. 457. The King's Proclamation for the Abolishing of the Usurped Power of the Pope; *Letters of King Henry*, No. VIII, June 9, 1534/5, pp. 123–125.

⁷ Edward Lee had been appointed Archbishop of York in 1531. Bernard 2005, p. 178. Chibi 2003, pp. 297, 301–310.

under the jurisdiction of the pope, and had vested interests in the old church structure.⁸ Duffy notes that Lee suggested to Henry and Cromwell that attacks on traditional religion made otherwise obedient people nervous.⁹ Radical preachers of the new doctrine were not readily accepted by the conservatives.

The reform-minded bishops wanted doctrinal reform in the church. The most prominent of the reform-minded bishops were Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury (1489–1556); Thomas Goodrich (d. 1554); Nicholas Shaxton (c. 1485–1556), Bishop of Salisbury from 1535; Hugh Latimer (c.1485–1555), Bishop of Worcester from 1535; John Hilsey (d. 1539), Bishop of Rochester from 1535; and William Barlow, the Bishop of St. Asaph from 1535, who became Bishop of St. David's in 1535.¹⁰ Henry held his jurisdictional powers by balancing the bishops' different beliefs and by ensuring that those chosen for new bishoprics were his candidates. Chibi argues that to balance the various elements, King Henry and his bishops wanted to avoid extremist acts, control the speed of reform, and preserve the king's authority.¹¹ In this sense, one may conclude that the bishops retained some power. They determined how reforms were introduced to help maintain Henry's supremacy. The king needed to maintain stability in both international and domestic scenes.

Since Henry was also entitled to the incomes of the church, all vacant bishoprics were thus automatically assigned to him. Dr. Edward Fox (1496–1538), the king's almoner, was made Bishop of Hereford; an ex-Black Friar of Bristow, John Hilsey, took the place of John Fisher as Bishop of Rochester, and Dr. Hugh Latimer, a great preacher of the new doctrine, became the Bishop of Worcester.¹² The reform-minded clergy were instrumental in spreading the new doctrine through their ministries.

Bernard argues that those bishops who were instrumental in the king's divorce were rewarded by being promoted to vacant sees. Cuthbert Tunstall was transferred to Durham in 1530 and Stephen Gardiner to the See of Winchester in 1529 (1530).¹³ Rex notes that the conservative bishops were asked to visit the Charterhouse monks to win them over to royal supremacy.¹⁴ This author concurs with Bernard and Rex that both these strategies served royal supremacy and increased the conservative influence in the church. This author also concurs with Chibi, who argues that the intellectual clergy became more aware that they were a threat to Catholic orthodoxy—they were therefore cautious in their domestic and international connections and at least complied outwardly with supremacy.¹⁵ Furthermore, Chibi notes that Cromwell ordered the conservative bishops to preach against the pope at St. Paul's Cross.

⁸ A Letter of the Archbishop of York's, setting forth his Zeal in the King's Service, and against the Pope's Authority. June 25, 1535. Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P. 236; Burnet, Book II, No. XXXIV, pp. 457–458.

⁹ Eamon Duffy: *The Stripping of the Altars*. 1992, p. 387 (hereafter, Duffy 1992).

¹⁰ Chibi 2003, Appendix: Biographical Information, pp. 289, 293, 298, 300, 306.

¹¹ Chibi 2003, p. 209.

¹² *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, Vol. I, pp. 30–31; Chibi 2003, Appendix: Biographical Information, pp. 296, 298, 300.

¹³ Bernard 2005, pp. 43–44, 196.

¹⁴ Rex 2006, p. 21.

¹⁵ Chibi 2003, p. 176.

Cromwell would publish their sermons as propaganda favoring the king.¹⁶ This author sees Cromwell using the conservative bishops to defend supremacy.

The other conservative bishops assured the throne of their obedience. For instance, Archbishop Lee assured Cromwell of his commitment to royal supremacy, and had forwarded open benefices since January 1, 1535.¹⁷ One of the bishops wrote to Cranmer that he had encouraged Archbishop Lee to preach the new doctrine.¹⁸ Rex notes that Lee had lamented to Cromwell that only a few priests in his diocese preached the supremacy.¹⁹

Lee also assured the king that he would use the book *On the Order of Preaching*, according to the succession law. He also promised to erase the pope's name—"pro Papa and de Papa"—from their service books. Lee also sent a letter to "Lord Duresme" [Bishop of Durham, Cuthbert Tunstall], asking him to put "the new order in the old books."²⁰ As seen in this example, the conservative bishops supported each other in their compliance with the new order.

All bishops' communication with the pope had to be halted, and they had to surrender any papal bulls in their possession to the king. Henry controlled all episcopal appointments. Diocesan visitations were transferred to lay commissioners; one of whom, Dr. Layton, ordered the bishops to bring the bulls of confirmation from Rome to him by a certain date. Layton's letter aimed particularly at the conservative bishops, as seen in Bishop Tunstall's response to the king's request, on January 29, 1535:

Advertising the same, that I have of late received a Letter from Master Doctor Layton, declaring unto me that ye willyd him to write unto me, that albeit the Kings Highnes hath directed his Letters Missives to all and singular his bishops in this his Realme, to appere before his Grace immediately after the Feast of the Purificacyon next cominge to the Intent that they shall deliver up unto his Graces Handes all their Bullys of Confirmation, or such other like, as they have had from Rome at any Time heretofore.²¹

At the time, however, Tunstall confirmed that he had already denounced all that was contrary

To his prerogative Royall, at suche Time as I presented to his Grace his Bull unto him, as that will appere by the other of my Homage remayinge with the saide Bull in the Kings Records now byeynge in your keeping, as all Bishops ever have been accustomed to doe by the Laws of this Realm heretofore used.²²

Bishop Tunstall's letter is evidence of how slowly the process of supremacy was moving in various dioceses. Due to his age, Tunstall asked if the king would allow him to send his representative, William Redmayn, "who thereupon shall deliver the said Bullys [bulls] into your

¹⁶ John Stokesley (1475–1539), Bishop of London, since 1530, John Longland (1473–1547), Bishop of Lincoln since 1520, Richard Nix (c.1447–1535), Bishop of Norwich since 1501, Cuthbert Tunstall, Bishop of Durham since 1531, and Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, since 1530, Chibi 2003, p. 176; Chibi 2003, Appendix: Biographical Information, pp. 297, 302–303, 309, 310.

¹⁷ St. P. Vol. I, Pt. 2, No. XXVIII, p. 428. L&P, VIII, No. 284, p. 116, SP 1/90, Fols. 182–183; No. 307, p. 125, SP 1/91, Fols. 3–4.

¹⁸ A Letter of D. Legh's, concerning their Visitation at York. January 13, [1535?] Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 4. P. 104; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book II, No. XXXIX, pp. 465–466.

¹⁹ Rex 2006, p. 21.

²⁰ Cott. Libr., Cleop. E. 6. P. 236; Burnet, Book II, No. XXXIV, pp. 458–459. Rex 2006, p. 21.

²¹ A Letter of Tunstall's upon the King's ordering the Bishops to send up their Bulls. January 29, [1535?] Cott. Lib. Cleop. E. 6. P. 246; Burnet, Book III, No. XL, p. 466.

²² Cott. Lib. Cleop. E. 6. P. 246; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. XL, p. 466.

Hands, or to whom the Kings Grace will appoint to receive them, yf the Kings Will and Pleasure be to have them.” Later, Tunstall confessed that the remaining five bulls concerning his bishopric were sent “one to King’s Highness, one concerning Lord Cardinal [Wolsey], one to Late Bishop of Rochester to take my Othe to the ‘Bishop of Rome’ with the Othe as hathe been accustomyd to be done.”²³

Tunstall shared the same conservative outlook as the Bishop of Rochester, John Fisher, who was imprisoned at this time. Bishop Fisher had been detained by Parliament as early as December 1534 for refusing to take the Oath of Succession. Tunstall must have decided to become a supporter of royal supremacy to avoid Fisher’s fate. Fisher was interrogated because he had met and communicated with the Nun of Kent who predicted the downfall of the king. Bernard thinks that the government was determined to use Fisher’s involvement with the Nun of Kent against him. Cromwell had requested that Fisher admit his guilt and seek the king’s pardon for having heard, believed and concealed the nun’s revelations.²⁴ Chibi argues that the king had sent Tunstall a cordial reply regarding Fisher and More, which was an indication that their opposition was perceived as more serious.²⁵

Bernard finds that Fisher’s colleagues—the most conservative bishops—were not intellectually or emotionally ready to form a collective defiance against the supremacy, with oaths and demands over *praemunire*.²⁶ Furthermore, he argues, if the bishops had realized the implications of Henry’s doings—a confrontation with the pope—they most likely would have sided with Fisher. Bernard notes that the bishops failed to stand together against Henry, because they were submissive to royal supremacy without questioning it.²⁷ Certainly their position was weakened since they had no jurisdictional authority and the convocation’s decisions were replaced by the new parliamentary laws.

The struggle between the reform-minded and the conservative clergy regarding doctrinal changes continued. In a letter to Cromwell, William Barlow (d. 1568), Bishop of St. Asaph,²⁸ stated that the Bishop of St. David came to the house of his servant and forced him to deliver his English New Testament.²⁹

Fynally they abused Fashiones at length to discover at your Commandment; I shall be ready with such certenter of Truth, that no Advirsary shall be able to make contrary Denyall; which so performed, it may then please your good Mastershippe to licence me to deaparte, under the lawfull Favour of your Protection; without the which, nether can I without Perell repair Home, nor there I Safe contynue, among so odious Adversaries of Christs Doctrine, by whose Tyranny, that I may not be unjustly opprest, I most humbly beseech your assistant Aide.³⁰

²³ Cott. Lib. Cleop. E. 6. P. 246; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. XL, p. 466.

²⁴ Bernard 2005, p. 116.

²⁵ Chibi 2003, p. 169.

²⁶ The Statutes of *Praemunire* and Provisions were passed during the latter half of the fourteenth century. The *Praemunire* Statute prevented papal interference with the jurisdictional rights of the Crown in regard to benefices. The Provisions Statute checked the nomination to the English benefices in derogation of the rights of English patrons. Dickens & Dorothy Carr 1967, pp. 166–167. Bernard 2005, p. 198.

²⁷ Bernard 2005, p. 198.

²⁸ William Barlow was later transferred to become Bishop of St. David. See Chibi, Appendix, Biographical Information. 2003, p. 289; Bernard 2005, pp. 266–267.

²⁹ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P. 246; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. LX, pp. 464–465.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 465.

At that time, the conservative clergy regarded those who had translations of the New Testament as heretics. Barlow, a reform-minded clergyman, did not see any hope for reforms in his diocese unless idolatry was suppressed, so he sought to resign.³¹ This shows how the bishops had no power over doctrinal changes, and when disagreements occurred, bishops had to appeal to the king. It also demonstrates how freedom to behave differently ended in opposition and violence toward the reform-minded Barlow.

Barlow felt a threat from the opposing party, the conservatives, who did not tolerate the doctrinal reforms of the reform-minded clergy. Although both parties were in broad agreement on the supremacy question, they were divided on doctrinal issues.³² The division among the clergy affected how the adiaphora questions developed and how they were interpreted.

Marriage of priests was a major issue, and, as a result, the number of priests who were married or celibate fluctuated throughout the 1530s. The official policy of the Henrician church was that celibacy was enforced by law, even though preaching continued in defense of priestly marriage and some clergy took wives. Stephen Gardiner, in his *De Vera Obedientia*, supported the marriage of clergy even though a law was published soon after that threatened to deprive married priests of their benefices.³³

Instead of the verbal oath to renounce their allegiances to the pope, the bishops were asked to do so with their signatures. Of course, there were various ways to interpret the government's proceedings—either to mitigate its actions against the Catholic powers, or to enforce the law to its extreme. As a result, in February 1535, bishops were asked to formally renounce their allegiance to the pope. There were eleven bishops, including Archbishops Cranmer and Lee, who signed their declarations. By March, four more bishops had sworn allegiance.³⁴ By April, one more bishop was sworn in and still another by June.³⁵

Bernard states that Bishop Stokesley unwillingly renounced papal authority and swore the oath in February 1535, in fear of being accused of *praemunire*. Furthermore, he finds that Stephen Gardiner published *De Vera Obedientia* to justify the king's actions. Gardiner could denounce papal power, but left the way open for eventual compromise.³⁶ Publishing his book and defending supremacy were intended to show he was on good terms with the king.

In addition to defending the supremacy laws, Gardiner influenced the delineation of the bishops' new roles as the delegation of duties among bishops was not clearly defined. The king's trust in Archbishop Cranmer, to whom he allowed more authority than he did to conservative bishops like Stephen Gardiner, caused dissent. Thus, the change in ecclesiastical jurisdiction also affected the relationship between the conservative ("Old Learning") and reform-minded ("New Learning") bishops.³⁷

³¹ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P. 246; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. LX, p. 465.

³² Eppley argues that obedience to Royal policies was equal to obeying God's will. See Eppley 2007, p. 13.

³³ Parish: *Clerical Marriage and the English Reformation*. 2000, pp. 27–28 (hereafter, Parish 2000).

³⁴ L&P, VIII, No. 190, p. 74, No. 311, p. 126.

³⁵ L&P, VIII, No. 494, p. 190, No. 803, p. 305.

³⁶ Bernard 2005, 190, 193, 197.

³⁷ In this study the term "conservative" ("Old Learning") is used for the clergy who either approved or disapproved the King's Supremacy, and wished to maintain Catholic doctrine and ceremonies. The term "reform-minded" ("New Learning") clergy refers to those who supported both the supremacy and change in doctrine and

The delegation of supreme authority in the church was problematic. One of the rare instances in which the king delegated it to a bishop in the beginning of Reformation was when Cranmer took his pallium in Rome and soon after became the Archbishop of Canterbury. The dispute that ensued was because the king allowed Cranmer more power than the other bishops. This caused conflict that changed the king's plan to give those powers, to Thomas Cromwell, a lay leader, instead of to a bishop. It also meant that bishops bringing reform ideas had to be careful not to assume that their authority exceeded that of the king.

Cranmer's letter to Thomas Cromwell of May 12, 1535 shows that Bishop Gardiner complained about Cranmer's title as *Totius Angliae Primas*.³⁸ There was conflict between them over the transfer of powers from the pope to the king, and the king's delegation of his powers to the archbishop.³⁹ Chibi states that the king could not delegate ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the archbishop in real terms because of the conflict of interest with other bishops.⁴⁰

During the beginning of the Reformation in England, it was not always clear who held authority—the king or the archbishop. The Ecclesiastical Appointment Act implied that Henry had delegated temporary, qualified permission to the Archbishop of Canterbury to act on the king's behalf. But Henry reserved the right to make the final determination himself.⁴¹ Regardless of this provision, the act later caused confusion among other bishops over Cranmer's rights as metropolitan or spiritual overseer of the clergy, so the king had to rescind Cranmer's metropolitan powers.

As late as April, Cranmer still acted as metropolitan. When Cranmer tried to visit Gardiner's diocese, Gardiner viewed Cranmer as assuming the king's jurisdictional role. He would not allow Cranmer's visit. MacCulloch finds that Gardiner's outspoken criticism of the pace of religious reform resulted in the loss of his position as the king's secretary to Cromwell. Gardiner

rites. The word "evangelical" will be used to refer the English and Continental Reformers whose outlook was akin to the theology of Wittenberg.

Rex has rightly pointed out that the phrase "New Learning" is familiar to historians of Tudor England and somewhat archaic, and provides a synonym for Renaissance Humanism (the revival of classical languages and literature during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries), and suggested that it should be used in its original meaning. He further notes that in the sixteenth century, it was a pejorative term variously attached to such terms as "reformed," "radical," "evangelical," or "Protestant" as a description of religious error. On the other hand, as seen in the context of elite and popular culture during the sixteenth century, the phrase was used to mean "God's Word" and new doctrine associated with it. Its use by the conservatives as rhetorical strategy was less successful. It was used more successfully by Erasmian Humanists to refer to "new erudition," far removed from heresy. It was a concern to the ruling party when the phrase took on political overtones, such as the equation between the supremacy and the "new learning," suggesting that those who opposed Protestantism were committed to the papacy. Richard Rex: "The New Learning." In *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*. 44.1993, pp. 26, 28–29, 34, 37. MacCulloch recommends using 'evangelical' to describe religious reforms. In his opinion the terms 'Protestant' or 'Lutheran' will create confusion at this early stage of the English Reformation. MacCulloch.1996, p. 2. McEntegart speaks of Cromwell's advisers as using "evangelical." McEntegart. 2002, p. 6. Dugmore divides the two opposing parties into "Henrician Catholics" and "Reformed Catholics." Dugmore 1958, p. 106.

³⁸ The Archbishop of Canterbury's Mandate, to inhibit the Provincial Bishops to exercised of any Jurisdiction during the King's Visitation. September 18, 1535. Regist. Stokesly, Fol. 47. XXI, *Ecclesiastical History*, pp. 123–124.

³⁹ Act Forbidding papal dispensations and the payment of Peter's Pence, A.D. 1534. 25 Henry VIII. cap. 21. *Documents*, LIII, pp. 223–226. Stokesley had argued that if they acknowledge Cranmer's authority as 'Primate of All England', this might seem as if they acted against the Crown. MacCulloch 1996, p. 126.

⁴⁰ Chibi 2003, p. 192; See also MacCulloch 1996, pp. 126, 129.

⁴¹ Act Forbidding Papal Dispensations and the Payment of Peter's Pence, A.D. 1534. 25 Henry VIII. cap. 21. *Documents*, LIII Ibid. pp. 213–215. Elton 1977, p. 183.

was transferred to the diocese of Winchester in April 1534.⁴² Gardiner protested that since the last visit, he had paid the tenth part of the spiritualities according to the act and should not be charged again.⁴³ Gardiner accused Cranmer of considering his position as parallel to that of the Metropolitan of the Roman Church. Cranmer thought that, just as the pope delegated duties to bishops without detracting from his own authority, Henry was at liberty to delegate without diminishing his oversight. Cranmer assured Gardiner that he had no intention to be above other bishops.⁴⁴ Cranmer himself may have been unaware how much authority the bishops had lost in the transition and what problems might ensue. During the first consolidation period, it was not even clear to Henry's most trusted bishop how authority should be exercised in practice. Cranmer saw his position as bishop according to the Roman Church hierarchy.

Gardiner considered Cranmer the representative of the pope.⁴⁵ Since Cranmer had received his pallium from Rome, it is not surprising that the bishops still feared accusations of *praemunire*.⁴⁶ Chibi finds that Gardiner raised questions of his real authority over the archbishop's metropolitan powers. Metropolitan jurisdiction did not exist after the separation from Rome, Stokesley argues, since Cranmer's exercise of his office left no authority to the other bishops. Cranmer was seen as a representative of the papacy rather than the king.⁴⁷ Furthermore, the royal power was only nominal. The king needed a spiritual officer to oversee *potestas ordinis* and another one to oversee legal and temporal matters.⁴⁸

The conflict showed how difficult it was to interpret the supremacy in practice. Eventually, the king realized that one subordinate bishop in higher authority caused conflicts and prevented the desired reform throughout the kingdom.⁴⁹ Cranmer was still puzzled by Gardiner's argument and he asked Cromwell's advice: "Now I pray you, good Maister Secretary, of your Advice, whither I shall need to writte unto the Kyng's Highnes herin."⁵⁰ Hence Henry delegated all spiritual and temporal powers to his lay leader, Thomas Cromwell.⁵¹ Under Cromwell, lay

⁴² MacCulloch 1996, p. 132.

⁴³ Cranmer's Letter to Cromwell; justifying himself upon some complaints made by Gardiner. May 1535(?). Burnet, Book II, No. XXXVII, pp. 463–464.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ See Margaret Bowker: "The Supremacy and the Episcopate: The Struggle for Control, 1534–1540." In *The Historical Journal*, XVIII, 2. (1975), pp. 230–231, 233 (hereafter, Bowker 1975); see also MacCulloch 1996, p. 126.

⁴⁶ The Statutes of *Praemunire* and Provisions were passed during the latter half of the fourteenth century. The *Praemunire* Statue prevented papal interference with the jurisdictional rights of the crown in regard to benefices. The Provisions Statute checked the nomination to the English benefices in derogation of the rights of English patrons. Dickens & Carr 1967, pp. 166–167; Bernard 2005, pp. 71, 308; Rex 1993, p. 8.

⁴⁷ Chibi 2003, pp. 185–188.

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 191.

⁴⁹ The Archbishop of Canterbury's Mandate, to inhibit the Provincial Bishops to exercise of any Jurisdiction during the King's Visitation. September 18, 1535. Regist. Stokesly, Fol. 47. XXI, *Ecclesiastical History*, pp. 123–124. John Stokesley was appointed to the See of London in 1530. Bernard 2005, p. 44.

⁵⁰ Cranmer's Letter to Cromwell; justifying himself, upon some complaints made by Gardiner. Burnet, Book II, No. XXXVII, pp. 463–464; *Cranmer's Memorials*, Vol. 1, pp. 46–48. Canterbury's legal jurisdiction ended in August 1535. MacCulloch 1996, p. 133.

⁵¹ King Henry VIII's Commission in allowance of the Deputation made by Cromwell, Vicar-General. Biblioth. Cotton. Cleop. 6. F. 2. Fol. 131. 1535. *Ecclesiastical History*, XXX, pp. 119–123. It was Henry's idea, that princes should appoint the lay magistracy to examine the doings of the bishops, the purpose of which was to safeguard supremacy. Cargill Thompson 1980, p. 122.

commissioners made visitations to the dioceses to ensure that the necessary changes had been made.⁵²

Since constitutional change had taken place with various statute laws that imposed the royal will, Parliament replaced convocation as the legal body for ecclesiastical as well as secular legislations. At the end of January, 1535 Cromwell established royal commissions in order to estimate the annual value of monasteries, parsonages, and other spiritual benefices. Each county in England had its own special commission, authorized by the king.⁵³ Duffy argues that Cromwell's open criticism of traditional religious practices and doctrine alarmed the conservatives. The alarm was increased by the visits of the royal commissioners to the monasteries.⁵⁴

Ecclesiastical jurisdiction was in the hands of the lay commissioners. In this new situation, the bishops decided to redefine the ministerial duties of their episcopal office. While accepting the supremacy, they also accepted the king as overseer. They expected that the new doctrine would also be the judge of the king's actions, as the body politic constituted the church and the state.⁵⁵ The bishops' demand that the king's actions be judged by the same doctrine at least theoretically increased their power. How much they were able to influence the doctrinal changes in practice depended on the laws attached to the changes.

The reform-minded bishops' arguments were the same as those written in Melanchthon's *Loci Communes* of 1535. Here Melanchthon saw the entire secular magistracy as a member of the church, which should be obedient to doctrine.⁵⁶ This may not quite apply to the English situation, since it was an anomaly for a king to be head of both church and state. Melanchthon divided ecclesiastical polity into two categories: (a) divinely ordained ministry, which included preaching the Gospel and administering the sacraments; and (b) the order of the church that has ecclesiastical jurisdiction.⁵⁷ Henry took the second of these from the bishops, as well as the right to define doctrine.

Without the pope's leadership, the doctrine of ecclesiology changed in the English Church. The reform-minded bishops and evangelical clergy adopted the definition of the church according to the doctrine in the *Confessio Augustana*, i.e., to preach the Gospel and to administer the sacraments. The Catholic Mass was celebrated according to the principle of *lex orandi—lex credendi*. Thus the doctrine of soteriology could be interpreted either by belief in "Scripture alone" according to reform-minded clergy, or by belief in the sacrifice of the Mass according to conservative clergy.

Melanchthon offered two proposals regarding authority to define doctrine. Citing Isaiah, Melanchthon appealed to the king by asking him to protect the church and propagate its

⁵² The Archbishop of Canterbury's Mandate, to inhibit the Provincial Bishops to exercise of any Jurisdiction during the King's Visitation. September 18, 1535. Regist. Stokesly, Fol. 47. XXI, *Ecclesiastical History*, pp. 123–124; Note on the Appointment of Cromwell as Vicar-General. His appointment may have occurred in the middle of December 1534. *Documents*, No. LX, pp. 250–251. Cargill Thompson 1980, p. 122.

⁵³ L&P VIII, No. 75, p. 24; No. 129, p. 40, SP 1/89, Fols. 74–84.

⁵⁴ Duffy 1992, pp. 383–384.

⁵⁵ The Judgment of some Bishops concerning the King's Supremacy. Ex Mss. D. Stillingfleet; Burnet, Vol. 4. Book III, No. X, p. 100.

⁵⁶ LC 1535, Fols 445L, 447R; Selderhuis 2011, pp. 220–221.

⁵⁷ LC, 1535, Fols. 459L; 459R, 461L.

doctrine.⁵⁸ Melanchthon believed that as supreme head of the Church of England, it was up to the king to resolve controversial doctrinal issues as well as civil disputes;⁵⁹ the king was the protector of the pious against unjust severity.⁶⁰ Melanchthon may not have realized at the time that the supremacy law gave the king the power to define doctrine.

Second, Melanchthon wrote, rather than having a single individual resolve disagreements in the church, synods should resolve disputes and establish doctrinal consensus.⁶¹ At that time, Henry would not have accepted the latter proposal.

According to the supremacy law, the king's position as supreme head included the right to define doctrine and reform the church, but he did not have the right to preach, ordain, or administer the sacraments and rites of the church (*potestas ordinis*)—these rights were reserved for the clergy.⁶² The Supremacy Law stated:

The Sovereign Lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall have full power and authority from time to time to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, whatsoever they be, which by any manner spiritual authority or jurisdiction ought or may lawfully be reformed, repressed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained, or amended, most to the pleasure of Almighty God, the increase of virtue in Christ's religion, and for the conservation of the peace, unity and tranquillity of this realm.⁶³

Bray finds that opposition to Henry centered on his claim to have the right to define doctrine. Furthermore, Bray argues that in the past the ecumenical councils of the early church established doctrine with the emperor, who presided over the deliberations of the councils; but the decisions were made by the assemblies of bishops. Bray thinks that Henry could not have done this because he must have been aware that most bishops would not have supported his break from Rome.⁶⁴ The convocations still acted as bishops' assemblies, but it was up to the king to accept their recommendations. The difficulty arose in the interpretation of the ceremonies, since they were linked closely to doctrine. Since the bishops' duties were to perform the sacraments and the rites of the Mass, the form of prayer was the form of doctrine—*lex orandi—lex credendi*.

Because the ecclesiastical laws were now laws accepted by Parliament, the church had lost its power. Lay control over clergy was reflected in another measure of legality: Henry announced a

⁵⁸ Wengert 2010, XII, pp. 24, 27.

⁵⁹ LC 1535, 7 R. The Prophet Isaiah, when he prophesies that pious 'Kings' would be 'tutors' of the Church, as he put it, demands that kings should protect the pious against unjustified ferocity so that they can take care that right doctrine be propagated. What titles, what trophies are more to be wished for, by great and wise Kings, than that this sweetest name be ascribed to them with a heavenly voice, that they should be called the tutors of the church of Christ? LC 1535, 7R; MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1555, p. 339.

⁶⁰ LC 1535, Fol. 7R; MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1555, p. 339; Wengert 2010, XII, p. 24, 27.

⁶¹ LC 1535, Fol. 5R; MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1555, p. 339; Wengert 2010, XII, p. 27. Therefore, since there is so much both difficulty and danger in putting together a method, it has often occurred to me that it should not be the work of a single individual, but of a synod. In a synod, the most learned and excellent men can diligently make judgment, after deliberation in common over all those articles concerning which controversies often arise and there is even some disagreement among the ancients, and can publish a clear and completer doctrine of religion LC 1535, Fol. 3L, R; MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1555, p 335.

⁶² Bray 2004, pp. 113–114.

⁶³ The Act of Supremacy, 1534 (26 Henry VIII c. 1); Bray 2004, p. 114.

⁶⁴ Bray 2004, pp. 113–114.

royal proclamation on June 9, 1535,⁶⁵ which combined all the previous statutes (Act of Supremacy, Act of Succession) that the clergy had to obey.⁶⁶ These acts reflected Henry's succession and implicitly included the denial of the pope's authority over the English Church.

The conservative bishops surely held the pope as head of the universal church. At the same time, they were most probably concerned with the *praemunire* legislation and the king's authority to use other legislative measures against the ecclesiastics, such as having a lay leader in charge of inspecting the clergy's obedience.

For example, to avoid any suspicion from the king's commissioners, the Bishop of Winchester, Stephen Gardiner, in his letter to Cromwell on June 10, 1535, offered very little information about his activities in his diocese. Gardiner and another conservative bishop, Stokesley, made assurances that they followed the supremacy laws and confessed the true Catholic faith.⁶⁷

Religious Houses under the New Order

In addition to secular clergy, there were 750 monasteries, priories, convents and dependent cells in England and Wales. The most flourishing were the Carthusians and Observant Franciscans. Monasteries were mostly self-sufficient units in isolated rural areas supported by landed endowments; friaries integrated with the local community. They were mostly located in towns supported by charitable donations.⁶⁸

Evidence shows that religious houses and their professions of supremacy were also closely inspected by the king's agents. The monasteries and religious houses became the main target of the supremacy law, and noncompliant ones were brought to the king's attention and punished according to the law. They were opposed to Henry's new supremacy laws, since monasteries traditionally were under the pope's jurisdiction. The lay commissioners sought out monasteries that did not follow the new statutes—one example being those that did not erase the pope's name from the service-books. These monasteries would fall under the direct jurisdiction of the king. Their abbots would lose their positions and their successors be appointed and sworn to an oath.⁶⁹ From that time on, Cromwell's plan was to create a "Book of Findings" (*Valor Ecclesiasticus*) of the religious houses. The royal commissioners would make a detailed inventory of the wealth of the church in order to maximize the government's income.⁷⁰ This was a nascent plan for the dissolution of the monastic system.

⁶⁵ *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, Vol. I. No. 158, pp. 229–232.

⁶⁶ The First Act of Succession, A.D. 1534, 25 Henry VIII, Cap. 22, *Documents* No. LIV, pp. 242–243; L&P, VII, No. 392, p. 164; No. 395, p. 166. The Supremacy Act, A.D. 1534. 26 Henry VIII, CAP. 1. *Documents*, No. LV, pp. 243–244. The King's Proclamation for the Abolishing of the Usurped Power of the Pope; *Letters of King Henry*, No. VIII, June 9, 1534/5, p. 125; L&P, VIII, No. 52, p. 18.

⁶⁷ Bishop Gardiner to Cromwell. June 10, 1535? St. P. Vol. I, Pt. 2, XXX, p. 430.

⁶⁸ Rex 2006, pp. 36–37.

⁶⁹ *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, Vol I, p. 26; L&P, VIII, No. 76, p. 24.

⁷⁰ Act annexing First fruits and Tenths to the Crown, 1534. 26 Hen. VIII, c. 3. *The English Reformation. Modern Historical Documents*. Eds. Dickens & Carr 1967. pp. 65–68. Rex 2006, pp. 44–45.

The religious were an easy target for non-compliance. Opposition to the supremacy act was common among monks and nuns, as the Archbishop of Canterbury wrote in a letter to the king.⁷¹ A number of friars, priories, and monks openly opposed the king's laws, and supported the pope and Queen Catherine. Part of the purpose of requiring the swearing of the oath of allegiance to the king was to persuade the people of the legitimacy of the king's divorce from Catherine. The divorce was an implicit rejection of the pope. Those opposing the law were guilty of treason, which was punishable by death.⁷²

The religious houses were the main establishments that preserved popular culture in England. Intruding on them could be equated to destroying the remnants of popular culture that still flourished in large parishes and their endowments.

However, Christopher St. German added that the crown and Parliament should always exercise royal power together. This allowed great powers to the king,⁷³ who certainly used Parliament's prerogative in order to protect himself from accusations of tyranny. By appealing to Parliament he could present his actions as legal, since Parliament represented the whole nation in its decisions. This ideal was espoused by Christopher St. German, an English humanist, on the relationship of church and state. He supported the idea that the crown and parliament had power to define a doctrine that defended Henrician supremacy.⁷⁴ He also wrote that the pope's previously exercised power had only been usurpation. Parliamentary statutes had renounced papal authority in England and the idea of power made by divine law; the pope had power in England only according to human law.⁷⁵ If indeed the parliamentary laws were interpreted as divine, then their stipulation in adiaphora matters would not bind consciences. This would be an extreme position in further discussions on adiaphora. There would be a claim that since the king's authority was divine, the laws relating to adiaphora were not binding on conscience.

Disobedience and its Consequences

Henry had to face opposition on two fronts. First, he had to secure the obedience of his clergy to his supremacy in the church. Second, he had to prevent Catholic influence through Catherine the Princess Dowager and Lady Mary, both of whom refused the oath of succession.⁷⁶ The most significant examples of disobedience are the cases of Thomas More and John Fisher. The Nun of Kent had predicted the downfall of the king, because of his divorce from Catherine, to John Fisher and Thomas More. Both men were accused of disobedience to the supremacy laws.⁷⁷ Duffy also notes that More's fate is an example how the Reformation's attack on popular culture was evident. More supported both the invocation of saints and doctrine of purgatory. The radical preaching that was directed against these doctrines was not for their reform, but abolition.⁷⁸

⁷¹ Cott. Libr. Cleopatra, E. vi. 232; *Cranmer's Memorials*, Vol. 2 Appendix, XIII, pp. 263–266.

⁷² The Treason Act, A.D. 1534. 26 Henry VIII, CAP, 13. *Documents*, pp. 247–250. L&P, VIII, No. 609, pp. 229–230. See Bernard 2005, pp. 155, 157, 159; St. P. Vol. I, Pt. 2, XXXIII, pp. 437–438.

⁷³ Eppley 2007, pp. 59–60, 63–64, 76.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

⁷⁵ Eppley 2007, pp. 107–108.

⁷⁶ Bernard 2005, pp. 77–78.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 89, 116.

⁷⁸ Duffy 1992, pp. 380–381.

Fisher's case shows how dissent from royal policies was handled. Eppley argues Chapuys was aware that Fisher had asked help from the emperor to invade England and depose the king. Fisher believed that, whenever the civil authority acted against God's will, then his obedience was first due to God.⁷⁹

Thomas More and his confessor, John Fisher, who was Bishop of Rochester, were interrogated because they had met and communicated with the Nun of Kent.⁸⁰ Henry especially wanted to see these two men of high ecclesiastical rank swear allegiance both to the succession and to the supremacy. More and Fisher⁸¹ were given six weeks to consider the matter.⁸² Bishop "John Fisher, Doctour of Divinitie, late bishop [of Rochester] was interrogated on the King's behalf on June 14th in the 27th year of the Reign of King Henrie the Eight witin the Towere [of London],"⁸³ as the event was described by the Chronicle:

This yere also, the 17th day of June, was arreigned at Westminster in the Kinges Benche Mr. John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, for treason against the Kinge, and there was condemned by a jurie of knightes and esquiers [the Lord Chauncellore sittinge as Highe Judge]... The effect of the treason was for denying the Kinge to be supreme head of the Churche of Englande, according to a statute made at the last session of the Parliament." [The pope did elect him as cardinal and sent the Cardinal's hat as far as Calais... it was too late and therefore he neither wore it nor enjoyed his office.]⁸⁴

More did not approve the king's divorce, and would not respond to interrogations regarding the oath. Asked whether he would obey the king as supreme head of the church, he said he could not answer.⁸⁵ All he would say was that he was a loyal subject of the king. More was beheaded on June 19, 1535.

The 19th day of June, beinge Saturday, the 3 muncks of the Charterhouse, afore written, were drawne from the Towere to tyborne, and were executed according to their judgment... for refusing to subscribe to the new oath of Supremacy as enacted by the last Parliament.⁸⁶

In an attempt to assist Fisher, the pope had made him a cardinal on May 20, 1535, and he also wrote to King Francis of France and King Ferdinand of Hungary on Fisher's behalf. Cardinal du Bellay feared the worst: that Fisher being made a cardinal just made him a victim of martyrdom.⁸⁷ Henry continued with the trial.⁸⁸

⁷⁹ Eppley 2007, p. 15.

⁸⁰ Strype, Vol. 1, pp. 276–282; *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, Vol. I, p. 23. Strype, Vol. 1, pp. 276–282. L&P, VIII, No. 666, p. 251; No. 742, p. 277; No. 856, p. 330. Cromwell had learned about their dealings with the Maid of Kent through Fisher, a chaplain of the Queen and schoolmaster of the Princess. Consequently, Fisher was accused of letting those revelations become a threat to the King. Cromwell told Fisher that it was his duty to tell the king of the Holy Maid of Kent's preaching if he believed it was divine revelation. This kind of prophesying was a remnant of popular religion, and Catholic spirituality was seen as a threat to Royal Supremacy. Elizabeth Barton, the Holy Maid of Kent, had acknowledged that her revelations were false, and under pressure she acknowledged that what was said against her was true. Bernard 2005, pp. 94, 116, 118–119.

⁸¹ The pope had made him Cardinal on May 20, 1535. L&P, VIII, No. 742, p. 277.

⁸² L&P, VIII, No. 666, p. 251; No. 742, p. 277; No. 856, p. 330.

⁸³ St. P. Vol. I. Pt. 2, XXXI, pp. 431–432.

⁸⁴ *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, Vol. I, pp. 28–29; L&P, VIII, No. 985, pp. 388–389.

⁸⁵ St. P. Vol. I, Pt. 2, XXXII, p. 436.

⁸⁶ *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, Vol. I, p. 29.

⁸⁷ L&P, VIII, 742, p. 272, No. 837, p. 320; Nos. 1116–17, p. 437; Henry was incensed by the news that Fisher was made a Cardinal by Pope Paul III. See Bernard 2005. p. 121; Elton 1977, pp. 193–194.

Because John Fisher refused the oath, Henry authorized his hanging. Later Henry commuted this to the nobler form of execution, decapitation, which took place on July 6, 1535.⁸⁹ Bernard offers that More had told Fisher's servant he had not refused to swear to the succession. This may show that the marriage of Henry and Anne Boleyn was not the reason for Thomas More's refusing the oath.⁹⁰ This author agrees with Richard Rex, who sees in the execution of Fisher and More a change in the official attitude to the cult of saints. Traditional religion often developed a cult of martyrdom around victims. The government ordered preachers to proclaim that Fisher and More were traitors.⁹¹

The Reformation, from Henry's point of view, was a state action against any ecclesiastics who did not support the supremacy. In defending royal supremacy, he used quasi-Protestant terms, such as "the King who of his most noble and gentle heart more desireth the reformation of his loving subjects by gentle warnings and monitions than by rigor and extremity of his laws."⁹² Henry condemned Fisher's writings that diminished his royal authority, since the purpose of the king's statutes was to abolish "the usurped power of the Bishop of Rome".⁹³ The Catholic practice of selling indulgences was forbidden by statutory law: "Nor declare, publish, use or practice any such pardon or indulgence in any monasteries, churches or places." Fisher argued that the application of the controversial text in Scripture to Henry's divorce resided with the pope, as Rex asserts.⁹⁴ Thus, Fisher became the enemy of the monarch.⁹⁵ Henry must have felt threatened by Bishop Fisher's presence; and his execution must be interpreted as Henry seizing not only the pope's authority to interpret Scripture, but also his authority as head of the universal church. This is also seen in Henry's response to the pope's letter.

The Pope's Brief to Francis, and Henry's Reaction to It

After learning of the execution of Fisher, the pope was more determined than ever to execute a sentence against Henry VIII.⁹⁶ There was also a pamphlet that circulated around Europe with a graphic description of the execution, to the horror of Protestants and Catholics alike.⁹⁷ When royal commissioners in England read the pamphlet about the executions of John Fisher and Thomas More, they immediately started preparations to strengthen the nation's fortifications, expecting an imminent attack from the Continent.⁹⁸ Cardinal Tournon appealed to the pope to obtain aid from the Catholic European princes to avenge the injuries inflicted by the king on the

⁸⁸ St. P. Vol. I, Pt. 2, XXXII, pp. 431–432; L&P, VIII, No. 867, pp. 340–341. Elton 1977, pp. 193–194.

⁸⁹ St. P. Vol. I, Pt. 2, pp. 431–432; L&P, VIII, No. 867, pp. 340–341; SP 6/7, Fols. 5, 10. Bernard thinks that the King wanted to find out from More whether he regarded the King's statute as lawful. Bernard 2005, pp. 144–145.

⁹⁰ Bernard 2005, pp. 121–122, 141.

⁹¹ Rex 2006, p. 152.

⁹² Ordering Surrender of Bishop Fisher's Sermon, Books. *Tudor Royal Proclamation*, Vol. I, No. 161, pp. 235–236.

⁹³ Ordering Surrender of Bishop Fisher's Sermon, Books. *Tudor Royal Proclamation*, Vol. I, No. 161, pp. 236.

⁹⁴ Rex 2006, pp. 3–4, 18.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 237.

⁹⁶ Gardiner's Tract on Fisher's Execution 1535, *Obedience in Church and State*, pp. 21–65; L&P. VIII, No. 949, p. 373; No. 1116, p. 437; No. 1118, p. 438.

⁹⁷ Elton 1977, p. 194.

⁹⁸ L&P, VIII, No. 1018, p. 402.

church. The Holy See looked to France to lead any force against England, but the French were unwilling to help since they knew of Henry's formidable fleet.⁹⁹ Francis's support of Henry's divorce and break with Rome angered Pope Paul III. In order to have Francis as an ally, the pope asked him to be a mediator between himself and Henry VIII.¹⁰⁰

The previous pope, Clement VII, had censured Henry for his disobedience and accused him of heresy and schism, and intended to deprive Henry of his royal dignity. He had accused Henry of tearing the English Church from the universal church to which the Roman Church belonged.¹⁰¹ Pope Paul III wanted to use Francis to support his cause against Henry.¹⁰² However, Francis had political reasons for not supporting the pope in the manner the pope wanted. In addition, Henry used Francis to protect himself from the pope. Francis sent Bailly of Troyes to England with the pope's letter because he did not want to be directly associated with the letter. Henry, of course, was appalled upon reading it.¹⁰³ Pope Paul III lamented the loss to the universal church caused by Cardinal Fisher's death. He was about to deprive Henry of his royal status, claiming that Henry was discontent with the censure of Pope Clement VII.¹⁰⁴ Henry's action against Fisher and More alarmed the pope, as well as the European monarchs and princes. Henry could not avoid its consequences and had to answer to the pope's condemnation of his actions. Henry chose his most conservative bishop, Stephen Gardiner, to respond to the letter that Francis had delivered to Henry.

At the end of September 1535, the Bishop of Faenza, papal nuncio in France, presented a papal brief to the king of France with the hope that it would inflame Francis against the "wicked King of England." Francis acknowledged that his Holiness acted like a good pope, and he also acknowledged Henry's impiety, but he declined to give a definite answer. However, if the emperor should agree, Francis would join him, and would not fail in his duty to the Holy See.¹⁰⁵ The pope was infuriated that Francis did not do more to influence Henry than forwarding a letter. The letter, not signed by the pope but one of his agents, gave the English a weapon with which to strike back. The subscription of the letter disturbed the English, who did not believe that it was even written by the present pope. "Given at Rome at Saint Mark's, under the Fisher's ring, the 26th day of July, 1535, and the first year of our pontificate. Signed, Blosio."¹⁰⁶

Henry's choice of Gardiner to respond to the pope's letter is evidence of how he used both conservative and reform-minded clergy to support his supremacy. Henry had not anticipated that Francis would send him this brief, but in any case, it required an answer. So Henry sent Stephen

⁹⁹ L&P, VIII, No. 1060, p. 418.

¹⁰⁰ *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, Vol. I, p. 29.

¹⁰¹ The Pope's Brief to Francis I, July 26, 1535. *Obedience in Church and State*, pp. 12–19.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*

¹⁰³ L&P, IX, No. 434, p. 140.

¹⁰⁴ The Pope's Brief to Francis I, July 26, 1535, *Obedience in Church and State*, pp. 12–19.

¹⁰⁵ L&P, IX, No. 148, p. 43.

¹⁰⁶ The Pope's Brief to Francis I, July 26, 1535. *Obedience in Church and State*, p. 19; L&P, VIII, No. 1117, p. 437. Blosio [Palladio] = Biago Pallai. He often wrote letters for Paul III. See Paul III's letter to Pole. February 17, 1537. Contarini in his letter to Pole mentioned that the letters to King of the Romans, King of France and the Archbishop of Cologne were given to Blosio [Palladio], No. 151. Paul III to Pole, February 14, 1537; No. 197. Contarini to Pole July 21/22, 1537. Mayer, Thomas F. Ed. *The Correspondence of Reginald Pole*. 2002 (hereafter, Mayer 2002).

Gardiner, the Bishop of Winchester, to France with this uncomfortable task.¹⁰⁷ Gardiner, the most ardently conservative bishop, was tasked with writing against the pope for Henry. If indeed Gardiner and other canonists had tried to get the pope to surrender to Henry's demands as Elton assumes, writing a letter against the pope was an opportunity to realize this plan.¹⁰⁸ Redworth notes that Gardiner worked on the response closely with Archbishop Cranmer, and probably Cromwell had a part in the composition of the letter.¹⁰⁹ Cromwell's part in its composition can only be understood as acting on Henry's orders.

Gardiner's response to the pope's letter is important proof of how the royal supremacy was defended by the most conservative scholars. It is also evidence of the declaration of the English Church's right to defend its ecclesiastical laws—Parliament's laws. Gardiner would claim that the king's laws were above the pope's canonical laws. Anyone opposing the king's laws should be punished, as in the case of Cardinal Fisher. Responding to the pope's letter is an instance in which Henry demonstrated how he could use his bishops as pawns for his various goals to prevent any Catholic intrusion. He also used the Catholic canon law expert Gardiner to write to the pope, since he, more than anyone else, was aware of the workings of the Roman Church.

At approximately the same time, a treatise by Thomas Starkey, one of the English propaganda writers, was published, entitled: "An Exhortation to the people instructing them to Unity and Obedience." Starkey justified the "middle way" by explaining what *adiaphora* means. He states that papal supremacy belonged to "indifferent things" (*adiaphora*). He found that two things prevented its treatment as *adiaphora* in government policy: superstition and arrogance. He claimed that Fisher and More were superstitious and therefore held firmly to the pope's authority. Starkey's exhortation was presented to the king in September 1535, but printed a year later in April 1536.¹¹⁰ Starkey suggested that disobedience is against the will of God and therefore he supported the royal supremacy with Gardiner, declaring that the pope's supremacy was as a matter of *adiaphora*. He even went as far as declaring that only Nicene orthodoxy and obedience to the prince are necessary to salvation.¹¹¹

Gardiner's letter created suspicion among the evangelical ambassadors in Germany. Meanwhile, Edward Fox, one of Henry's ambassadors to Germany, wrote to Cromwell on September 21, 1535 that he would like to see a copy of what Gardiner would say to Francis in order to inform the Saxon Reformers, with whom the king's agents were about to start negotiations regarding a common strategy for a General Council. McEntegart argues that Fox's mission was to tell the Germans how the pope had slandered Henry to Francis. Certainly one of the purposes of Fox's mission was to justify Henry's domestic actions to the Germans.¹¹²

Five days later, on September 26, 1535, Gardiner wrote to Cromwell that he had prepared his answer,¹¹³ justifying the execution of Cardinal Fisher. It began as follows:

¹⁰⁷ L&P, IX, No. 403, p. 133; No. 442, p. 143; SP 1/97, Fol. 14; L&P IX, No. 443, p. 144; SP 1/96, Fol. 24v. G. R. Elton: *Policy and Police*. 1985, pp. 193–194 (hereafter, Elton 1985); Elton 1977, p. 165.

¹⁰⁸ Elton 1977, p. 137

¹⁰⁹ Glyn Redworth: *In Defence of the Church Catholic*. 1990, pp. 68–69 (hereafter, Redworth 1990).

¹¹⁰ Elton 1985, pp. 193–194; Elton 1977, p. 165.

¹¹¹ Eppley 2007, pp. 50–51, 57.

¹¹² McEntegart 2002, p. 34.

¹¹³ See Fox's instructions SP1/96, 1535, Folio, 24v; L&P, IX, No. 403, p. 133; No. 442, p. 143, SP 1/97, Fol. 14.

A speech or pamphlet, in answer to the preceding brief of the Pope Paul III vindicating the King's conduct with regard to the death of bishop Fisher causing spitefully touching the King's good name and accusing the Holy See of influencing the French King to deliver of the late bishop of Rochester.¹¹⁴

Gardiner's first defense was that the king wanted to protect his royal dignity, which had been rebuked by the Holy See.¹¹⁵

Fisher deserved condemnation for treason, Gardiner wrote, and accused the pope of exciting hatred of all cardinals by naming Fisher a cardinal after the fact. He also complained that the See of Rome had tried to get Francis to intercede for the Bishop of Rochester. Gardiner then repudiated the insinuation that the intercession of Francis would have precipitated Bishop Fisher's fate.

And to speke att a worde, all is full of lyes and replenisshid with fictions, such as the rhetoricians haue tawght to be mete for the amplifying or setting fourthe of a matter, ffor first to assaye the mynde of the most Christian Maieste (a subtile crafte) concernyng the deliuerance of the late bisshop of Rochester, beyng in thende for his onfeynyd deseruyng condemnyd of treason, whom they after his deth (and God will) to exite the hatred of all Cardinalls, name a Cardinall, he doth say that the labor of the most Christian Maieste interposid with his brother the most noble Kyng of Englande, was contemnyd sett att nowght and mockyd wher in ded no suche labor was made.¹¹⁶

Gardiner stressed that Fisher was punished fairly according to the law. He pointed out that the Holy See was lamenting the death of an evil man (Fisher), one who did not obey the king's laws. Gardiner put the blame on the Holy See, which had treated innocent people unfairly, for whom it should be sad.¹¹⁷

Gardiner then downplayed the cruelty of Fisher's execution and defended the action of the government against a traitor and his crime. He blamed the pope for spreading the news of Fisher's death in order to gain sympathy, but omitting to tell the reason why he died.¹¹⁸

Gardiner criticized the pope's letter and attributed it to Blosio,¹¹⁹ as if it had been written without the authority of the Holy See. At the same time, Gardiner blamed the pope and advocated for Henry, who was supported by the French king, as well as the English universities when they rescinded the pope's initial decision.

And yett this nott with standyng, this yong Rhethoricion, because he wolde prolong his deploration, after dyuers ways, complaynyth more then foolyshly, of the kynde of Rochesters deth, for this

¹¹⁴ Stephen Gardiner's Tract, September 26, 1535. *Obedience in Church and State*, pp. 22–65.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 22–23.

¹¹⁶ *Itaque ut vno verbo dicam mendatijs plena sunt omnia multisque fictionibus referta/quas ad amplificacionem et exaggerationem docuerint aliquando Rethores pertinere/Primum enim[tentat] vt tentent animum Christianissime maiestatis et /o [magnam] callidam astuciam in liberando illo olim Roffensi Episcopo tandem suo merito de proditione condempnato/ quem isti scilicet post mortem ut odium excitent omnium Cardinalium Cardinalem vocant/[et] operam ab illa Christianissima maiestate cum charissimo fratre suo Serenissimo Anglie Rege interpositam/ quam nunquam interposuit* (pp. 24, 26). Stephen Gardiner's Tract, September 26, 1535. *Obedience in Church and State*, pp. 24–27.

¹¹⁷ Gardiner's Tract, 1535, *Obedience in Church and State*, pp. 26–29.

¹¹⁸ Stephen Gardiner's Tract, September 26, 1535, *Obedience in Church and State*, pp. 30–31.

¹¹⁹ Blosio [Palladio] = Biago Pallai, of ten wrote letters for Paul III. See Paul III's letter to Pole. February 17, 1537. Contarini in his letter to Pole mentioned that the letters to the King of the Romans, the King of France and the Archbishop of Cologne were given to Blosio [Palladio], No. 151. Paul III to Pole, February 14, 1537. Contarini to Pole July 21/22, 1537. Mayer. 2002, No. 197, p. 133.

breve hath many thyngs which bee of blosius and nott of paulus, butt almost all together is onfaynydly of thatt holy see.... And I pray yow consider well the Judgement and censure of these men in their waying of vices, which doo reken it a myche more heynous offence to putt to deth a man gilte of treason, then to lyve in open adultery or fall in to heresy....¹²⁰

Gardiner blamed the pope for changing his mind when judging Henry's divorce. Gardiner claimed that England had not caused any schism in the Holy See nor separated the English Church from the universal church, as claimed by the pope.¹²¹

Gardiner thus refused to accept the pope's blame of Henry for schism. He further denounced the pretensions of the pope who, in order to afford protection to his cardinals, did wrong when he named Fisher a cardinal in an attempt to prevent his lawful punishment.

And yet if wee shulde grawnte thatt ther war suche one, and had also this prerogative, to geve a sanctuarie, and immunitie, to all his cardinals, in ther crimes and offenses, bee they neuer so grete, yet it [exte] stretchith nott so ferre, that it may appertayne nott only on to those, whiche bee made all redy befor any offence commytyd of them, but also those which after they haue offendyd, be made Cardinals for this purpose thatt they shulde not suffre punishment, according to ther merits to the pernicious example of others.¹²²

In addition, Gardiner accused the Holy See, claiming that the Roman Church regarded England as a tributary, even though the pope's primacy was not based on the "law of God." Instead, he supported King Henry, who had granted true liberty to England.¹²³ Quoting from the *Donation of Constantine*, he declared that the English Church used to give annuities to Rome, but no more.¹²⁴ As an expert in canon law, Gardiner derogatorily called the pope an ultramontanist, stating that from now on the pope's primacy should not extend beyond Rome.¹²⁵ He defended King Henry, comparing his authority to that of the emperors, who had primacy over financial, doctrinal, and ecclesiastical decisions in their realms.

¹²⁰ *Et tamen Rethorculus hic quo deploracionem produceret in multa membra de genere scilicet mortis minus quam ridicule conqueritur Habet enim hoc breue quedam que Blosij sunt non Pauli/ sancte vero sedis pleraque omnia/... iudicium [atq] atque censuram apud quos videlicet grauius sit multo atque atrocius hominem [reum] proditionis reum morte afficere quam in adulterio viuere notorio/quam in heresim incidere/...* Stephen Gardiner's Tract, September 26, 1535. *Obedience in Church and State*, pp. 30–35.

¹²¹ Stephen Gardiner's Tract, September 26, 1535. *Obedience in Church and State*, pp. 34–37.

¹²² *Quam tamen si concederemus aliquam esse et eam prerogatiuam habere que omnibus suis cardinalibus asylum prebeat et Immunitatem in facinoribus adeo et sceleribus a maximis non eousque tamen sese porrigat/ ut etiam ad eos pertineat non modo qui iam sunt ante crimen admissum/ sed etiam futuri sunt postea ad idipsum Cardinales ne commeritas penas ad exemplum persoluant* (pp. 54, 56). Stephen Gardiner's Tract, September 26, 1535. *Obedience in Church and State*, pp. 54–57.

¹²³ Stephen Gardiner's Tract, September 26, 1535. *Obedience in Church and State*, pp. 338–339.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 39–40.

¹²⁵ Stephen Gardiner's Tract, September 26, 1535. *Obedience in Church and State*, pp. 40–41, 46–47. Irena Backus asserts that medieval writers such as Marsilio of Padua showed that the pope and the Roman Church had no particular privileges before Constantine's period. Wyclif, citing Augustine, did not question the authenticity of the "Donation" either, but regarded it as a historical proof. In Wyclif's discussion of two swords, he proved that the papacy was inferior to civil government. As the emperor conferred special power and territories to the pope, his powers and territories are greater than those of the pope. Backus further comments that the most faithful Augustinian theologians had questioned the authenticity of the "Donation;" since on one hand it was not mentioned in either lawbooks, ecclesiastical histories, or chronicles of the period, and on the other hand Augustine had affirmed in his *De ciuitate* 5, 25 that Constantine truly had expanded the Roman Empire. Backus asserts that the way Augustine was cited in the 14th- and 15th-century treatises on church reform had little to do with the 16th-century reforms. Irena Backus: *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation. (1378–1615)*. 2003, pp. 36–39 (hereafter, Backus 2003).

This case demonstrates that the stipulations of canon law had no effect in England, which as a nation had radically changed its laws to secular parliamentary statutes. This incident also demarcated the line between the authority Henry had claimed for himself—that is, similar to the former emperors—and denied that the Roman Church belonged to the universal church as did the English Church, which was the early patristic church, the true Catholic Church.

The writings of Gardiner about the universal church were unclear—whether he referred to both the invisible and visible church led by the emperor, and claimed that this authority belonged to King Henry. Because the English Church’s legal authority rested on Parliament’s laws, the claim of the universal church was not quite the same as what Melancthon referred to as the “true Church,” whose authority rested on the new doctrine.

Gardiner said that Fisher’s title as “cardinal” was no help to him, since Fisher had offended the king’s laws. Rather, immunity could have been granted by the pope to Fisher, as was granted to other cardinals.¹²⁶ Gardiner claimed that Fisher’s death had diminished the dignity of the Roman Church. Referring to the pope as “Emperor of Rome,” Gardiner claimed he had taken the power from the emperor (referring to the *Donation of Constantine*), and was in fact a traitor.¹²⁷ Reversing the *Donation of Constantine* to Henry’s benefit, Gardiner said that England was not obligated to pay gifts to the church of Rome, which he said was not part of the universal church. Thus, he diminished the pope’s authority even further by presenting Fisher’s execution as a symbolic killing of the false, pretended papacy. He legitimized Henry’s supremacy as head of the English Church, even as head of the universal church, like former emperors.

The attack in Gardiner’s letter is directed to the pope using legal arguments, and not against Bishop-Cardinal Fisher as a person. The letter also demonstrated that Gardiner protected royal supremacy, but it soured his relations with the European powers, especially in France.¹²⁸

This letter had three purposes. First, it justified the independence of the English Church from the Roman Church, and maintained that the English Church remained part of the universal church, claiming Henry as its head instead of the pope. Second, it justified the superiority of state law to canon law; i.e., that statutory laws were valid declarations for the punishment of heretical ecclesiastics who opposed those laws, such as Fisher. Third, the pope’s authority in secular matters was invalid. He should not intrude on the politics of Francis or Henry. Finally, based on its subscription, Gardiner suspected that the pope had not written the letter.

Consequences of Bishop Gardiner’s Response to the Pope’s Letter

Henry had asked Gardiner to respond on behalf of the English Church and defend it as part of the universal church. Meanwhile, Cromwell seemed to think he needed to make a secular response. In September 1535, Cromwell wrote a letter to Sir Gregory Da Casale, Henry’s resident English ambassador at Rome, defending the recent executions of Fisher and More.¹²⁹ It was important to keep communications open between all parties, especially the Roman court,

¹²⁶ Stephen Gardiner’s Tract, September 26, 1535. *Obedience in Church and State*, pp. 47–48, 50–57.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 54–55.

¹²⁸ Redworth 1990, pp. 69–70.

¹²⁹ Elton 1977, p. 194.

because the pope took Fisher's execution as a serious injury to his authority. The executions of Fisher and Sir Thomas More had incensed the pope and his council. Cromwell defended the king, saying that he was only responsible to God for his actions.

In his letter, Cromwell stated that the king had high respect for More and Fisher, and had hoped they would change their minds. But they were ambitious and self-seeking, and had abused the king's clemency and good will. Finally, he had proof of their crimes—they interfered in Parliament's business and interpreted the king's laws in a manner opposite to how they were intended. Both Fisher and More realized that swearing the oath would be equivalent to denying the pope's supremacy over the universal church, and they refused to do that. The king concluded that Fisher and More were degenerate and seditious subjects, ungrateful to their native land and disturbers of the public peace. He treated them mercifully in prison by showing them clemency, respect, and love. Still, they refused to obey the laws and statutes of the country, and preferred their own divine contemplation. Cromwell then pointed out that the pope was overhasty in judging the king, who had the right to punish evildoers in his own country. Cromwell ended his letter by saying that once the pope learned the truth, he would agree that their punishment was just.¹³⁰

Henry had to maintain cordial relations with Catholic Europe, and Gardiner's pamphlet had been distributed all over Europe in an effort to protect England from any additional papal intervention. Henry's political stance toward Francis also changed, as he needed his support against the pope. Henry realized his friendship with Francis came at a high price. He gave instructions to Gardiner to negotiate a treaty in the interest of both crowns. Gardiner was to explain to Francis that Edward Fox went to Germany to meet with the Elector of Saxony to defend the king's proceedings. Henry made six proposals to Francis: 1) he was willing to join with Francis to raise an army in France; 2) he would contribute a third of the expenses of an army to invade Italy; 3) after the treaty, Francis would not make peace either with the pope or the emperor without Henry's consent; 4) if the pope or the emperor invaded England, Francis would aid Henry; 5) Francis would revise France's treaties with Flanders; and 6) neither Henry nor Francis would violate the earlier treaties between them.¹³¹ King Henry had to repair his relations in Europe by making a proposal to Francis and planning to send ambassadors to Saxon princes. He was afraid of becoming isolated and threatened by the papal bull. This factor has to be taken into account concerning Henry's dispatch of his ambassadors to Germany.

It seems the pope had lost his power over Francis, who did not wholeheartedly support the pope's intentions towards Henry. Quite the opposite was the result, and Henry was able to maneuver the pope's letter for political gain for himself. Since the papal bull was suspended in 1535,¹³² Gardiner's letter must have had its intended effect, even though one may question Gardiner's personal sincerity in writing against the pope. Did Gardiner want to prove his obedience to Henry?

¹³⁰ Cromwell to Sir Gregory da Casale. September, 1535. *Cromwell's Letters* Vol. 1, No. 122, pp. 427–431. Elton 1977, p. 194.

¹³¹ L&P, IX, No. 443, pp. 143–144.

¹³² Cott. Libr. Vitell. B 14, Fol. 66. Burnet, Vol. 4, III, pp. 452–453. *Concilia Magnae*, pp. 840–841.

Henry was concerned about his relationship with Francis who, Henry knew, would support the pope and emperor as far as the threat of the papal bull was concerned. On November 18, 1535, Henry sent a letter to Stephen Gardiner and John Wallop, his ambassadors to France. He told them Sir Francis Brian would come to Paris in order to defy papal and imperial authority. Wallop had recently received news from de Langey that the emperor had declared the “Gift of Constantine” an invalid document, and that the pope was in great fear. Consequently, if England would join France against the emperor, it would be most favorable for Henry. However, Henry hoped the emperor would declare the pope a vassal of the Holy Roman Empire, so that the pope’s censures against England would be void.¹³³

Gardiner must have impressed both the pope and the emperor when he refuted the *Donation of Constantine* and the pope’s universal claims. A struggle for authority between Charles V and Pope Paul III ensued. If indeed the emperor had doubts about the authenticity of the *Donation of Constantine* to which Gardiner referred in the papal letter, Henry had succeeded in undermining the papacy. Ultimately, Henry’s hope to subdue the pope under the emperor’s rule also failed and the threat of the bull was temporarily eliminated by Gardiner’s answer to the pope.

In the midst of all this intrigue, Henry and Francis were both intent on inviting Melancthon to their courts. Henry was still looking for someone to help justify his supremacy in the Church of England. Francis wanted to find out how far he could trust the Protestants to agree to postpone the General Council, so that Henry would give him financial aid for his campaign to take Milan from the emperor.¹³⁴ Henry knew how to use his bishops and agents to refute any attacks on his supremacy.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we looked at how the English bishops faced the problems regarding the power of the church. The king took measures to assure that all clergy and religious supported the royal supremacy. Thomas Starkey, an English humanist, categorically declared that disobedience to the royal supremacy was against God’s will, and declared the pope’s power was based on human, not divine law. Obedience was required to the royal supremacy, and thus the pope’s divine power was replaced by that of the supreme head, whose power was of divine origin in the eyes of English clergy. In addition, Henry, as head of church and state, had taken jurisdictional powers away from bishops. While they maintained their *potestas ordinis*, the most essential part of the ministry except for defining doctrine, bishops did not have authority to decide adiaphora matters. Since statutory laws replaced canon laws, the struggle for control in England meant that papal supporters became enemies of the monarchy. The transition proved that papal curialism was no longer accepted by even the most conservative bishops in England, as seen in Gardiner’s letter to the pope. This seems to have been the final separation from Rome, justifying parliamentary laws for both the state and the church.

Melancthon supported Henry as head of the church and state, and that it was up to him to resolve controversial doctrinal issues as well as civil disputes. Melancthon may not have

¹³³ L&P, IX, No. 838, p. 282.

¹³⁴ L&P, IX, No. 337, p. 113, SP 1/96, Fols. 123–125.

realized then that the supremacy law had given the king the power not only to propagate but also define doctrine. The most opposition on the part of the clergy was to Henry's doctrinal authority over them. Henry silenced the opposition by using legal means, subjecting his personal decisions to Parliament as if the whole nation supported the legality of separation from Rome.

Because Melanchthon stated that the civil laws were equal to natural law and of divine origin in *Loci Communes* of 1535, it was difficult for the bishops to know whether parliamentary laws were equal to ecclesiastical laws and should be interpreted as binding on conscience. The reform-minded clergy agreed with Melanchthon's doctrine of ecclesiology and soteriology and pushed the Reformation through, preaching the new doctrine and interpreting the Mass according to Reformation principles in the Eucharist and the communion. This was the time for the reform-minded bishops to interpret doctrinal and practical reform in the doctrine of adiaphora.

In addition, the practical problem among the bishops was the delegation of power to them. This led to a decision by Henry to have lay leader Thomas Cromwell assume jurisdictional power, which in theory meant even to define doctrine. Cromwell's main function was to establish an inventory of all the property owned by the English Church, including the property of monasteries. This in turn led to extensive visitations and findings that led to drastic measures against monasteries.

Without the pope's leadership, the doctrine of ecclesiology changed in the English Church. The reform-minded bishops and evangelical clergy adopted the definition of the church according to the doctrine in the *Confessio Augustana*; that is, to preach the Gospel and to administer the sacraments. The Catholic Mass was celebrated with the principle of *lex orandi—lex credendi*; thus the doctrine of soteriology could be interpreted either in belief in Scripture alone, according to the reform-minded clergy, or believing in the sacrifice of the Mass, according to the conservative clergy.

On the international political front, the pope was so threatened by this change that he appealed to the French king to mediate between himself and Henry in the hope that Henry would return to the Roman Church; otherwise, he threatened to depose Henry. Gardiner's appeal in his response to the pope's letter diminished the pope's authority. Gardiner claimed that the English Church was part of the universal church, and King Henry replaced the pope as its head. He successfully claimed that statute laws are superior to canon laws, which justified Henry's actions. The theory of supremacy extended to equating obedience to the king as obedience to God.

The correspondence between Henry, Francis, and the pope revealed the final settlement between the papal and kingly powers, as this is where Henry claimed that the English Church was free from papal jurisdiction. It was also claimed that the English Church was part of the universal church; that the king should have the same powers in ecclesiastical matters as the former emperors; and that canon laws were replaced by statute laws.

Next, we turn to follow Henry's international dealings as he sent his ambassadors to Germany, and follow Bishop Fox's mission to the Saxon Reformers to explain the contents of Gardiner's response to the pope's letter to Henry, and their response to Fox's mission.

Chapter 5:

Anglo-Lutheran Negotiations and the Wittenberg Articles

(September 1535–September 1536)

The first part of this chapter will deal with Anglo-Lutheran negotiations in Germany during 1535–1536. The second part of this chapter deals with the Wittenberg Articles of 1536, the document on church policy matters on adiaphora.

Part I: Anglo-Lutheran Negotiations

Introduction

The Germans and Edward Fox, the ambassador to Germany, knew about the letter Gardiner had written for Henry. It seems to have been urgent to get the response to the pope before Henry initiated the mission to the Saxon Reformers to discuss a common strategy against the pope's authority. Once Henry was convinced that Melancthon would not travel to France, his ambassadors on the Continent were to help in Henry's second plan—to send an embassy led by Bishop Edward Fox to the Saxon princes, to seek advice in their struggle against the pope and the General Council. First, Henry had to convince them that he, too, wanted to reform church doctrine according to the same principles they had employed. It certainly was Henry's hope that Melancthon could meet and negotiate with Henry's ambassadors in Saxony. The English and German theologians attempted to find a common ground in their defense against the pope's council and in church policy. The principal question had to be resolved: was Henry willing to accept the offer to become the defender of the Schmalkaldic League, and how would he respond to their proposals? The English and the Germans had to agree on the church's authority and related adiaphora matters.

English Preparations for the Negotiations

As seen in Chapters Three and Four, there were three factors that motivated Henry to send his ambassadors to the Saxon princes: to prevent Melancthon's trip to France and divert it to England, to secure an alliance against the pope's General Council, and defend his actions against Fisher and More. Fox, like Cromwell and Cranmer, was associated with the reform movement and a supporter of Henry's divorce and supremacy.¹ Henry needed a man to lead the embassy and appointed Fox, whom he could trust to support his supremacy when negotiating with a party

¹ McEntegart 2002, pp. 31–32.

that also had repudiated the pope. Repudiating the pope's divine authority was the major criterion to consider for entering into a relationship with Henry.² According to McEntegart, Fox had been consecrated Bishop of Hereford before he left England in order to increase his prestige for the mission.³ Nicholas Heath had been in Germany earlier with Mont and Barnes to look for Melanchthon and would be part of Fox's embassy when the embassy arrived.⁴ Fox's mission to the Saxon princes seems to have been prepared much more carefully than earlier missions to the Continent in the previous year. Therefore, Henry appointed him to lead this embassy. Bishop Fox carried with him letters of credence from the king himself, instructions, copies of his commission, and additional writings.⁵

On August 31, 1535, Fox received the following instructions from the king: to seek advice from the princes on general matters, and to request private conferences.⁶ Henry's general appeal to the princes in Germany was to advance the new doctrine in his kingdom but not without deliberation, consultation, and advice on doctrinal matters from his friends.⁷ Having corresponded with Melanchthon, Henry knew quite a bit about the Saxon Reformers' doctrine. McEntegart and Bernard have different opinions about the embassy sent to Germany in 1535. McEntegart claims that Thomas Cromwell was in charge of dispatching the embassy. Bernard argues that Cromwell was an important link, but the king was in charge of the dispatch.⁸ Bernard opposes McEntegart's argument that Cromwell, Cranmer, and other evangelicals went beyond royal policies when asking Henry to adopt evangelical reforms. Bernard believes that Barnes was to meet German princes and look for Melanchthon. He argues that as early as 1535, Henry was keen to have Melanchthon visit England. Melanchthon did not come then, but dedicated his *Loci Communes* to Henry VIII. Concurring with Bernard,⁹ this author believes that Henry received *Loci Communes* a few months earlier, in August 1535, before the ambassadors left England.¹⁰ Additional evidence that the king was behind Fox's instructions was his use of Protestant rhetoric. This would be familiar to the Saxon Reformers, in such phrases as "setting forth the glory of God and promoting the worth and certain truth of His Word, by which all things in Christian royal lines ought to be administered and governed."¹¹

Fox was to propose that, in all proceedings, the "Word of God" was the true, faithful, and infallible guide for men that shows the way to live within the limits and boundaries set by those

² Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P 330; Burnet Vol. 4, No. XLII, pp. 468–469; Cromwell's Letter to Wallop, August 23, 1535; *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. 1, No. 113, pp. 416–420; L&P, 1535, VIII, No. 1062, p. 419; SP1/96, 1535, Fol. 12v.

³ McEntegart 2002, pp. 31–32.

⁴ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P 330; Burnet Vol. 4, No. XLII, pp. 468–469; Cromwell's Letter to Wallop, August 23, 1535; *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. 1, No. 113, pp. 416–420; L&P, 1535, VIII, No. 1062, p. 419.

⁵ SP 1/96, 12v, 19r. The writer agrees with Bernard, who supported the view that Fox's instructions were given by Henry VIII. Bernard 2005, pp. 536–538.

⁶ SP 1/96, Fols. 12r, 12v.

⁷ SP1/96, 1535, Fols. 13r, 13v.

⁸ See McEntegart 2002, pp. 22, 27–28. The present writer agrees with Bernard. See Bernard 2005, p. 536.

⁹ Melanchthon to King Henry VIII of England [M. an Kg. Heinrich VIII von England]. March 13, 1535. MBW T 6, 1552, p. 326; CR II, 1264, pp. 861–864. See Bernard 2005, pp. 537, 539; McEntegart 2002, pp. 29, 52–54, 59. Kohnle 2011, p. 49.

¹⁰ SP 1/96, 1535, 12r, 13r. Melanchthon to King Henry VIII of England [M. an Kg. Heinrich VIII von England]. August 17, 1535. MBW T 6, 1607, pp. 423–424; CR II, 1310, p. 924.

¹¹ SP1/96, 1535, Fol. 12r.

whom God had appointed for their governance.¹² The king praised the elector for sincerely teaching “the Gospel.” The present writer concurs with Bernard, who interprets Henry’s use of rhetoric as similar to that of Erasmian humanists. He argues that Henry’s use of Protestant rhetoric has been misinterpreted. It had seemed that he was more interested in their theology than he really was. Henry’s goal was that of consultation. Bernard has also argued that Henry needed to justify his royal supremacy with quasi-Protestant terms and make it sound as if he were truly interested in the Protestant reforms as presented by the German Reformers.¹³ This shows that Henry was interested in German reforms on his terms, not on those presented to him by the leaders of the Schmalkaldic League. It was of the utmost importance for Henry to prove that authority in the church was based on Scripture, not on the pope’s canon law.

Even though the English Church had broken off with Rome, its church structure had not changed. Catholic ceremonies were celebrated, but the Mass and other ceremonies had to be interpreted differently in order to omit the pope’s supremacy. The king truly needed to find out what ceremonies kept were *adiaphora* and how they were to be interpreted based on the authority of Scripture alone.

Henry said he not only intended to set forth “Christ’s Word” and religion within his own realm and dominions, but he also wanted to confer and consult with the princes about “certain other things.”¹⁴ In his instructions, Henry specified that he was sending his embassy in order to look for advice; it is clear that this embassy was a preliminary inquiry on Henry’s part, not a commitment to form an alliance.

Nevertheless, it was an official mission between two sovereigns and between two courts: the King of England and the Elector of Saxony. The Protestant princes formed a defensive alliance against the emperor in 1531, after religious issues could not be resolved in Augsburg in 1530. The Schmalkaldic League had achieved security from imperial powers and experienced its best years in 1535–1542. The league was divided into northern and southern districts and led by two powerful princes: John Frederick, the Elector of Saxony, and Philip, Landgrave of Hesse. The league developed state-like qualities, and had met seventeen times during 1531–1540. The Imperial Diet, which was the lead court dealing with issues that concerned the whole empire, met only once. This arrangement alone made the Imperial Diet unnecessary for many years.¹⁵ John Frederick was Elector in the Holy Roman Empire under Charles V. His brother, Ferdinand of Bohemia and Hungary, had gained a crown as the King of Romans (King of Germany) in 1531 and took care of German affairs for Charles.¹⁶

The issues were delicate for the king and he had to make a most positive impression on the Saxon Reformers. This can be seen from the personal notes of Henry, which refer to their mutual friendship, their common ancestry, and the kindness that had increased between them.¹⁷ It was very important to King Henry that his personal contacts with the Germans would produce

¹² SP 1/96 Fol. 12r.

¹³ Bernard 2005, pp. 225–226, 242, 537.

¹⁴ SP 1/96, Fol. 12r.

¹⁵ Brady 1998, pp. 116–117, 121.

¹⁶ Brady, 2009, p. 208.

¹⁷ SP 1/96 1535, Fol. 13r.

positive results as far as his divorce was concerned. He sought support from the Saxon princes regarding the time and place of the General Council for which he had appealed.

Since Henry had appealed to the General Council over his divorce, Fox had to use extreme dexterity in discussing it as the instructions specified. He was not supposed to make the “king’s matter” the principal cause of his coming. However, if the princes brought it up, Fox was to openly discuss the craftiness of the “Bishop of Rome’s” dealings with the king.¹⁸ If the princes agreed that the “Bishop of Rome” had acted craftily, then Fox was advised to include it as an article.¹⁹ The discussion regarding the General Council was very much tied to the “king’s matter,” and Fox was to make it appear to the Reformers as if it were not.

It is noteworthy that the king referred to Melanchthon’s *Loci Communes*²⁰ when he commissioned Fox to argue the validity of his marriage and divorce.²¹ The king was very interested in meeting Melanchthon personally and gave instructions to his ambassadors that they should convince Melanchthon to come.²² Bernard argues, according to McEntegart, that Cromwell and Cranmer wanted to have Melanchthon come to England since the king wished to adopt more evangelical policies. Bernard has a different opinion. He argues it was Henry who was keen for Melanchthon to visit England as early as 1535. Instead of coming, Melanchthon dedicated his *Loci Communes* to Henry.²³

The change in authority necessarily changed the interpretation of church law in either country. This was an important topic during their mutual discussions. In the second part of the instructions, the king advised Fox that, after his initial oration, he should proceed to the special points in private conference. Fox was then to repeat the true cause for his coming: the controversies related to the General Council and its support of the papist faction and its enormous abuses, especially against Henry. Those abuses needed to be determined and abolished.²⁴ He was to remind the Germans that they had also condemned the authority of the “Bishop of Rome.” Fox would describe the injuries caused by the “Bishop of Rome,” since he had been “oppressive not only against the law of God and man but also against his own laws.”²⁵

Because Henry had heard through secret reports that the educated men in Germany were willing to yield and be flexible to a certain degree, he wanted to confer with the Saxon theologians.²⁶ He wanted to have private conferences to see how much they would be willing to concede in the rest of the articles under discussion. Besides his rhetoric, it was also important for Henry’s cause to assure his stance against any heretical groups, such as the Anabaptists and

¹⁸ SP 1/96, 1535, Fol. 19r.

¹⁹ SP 1/96, 1535, Fol. 19r.

²⁰ Timothy Wengert sees Melanchthon’s central role in the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations and the king’s patronage through the dedication of his *Loci Communes* of 1535 to Henry VIII. “Famous Last Words: The Final Epistolary Exchange between Erasmus of Rotterdam and Philip Melanchthon in 1536,” Wengert, 2010, XII/ p. 23. McEntegart 2002, pp. 46, 59. Bernard 2005, p. 539.

²¹ Melanchthon to Joachim Camerarius in Nuremberg [M. an Joachim Camerarius in Nürnberg]. September 6, 1534. MBW T 6, 1489, pp. 197–198. See Bernard 2005, p. 539.

²² Melanchthon to Joachim Camerarius in Nuremberg [M. an Joachim Camerarius in Nürnberg]. January 10, 1535, p. 274; CR II, 1240, p. 823.

²³ See Bernard 2005, p. 539.

²⁴ SP 1/96, 1535, Fol. 15r.

²⁵ Ibid., Fols. 16r, 16v.

²⁶ SP 1/96, 1535, Fol. 14r.

Sacramentaries, with immoderate zeal or excessive appetite for novelties. He was to present himself as the king protecting right doctrine,²⁷ while hoping for flexibility in their mutual negotiations.

Henry was no longer sure if the General Council would be the right forum to appeal to. He must have known that the pope governed its decisions. It is obvious that he wished to discuss the authority and validity of the General Council further with the Reformers.²⁸ This is where the two authorities coincide: Scripture and Tradition. The latter includes unwritten traditions equal to Scripture in binding consciences, as most conservative clergy in England believed. The opposite view was supported by the Reformers; Scripture alone as the highest authority in matters of faith and practice.²⁹ Irene Dingel explains the concept of Scripture and Tradition; that the evangelicals accepted the Tradition of the writings of the Church Fathers and the decisions of councils as a standard of teaching. However, in public teaching against the dominant role of Tradition, the Reformation emphasized the Holy Scriptures as the norm of faith and doctrine, and authority in the church.³⁰ Later alongside of the primary authority of the Bible emerged the binding summaries of faith.³¹ There must have been a shift in Henry's mind to question the validity of canon law in accordance with Scripture alone, which was supported by the Saxon Reformers in matters of conscience.

It seems as if the king initially regarded the points Fox had made as necessary for the General Council. Henry asked how far the theologians would agree with his views.³² The king wanted them to declare honestly whether they would agree or disagree to advance the new doctrine. Henry's relationship with the Germans was pragmatic; he was interested in the league's theology. Having destroyed the old monastic order and replaced it with a new order, a new faith had to be established. The league would be more effective if the English and Germans would agree about religion in order to defend themselves in the General Council under the pope's jurisdiction. McEntegart points out that Henry wanted to find out the views of the non-Roman religious spectrum, since he was surrounded by evangelicals who wished for further reform, as well as and religious conservatives like Gardiner. Factions were created in response to the king's interest in the German theological position.³³ In this writer's view, Henry seems to have been sincerely interested in the theology of the league, but not willing to accept their views on confession outright.

The General Council was not only important for Henry's and the Saxon princes' mutual negotiations. The council was also important for the pope and the emperor, who since the Diet of Augsburg attempted to unify religious factions in the Holy Roman Empire. But Henry's first priority was to have a conference in England concerning the General Council that had been

²⁷ SP 1/96, 1535, Fol. 14r.

²⁸ SP 1/96, 1535, Fol. 13r.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Irene Dingel: *Philip Melancthon and the Establishment of Confessional Norms*. 2006, pp. 147–148 (hereafter, Dingel 2006).

³¹ Irene Dingel: *Melancthon and the Establishment of Confessional Norms*. 2012b, pp. 162–163 (hereafter, Dingel 2012b).

³² McEntegart 2002, p. 33.

³³ Ibid., p. 49.

proposed by the pope. Instead of it being held in Mantua, as the pope wished, Henry preferred it to be held in a free and neutral place.³⁴

The Germans and the English were to agree on the actual place of the General Council. Henry and the Germans were suspicious of the council convened by Pope Paul III. They wanted an independent free council. Henry's fears centered on his divorce, the break from Rome, and the formation of an independent church. The Germans feared that they were being condemned as heretics and that their religion would be suppressed.³⁵

If the pope and emperor decided on the location it would, in all likelihood, prejudice the situation against other rulers. The place should allow for frankness and liberty so that the truth could be spoken and heard, determined and concluded. Henry feared that the truth would be in as great a peril of oppression as it had been in similar cases previously.³⁶ In Henry's opinion, other rulers in Europe should have a say in the convening of the council and its place to remedy the religious situation. This would change the authority of sovereign kings to equal that of the pope.

Regarding special points in doctrine that were of interest, the king had suggested that Fox include at least the following matters in their discussions: the subjects of free will (*de libero arbitrio*), the rightly understood power of the church (*de potestate ecclesiastica*), and condemnation of the power of the "Bishop of Rome." This seemed to be a continuation of their previous discussions of the articles to determine those on which they were in agreement.³⁷

There is an interesting caveat to the instructions. Had Henry been able to read the *Confessio Augustana* by the time he sent Fox to Germany? Alternatively, did he only know that the *Confessio Augustana* would be a condition for holding mutual conferences with the Reformers? As for Melancthon's *Confessio Augustana*, Fox was instructed to say that if it agreed with the new doctrine, Henry might accept it and join the Schmalkaldic League. This shows that Henry was not at all prepared to commit himself to the Saxon Reformers' view on confession. Furthermore, Fox was to bring with him a copy of Stephen Gardiner's *De Obedientia*,³⁸ (which was a defense of Henry's supremacy in the church), Gardiner's answer to the papal brief, and a copy of Melancthon's *Loci Communes* for the discussion of doctrine.³⁹

What he understood from what was sent to him by Melancthon, was that Melancthon supported Henry as the head of the Church of England. The same applies to *De Vera Obedientia*, written by Gardiner, the most conservative English bishop. Henry was not always so secure in his supremacy, even though he presented himself that way. This is shown in how he strategically used his bishops like pawns against the pope. For example, he used Gardiner to answer the pope regarding the executions of More and Fisher.

The question of human law versus the pope's canon law became part of Fox's discussion of the fates of More and Fisher. At this time, their executions were a delicate matter in England. Fox was to stress that whatever the king had decided in that regard, he did so according to the

³⁴ SP 1/96, 1535, Fol. 15r.

³⁵ McEntegart 2002, p. 26.

³⁶ SP 1/96, 1535, Fol. 15r.

³⁷ SP 1/96, 1535, Fol. 16r, 16v.

³⁸ McEntegart does not mention either Melancthon's *Loci Communes* or Gardiner's answer to the papal brief, even though *Loci Communes* was to be an essential part of the doctrinal negotiations. McEntegart 2002, pp. 33–34.

³⁹ SP 1/96, 1535, Fol. 18v.

laws of the land. The king advised Fox to let the princes know that More and Fisher were “founde guilty under the law and justly executed.”⁴⁰ If the princes seemed displeased, Fox should confirm to them that More and Fisher were traitors and rebels against the king.⁴¹ Fox was to argue to the princes that they should not judge other princes in dealing with their own subjects who practiced insurrections within their realms. He was to defend the king by saying, “to defame and slander his majesty and his most virtuous doings and proceedings is also to procure the impeachment and utter destruction of his most royal person.”⁴² The king seemed to be defensive in his argument, as if anticipating that the Saxon Reformers would be a threat to him. Scripture also was used to defend the king’s divorce. The book of Leviticus, Chapter XVIII, talks about the precepts of marriage. Fox was to point out that even Melanchthon in his *Loci Communes* had treated this matter as grounded upon the voice of nature, which prohibits marriage of the Israelites with the neighboring Canaanites.⁴³ Henry agrees with Melanchthon’s opinion that no human law would be able to refute natural law.

Furthermore, to defend the king, Fox was instructed to say that Henry had canvassed all the learned men of all the universities in Italy and France, and all were agreeable to his divorce. The pope could not dispense a marriage between a man and his brother’s wife. Both divine and natural law prohibited it, and no human law would be able to refute it.⁴⁴

Thus, Fox was to argue, they should defend the holy faith of the holy church based on “God’s Word” by agreeing with each other. When Fox had concluded discussions with the Elector of Saxony, he was to meet with other princes with the same points he had made to the elector. This was in order to obtain their seals and subscriptions, to conclude the articles, determine the place of the General Council, and other related issues.⁴⁵ The principal concern for which Henry sent his first embassy was the General Council. Fox was to explain that the Germans and English should have a common strategy for the council and support Henry’s divorce. He was to refer to Gardiner’s *Vera obedientia*. The league was willing to seek an agreement with Henry on a common policy with regard to the General Council. The articles proposed by the Germans to Henry were the acceptance of the *Confessio Augustana* and the defense of it at the General Council. Both Henry and the Germans should oppose the papal council. Neither side should provide aid against the other. The alliance’s provisions unconnected to faith would not apply to the emperor, the King of Romans, or the empire. The league would not be involved in Henry’s divorce suit.⁴⁶ It seemed an utmost urgency for Henry to have written proof from the princes. But Fox repeated the invitation to make final decisions on the articles (points) he had presented. He was then to ask them to send orators to England.

⁴⁰ SP 1/86, Fol. 24v.

⁴¹ SP 1/96, 1535, Fol. 24v; McEntegart 2002, p. 33.

⁴² SP 1/96, 1535, Fols. 22v, 23r, 24r, 24v.

⁴³ SP 1/96, 1535, Fols. 18, 18v.

⁴⁴ SP 1/96, 1535, Fol. 17r (*que ducere uxorem fratris mortui sine liberis est prohibitum de iure divino et naturali sic ut nulla humana potestas aut autoritas in eiusmodi matrimonii dispensae possit*). And to marry the wife of a deceased brother with no children is prohibited according to both divine and natural law so that no human power or authority could dispense for marriages of this kind.

⁴⁵ SP 1/96, Fols. 19v, 20r, 21r.

⁴⁶ McEntegart 2002, pp. 33–34, 37–38, 71.

Henry gave particular instructions to Fox about encountering agents of the French king and regarding Henry's politics with Lübeck. Even though Henry was partially responsible for the abortion of Melanchthon's trip to France, he gave specific instructions to Fox not to offend Francis. If Fox were to meet de Langey or other French agents, he should treat them in as friendly a manner as the friendship between the two kings required. He should also clarify the conflicts between Henry and the French king.⁴⁷ On the one hand, McEntegart sees that since the pope had slandered Henry to Francis, Henry used the Schmalkaldeners in a diplomatic effort to establish anti-imperial and anti-papal diplomatic alliances. On the other hand, he cautions that one should not think that Henry had a greater European scheme in mind when discussing religious matters with the Schmalkaldic League.⁴⁸

It is possible, since the writing is different, that Fox added his own comments to make the matter more appealing to the princes. The elector was requested to ask all the estates to be present and to declare to them the king's commission after Melanchthon had confirmed Bishop Fox's coming to him. Fox then should have a conference with all of the princes that belonged in the *foedus euangelicum* to hear his message. If the estates were present with the elector, Fox would not need to travel any further to declare his commission. If they could not be assembled all together with the elector or if there was, any difficulty getting them together or they refused to come, Fox was to visit separately any prince belonging to this *foedus euangelicum* with the king's charge.⁴⁹

It seems that Fox made two separate requests to the elector: religious negotiations and the political appeal to enter the Evangelical League. As soon as they had conferred mutually with the German theologians and made their proposals, and after the king had examined the articles and seen that they were agreeable to the new doctrine, he would be willing to enter their league, the *foedus euangelicum*,⁵⁰ and to receive the whole of their confession. Furthermore, the king, being so far away in England, asked the elector to send persons to England to further discuss the articles that they were to maintain between them.⁵¹ Fox had expressed the hope that Henry would accept Melanchthon's *Confessio Augustana* and become a member of the Schmalkaldic League. He may have gone beyond his authority and promised more than Henry was prepared to commit at that point.

Henry might not have understood the Saxon Reformers' position for two reasons. First, Henry was both head of the state and church. Hence in England, the same laws applied to church and state. The Saxons, however, had an elector who was the secular magistracy in the Protestant territories, while the theologians dictated the church's authority in adiaphora questions. The doctrine of two kingdoms affected mutual relations with secular and ecclesiastical rule within Saxony. However, the emperor was above the elector and his involvement further complicated the question of obedience. Second, the Saxons acknowledged Scriptural authority in adiaphora matters and kept the Catholic traditions where they did not deviate from scriptural authority.

⁴⁷ SP 1/96, 1535, Fol. 22v.

⁴⁸ McEntegart 2002, pp. 34–35.

⁴⁹ Ibid., Fols. 25r, 25v.

⁵⁰ McEntegart sees Henry as being cautious and wanting to know what their proposals were for him to enter the League. McEntegart 2002, p. 34.

⁵¹ SP 1/96, 1535, Fol. 22r.

It is unclear whether Henry, when referring to “God’s Law,” meant Scripture and Tradition, including unwritten traditions. The Saxon Reformers supported God’s law as the highest authority in their belief in Scripture alone. Henry struggled to understand whether the pope’s canon laws were above “God’s law.” At least Henry went as far as to acknowledge the pope’s authority by human law, and therefore he must have equated canon law with human law.

Preparatory Discussions in Germany

In a letter to Dr. Gregory Brück, the founder of the Schmalkaldic League, Martin Luther described the reception of the English ambassadors in Germany and the reason for their visit.⁵² The German theologians, particularly Luther, who had been involved with this matter earlier in 1531, firmly believed that the purpose of the ambassadors was the defense of Henry’s new marriage.⁵³

The German princes had great hopes that Henry would immediately accept their confession and join the Schmalkaldic League. Therefore, Saxon theologians approached the elector on two different fronts. On September 12, 1535, Luther and his colleagues Justus Jonas, Caspar Cruciger, and John Bugenhagen petitioned the elector to have a private meeting with Robert Barnes, one of Henry’s ambassadors to the Germans, whom they called “Antonius Anglicus.” In their petition, they also requested that the elector allow Melanchthon to make an official visit to England to propagate sound doctrine.⁵⁴ Luther further stated that he supported the idea of Melanchthon going to England, since he felt that Henry needed his help in the battle with the pope. According to Luther, Melanchthon himself would be profoundly disappointed if he did not go, since he had great zeal for making peace among the various religious factions.⁵⁵ Luther’s position remained the same as when Melanchthon had planned to go to France only a few months before. The author agrees with Tjernagel, who argues that Luther, along with other Reformers, hoped that King Henry might accept the *Confessio Augustana* in England.⁵⁶

It seems that the Saxon Reformers had unrealistic expectations that King Henry would accept the *Confessio Augustana* at the outset. Henry’s instructions specifically showed that divorce and consultation on Church reform was on his agents’ agenda.

In preparation for the English embassy, on September 13 the Elector of Saxony asked Dr. Brück, his chancellor, to welcome Robert Barnes at Wittenberg and employed Melanchthon or Georg Spalatin (an associate of Luther) to translate Barnes’s Latin message for him.⁵⁷

At the end of September, the elector sent a letter to Luther, Jonas, Bugenhagen, Melanchthon and Cruciger in which he asked the theologians to confer with the English embassy due to his forthcoming trip. The elector pointed out that they should not enter into any agreement with the English before his return in December.⁵⁸ It seems that the elector was working on the embassy

⁵² L&P, IX, No. 355, p. 119; SP1/196, Fols. 143–145.

⁵³ WA VI, No. 1861, pp. 178–182 = LW L, No. 245, pp. 27–40; L&P, IX, No. 838, p. 282.

⁵⁴ WA VII, No. 2240, pp. 266–267. See Kusukawa 2002, pp. 236–237; McEntegart 2002, p. 29.

⁵⁵ WA VII, No. 2240, pp. 266–267. Tjernagel 1965, p. 140.

⁵⁶ Tjernagel 1965, p. 148.

⁵⁷ CR II, 1326, pp. 938–939; L&P, 1535, IX, No. 363, p. 123. McEntegart 2002, pp. 29, 35.

⁵⁸ WA VII, No. 2249, pp. 281, 283–284. McEntegart 2002, p. 35.

both directly and through his theologians. It was very important for the elector that no agreement be made while he was absent.

Barnes must have brought communications from Henry VIII. Three days later, on September 21, the elector responded to Barnes. He said he would gladly welcome the other ambassador (Edward Fox), but apologized for having to go to Vienna on important business.⁵⁹ However, he instructed the ambassadors to have peaceful negotiations with the doctors at the university. Regarding the king's request to have Melanchthon make the journey to England, the decision would have to wait until the elector's return. Kohnle argues that Melanchthon's invitation had to go through official channels. Since the elector was not present, the matter was delayed until it was no longer valid since the king's delegation was already in Germany to negotiate.⁶⁰ There are other reasons to consider the elector's delay and possible denial. The elector had rebuked Melanchthon's attempts to travel to France as a private citizen and denied his trip. So, how could he allow him to travel to England? The elector invited Henry to join the Schmalkaldic League on the condition that he subscribe to the *Confessio Augustana*.⁶¹ It seems that the elector had plans for Henry without even having heard the ambassador's reasons for coming. Putting forward this invitation at the outset greatly diminished the possibility of winning Henry to their side. The elector had neglected to allow an opportunity for Fox to present the king's issues, and must have had a different idea of the embassy sent by Henry than the theologians. This shows that the Schmalkaldic League strengthened the conservative party in England. The Anglo-German negotiations showed them that the Protestants were as immovable as the Roman Church in their religious opinions, as the Protestants allowed little time for the consultation that Henry expected.⁶² Furthermore, Kohnle argues that the elector kept the right of veto concerning any decisions, even the theological ones.⁶³

The denial of Melanchthon's trip to France was still fresh, and asking the elector to allow him to travel to England was too premature. Besides, the elector immediately announced that he had other important business to do, and when he returned he would start negotiations. This shows how the elector wanted to demonstrate his primary duty to the emperor and how foreign relations took precedence over religious talks.

A week later, on September 28, 1535, the Elector of Saxony sent a letter to Henry VIII, thanking him for Barnes' speech and the good disposition the king had shown in sending his embassy to Germany. He wished to reciprocate that affection, since it had increased after he learned of the king's interest in reforming doctrine. Abuses in the church due to the negligence of the Roman popes needed to be corrected, in which King Henry might help. Dr. Barnes would inform the king of most of their affairs.⁶⁴ Tjernagel argues that Barnes' mission was the first one

⁵⁹ McEntegart notes that the Elector was travelling to Austria to meet King Ferdinand. McEntegart 2002, p. 35.

⁶⁰ Kohnle 2011, p. 49.

⁶¹ John Frederick, to the dictates of the most Serene King of England, as reported by the venerable and most learned man Dr. Antony Barnes. CR II, 1329, pp. 940–943.

⁶² McEntegart 2002, p. 51.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1631, pp. 457–459; CR II, 1330, pp. 943–344. The same letter was composed by Melanchthon in German and sent to the Elector, but in Latin to Henry VIII. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1631, pp. 457–459; CR II, 1330, pp. 943–344.

and that the elector did not offer much support either to Melanchthon's trip to England, nor to England's acceptance of the league, nor to changes in their theological position.⁶⁵ This author concurs that there were two different meetings. The first was with Barnes, who was well acquainted with the Reformers, and to which the elector responded to Henry in his letter. The second meeting took place when Fox arrived later but was dismissed by the elector, who excused himself for urgent business reasons.

Melanchthon seemed to be over the unpleasant French project. He noted in a letter to Justus Jonas that the elector treated Robert Barnes honorably on his arrival and that he himself had spoken with the elector in a fairly friendly fashion. Melanchthon also wrote to Jonas that the elector had arranged a "state banquet in the old fashion, a most beautiful remembrance which is a token of extraordinary good will to honor Antony [Dr. Barnes], the Englishman."⁶⁶ Tjernagel argues that Barnes seemed to have taken credit for preventing Melanchthon's trip to France and thought that he had secured his trip to England. This is without factual support, as is Barnes' interpretation of his reception with the elector, who delayed any requests after his return. Melanchthon did not mention anything about Fox's arrival.⁶⁷ He later learnt from Luther that Fox's departure had been delayed because Fox had been ill.⁶⁸

While the elector was in Vienna, the professors seem to have remained in Jena due to pestilence at Wittenberg. On October 17, in a letter to Luther, Melanchthon wrote that the English messenger [Christopher] Mont had not returned to see him in Jena.⁶⁹ Mont had initially been sent to look for Melanchthon in France, and then, had joined the other English ambassadors in Germany. Melanchthon had corresponded with him earlier and hoped to see him for further discussions.

Fox's embassy's departure was delayed until the middle of October. Fox's embassy finally arrived on November 25, 1535.⁷⁰ Luther wrote to Melanchthon in Jena, on December 3, 1535 that there was no need to write since Robert Barnes had arrived in Jena a second time and would report everything that happened at Wittenberg in person. Barnes, he said, was free from worries, since Barnes thought that the enemies of the Reformation might have prevented the embassy's trip.⁷¹ Since the ambassadors had arrived safely, preparation for mutual conference began.⁷²

⁶⁵ Tjernagel 1965, pp. 149–150.

⁶⁶ Melanchthon to Justus Jonas at the end of September 1535. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1634, p. 461; CR II, 1332, p. 945.

⁶⁷ Luther to Melanchthon in Jena, December, approximately 3, 1535 [Luther an Melanchthon in Jena. Wittenberg, c. 3. Dezember 1535]. WA VII, No. 2276, pp. 330–331. McEntegart notes that Edward Fox became ill and did not leave England until the middle of October and did not arrive until November. McEntegart 2002, pp. 35–36.

⁶⁸ WA VII, No. 2276, pp. 330–331 = LW, L, No. 266, p. 115.

⁶⁹ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1646, p. 478; CR II, 1343, pp. 954.

⁷⁰ WA VII, No. 2276, Introduction, p. 330. McEntegart 2002, pp. 35–36.

⁷¹ WA VII, No. 2276, p. 330, = LW, L, No. 266, pp. 115–116. When learning of the delay in Fox's arrival, Barnes and Luther were afraid that the sending of Fox and Heath had been sabotaged by the enemies of Reformation in England. They left for Germany on October 12. Luther wrote to Melanchthon in Jena, on December 3, 1535, that Robert Barnes had arrived in Jena a second time, so there was no need to write, since Barnes would report everything that happened at Wittenberg in person, and that Barnes was free from worries. WA VII, 2276, note 2, p. 331; LW, L, No. 266, notes 7–8, p. 115.

⁷² According to Luther, Melanchthon had the honor to meet the ambassadors of the King of England, Fox and Heath, and "our Sovereign," referring to Elector John Frederick, and to prepare to have a conference with them. WA VII, No. 2276, pp. 330–331 = LW, L, No. 266, p. 114. Luther never went to Jena; LW, L, No. 266, note 6, p. 115.

McEntegart points out that Wolfgang von Anhalt at Erfurt received the English ambassadors,⁷³ and that they were handed a letter from the Elector John Frederick dated November 17.⁷⁴ This author thinks that McEntegart's dating of the letter is incorrect. The letter, drafted by Melancthon, was not in fact given to the embassy until December 22, 1535, on behalf of the Schmalkaldic League, in the name of Francis Burchard.⁷⁵

In this writer's view, Henry's main purpose in sending his ambassadors was to find a common strategy for the council. The Germans' proposal seems to have been for Henry to subscribe to their confession rather than discussing the council. Chibi argues that the embassy's mission was to influence the Saxon princes not to attend the council.⁷⁶ The embassy's mission was one of consultation, and Fox's proposals did not clearly indicate the king's determination not to attend, but to find a common strategy.

When the elector returned from his trip to Vienna, on December 6, 1535, he ordered both Luther and Melancthon to go to Jena to hold discussions with the English embassy.⁷⁷ The elector had sent Francis Burchard ahead to meet the embassy, and Barnes had gone there to meet the English ambassadors.⁷⁸ On December 3, 1535, Luther had written to Melancthon that Barnes had arrived and asked him to welcome the English embassy.⁷⁹ Melancthon wrote to Luther three days later that he was unable to meet Barnes since he had just arrived to investigate some Anabaptists.⁸⁰ Certainly, Melancthon wished to meet Barnes immediately on his arrival to hear how things were at Wittenberg.⁸¹ It seems that the elector and Luther had the upper hand in dealing with the English embassy, not Melancthon.

On the elector's return, he took over the leadership of the English embassy to avoid any misconception that his theologians were leading foreign relations. This must have influenced the topics during the negotiations. The Schmalkaldic League was such a power in European politics that the elector's negotiations with King Henry would not have caused much turmoil inside the empire. Melancthon probably did feel comfortable at the outset in joining the negotiations in which both parties presented their respective goals.

On December 15, 1535, in a secret meeting with Dr. Brück and Francis Burchard, the English embassy presented these five points: 1) that the king would support the doctrine of the Saxon

⁷³ Luther knew that Fox and Heath arrived at Erfurt on November 25 and were received by Prince Wolfgang von Anhalt representing the Elector, who was in Vienna. WA VII, No. 2276, Introduction, p. 330. McEntegart quotes the date of the ambassadors' arrival as November 28, 1535. McEntegart 2002, p. 36.

⁷⁴ McEntegart argues dating the letter to November 17, 1535, using the date on CR II, No. 1356, pp. 968–972. The correct date is December 22, 1535 in MBW T 6, 1679, pp. 547–550. McEntegart 2002, pp. 35–36.

⁷⁵ The League of Schmalkalden to the English embassy. [Edward Fox in Schmalkalden. The letter was drafted by Francis Burchard and Philip Melancthon.] December 22, 1535. [Der Schmalkaldische Bund an den englischen Gesandten Edward Fox in Schmalkalden. Von Franz Burchard und M. formuliert.] MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1679, pp. 547–548.

⁷⁶ Chibi 2003, p. 170.

⁷⁷ WA VII, No. 2277, Introduction, p. 332; McEntegart points out that the Elector sent for the English embassy from Erfurt to Weimar on December 8, 1535. McEntegart 2002, p. 36; Dingel 1998, p. 116.

⁷⁸ WA VII, No. 2276, p. 330 = LW, L, No. 266, p. 114.

⁷⁹ WA VII, No. 2276, p. 330 = LW, L, No. 266, p. 114.

⁸⁰ WA VII, No. 2278, p. 334. McEntegart 2002, p. 36.

⁸¹ WA VII, No. 2276, Introduction, p. 330. Barnes probably arrived in Jena in the evening of December 5, 1535. He probably left Wittenberg December 3, [or beginning of December?] 1535, when Luther wrote to Melancthon. WA VII, No. 2276, Introduction, p. 330; LW, L, 266, p. 113.

princes; 2) that Henry did not object to the principle of the General Council, but demanded that it should meet in a free and safer place; 3) that the pope should not be its arbitrator; 4) that the embassy and the league should discuss the doctrine before attending the council; 5) that Henry would like to have an embassy sent to England to discuss doctrine.⁸² It seems that Fox's instructions were summarized during this preliminary meeting. Obviously, the ambassadors were to avoid discussion of the divorce, the Lübeck question, the relations with the French, and the executions of Thomas More and John Fisher; they were to present just the essential points.

Negotiations at Schmalkalden

After the initial meeting with the elector's representatives, Dr. Brück and Francis Burchard, the elector himself responded to the English ambassadors. His response touched the points of Fox's instructions. The situation was complicated by the presence of the papal legate, Peter Paul Vergerio, whom Luther saw as a threat to Wittenberg. Luther said that he wished there were more kings of England who would "slay them."⁸³ Was this Luther's acceptance of the executions of Fisher and More, or only a rhetorical statement on facing the threat of the papal nuncio⁸⁴ in Wittenberg?

On December 22, 1535, the Elector of Saxony assured the English delegation that the confederated states had accepted the evangelical doctrine as based on Holy Scripture and they had reprobated the impious doctrine of the pope, even though they had suffered great injuries and threats from their adversaries.⁸⁵ He asked King Henry to trust the constancy of the allied states in defending the truth of the Gospel.⁸⁶ The elector was delighted to hear that the king had uprooted the tyranny of the Roman pope in England. To the king's wish to have agreement on religion, the elector responded that the allied states were unanimous in the confession they stated at Augsburg before the emperor.⁸⁷ The elector affirmed that the allied states did not tolerate the Anabaptists in their territories. Regarding the council, of which the king had warned the allied states, the elector reiterated that the pope's orator had visited him, offering a free Christian council in Mantua. He would respond to the papal orator as soon as he had received the opinion of the allied states.⁸⁸

The elector promised to inform the ambassadors of any proposals about the General Council made to the pope's orator by the princes, so that they could forward them to King Henry. The orator had stressed that the right to hold a synod belonged to the pope. But the allied princes

⁸² CR II, 1375, pp. 1007–1009. McEntegart 2002, p. 37.

⁸³ WA VII, No. 2276, pp. 330 = LW, L, No. 266, p. 115.

⁸⁴ He had arrived on November 6, 1535. Luther to Justus Jonas, November 10, 1535 [Luther an Justus Jonas. 10. November, 1535]. WA VII, No. 2270, p. 322; LW, L, No. 265, p. 110.

⁸⁵ The Schmalkaldic League's constitution was approved at Schmalkalden the very next day: December 23, 1535. It adopted the common forms of later medieval German urban and noble associations, with several innovations. The members belonged to two geographical districts: The Saxon Elector led the northern district; the Hessian Landgrave the southern one. Brady 2009, p. 220.

⁸⁶ The League of Schmalkalden to the English embassy. [Edward Fox in Schmalkalden. The letter was drafted by Francis Burchard and Philip Melanchthon.] December 22, 1535. [Der Schmalkaldische Bund an den englischen Gesandten Edward Fox in Schmalkalden. Von Franz Burchard und M. formuliert.] MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1679, pp. 547–548.

⁸⁷ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1679, p. 548.

⁸⁸ Ibid., pp. 548–549.

thought that it required the kings' consent to be legitimate, and they asked King Henry to warn other kings of the pope's trickery.⁸⁹ The elector agreed to hold further discussions with the ambassadors of King Henry.⁹⁰ It was clear that the elector was bound by all the states belonging to the Schmalkaldic League. He realized that his responses to the English embassy needed to include the opinions of all the allied states. The question of the authority to convene a council became a crucial point of discussion between the opinion of the pope's legate and the opinion of the leaders of the allied states—the power of the pope, or the secular magistracy.

At the same time, Melanchthon wrote to Joachim Camerarius on December 22, 1535, to forward a letter to one of the envoys, wanting an answer from him as soon as possible.⁹¹ Since Melanchthon mentioned the fate of Thomas More in the same context, saying: "I am affected by the fate of More, but I will not get mixed up in those matters,"⁹² it seems he wanted to find out more of what was going on in England, even though he already knew about the fate of More from Luther earlier in December.⁹³

Kusukawa points out that Melanchthon had expressed nothing of his personal views in writing. Melanchthon was in no hurry to travel to England. Perhaps the elector's denial of the French invitation and More's fate made him unwilling to travel. Melanchthon might have also identified himself with a fellow humanist's fate whose disagreement with the king cost him his life, implying that if he disagreed he might suffer the same fate.⁹⁴

In this writer's view, Melanchthon had expressed in several letters his disappointment with the elector's denial. It seems that his disagreement with the elector had more to do with Melanchthon being unwilling to travel without the elector's specific orders.⁹⁵ Melanchthon then touched on the use of the number of sacraments by the Church of England. At the same time, he said that he wrote the *Loci Communes* to shed light on such obscure and intricate matters as the English use of the sacraments. Melanchthon then ended his letter with an example of his own fellow-countrymen who, when explaining doctrinal matters, used incorrect phrases but held to the main points of the doctrine, which was more important.⁹⁶

On December 24, Edward Fox addressed the Schmalkaldic League. His main points were the friendship between Henry and the Elector of Saxony, public peace and concord based on the "Word of God," the abuses and insults of the Bishop of Rome [the pope] in England, the similarity of the will and mind of the king and the elector in doctrine, the Anabaptists, and

⁸⁹ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1679, p. 549; CR II, 1356, pp. 968–972; L&P, IX, No. 834, p. 280.

⁹⁰ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1679, pp. 549–550.

⁹¹ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1678, pp. 544–546; CR II, 1381, p. 1028.

⁹² MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1678, p. 546; CR II, 1381, p. 1028.

⁹³ WA VII, No. 2276, pp. 330–331. Probably Melanchthon knew about More's fate earlier, as early as August 1535. The condemnation of religious men in England must have been a general remark. "Famous Last Words: The Final Epistolary Exchange between Erasmus of Rotterdam and Philip Melanchthon in 1536," Wengert 2010, XII, p. 19, has proved with considerable evidence that Melanchthon would have not known of Thomas More's execution in March 1535, but in August. See MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1616, p. 440; CR II, 1309, pp. 918–919.

⁹⁴ Kusukawa 2002, pp. 237–238.

⁹⁵ See Melanchthon's letters in MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1609, p. 425; MBW R 2; MBW T 6 1611, pp. 429–430; MBW R 2; MBW T 6 1613, p. 436. Melanchthon expressed the possibility of suffering the same fate as Thomas More if he would travel to France, comparing his fate to the persecution of the evangelicals in France. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1616, p. 440.

⁹⁶ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1678, pp. 545–546; CR II, 1381, p. 1027.

finally the pope's council. The last had to be impeded in order to block papal tyranny, hatred, and impious abuses. According to him, the council should be free, in order to achieve the goal of Christian peace and concord.⁹⁷

Horst mentions that both England and France were present at Schmalkalden at Christmas in 1535. Both the French and English kings were interested in joining the Schmalkaldic League. Both wished to have Melanchthon give advice on church polity questions in their respective countries. The major problem between the old church and the Reformation churches was the position of the pope. The Roman Church saw him as representing Christ on earth. Horst argues that the elector allowed Melanchthon to correspond with both kings.⁹⁸ The elector made the final decision over his theologians.

On Christmas Day 1535, the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse, who were the leaders of the Schmalkaldic League, responded to Fox's speech with thirteen articles (later known as the Christmas Articles),⁹⁹ which were written by Melanchthon: 1) That the king promote the Gospel of Christ and the doctrine of faith in the same measure as the princes and confederated states confessed it in the committee in Augsburg [i.e., the *Confessio Augustana*]; 2) That the king protect and defend the doctrine of the Gospel and the ceremonies conforming to the Gospel, together with the princes and confederated states in a future General Council; 3) That the king not make an agreement without the express consent of the aforesaid princes and confederated states, nor agree to any prohibition of the General Council, or to the council itself, and that all be done and carried out by mutual planning and consent of the king and the princes; 4) If the king, the princes, and the confederated states do not agree on the location of the council, and the Bishop of Rome and other princes joined with him wish nonetheless to proceed with the council to which the king, princes, and confederated states have not agreed, the king, princes, and confederated states will join forces and cause such an announcement to be entirely blocked; 5) That they will make their own public protestations and they will see that this is done also by their clergy, and they will dissent completely from a convocation and announcement of this sort; 6) In addition, that they will never obey or allow obedience to be practiced to any decrees, mandates, or motions, bulls, letters, briefs, or whatever is announced and celebrated by a council of this sort; but that they will consider and esteem all manner of writings of this sort as null, void, empty, and ineffective; 7) That the king, allied with Christian doctrine and its confession with the princes and confederated states, finds it worthy to be joined with them and that he should assume the name of defender and protector of the aforesaid alliance; 8) That neither the king nor the princes or confederated states will ever in the future acknowledge or defend what the Bishop of Rome holds, and will never concede that it is expedient for the Christian republic that the pope preside over all the other bishops, or exercise in the future any jurisdiction whatsoever in the realms, dominions, or possessions of the aforesaid king and princes; 9) If it happens that war or any other conflict be made or inflicted by any prince, state, or people against the aforesaid princes or confederated states, that none of the aforementioned parties will bear aid, support, or assistance against another party; but neither will they, individually or as a group, go

⁹⁷ CR II, 1382, pp. 1028–1032.

⁹⁸ Jesse Horst: *Leben und Wirken des Philipp Melanchthon*. 2005, p. 131 (hereafter, Horst 2005).

⁹⁹ Dingel 1998, p. 116; Tjernagel 1965, pp. 155, 161.

against the prince or the people thus attacking and waging war; 10) That the king will, for the safety of the pact and this most honorable cause, deposit with these princes the sum of one hundred thousand crowns [approximately \$120 million to \$360 million today], one-half of which will be available for the confederates to use for defense, and that the allies should take from the remaining halves that sum which they themselves have contributed and deposited;¹⁰⁰ 11) That if there is need of daily defense on account of the continuation of war or invasion of adversaries, since the princes and allies are obligated to a further collection of money and to mutual defense, the king should not be reluctant to contribute even more, namely another two hundred thousand crowns, and the allies should use half the money together with their own contributions, and if the war ended quickly, then whatever is left should be restored to the king; 12) If the king wishes it, the princes will promise and guarantee with their own additional deposits not only that they will not use such money for some other purpose, but also that they will pay back completely and faithfully to the same king the same sum; and 13) Since the ambassadors of the king are going to remain for a time in Germany and are going to speak with learned men about certain passages in sacred writings, the princes ask that they find out as soon as possible the intention and opinion of the king about the aforementioned conditions in the treaty; about the place and status of entering into it; and once they have been informed about these things, that they convey the king's response to the princes, the Elector of Saxony, and the Landgrave of Hesse, and as soon as they have done this, the princes will immediately send ambassadors to the king, among them an excellent scholar, to conclude points of doctrine of the faith.¹⁰¹

This is an instance in which Melanchthon was used as the voice of Wittenberg through his writing of the Christmas Articles for the elector. Earlier, he also wrote the letter that denied his trip to the king of France for the elector.

In summary, the Schmalkaldic League with its confederated states expected Henry to promote the doctrine of the *Confessio Augustana*; that neither would agree with the General Council; that they would block the meeting location; that they would make a public protestation against the council; that the parties would not obey the council's decrees; that the king would be the Defender of the League; that they would not defend the Bishop of Rome nor acknowledge his authority over bishops; that they will not engage in war against each other; and that the king would donate a certain portion of money used for defense and for no other purpose.

The German approach of expecting Henry to accept the *Confessio Augustana*, and that the confession even was the basis for the conferences, was too abrupt for the English embassy. This may have been the reason why the English pushed to have Melanchthon attend the negotiations. Luther also had recommended that Melanchthon should attend. The elector failed to see that Henry's purpose as far as religion was concerned was only to consult the Saxon Reformers, not to commit to their doctrine. This shows how political and religious matters are intertwined, and one agenda may overcome the other.

When the Elector John Frederick and Philip of Hesse asked Henry to accept the *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia*, Henry refused. Bernard argues it was because he did not want to

¹⁰⁰ For currency conversion rates, see Chapter Three, note 140.

¹⁰¹ Proposition made to the King, by the German Princes. Paper-Office, Burnet, Vol 4, Book III, XLIV, pp. 471–472. CR II, 1383, pp. 1032–35; L&P, IX, No. 1016, p. 345. McEntegart 2002, pp. 37–38.

declare himself a Lutheran.¹⁰² The Schmalkaldic League was prepared to pull Henry into a military alliance against the emperor, which would have entailed Henry's defense of the Protestant princes' prerogatives inside the Holy Roman Empire. The articles also stipulated that he would oppose the pope's prerogatives concerning the General Council. Hence the king would have united forces with the league against the pope. The leaders of the League assumed that Henry would accept their doctrinal stance—the *Confessio Augustana*—which the emperor had refuted in Augsburg in 1530. Consequently, Henry would have opposed the emperor both in religious and political matters. Henry needed to consider all the factors involved in the proposal. Bernard argues that Henry expected a compromise between the English and the Germans before he would consider accepting the title of the league's protector.¹⁰³

This seems to be the German response to the points presented by Edward Fox on December 24, 1535.¹⁰⁴ Henry's response to these articles, which came three months later, in March 1536, will be discussed below.

Negotiations at Wittenberg

After the meeting at Schmalkalden, the serious negotiations got under way. The negotiations between the English embassy and the Saxon Reformers were a necessary part of the search for common doctrinal ground to defend in a future General Council. It was also important for the formation of the Anglo-Schmalkaldic alliance and would help England and the league against its opponents, as the king had declared in his instructions to Fox.¹⁰⁵

The English emissaries—Edward Fox, Robert Barnes, and Nicholas Heath—wanted to have Melancthon attend the negotiations with the German theologians from the beginning. Melancthon himself, however, was unsure whether to attend. Kohnle argues that the English delegates spent three weeks securing Melancthon's attendance, since the elector objected to his presence.¹⁰⁶ Even though Melancthon did not think that it was right for him to hurry to be present at the discussions with the English, he indicated to Jonas on January 1, 1536, that if the elector would require him to come, he would not reject the request.¹⁰⁷ Melancthon left the decision-making authority to the elector. The Anglo-Lutheran negotiations continued from January 1 until April 1536. Dingel argues that the German Reformers were unable to reach a satisfactory decision on his divorce, which caused Henry to lose trust that they would defend him against the pope and his council; the religious unification efforts did not fit into the king's political plans.¹⁰⁸

There seemed to be confusion about who should decide on leadership of the discussions with the English embassy. On January 9, 1536, the Elector of Saxony wrote to Luther stating that the

¹⁰² Bernard 2005, p. 239.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 240.

¹⁰⁴ CR II, 1375, pp. 1007–1009. CR II, 1382, pp. 1028–1032; McEntegart 2002, pp. 37–38.

¹⁰⁵ SP 1/96 1535, Fol. 13r, 13v, 14r, 15r, 19v. In the political context of ratifying the Schmalkaldic League and the discussions around mutual alliance with the League, it is proper to use term the Anglo-Schmalkaldic alliance.

¹⁰⁶ Kohnle 2011, p. 49.

¹⁰⁷ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1684, p. 28. Philip Melancthon signed the letter on December 31, 1535 [1536].

¹⁰⁸ Dingel 1998, pp. 116–117, 121.

English embassy would like to have Melanchthon join in the negotiations, and asked Luther his opinion about whether Melanchthon should participate.¹⁰⁹ This author agrees with Dingel that the English might have hoped to have Melanchthon on their side.¹¹⁰ While the elector himself preferred Melanchthon to stay in Jena, Luther responded that he felt Melanchthon should be present because the English looked favorably upon his opinions. In addition, some might interpret Melanchthon not attending as if he was not important enough to invite, or as a slight to the English.¹¹¹ The elector's denial may reflect his past encounter with Melanchthon or the elector might have wanted to take the lead with the English, as seen in the propositions in the Christmas Articles.

Melanchthon had already given his opinion on Henry's marriage in 1531 when he had not found any scriptural grounds for divorce.¹¹² Nevertheless, the English still wanted his presence, since they felt he was more sympathetic to the divorce than Luther.¹¹³ It was Philip Melanchthon's Europe-wide reputation as a representative of moderate Protestantism and the composer of the conciliatory *Confessio Augustana* that had impressed Henry.¹¹⁴ It appears that Melanchthon had considered attending the meeting at Wittenberg.

The discussion on divorce seemed to have a sudden end, since Luther also wrote to the elector "I shall not let myself be talked into publicly condemning the Queen and the young Queen [Catherine and Mary], together with the whole kingdom, as being incestuous, as they brag that the pope and eleven universities have already done."¹¹⁵ Ironically, Luther was not aware that Catherine had died four days earlier, on January 7, 1536.¹¹⁶

Melanchthon had returned from Schmalkalden to Jena, where the University of Wittenberg had been transferred due to pestilence. Melanchthon excused himself at first since he was busy at the university and was also interrogating the Anabaptists at the request of the Elector of Saxony, and his excuse was accepted.¹¹⁷ On January 15, 1536, Melanchthon, remaining at Jena on the order of the prince, sent a letter with greetings from the Landgrave of Hesse to Dr. Martin, Dr. Jonas, Johan Bugenhagen, and Dr. Cruciger, and mentioned him wanting to meet Bishop Fox and Robert Barnes.¹¹⁸ He must have received an invitation from the elector, as a letter from Anthony Musa to Stephen Rothe indicated that Melanchthon had left for Wittenberg the previous day. Since this letter was written on January 16, Melanchthon must have left on January 15, the

¹⁰⁹ WA VII, No. 2282, p. 340. Dingel 2012a, p. 115.

¹¹⁰ Dingel 2012a, pp. 115–116.

¹¹¹ WA VII, No. 2283, pp. 341–342 = LW, L, No. 267, pp. 120–121.

¹¹² WA VII, No. 2283, p. 342 = LW, L, No. 267, p. 120. McEntegart argues that the Anglo-German discussions of Henry's divorce started as early as 1531. McEntegart 2002, p. 39.

¹¹³ WA VII, No. 2283, pp. 341–342 = LW, L, No. 267, pp. 118–122; CR III, 1387, pp. 10–11; No. 1397, pp. 37–38; CR II, 1000, pp. 520–527; No. 1001, pp. 527–529; L&P, X, No. 63, p. 23; No. 108, p. 38; L&P, X, No. 112, pp. 38–39; No. 266, p. 98.

¹¹⁴ McEntegart 2002, p. 46.

¹¹⁵ Luther to Elector John Frederick, January 11, 1536 [Luther an Kurfürst Johann Friedrich]. WA VII, No. 2283, pp. 341–343 = LW, L, No. 267, pp. 119–122; L&P, X, No. 108, p. 38; L&P, X, No. 158, p. 58.

¹¹⁶ *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, Vol. I, pp. 32–33.

¹¹⁷ Philip Melanchthon to Justus Jonas [M. an Justus Jonas in Wittenberg]. January 15, 1536. MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1688, p. 37; CR III, 1388, p. 11; WA, VII, No. 2283, pp. 341–342; LW, L, No. 257, pp. 118, 120–121.

¹¹⁸ Melanchthon to Justus Jonas [M. and Justus Jonas in Wittenberg]. MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1688, pp. 36–37; CR III, 1388, p. 11.

same day he wrote to Justus Jonas. They thought that Melanchthon would only stay away fourteen days.¹¹⁹

The English and the Germans had a different understanding of doctrinal authority. The common interest in the meetings between the two sides was the threat of a General Council convened by the pope. When the English had first arrived at Wittenberg, Fox had stressed that they and the Germans should both oppose the convening of such a council. They wanted any decisions they might reach to be based on Scripture rather than on papal canons, the former being divine, and the latter only human. For their part, the German theologians—Martin Luther, Philip Melanchthon, Justus Jonas, Caspar Cruciger, and John Bugenhagen—wanted to prepare for the General Council, should there be one, by getting the English to agree to the principles set forth in Melanchthon's *Confessio Augustana*.¹²⁰ McEntegart argues that the king's intention was to consult the princes on their doctrine, which he had mentioned in his instructions to Fox.¹²¹ His acceptance or refusal of the doctrine of the *Confessio Augustana* was another matter. The king's refusal to accept their doctrine outright was hard for the league to tolerate.¹²²

On January 19/20 1536, Melanchthon returned from his interrogation of the Anabaptists in Jena to stay in Wittenberg along with Luther and the other Saxon theologians.¹²³ Melanchthon assured Burchard that Luther had invited him to Wittenberg, and told him that the English had not discussed anything with the Wittenberg theologians, and that the English embassy preferred him to stay and discuss doctrine.¹²⁴

Luther expected the negotiations to last only three days. He expressed his frustration to the Elector of Saxony, on January 25, that the English seemed to have no intention of ever leaving,¹²⁵ thinking that there was no issue left since the Queen of England had just died. In the meantime, Luther wrote to his friend Caspar Müller, informing him that Queen Catherine was dead and giving his opinion on the status of Mary Tudor:

It is also said that the child, her daughter is deathly ill. In the eyes of the whole world she has lost her case; we poor beggars, the theologians at Wittenberg, are the only exceptions who would like to maintain her in royal honor, where she should have stayed. This has been the end and solution [of this matter].¹²⁶

Luther opposed Henry's divorce from Queen Catherine on the grounds that his divorce was against divine law.¹²⁷ However, even though he was against the divorce, he still believed that the pope did not deal fairly with King Henry:

¹¹⁹ CR III, 1389, p. 12.

¹²⁰ WA VII, No. 2283, pp. 341–342 = LW, L, No. 267, pp. 118–119. L&P, X, No. 63, p. 23; No. 108, p. 38; No. 168, p. 61.

¹²¹ SP 1/96 1535, Fol. 14r.

¹²² McEntegart 2002, pp. 47–48.

¹²³ Philip Melanchthon to Francis Burchard, January 19/20, 1536. MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1690, p. 45; CR III, 1393, p. 26. See also Philip Melanchthon to Justus Jonas. January 15, 1536. MBW T 7, 1688, p. 37; CR II, No. 1388, p. 11; Anthony Musa to Stephen Rothe. January 16, 1536. CR III, 1389, pp. 12–14.

¹²⁴ Philip Melanchthon to Francis Burchard January 19/20, 1536. MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1690, p. 45; CR III, 1393, p. 26; L&P, X, No. 158, p. 58.

¹²⁵ WA VII, No. 2287, p. 349 = LW, L, No. 269, pp. 126–127; WA VII, No. 2289, p. 352 = LW, L, No. 270, p. 131. L&P, X, No. 180.

¹²⁶ WA VII, No. 2287, pp. 348–350 = LW, L, No. 269, pp. 126–127.

¹²⁷ WA VI, No. 1861, pp. 178–182 = LW, L, No. 245, pp. 31–40.

In this case the Pope has acted like a real Pope, and has issued contradictory bulls. He has played such a game that it served him right to be ousted from England—and not even for the sake of the gospel. He has played his game well against the King, so that I am forced to stand up for the King, and yet I am unable to approve of the matter. For goodness sake, pray the Pater noster at least once against the papacy, that St. Valentine may grab it by the neck!¹²⁸

By the beginning of February, the English emissaries were still discussing the subject of Henry's divorce, as we know from Melanchthon's letter of February 6 to his friend Joachim Camerarius.¹²⁹ Henry wanted to have the divorce approved retroactively, even though Catherine was dead.¹³⁰ The issue would affect the succession to the crown. In his letter to Camerarius, Melanchthon esteemed Nicholas Heath, but was less enthusiastic about the other English emissaries.¹³¹

On February 6, Melanchthon also wrote a letter to his colleague, Vitus Theodoric (Veit Dietrich) and reported that the discussions dealt with the former queen's divorce. The English and German theologians disagreed with the dispensation question, but thought the divorce was not necessary. The English were against the dispensation, and the Germans were for it but against the divorce. The commission was to commence discussion of the doctrinal issues, Melanchthon wrote.¹³²

The official negotiations between the English and Saxon theologians probably began on February 6 when Melanchthon wrote to Vitus Theodoric that he was summoned because of the English colloquium. He added that they had discussed doctrine only occasionally, but now "we will be getting to them, and there you will have the whole story of the English."¹³³

Melanchthon requested Theodoric to ask Andreas Osiander, a Lutheran reformer, to write out the position of the Jewish preachers on whether a germane brother ought to marry his brother's widow. Interestingly, on February 6, Osiander wrote to Luther that the Jewish prohibition concerning marriage to the wife of one's brother applied at all times, whether the brother was alive or dead.¹³⁴ In the second half of February, Osiander wrote to Melanchthon on the same issue.¹³⁵ Osiander gave the opinion that the Levitical law prohibiting marriage with the brother's wife is applicable to all people at all times. Leviticus was natural law, Osiander said, but its practices were not applicable to Christians as stated in Deuteronomy, which Luther and Melanchthon had overestimated.¹³⁶ Luther and Melanchthon had to retract their opinions of 1531 for the benefit of the English embassy.

¹²⁸ WA VII, No. 2287, p. 349 = LW, L, No. 269, p. 127.

¹²⁹ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1694, 49, 51; CR III, 1396, pp. 35–36.

¹³⁰ Catherine's death reduced the importance of the divorce as far as the Schmalkaldic League was concerned. McEntegart 2002, p. 44.

¹³¹ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1694, pp. 49–51; CR III, 1396, p. 35; L&P, X, No. 265, p. 98; *Cranmer's Miscellaneous*, p. 276.

¹³² MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1695, p. 52; CR III, 1397, p. 37.

¹³³ Ibid.

¹³⁴ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1696, p. 54; CR III, 1399, p. 39; WA VII, No. 2294, pp. 359–362. McEntegart 2002, pp. 43–44.

¹³⁵ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1705, pp. 64–67. McEntegart notes the English applied the greatest pressure on the relevance of Mosaic Law to Christians and forced both Melanchthon and Luther to seek Andreas Osiander's opinion. 2002, pp. 43–44.

¹³⁶ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1705, pp. 64–67; WA VII, No. 2294, pp. 359–362. McEntegart 2002, pp. 43–44.

In March, Henry seems to have expressed pleasure about the position of the Saxon theologians on his divorce, because his emissaries stated that the king wanted the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse to “take upon them, in all future councils and elsewhere, to defend the opinions of Dr. Martin [Luther], Justus Jonas, Cruciger, Pomeranus [Bugenhagen], and Melanchthon [sic], on the King’s marriage.”¹³⁷ It was not clear to Henry that the Saxon theologians had not approved his divorce,¹³⁸ but the mere knowledge that they had approved the Leviticus law as binding was enough reason for him to make this positive statement. At the end of March, Luther, Jonas, Bugenhagen, and Melanchthon announced their judgment concerning the divorce of Henry VIII. According to their statement, the law of Leviticus 18 and 20 prohibited marriage to a wife of a brother, and divine, natural, and moral law refers as much to a living as to a dead brother’s wife, based on the judgment of the church, its synods, and the Church Fathers, as well on civil law. Civil law had always maintained that such marriages are incestuous and prohibited them, and no dispensation should be given. Even though the marriage had taken place, the Reformers did not recommend that divorce should have taken place.¹³⁹ The German theologians took a final position on Henry’s divorce that was highly negative from the king’s perspective.

Stephen Gardiner’s Response to the Christmas Articles

The articles of the German princes were presented to Edward Fox on Christmas Day of 1535; on February 4, Cromwell sent them to Gardiner saying that the king wanted his opinion of them.¹⁴⁰ McEntegart finds that the conservative religious clergy did not have much to say for reform and any efforts were interpreted as disloyal to the king. On the other hand, they could easily influence the king, since they also knew that the king had the final authority in doctrinal decisions.¹⁴¹

Back in England in February, Stephen Gardiner, the Bishop of Winchester, wrote to Cromwell complaining that the king should not join the Schmalkaldic League with the German princes, since they were beneath Henry in rank and subservient to the emperor. Instead, he advised Henry to give them money and demand that they accept his supremacy and his divorce.¹⁴² Gardiner had been in France as Henry’s ambassador during the time of the Wittenberg negotiations. McEntegart argues that as soon as Henry received the Christmas Articles from Schmalkalden, he immediately contacted his advisers; among them, Stephen Gardiner.¹⁴³ This author concurs with McEntegart that Gardiner’s influence on the outcome of the negotiations

¹³⁷ L&P, X, 457, pp. 148–149; SP1/197, Fols. 28–30. McEntegart 2002, p. 44.

¹³⁸ McEntegart notes that the king thought the Lutheran theologians agreed with the divorce, while they thought they did not. McEntegart 2002, p. 44.

¹³⁹ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, No. 1716, pp. 81–83; L&P, X, No. 771, p. 323. Tjernagel 1965, p. 159.

¹⁴⁰ “The Opinion of me, the Bishop of Winchester, concerning the articles presented to the Kings Highness from the princes of Germany.” Gardiner to Cromwell, middle of February 1536. Harl. 283, 137–141; Cleop. E, v. 226. L&P, X, No. 256, pp. 93–94. *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, No. 53, p. 72; McEntegart 2002, pp. 49–51.

¹⁴¹ McEntegart 2002, pp. 49–51.

¹⁴² The Opinion of me, the Bishop of Winchester, concerning the articles presented to the Kings Highness from the princes of Germany. Gardiner to Cromwell, middle of February 1536. Harl. 283, 137–141; Cleop. E, v. 226. L&P, X, No. 256, pp. 93–94. *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, No. 53, p. 72.

¹⁴³ McEntegart 2002, pp. 61–64.

was considerable. His opinion was a powerful weapon for the conservatives. Gardiner warned that the association with the league would rob the English Church of independence.¹⁴⁴

Gardiner responded to five of the Christmas Articles. In the first article Gardiner questioned Henry on “how He compares the princes as subjects of the emperor and as the king orders in England so the emperor should be ordering his subjects in Germany” and added: “according to the Word of God.”¹⁴⁵

Gardiner thought that the German princes should allow the emperor to be the head of their church and that without him they would not be able to establish anything as far as the “Word of God” was concerned.¹⁴⁶

Gardiner then answered the second article—how can the king trust the promises of the German princes, as they are subjects of the emperor? The king might make a promise in accord with the article and eventually be bound by this promise, even if the princes changed their mind.¹⁴⁷

He also pointed out that Henry was king and head of the Church of England, but the princes of Germany were only dukes and lower degrees, with the emperor as their supreme head. Based on Scripture, the king’s majesty was acknowledged as the head of the church, and thus Henry was head of the English Church, just as the emperor was the head of the German church. Gardiner posed a question: “Howe shal they, without the consent of the head of ther church, which is the Emperour, establish with us the agrement upon ther religion.”¹⁴⁸

In response to the third article, Gardiner stated:

That neither the King nor the Princes shall agree to a General Council without mutual consent, but they shall not refuse such a free Council as the Confederates demanded in their answer to the Bishop of Rome’s orator Peter Paul Vergerio.¹⁴⁹

This article made an exception to such a council as they had requested by way of Vergerio, about which Gardiner wrote:

Inasmoch as the Kinges Highnes hath nothing adoo with the Emperour, I see not howe his Grace shuld agree to any Counsail to be indicted by the said Emperour. And yeat this article doth import that effecte, in that it maketh an exception of such a Counsail as shuld be indicted according to the answer made to Peter Paul Vergerio.¹⁵⁰

To the fourth article—that if the king and the princes cannot agree upon the place or upon the indictment of the council and if the “Bishop of Rome” should proceed nonetheless, they would

¹⁴⁴ McEntegart 2002, pp. 62–63.

¹⁴⁵ The Opinion of me, the Bishop of Winchester, concerning the articles presented to the Kings Highness from the princes of Germany. Gardiner to Cromwell, middle of February 1536. Harl. 283, 137–141; Cleop. E, v. 226. L&P, X, No. 256, pp. 93–94. *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, No. 53, p. 73.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

¹⁴⁷ The Opinion of me, the Bishop of Winchester, concerning the articles presented to the King’s Highness from the princes of Germany. Gardiner to Cromwell, c. middle of February 1536. Harl. 283, 137–141; Cleop. E, v. 226; L&P, X, No. 256, p. 93; *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, No. 53, p. 72; CR II, 1383, pp. 1032–1035.

¹⁴⁸ Opinion of me, the Bishop of Winchester, concerning the article presented to the King’s Highness from the princes of Germany. Gardiner to Cromwell, c. middle of February 1536. Harl. 283, 137–141; Cleop. E, v. 226; L&P, X, No. 256, p. 93; *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, No. 53, p. 72.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

do their utmost to block it—Gardiner responded that the king would do his part, but he could not see how the princes could do their parts.¹⁵¹

Gardiner also questioned the seventh article—that his Majesty [Henry] will be “Defender of the League.” He responded:

The worde ‘association’ soundith not wel. Ne it were convenient that the Kinges Highnes shuld have any lower place thenne to be chief, principal, and hed of the leage, and the rest not to be associate, but adherent and dependaunt therunto, as contrahentes. And if any were, oonly the Duke of Saxe to be associate; whom, for that he is an Electour, the Kinges Highnes hath been accustomed to write, His Cousin, etc.¹⁵²

Gardiner also informed Cromwell that the princes did not seem to reciprocate their friendship, in addition to which they were so far from England and were the emperor’s subjects.¹⁵³ Further, Gardiner reminded Cromwell of their motivations: they did not send their ambassadors to learn from the English but to instruct them and direct their church in ceremonies, and asked the English to accept their doctrinal position.¹⁵⁴

Gardiner then advised the king not to mix himself up in the affairs of Germany, as the emperor was the head of their church. He did not oppose inviting the ambassadors to come and hold discussion for the purpose of consulting them, but the king should avoid forming a permanent bond, “wherof the oon ende shalbe in Germany, shal declare rather a change of a bonde of dependaunce thenne a rydaunce therof.”¹⁵⁵ Gardiner also warned the king that the Germans might not agree to his supremacy for fear of the emperor:

And this cause [supremacy] is nowe soo necessary as the other. For, synnes my cummyng hither, I have been assayed therin; and oon said he thought they in Germanye wold not agree therunto, for feare of geving unto thEmperour overmuch auctorite over them.... The King our master hath a special case, because he is emperour in himself and hath noo superiour.¹⁵⁶

Gardiner pointed out the dangers of joining the Schmalkaldic League: that the Germans were the subjects of the emperor; whether their doctrine of *Confessio Augustana* was “according to the Word of God”; if Henry could trust their promises since the emperor was the head of their church, as Henry was head of the English Church; that their refusal of the General Council was not possible without the permission of all the confederated states; that even if the king blocked the General Council would the league do the same; that their offering of the title Defender of the League was demoting his position as the head of the church.

¹⁵¹ The Opinion of me, the Bishop of Winchester, concerning the articles presented to the Kings Highness from the princes of Germany Gardiner to Cromwell, c. middle of February 1536. Harl. 283, 137–141; Cleop. E, v, 226; L&P, IX, No. 1016, p. 345. *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, No. 53, p. 73. CR II, No. 1383, pp. 1032–1035.

¹⁵² The Opinion of me, the Bishop of Winchester, concerning the articles presented to the Kings Highness from the princes of Germany Gardiner to Cromwell, c. middle of February 1536. Harl. 283, 137–141; Cleop. E, v, 226; L&P, IX, No. 1016, p. 345; L&P, X, No. 256, p. 94; *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, No. 53, p. 73.

¹⁵³ The Opinion of me, the Bishop of Winchester, concerning the articles presented to the Kings Highness from the princes of Germany Gardiner to Cromwell, c. middle of February 1536. Harl. 283, 137–141; Cleop. E, v, 226; L&P, X, No. 256, p. 93; *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, No. 53, p. 74.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 75.

Gardiner's use of the term "according to the Word of God" was misleading, as he did not explain, as a conservative bishop, how he understood the use of the term. In addition, Gardiner proclaiming the emperor as of head of the church would indicate that he acknowledged the supremacy of the Roman Church led by the pope, and that the church belonged to the Holy Roman Empire. A few months earlier, Gardiner had condemned the Roman Church in order to defend Henry's supremacy.

At the same time, Gardiner claimed that the Reformation churches belonged to the Roman Church, since they were under the emperor's rule. Thus Gardiner would not refer to the Protestant churches as "Churches." He also made blocking of the General Council dependent on all the other confederated states, which shows how well he knew the structure of the league. Finally, Gardiner compared the emperor's position to that of Henry and saw the offer to be Defender of the League as a disparagement.

The king did not want to ignore either King Francis or Emperor Charles when negotiating with the Germans. The argument that Henry ceased to show any interest in the league during 1536 and 1538 has been explained as if Henry needed the league's support until the French king and the emperor ceased hostilities. McEntegart points out that Pruser supports this kind of orthodoxy; others who follow him are Merriman, Doernberg, Elton, and Jacobs. McEntegart considers their approach to be determined historiography.¹⁵⁷ This writer agrees with McEntegart that the political and religious implications were manifold. Henry needed support against the pope. It is hard to differentiate in each phase what best suited his goals. Henry's relationship to the Schmalkaldic League represents a firm decision on Henry's part to get their religious support for his reforms in England, and political support against the pope. There were domestic factors that delayed his contacts with the Schmalkaldic League.

Henry wanted to explore all alternatives when making diplomatic overtures in order to secure his neutrality with the emperor and the French king.¹⁵⁸ Of course Gardiner, who was the resident ambassador in France, knew the French connections to German affairs well. McEntegart agrees that Gardiner had considerable influence and advised Henry to remain independent from Wittenberg.¹⁵⁹ McEntegart argues that the conservative clergy's best chance for success was to encourage hesitancy in Henry's theological commitments, but also to remind him that German Protestantism was as authoritarian as Catholicism led by the pope.¹⁶⁰

Gardiner's response to Henry certainly affected his decision on the proposal of joining the Schmalkaldic League. It also strengthened the conservative clergy's position on supremacy and made Gardiner demonstrate to Henry his loyal support for supremacy, even if it was sometimes in doubt.

¹⁵⁷ Roger Bigelow Merriman: *Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell*. 1902, pp. 228–241; G. R. Elton: *England under the Tudors*. 1974, pp. 154–155. Elton 1977, pp. 276–277. Erwin Doernberg: *Henry VIII and Luther*. 1961, pp. 111–115; Henry Eyster Jacobs: *The Lutheran Movement in England*. 1902, pp. 127–130. See McEntegart 2002, pp. 77–78.

¹⁵⁸ McEntegart 2002, pp. 62–63.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

Henry's Response to the Christmas Articles

On March 12, the English emissaries presented Henry's response to the Christmas Articles.¹⁶¹ One may ask whether the ambassadors had actually been able to communicate with Henry concerning his responses during the two months since the conference at Schmalkalden, or whether they had been given the king's authority to respond to the Christmas Articles. Therefore, one may approach the discussion of the responses with caution.

The doubt as to whether the response to the Christmas Articles was from Henry, or given by the ambassadors without consulting Henry, may prove to be a tactic of the Schmalkaldic Leaders. The purpose would be to postpone the final decisions on the mutual contract since they had to wait until all the allied states had given their consent to accept Henry as the Protector of the League.

While he made some amendments, Henry accepted nine of the articles: numbers three, four, five, six, eight, nine, eleven, twelve, and thirteen. In response to the rest of the articles, he made several amendments. He wanted to reword Articles Three and Nine more explicitly. To Article Three, Henry added: "If it be decided by the said most serene king and the said most illustrious princes and allied States in certain agreement and for just reasons." To Article Nine, Henry added: "that neither party should allow anyone of his slaves or subjects to wage war against the other party, or to serve or be of help for any reason, directly or indirectly to those who undertake to invade the other party or to bring any harm upon them." In response to the rest of the articles, he made various amendments.¹⁶²

To Articles One, Two, Seven and Ten, which spoke of Henry's commitment to the Schmalkaldic League, he wanted to add his comments. He responded to Article Ten first. He assured the Germans that he was not in need of defense against either the pope or the emperor—there was no danger from the pope or emperor since Catherine's passing. He was willing to work with the Germans for the restoration of the church and to contribute 100,000 crowns to protect their league.¹⁶³

He then responded to Articles One, Two, and Seven, which he considered linked to Article Ten. It was important for him that the princes and the English ambassadors discuss the first and second articles and come to an agreement on the doctrine of their confession.¹⁶⁴ In his opinion, such an agreement would not be possible if the Germans would not be more flexible in private discussions. Henry did not want to overburden the German negotiators, but asked someone from Germany to come to England to discuss matters with him directly in order to reach an agreement.¹⁶⁵ After the allied states had shown their good will to Henry, he also expected reciprocal compensation between himself and the states, and added three requests.

First, if anyone were to invade England for gain or for religious reasons, the Germans would be willing to provide five hundred armed horsemen or ten ships equipped for naval warfare for

¹⁶¹ Proposition made to the King, by the German Princes. Paper-Office, Burnet, Vol 4, Book III, XLIV, pp. 471–472. CR II, 1383, pp. 1032–35; CR III, No. 1407, pp. 46–50. L&P, IX, No. 1016, p. 345.

¹⁶² CR III, 1407, pp. 45–50.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, 46–47.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

four months, and would obey the king on land and sea. Henry had the right to choose between horsemen and ships, and they should be sent to the place he appointed.

Second, in addition to ships and horsemen, the allied states would be willing to equip them at a reasonable expense and in greater numbers, if necessary. The horsemen would not exceed two thousand in number and the infantry five thousand; naval soldiers and twelve warships together with machinery and other provisions could replace these. Henry could keep them as long as necessary and the choice would be his between ships or infantry. They should reach him within two months after he had requested them.

Third, in the future General Council, Henry would be willing to accept the opinion of Martin Luther, Justus Jonas, Cruciger, Pomeranus, and Philip in the matter of his divorce.¹⁶⁶

The dominant question of whether the allied states should send a major embassy to England was left to the members to decide. The final decision of the league was deferred to the Diet of Schmalkalden in Frankfurt.¹⁶⁷

The Result of the Doctrinal Discussions

After the parties had spent weeks negotiating Henry's divorce, doctrinal discussions finally got under way in March. The change in their agenda is seen in Melanchthon's correspondence. On March 9, Melanchthon wrote to Vitus Theodoric and commended the English ambassador Nicholas Heath for his humanity and learning, describing him as "fair-minded" in contrast to Edward Fox, and added "but the English bishop does not seem to love our philosophy." Melanchthon wrote: "We are now disputing with the English about religious doctrine."¹⁶⁸ Melanchthon's optimism about the negotiations was clear in a letter he wrote the next day, on March 10, to George, Prince of Anhalt: "The English delegation keeps me here. We have been discussing all the articles of Christian doctrine. The English delegates seem to us not to be against the pursuit of purer doctrine." By that time, they had made progress in formulating articles and Melanchthon expressed hope that this work would be beneficial for the church in eliminating controversial issues.¹⁶⁹

McEntegart states that since the Germans and Henry thought that if they had to attend in order to defend their doctrine in a General Council under the pope's jurisdiction, then they would attend. Henry thought that it would be mutually beneficial to have a shared theological position to defend. Hence forming an Anglo-Schmalkaldic League would be more effective if common agreement could be reached.¹⁷⁰

On March 29, 1536, the negotiations continued. Melanchthon wrote to Joachim Camerarius that his help was needed on both sides, and that he could not leave because the heated discussions on doctrine had not been resolved. He also noted that the English ambassadors had

¹⁶⁶ CR III, 1407, pp. 49–50.

¹⁶⁷ McEntegart has dealt extensively with the discussions in Frankfurt to clarify the position between England and the League of Schmalkalden. See McEntegart 2002, pp. 65–74.

¹⁶⁸ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1707, p. 70; CR III, 1405, pp. 44–45. McEntegart 2002, p. 52.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid.

¹⁷⁰ McEntegart 2002, p. 45.

been hanging on longer than expected. But he indicated that they had agreed on several points.¹⁷¹ Melanchthon must have meant that they had agreed on the essential doctrinal points. At the end of the letter, Melanchthon stated that the English had worked him so hard, he could hardly breathe.¹⁷² McEntegart concludes that the major doctrinal discussion ended in the middle of March 1536,¹⁷³ which differs from Melanchthon's report that doctrinal discussions continued until the end of March 1536.¹⁷⁴ It is also possible that Melanchthon included the disputed articles in the doctrinal discussions: private Masses, communion in both kinds, priestly marriage, and monastic vows.¹⁷⁵

While the negotiations were still ongoing, there possibly was dispute over the question of divorce law. Melanchthon indicated that they disagreed if the law about not marrying the wife of a brother was dispensable, as seen in Melanchthon's letter to Joachim Camerarius.¹⁷⁶ There must have been an overlap on various subjects, and one may only conclude that the timeframe was an approximation for each subject discussed.

In a letter to the elector on March 28, 1536, Luther reported that Francis Burchard would be giving him a German translation of the new articles that the German theologians had concluded with the English emissaries. Luther noted that he had approved the proceedings during the negotiations and was ready to establish an alliance with Henry, provided that the king accepted the articles as agreed upon and would not change any of them. The basis for mutual agreement remained the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apologia*, Luther specified. To Luther, the divorce issue was less important than the doctrinal matters.¹⁷⁷ Tjernagel points out that that Luther did not want to give any further concession than had already been made. The league had demanded Henry subscribe to their confession in order to be accepted into it. The Wittenberg Articles, the Germans hoped, would result in Henry later subscribing to the *Confessio Augustana*. But the king would not accept a unilateral document from the Germans.¹⁷⁸ Schofield sees the attitude of the Germans as conciliatory to the English.¹⁷⁹ The present writer disagrees, since the Germans had been adamant all the way throughout the negotiations that Henry accept the *Confessio Augustana*, and their insistence might have had a negative impact on Henry.

The Wittenberg Articles served as evidence of how far Melanchthon was willing to bend in order to win the English king for the Reformation.¹⁸⁰ The German and English theologians had agreed provisionally to the doctrine, but left open the questions of controversial issues. The

¹⁷¹ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, No. 1714, p. 79.

¹⁷² Ibid.

¹⁷³ McEntegart 2002, p. 55.

¹⁷⁴ MBW T 7, No. 1714, p. 79.

¹⁷⁵ McEntegart concludes that it became clear that the four disputed articles had become a sticking point in the negotiations. McEntegart 2002, p. 57.

¹⁷⁶ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, No. 1714, p. 79.

¹⁷⁷ WA VII, No. 3003, pp. 381–383 = LW, L, No. 271, p. 133.

¹⁷⁸ Tjernagel 1965, p. 161.

¹⁷⁹ Schofield. 2006, p. 112.

¹⁸⁰ Dingel sees both the Wittenberg Articles and the French "Counsel" as unification documents in which Melanchthon translated the *Confessio Augustana* into different west European contexts. Dingel 1998, pp. 121–122. Dingel 2012a, p. 117.

Germans expected to hear Henry's reactions to them.¹⁸¹ McEntegart cautions that the impression should be avoided that a theological agreement was reached between the Germans and the English. Dingel sees the main purpose of the Wittenberg Articles as a firm norm for a desired unity, and their specific points are understandable if one considers the political context and the negotiating partner toward whom these concessions were directed.¹⁸²

The Wittenberg Articles were a result of events that led to the negotiations between the Germans and the English. The thoughts expressed in this document written by Melancthon reveal his thoughts on adiaphora matters during the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations that had a specific goal of uniting parties in church policy matters against the pope.

Kohnle argues that using the *Confessio Augustana*, *Apologia* and *Loci Communes* as the basis for the Wittenberg Articles presented a line of confessional articles and protected Melancthon personally from any accusation of being inconsistent. Using established confessional norms allowed the negotiations to end with success.¹⁸³ This author concurs and agrees that the elector's influence in the negotiations was essential, especially as part of the goal was political partnership of the king with the Schmalkaldic League.

There were seventeen articles—eight doctrinal articles; three related to church policy, four that the parties would not agree upon, and two articles related to the Mass: “Saints” and “Images.” The Germans were especially concerned that Henry might reject those four concerning the so-called abuses.¹⁸⁴ Lutherans were adamant that the new doctrine and Christian liberty be applied to the four conflicting articles. Schofield also points out that Melancthon might have been more conciliatory on episcopal authority (that bishops were allowed to preach new doctrine freely) than on the rest of the conflicting articles at Augsburg, 1530.¹⁸⁵ The Germans felt that they had made all possible concessions and they expected the same from Henry. But the Germans definitely could not go any further.¹⁸⁶ McEntegart points out that the English ambassadors did not have the authority to agree or disagree over the articles of religion.¹⁸⁷

The articles discussed in this study are the articles the envoys would not agree upon, dealing with issues of church policy, and articles that the German reformers called adiaphora, based on Scriptural authority. An essential part of this discussion is the doctrine of justification by faith. Once established that salvation is deserved not by work righteousness but by faith alone, the human traditions that do not oppose the doctrine of salvation but are kept for the good order of the church can be kept without violating conscience.

¹⁸¹ WTA 1536, pp. 18–79. The Wittenberg Articles [Die Wittenberger Artikel]. The Articles were edited by G. Mentz, Leipzig 1905. He included the doctrinal articles with the disputed articles, even though no final agreement was made on any of them.

¹⁸² McEntegart 2002, pp. 58–59. Dingel 1998, pp. 115–122.

¹⁸³ Kohnle 2011, p. 50.

¹⁸⁴ WTA 1536, pp. 58–77.

¹⁸⁵ Schofield 2006, p. 87.

¹⁸⁶ WA VII, No. 3016, pp. 403–404 = LW, L, No. 273, pp. 140–141.

¹⁸⁷ McEntegart 2002, p. 58.

Article XII, The Mass, stated that it is a public service for instruction and that the sacrament might be distributed to a number of people.¹⁸⁸ The article in the Mass reads that “we fault those who think that it is held for other people living and dead and that it merits remission of guilt.”¹⁸⁹

Article XIII, Of Both Kinds,¹⁹⁰ states that Christ instituted the celebration of the sacrament for the entire Church, not only for a part of the Church; namely, the priests. (Unlike the Catholic service, in which only the priests drank the wine.)

Article XIV, The Marriage of Priests, permitted priests to marry (unlike the Catholic practice).¹⁹¹

Article XV, Monastic vows,¹⁹² stated that those opinions are godless which hold that monastic vows merit the remission of sins and eternal life, or that they justify or constitute Christian perfection.

Article XVI, The Saints, stated that Christ is the only mediator but the saints are profitable as examples of faith.¹⁹³

Article XVII, Images, stated that they are not to be worshiped as if they have power, but accepted to serve as instruments of learning, like books.¹⁹⁴

The Wittenberg Articles never gained official endorsement from the Germans or the English. But it is apparent that Melancthon was their author and that phrases and ideas from the *Confessio Augustana* and *Loci Communes* are either quoted directly or explained in the Wittenberg Articles.¹⁹⁵

Tjernagel and Schofield agree that the Wittenberg Articles are based on the *Confessio Augustana* and Melancthon’s *Loci Communes*.¹⁹⁶ Kusakawa writes that Melancthon’s role in its composition is unclear, but admits that it introduced several points from *Loci Communes* to England.¹⁹⁷ Dingel agrees that Melancthon’s *Loci Communes* 1535 and the *Confessio Augustana* were the main documents used in the formulation of the Wittenberg Articles. Both documents were cited word for word.¹⁹⁸

McEntegart argues that the Wittenberg Articles were sent back to England, and influenced the Ten Articles and the Bishops’ Book in the following year. He is cautious since he says that there were other formulations such as *Loci Communes* and *Confessio Augustana* in England.¹⁹⁹ Rex tends to think that the Ten Articles were formulated to resolve certain disputed doctrinal and ceremonial questions.²⁰⁰ MacCulloch has inclined towards the view that the Wittenberg Articles

¹⁸⁸ WTA 1536, Article XII, pp. 58–65.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 60.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., pp. 64–65.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., pp. 66–69.

¹⁹² Ibid., 68–77.

¹⁹³ WTA 1536, Article XVI, pp. 77–78.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., pp. 78–79.

¹⁹⁵ Georg Mentz. 1905. *Introduction [Einleitung] to the Wittenberg Articles of 1536 [Die Wittenberger Artikel von 1536]*, p. 10 (hereafter, Mentz 1905). See MacCulloch 1996, p. 161.

¹⁹⁶ Tjernagel 1965, p. 161 and Schofield 2006, p. 67.

¹⁹⁷ Kusakawa 2002, p. 237.

¹⁹⁸ Dingel 1998, pp. 117–118. Meyer 1966, p. 197.

¹⁹⁹ McEntegart 2002, pp. 58–59.

²⁰⁰ Rex 2006, p. 117.

may have had some influence on the Ten Articles (1536) and Bishops' Book (1537).²⁰¹ Elton regards the Wittenberg Articles as a distinct Protestant formulation, which he thinks the king had nothing to with.²⁰² This author argues that there is considerable evidence that the *Loci Communes* influenced the Wittenberg Articles on church policy issues called adiaphora. They are also evidence of Melanchthon's approach to solving controversial church policy matters when the national churches were seeking a compromise during the transition period.

On April 8, 1536, John Frederick wrote a letter to Henry VIII, saying that the Bishop of Hereford and the Archdeacon had witnessed the Germans' zeal toward the king and their kindness toward the ambassadors. The ambassadors were well educated in doctrine and wished to promote Christian religion in England. They would report the result of the negotiations on their return to England. Concerning the disputed points, the elector wrote that he hoped that the king would be willing to consider the correction of abuses and the idol worship of the pope, and wished that true doctrine be propagated in England. The elector then politely ended the negotiations.²⁰³

The German position was firm, and the elector was unbending. He requested Henry subscribe to the *Confessio Augustana* before further negotiations could continue. It seemed to be important for the Germans to give detailed instructions composed by Francis Burchard, as to how to reply to the king's "answer" of March 12, 1536.²⁰⁴

On April 9, Luther wrote to Cromwell, complaining "Doctor Barnes suddenly left and did not consider me worthy of a greeting or a farewell, in such a great hurry was he. But the place and time will come for me to revenge myself on him for this neglect of me."²⁰⁵ Using the same courier to Cromwell as Luther had, Fox and Heath informed Henry that the negotiations were over, and asked for further instructions.²⁰⁶ Before leaving Wittenberg, Fox twice requested a farewell audience with the elector. However, he was politely but firmly turned down.²⁰⁷ When the English finally left Wittenberg, their relations with the Germans were cool, to say the least. The Elector of Saxony wrote to Henry, praising Fox and Heath, and politely urged the king to accept the German position on all doctrinal points.²⁰⁸

An additional complication to the further negotiations was the fact that all the allied states were included in the decision making. On April 9, 1536, the Elector of Saxony asked Burchard to respond for him to the Bishop of Hereford.²⁰⁹ Initially, Burchard said, the elector had planned to meet the ambassadors at Wittenberg and discuss Henry's response to the Christmas Articles,

²⁰¹ McCulloch 1996, pp. 161–162.

²⁰² Elton 1977, pp. 256–257.

²⁰³ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1722, pp. 94–95; CR III, 1416, pp. 63–64; McEntegart 2002, pp. 67–68.

²⁰⁴ WA VII, No. 3016, pp. 401–402 = LW, L, No. 273, n. 1, pp. 138–139.

²⁰⁵ WA VII, No. 3010, p. 395 = LW, L, No. 272, p. 137.

²⁰⁶ WA VII, No. 3013, p. 396 = LW, L, No. 272, p. 137.

²⁰⁷ WA VII, No. 3016, pp. 401–402 = LW, L, No. 273, p. 139, n. 1. McEntegart 2002, pp. 66–67.

²⁰⁸ WA VII, No. 3003, p. 383 = LW, L, No. 271, p. 133; WTA, pp. 58–77. MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1722, pp. 94–95; CR III, 1416, p. 64.

²⁰⁹ From the beginning of the negotiations, John Frederick had demanded that the basis for offering Henry the title of Defender of the Evangelical League would be acceptance of the *Confessio Augustana* and adoption of religious ceremonies based on the Gospel. He did not think that there was any use sending more ambassadors or making a treaty before this qualification was met. See Tjernagel 1965, pp. 158–159.

but he was unable to meet due to urgent business. Since the ambassadors were prepared to leave, the elector did not want to delay their departure.²¹⁰

Furthermore, Burchard wrote, since the king's response to the articles presented at Schmalkalden in December 1535 also concerned the other allied states of the Roman Empire, the elector had no power to respond without their consent. But he would confer with his allies as soon as possible. Since the allied states were to meet soon, the elector could either respond to Henry or send an embassy.²¹¹ The elector was unwilling to declare his own opinion at this time because later, he might be forced to change it. The elector, however, told the ambassadors through Burchard that the title "Defender of the League" required subscription to the *Confessio Augustana*.²¹² Even though the position of the leaders of the Schmalkaldic League was quite clear, they included the allied states of the league to further delay their final commitment and decision.

McEntegart writes extensively of the meeting with the allied states in Frankfurt.²¹³ He argues that in the instructions given by John Frederick to Dr. Brück and Francis Burchard, the elector showed a more positive attitude than before. He was in favor of an embassy and would have included Melanchthon, and was ready for a limited political understanding even if they could not agree on all religious articles.²¹⁴ It seems that this would have been the elector's private opinion and he did not need to make a commitment at this point, since the allied states had not made their unified decision regarding the embassy to England.

McEntegart successfully proves that initially, at Frankfurt, it was decided that Philip Melanchthon should lead the team of theologians to England. At first the elector was in favor of sending an embassy to England, even though agreement had not been reached, and that Melanchthon should accompany Burchard and Anhalt. Saxony, Hesse, and Strasbourg favored sending an embassy to England, but most of the smaller members were against it because they feared that it would anger the emperor. Many of the delegates who arrived in Frankfurt had no power to discuss the English matter. This was because the elector had neglected to tell those members what was to be discussed, and they then had to consult their masters, which caused a delay in decision making. Fox was eager to get confirmation that an embassy would be sent to England before his departure from Germany.²¹⁵

As to the request for military aid made by Henry, the elector reduced the numbers: the German horsemen should not exceed five hundred (Henry requested two thousand), and the infantry should not exceed fifteen hundred²¹⁶ (Henry had requested five thousand).²¹⁷ The elector

²¹⁰ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1722, pp. 94–95; CR III, 1416, pp. 63–64.

²¹¹ McEntegart writes extensively of the meeting with the allied States in Frankfurt. McEntegart 2002, pp. 68–76. McEntegart argues that in the instructions given by John Frederick to Dr. Brück and Francis Burchard, he showed a more positive attitude than before. He was in favor of an embassy and would have included Melanchthon, and was ready for a limited political understanding even if they could not agree on all religious articles. McEntegart 2002, pp. 68–69.

²¹² MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1722, pp. 94–95; CR III, 1416, pp. 63–64. McEntegart 2002, p. 71.

²¹³ McEntegart 2002, pp. 68–76.

²¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 68–69.

²¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 69–71, 73.

²¹⁶ McEntegart quotes 2,000. McEntegart 2002, p. 71.

²¹⁷ CR III, No. 1407, pp. 49–50; No. 1414, p. 62.

repeated the conditions of a mutual treaty: acceptance of *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia* and the articles resulting from the discussions at Wittenberg. The final response would be sent to Henry after the conference with the allied states, Burchard wrote.²¹⁸ The elector's firm, reiterated statement that the doctrine of the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apologia* would be the basis for Henry's acceptance to the Schmalkaldic League is evidence that the Germans were not manipulated by Henry VIII, as claimed by the deterministic historiography.²¹⁹

Meanwhile, the Landgrave of Hesse was putting pressure on the Elector of Saxony to make some concessions to the English for the sake of the unity of the churches. When the elector consulted Francis Burchard about this, Luther wrote to Burchard on April 20, stating that the Germans could not make any more concessions. The rulers, he argued, can handle ceremonies, which are temporal matters, but the central points of Christian doctrine must not be changed. Luther was also opposed to forming a secular alliance with Henry, in case the king did not agree with the articles in the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apologia*.²²⁰ It was important to keep separate the questions "necessary to salvation," the doctrinal articles, and those things "not necessary to salvation"—adiaphora, which dealt with church policy. The relationship between these questions had been at stake during the negotiations and it was in these questions that a compromise could not be reached.

Melanchthon's letter to Joachim Camerarius on May 9, 1536, indicates that the English had left.²²¹ On the same day, Melanchthon wrote to Vitus Theodoric.²²² He evidently referred to a meeting that came to be called the Wittenberg Concord. It seems that this meeting was one step in preparation for a synod, which Melanchthon thought the emperor would call after returning from his wars. He wished to delay the meeting if there would be discord and to push ahead if there was hope of an agreement.²²³ Melanchthon stressed that before the emperor's return, they should decide how their opinions on the articles would agree or disagree with those of other nations.²²⁴

Melanchthon may have been planning the Wittenberg Concord as a step to a broad unification among the evangelicals, which eventually would even replace the pope's and emperor's General Council. It was also important to Melanchthon that the Reformers agree with as wide a consensus as possible, in order to be able to negotiate with other nations on church polity.

Although Barnes returned to England as soon as the negotiations ended, Fox and Heath stayed on in Germany until June 11, to attend the Schmalkaldic Diet at Frankfurt, in order to see how that allied body would respond to Henry's replies to the Christmas Articles.²²⁵ Fox had waited patiently for the decision from the allied states, but could not wait any longer.²²⁶ The

²¹⁸ MBW T 7, 1722, pp. 94–95; CR III, 1416, pp. 63–64.

²¹⁹ See McEntegart 2002, pp. 6, 71.

²²⁰ WA VII, No. 3016, pp. 403–404 = LW, L, No. 273, pp. 140–141.

²²¹ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1732, p. 111.

²²² MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1733, pp. 112–113.

²²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 112–113.

²²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 113.

²²⁵ WA VII, No. 3016, pp. 403–404; LW, L, No. 273, pp. 139, 141; L&P, X, No. 847, p. 284. McEntegart 2002, pp. 72–73.

²²⁶ McEntegart 2002, p. 72.

matter was complicated since John Frederick had to present it to all the member states for a decision. Henry needed to discuss the proposals negotiated in Wittenberg with his scholars in England in order to make a decision, especially on the controversial articles. A compromise could not be reached.

As the articles were formed during the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations, the English clergy were able to use their influence in their adiaphoristic discussion in England. Authority lay in the Scriptures; the interpretation was based solely on ecclesiastical law by the power of the bishops given to them in the Scriptures. The Wittenberg Articles further influenced the use of ecclesiastical jurisdiction based on the Scriptures, on the adiaphora questions that were not resolved during the negotiations. Certainly, the Wittenberg Articles had influenced the doctrinal formulations, as seen from the doctrinal and point of view. They presented a relativistic approach to doctrinal questions interwoven with the present practices known as *lex orandi–lex credendi* and their relation to the resolution of various church practices and policy on adiaphora questions, as a compromise during the transitional period. The power of the church in the Wittenberg Articles was adiaphora. Consciences were free and not bound by outward ceremonies, to achieve peace and concord in the spirit of Christian liberty.

On June 9/10, 1536, Melanchthon received a letter from Robert Barnes stating that Queen Anne had been beheaded. Barnes warned Melanchthon not to travel to Britain.²²⁷ Melanchthon wrote to Joachim Camerarius on June 9, 1536, and said that he was freed of the undertaking to travel to England after hearing of the tragic events.²²⁸ He deplored that the queen was ultimately punished for her adultery.²²⁹

Melanchthon's unification plans were crushed by three events around that time. First, the elector prevented his trip to France; second, the Wittenberg Articles were left open by the English, and third, his plans to England were changed with the news of the queen's death. In spite of these events, Melanchthon encouraged Camerarius to continue the reforms with even greater equanimity.²³⁰ MacCulloch argues that though Melanchthon had received more than one invitation from King Henry, he never dared to cross the Channel and mistrusted England's political and theological atmosphere.²³¹ This author concurs and refers to the recent development with the elector after Melanchthon's abortive attempt to visit France; he would not have dared to ask another permission to travel to England because he understood the consequences to the elector. The author concurs that if Melanchthon had overcome his natural reluctance to meet King Henry, evangelical reform in England would have taken an easier course.²³² Possibly, it would have changed the course of the Reformation, but since the decision to travel was not only dependent on Melanchthon but also the elector, his presence in England was not realized during Henry's reign.

²²⁷ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1753, pp. 165–166.

²²⁸ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1752, pp. 163–164.

²²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 163.

²³⁰ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1752 p. 163. Kusakawa 2002, p. 238.

²³¹ MacCulloch 1996, pp. 137–138.

²³² *Ibid.*, p. 613.

Aftermath of the Negotiations

Three months later, on September 1, 1536, Elector John Frederick and Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, sent a letter composed by Philip Melanchthon to King Henry VIII.²³³ McEntegart rightly argues that the Germans wanted to find out about his attitude to Protestants from persons close to the king, and it was decided that Luther and Melanchthon should contact Robert Barnes for this very purpose. John Frederick wanted to know if recent events in England had changed the king's view towards the General Council.²³⁴

The Roman Bishop had promised the emperor a general synod, published its declaration in Rome, and would soon invite Christian princes to it.²³⁵ In the letter, the German princes seem to be more conciliatory. The letter does not have a strict tone or demand that Henry subscribe to the *Confessio Augustana*, as John Frederick had demanded when the Wittenberg negotiations ended in April 1536.

The letter reiterates the reasons why the English embassy had been sent to Germany, namely to announce the decree published in England concerning the tyranny of the "Bishop of Rome," the rejection of papal abuses, and the English defense of pure doctrine.²³⁶ The letter summarizes the outline of the Anglo-Lutheran conference earlier in the year. The Bishop of Hereford had held a disquisition and exhorted the Saxon princes not to agree to the "Bishop of Rome's" council without the king's approval; to grant a place of honor to the king in the Schmalkaldic League, and to send an embassy to England.

Lastly, the princes referred to the opinion of all allied princes concerning the ambassadors' response to the Christmas Articles in the convention at Frankfurt. The Saxon princes trusted that the Bishop of Hereford had informed the king by now of the princes' and their allies' will at the convention. The Saxon princes also trusted that the king had received the letter they had sent in June 1536. The princes expected a response from the king, and at least they expected that the Bishop of Hereford would have written about the king's opinion concerning the articles they had concluded at Wittenberg in April 1536.²³⁷

What is interesting in this letter is that the Germans still thought that the outcome of the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations was pending. In the meantime they still, as if by the back door, asked the king if he was willing to defend the same doctrine as the Saxon theologians and to have the same feelings about the "Bishop of Rome's" Council as the Bishop of Hereford had told them in his instructions back in 1535. This letter was the elector's request for Henry to subscribe to join the Schmalkaldic League. It seems that the estates would not accept the princes' proposal, since they were delaying their responses and commitment. If they knew the king's opinion in these matters, they wrote, the Saxon princes could then advise concerning their decision regarding the Council and maintain the sentiment of the Christmas Articles published at Schmalkalden in 1535.²³⁸

²³³ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1781, pp. 222–224.

²³⁴ See McEntegart 2002, pp. 75–76.

²³⁵ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1781, p. 223.

²³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 222.

²³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 222–223.

²³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 223.

The elector's conciliatory attitude reveals that he was very interested in having Henry become Protector and Defender of the Schmalkaldic League. Being conciliatory in the religious questions subscribing to the *Confessio Augustana* reveals that he probably preferred political to religious negotiations at that time. He had delayed the decisions and used the delay as an excuse to have the allied states agree to his proposal, which he had forgotten to tell them in a timely manner.

Having made this request, the Saxon princes explained that the reason they could not send an embassy to England more quickly was that the allied states were still negotiating in their provinces and they had not been able to respond to the deliberations in the convention at Frankfurt. However, they promised to respond soon. In addition, the men they intended to send as an embassy to England were deliberating about the pending synod and could not be sent.²³⁹ The political situation controlled the end results of the negotiations—English and German theologians were needed, because unity in confession was the condition for an alliance.²⁴⁰ The Wittenberg Articles were left undecided, as theological compromises were expected on both sides.

The letter is ambiguous, in the sense that it requested the king's response to the Wittenberg Articles. On the one hand, they assumed that the king had received the princes' earlier letter; on the other hand, they thought that the Bishop of Hereford had informed Henry about the Christmas Articles. At the same time, the princes wrote that negotiations were still going on, since the allied states had not given their opinion of the ambassadors' response to the Christmas Articles in March 1536, which the Germans had presented to the ambassadors at Schmalkalden.²⁴¹ After the negotiations ended in April 1536, the elector specifically said that he could not give his personal opinion about the ambassadors' responses, but that the allied states would soon give their opinion in the convention at Frankfurt. One may still question whether the Germans trusted that the ambassadors' responses were authorized by Henry.

At the same time, the letter reveals the urgency of the princes to get the king on their side regarding the impending pope's council, and they bluntly ask if the king would agree with their doctrinal stance.²⁴² They had expected the Bishop of Hereford to write to them regarding the convention at Frankfurt and about the king's response to the Wittenberg Articles. The Bishop of Hereford was put in a difficult position, as he was under the king's supreme authority and unable to make a decision either about doctrinal or diplomatic matters. This puts the ambassadors' response to the Christmas Articles in a new light in the eyes of the princes. It seems that they wanted a response directly from the king. It is as if they would not have trusted that those opinions the ambassadors gave in March were the king's final decision. This would explain why the letter stressed that allied opinions were still open, in order to give the king a chance to respond directly to them.

²³⁹ MBW R 2; MBW T 7 1781, pp. 223–224.

²⁴⁰ Kohnle 2011, p. 50.

²⁴¹ Propositions made to the King, by the German Princes. (1535?). Paper-Office, Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. XLIV, pp. 471–472; CR III, No. 1407, pp. 45–50; CR II, No. 1383, pp. 1032–1035; L&P IX, No. 1016, pp. 345–346.

²⁴² MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1781, p. 223.

The Germans wanted to have the king on their side on the council question, but that issue was never discussed. They had doubts about the ambassadors' response to the Christmas Articles; therefore they delayed the final decisions. Because of the domestic changes in England, there was a lack of communication throughout the summer and whether the Germans knew that Henry had taken steps to implement his confession in the Ten Articles was unclear.

Conclusion

Differing political agendas influenced the results of the negotiations. For one, the conflict between Melancthon and the elector affected the results of the negotiations. In addition, Henry's agenda was to retroactively get the Saxon Reformers' opinions on his divorce and to learn how they had reformed their churches. He also wanted a common strategy against the pope's council. Finally, the Germans wanted Henry to subscribe to the *Confessio Augustana* and become the Defender of the League. The elector's strict demand for Henry to subscribe to the *Confessio Augustana* may have affected any possibility of reaching an agreement. In the end, neither the English nor the Germans discussed a common strategy specifically regarding the pope's council, which essentially was the one of the most important points.

Even though Melancthon formulated a doctrine that would be acceptable to the English, political exigencies prevented the doctrinal proposition from passing. The English theologians did not have the authority to decide doctrine, and the elector had to consult the allied states to find out if the proposal offered by the Schmalkaldic League was acceptable. Henry was interested in the negotiations mainly for political purposes, and hence needed an alliance with the Schmalkaldic League. Henry consulted the conservative English Bishop Gardiner, since his position was still uncertain with the emperor and the pope. As a result, the influence of the conservative bishops in religious politics increased in England.

The diplomatic relationship with the German theologians and the English ambassadors did not produce mutual agreement on adiaphora matters. However, it proved how much the Wittenberg theologians were willing to condone for the sake of church unity. It is noteworthy that the parties agreed to the doctrinal articles modified from the *Confessio Augustana*. The Wittenberg Articles came about as a result of the negotiations and are discussed in Part II below. They represented a modification of Melancthon's *Confessio Augustana* written with the hope that, since the English delegates had accepted the doctrinal part, they would also accept the adiaphora section. While the English bishops may have accepted Melancthon's position, as stated in research question three, they did not have authority to decide doctrinal or adiaphora questions, because the king had the final say. However, the English embassy's acceptance of the doctrinal articles certainly influenced English adiaphora discussions.

The Wittenberg Articles are discussed in Chapter Five, Part II. Chapter Six also deals with the consequences of the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations. During the negotiations, the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apologia* were translated into English.

Part II: The Wittenberg Articles

(April 1536)

Introduction

Melanchthon wrote the *Advice* in 1534 for the purpose of unifying church policy. The Wittenberg Articles were a second publicly devised collection of Melanchthon's articles on church policy. Both the *Advice* and the Wittenberg Articles had similar emphases and a common goal.²⁴³ Anglo-Lutheran theologians met in Wittenberg in January through April 1536 to collaborate and accept a document called the Wittenberg Articles. Since the articles use text that is highly similar to the text of the *Confessio Augustana*, the *Apologia*, and the 1535 edition of the *Loci Communes*,²⁴⁴ Melanchthon can be thought of as the virtual author of the articles.²⁴⁵ However, the English and Germans could not come to an agreement on all the articles; they disagreed on four (Articles XII–XV) of the seventeen. In this chapter, these disputed Wittenberg Articles are discussed and compared with the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Advice*.

To demonstrate that the disputed articles in fact belong to the doctrine of adiaphora, it is essential to compare the doctrine of justification by faith with Article IV of *Confessio Augustana* and Melanchthon's doctrine of justification by faith in *Loci Communes* of 1535. One has to keep in mind that the doctrine of justification by faith in *Confessio Augustana* was a statement in the confession by the Lutheran princes of their position to the emperor. The doctrine of justification by faith in the *Loci Communes* represents Melanchthon's belief in 1535. The similarities and differences between the corresponding articles are delineated. Presented in this chapter are the transmission and contents of the following Wittenberg Articles: (IV) Penitence and Justification, (X) Church Ordinances, (XI) Civil Affairs, (XII) The Mass, (XIII) Of Both Kinds, (XIV) The Marriage of Priests, (XV) The Monastic Vows, (XVI) The Saints, and (XVII) Images. In addition, the doctrine of the Eucharist in Reformation theology, the theology of the Mass and the Catholic concept of *lex orandi–lex credendi* are discussed. Furthermore, Article X discusses bishops' power in the church and will be discussed in relation to how the negotiators understood the bishops' power in the church. Article XI is discussed in the context of how the relationship of the church to the civil magistracy was understood.

Even though the German articles on the Saints [*Von den Heiligen*] and of Images [*Von Bildern*] were not discussed during the Wittenberg negotiations, their inclusion in this discussion is warranted. They were closely related to the Mass's doctrine of reconciliation, and therefore their importance for adiaphora was already crucial in Melanchthon's unification discussions in 1534, and again in the Ten Articles of 1536.

²⁴³ Dingel 2012a, pp. 116–117.

²⁴⁴ Dingel 1998, p. 118.

²⁴⁵ Dingel 2012a, p. 116.

History, Contents, and Transmission

The Articles were originally published in Latin. However, the first draft, which was given to the Elector of Saxony on March 28, 1536, two weeks before the negotiations ended, was in German. At that point, Luther expressed great hope that Henry VIII would agree to the terms of the articles, with the exception of the four controversial ones.²⁴⁶ The official Latin text was completed after the German translation had been sent to the elector. Whether the articles were immediately sent to England or brought back by the English envoys several weeks later has not been determined.²⁴⁷ In this study, I mainly use the Latin text for the controversial articles.

The Articles in Mentz's edition were mostly in Latin and German as they were transmitted to Mentz's version of 1905. The Wittenberg Articles (abbreviated to WTA) consist of the following articles: (I) *De symbolis* [The Creeds], (II) *De peccato originali* [Original Sin], (III) *De baptismo/Von der tauff* [Baptism], (IV) *De poenitentia et iustificatione/Von der buss und wie die mensch gerecht wird* [Penitence and Justification], (V) *De bonis operibus/Von guten werken* [Good Works], (VI) *De coena Domini/Vom heiligen sacrament des leibs und bluts Cristi* [The Lord's Supper], (VII) *De confessione et satisfactione/Vom der beicht und genugthuung* [Confession and Satisfaction], (VIII) *De usu sacramentorum/Vom rechten brauch der sacrament* [The Right Use of the Sacraments], (IX) *Von dem kirchenregiment* [Church Order], (X) *Von kirchenordnungen* [Church Ordinances], (XI) *Von weltlichen Ständen* [Civil Affairs], (XII) *De missa/Von der Mess* [The Mass], (XIII) *Of Both Kinds* [*De utraque specie/Von baiden gestalt*], (XIV) *De conjugio sacerdotum/Von der briesterehe* [The Marriage of Priests], (XV) *De votis monasticis/Von den klostergelubden* [Monastic Vows], (XVI) *Von den heiligen* [The Saints], (XVII) *Von bildern* [Images]. Articles IX, X, and XI appeared only in German, without Latin, in the Mentz edition.²⁴⁸

Article X on Church Ordinances in the Wittenberg Articles is derived from the *Confessio Augustana*, Article VII on the Church and Article XV on Ecclesiastical Rites, speaking of the unity of the Church. This was the article that was needed to clarify the power of the church. According to the *Confessio Augustana*, church unity consists of preaching the new doctrine and administering the sacraments.²⁴⁹ Human traditions are not necessary to salvation. Article X of the Wittenberg Articles specifies that church ordinances belong to church government.²⁵⁰ It is important to be aware of how the concept of "church" influences the interpretation of the doctrine of adiaphora. The soteriological aspect of the doctrine of justification addresses each individual member of the church, and from the doctrine of justification by faith defines how each church understands the doctrine of adiaphora and interprets it.²⁵¹

The English embassy was familiar with Melancthon's position on the doctrine of adiaphora in the *Loci Communes*, which they brought with them. The goal of the negotiations was to formulate an agreement acceptable to the English and German theologians. The doctrinal articles

²⁴⁶ WA VII, No. 3003, pp. 383–384 = LW, L, No. 271, pp. 132–134.

²⁴⁷ CR III, No. 1409, pp. 52–53; LW, L, No. 271, p. 133.

²⁴⁸ WTA 1536, pp. 18–79.

²⁴⁹ CAL 1530, VII, p. 61; Grane 1987, pp. 89–90; WTA, Article X, 1536, pp. 56–57; Bray 2004, pp. 142–143.

²⁵⁰ CAL 1530, XV, p. 69; Grane 1987, pp. 159–160.

²⁵¹ CAL, 1530, VII, p. 61; Grane 1987, pp. 90–91.

were accepted by both parties, including the doctrine of the sacrament related to the Mass and communion in both kinds; the doctrines of justification by faith and of church order were essential in order to understand how the power of the church was understood in relation to the indifferent matters in the church. Tjernagel boldly calls the Wittenberg Articles an exegesis of the *Confessio Augustana* and states that the negotiators also drew from Melanchthon's *Loci Communes*. According to Tjernagel, the purpose of the Wittenberg Articles was to have the English accept a document that resulted from the collaborative efforts of the English and German theologians, rather than accepting *Confessio Augustana* outright.²⁵²

He also states that when Seckendorf wrote of the "Reformation" in the seventeenth century, he had a complete copy of the Wittenberg Articles. However, Seckendorf did not quote the entire collection and historians have found only fragments until Georg Mentz discovered Latin and German copies in the Weimar archives.²⁵³

McEntegart cautions that Mentz's edition represents an agreement of Anglo-Schmalkaldic discussions. Even though the theologians agreed on the doctrinal part of the articles, it was provisional and there was no acceptance of the remaining four of the present discussion. Mentz listed the articles in the sequence originally used in the German translation for John Frederick by Burchard, who inserted the four disputed articles into the German version.²⁵⁴ They were published in a Latin and German edition in 1905 by Mentz, who observed that the articles represented major concessions even though important theological views were maintained.²⁵⁵

Interestingly, Dugmore passes the subject of the Wittenberg Articles with little notice. However, he mentions, in reference to the Wittenberg Articles, that Thomas Cranmer had hopes for a pan-Protestant conference that would reach doctrinal agreement and act parallel to Henry's politics against Rome.²⁵⁶ This supports the argument that Melanchthon was supported by reform-minded clergy in England.

Chibi offers a different interpretation of the Wittenberg Articles. He sees the Christmas Articles as more decisive than the Wittenberg Articles, and argues that the king responded to each of the Christmas Articles but avoided the request to subscribe to the *Confessio Augustana*. Chibi's position is not convincing, as he quotes: "conversations and discussions continued for another year."²⁵⁷ In fact, the Wittenberg Articles were drawn up earlier, in mid-March of 1536.

It seems plausible to agree with MacCulloch, who finds, that the Wittenberg Articles were not published in England, nor in Germany. They were shaped according to the *Confessio Augustana* and the key ideas were transmitted in the Ten Articles of 1536, focusing more on its doctrinal part than the ceremonial.²⁵⁸

²⁵² Tjernagel 1965, p. 161.

²⁵³ Ibid., 161–163.

²⁵⁴ McEntegart 2002, p. 59.

²⁵⁵ Tjernagel 1965, pp. 161–163.

²⁵⁶ Dugmore 1958, p. 106.

²⁵⁷ Chibi 2003, p. 213.

²⁵⁸ MacCulloch 1996, pp. 161–162.

*Article IV: On Penitence and Justification/De pœnitentia et justificatione*²⁵⁹

Article IV of the Wittenberg Articles follows closely the concepts in the *Loci Communes* concerning “Grace and Justification.” The Justification is a declaration not solely for the dignity of the receiver, but because of Christ.²⁶⁰

Iustificatio significat remissionem peccatorum & reconciliationem seu acceptationem personæ ad uitam æternam. Nam Ebraeis iustificare est forense uerbum, ut dicam populus Romanus iustificauit Scipionem accusatum a Tribunis, id est absoluit, seu iustum pronunciauit. (LC 1535, Fol. 167 L.)

Justification signifies remission of sin and reconciliation or acceptance of a person to eternal life. For to justify is a forensic word among the Hebrews, so that when I say “the Roman people justified Scipio when he was accused by the tribunes,” that signifies that they absolved him, or pronounced him just. (LC 1535, Fol. 167 L.)

Mens perterrefacta agnitione peccatorum, statuere debet, remitti sibi peccata gratis propter Christum per misericordiam non propter dignitatem contritionis, dilectionis, aut aliorum operum. (LC 1535, Fol. 165 R.)

The mind terrified by recognition of sins, ought to determine that its sins are freely forgiven it because of Christ through mercy; not through the worth of his repentance, love, or other works. (LC 1535, Fol. 165 R.)

In the Wittenberg Articles, God is mentioned and justification is declared not because of our works, but because of Christ who forgives our sins and declares us sons of God. Justification is also renovation, constituting a new birth as the Holy Spirit produces new faith and love in the heart of the believer. It is not an idle faith, but faith that produces new obedience. Uniting justification with penance is remarkable, since the idea follows the medieval structure in which the infusion of grace was mediated through the sacraments. Even though Melancthon did not recognize penance as a sacrament, he created a similar structure with different contents.²⁶¹

Fidem necesse est, qua credimus, nobis ipsis, a Deo remitti peccata et nos iustificari ac iustos reputari et fieri filios Dei non propter dignitatem contritionis aut aliorum operum, sed gratis propter Christum. (WTA 1536, IV, p. 28.)

The faith is necessary, whereby we believe that our sins are forgiven us by God and that we are justified and considered just, and become sons of God, not because of the worth of our repentance or our other works, but freely because of Christ. (WTA 1536, IV, p. 28.)

Justification is total renovation, which both the *Loci Communes* and Wittenberg Articles refer to as *regeneratio*. Thus, sanctification is included in the doctrine of justification. The Holy Spirit produces a new motion called new faith, new love, and the fear of God, in which one avoids sin and produces good fruit:

Et errant imperiti, qui somniant remissionem peccatorum ita contingere ociosis, sine aliquot uero animi motu, sine certamine, sine fiducia consolante animos. Et quia Spiritus sanctus affert...nouam uitam, nouos motus, ideo hæc

And unskilled folks are in error, when they dream that remission of sins accrues to the idle in this way, without any kind of movement of the Spirit, without effort, without the consolation of faith for their souls. And since, as I will tell later, the Holy

²⁵⁹ Dingel 1998, p. 121.

²⁶⁰ Schofield 2006, pp. 61–64, 74–78, 87.

²⁶¹ Bruce McCormack: *What's at Stake in Current Debates over Justification*. In *Justification: What's at Stake in the Current Debates*. 2004, p. 89.

renouatio, uocatur regeneratio sequi debet noua obedientia. (LC 1535, Fol. 181L.)

Spirit brings new life and new impulses with that consolation, this renovation is thus called renewal and regeneration, and new obedience must follow. (LC 1535, Fol. 181L.)

Et cum spiritus sanctus sit efficax, parit iam novos motus in cordibus consentientes legi Dei, scilicet fidem, dilectionem Dei, timorem Dei, odium peccati, propositum non peccandi et reliquos bonos fructus iuxta illud.[Jer. 31, 33]: Dabo legem meam in cordibus eorum. Igitur iustificatio, quae fit fide hoc modo, ut dictum est, est renovatio et regeneratio. (WTA 1536, IV. pp. 28, 30.)

And since the Holy Spirit is effective, it now gives rise to new impulses in their hearts consonant with the law of God: namely, faith, love of God, fear of God, hatred of sin, resolve not to sin, and all the other good results besides that. I will put my law in their hearts. Therefore justification, which comes through faith in the manner described, is renewal and regeneration. (WTA 1536, IV. pp. 28, 30.)

Concerning penance, Melanchthon discussed the relationship of the church's ministry, new obedience, repentance, and faith, to the good works described in the *Confessio Augustana*. He clearly differentiated the Catholic doctrine of penance. According to him, contrition, faith, and new obedience belonged to penance. Contrition recognizes sin; with faith it is believed that sins are forgiven and the person is justified, not because of works, but for Christ's sake.²⁶² Thus, in penance, confession is replaced by faith, and satisfaction is replaced by new obedience. It is important to notice that Melanchthon combined the doctrine of justification by faith with penance, as in the medieval concept, but gave it new contents.

Poenitentiam ... quam Christus praecipit, constare his tribus partibus, contritione, fide, seu fiducia misericordiae Dei, quae propter Christum promissa est et novitate vitae seu noua oboedientia. (WTA 1536, Article IV, p. 26.)²⁶³

Penitence which Christ commands consists of three parts: contrition, faith, i.e. trust in the mercy of God which is promised on account of Christ, and newness of life or new obedience. (WTA 1536, Article IV, p. 26.)

Melanchthon speaks of the new obedience in "good works" and connects it to justification by faith. Renewal occurs in justification. He says that justification cannot be retained unless this "incipient obedience" is also retained. He calls the new obedience the fulfillment of "the law or righteousness."²⁶⁴

Quare non potest retineri iustificatio, nisi retineatur haec inchoata obedientia iuxta illud. (WTA 1536, Article V, pp. 42–44.)²⁶⁵

Therefore justification cannot be retained unless this incipient obedience is retained, together with it. (WTA 1536, Article V, pp. 42–44.)

Iam et dignitas magna est huius inchoatae oboedientiae. Quamquam enim est imperfecta, tamen quia personae sunt in Christo, reputatur haec oboedientia esse quaedam legis impletio et est iusticia. (WTA 1536, Article V, pp. 42–44.)²⁶⁶

Now the value of this incipient obedience is great, for although it is imperfect, nevertheless because the people concerned are in Christ, this obedience is reckoned to be a kind of fulfillment of the law and is righteousness. (WTA 1536, Article V, pp. 42–44.)²⁶⁷

Melanchthon thus includes good works together with justification, and explains that "we are not justified by faith alone but by works." He then warns that this should not be understood as

²⁶² WTA 1536, Article IV, p. 28; Bray 2004, p. 125.

²⁶³ WTA 1536, Article IV, p. 26; Bray 2004, 124.

²⁶⁴ WTA 1536, Article V, pp. 38–40, 42–44; Bray 2004; pp. 132, 135.

²⁶⁵ WTA 1536, Article V, pp. 42–44; Bray 2004, p. 135.

²⁶⁶ WTA 1536, Article V, pp. 42–44; Bray 2004, p. 135.

²⁶⁷ Ibid.

saying that we obtain remission of sins because of works, but “the meaning is that both righteousness and faith are necessary.” The regeneration occurs by faith, but the righteousness of works, which he then specifies and calls good conscience, is also necessary.²⁶⁸

Primum fides, qua coram deo iustificamur, id est, consequimur remissionem peccatorum et reconciliationem seu regeneramur et efficimur filii; deinde et altera iusticia, videlicet iusticia operum seu iusticia bonae conscientiae debita et necessaria est. (WTA 1536, Article V, p. 44.)²⁶⁹

First, faith is necessary, for by it we are justified before God, that is, by it we obtain remission of sins and reconciliation; i.e. we are born again and made sons; and then also that another righteousness is necessary and owed, namely, the righteousness of works, i.e. the righteousness of a good conscience. (WTA 1536, Article V, p. 44.)

Melanchthon is not equating the righteousness of justification with works, since the Latin word “iustitia” ought to be understood as “justice,” “fairness” or “equity.” One may interpret Melanchthon’s concept of works as the civil justice in society that he emphasized. Since Melanchthon ties together so many elements of *Confessio Augustana*, the essence of the doctrine of justification by faith is convoluted in Article IV. Melanchthon’s third use of law is evident in the doctrine of justification. Combining the various elements of the doctrine of justification, Melanchthon wished to present a doctrine that would be acceptable to both the conservative and the reform-minded English theologians.

In the article of penance, Melanchthon presented the whole doctrine of grace using new concepts in an old structure: contrition, faith, and new obedience. He again equates “good works” with good conscience, clarifying his position that any works are excluded from salvation. By faith one’s sins are forgiven by God and one is justified and accounted righteous, freely for Christ’s sake.

Dingel claims that one must understand the political context of the negotiations and the importance for Melanchthon to prove that he held on to the main points of the doctrine, especially the doctrine of justification, while agreeing to the compromises on outward church structure.²⁷⁰ Schofield agrees that the Wittenberg Articles had two distinct points: justification as a free gift, and good works necessary to Christian living, as in the *Loci Communes* and passed on to the Ten Articles (1536) and the Bishops’ Book (1537). It was in the last work that Henry first commented on it.²⁷¹ Melanchthon had the ability to approach the negotiations from a doctrinal standpoint in order to clarify the relationship between doctrine and practice. In contemporary discussions on the doctrine of justification, it has been recommended that the doctrine be brought within the doctrine of ecclesiology, in order to determine how the practices of different churches can affect our understanding of the doctrine of justification, and how the concept of justification affects our interpretation of what constitutes the church. In addition, the Trinitarian account in human salvation should be part of the discussion within the church, which as a fellowship of those redeemed by God’s grace equally accept one another.²⁷²

²⁶⁸ WTA 1536, Article V, pp. 42–44; Bray 2004, p. 135.

²⁶⁹ Ibid.

²⁷⁰ Dingel 1998, pp. 110–111.

²⁷¹ Schofield 2006, pp. 86–87.

²⁷² Geoffrey Wainwright: *The Ecclesial Scope of Justification*. In *Justification: What’s at Stake in Current Debates*, 2004, pp. 249–259 (hereafter, Wainwright 2004).

Article X: Of Church Ordinances [Von Kirchenordnungen]

Article X on church ordinances follows the *Confessio Augustana* closely in Article XV, Ecclesiastical Rites, and the latter part of Article VII, The Church.²⁷³ The bishops have authority to establish rites and ceremonies that may be observed without sin.²⁷⁴ Righteousness of faith is not dependent on rites, which are not necessary to salvation.²⁷⁵

Zu dem leren wir auch, das man hirin die cristliche freiheit behalten solle, nemlich das die leute verstehen, das soliche satzungen nicht der meinung zu halten, als seien sie nottig zur seligkeit, und das die gewissen nicht verletzt werden, ob sie underweilen nicht gehalten werden.(WTA 1536, Article X, p. 56.)²⁷⁶

De talibus rebus tamen admonentur homines, ne conscientiae onerentur, tamquam talis cultus ad salutem necessarius sit. (CAL 1530, p. 69.)

We also teach that in this way Christian freedom should be maintained, that is, that people should understand that they are to observe such usages not as if they were necessary to salvation, and that consciences should not be violated if sometimes such usages are not observed. (WTA 1536, Article X, p. 56.)²⁷⁷

Nevertheless, men are admonished not to burden consciences with such things, as if observances of this kind were necessary to salvation. (CAL 1530, p. 69.)

The rites in the Church exist for peace and order, and any human traditions should not burden consciences. Article X of the Wittenberg Articles and Article XV of the *Confessio Augustana* agree in various places that rites and ceremonies belong to the church government, are not necessary to salvation, and need not be uniform.²⁷⁸

Nit not ist, das soliche kirchensatzunge oder ceremonien von menschen eingesetzt allenthalben gleich und einerlei sind, denn ein itzlich land ir.... seine eigene weise und ordnung. (WTA 1536, Article X, p. 57.)²⁷⁹

Nec necesse est ubique similes esse traditiones humanas seu ritus aut cerimonias ab hominibus institutas. (CAL 1530, Article VII, p. 61.)

It is not necessary that such Church rites or ceremonies instituted by men should be observed uniformly in all places, since each country ... has its own custom and usage. (WTA 1536, Article X, p. 57.)²⁸⁰

It is not necessary that human traditions or rites and ceremonies, instituted by men should be alike everywhere. (CAL 1530, Article VII, p. 61.)²⁸¹

Melanchthon clearly indicates in the Wittenberg Articles that the adiaphora matters belong to the bishops' authority, and that rites and ceremonies are not necessary to salvation. The ceremonies need not be uniformly observed; each country may establish its own customs. Melanchthon's position is essentially the same on human traditions in indifferent matters in the *Advice* of 1534, when he wrote that agreement should be easily found among the churches regarding "indifferent matters,"²⁸² if the parties agreed on doctrine. Melanchthon refers to right understanding of the doctrine of justification and the definition of the bishop's power in the

²⁷³ WTA 1536, Article X, pp. 56; 142, Bray 2004, p. 142.

²⁷⁴ Ibid.

²⁷⁵ Grane 1987, p. 96.

²⁷⁶ WTA 1536, Article X, p. 56; Bray 2004, p. 142.

²⁷⁷ Ibid.

²⁷⁸ WTA 1536, Article X, p. 57; Bray 2004, p. 143; Grane 1987, p. 90.

²⁷⁹ WTA 1536, Article X, p. 57; Bray 2004, p. 143.

²⁸⁰ Bray 2004, p. 143.

²⁸¹ Grane 1987, p. 89.

²⁸² Dingel 1998, pp. 110–111; Scheible 2002, pp. 200–201.

church. In the *Advice*, he hoped that his writing about the “indifferent matters” would help other nations also to approve similar doctrinal positions.²⁸³ The right understanding of the nature of the Church, and the doctrine of justification by faith were the prerequisites for understanding the adiaphora matters.

McEntegart states that most of the discussion on doctrinal articles went smoothly during Anglo-Lutheran negotiations. It was decided that ceremonies (Article XV of the *Confessio Augustana*) are not necessary to salvation and that the rites do not have to be the same in all places. Diversity was accepted as long as the new doctrine was preached and the sacraments administered. Article X of the Wittenberg Articles made use of the *Confessio Augustana*.²⁸⁴ Agreement was even reached on Article X, regarding rites. Disagreement remained on the conflicting articles.

Article XI: Civil Affairs [Von Weltlichen Ständen]

Article XI, On Civil Affairs (Von Weltlichen Ständen), is discussed in respect to the corresponding Article XVI, Civil Affairs, in the *Confessio Augustana*. The reason for including these articles is that they speak to the relationship between civil government and the church, which differed in Germany and England. The article will also be compared to the article “Concerning Civil Magistrates and the Dignity of Political Matters” in the *Loci Communes* of 1535.

Article XI states that Christ’s kingdom is spiritual and does not destroy civil government, but confirms it as an ordinance from God.²⁸⁵ Since civil government is pleasing to God, according to divine law, a Christian can hold office,²⁸⁶ as agreed in the *Confessio Augustana*, Article XVI.²⁸⁷ Christians ought to be subject to civil authority unless the rulers command something that cannot be obeyed without sin,²⁸⁸ as in Article XVI of the *Confessio Augustana*.²⁸⁹ Article XI of the Wittenberg Articles speaks of the spiritual kingdom that is in the heart of men,²⁹⁰ as *Confessio Augustana* Article XVI speaks of the Gospel that “teaches eternal righteousness” and is parallel with it.²⁹¹

Melanchthon differentiates between the spiritual function of the church and secular political life.²⁹² He bases the function of civil magistrates on the law of nature, which judges both good

²⁸³ Melanchthon’s opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume de Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 135.

²⁸⁴ McEntegart 2002, p. 55.

²⁸⁵ WTA 1536, XI, p. 57; Bray 2004, p. 144.

²⁸⁶ Ibid.

²⁸⁷ *De Rebus civilibus docent, quod legitimaee ordinationes civiles sint bona opera Dei, quod christianis liceat.* CAL 1530, 16, p. 70. Grane 1987, p. 166.

²⁸⁸ WTA 1536, XI, Bray 2004, p. 145.

²⁸⁹ *Itaque necessario debent christiani oboedire magistratibus suis et legibus, nisi cum iubent peccare, tunc enim magis debent oboedire Deo quam hominibus.* CAL 1530, XVI, p. 71; Grane 1987, p. 167.

²⁹⁰ WTA 1536, XI p. 57; Bray 2004, p. 144.

²⁹¹ *Evangelium tradit iustitiam aeternam cordis.* CAL 1530, XVI, p. 71.

²⁹² *Euangelium docet de quadam spiritali & aeterna iusticia in corde, nec abolet interim in uita corporali oeconomiam aut politiam, sed docet oeconomiam et omnes politias ratione constitutas, bonas ordinationes Dei esse.* LC 1535, Fol. 435L

and bad works. Both natural and civil law, he argues, are equal.²⁹³ In the *Loci Communes* of 1535, Melanchthon praises obedience to civil law, referring to Paul’s teaching that one must obey not only outwardly but also in mind and will.²⁹⁴ Civil law, according to Melanchthon, maintains discipline and piety by its rules and laws. Melanchthon’s concept follows the line of Article XI of the Wittenberg Articles on obedience to civil magistrates and that of Article XVI of the *Confessio Augustana*. In the *Loci Communes* of 1535, he adds that the obedience should be “obedience of mind and will” relating to the idea that civil government is divine in origin and obedience to its laws is the same as obedience to God. This is seen in his statement that a magistrate teaches knowledge of God.²⁹⁵ Melanchthon also believed that civil law should prevent impious practices and doctrines and punish heretics.²⁹⁶ This idea is found both in *Loci Communes* and Article XI of the Wittenberg Articles, which states “punish evildoers.”²⁹⁷ In the *Loci Communes*, Melanchthon states that “the works of the economic and political life, whichever each man does according to his own vocation, are good works and among the pious.”²⁹⁸ Article XI of the Wittenberg Articles expresses the same idea by the phrase “a Christian may without sin hold civil office.”²⁹⁹

This article was included because the understanding of civil affairs differed in England and Germany. In Saxon principalities, secular magistracy protected the church. The discussion on magistracy and church relations elucidates each sphere’s responsibility in maintaining order in society, which in turn affected the church. The spiritual function of the church and civil function of society both have their own specific roles.

[The gospel teaches a certain spiritual and eternal justice in the heart, but in the meanwhile it does not do away with economy and organization in physical life, but teaches that economy and all organizations that are reasonably established, are good ordinances of God.]

²⁹³ *Iam quæ sint bona, quæ sint mala opera iudicat ratio naturalis seu Lex naturæ & Magistratus.* LC 1535, Fol. 447R.

[Now which are good and which are bad works is decided by the magistrate and natural reason or Law of nature.]
²⁹⁴ *Deinde studium obedientiæ maius in nobis esse debet, cum intelligimus haud dubie poenas Deo daturos esse eos qui non obediunt, ut maxime putent se Magistratum iracundiam clu? [elusu] uros esse. Deinde Paulus non solum de externis officiis, seu obedientia externa concionatur, sed etiam de animi iudicio ac uoluntate.* LC 1535, Fol. 451L.

[Therefore the pursuit of obedience ought to be greater in us, when we understand that those who do not obey will be punished by God without any doubt, even if they think that they can escape the wrath of the magistrates. Thus, Paul does not only preach about external duties or external obedience, but also about the judgment and will of the mind.]

²⁹⁵ *Magistratus curare debent, ut pace bene utantur homines non ad luxum, libidines, & cætera uitia, sed regendi sunt mores legibus & disciplina. Item instituendi sunt homines ad pietatem & agnitionem Dei.* LC 1535, Fol. 445L.

[Magistrates ought to take care that men make good use of peace not for extravagance, pleasures, and the other vices, but so that their conduct is ruled by laws and discipline. In the same way, men should be instructed in piety and acknowledgment of God.]

²⁹⁶ LC 1535, Fol. 457 L. Melanchthon’s approach to history shows his characters either supporting good laws and true church or committed to injustice and persecution. He, however, stressed that God is above history and history is preserved in the church. Wengert 2010, V, pp. 20–21.

²⁹⁷ WTA 1536, XI, Bray 2004, p. 144.

²⁹⁸ LC 1535, Fol. 435R.

²⁹⁹ WTA 1536, XI, Bray 2004, p. 144.

Article XII: Of the Mass [De Missa/Von der Mess]

According to the consensus reached by the German and English theologians, the character of the Mass was changed from the Roman Church's focus on the sacrifice of Christ to a public ceremony for reading sacred texts. Hence this would encourage the congregants to have faith in God. Thus, the new purpose of the Mass was to join the members of the church together in a community with the promise of redemption. Essentially, the new Mass was more spiritual and looked to the promise of redemption rather than literally creating redemption in the present. In other words, unlike the old Mass, which was part of doctrine (*lex orandi–lex credendi*), the new Mass was part of adiaphora.

As we can see in the passage below, the Mass became just one of many ceremonies in the church, no more or less important than any other. It was a ceremony of public prayers based on the promise of Christ in Matt. 19: 19–20.

Si duo ex vobis consenserint super terram de omni re, quaecumque petierint, fiet illis a patre meo, qui in coelis est; ubi enim sunt duo vel tres congregati in nomine meo, ibi sum in medio eorum. (WTA 1536, Article XII, p. 58.)

If two of you are in agreement together concerning anything on earth, whatever they ask for will come to them from my father, who is in heaven: for wherever there are two or three gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them. (WTA 1536, Article XII, p. 58.)³⁰⁰

The needs of the universal church will be placed above the private needs of an individual. One person can be an example and beneficial in encouraging others to also pray. The *Apologia* and *Confessio Augustana* both speak of the Mass as a public ceremony to be celebrated with reverence.³⁰¹

Particularly when referring to the sacrament and sacrifice, the Wittenberg Articles agree with the *Confessio Augustana* that the authority of the Mass is based on Scripture and the Church Fathers³⁰² The doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass is beyond the scope of this chapter, as its meaning is ambiguous, as stated in the *Apologia*.³⁰³

Both the Wittenberg Articles and the *Confessio Augustana* agree with the didactic aspect of the Mass. The Wittenberg Articles especially reflected the Church of England's interpretation of the Eucharist as *lex orandi–lex credendi* [law of prayer–law of belief] dividing the service into lessons, prayers, and communion as an exercise of faith.³⁰⁴

Unlike in the Catholic tradition, the Mass does not automatically absolve sins. The Wittenberg Articles interpreted the Mass as a communion between God and the body of Christ's church. Attendees were warned to be worthy participants in the Mass. The focus of the Mass was the right use of the sacrament of the altar, which in the Wittenberg Articles is called Eucharist, the feast of thanksgiving. The very essential part of the Eucharist is the communion that follows the prayer service. In this article, congregants were warned that they had to be especially

³⁰⁰ WTA 1536, XII, p. 58; Bray 2004, p. 145.

³⁰¹ CAL 1530, XXIV, p. 91; Apol. 1531, XXIV, p. 351; ApolE, 1536, Fol. 139 R.

³⁰² WTA 1536, XII, p. 62; CAL 1530, XXIV, pp. 94–95; ApolL. 1531, XXIV, pp. 350–351.

³⁰³ ApolL 1531, XXIV, p. 353; ApolE, 1536, Fol. 141 L.

³⁰⁴ WTA 1536, XII, p. 58.

respectful when they ate of Christ's body and drank his blood during the communion.³⁰⁵ The Wittenberg Articles clearly state that the practice of the Mass in order to merit remission of sins for others is not an acceptable use of the sacrament.

Etsi autem adversarii in hoc loco multa congerunt. ut probent missam esse sacrificium, tamen ille ingens tumultus verborum prolata hac unica responsione consilescent, quod haec quamvis longa coacervatio auctoritatum, rationum, testimoniorum non ostendat, quod missa ex opere operato conferat gratiam, aut applicata pro aliis mereatur eis remissionem venialium et mortalium peccatorum culpae et poenae. (ApolL, 1531, Article XXIV, p. 351.)

Sed de usu sacramenti corporis et sanguinis domini in missa, improbamus eos, qui sentiunt, usum sacramenti cultum esse applicandum pro aliis vivis et mortuis et mereri illis remissionem culpae et poenae, idque ex opere operato. (WTA, 1536, Article XII, p. 60.)

Nowe albeit our aduersareis in this place do heape many thynges together, to proue that the masse is a sacrifice: yet neuertheles that greate crye of wordes shall ceasse and be put to silence, if onely this one answeere be made/that all that greate and longe heape of auctorities, of reasons, of testimonies, worthe not proue That the masse dothe gyue grace by virtue of the worke wrought, or that the masse being applied for others, doth merite to them remission of veniala and deadely synnes, of the cryme, and of the payne.(ApolE, 1536, Fol. 140L.)

Now even if the opponents assemble many sayings on this topic to prove that the Mass is a sacrifice, nevertheless the great roar of their words will be silenced by advancing this single response: no matter how long their list of authorities, reasons, and testimonies may be, it still does not prove that the Mass confers grace ex opere operato. No does it prove that when the Mass is applied to others, it merits the forgiveness of venial and mortal sins or the remission of guilt and punishment for them. (The Book of Concord, Apol. 1531, p. 259.)

But concerning the celebration of the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord in the mass, we blame those who think that the celebration of the mass is a service to be held for other people living and dead, and that it merits for them the remission of guilt and punishment, and this by virtue of the mere performance of the rite.(*ex opere operato*). (WTA 1536, Article XII, p. 60; Bray 2004, p. 147.)

The articles do not approve of the use of the Mass ceremony with the intention that the performance of the ceremony would grant remission of sins, as the opponents taught. In fact, the English translation of the *Apologia* from the Latin reflects a slightly different idea. First, the English translation is shorter and translates the Latin *ex opere operato* as “by virtue of the worke wrought.” The Wittenberg Articles add that it is erroneous to think that remission is given to the “living and dead” in the Mass. Remission does not exist in a common nor a private Mass. The latter notion is not in either the Latin or English *Apologia*. The articles sternly warn those who think that the celebration of the Mass achieves the remission of sins and deliverance from punishments. The English *Apologia* expressed “veniala and deadely synnes, of the cryme, and of the payne,” Latin *Apologia* has venial and mortal sins and a phrase “*culpae et poenae*,” the Wittenberg Articles have “guilt and punishment.”³⁰⁶ The Latin *Apologia* opposes the cardinal sins (venial and mortal) that the opponents claimed that the Mass ceremony absolves *ex opere*

³⁰⁵ WTA 1536, XII, pp. 60, 62, 64; ApolL, 1531, XXIV, p. 351; ApolE, 1536, Fol. 140L.

³⁰⁶ WTA 1536, XII, p. 60; Bray 2004, p. 147; ApolL, 1531, XXIV, p. 351; ApolE 1536, Fol. 140L.

operato. The English *Apologia* explains “mortal” sin as “deadely.” It also adds crimes as sins, including sins against human laws. The word “payne” corresponds to the Latin phrase “*culpaē et poenae*.” The Wittenberg Articles continue that the abuse of the Mass was not known in the ancient church, nor was it mentioned in the Scriptures. The Mass is concerned with the faith of the participant and spiritual service to God, as emphasized in the Wittenberg Articles.³⁰⁷

The emphasis in the Wittenberg Articles, as in the *Confessio Augustana*, was on the spiritual service to God. The purpose of the Mass, according to the Wittenberg Articles, is to exercise faith in prayer and thanksgiving (Eucharist). In both the *Confessio Augustana* and the Wittenberg Articles, the benefits of Christ are received by faith during the Mass ceremony. The Wittenberg Articles refer to the ancient custom of the Eucharist, the central event of the Mass.³⁰⁸ The change in understanding the Mass ceremony also represents a change in understanding the doctrine of soteriology in the sacrament.

Hæc fides, qua accipiuntur beneficia Christi, est spiritualis cultus Dei, et quia cum ea fide debet esse coniuncta graciaram actio, qua corda vere pro remissione peccatorum et redemptione graciars agant Deo patri [et] domino nostro Jesu Christo, ideo vetus ecclesia hunc usum sacramentorum vocavit Eucharistiam. (WTA, 1536, Article XII, p. 62.)

This act of faith, by which they receive the benefits of Christ, is spiritual worship of God, and since thanksgiving ought to be conjoined with that faith, by which hearts truly give thanks to God the Father and to our Lord Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and redemption, therefore the old church called this rite of sacrament the Eucharist. (WTA, 1536, Article XII, p. 62.)

In the text below, the Wittenberg Articles, the “unworthy partaking of the bread and wine” agrees with the text of the Latin and English *Confessio Augustana* about the “unworthy use of the Sacrament.” The unworthy partaking of the sacrament was caused by the misuse of private Masses for gain, which made the use of the sacrament even more grievous.³⁰⁹

Paulus autem graviter minatur his, qui indigne tractant eucharistiam, cum ait: Qui ederit panem hunc aut biberit calicem Domini indigne, reus erit corporis et sanguinis Domini. Itaque cum apud nos admonerentur sacerdotes de hoc peccato, desierunt apud nos privatæ missæ, cum fere nullæ privatæ missæ nisi quæstus causa fierent. (CAL, 1530, Article XXIV, p. 92.)

But Paule greuously thretneth them whiche entreate and receyue the sacramet unworthily whe he sayeth. who eateih thys breade or drynketh the cuppe of the lorde unwor hely shal be gilty of the body and bloude of the lorde. Therefore when prestes were monished with us of that syn: private masses ceased with us because almoste no priuate masses were done but for lucre and aduantage. (CAE 1536, Fol. 18L.)

Cum enim Paulus dicat (I Cor. 11: 27) reos esse corporis et sanguinis Domini illos, qui abutantur sacramento, summa cura praestandum est, ut pius et sanctus usus ad gloriam Christi et salutem ecclesiae restituatur. (WTA 1536, Article XII, p. 64.)

For since Paul says (I Cor 11: 27) that those who misuse the sacrament are guilty of the body and blood of the lord, great care must be taken that a godly and holy celebration be restored, to the glory of Christ and the well-being of the Church. (WTA 1536, Article XII, p. 64.)

The central theme concerning the Mass is to put it to the right use. The Mass as a ceremony does not automatically remit sin only by virtue of someone’s listening to it. It was the idea that the Mass ceremony itself would grant the remission of sins especially in the celebration of private Masses. This was the misuse of the sacrament as stated in the Latin and the English

³⁰⁷ WTA 1536, XII, pp. 60, 62, 64; ApolL, 1531, XXIV, p. 351; ApolE, 1536, Fol. 140L.

³⁰⁸ WTA 1536, XII, p. 62; CAL 1530, XXIV, p. 94; CAE 1536, Fol. 19L.

³⁰⁹ WTA 1536, XII, p. 64; CAL 1530, XXIV, p. 92; CAE 1536, Fol. 18L.

Confessio Augustana. Article XII of the Wittenberg Articles indicates that private Masses were responsible for the unworthy partaking of the sacrament.

In the *Apologia*, the entire service of the Mass occurs in the Eucharist. In the English version of the *Apologia*, the word “skille” literally means the delivering of bread and wine to the communicants. The Wittenberg Articles place more emphasis on the “receiving” aspects of the benefits of Christ than on the “delivery aspects,” which is very much akin to Melancthon’s thinking.³¹⁰ The *Confessio Augustana* supports offering both bread and wine in the Lord’s Supper, since any other manner would offend the conscience. The English and Latin *Apologia* says that both kinds should be served in the Lord’s Supper, since the withholding of one element shows a distinction between lay and clergy. The Wittenberg Articles indicate that since Christ instituted the sacrament to be communion, the distribution of the sacrament to others besides the celebrant is a sign of true communion. This is the true meaning of the Lord’s Supper as seen in the text below:

Si hac ratione prohibent, ut sit ordinis discrimen, haec ipsa ratio movere debeat, ne assentiamur adversariis, vel si alioqui morem cum ipsis servaturi eramus. (Apoll, 1531, Article XXII, p. 331).

If they do forbydde it for this skille, that there shuld be a difference of the ordre: this selfe same reason ought to moue vs, that we do nat agre to our aduersaries, euen though we were elles minded to haue obserued the custome and maner with them. (ApolE, 1536, Fol. 128L.)

If they withhold one element so that there might be a distinction between lay and ordained orders, this in itself should keep us from agreeing with our opponents, even though we would be inclined in other respects to comply with their custom.³¹¹

Cum igitur Christus sic instituerit usum sacramenti, ut esset communio, in qua porrigeretur aliquibus sacramentum, et hunc morem diu servaverit vetus ecclesia nec habuerit privatas missas, sentimus nos, talem ritum, in quo fit communio aliquorum, pium et cosentaneum esse evangelio. (WTA 1536, Article XII, pp. 62, 64.)³¹²

Since therefore, Christ so instituted the celebration of the sacrament as to be a Communion in which sacrament might be distributed to others, and since the ancient Church preserved this custom for along time and did not hold private masses, we hold that a rite in which the Communion of others takes place is godly and in keeping with the Gospel. (WTA 1536, Article XII, pp. 62, 64.)

Quare si qui maluerunt utraque specie sacramenti uti, non fuerunt cogendi, ut aliter facerent cum offensione conscientiae. (CAL, 1530, Article XXII, p. 86.)³¹³

Consequently, if any people preferred to use both kinds in the sacrament, they should not have been compelled, with offence to their consciences, to do otherwise. (CAL, 1530, Article XXII, p. 86.)

As seen below, both the English and Latin *Apologia* agree that the sacrament should be offered to all who participate in the Lord’s Supper. In another context, the English version of the

³¹⁰ WTA 1536, XII, p. 62; CAL 1530, XXII, p. 86; ApolE, Fol. 128L.

³¹¹ The Book of Concord, Apoll, 1531, p. 247.

³¹² WTA 1536, XII, pp. 62–64; Bray 2004, pp. 148–149.

³¹³ Grane 1987, p. 216.

Apologia has “the sacramente of the alter” where the Latin version has *Eucharistia* as seen below:³¹⁴

Sacerdotes qui eucharistiae serviunt et sanguinem Domini populis eius dividunt. (ApolL, 1531, Article XXII, p. 329.)

The prestes, whiche do serue the sacramente of the alter, whiche do deuide the bloude of the Lorde to the people. (ApolE, 1536, Fol. 127L.)

Dingel agrees that the concepts of work-righteousness and private Masses were rejected, but despite Melanchthon’s acknowledgement of the real presence in the Lord’s Supper, he kept the sacrifice notion in order to bring forth the early Church’s concept of remembrance and thanksgiving of the Lord’s Supper, called *Eucharistia*.³¹⁵

As quoted above, the main focus of the Latin and English *Confessio Augustana* is the abolition of private Masses due to their abuses, particularly in the invocation on another’s behalf for avoiding punishment, and for the gain of the celebrant. The phrase below is the language of both the *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia*.³¹⁶ In this article on the Mass, Melanchthon follows the *Confessio Augustana* in that most customary ceremonies have been retained. The Wittenberg Articles also opposed the offering of private masses for others, as stated below:

Deinde privatae missae solitae sunt fieri cum illa opinione de usu sacramenti, quod necesse sit, existere in ecclesia hunc cultum applicandum pro aliis, ut mereatur eis remissionem culpae et poenae, tales igitur missae abrogandae sunt. (WTA 1536, Article XII, p. 64.)

Thus the private Masses tended to become associated with the opinion concerning the use of the sacrament, that it is necessary that this worship that could be applied on behalf of others should exist in the church, so that it earns for them remission of sin and punishment; therefore Masses of this sort should be abrogated. (WTA 1536, Article XII, p. 64.)

Article XII of the Wittenberg Articles “On the Mass,” closely follows Melanchthon’s *Advice* of 1534, “On the Mass” in the section that speaks of the misuse of private Masses. The object of criticism by the reformers was that the private Masses were celebrated for gain. Melanchthon himself expressed a more positive attitude to private Masses in the *Advice*—that if the abuses were rectified the disputes would be lessened, as seen in the text below:

*Sed privatas missas nullas habemus. Et de his sunt magnae disputationes, quibus praebuit occasionem ingens ille abusus missarum per totum orbem terrarum, ad quem tot iam seculis pontifices connivent. Emendatis his abusibus fortasse disputationes de privata missa etiam mitigarentur. Sunt autem hi abusus noti ac manifesti: quod fingunt oblationem illam valere pro aliis, et quidem pro vivis et mortuis, ac mereri aliis remissionem peccatorum.*³¹⁷

But we do not hold any private Masses, and there are great disputes over these, in which that great abuse of Masses over the whole world is given opportunity, to which popes for so many centuries now have been turning a blind eye. If these abuses were rectified, perhaps the disputes over the private Masses could be assuaged too. For these abuses are known and blatant: that they pretend that the offering of the Mass is valid on behalf of others: indeed, on behalf of both living and dead and that remission of sins is earned for others.

³¹⁴ ApolL, 1531, XXII, p. 329; ApolE, 1536, Fol. 127L.

³¹⁵ Dingel 1998, p. 119; Dingel 2012a, p. 117.

³¹⁶ WTA 1536, XII, p. 64; CAL 1530, XXIV, p. 92; CAE 1536, Fol. 18L; ApolL, 1531, p. 351.

³¹⁷ Melanchthon’s opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 138.

The abuse, in his opinion, was the use of private Masses on behalf of others both living and dead, implying that remission of sins is earned for others simply by performance of these Masses.³¹⁸ The Reformers did not see it necessary to change the Mass ceremony, as long as the right doctrinal understanding was clear that it was an adiaphora matter.

McEntegart states that the second part of the theological discussions at Wittenberg involved the private Masses, communion in both kinds, priestly marriage, and monastic vows. The most important of the four articles in both the German and English versions was the one discussing private Masses. The Roman Church claimed that the sacrament could be celebrated on behalf of other men, that the performance itself would remit sins. This was against the Lutheran doctrine of grace. The indulgence controversy originated in the misuse of private Masses.³¹⁹ The Lutherans claimed that communion in one kind was only a human tradition, not of divine ordinance. They also believed that priests should be married as they were in the ancient practice of the church, and that the belief that monastic vows bring about salvation should be abolished.³²⁰

The changes in a new understanding of the celebration of the Mass represent a change in understanding the doctrine of soteriology. In the *Confessio Augustana*, Article V, “The Ministry of the Church,” teaches that the justifying faith is obtained through the ministry of preaching the Word and administering the sacraments as means of grace. The Holy Spirit working through them creates faith. It is the Word that constitutes the sacrament. Thus, the ministry of the Word and the sacraments are signs of the true church.³²¹ The term “justification” came from the ancient Roman judicial system, in which the accused who were absolved were pronounced “just” (Latin, *iustus*). Because Melancthon believed that no one is capable of fulfilling human—let alone divine—laws, he concluded that justification does not come from one’s good works, but rather from the freely given grace of Christ.³²²

The Roman Church’s position was that the sacraments were sufficient in and of themselves as expressed with the phrase *ex opere operato*, and the sacrament’s efficacy depended on its correct performance and worthy reception.³²³ Zwingli reduced the Word and the sacraments to empty signs. Thus, both Rome and Zwingli avoided the lowly appearance of Christ. Zwingli’s emphasis on the Spirit’s sovereignty led to his theology of predestination, and Rome’s emphasis on the Spirit’s bondage to the means of grace makes the sacraments sufficient in and of themselves.³²⁴ The Mass is God’s work, testament to Christ’s incarnation and death for the forgiveness of sins, offering the promise (*promissio*) of salvation and faith (*fides*).³²⁵

Melancthon, citing texts from church history and canon law, claimed that the distribution of the Lord’s Supper had been in both kinds for a long time, opposing the Roman view of one kind.³²⁶ The Wittenberg Articles defended delivering the sacrament in both kinds.

³¹⁸ August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 138.

³¹⁹ McEntegart 2002, pp. 55–56.

³²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

³²¹ CAL 1530, Article IV, pp. 58, 61; Grane 1987, pp. 69–71, 73, 75; 89–90.

³²² LC 1535, Fol. 7R.

³²³ Grane 1987, p. 76.

³²⁴ Grane 1987, pp. 76–77.

³²⁵ CAL 1530, Article X, pp. 85–86; Grane 1987, pp. 113, 120.

³²⁶ CAL 1530, Article X, pp. 85–86; Grane 1987, pp. 215–216.

At the same time, Melanchthon was working on the Eucharist disputes to reach agreement. The attempts to reconcile disputes about the Eucharist between Zwinglians and Lutherans in Marburg in 1529 failed, as a disagreement remained on the nature of Christ's presence in the Eucharist. Thus, the political union of Reformers failed at that time, until an agreement was reached in March through May of 1536 in the Wittenberg Accord. Melanchthon, Luther, Bucer and Bugenhagen agreed that Christ's body was present and received in the Eucharist. This agreement meant full political and doctrinal unity between north and south Germany.³²⁷ All Reformers agreed that Christ was present in the Lord's Supper, but not in the manner of the scholastic doctrine of transubstantiation. They also rejected the Mass as a sacrifice or as a representation of Christ's sacrifice; adoration of the elements; withholding wine from laity, and superstition and idolatry related to the celebration.³²⁸ The question on communion that caused division and disagreement was what is meant that Christ's body and blood were present in the elements of bread and wine? Cameron finds that the Reformers discussed each within the medieval framework.³²⁹ Their concepts of salvation and Christological understanding of divine nature played a considerable role in the interpretation of the Lord's Supper. According to Luther, Christ's human and divine natures were present, and the *Confessio Augustana* states: the body and blood of Christ are truly present, excluding a symbolic understanding of Christ's presence; two realities were present at the same time, as Luther wrote.³³⁰

Article XIII: Of Both Kinds [De utraque specie/Von beider gestalt]

The Confutation tried to prove that communion in one kind was used since the Apostles. The Reformers held that the Roman Church practice was human tradition. For them, Christ's ordinance, according to this article, cannot be changed by human tradition, since it is above human laws or church traditions. As Dugmore has pointed out, the Reformers demanded to restore communion in both kinds to all present at communion who believe in the real presence of Christ in the sacrament. The presence of Christ in the sacrament became a major dispute between the Reformers of different schools. The early English evangelicals, who visited the Continent, must have brought ideas that influenced the development of the Eucharistic doctrine of the English Church.³³¹

The nature of the Lord's Supper is a communion and worship by the congregation. The delivering of the elements joins the real presence of Christ into the sacramental act, which is essential. The *Confessio Augustana* disapproves of those who teach the spiritualistic or scholastic understanding of the sacrament because of their different understanding of the Word and sacrament.³³² Adding an article on both kinds made the Reformers' teaching on the sacrament clear. It is no more adiaphora, as the opponent had declared, but an essential part of the sacrament.

³²⁷ Cameron 2012, pp. 192–193.

³²⁸ Ibid., pp. 189–190,

³²⁹ Ibid., p. 196.

³³⁰ Grane 1987, p. 113; Cameron 2012, pp. 190–191.

³³¹ Dugmore 1958, pp. 93–96.

³³² CAL 1530, XXII, p. 85–86; Grane 1987, pp. 113–115.

Contrary to the medieval Church tradition, it is maintained in the Wittenberg Articles that Christ did not order communion for priests alone, but for the whole church—“communion in both kinds.”³³³

The last point concurs with both the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apologia*. To support this position, the *Confessio Augustana* referred to the testimonies of Scripture and the Church Fathers, who stated that the custom is against God’s commandment and even against the canon law of the Roman Church.³³⁴ The practice of communion in both kinds, where the sacrament is offered to the whole congregation, is referred to in both the *Confessio Augustana* and the Wittenberg Articles. The *Confessio Augustana* cites the ancient church of Corinth, and in both the *Confessio Augustana* and the Wittenberg Articles earlier popes are cited.³³⁵

The tradition of offering both kinds to the laity and priests was obscured during the time of the Reformation and related to the scholastic influence on Catholic thinking that supported a doctrine of concomitance. This belief held that the body of Christ was present both in bread and wine, and thereby justified denying the cup to the laity. Note that in the second English passage above, the translation of *Papa*, “Pope,” is “byshoppe of Rome,” showing how the English were already dismissing the authority of the pope now that Henry VIII was Supreme Head of the Church of England and responsible for ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the nation.³³⁶

In Melancthon’s opinion, the denial of the cup to the laity is human law, whereas it is Christ’s ordinance to give Christ’s institution of bread and wine.³³⁷ Melancthon did not demand an immediate change of practice as long as the Reformation doctrine was upheld, and as long as communion participants did not act against their consciences.³³⁸ Melancthon’s position concerning communion in both kinds had changed since he wrote the *Advice*. He hoped that the old customs and rites could be restored, and also that the pope would take the initiative and remove the prohibition on the practice, allowing it to be free so that one side would not condemn the other.³³⁹ This was a major departure from *Confessio Augustana* and the Wittenberg Articles.

Movetur enim populus, cum allegatur institutio Christi et vetus ritus ecclesiae. Et ut maxime queratur aliqua excusatio utentium una spetie, tamen non desinunt illi tumultus. Et in his tumultibus etiam conscientiae aliquorum periclitantur. Porro facile mederi his incommodis pontifex sine detrimento ullo posset, si sublata prohibitione relinqueret usum liberum et constitueret, ne qua pars alteram damnaret. Haec libertas plurimum ad tranquillitatem conduceret et nihil noceret ulli generi hominum. Et tota haec res est pontifici in manu, quia constat prohibitionem tantum esse iuris humani. Fortassis etiam aliae multae controversiae fierent mitiores, si pontifex in hac causa aliquid populo concederet. Nam hanc

For the people are upset when the institution of Christ and the old rites of the church are taken away. And even if some excuse is sought for those who practice communion in one kind, those uproars will not abate, and in these uproars the consciences of people are at risk. Furthermore, the Pope could easily stem these upheavals without any harm if he removed the prohibition and left the usage free, and established it so that neither side would condemn the other. This freedom would be very conducive to peace, and would do no harm to any kind of man. And this whole matter is in the hand of the Pope, since it is agreed that prohibitions pertain only to human law. Perhaps many other controversies would be mitigated too,

³³³ WTA 1536, XIII, pp. 64–65; CAL 1530, pp. 85–86; CAE 1536, Fols. 13R, 13L.

³³⁴ CAL 1530, XXII, pp. 85–86; CAE 1536, Fols. 13L, 13R.

³³⁵ WTA 1536, XIII, pp. 64–65; CAL 1530, p. 85; CAE 1536, Fols. 13L, 13R.

³³⁶ CAL 1530, XXII, p. 85; CAE 1536, Fol. 13R.

³³⁷ Dingel 2012a, p. 118.

³³⁸ Dingel 2012a, p. 118; Dingel 1998, p. 120.

³³⁹ See Dingel, 1998, pp. 113–114; Scheible, 2002, pp. 200–201.

*ceremoniam populus maxime curat, et quia est res externa, dissimilitudo in usu facile parit tumultus.*³⁴⁰

if the Pope would concede something to the people in this cause. For the people care especially for this ceremony and, since it is an external matter, diversity of practice easily breeds uproar.

In the *Advice* of 1534, “Of Both Kinds” Melanchthon left the door open for the alternatives of one kind or both kinds.

Article XIV: Of the Marriage of Priests [De conjugio sacerdotum/Von der briesterehe]

In this article on the marriage of priests, Scripture is placed above human traditions. It is not lawful, they say, to deny marriage, either by vows or human laws. This article included Melanchthon’s concepts of divine law and natural justice (*lex divina et ius naturae*). Marriage, he believed, belongs to the area of created order, which subsequent church laws cannot change. Therefore, marriage is a human tradition. This concurs with what is written in the *Apologia*.³⁴¹

In the Wittenberg Articles, it is stated that celibacy is preferred over marriage for priests in order to give them more time for prayer and ministry (*bona opera*). But it also states a preference for married priests over ones who practiced “unclean celibacy” (*impurus caelibatus*)—that is, fornication. Thus, in the articles, priests are given the choice of celibacy or marriage, unlike the Catholic position, which forbade marriage for priests. The *Confessio Augustana* had taken a similar position.³⁴²

In a similar way, the *Apologia* spoke about the “special gift” (*peculiare donum*) of virginity for priests. Previous laws that prohibited priestly marriages were mere human traditions, the Wittenberg Articles concluded, as had the *Confessio Augustana*.³⁴³

In Article XIV, a higher value is placed on divine law in the Scriptures than on any of the laws created by the “Roman Bishop.”³⁴⁴ One finds in the articles that laws created by the pope are deemed the “new tradition” (*nova traditio*).³⁴⁵ Scripture was cited in the Wittenberg Articles for its position on the marriage of priests, which argue that celibacy is against divine law, and that every man should have a wife to avoid fornication. In the *Apologia*, the position is essentially the same.³⁴⁶

It is not only declared in the Wittenberg Articles that the papal prohibition of marriage by priests was wrong, but that all the pope’s laws were merely human, not divine. The above position is also in *Apologia*, and argues that the pope’s opinions disagreed even with the Catholic Church’s own canon law.³⁴⁷

³⁴⁰ Melanchthon’s opinion for de Langey (M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay), August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 139.

³⁴¹ WTA 1536, XIV, pp. 66–67; ApolL, 1531, XXIII, p. 335.

³⁴² WTA 1536, XIV, pp. 66, 68; CAL 1530, XXIII, p. 87.

³⁴³ WTA 1536, XIV, pp. 66, 68; CAL 1530, XXIII, pp. 90–91; ApolL, 1531, XXIII, p. 337.

³⁴⁴ The English negotiators objected to this article. Melanchthon tried to convince them that celibacy was the pope’s fabrication causing only decay, hoping that the English eventually would accept it. Melanchthon, however, presented the matter in a positive light referring to both divine and natural law for the justification of the marriage of priests. Dingel, 1998, p. 120.

³⁴⁵ WTA 1536, XIV, pp. 68–69.

³⁴⁶ WTA 1536, XIV, p. 66; ApolL, 1531, XXIII, p. 346.

³⁴⁷ WTA 1536, XIV, p. 68; ApolL, 1531, XXIII, pp. 338, 345.

The Wittenberg Articles also addressed the matter of the sins of priests who do not marry, referring again to natural law and agreeing with the *Apologia* that priests ought to marry because it is a natural remedy for human appetites.³⁴⁸

Et ius naturæ est appetitio coniunctionis conformis rectæ rationi. Ad hanc naturalem, ut vocant, στοργην accessit iam concupiscentia, quæ magis inflamat naturam, ut magis opus sit coniugio, tanquam remedio. (WTA, 1536, XIV, p. 66.)

And the law of nature is appetite conjoined with right reason. Now there is desire in addition to this natural ‘love’, as they call it, which inflames nature even more, so that there is even more need for marriage, as a remedy. (WTA, 1536, XIV, p. 66.)

Et coniugium non solum procreationis causa necessarium sit, sed etiam remedii causa. (ApolL, 1531, XXIII, p. 336.)

And marriage is not only necessary for the sake of procreation, but also as a remedy. (ApolL, 1531, XXIII, p. 336.)

As discussed on the celibacy of priests, Melanchthon’s position was unchanged from what he wrote in the *Advice* in 1534. He added that only celibate clergy were awarded the highest offices by the pope, and since universal celibacy was not a realistic goal, Melanchthon felt that the pope needed to make a decision on this issue.³⁴⁹ Dingel finds that Melanchthon addressed the issue more directly with the English in the Wittenberg Articles, comparing marriage instituted by divine law and celibacy by human law.³⁵⁰

Article XV: Of the Monastic Vows [De votis monasticis/Von den klostergelubden]

In both the Wittenberg Articles and the *Apologia*, there is a complaint that monasteries had declined as educational centers. In Article XV of the Wittenberg Articles, the responsibility of kings and princes to support studies in the monasteries is addressed. In the past, monasteries educated the leaders of the church.³⁵¹

To support its position in Article XV, Augustine and Ambrose are cited. They had both supported the monasteries’ teaching of Christian doctrine. According to Article XV, the old Catholic doctrine taught that monastic vows would earn a monk forgiveness of his sins and eternal life. That is, the vows were the monks’ way to be justified.³⁵² The new Reformation doctrine was that monastic vows were not necessary for salvation and actually obscured true faith.³⁵³

Furthermore, the Wittenberg Articles draw a distinction between right and wrong vows. The monastic vows were wrong because they promoted the idea that one can earn eternal life through good works. Right vows, according to the Wittenberg Articles, as well as the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apologia*, were adiaphoristic.³⁵⁴ In the Wittenberg Articles, as in the *Confessio Augustana*, monastic vows were equated with vows for any other profession.

³⁴⁸ WTA 1536, XIV, p. 66; ApolL, 1531, XXIII, p. 336.

³⁴⁹ Melanchthon’s opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 142.

³⁵⁰ Dingel 2012a, pp. 118–119.

³⁵¹ WTA 1536, XV, pp. 68, 70; ApolL, 1531, XXVII, p. 378.

³⁵² WTA 1536, XV, p. 72.

³⁵³ WTA 1536, XV, p. 74; CAL 1530, XXVII, p. 116; ApolL, XXVII, 1531, pp. 387, 396.

³⁵⁴ WTA 1536, XV, p. 72; CAL 1530, XXVII, p. 116; ApolL, XXVII, 1531, p. 379.

Otherwise, they would place monks above everybody else. So long as monks did not think they were earning salvation through their vows, the vows were appropriate. However, anyone who took such vows had to be sure to remain celibate. Youth who took monastic vows at too young an age should have permission to leave the monasteries if they wished.³⁵⁵

According to both the Wittenberg Articles and the *Apologia*, those men who remained in monasteries were to regard impious ceremonies (i.e., those that promised salvation) as adiaphora.³⁵⁶

Si qui autem idonei ad vitam monasticam malunt in illis collegiis vivere, si sunt emendatæ opiniones et cultus, et utuntur ordinationibus velut rebus indifferentibus, hos non repræhendimus, ac multos sanctos et præstantes viros hoc animo pie vixisse in monasteriis iudicamus.... Ut sint talia collegia doctorum et piorum virorum, in quibus ad utilitatem communem ecclesiæ colantur studia doctrinæ christianæ et adolescentes non solum doctrina erudiantur, sed etiam piis exercitiis et illa pædagogia rituum assuefiant ad pietatem, sed ita, ne votis irretiti cum periculo conscientie retineantur. (WTA, 1536, XV, p. 74.)

However, if there are some who are suited to the monastic life who prefer to live in those colleges, if their opinions and worship practices have been corrected, and they regard their ordinances as indifferent, we do not object to these; indeed we believe that many holy and exemplary men have lived piously in monasteries in this spirit... Would that there were such colleges of learned and pious men, in which the studies of church doctrine could be cultivated to the universal utility of the church, and so that young men could be educated not only in doctrine but also in pious practices and, by this training in the rites, might become habituated to piety, but in such a way that they are not kept ensnared by their vows to the danger of their conscience. (WTA, 1536, XV, p. 74.)

Obedientia, paupertas et cælibatus, si tamen non sit impurus, exercitia sunt ἀδιάφορα. (ApolL, 1531, XXIII, p. 384.)

Obedience, poverty and chastity, if one is not impure, are indifferent practices. . (ApolL, 1531, XXIII, p. 384.)

Melanchthon followed the same position in Wittenberg Article XV as “On Vows” in the *Advice*. He did not believe that the monastic foundation should be destroyed, but also thought that the matter ought to be decided by the pope. In the past, the monasteries were kept as schools under the pope’s authority.³⁵⁷

Neque hic articulus habet aliquam subtilem controversiam, sed tota res pontifici in manu est. Non enim opus est monasteria funditus delere... Haec monasteria possent autoritate pontificis et regum cum tempore converti in scholas.³⁵⁸

The article concerning the vows of monks and celibacy also holds no subtle controversy, but the whole matter is in the hands of the pope. For there is no need to destroy the monastic foundation... With time, those monasteries could be converted into schools by papal and royal authority.

Both documents supported the retention of monasteries for use in education, substituting the pope’s leadership with the king’s. This writer agrees with Dingel, who finds the Wittenberg Articles were clearer than the *Advice* and emphasized monasteries as a human creation, though

³⁵⁵ WTA 1536, XV, p. 74; CAL 1530, XXVII, p. 114.

³⁵⁶ WTA 1536, XV, p. 74; ApolL, 1531, XXVII, p. 384.

³⁵⁷ Melanchthon’s opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay], August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 141. Scheible, 2002, p. 201.

³⁵⁸ Melanchthon’s opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay], August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 141.

often misused and obscuring the merit of Christ. Dingel suggests that the article on monastic vows should be viewed in the light of the dissolution of the monasteries.³⁵⁹

The matters faced by the German and English negotiators were the same as those written about by Melanchthon in the *Advice*.³⁶⁰ As Melanchthon's *Advice* was more his private initiative, the English negotiations aimed for a desired unity. However, there were many obstacles to religious unity between the German and English negotiators. Henry made it quite clear that he expected changes to the *Confessio Augustana* in order to subscribe to it. Melanchthon had made concessions in the *Advice*. For instance, communion was left open to individual conscience during the transition period of the Reformation. Melanchthon stressed the thanksgiving character of the Mass, as in the Wittenberg Articles, and did not accept private Masses for gain in either document. The Wittenberg Articles recommended the choice of celibacy or marriage; in the *Advice*, Melanchthon stated that universal celibacy is not a realistic goal. In the Wittenberg Articles, Melanchthon did the same with monastic vows by condemning them as abuses, hoping that the English would agree, since the monasteries were in the process of dissolution. Melanchthon further suggested leaving the remaining monasteries as schools for learning, and conceded to monastic life with correct teaching. In the *Advice*, Melanchthon also recommended that monasteries remain schools under the pope's leadership. It was Melanchthon's firm hope that the negotiations in Wittenberg would bring religious unification. Even though the king did not accept the articles, Melanchthon adapted the contents of the *Confessio Augustana* in order to create religious unity.

The Wittenberg Articles mostly agree with the *Advice*. However, unlike the *Advice*, they do not suggest that the pope should make a dispensation so that no one would be kept in a monastery against his will. The articles further recommended that monasteries should promote good conscience, and stated that even if the pope could not stop the scandals, as long as the monks would hold on to pure doctrine and indifferent rites without superstition, their service was acceptable. The Wittenberg Articles state that kings should support studies in monasteries for education and learning. Melanchthon recommended that impious practices, not education, should be condemned, in order to promote peace in the church. The Wittenberg Articles indicate that impious ceremonies thought by the monks to serve for justification, were in fact adiaphora.

Dingel finds that the Wittenberg Articles clearly indicated that the monastic vows were human ordinances and obscured the work of Christ. When Melanchthon stressed the use of monasteries for education and to make them schools, he stated that only in those circumstances would he consider all their rites and ceremonies as adiaphora.³⁶¹

Article XVI: Of the Saints [Von den Heiligen]

This article was written in German in the Wittenberg Articles. The same article belonged to the doctrinal part of *Confessio Augustana* and was not part of the disputes during the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations in Germany in 1536. However, it is essential to know Melanchthon's view

³⁵⁹ Dingel 2012a, p. 119.

³⁶⁰ Dingel 1998, pp. 119–122.

³⁶¹ Dingel, 1998, p. 121.

on this issue, since he included it in one of his articles back in 1534, and it is part of the Wittenberg Articles. Soon after the Wittenberg negotiations, the first articles of the Church of England—the Ten Articles—were published in 1536. They included articles concerning the worship of saints: Article Seven, “Of Honouring of Saints” and Article Eight, “Of Praying to Saints.”³⁶²

Wittenberg Article XVI, “The Saints,” was written in German, and will be compared with the German translation of Article XXI of the *Confessio Augustana*, “Concerning the Cult of Saints” [Vom Dienst der Heiligen], [*De cultu sanctorum*] respectively.³⁶³

In the *Confessio Augustana* one is taught to remember the saints strengthen faith. Article XXI teaches following the saints’ good example.³⁶⁴ There is no mandate either from the Church Fathers or Scripture that one pray to the saints.³⁶⁵ Article XXI of *Confessio Augustana* and Article XVI of the Wittenberg Articles stated that one should trust only in Christ, who is the only mediator between man and God.³⁶⁶ Melancthon discussed the misuse of the invocations of Saints in which Christ’s honor, as the only mediator between God and man, should be preserved. Melancthon believed that when consensus was reached on doctrine, the abuses of the worship of saints would disappear.³⁶⁷ His position was unchanged in Wittenberg Article XVI. In the *Advice* it is indicated that as long as we honor Christ as our mediator, saints can be imitated and

³⁶² A 10 1536, pp. 233–234.

³⁶³ CAE 1536, XXI, pp. 83b,c,d; ApolL 1531, XXI, pp. 316–326.

³⁶⁴ We do not reject the remembrance of saints but consider that it is beneficial and Christian to keep them in remembrance. [*Der heiligen gedechtnus und feier verwerfen wir nit, sondern achten, das umb dieser ursach willen nutz und cristlich sei ir gedechtnus zu halten.*] WTA 1536, Article 16, p. 77. Concerning the cult of the saints our people teach that the saints are to be remembered so that we may strengthen our faith when we see how they experienced grace and how they were helped by faith. Moreover, it is taught that each person according to his or her calling should take the saints’ good works as an example. CA 1530, XXI, p. 83b. [*Vom Heiligendienst wird von den Unseren also gelehret, dass man der Heiligen gedenken soll, auf dass wir unsern Glauben stärken, so wir sehen, wie ihnen Gnad widerfahren, auch wie ihnen durch Glauben geholfen ist; darzu, dass man Exempel nehme von ihren guten Werken, ein jeder nach seinem Beruf.*] CAL 1530 XXI, p. 83b.

³⁶⁵ As for the invocation of the saints, there is no command and no example of this in Holy Scripture, nor was this taught by the ancient fathers. [*Auch wirt solichs nit gelert von den alten heiligen vettern...nit wider die heilige schriefft, auch nit wider die alte kirche, so die heiligen nit anruffen.*] WTA 1536, XVI, p. 78.

It cannot be demonstrated from Scripture that a person should call upon the saints or seek help from them. [*Durch Schrift mag man aber nicht beweisen, dass man die Heiligen anrufen oder Hilf bei ihnen suchen soll.*] CAL 1530, XXI, p. 83b.

Here the opponents command us first of all to call upon the saints, even though they have neither a promise of God, nor a command, nor an example from Scripture. Nevertheless, they contend that we should place greater confidence in the saints’ mercy than in Christ’s. ApolL 1531, XXI, p. 321. [*Da lehren nu die Widerfacher, wir sollen die Heiligen anrufen, so wir dazu weder Gebot noch Verheissung noch Exempel in der Schrift haben, und machen doch damit dass, man grösser Vertrauen auf die Heiligen setzet, denn auf Christum.*] ApolL 1531, XXI, p. 321.

³⁶⁶ More than that trust in a mediator or reconciler is something which belongs to Christ alone and not to the saints, for Christ’s merit alone avails for our sins, and the heavenly Father has set Him alone before us as the one Mediator and Priest and has promised to hear us for the sake of this Christ. [*Dazu das vertrauen uf ein mitler oder versoner gehort allein Christo und nit den heiligen, dann allein Christi verdienst gelden fur unsere sund, und der himelisch vatter hat uns diesen allein zu einem mitler und priester fargestellet und zugesaget, das er uns umb dieses Cristi willen erhoren wolle.*] WTA 1536, XVI, p. 78.

For there is only one single reconciler and mediator set up between God and humanity, Jesus Christ (1 Tim. 2:[5]). [*Dann es ist ellein ein einiger Versuohner und Mittler gesetzt zwischcen Gott und Menschen, Jesus Christus, 1 Timoth. 2.*] CAL 1530, XXI, pp. 83b, c.

³⁶⁷ Melancthon’s opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, pp. 139–140.

honored. In the past, Christ's role had been obscured because of the abuses in the worship of saints, Melanchthon wrote. In both, Christ's role as a mediator is stressed and it is stated that it was the misuse of this article that had to be corrected.

Article XVII: Of the Images [Bildern]

The main focus of this article was that images were not to be despised, but only their abuse, which meant any worshipping of images. In addition, one should not believe that images have any power, that God is merciful through images or through their use, or that God would function through them.³⁶⁸ Faith should rest in God's Word and sacraments. It is an error to tie God to images without his Word. God hears simultaneously in all places all who really and truly pray to him. The purpose of the images is to instruct the unlearned; one should trust in God by faith in his Word and sacraments.³⁶⁹

The images are useful for the unlearned, as if they would see and learn history from books; the article stated, "We do not reject images in themselves nor abolish them, but we do reprove their misuse."³⁷⁰ In the *Apologia*, one is warned that the custom of praying to the saints will easily lead to the custom of worshipping their images.³⁷¹ The most dangerous part of worshipping images is seeing them as mediators, thus taking away the honor belonging to Christ.³⁷²

Images are useful for learning and education as long as one does not worship them, thinking that God is more gracious than otherwise if he is invoked using images. God wants people to trust in him in faith through his Word and sacraments, not through images. Melanchthon warned of the abuses that will ensue from praying to saints, which might lead to thinking that the images

³⁶⁸ We teach that images should not be worshipped, nor should it be held that they have some kind of power in themselves. [*Denn wir leren, man sol die bilder nit anbetten, man sol auch nit halten, das sie ein crafft haben.*] WTA 1536, XVI, p. 79.

³⁶⁹ For God wants men to trust in God through his Word and sacraments. [*Den got wil, das man in allein durch sein wort und seine sacrament mit glauben fasse, darumb ists ein gotloser irthumb got anbinden an gewisse bilder ane gots wort.*] WTA 1536, XVI, p. 79.

³⁷⁰ [*Doch dieweil soliches gemehl den ungelarten diesen nutz bringet, das sie deren [darin?] gleich als in buchern die historien sehen und lernen, verwerfen wir die bilder an im selb nicht, thun sie auch nit ab, sondern wir straffen den missbrauch.... das ist, das sie uns die historie weisen, wie geschriebene bucher, solichs ist ein mittelding an im selb...*] WTA 1536, XVI, p. 79.

³⁷¹ It seems that when the saints were first mentioned, as in the ancient prayers, this was done in a tolerable way. Soon afterward, invocation followed and then after that enormous abuses far worse than pagan practices. The invocation of saints then led to the veneration of their images. These supposedly contained some sort of power, just as sorcerers imagine that when artisans fashion astrological signs at a certain time, they contain power. Apoll 1531, XXI, pp. 323–324. [*Denn es mag sein, dass erstlich etliche guter Meinung der Heiligen gedacht haben in ihrem Gebet. Bald hernach ist gefolgt das Anrufen der Heiligen. Bald nach dem Anrufen sein entzeln eingeriffen die wunderliche heidnische Greuel und Missbräuche &c, als dass mans dafür gehalten, dass die Bilder ein eigen heimliche Kraft hätten, wie die Zäuberer und Magi dafür halten, dass wenn man etlicher Sternzeichen zu gewisser Zeit in Gold oder ander Metall gräbt oder bildet, die sollten ein sonderliche heimliche Kraft haben und Wirkung.*] Apoll 1531, XXI, pp. 323–324.

³⁷² As I said earlier, when we seek other mediators in addition to Christ and place our trust in them, our entire knowledge of Christ disappears. Apol 1531, XXI, p. 242. [*Erstlich aber ist es darum ganz fährlich, den so man andere Mittler süchet, denn Christum, so setzt man Vertrauen auf dieselbigen und wird also Christum und das Erkenntnis Christi ganz underdrückt, wie wir leider die Erfahrung haben.*] Apoll 1531 XXI, p. 323.

have a certain power in themselves, as in pagan practices. He stressed that one should not replace Christ's honor with other mediators.³⁷³

The position of "Images" and "The Saints" in the Wittenberg Articles is similar to that of the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apologia*. Some of the text has been borrowed word for word.

The saints are honored by remembering them and following their example, but there is no mandate to trust them as mediators. The third honor, according to Wittenberg Article XVII, is praise and thanksgiving for the gifts God has given to the saints. This idea is seen also in Article XX of the *Apologia*.³⁷⁴ According to Melanchthon, praying to the saints is human tradition and adiaphora, as he stated in the *Advice*. Melanchthon compared the saints' prayers to "pious men's prayers for the Universal Church." He regretted the abuses in the worship of the saints, but once a consensus would be reached in doctrinal matters, he believed that the abuses would disappear.³⁷⁵ Even though in Melanchthon's theology these belonged to adiaphora matters, he included the saints because he thought it necessary for the unification efforts to include matters essential to the Roman Church, and to explain their right uses. Melanchthon's position is a change from the Catholic doctrine of reconciliation, which accepted extra-scriptural tradition as equal to Scripture. The Reformation doctrine of reconciliation regarded Scripture alone as the highest authority in doctrine and practice. Since Scripture did not allow a special command for the worship of the saints, it remained adiaphora in the theology of the Reformers. According to McEntegart, the article on "Images" took a moderate view.³⁷⁶ They would retain the article on "Saints" as examples of faith and virtue and how meritorious works of faith and virtue should be praised. However, they should not be invoked and regarded as mediators, since there was no scriptural authority for it.³⁷⁷

The content of the Wittenberg Articles was based on scriptural authority in doctrine and practice. The reform-minded clergy who attended the Wittenberg negotiations in Germany probably took the Wittenberg Articles to England in order to reform the adiaphoristic stance of the English Church. The reform-minded clergy was influential at this time, since Henry had assured the Germans that he wished to consult with them in order to reform doctrine and practice in England. At that time, it appeared that the English Church was not quite ready for such a drastic change in adiaphora matters, as suggested in the disputed articles of the Wittenberg Articles.

Melanchthon used his ability to approach the negotiations from a doctrinal standpoint in order to clarify the relationship between doctrine and practice. In today's discussion on the

³⁷³ ApoIL 1531 XXI, pp. 323–324; WTA 1536, XVI, p. 79.

³⁷⁴ Third, we should thank God that He gave these gifts to the saints, and they should be praised for having used God's gifts so well. [*Zum dritten sol man auch got danken, das er den heiligen diese gaben geben hat, und sollen sie auch gelobet werden, das sie gottes gaben wol gebraucht haben....*] WTA 1536, XVI, p. 78.

The third honor is imitation: first of their faith, then of their other virtues, which people should imitate according to their callings. [*Für das dritte ehren wir die Heiligen, wenn wir ihres Glaubens, ihrer Liebe, ihrer Geduld Exempel nachfolgen, ein jeder nach seinem Beruf.*] ApoIL 1531 Article XXI, p. 318.

³⁷⁵ Melanchthon's opinion for Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, pp. 139–140.

³⁷⁶ McEntegart 2002, p. 55.

³⁷⁷ Ibid.

doctrine of justification, it has been recommended that it be brought into discussion within the doctrines of ecclesiology, salvation, and the church as a fellowship of those justified by faith.

This researcher was able to discern Melanchthon's influence on the thoughts of the English on adiaphora matters in two manners: by the outside historical events discussed in Part I, in which the documents were produced; and through Melanchthon's thoughts expressed in the Wittenberg Articles he composed as a result of the negotiations, discussed in Part II.

Conclusion

This chapter demonstrated the difference between the *Advice* and the Wittenberg Articles. The Wittenberg Articles, resembling the *Advice* on adiaphora matters, needed to be interpreted in a dialogue and concessions had to be made among all parties involved. At the time of the Wittenberg negotiations, the matters facing the German and English negotiators were different than they were when Melanchthon wrote the *Advice* to Francis' associates. Melanchthon gave more concessions in the *Advice* than in the Wittenberg Articles, because the elector, leading the negotiations, wanted to enforce the doctrine of the *Confessio Augustana*, which influenced the theological decisions. The English and Germans aimed for a unified front against the pope's council and mutual agreement on the church policy on adiaphora. In addition, the English hoped to learn from the Germans how to reform their churches. The Germans hoped that Henry would subscribe to the *Confessio Augustana*, but he made it quite clear that he expected concessions before he would even subscribe to the Wittenberg Articles.

The doctrine of justification follows the doctrine of the *Loci Communes*. The Article does not explicitly discuss the "imputation" as does *Loci Communes*, but it is implicitly clear from the context. Faith is the necessary component for justification and reconciliation, which is freely given because of Christ. Melanchthon's Christological understanding of justification is present without the forensic aspect as in the *Loci Communes*. Other aspects represent the doctrine of justification, as did the *Loci Communes*, as the new life produced by the Holy Spirit, the renewal and regeneration. The Article combines justification and sanctification as one process and connects it to penance with a new content. Good works also are said to be necessary, not as a condition, but as a consequence of justification, as stated in the third use of the law. The Wittenberg Articles agreed with the *Advice* except that "free will" was not mentioned.

The civil government paralleled the ideas of *Loci Communes*, but added that civil government may punish impious preachers and heretics. Melanchthon wished to retain the old structure as much as possible; for instance, the Mass was defined as Eucharist, feast of Thanksgiving. The abuses of the Mass were clearly stated as supporting the idea of work-righteousness. The *Advice* stressed the misuse of private Masses, but said that the disputes might be lessened when abuses from private Masses were abolished. Melanchthon did not condemn them outright, as he did in the Wittenberg Articles. As seen in the *Advice*, Melanchthon's position had changed on communion in both kinds. He had hoped that the old customs and rites could be restored and that the pope would take the initiative and remove the prohibition on the practice and let it be free, so that one side would not condemn the other. Even this concession was not acceptable to the elector. In the Wittenberg Articles, communion of both kinds is defended in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper as an old church custom. In the Wittenberg

Articles it is indicated that that communion is Christ's ordinance and no leeway is possible in its interpretation. In the articles on celibacy, Melanchthon had appealed to the pope to make changes. In the Wittenberg Articles, celibacy and virginity were paralleled; otherwise the discussion concurs with the *Confessio Augustana*. The *Advice* and the Wittenberg Articles agreed that the monastic system should be used for educational purposes, but in the *Advice* Melanchthon hoped that the pope would influence the changes. In "The Saints," the concession was made that one could follow their examples. In the *Advice*, Melanchthon believed that when doctrinal agreement was reached, the role of Christ would attain its proper prominence. All the disputed articles were said to be not necessary to salvation, except communion in both kinds became an essential part of the doctrine of sacrament.

Melanchthon refers to right understanding of the doctrine of justification and the definition of the bishop's power in the church. It was his hope that his writing about the "indifferent matters" would help other nations also to approve similar doctrinal positions. According to Melanchthon, right understanding of the nature of the church—preaching the new doctrine and administering the sacraments—resulted in the right understanding of the doctrine of justification by faith, and was the prerequisite to understanding the adiaphora matters. Melanchthon firmly supported the old church structure and was still hopeful that under the leadership of the pope, it could be maintained by human right rather than divine right. One may see how Melanchthon attempted to demonstrate how new concepts with new meaning would fit into the old church structure.

In the following chapter we will discuss how accurate the English translation of the *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia* were, and how the translations could have influenced Henry and the English bishops on adiaphora matters.

Chapter 6:

The English Reaction to the Wittenberg Negotiations

(1536)

This chapter is divided into three parts. The first part begins with a presentation of the conflicting articles, the historical background of the translation of the *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia* into English, and general themes of the Latin and English translation of the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apologia*. The second part presents the comparisons of the English translation of the articles of the Latin *Confessio Augustana*, and the third part presents the English translation of the *Apologia* of the *Confessio Augustana* with a presentation of the conflicting articles.

Introduction

Henry had been invited to be the Defender of the League by the Germans and to acknowledge the articles of the *Confessio Augustana*. Both the German and English delegates had accepted the Wittenberg Articles, except for the controversial articles, which remained subject to open dialogue between the German and English emissaries. During the Reformation, many continental books were sent to England to support English evangelicals, but often their contents were changed for the purposes of propaganda. Cromwell requested that the Latin *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia* be simultaneously translated into English. In the previous chapter, the Wittenberg Articles, which came about as a result of the negotiations at Wittenberg, were compared with the *Confessio Augustana*. In this chapter, the results of the philological and textual comparison of the two texts are presented in order to ascertain how closely the ideas on adiaphora in the English translation represent Melancthon's views expressed in the Latin *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia*, and on which points they differ. It was important to compare the translations with the original to affirm that it was in fact a translation from the original text and not simply an interpretation. Another significance of looking at differences in these texts is to elucidate how King Henry and the clergy were influenced by Melancthon's work at that time. The *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia* influenced the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations and the formulation of the Ten Articles of July 1536.

The articles chosen for comparison include the controversial ones on which the German and English theologians did not agree at Wittenberg: the Mass, communion in both kinds, monastic vows, the marriage of priests, and the power of bishops.

***Part I: The Conflicting Articles of the English and Latin
Confessio Augustana and Apologia***

At the time of the translation of *Confessio Augustana*, many bishops held a princely position within the empire and in their respective dioceses, which included temporal territories. At the time of the composition of the *Confessio Augustana* in Germany, the Reformers faced the ecclesiastical and legal situation in regard to worship and church law. Many evangelical territories, including Saxony and Hesse, had abolished the existing church structure. Gradually, temporal authorities assumed functions that used to be under the former bishops' jurisdiction.¹

In electoral Saxony, it may have seemed that the elector had overstepped his legal boundaries when, as a temporal authority, he allowed what the Reformers saw as ecclesiastical abuses to be discontinued without any punishment. Maurer asserts that the elector did not take anything away from the bishops, but simply used canon law, "which provided for this in the event of its own abuse."²

The controversial articles on which the Germans and the English delegates were not able to agree during the Anglo-Schmalkaldic negotiations were closely connected to their different understanding of the power of the church. Instead of the authority of the Roman pope by divine law, for the Germans, the authority rested on Scripture alone. The English reform-minded clergy would agree with the Germans, but both the reform-minded clergy and conservative clergy regarded the king as the authority in matters of faith and practice. This different concept affected all the other controversial articles. The Germans were still officially under the jurisdiction of the Holy Roman Empire in the reformed principality of Saxony. The Saxon Reformers had declared that they accepted the pope by human law,³ and consequently had said that their purpose was only to reform certain Roman abuses that could not be followed with good conscience:⁴ the prohibition on celibacy of the clergy, monastic vows, private Masses, and the prohibition on communion in both kinds.⁵ They regarded all these as abuses on the part of the Roman Bishop (i.e., the pope), whose power was manifested by things they regarded as indifferent human traditions, not necessary to salvation.⁶ Since they believed that salvation was received through justification by faith, all other matters belonged to church policy under human law, and they could not bind consciences. Maurer agrees that justification by faith is the basis for all statements about worship and church law.⁷

¹ Maurer 1986, Introduction, p. 15.

² Maurer 1986, pp. 103–104.

³ Maurer 1986, Introduction, pp. 28–29.

⁴ The elector had justified his participation in the ecclesiastical innovations before the emperor on account of his conscience and would not force people to fulfill human ordinances that one could not observe without sin. Maurer 1986, p. 104.

⁵ Wilhelm Maurer refers to the "disputed articles" as having a doctrinal character of their own based on Article XXVIII which lays down principles which became a theological basis for them: Church order is obligatory because it is based on Scripture, and should never claim to be necessary to salvation. Maurer, 1986, Introduction, pp. 18, 20.

⁶ See Maurer 1986, pp. 174, 176–178, 206 ("middle works" or "intermediate things"). Maurer 1986, pp. 176, 206.

⁷ Maurer 1986, Introduction, p. 18.

However, this evangelical preaching went on side by side with official favoring of celibacy. The celibacy question was closely related to the celebration of the Eucharist—the central act of the Mass itself. To understand the priesthood, it is necessary to understand the doctrine of the Eucharist. Evangelical preachers displayed the style of priesthood exhibited by the Old Testament example of a priest offering sacrifice as intercessor, and interpreted the celebration of the Mass as a sacrifice.⁸ The demand to change the culture of the priesthood was strong, as the evangelicals were about to destroy idolatry by demanding a change from the Old Testament example of a priest to a Protestant model of a minister, which was considered one of the successes of the Reformation.⁹ At the same time, the evangelical preachers compared celibacy with idolatry and condemned the vows and the concept of righteousness of works.¹⁰

The present author concurs with Eppley, who argues that contemporaries regarded Old Testament images of a king, such as David and Solomon, as appropriate for Henry as head of the church, who, like Josiah, cleansed the idolatrous shrines in his kingdom and enforced the Mosaic Law. Furthermore, the Emperor Constantine had a leading role in religious affairs; therefore the monarchic papal power over the church should be eliminated.¹¹

The translation of the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apologia* has to be interpreted in the historical context in which it was made—the Wittenberg negotiations between the German and the English theologians. Probably the primary reason for the translation was to have it during the negotiations, and the secondary reason was to have it available during the formation of the doctrine of the English Church. The time of the translation corresponds to the peak of evangelical influence and there was no official confession of the English Church. There was a great hope by the German Reformers that Henry VIII would subscribe to their Confession during the negotiations.

Historical Background of the Translation of the *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia*

The English *Confessio Augustana*, translated by Richard Taverner, came about as a result of the negotiations in Germany. Taverner, the English humanist, dedicated the preface of his English translations of the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apologia* to Thomas Cromwell. He praised Cromwell for his mastery of Christian religion and for allowing others to achieve similar mastery. Taverner wrote that Thomas Cromwell had asked him to translate the *Confessio Augustana* into English, because the most learned men composed it. Taverner expressed the hope that it would be acceptable to the people for whom it was intended, probably the reform-minded clergy. Taverner took responsibility for any errors, as “in such a long work it is possible to make them.”¹² In closing, he offered his services to Cromwell. The *Confessio Augustana* in English of 1536 does not have an exact date. Cromwell must have seen to it that the translation was available for Henry during the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations or at least soon after they

⁸ Parish 2000, p. 24.

⁹ Ibid., p. 23.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 154.

¹¹ Eppley 2007, pp. 16–17; Parish 2000, p. 234.

¹² CAE 1536, Fol. 2R, 3L. Rex 2006, pp. 149–150.

ended. Pragman thinks that the English translation was available by the time the English and the Germans negotiated at Wittenberg, January through March 1536.¹³ Clebsch notes that Richard Taverner was a member of the “Little German” group of English humanists who studied Luther’s writings, but in his translations, he emphasized the moralistic theme of William Tyndale.¹⁴ John K. Yost sees Taverner as an Erasmian popularizer, who protestantized Erasmian humanism in the translations of the 1530s. A. G. Dickens sees Taverner as belonging to Cromwell’s circle, a full-blooded Protestant who translated Melancthon and other Protestant authors, but adapted their writings to the characteristics of the English Reformation. The Cromwellian writers’ most popular subject was adiaphora.¹⁵

McEntegart surmises that Cromwell was inclined toward Lutheranism since he let Taverner translate the *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia* into English.¹⁶ Richard Rex supports the view that, from the outset, Cromwell considered Lutheranism the best alternative to the papacy, since it supported the doctrine of Scripture alone and taught obedience to human authorities. This in turn was an asset to royal supremacy superior to the Catholic tradition. He supported evangelical preachers in the Church of England and let Lutheran literature be translated into English by Richard Morison and Richard Taverner.¹⁷ Cromwell would have supported whichever religious affinities served his political goals as vice-regent and whatever he thought would serve the king’s interests. But it was the king who ultimately made the final decisions on English foreign policy. At that time, the king wanted to consult with the German Lutheran princes about their Reformation doctrine.

Basil Hall has noted that Henry himself may not have been aware of how much Lutheran influence infiltrated into England both in doctrinal and liturgical works, books of private devotion (primers), and translations of works by Luther on prayers on the passion.¹⁸

McEntegart argues that Henry would have accepted all of the articles in the *Confessio Augustana* and that the disagreements were only on the conflicting articles of the *Apologia* of the *Confessio Augustana*, based on the fact that Melancthon wrote the *Apologia* in response to the use of sacraments, church orders, religious ceremonies, civil affairs, Christ’s return, free will, cause of sin, good works and invocation of saints.¹⁹ Since the conflicting articles appeared also in the *Confessio Augustana*, they will be discussed in this study.

¹³ James H. Pragman: “The Augsburg Confession and the English Reformation: Richard Taverner’s Contribution.” In *Sixteenth Century Journal*. XI. No. 3. p. 83 (hereafter, Pragman 1980).

¹⁴ Clebsch 1964, pp. 253, 256. Clebsch mentions the translation of *Confessio Augustana* by Taverner, but dates its translation inaccurately to 1530. Clebsch 1964, p. 256.

¹⁵ See Pragman 1980, pp. 78–79, 83. Kusakawa points out that Melancthon’s reputation was on the rise during the translation of the *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia* and when Cromwell prescribed in the Royal Injunctions Melancthon’s works in the art curriculum at Cambridge. Kusakawa 2002, pp. 235–237. See Pragman 1980, pp. 78–79, 83. John K. Yost: “German Protestant Humanism and the Early English Reformation: Richard Taverner and Official Translations.” In *Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance*, XXXII, 1970, pp. 613–625; A. G. Dickens 1964, *Thomas Cromwell and the English Reformation*, pp. 85–86.

¹⁶ McEntegart 2002, p. 136; MacCulloch 2003, p. 199;

¹⁷ See Rex ed. 1999, pp. 50–53, 70.

¹⁸ See Basil Hall: *The Early Rise and Gradual Decline of Lutheranism in England (1520–1600). Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent, ca. 1500–1750*. 1979, pp. 114–116 (hereafter, Hall 1979). Melancthon’s rhetorical books had arrived in England as early as the 1520s. See Rex ed. 1999, pp. 50–53, 70.

¹⁹ McEntegart 2002, p. 12.

Rex offers still another viewpoint on Cromwell's influences as including not only evangelical but also conservative scholars. Cromwell did not commission any theological books of a conservative nature. For instance, Thomas Swynnerton's "Tropes and Figures of Scripture," which was influenced by Melanchthon, was dedicated to Cromwell. Swynnerton's authorities besides Melanchthon were Robert Barnes and William Tyndale. His book, published in 1536–1537, is a treatise on sacred rhetoric or an evangelical handbook, like a catechism—a complete statement of evangelical doctrine as it stood in England after the break with Rome.²⁰ This author concurs that, based on his choice of translators, Cromwell supported both the moderate and more radical reform-minded clergy.

General Themes of the Latin and English *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia*

Certain words and phrases are mentioned repeatedly throughout the English texts of the articles. For example, the *Confessio Augustana* in English replaces "Gelasius Papa" with "Bishop of Rome." The English Reformation Church acknowledged only a "Bishop of Rome," even when referring to past popes.²¹ The authority question in England between the king and the pope means that the translator had to avoid using the word pope and replaced it with "Bishop of Rome." In this way, the translator and the reform-minded party agreed with the German position and acknowledged that the pope's power was based on human right. Communion in both kinds in the Lord's Supper was interpreted as old church custom by the Reformers, and the Roman use of communion "in one kind" as a new intervention without scriptural authority. The article on both kinds claims that the "new" form (prohibitor) goes back to the Fourth Lateran Council, according to Nicholas of Cusa.²²

Maurer argues that the doctrine of justification by faith emphasizes the spiritual character of the church so strongly that no ecclesiastical law could possibly be derived directly from it. Furthermore, he argues that every church order that claims to be necessary to salvation must be abolished.²³

The relationship between state and ecclesiastical laws is discussed in each of the articles. The question of who had authority became crucial when the German Reformers and the English king rejected the pope's divine power. The pope's law, that is, canon law, became statute law. According to Melanchthon, the true authority in doctrine came from divine law expressed in Scripture, not from the pope. The divine law expressed in Scripture was the authority in doctrine and practice for the Reformers. In England, there was no distinction between ecclesiastical power and secular power, since Henry held both, and had authority over the doctrine of the church. In the article on the Power of the Church, the English translation is cautious and stresses the king's authority over the church.

²⁰ Rex ed. 1999, pp. 50–53, 70.

²¹ CAL 1530, XXII, p. 85; CAE 1536, Fol. 15L.

²² CAL 1530, XXII, p. 86; Grane 1987, p. 216. See Morimichi Watanabe: *Nicholas of Cusa and the Reform of the Roman Curia*. In *Humanity and Divinity in Renaissance and Reformation*. Eds. John W. O'Malley; Thomas M. Izbicki; Gerald Christianson. 1993, pp. 185–203.

²³ Maurer 1986, p. 234.

Maurer notes that Melanchthon claimed that the *Confessio Augustana* represents Catholicity of doctrine. What Melanchthon refers to as “abuses,” that is—church customs practiced illegally and thus contradicting their intended use—Maurer calls the “disputed articles.”²⁴ Ecclesiastical observances and traditions are not necessary for salvation and unable to make satisfactions for sins. The Reformers in Germany kept the existing rites as long as they did not conflict with the new doctrine, contributed to good order in the church, and did not burden consciences. Only those traditions in conflict with the new doctrine were rejected.

In the original Latin *Confessio Augustana*, “Communion in Both Kinds,”²⁵ “Of the Mass,”²⁶ and “Of the Marriage of Priests”²⁷ belonged to the liturgical section of the “disputed articles.” Their doctrinal prerequisite would be articles I to III of the *Confessio Augustana* related to articles of God,²⁸ Original Sin²⁹ and the Son of God.³⁰ In the territories in Germany that accepted the Reformation, communion in both kinds was regulated by church order (coordinated through the opinions of ministers) based on confessing the right doctrine. However, the practice around administering the sacrament was left to the minister’s discretion and adapted to the practice of individual conscience and free choice.³¹ Furthermore, Maurer argues that, with the omission of the procession during Mass, some of the old customs were eliminated in the sacrament.³² The preaching and administering of the sacraments were bound to external conditions, but those human traditions, that is, liturgy, or church ordinance, would no longer bind consciences. Also essential are the questions concerning authority; that is, on whose authority were church doctrine and ceremonies decided—Scriptural authority vs. church councils’ authority, or the bishop’s authority?

Maurer argues that the Reformers requested that the emperor restore the original marriage laws. Furthermore, he asserts that the prohibition of marriage was the chief offense in Roman legislation for the Reformers, since the Germans particularly felt the domination over them by the curia through this.³³ The transformation of the Mass from sacerdotal office of a priest to a ministry of the Word was a natural change, which gradually replaced priestly celibacy with married clergy.

What were the Reformers’ responses to the monks who left monasteries? The best way to respond to this question was to criticize the monastic establishment, Christian perfection, the support of celibacy, and the sale of Masses for others.³⁴

As will be seen in the article of the power of the church, the English and the Latin *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia* agree on the essential point that the power of the church belongs to the bishops’ ministry. He has the power to define doctrine—justification by faith—and, in human

²⁴ Ibid., p. 215.

²⁵ CAL 1530, XXII, pp. 85–86; CAE 1536, Fol. 13.

²⁶ CAL 1530, XXIV, pp. 91–95; CAE 1536, Fols. 15–17.

²⁷ CAL 1530, XXIII, pp. 86–91; CAE 1536, Fols. 13–15.

²⁸ *De Deo*. CAL 1530, I, pp. 50–51; Grane 1987, pp. 31–32.

²⁹ *De peccato originis*. CAL 1530, II, p. 53; Grane 1987, p. 40.

³⁰ *De filio Dei*. CAL 1530, III, p. 54; Grane 1987, p. 50.

³¹ CAL 1530, XXII, pp. 85–86. Maurer 1986, pp. 181–182.

³² CAL 1530, XXII, p. 86; Maurer 1986, p. 183.

³³ Maurer 1986, pp. 170, 185–186.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 184.

traditions, manage the adiaphora matters that belong to church polity. The church does not have authority over conscience to enforce human traditions. This is made clear in the article on the power of the church.

Maurer finds that the bishops' princely privileges were restricted and their legal jurisdiction and religious rights were sharply criticized. Yet they were assured of legal power if they agreed to cooperate with the new church orders, allow free preaching, and did not forcibly promote ecclesiastical abuses. Since, obviously, the bishops failed to do this, the secular magistracy took up the reforms of the churches in its territories. Maurer contends that this article was formed purely from a practical point of view without reference either to canon or imperial law, as freedom of evangelical doctrine was announced in the Saxon territories for a reordering of worship practice whose existence was guaranteed by a territorial church, free from Rome.³⁵ Maurer also notes that the article's emphasis is on spiritual matters, even though temporal and spiritual are closely interwoven, since both *politia* and *oeconomia* belong to *ecclesia*.³⁶ Estes states that, had the bishops taken up the reforms, there would not have been need for the princes to take action. Even if the bishops did not follow the new doctrine, one could concede to them by human jurisdiction.³⁷

Article XXVIII sets forth the distinction between the bishop's (and the pope's) spiritual (power of keys) and temporal powers.³⁸ This distinction underlies all the other "disputed articles" and offers a systematic approach to all individual questions.³⁹ Article XXVIII, On the Power of the Church, makes clear that the bishop's duty is to make decisions on human traditions: on the celebration of the Mass, administering communion in both kinds in the Lord's Supper, and on the question of the marriage of the priests and monastic vows. Again, the pleonasm in the English version makes it harder to interpret doctrinal differences, although many of the English pleonasms seem to be near synonyms.

The changes demanded by the Reformers were challenging for the pope to accept. It is clear that they demanded the pope give free reign to the new doctrine. The condition laid out to the old church bishops was to stop requiring vows of celibacy and to rescind the evangelical doctrine on ordination. As most of the Catholic bishops were unable to comply, it meant that spiritual matters were taken out of their hands, but it was not the elector who had taken them from the bishops; he was willing to reinstate their duties if they promised not to burden conscience.⁴⁰

The English Apologia states mostly the essential parallels with the Latin text regarding the bishop's authority in the church. However, there is a section that is not paralleled in the Latin and is mainly explanatory, which speaks of the power of the church with the intent to avoid offending the authority of the king.

For the purpose of detecting possible differences in the text, the various presentations of the doctrine of justification by faith will be compared. In the Latin text, it is emphasized that justification is related to faith, not ceremonies. The English text interchangeably uses

³⁵ Maurer 1986, Introduction, pp. 38, 44; Maurer 1986, pp. 59, 87, 89; Estes 2005, pp. 128–133.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Estes 2005, p. 132.

³⁸ Maurer 1986, Introduction, pp. 27, 29.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 30.

⁴⁰ Maurer 1986, Introduction, pp. 38, 44; Maurer 1986, pp. 59, 87, 89; Estes 2005, pp. 128–133.

“righteousness” and “justification,” sometimes interpreting the Latin “justification.” Another use of the doctrine of justification is when the Latin text has *mereantur gratiam et iustificationem*, which the English text translates as “deserue remission of synnes and iustification,” with “remission of sins” instead of “grace” for the Latin *gratiam*. This change of words does not alter the meaning but rather makes more specific the concept expressed by the Latin. An additional context for justification is seen in the Article XXVII, On Monastic Vows. The English text adds a phrase: “and that they make amendes for synnes,”⁴¹ which completes the active role of a recipient (the monks) in the process of justification. Alternatively, the Latin *iustificationem et gratiam* becomes in English “the remission of sins and justification” (reverse word order); that is, it translates “grace” as “forgiveness of sins.”⁴² Or, it translates with a set phrase, indifferent to the ordering of the two conjuncts. In another example of the doctrine of justification by faith, there is a slightly different theological emphasis between the texts. The English emphasizes that nothing humans do can deserve justification (a negative emphasis), whereas the Latin emphasizes the importance of faith (a more positive emphasis). One may interpret that the Latin text speaks more of God’s grace in the justification process rather than of human cooperation, as does the English. One may perceive, in the English version, the attempt to interpret and adapt the doctrine of justification to the English situation.

Another recurrent theme is the meaning of the “Church.” The English text capitalizes “Church” for the Latin *ecclesia*, referring to the Western Catholic Church or the English Church. The translator also sometimes uses the word “congregation” pleonastically together with “Church.” It may be covering two meanings of the polysemous Latin word and may be interpreted as expository. The English Church claimed its own independent existence, but also belonging to larger community of Western Christianity. Several other pleonastic and other literary expressions are evident throughout the articles; some of them will be demonstrated in the text. This feature makes it problematic to gauge the accuracy of the English translation. For the most part, it has become clear that the English text closely follows the Latin and that most divergences can be explained on an individual basis.

It is not always clear what theological opinion the translator supports in each case since he supplies additional information that does not appear in the Latin text, especially in the article on the Power of the Church in the *Apologia*. This author uses the word “translator,” as it is not clear whether Taverner wrote or whether he had an associate.

The comparison of the English translation of the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apologia* was necessary to find out whether the translation corresponded to the Latin text and how the translation influenced the English reform-minded clergy in the doctrine of justification by faith and related adiaphora matters that the articles discussed.

While defining the doctrine of justification that is explained in a different cultural and theological tradition, finding a vocabulary that gives justice to the original text and its translation requires more thorough knowledge of the theology of both parties. For example, the Joint Declaration of 1999 between Lutherans and Roman Catholics on justification could say the

⁴¹ CAE 1536, Fols. 26R, 27L.

⁴² CAL 1530, XXVII, pp. 115–116; CAE 1536, Fol. 26R.

breakthrough occurred when the doctrine of justification was placed in the context of the doctrine of the Trinity. Justification must be included in such a theological method that includes such doctrines as the knowledge of God and Christological components of the incarnation and resurrection. If consensus could be achieved on these issues, practical unity becomes not only symbolic but also a real possibility.⁴³ In the presentation of the conflicting articles below, an understanding of the doctrine reflected in the phrases would prove helpful in understanding the exact meaning.

The *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apologia* presented the most comprehensive doctrine and practice of adiaphora matters. Both conservative and evangelical clergy were aware of the translation. One had to compare the ideas of both texts, not just the literal translations, and cannot exclude the influence of the translator's ideas. In several places the English text was pleonastic; a concept or word had different expressions in English but had the same meaning as the Latin. As will be seen below, there are sections that seem like interpretations as well as independent ideas without any comparison to the actual text.

This researcher was able to discern Melancthon's influence on the thoughts of the English on adiaphora matters by the outside historical events during Anglos-Lutheran negotiations, and through Melancthon's thoughts expressed in the English translation of the *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia* as a reaction to the negotiations, discussed in Chapter Six, Parts I, II and III.

⁴³ Paul D. Molnar: *The Theology of Justification in Dogmatic Context*. In *Justification: What's at Stake in the Current Debates*. 2004, pp. 223, 247–248 (hereafter, Molnar 2004).

Part II: Melancthon's Confessio Augustana into English (1536)

Article XXII: Of Communion in Both Kinds [De utraque specie]

The liturgical articles of Both Kinds, the Marriage of Priests, and the Mass went through a drastic change for the customary use of the Mass in which Christ was offered as sacrifice, the priest presenting the image of the Old Testament priest offering the sacrifice and withholding the communion from laity. The change did not only involve the ceremonies that the congregation was visually able to follow, but it involved a complete reversal of thinking in the doctrines of reconciliation and justification by faith. The doctrines of God, Christology, and original sin applied to the understanding of the evangelical Mass. The ceremonies belonged to church order and adiaphora even though many old ceremonies were left.

Article XXII is very explicit, in which Melancthon argues the position of delivering the sacrament in two kinds. The article refers to Scripture, the authority of old canons, and the example of church usage.⁴⁴ The article makes use of canon law and history, as he claims that the distribution in both kinds had continued in the church until the thirteenth century. For the Catholic Church, distributing the sacrament in one form became a doctrine at the Council of Constance, when John Hus was condemned.⁴⁵ The Reformers could argue that it was a “new” custom made by the pope, and was not decided according to the proper authority; that is, Scripture. The article claims not even canon law supported the practice of offering the sacrament in one kind. The disagreement is based on proper authority, Scripture alone.

An interesting distinction can be seen where the Latin article states that the priests administer the Eucharist and divide the blood of Christ to the people, whereas the English version speaks (pleonastically) of serving and ministering the body and dividing the blood. “Eucharist” and “body” are not exactly parallel.⁴⁶ It seems that the English article maintains the old structure of Mass with new content, naming it the Eucharist—the thanksgiving meal—in which both elements are distributed according the reform-minded clergy’s ideas as to how they could interpret the Mass ceremony *lex orandi—lex credendi*, according to their belief that Christ is truly present in the celebration of the Eucharist. The English doctrinal basis is articles X and XIII of the *Confessio Augustana*.⁴⁷ The doctrine clearly states that the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper is an outward act, but joins Christ’s presence in the act of eating and drinking. It is communion, stated more clearly in the English article—worship of the congregation, naming it a thanksgiving meal for the congregation. The English text also omits reference to Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa.⁴⁸ He was an authority from the tradition of the Catholic Church led by the pope. Possibly neither his name nor that of any other cardinal was welcomed by the English Church after the break with the pope, since even most conservative clergy would not support the pope because of fear of

⁴⁴ CAL 1530, XXII, p. 85; CAE 1536, Fol. 15L.

⁴⁵ Grane 1987, p. 216.

⁴⁶ CAL 1530, XXII, p. 85; CAE 1536, Fols. 15L, 15R.

⁴⁷ CAL 1530, X, p. 64; XIII, p. 68; Grane 1987, pp. 113, 145–146.

⁴⁸ CAL 1530, XXII, p. 85; CAE 1536, Fol. 15L.

punishment. The English Reformation Church acknowledged only a “Bishop of Rome,” when referring to past and present popes.⁴⁹ Thus the English *Confessio Augustana*⁵⁰ replaces *Gelasius Papa* with the phrase “Bishop of Rome.”⁵¹

Article XXIII: Of the Marriage of Priests

Article XXIII, on the marriage of priests, is closely related to how the Reformers understood the priest’s new position as minister of the new doctrine and the worship service, which was divided into two parts: the ministry of the word and the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper and communion in both kinds. Defending the marriage of priests, article XXIII based the arguments on natural law and God’s creative order while defending the marriage of priests. No man can alter God’s creation, and not all men can live celibate. Forced celibacy is against divine and human laws and even against the canons of the popes and the councils. The article contended that many priests in the early church were married men. The article offered marriage as a remedy to man’s weakness and complained of the many scandals that celibacy had caused. It ended by saying that no human law could nullify the commandment of God.⁵² In speaking of celibacy, the Latin and English texts are closely parallel; however, there are some emphatic differences. The English translation avoids using the word “celibacy” for other forms of speech.⁵³ In the passage below, for example, the English quotation is exactly equivalent to the original Latin text, but prefers to use “sole and unmarried” for *caelibatum* (“celibate”).

Secundo, Christus inquit: Non omnes capiunt verbum hoc; ubi docet non omnes homines ad caelibatum idoneos esse. (CAL 1530, XXIII, p. 87.)

Secondarely Christe sayeth. Non omnes capiunt verbum hoc. That is to say. Not al do take this worde where he teacheth that nat all men be apte to lyue sole and unmaried. (CAE 1536, Fol. 16L.)

The text contains examples of how the English *Confessio Augustana* frequently uses pleonastic expressions that do not change the meaning of the text, but make the English more concrete. For example, *impurus caelibatus* is rendered in English as a pleonastic phrase “the unclene lyuinge without wyues.” The English phrase “sclaunders and occasions of euyl” is pleonastic for Latin *scandal*; the Latin phrase *adulteria et alia scelera* is in English “so many adulteries & other crimes.” The English phrase “unclene lyuinge without wyues” (having relationships without being married) expresses two ideas: that celibacy is unclean living and that living without wives is unclean. The Latin only states that celibacy is unclean. The English is more emphatic and more sarcastic, because the phrase “living without wives is unclean,” implied that the priests had marriage relationships, but the article implies that those were not legitimate, which brings consequences as seen below:

⁴⁹ CAE 1536, Fol. 15 L.

⁵⁰ In this study the translation of the Latin *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia* will be called the English *Confessio Augustana* for short.

⁵¹ CAL 1530, XXII, p. 85.

⁵² CAL 1530, XXIV, pp. 86–91; Grane 1987, pp. 217–219; Maurer 1986, pp. 185–186.

⁵³ CAL 1530, XXIII, p. 87; CAE 1536, Fol. 16 L.

Cum autem exstet mandatum Dei, cum mos ecclesie notus sit, cum impurus cælibatus plurima pariat scandala, adulteria et alia scelera digna animadversione boni magistratus: tamen mirum est nulla in re maiorem exerceri sævitiam quam adversus coniugium sacerdotum. Deus præcepit honore afficere coniugium; leges in omnibus rebus publicis bene constitutis. (CAL 1530, XXIII, p. 90.)

But when the commaundemente of god is open/ when the custome of the Churche is knowen/ when the unclene lyuinge without wyues bringeth forth so many sclauders/ & occasions of euyl/ so many adulteries & other crimes worthy to be loked upo/ and ponyshed of a good gouernour./yet it is a meruculous thing that in nothing more crueltie is excercised then against the mariage of prestes God comaudeth to honour marriage/ lawes in al come wealthes wel ordered. (CAE 1536, Fol. 16R, 17L.)

The English use of “commonwealth” included the reform both of the church and the state under the leadership of Henry VIII. There is a clear understanding in the Reformers’ minds of the commonweal and its benefits in reforming the church body and politics. In addition, reflecting the new statute laws in England, the same passage speaks of the benefit of reforming the Church body politic and translates the Latin *rei publicæ*⁵⁴ (literally: “public matter”) but named the state similarly as the Roman *republica* was called as the “commonwealth.”⁵⁵ The Latin *digna animadversione boni magistratus* is translated into English as “worthy to be loked upo and ponyshed of a good governor.” The English phrase is more explicit than the Latin. The English expression “the good governor” refers to the king who was head of church and state and has authority to punish wrong practices such as celibacy and “living without wives” producing scandals, as stated above. The reform-minded clergy supported the marriage of priests.

In the same paragraph above, the English renders “Church” as the Western Catholic Church (not the Roman Church led by the pope [the Bishop of Rome]). A rhetorical point is made suggesting that there are far more important concerns for the church than priestly marriage, which is presumably not uncontroversial. The Reformers based their argument on the customs of the early church when speaking of the marriage of priests. In the next sentence, instead of “in the early church” for the Latin *in ecclesia veteri*, the English text paraphrases it as “in the begynnyng of the Church.”⁵⁶ This Latin phrase itself confirms that the article refers to the customs of the early church where priests in which allowed to marry.

Constat etiam in ecclesia veteri sacerdotes fuisse maritos. (CAL 1530, XXIII, p. 87.)

It is evidently knowen also that in the begynnyng of the Church prestes were maried men. (CAE 1536, Fol. 16L.)

The concept of law had to be understood differently in the church. The canon laws were replaced by ecclesiastical or statute laws that were human laws. Scripture was claimed to be divine law by the Reformers, replacing the pope’s claim for divine authority. One could find various words translated simultaneously as human and divine law, and had to understand the meaning from the textual context. The Latin word *lex* refers to human laws, but the Latin word *iura* to either human or divine law. The Latin *lex humana* and *iura humana* are in English “man’s law” and “law of man” respectively,⁵⁷ whereas the Latin *mandatum Dei* is rendered as

⁵⁴ Literal translation is “State.”

⁵⁵ CAL 1530, XXIII, p. 90; CAE 1536, Fol. 16R, 17L.

⁵⁶ CAL 1530, XXIII, p. 87; CAE 1536, Fol. 16 L.

⁵⁷ CAL 1530, XXIII, p. 88; CAE 1536, Fol. 16 R.

“commandment of God,”⁵⁸ which refers to the authority of Scripture as opposed to either the pope’s laws or the statute laws of Parliament. Latin *iura divina* is translated “law of God.”⁵⁹ The former use refers to scriptural authority, as the latter refers to divine law, including natural law. It seems that the English translation is cautious when referring to divine law, implying it in the phrase “law of God.” The English text refers to “God’s commandment” in place of Latin *mandatum Dei*, both can be interpreted as referring to Scripture’s authority in deciding matters of adiaphora. According to this article, the vow of celibacy is based on human law and is thus adiaphora.⁶⁰

Sicut autem nulla lex humana potest mandatum Dei tollere, ita nec votum potest tollere mandatum Dei. (CAL 1530, XXIII, pp. 90–91.)

But nowe as no mans lawe can take away the commaundement of god: so no vowe can take away the commaundement of god. (CAE 1536, Fol. 17L.)

Article XXIV argues that the law was given to men to help them distinguish right from wrong. God’s law is revealed in Scripture and is authoritative in matters of faith and practice; that is, in adiaphora. God’s laws were revealed by the Mosaic laws such as the Ten Commandments for moral behavior and Leviticus for ceremonies and justice (marriage laws) in the Old Testament, and the Gospel laws covered the fulfillment of the Mosaic laws by Christ.⁶¹ Divine law has three functions: 1) It sets forth our duties to God and to each other. 2) It terrifies our conscience, thus motivating us to do right. 3) It gives us faith to do good works, not for salvation, but as a result of it (*inchoata obedientia*).⁶² In the English translation, “God’s law” was not always clear and the phrase could refer to either the Old or the New Testament.

Article XXIV: Of the Mass

The doctrines supporting Article XXIV are Christology and soteriology. The article deals with Christ’s sacrificial work for mankind and salvation through faith, by which, according to Article IV, the believer is justified for Christ’s sake.⁶³ The Latin article states that the Mass ceremony is essentially kept, but native hymns have been added for the sake of instruction. The Mass should be a public worship service, which offers the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper. The abuses of the Mass were the unworthy participation in the Eucharist. The Mass offers Christ’s

⁵⁸ CAL 1530, XXIII, pp. 90–91; CAE 1536, Fol. 17L.

⁵⁹ CAL 1530, XXIII, p. 88; CAE 1536, Fol. 16R.

⁶⁰ CAL 1530, pp. 87–88, 90; CAE 1536, Fol. 16L, R, 17L.

⁶¹ LC 1535, Fols. 103R, 105L, 107R.

⁶² *Tertium officium legis in his qui sunt fide iusti, est ut doceat eos de bonis operibus, quæ nam opera Deo placeant & præcipiat certa opera in quibus obedientiam erga Deum exerceant. Etsi nos liberi sumus, a lege quod ad iustificationem attinet, tamen quod ad obedientiam attinet, manet et [manet] Lex. Nam iustificatos necesse est obedire Deo. Et quidem incipiunt aliqua ex parte facere legem. Et placet illa inchoata obedientia, propterea quia personæ placent propter Christum.* LC, 1535, Fols. 135 R, 137 L

[The third role of the law among those who are justified by faith is that it should teach them about good works, which are the works that please God, and should indicate specific works in which they might practice obedience toward God. Although we are free from the law as far as it relates to justification, nonetheless the law stands, because it relates to obedience. For it is necessary for those who are justified to obey God. And indeed, in some ways, they begin to fulfill the law. And that beginning obedience is pleasing, because the persons are pleasing on account of Christ.]

⁶³ CAL 1530, I, p. 50–51; II, p. 53; III, pp. 54–55; IV, p. 56; Grane 1987, pp. 31–32, 40, 50.

oblation for original guilt and sins through reconciliation. The Reformers argued that Scripture is divine authority, and based on that, the Mass was changed to a worship service.⁶⁴

The introduction of the evangelical Mass changed the social environment of the congregation. Foundations for the benefit of the deceased disappeared; instruction replaced the priest performing the sacrificial action during the canon of the Mass. Private Masses were forbidden, and those celebrated for the living and dead were eliminated. The Mass became an evangelical service celebrated with reverence. The sacrament was optional and offered during the communion; that is, God's justifying action through Christ.⁶⁵

The abuses of the Mass were directed mainly to the misuse of private Masses. The Reformers demanded the discontinuance these Masses, because the purpose of their use was for gain and therefore the congregants became guilty of unworthy partaking in the whole sacrament of the Lord's Supper. In the passage below, the Latin text warns priests "of that syn" (*de hoc peccato*) when they continue private Masses for profit. Both texts make the point that priests were admonished, that lucrative private Masses were sinful, and, thereafter, private Masses were almost discontinued. The English "unworthily" refers to people's motivations and causes for behavior as unworthy use of the sacrament.

Paulus autem graviter minatur his, qui indigne tractant eucharistiam, cum ait: Qui ederit panem hunc aut biberit calicem Domini indigne, reus erit corporis et sanguinis Domini. Itaque cum apud nos admonerentur sacerdotes de hoc peccato, desierunt apud nos privatæ missæ, cum fere nullæ privatæ missæ nisi quæstus causa fierent. (CAL 1530, XXIV, p. 92.)

But Paule greuously thretneþ them whiche entreate and receyue the sacramet unworthily/ whe he sayeth. who eateih thys breade/ or drynketh the cuppe of the lorde unwort hely shalbe gilty of the body and bloude of the lorde. Therfore when prestes were monished with us of that syn: priuat'e Masses ceased with us because almoste no priuate Masses were done/ but for lucre and aduantage/ (CAE 1536, Fol. 18L.)

The doctrinal change was the most significant. Consequently, the new change in practice made all the liturgical articles (the Marriage of Priests, the Mass, and the Power of the Bishop) adiaphora; that communion in both kinds once was celebrated according to Christ's ordinance remained controversial during the transition period of the Reformation.

In order to understand the doctrine of adiaphora, it was necessary to differentiate the ecclesiology. In the next passage, the English text, again, renders both "church" and "congregations" interchangeably for the Latin *ecclesia*. The interpretation depends on the textual context, since the translation may be interpreted either as pleonastic or as speaking in ecclesiastical terms. When the English text refers to the "example of the Church," it means the universal church before the separation of the Eastern and Western Churches. The Church of England claimed to belong to the universal church. "Congregation" refers to a local congregation. Each local congregation had a right to decide adiaphora matters on an individual basis.

Both the English and the Latin texts agree that the Mass is adiaphora, based on scriptural authority.⁶⁶ The change occurred when the English Church separated from the Roman Church

⁶⁴ CAL 1530, XXIV, pp. 91, 93–95; Grane 1987, pp. 221, 223–224.

⁶⁵ CAL 1530, XXIII, pp. 91–94; Grane 1987, pp. 221–224; Maurer 1986, p. 183.

⁶⁶ CAL 1530, XXIII, p. 94; CAE 1536, Fol. 18R.

and claimed to belong to the universal church whose head, Henry, claimed to replace the pope. What was left after the separation was the Western Catholic Church as stated in the same paragraph. Thus, the English text renders “Church” as the Western Catholic Church (not the Roman Church led by the pope [the Bishop of Rome]).

Postquam igitur missa apud nos habet exemplum ecclesiae ex scriptura et patribus, confidimus improbari eam non posse, maxime cum publicae caerimoniae magna ex parte similes usitatis servantur; tantum numerus missarum est dissimilis, quem propter maximos et manifestos abusus certe moderari prodesset. Nam olim ne quidem in frequentissimis ecclesiis ubique fiebat cotidie missa, ut testatur Historia Tripartita lib. 9: Rursus autem in Alexandria quarta et sexta feria scripturae leguntur easque doctores interpretantur, et omnia fiunt praeter solemnem obalationis morem. (CAL 1530, XXIV, p. 95.)

For as moch tha as the Masse with us hath for it selfe the example of the Church taken out of scripture/ and of fathers: we truste it can not be improued namely sythe the common & publyke ceremonies for the most part are kept lyke to the usuall and accustomed ceremonies/ only the number of masses is unlike/ which for great and manifeste abuses/ it were profitable/ at the lest way to moderate. For in times passed masse was not done euery day/ no not in great congregations/ and where moch people assembled together/ as the historie tripartite dothe witnes in the ix boke the. xxxviii. chapiter/ in thys wyse. Agayne i Alexandria scriptures be redde upon the wednesdaye./and the Friday/ and doctors do expoune them and al thinges are done without the solempne maner of the oblation. (CAE 1536, Fol. 19R.)

Another abuse related to the Mass was the doctrine of work-righteousness. If it is understood from the sentences below, that the benefits of Mass come from the celebration of the Mass, then the celebration itself is the cause of justification and not faith. The translator is covering his bases to avoid any misunderstanding of the point that justification comes from faith, not from the celebration of the Mass.

Contingit iustificatio ex opere missae, non ex fide. (CAL 1530, XXIV, p. 94.)

Then iustification dothe chaunce & come of the worke of Masses/ & not of fayth. (CAE 1536, Fol. 19L.)

The difference between the Reformers and their Catholic opponents was the central doctrine of reconciliation during the Mass. The subsequent text deals with the theological concept of reconciliation. The Latin has *coram Deo iustificari per fidem in Christo*, and the corresponding English is “to be justified before God by faith in Christ.” Again as seen below, the emphasis is on the concept that justification is by faith, not participation in the ceremony. Both texts refer to the doctrine of justification: “to remember Christ is to remember the benefits of Christ.” In the distribution of Christ’s body and blood, Christ is truly present and his presence is joined to eating and drinking. God imputes righteousness in his sight because of faith in Christ. The English text is more pleonastic but the contents are the same:

Quare missa instituta est, ut fides in his, qui utuntur sacramento, recordetur, quae beneficia accipiat per Christum et erigat et consoletur pavidam conscientiam. Nam id est meminisse Christi, beneficia meminisse ac sentire, quod vere exhibeantur nobis. (CAL 1530, XXIV, p. 94.)

Wherfore the Masse was institute to thentente that fayth in them that use the sacramet shulde remember what benefytes it taketh by Christe and so shulde rayse up/ and comforte the tremling and fearful cousciences. For to remembre Christe is to remember the benefytes of Christ and to fele/ perceyue/ and thynke that truly/ and in very dede they be exhibited and gyue unto us/ (CAE 1536, Fol. 19L.)

The outward celebration of the Mass itself was believed to bring forgiveness, which the Reformers rejected as a doctrine of work-righteousness. In the next phrase, the English text renders the Latin phrase *ex opere operato* with “by vertue of the worke wrought,” which is a fixed phrase in the Latin. This translation of the phrase is literally “out of or from the work done.” The English text does not use the customary Latin phrase but had even replaced it in all the service books in order to diminish the pope’s authority and influence in England.

Hinc manavit publica opinio, quod missa sit opus delens peccata vivorum et mortuorum ex opere operato. (CAL 1530, XXIV, p. 93.)

Of thys dyd sprynge forth a comen opinion that the Masse is a worke that taketh away the synnes of the quyeke/ and of the deade/ by vertue of the worke wrought. (CAE 1536, Fol. 18R.)

As shown below, in the English text there is an additional note for justification that does not appear in the Latin version. At this time, English and German theologians were negotiating at Wittenberg, and concessions were being made on disputed points. The additional English phrase “when we beleue that our synnes be forgyuen us for Christe” may be interpreted as reflecting both justification by faith in addition to the whole process of salvation: “when we beleue that our synnes be forgyuen us for Christe.”

Item scriptura docet nos coram Deo iustificari per fidem in Christum. (CAL 1530, XXIV, p. 94.)

Also the scrypture teacheth us to be iustified before god by faythe in Christe when we beleue that our synnes be forgyuen us for Christe. (CAE 1536, Fol. 18R.)

Article XXVII: Of the Monastic Vows [De votis monasticis]

The monasteries represented medieval culture. The discipline in the monasteries required vows often against one’s conscience. Their lifestyle became equated to a meritorious life that earned righteousness before God. As seen above, the elector tried to separate himself from any responsibility, treating monasticism as a private matter; however, the imperial laws protected everyone who resided in the territories of the Holy Roman Empire. Furthermore, Article XXVII is connected with the following doctrinal Articles VI, “The New Obedience,”⁶⁷ Article VII, “The Church,”⁶⁸ and Article VIII, “What is the Church?”⁶⁹

The English text uses several pleonastic expressions, a total of thirteen altogether in this chapter. Some expressions are metaphorical, such as when the English text makes it quite clear that young people were sent to monasteries before reaching the proper age. The Latin phrase *iniecta sunt* means “were cast upon.” The English phrase “upon the neckes of many” is not in the Latin text, but makes the expression concrete rather than metaphorical. It is a literal expression of how the bondage of monasteries was cast upon young people. The English text also paraphrases, for example, when speaking of monasteries, or in addition to the words “free College,” there is “copanyes to enter and depart at wyl,” which does not appear in the Latin text, but paraphrases the Latin *libera collegia*.

⁶⁷ *De Nova Obedientia*. CAL 1530, VI, p. 60; Grane 1987, p. 81.

⁶⁸ *De Ecclesia*. CAL 1530, VII, p. 61. Grane 1987, p. 89.

⁶⁹ *Quid sit ecclesia?* CAL 1530, p. 62. Grane 1987, p. 99.

Monks leaving the monasteries suffered great social and economic consequences. There was not much left to create a comparable life style anew. Article XXVII objected to the obligation of vows in monastic life and the claim that their observance made satisfaction for sins and merited grace, forsaking marriage and claiming a state of perfection.⁷⁰ While English monasteries were being dissolved, Article XXVII supported the suggestions that monasteries remain as schools for education.

The most extreme abuse of the vows was claiming merit and righteousness before God. In the next phrase, the monks had claimed equality of their vows to the sacrament of baptism that grants justification. The Latin words *iustificationem* or *iustitiam* are interchangeably rendered again into English as “righteousness” or “justification.”⁷¹ The Latin *mereri remissionem peccatorum et iustificationem coram Deo* is rendered, “deserued remission of synnes & rightuousnes before God.” That is, instead of “justification” the English has “righteousness.” The English fairly often uses “righteousness” in place of “justification.” The point being made is that justification is granted in the sacrament of baptism and not in any other human works.

Dicebant vota paria esse baptismo; docebant se hoc vitæ genere mereri remissionem peccatorum et iustificationem coram Deo. (CAL 1530, XXVII, pp. 111–112.)

They taught (I saye) vowes to be egall with baptisme/ & that they by that kynde of lyuing deserued remission of synnes & rightuousnes before god/ (CAE 1536, Fol. 25L.)

The monks believed that their life style deserved forgiveness and justification. In the passage below, the Latin text says *mereantur gratiam et iustificationem*, which the English text translates as “deserue remission of synnes and iustification” instead of using “grace” for the Latin *gratiam*. The Latin *satisfaciant pro peccatis* has been translated into English “they make amendes for synnes.” This is a fairly literal translation. Forgiveness of sins has been implied twice in the English text. First, “deserue remission of synnes” and second, “they make amendes for synnes.” The former is the translation of the Latin *satisfaciant pro peccatis*; the second is the translation of *mereantur gratiam*. The Latin and English have these two corresponding phrases in reverse order from one another.

Constat autem monachos docuisse, quod facticie religiones satisfaciant pro peccatis, mereantur gratiam et iustificationem. (CAL 1530, XXVII, p. 116.)

But clere hit [i.e., it] is that monkes and freers haue taught that these fayned and made religious deserue remission of synnes and iustification and that they make amendes for synnes. (CAE 1536, Fol. 26 R, 27L.)

In believing that the monks earn justification, the idea in the English article is that their life style contributes to forgiveness of sins. As already shown when discussed in Article XXVII, the English text adds “and that they make amendes for synnes,” and the Latin, *iustificationem et gratiam* in English becomes “the remission of synnes and justification” (reverse word order). Again the Latin text speaks more of God’s grace in the justification process than of human cooperation. The English article in fact emphasized the crucial point that the monks truly believed their lifestyles were meritorious.

⁷⁰ CAL 1530, XXVII, pp. 111, 113–114, 117; Grane 1987, pp. 235–238.

⁷¹ CAL 1530, XXVII, pp. 115–116; CAE 1536, Fols. 26R, 27L.

Because the idea of merit is so prevalent in the English text, it is obliterated from the doctrine of justification as seen in the next passage. The English “nat for any our merites” does not have a Latin equivalent and speaks of “god pacified and mercyfull,” whereas the Latin text stresses *recipi in gratiam a Deo propter Christum* (literally, “[we] to be received in grace by God because of Christ”). The English phrase has Christians believe the active “they have god pacified and mercifull,” whereas the Latin has the Christians believe the passive “that they are received in grace.” This is a philological difference and may be interpreted theologically as the English emphasizing that nothing humans do can deserve justification (a negative emphasis), whereas the Latin emphasizes the importance of faith (a more positive emphasis). One may interpret the Latin text as speaking more of God’s grace in the justification process rather than human cooperation, as in the English. The Latin phrase *nostris observationibus et cultibus, qui sunt excogitate ab hominibus* is pleonastic in comparison to the English phrase “thobseruations and honours deuised by men.” None of the monks’ performances, which they believed would earn justification, had any merit with the new doctrine of justification by faith in God’s mercy.⁷² The different emphasis on the English and the Latin articles has to be interpreted from their respective contexts:

Et Paulus ubique docet iustitiam non esse quærendam ex nostris observationibus et cultibus, qui sunt excogitati ab hominibus, sed contingere eam per fidem credentibus, se recipi in gratiam a Deo propter Christum. (CAL 1530, XXVII, p. 116.)

And Paule teacheth euery where that ryghtuousnes is nat to be sought of thobseruations and honours deuised by men/ but that it comith by faythe to them that beleue that they haue god pacified and mercyfull through Christe/& nat for any our merites. (CAE 1536, Fol. 26R.)

In the next passage, the most striking difference between the two texts appears. The subject is justification (grace or blessing) and forgiveness through Christ and the impossibility of being justified (blessed) by works, as the monks taught. The Latin is much more concise.⁷³ The first section of the English corresponds to the Latin’s first six words, “therefore too, those who want to say that they are justified by vows....” The Latin phrase *evacuantur a Christo* corresponds to the English phrase “these lose Christ”; the Latin adds “and fall from grace” (*a gratia excidunt*). The Latin continues, “For those who ascribe justification to vows also ascribe to their own works that which rightly pertains to the glory of Christ.” (*Nam, et hi, qui votis tribuunt iustificationem tribuunt, propriis operibus hoc, quod proprie ad gloriam Christi pertinent.*) The English text is similar: “with the honour due to Christ they apply to their warkes.”⁷⁴ The Latin text concludes: “Nor can it be denied that the monks have taught that they are justified through their vows and observances, and merit remission of sins.” (*Neque vero negari potest, quin monachi docuerint se per vota et obserationes suas iustificari et mereri remissionem peccatorum.*) This corresponds closely to the English: “But it is clere, that monkes and religious persons teache this...”⁷⁵ There is no corresponding English for the Latin: “Indeed, they have added even more absurd things:

⁷² CAL 1530, XXVII, pp. 116–117; CAE 1536, Fols. 27L, R.

⁷³ CAL 1530, XXVII, pp. 116–117.

⁷⁴ CAL 1530, XXVII, p. 116; CAE 1536, Fols. 27L, R.

⁷⁵ CAL 1530, XXVII, pp. 116–117; CAE 1536, Fols. 27L, R.

they have boasted that they atone for others through their own works” (*immo affinxerunt absurdiora, gloriati sunt se aliis mutuari sua opera*).⁷⁶

The English text is quite comprehensive, much longer, and even differs in content from the Latin. In addition, the English text lacks the clause about monks boasting that they atone for others through their own works. For example, the English text adds “they...thynke to deserue remission of synnes with theyr owne and to please god, for warkes, their owne fulfilling of the lawe...so that the honour due to Christ they apply to their warkes.”⁷⁷ The text is not the monks’ perspective, but is just saying that they misapply to their own work what is due to Christ, and whoever thinks this way and does not believe that they obtain remission of sins freely through Christ, loses Christ. It is apparent that the English text implies justification by faith, but it also asserts that the self-righteousness of the monks hinders the glory of Christ. The monks obscure justification by faith by their claim to merit it through their works and celibacy. But the English text, which is so explanatory, does not mention the last point in the Latin of claiming to earn justification on behalf of others.⁷⁸

Ergo etiam qui votis iustificari volunt, evacuantur a Christo et a gratia excidunt. Nam, et hi, qui votis tribuunt iustificationem, tribuunt propriis operibus hoc, quod proprie ad gloriam Christi pertinet. Neque vero negari potest, quin monachi docuerint se per vota et observationes suas iustificari et mereri remissionem peccatorum; immo affinxerunt absurdiora, gloriati sunt se aliis mutuari sua opera. (CAL 1530, XXVII, pp. 116–117.)

Paule saieth ye be auoyded from Christe/ ye be fallen from grace/whiche be iustified in the law (that is to wytte) they that thynke to deserue remission of synnes with theyr owne warkes/ and to please god/ for their owne fulfilling of the lawe/ and whiche do nat fele that for Christe they frely take by feythe remission of synnes gyuen them by the mercy of god/ and that for Christe they please god: these lose Christe/ for the truste due to Christe and to the promyse of god they remoue away/& applie to warkes: Also they plede agaynst the wrathe of god nat Christe the mercy stocke/ but theyr owne warkes/ so that the honour due to Christ they apply to their warkes. But it is clere/ that monkes and religious persons teache this (I meane) that they deserue remission of synnes with theyr obseruacions/ and that they haue god mercyfull unto them for this cause. Wherefore fore they teache men to trust in theyr warkes & nat in the ppopiciacion & mercifulnes of Christe. This truste is ungodly/ wycked and contrary to the gospel/ (CAE 1536, Fol. 27L, R.)

The soteriological aspect of justification by faith is expounded thoroughly in the English text. The Latin text clearly affirms not putting trust in works in order to be justified or given grace. It states that monks thought their way of living created a state of perfection, since they “kept nat alonly the preceptes, but also the counselles,”⁷⁹ which were binding their consciences.

Similar to the previous passage, the Latin and the English texts below definitely affirm not putting trust in works in order to be justified or given grace. Furthermore, the Latin text refers to the monks’ persuasion that what is in fact “human traditions” lead to a state of Christian

⁷⁶ CAL 1530, XXVII, pp. 116–117.

⁷⁷ CAE 1536, Fols. 27L, R.

⁷⁸ CAL 1530, XXVII, p. 117.

⁷⁹ CAE 1536, Fol. 27R.

perfection, and the writer asks rhetorically, isn't this attributing justification to works? ⁸⁰ Precisely what they have been working to show is not what is needed. There is another English passage⁸¹ without corresponding Latin text, until the Latin passage beginning *Hæc si...*⁸² The English explains again that the error of the monks is that they fulfill commandments they no longer need to fulfill and continue practicing supererogation ("performance of more than is required"), expecting to earn more merit and applying the merit to other peoples' sins.⁸³

This error is most repugnant to the gospel/ because they have fayned them selues so to haue fulfilled the commaundementes/ that they no more also then they be bounden to. And out of this hathe spronge an horrible error in that they fayned themselues to haue merites of supererogation/ that is to say more then they were bounden to haue. These merites they haue applied for other to be satisfactious for other mennes synnes.

Hæc si quis velit odiose exaggerare, quam multa possit colligere, quorum iam ipsos monachos pudet! (CAL 1530, XXVII, p. 117.)

These thynges if any man were disposed odiously to handle/ howe many thynges myght he reherse of whiche euen the religious prsons themselues be nowe asshamed. (CAE 1536, Fol. 27R.)

Both the English and the Latin text agree that monastic vows are invalid and regard justification as coming about through work because the monks thought that through these monastic works, one received forgiveness of sins. Both texts elaborate on the reasons for this kind of thinking and refer to the precepts and councils and the canons. In the Catholic tradition, both Scripture and Tradition had equal authority, and the precepts from Tradition became comparable to canon law and were binding on consciences. The article corrects the misconceptions of the monks, who thought that by doing these extra ethical works they earned extra merit called "merit of supererogation" (English: "performance of more than is required"),⁸⁴ only mentioned in the English text.

A major departure in thinking occurs in the area of civil offices. The Latin *cum consilio evangelio pugnare* (to do battle with the Gospel's counsel) is interpreted as "for a Christian, the value of civil offices depends on one's moral conduct."⁸⁵

In the passage below, the Latin phrase *cum consilio evangelico pugnare* is translated into English "they could not stand with good Christian," meaning that holding public office is incompatible with being a good Christian, not mentioning incompatibility with the Gospel itself. The English text probably refers to the Anabaptists. The Latin, but not the English, states that these others are making an even greater error when they make the judgment that all magistracies and civil offices are inappropriate for Christian men. The Latin adds that they judge that civil offices are at odds with the counsel of the Gospel, whereas the English phrase "could not stand

⁸⁰ CAL 1530, XXVII, p. 117.

⁸¹ CAL 1530, XXVII, pp. 116–117; CAE 1536, Fol. 27R.

⁸² CAL 1530, XXVII, p. 117.

⁸³ CAL 1530, XXVII, pp. 116–117; CAE 1536, Fol. 27R.

⁸⁴ CAL 1530, XXVII, pp. 112, 117; CAE 1536, Fols. 26R, 27R.

⁸⁵ CAL 1530, XXVII, p. 118; CAE 1536, Fol. 28R.

with good Christian” repeats the “inappropriateness.” In this view, one cannot be a good Christian and hold public office. The “as though” indicates that, in the view of the writer, this opinion is erroneous.

Alii contra magis etiam errant, qui omnes magistratus, omnia civilia officia iudicant indigna esse christianis et cum consilio evangelico pugnare. (CAL 1530, XXVII, p. 118.)

Other there be which iudge y al rule and ciulie offices be unmete for christen men & as though they coulde nat stande with good christian. (CAE 1536, Fol. 28R.)

The dissolution of the monasteries in England coincided with the projection of a negative image of monks and their life style; for instance, comparing their condition with a holiday or new kind of worship or observance, and translating Latin “celibacy” either as “hypocritical chastite” or pretending as “chastite (for so these religious person call it),” or describing the religious life as an “obligacion” and “bonde” and that the vows are “frustrate” and “vayne,” or “vayne” and “none effecte” or “wicked honourynges of god.”⁸⁶ For the Latin *pudicus* (chaste), the English uses “religious persons,” including also bishops and priests. The Latin *vita monastica* is rendered as “monkish or religious life.” The Latin *cultus Dei* is rendered mostly “true honor of God.” The monks’ vows were not the honors that would earn salvation but quite the opposite. Henry VIII considered the monks and the monasteries the stronghold of resistance to the new order.

In the passage below, the Latin phrase *suo tempore novam hanc vocem fuisse* is translated “was but a new founde halydaye [holy day, sacred feast] and straunge sayeng euen in this time.” This may be interpreted in the English text as stating that the monkish life was a new kind of worship or observance. The Latin text *novam vocem* suggests the same thing: that it is an odd new way of thinking about the situation. The English text, instead of translating the Latin *monachorum* as “monks,” speaks of “religious persons.” For the Latin *vita monastica*, the English has “monkisshe or religious life.”

Et ante hæc tempora reprehendit Gerson errorem monachorum de perfectione et testatur, suo tempore novam hanc vocem fuisse quod vita monastica sit status perfectionis. (CAL 1530, XXVII, pp. 118–119.)

And before this tyme also Gersen rebuketh the errour of religious persons/ as touchynge perfection/ and witnesseth that to say the monkisshe or religious lyfe/ to be a state of perfection/ was but a newe founde halydaye and a straunge sayeng euen in this time. (CAE 1536, Fol. 28R.)

This is ironic and minimizes and belittles the monastic vocation. The monk’s life in the English version goes, “was but a new found holiday,” explaining that there was no special call from God to this kind of life style but that it was only a kind of holiday, not a duty. Therefore, the article concludes that their vows were the Latin *irrita vota* rendered, “vain” and “useless.”⁸⁷ The English text is more critical of the monastic life style and gives a more negative image of the abuses of vows, which in turn give more prominence to the new order replacing the old.

⁸⁶ CAE 1536, Fols. 26 L, R, 27L, 28L, R.

⁸⁷ CAL 1530, Article XXVII, pp. 118–119; CAE 1536, Fol. 28R.

Article XXVIII: Of the Power of the Church [De potestate ecclesiastica]

Article XXVIII combines all the other controversial articles under the authority the church. Bishops and ministers of the word have ultimate say on the doctrine of adiaphora. The *Confessio Augustana* presents the change in authority in the church regarding doctrine and practice. In Article XXVIII, both texts agree that the bishops' duties are the ministry of the Word and administering the sacraments, excommunication, and absolving sinners and bringing them back to the church. The English translation adds that the bishops' tasks are to reject wrong doctrine and judge the right one.⁸⁸ This could not be realized in the Church of England, since Henry as head of the church had the authority to decide on doctrine and not the bishops.

While both texts discuss obedience to the magistracy, the English text is different in that it speaks of lawful obedience of a subject to the laws of the prince, which clearly refers to the obedience required by the supremacy law. Obedience is expressed more elaborately in the English, as the citizens are "bounden to submitte them selues and shewe obedience." The English text also accuses the pope of abuses when he interfered in the temporal power "nat to brake into anothers office... as the byshops of Rome haue done." This clause is not in the Latin text. Of the bishop's power, the English refers to the testimony and authority of Scripture, whereas the Latin only relies on "testimony."

The Reformers recognized bishops (including the pope) by human law, which is also implicitly expressed in Article XXVIII.⁸⁹ The doctrinal background to Article XXVIII is Article IV, On "Justification" of the *Confessio Augustana*.⁹⁰ Here the temporal and spiritual are separated, following the doctrine of two kingdoms.⁹¹ Since the bishops in the old church had abused their power over the consciences of people, it was the Reformer's task to call ministers, who would preach the new doctrine and administer the sacraments.⁹² There were no degrees of service, and bishops were not to bind consciences with any additional ordinances.⁹³ As long as justification by faith was proclaimed, anything beyond the word and the sacraments was regarded as adiaphora. The article indicates that the pope has confused the two powers—spiritual power and the power of the sword. Both articles agree that the pope had established new forms of worship, which was not in his power or that of any bishop to do.⁹⁴ This opinion reflects the Reformers' conceptions of the nascent doctrine of ecclesiology, preaching the new doctrine and administering the sacraments.

In the following summary, the text indicates that the pope's power is transferred to Henry VIII, supreme head of the English Church. The English Church recognized the pope by human right. Since the bishop's jurisdiction in the English Church was transferred to the king, the spiritual jurisdiction remained; that is, the ministry of the Word.⁹⁵ The English bishops' concepts

⁸⁸ CAL1530, XXVIII, pp. 123–124; CAE 1536, Fol 30R.

⁸⁹ CAL XXVIII, pp. 126–127; Grane 1987, pp. 241, 245.

⁹⁰ CAL IV, *De iustificatione*, p. 56; Grane 1987, p. 58; Maurer 1986, pp. 285–290.

⁹¹ CAL XXVIII, pp. 122–123; Grane 1987, pp. 242–243.

⁹² CAL XXVIII, p. 121; Grane 1987, pp. 241–242.

⁹³ CAL XXVIII, p. 128; Grane 1987, p. 246.

⁹⁴ CAL 1530, XXVIII, pp. 120–121; CAE 1536, Fol. 29L; Grane 1987, p. 241.

⁹⁵ CAL 1530, pp. 120–121; CAE 1536, Fol. 29L.

of the doctrine of ecclesiology parallel that of reform churches in Germany. The bishop's power is the power of the keys: to preach the new doctrine, remit or retain sins, and administer the sacraments.⁹⁶ But the pope had added burdens with reservations of cases and violent excommunications. The English text adds to these burdens "cursings,"⁹⁷ which is a much more severe added burden than is mentioned in the Latin text, and which the pope had threatened to inflict on Henry VIII.

The article continued by claiming that the pope misuses his power. The English text is more absolute at this point with "gone about to take away the empire from the emperors affirmatively." The Latin quotes, "they have tried to take away."⁹⁸ The Article speaks of pious men who have discovered the pope's vices, the English text replaces "pious" with "well-disposed,"⁹⁹ which can refer to a Christian humanist in the English Reformation setting. The secular power and the ecclesiastical power are to be kept separate, as both texts agree, but the English has a milder expression concerning the separation of powers that is based on God's commandment, since Henry held both powers as did the pope. While both agree that ecclesiastical and secular power are taught by the church to be honored, as coming from God; the Latin expresses it as "to be venerated reverently and to be invested with honor."¹⁰⁰

Concerning magistracy, the English text uses the words "governor" and "ruler." This is not quite the same as the Latin "civil government,"¹⁰¹ but it is well understood in the English Reformation setting, in which both secular and spiritual power were invested in one person, namely Henry, as supreme head of church and state. The purpose, according to the English text, is to keep civil justice and peace.¹⁰² While the Latin speaks of the laws of magistracy, the English speaks of the laws of the prince,¹⁰³ which again refers to Henry VIII and his supremacy laws.

When speaking of mixing the two kingdoms, the ecclesiastical and secular, the English adds, as before, "as the Bishop of Rome has done," which is not in the Latin. Furthermore, the English adds, "not take away the lawful obedience of subject to his prince,"¹⁰⁴ which is to honor Henry's supremacy laws. This is a warning not to impinge upon another's office. The king had lordship over both spiritual and temporal domains, as a divine king and the embodiment of Marsilius of Padua's theory. According to him, church and state each have their own spheres; therefore Henry's position is an anomaly. While the Latin text states that the bishops should reject wrong doctrine, the English text states that they should discern and judge and reject doctrine,¹⁰⁵ which right the king took from the English bishops. No other jurisdiction belonged to the bishops but to administer word and sacraments and be obedient to those precepts upholding the doctrine necessary to salvation by divine right of the king.

⁹⁶ CAL 1530, XXVIII, p. 121; CAE 1536, Fol. 29L; Grane 1987, pp. 241–242.

⁹⁷ CAL 1530, XXVIII, p. 120; CAE 1536, Fol. 29L; Grane 1987, p. 241.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ CAL 1530, XXVIII, p. 122; CAE 1536, Fol. 29R; Grane 1987, p. 242.

¹⁰¹ Grane also uses the translation "civil government" for the Latin *magistratus*. Grane 1987, p. 242.

¹⁰² CAL 1530, XXVIII, pp. 122–123; CAE 1536, Fol. 30L; Grane 1987, p. 242.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ CAL 1530, XXVIII, p. 124; CAE 1536, Fol. 30R; Grane 1987, p. 243.

The passage below summarizes how justification by faith is understood in the articles on the Mass, the Marriage of priests, and Monastic Vows. Both texts state that it is against Scripture to establish such traditions and claim that one can acquire justification by any other means but faith. In the light of the English translation of the *Confessio Augustana* of Article IV on the justification by faith that is comparable to the Latin text and basis for judging all the disputed articles, the English translation of Article IV states:

Also they teache that man can nat be made ryghtuous in the sight of God by theyr owne proper powers merites or workes but yt [that] they be freely iustified for Christes sake throughe fayth whe they beleue that they be taken agayn into fauour and that theyr synnes be forgyuen for Christes sake. who with his dethe hath satsified for our synnes. Thys faythe God reputeth... before him.¹⁰⁶

The doctrine of justification by faith and any deviations from it will be examined in this article as follows: the theme of the doctrine of justification is present throughout this article. As long as the doctrine of justification by faith is clarified in Ecclesiastical power, the other disputed articles on adiaphora can be interpreted as to how the bishops understand the central doctrine, which is a basis for interpreting adiaphora.

In the passage below, the English translates the Latin *aut mereamur iustificari* “maye satisfie and make amendes for synnes.” When the Latin is speaking of “earning justification,” the English speaks only of “satisfying and making amends.”¹⁰⁷ This is either a significant difference or that the usage at the time was synonymous. It seems that the English text is skirting around not clearly expressing the doctrine of justification. One should remember that “satisfy” was a more understandable term at the time, since in the medieval church satisfaction for sins committed was required by the church law. In the new order, instead of human satisfaction, Christ was the satisfaction for sins.

Porro contra scripturam est traditiones condere, ut per earum observationem satisfaciamus pro peccatis aut mereamur iustificari. (CAL 1530, XXVIII, p. 126.)

But it is agaynst scripture to make traditios/ or to exacte or require them to be obserued/ for thetent that by that obseruation we maye get pardon of synnes/ and maye satisfie and make amendes for synnes. (CAE 1536, Fol. 30R.)

When talking about “justification” in another passage, the English is more explicit than before. The English translates the Latin *iustificari* that “we do not “deserue remission of synnes and iustification” following the observances of tradition.¹⁰⁸ It seems that the English text is also interpreting the doctrine of justification.

In the following text, the Latin *doctrina de fide et iustitia fidei* is rendered into English with, “the doctrine of fayth & ryghtuousnes of fayth.”¹⁰⁹ For the Latin *ordines novi institute*, the English text is “newe honourynges of sayntes.” It is unclear as to what kind of group the word *ordines* is referring. But the English translation picks up the honoring of saints. The Latin phrase *quia arbitrabantur se auctores talium rerum his operibus mereri gratiam* has become, “For the deuisers and auctors of suche thinges thought to gette remission of synnes & iustification with

¹⁰⁶ CAE 1536, Fol. 7 L.

¹⁰⁷ CAL 1530, XXVIII, p. 126; CAE 1536, Fol. 30R; Grane 1987, p. 244.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

these works.” The Latin *mereri gratiam* is translated as “to gette remission of synnes and iustification.” This phrase is an interpretation of the Latin, which literally means, “earn grace,” as the English text adds, “to gette remission of synnes & iustification.” The English is more inclined to explain to what *mereri gratiam* actually refers, because the monks were the biggest threat to royal supremacy and an emphasis on the doctrine of justification, which was contrary to what the monastic tradition claimed, would further the Reformation.

Constat autem, propter hanc persuasionem in ecclesia traditiones pæne in infinitum crevisse, oppressa interim doctrina de fide et iustitia fidei, quia subinde plures ferice factæ sunt, ieiunia indicta, cærimonie novæ, ordines novi instituti, quia arbitrabantur se auctores talium rerum his operibus mereri gratiam. (CAL 1530, XXVIII, p. 126.)

Nowe it is openly knowen that traditions haue growen almoste to an infinite nombre in the churche by the meanes of that persuasion/ and the doctrine of fayth & ryghtuousnes of fayth in the meane whyle hath ben oppressed. For styll more holy dayes and more were made/ and fastyngdayes were comaunded/newe ceremonies/newe honourynges of sayntes were institute. For the deuisers and auctors of suche thinges thought to gette remission of synnes & iustification with these workes. (CAE 1536, Fol. 30R.)

The Latin text below expresses that those who implemented traditions did so against God’s commandment. It is not that the writer calls traditions sin, but that he criticizes the location of sin in whether or not one observes the traditions rightly. The Latin says, “Likewise, the authors of the traditions act contrary to the commandment of God, when they locate sin in food choice, days, and similar matters, and weigh down the church in servitude to the law, as if there should be worship practices among Christians for earning justification similar to those in Leviticus, the ordination of which God committed to apostles and bishops.” The English text omits this and refers to writers who say that the same honor which is given to God in the New Testament would be given to God in the laws of Leviticus; now this ordering of God’s honor is committed first to apostles and then to bishops. The Latin text complains that this kind of legalistic attitude will bring the church into bondage if traditions become a condition for gaining righteousness. The English text omits speaking of gaining righteousness through traditions. The English text is shorter and equivalent to the Latin, starting at *quasi oporteat* in the Latin text.

Item auctores traditionum faciunt contra mandatum Dei, cum collocant peccatum in cibis, diebus et similibus rebus, et onerant ecclesiam servitute legis, quasi oporteat apud christianos ad promerendam iustificationem cultum esse similem levitico, cuius ordinationem commiserit Deus apostolis et episcopis. (CAL 1530, XXVIII, p. 126.)

Also many wryters there be/ which fayne that in the newe testament there must be an honourynge of god/ lyke as that whiche we reade in Leuiticus/ the orderynge wherof god comitted to the apostles and byshoppes. (CAE 1536, Fol. 31R.)

In the same text, the Latin expresses concern that this kind of legalistic attitude, and warned not to parallel the Old Testament ceremonies to those of the New Testament. The English says many writers omit speaking of gaining righteousness through traditions, but considers the honor of God equal both in the New Testament and in Leviticus’ law. The decision on the ceremonies was first ordered by the apostles and later, the bishops.¹¹⁰

¹¹⁰ CAL XXVIII, 1530, pp. 126–127; CAE 1536, Fol. 31R, 32L; Grane 1987, p. 245.

In the passage below, the Latin text clearly indicates that popes in the past were deceived by directions of the Mosaic Law. The English text elaborates here, adding how the writers were deceived into thinking that the New Testament righteousness would be the same as the Old Testament observation of ceremonies, in order to gain justice before God. The English text gives an example of the old law, which included the prohibition on eating swine. Both texts have similar thoughts, but the wording is different. Basically, the Latin corresponds to the first phrase of the English, as far as “Moyses lawe.” The “righteousness” of the Old Testament is characterized as being vested entirely in outward observances.

Sic enim scribunt quidam, et videntur Pontifices aliqua ex parte exemplo legis mosaicae decepti esse. (CAL 1530, XXVIII, pp. 126–127.)

And these writers seeme to be deceyued with the example of Moyses lawe/ as though the ryghtuousnes of the newe testamente were an outwarde obseruation of certeyne rites & ceremonies/ lyke as the iustice of the olde lawe was an outwarde obseruation of certeyne rytes. wherfore lyke as in the olde lawe it was synne to eate swyues flesshe.&c. So in the newe testament they putte synne in meates/in days/ in vesture and semblable thyngs. And they thynke that the ryghtuousnes of the newe testamet can not be with out these thinges. (CAE 1536, Fol. 31R, 32L.)

In addition, the English text is clear on the difference between the Old and New Testament righteousness and how these writers transferred the outward ceremonies of the Old Testament to the New Testament practice. The English text is quite long and detailed, whereas the Latin text simply says that the pope was misled by the example of the law of Moses.¹¹¹ In this passage, two different traditions appear: those who argue that Scripture is the final authority, and those who uphold Scripture and Tradition as equal in authority.

In the passage below, in correspondence with the Latin text *Hic sunt illa onera, quod peccatum mortale sit*, the English version omits an equivalent to *peccatum mortale sit*. “Of this occasion” translates *hic*. Also, the Latin *etiam sine offensione aliorum in feriis laborare manibus* is omitted in the English text. In fact the English text diverges from the Latin up to “that synne in a case reserve...” in Latin *quod peccatum in casu reservato...* The texts begin in parallel, but diverge after the first four words until they reconverge on the concept of sins in reserved cases. The essential difference in the beginning here is that the English omits the clause about manual labor on feast days. The Latin *quod certi cibi pollutant conscientiam* is rendered in English: “certain meates do defile and pollute the couscience,” so the English uses two verbs to express the single Latin verb. The Latin text continues by citing this opinion as claiming that punitive, unnatural fasting is pleasing to God: *sint opera placantia Deum*. For the Latin *sint opera placantia Deum*, the English text expresses as “desrue remission of synnes and that they be necessarye to the ryghtuousnes of the newe testament.” The Latin and English have the clause about observations of canonical hours in a different order.

For the Latin phrase *quod peccatum mortale sit omittere horas canonicas*, the English text reads: “that it is deadely synne to omitte and leave unsaid canonical hours,” “the canones them

¹¹¹ Ibid.

selues speak onelye of the reseruatiō of the canonical payne, and not of the reseruatiō of synne.” The Latin equivalent to this English section is *cum ipsi canones hic non de reserua'tione culpae, sed de reservatione poenae ecclesiasticae loquantur*—and here the English and Latin correspond exactly. The English is so much more specific about how the adversaries think that fasting is pleasing, and that “missing canonical hours” is explicitly also “leaving them unsaid” in the English.

Hinc sunt illa onera, quod peccatum mortale sit, etiam sine offensione aliorum in feriis laborare manibus, quod certi cibi polluant conscientiam, quod ieiunia, non naturæ, sed afflictiva, sint opera placantia Deum quod peccatum mortale sit, omittere horas canonicas, quod peccatum in casu reservato non possit remitti, nisi accesserit auctoritas reservantis; cum ipsi canones hic non de reserua'tione culpæ, sed de reservatione pænæ ecclesiasticæ loquantur. (CAL 1530, XXVIII, pp. 126–127.)

Of this occasion came those burdens/ that certein meates do defile and pollute the couscience/ and that it is deadely synne to omitte and leaue unsayde canonical hours/ that fastynges deserue remission of synnes/ and that they be necessarye to the ryghtuousnes of the newe testament/that synne in a case reserued can not be forgyuen without thauctorite of the reseruer/ where as in very dede the canones them selues speak onelye of the reseruatiō of the canonical payne, and not of the reseruatiō of synne. (CAE 1536, Fol. 32L.)

Whereas the Latin text states that under Levitical law, it is a mortal sin to do manual labor on a holiday, the English omits this and says that omitting canonical hours is a deadly sin. But the English is much more specific about how fasting is a burden on conscience and first insists that these practices are necessary to the salvation promised in the New Testament, then refutes this kind of thinking and definitely supports the doctrine of adiaphora in traditions.¹¹²

In the passage quoted below, the Latin approves the doctrine of adiaphora in traditions, and both texts agree that traditions cannot please God, especially that they cannot merit justification. The difference is this: When the Latin says, “to please God or necessary to salvation” (*ad placandum Deum aut tamquam necessarias ad salutem*), the English says, “deserue remission of synnes or as necessarye to the ryghtuousnes of the newe testament or to saluacion.” The English adds the phrase “ryghteousnes of the newe testament,” and replaces the phrase “to please God” with “desure remission of synnes.”¹¹³

Verum exstant clara testimonia, quæ prohibent condere traditiones ad placandum Deum aut tamquam necessarias ad salutem. (CAL 1530, XXVIII, p. 127.)

For euery man may se open auctorities and clere testimonies/ whiche prohibite the makynge of suche traditions eyther to deserue remission of synnes or as necessarye to the ryghtuousnes of the newe testament or to saluacion. (CAE 1536, Fol. 32L.)

Two aspects emerge: both texts agree that traditions cannot please God and specifically that they cannot merit justification. The English text has “deserve remission of synnes,” where the Latin text has *ad placandum Deum* (“to please God”). The Latin text says it is forbidden to found traditions to please God or as necessary to salvation (*tamquam necessarias ad salutem*), whereas the English text says, “prohibit tradition ... as necessarye to the ryghtuousnes of the newe testament or to saluacion,” interpreting the Latin text.

¹¹² CAL XXVIII, 1530, pp. 126–127; CAE 1536, Fol. 32L; Grane 1987, p. 245.

¹¹³ CAL XXVIII, 1530, p. 127; CAE 1536, Fol. 32L; Grane 1987, p. 245. Grane uses for *ad placandum* “appease.” Grane 1987, p. 245.

In the text below, the English and Latin are saying different things. The Latin is reminding that Peter forbade imposition of yokes on disciples and Paul said that power was given for building, not for destroying, and then asking why sins are being amplified through bringing in such traditions. The English focuses on the traditions and insists that it is clear from Scripture that it is forbidden to make as though traditions should be necessary for salvation. The English simply omits the Peter and Paul section and corresponds to this second Latin paragraph. The texts differ over expressing the concept of justification as righteousness or as pleasing to God.

Unde habent ius episcopi tales traditiones imponendi ecclesiis ad illaqueandas conscientias, cum Petrus vetet imponere iugum discipulis, cum Paulus dicat, potestatem ipsis datam esse ad aedificationem, non ad destructionem. Cur augent peccata per tales traditiones? (CAL 1530, XXVIII, p. 127.)

From whens I pray you/ & of whom haue the byshops theyr power and auctorite to laye these traditions upon the church to vere or greue theyr consciences. (CAE 1536, Fol. 32L.)

A major difference between the texts is when the Latin speaks of burdening consciences with many traditions; it sets the power of the bishop (the pope) and Scripture in opposition to one another.¹¹⁴ The text implies that if the bishops require that such traditions (including the Mass, marriage of priests, and the monastic vows) are necessary to salvation, it is against the new doctrine. The difference is the church versus conscience. The English Church still had remains of the collegiate Catholic structure, in which the head of the church—the king—had his say as far as doctrine was concerned.

In the text below, the Latin *Scriptura abrogavit sabbatum, non ecclesia* is more leniently expressed in the English text, “the Scripture permitteth and granteth the keypyng of the Sabbath day is nowe free.” In the Latin text, the keeping of the Sabbath is completely revoked according to Scripture. The English text expresses freedom of choice. The Latin states that it is the Scripture that abrogated the Sabbath, not the church, whereas the English does not mention the church at all.¹¹⁵ Both texts treat ceremonies of Mosaic Law as adiaphora. Both texts give the same reason for Sunday being the Lord’s day—namely, the church made that choice in the past—but this is another instance of adiaphora. Since it is not a matter of salvation, one should support Christian liberty in this case. Both texts agree that Sunday was chosen over Saturday to break with the rigidity of tradition and as a sign that any day would do as a holy day, which is ironic. The English text points out that Scripture makes the keeping of Sabbath “free.” Both passages discern a distinction between the conveniences of a set day, so that people know when to gather, and the unnecessary idea of a day that is sacred in and of itself.

Talis est observatio diei dominici, paschatis, pentecostes et similibus feriarum et rituum. Nam qui iudicant ecclesiae auctoritate pro sabbato institutam esse diei dominici observationem tamquam necessariam, non recte sentiunt. Scriptura abrogavit sabbatum, non ecclesia. Nam post revelatum evangelium omnes ceremoniae Mosaicae omitti possunt. Et tamen quia opus erat

Euen suche is the obseruation and keypyng of the Sonday/ of Easter,/of Penthecoste/ & lyke holydayes and rytes. For they that judge that by the auctorite of the churche the obseruyng of the Sonday in stede of the Sabbath day was ordeyued as a thyng necessary to greatly erre. The scripture permitteth and grauteth that the keppynge of the Sabbath day is nowe free/ for it teacheth that the

¹¹⁴ CAL 1530 XXVIII, p. 128; CAE 1536, Fol. 32R; Grane 1987, p. 246.

¹¹⁵ CAL 1530, XXVIII, p. 130; CAE 1536, Fol. 33L, R; Grane 1987, p. 246.

constituere certum diem, ut sciret populus, quando convenire deberet, apparet ecclesiam ei rei destinasse diem dominicum, qui ob hanc quoque causam videtur magis placuisse, ut haberent homines exemplum christianæ libertatis et scirent nec sabbati nec alterius diei necessariam observationem esse. (CAL 1530, XXVIII, p. 130.)

ceremonies of Moyses lawe after the reuelation and shewyng abrode of the gospell are not necessarye. And yet because it was nedefull to ordeyne a certeyn day/ that the people myghte knowe when they oughte to come together: it apperethe that the e dyd appoynte the Sunday/ whiche daye (as it semeth) pleased them rather than the Sabbat day/euen for this cause/that men myght haue an example of christen libertie/ & myght knowe that the keypyng and thobseruation neyther of the Saturday/nor of any other day is necessary. (CAE 1536, Fol. 33L, R.)

According to the Latin Confession, since the Catholic bishops opposed the proclamation of the new doctrine, the congregations had to intervene and assume the authority to call ministers. Ministry is to be understood and determined by the doctrine of justification.¹¹⁶ No one is a minister or a bishop unless he preaches the new doctrine called by the church.¹¹⁷

In the passage below, the texts differ over expressing the concept of justification as righteousness or as pleasing God. Furthermore, one may see the different usage of the doctrine of justification: Latin *gratia* is rendered, “obtain remission of sins or justification.”¹¹⁸ The Latin expressed the chief article: *quod gratiam per fidem in Christum consequamur*. The English text is somewhat different pleonastically and once again translates Latin *gratia* several ways: “we obteyne remission of synnes and iustification freely by faythe in Christe.” The English text interprets justification and its consequences, whereas the Latin text points to its essence, *gratia* (“grace”). Once again, the English translates *cultus* as “honors.” It seems as if the English version is constantly interpreting the concept of justification of faith but avoiding the phrase itself.

Necesse est enim in ecclesiis retineri doctrinam de libertate christiana, quod non sit necessaria servitus legis ad iustificationem, sicut in Galatis scriptum est: Nolite iterum iugo servitutis subiici. Necesse est retineri præcipuum evangelii locum, quod gratiam per fidem in Christum consequamur, non per certas observationes aut per cultus ab hominibus institutos. (CAL 1530, XXVIII, pp. 128–129.)

For it is necessarye that the doctrine of christen libertie be kepte styl in the churches/whiche is/ that the bondage of the lawe is not necessary to iustification as it is wryten in the epistle to the Galathians. Be nat subiecte agayne to the yoke of bondage. The chiefe place of the gospell muste nedes be keptes styll/ whiche is/ that we obteyne remission of synnes/ and iustification freely by faythe in Christe/ and not for certeyne obseruations or honours deuyssed by men. (CAE 1536, Fol. 32R, 33L.)

In summary, the statements in the article on the power of the church formed a formidable tool used by the reform-minded clergy to influence the Ten Articles published in 1536. Their claim for the freedom of conscience and not burdening it by ceremonies or rites certainly made headway towards the doctrine of justification of faith in the English Church when the English *Confessio Augustana* stated that consciences are not hurt even though traditions are forgotten. The question of adiaphora became the issue between the conservative and reformed-minded clergy: whether to retain the Catholic ceremonies and interpret the Mass, communion in both

¹¹⁶ CAL XXVIII, 1530, p. 128; Grane 1987, pp. 151, 154–155, 246.

¹¹⁷ *De ordine ecclesiastico*. CAL XIV, 1530, p. 69; Grane 1987, p. 151.

¹¹⁸ CAL 1530 XXVIII, p. 128–129; CAE 1536, Fol. 32R, 33L; Grane 1987, p. 246.

kinds, the marriage of priests, and the monastic vows as either adiaphora, or based on the beliefs of the conservative clergy according to their Catholic beliefs.

All the articles of the *Confessio Augustana* were substantiated by the corresponding doctrinal articles to interpret doctrine of adiaphora. The English *Confessio Augustana* argues that the bishops' tasks was to reject wrong doctrine and show that the English bishops knew their rights, but Henry had taken this authority from them requiring lawful obedience of a subject to the laws of the prince, referring to the obedience required by the supremacy law. While the English text also accuses the pope of abuses, that he interfered in the temporal power, the English text is more emphatic since the pope threatened Henry VIII when he declared head of the church and state seen in the context of the English text. The English text is more absolute when saying that the pope misused his power, but was less harsh when speaking of how the pope's secular and ecclesiastical powers should be separate. The translator could not criticize the pope, since the king assumed both powers. When English text uses the words "governor," it is well understood in the English Reformation setting, in which both secular and spiritual powers were invested in one person, namely Henry, as Supreme Head of and State. Henry's position is an anomaly, demanding obedience to those precepts upholding the doctrine necessary to salvation by arguing the divine right of the king.

The translator makes it clear that the bishops were not to bind consciences with any additional ordinances and ceremonies. As long as justification of faith was proclaimed, anything beyond the word and the sacraments was regarded as adiaphora. The English church still had remains of the collegiate Roman structure in which the head of the church—the king—had his say as far as doctrine was concerned and some of the traces are seen in the English text. As the English text expresses freedom of choice, the Latin is absolute in this. Mostly, the English text interprets justification and its consequences, whereas the Latin text points to its doctrinal essence.

Part III: Melancthon's Apologia into English (1536)

The articles necessary for salvation are missing (for example, of God, of Christ, of Baptism and of the Sacrament of Altar) from the contents of the Apologia. However, they include the article of justification and all the articles concerning indifferent things included in this study.¹¹⁹ It is possible that the translator did not think it necessary to include the other articles because they were included in the *Confessio Augustana*, or else the articles simply did not show in the original manuscript.

Article XXII: Communion in Both Kinds [De utraque specie]

Article XXII does not follow the original Latin *Apologia*, insofar as it renders the Latin *pontifices* as “the bysshope of Rome.”¹²⁰ It states that the adversaries have regarded communion in both kinds as adiaphora, against Christ’s ordinance. On the other hand, the English text acknowledges pontifical power as adiaphora, based on human law.¹²¹

The passage below reports that Catholics prohibited both kinds in communion of the Lord’s Supper, based on their arguments founded on traditions of administering communion in one kind only as part of the ceremony of the Mass. For Protestants, communion in both kinds is based on Christ’s ordinance. But, as seen in the English and Latin texts below, the writer’s opponents have regarded both kinds in the sacrament of the altar as “things indifferent,” in Latin, *res indifferentes*, against the ordinance of Christ as the text states:

<i>Quod amisso summo sacerdotio petitori sint unam partem sacerdotalem. 1 Reg.2. (Apoll, 1531, XXII, pp. 330–331.)</i>	That whe the office of the hygh preste was lost they shulde desyre but one parte sacerdotall as it is wrytten in the fyrste boke of kynges. (ApolE, 1536, Fol. 127L.)
--	---

The major interpretative difference is that the Catholics based their authority on Scripture and Tradition, which means that in the case of both kinds, the opponent based their authority on an extra-scriptural oral tradition and, therefore, could interpret communion in both kinds as not necessary to salvation—as adiaphora. The Reformers based their authority for claiming communion in both kinds as necessary on Scripture alone, in which they regarded it as offensive to make Christ’s ordinance adiaphora, since Christ’s ordinance is divine and not human.

Article XXIII: Of the Marriage of Priests [De coniugio sacerdotum]

This article is very clear in its presentation of justification by faith. Regarding the significance of justification by faith, the article states, “for we be iustified neyther for cause of virginite, neyther for cause of wedlock, but freely for Christis sake, whan we beleue that for his sake we haue god good and gracious to vs.” In the latter part of the phrase, the translator might

¹¹⁹ ApolE, 1536, Fol. 176R.

¹²⁰ ApolE, 1536, Fol. 128R; Apoll, 1531, XXII, p. 332.

¹²¹ ApolE, 1536, Fol. 128L; Apoll, 1531, XXII, p. 332.

have wanted to present the role faith plays in the doctrine of justification, as seen in this translation, “when we believe, God is gracious.”¹²² As seen below, the concept of justification by faith is equivalent in the English and Latin texts. The concept of justification is an important piece in this passage. Article XXIII says that justification comes about through faith, not through celibacy, virginity, or any other thing.

Postremo. Si ita intelligunt cœlibatum munditiam esse, quod mereatur iustificationem magis, quam coniugium, maxime reclamamus. Iustificamur enim neque propter virginitatem neque propter coniugium, sed gratis propter Christum, cum credimus nos propter eum habere Deum propitium. (ApolL, 1531, XXIII, p. 340.)

Finally, if in suche sorte they vnderstade single lyfe to be clenens. because it doth merite iustification, more then wedlocke: we than playnly with open voyce say agaynst them. For we be iustified neyther for cause of virginitie, neyther for cause of wedlocke, but freelye for Christis sake, whan we beleue that for his sake we haue god good and gracious to vs. (ApolE, 1536, Fol. 134R.)

The passage below exemplifies and supports the doctrine of justification by faith: *et fide iustus coram Deo reputetur* is rendered in English “by faith (a person) be reputed ryghtuous before god.”

Sed unusquisque in suo dono fideliter servire debet ac sentire, quod propter Christum fide consequatur remissionem peccatorum, et fide iustus coram Deo reputetur. (ApolL, 1531, XXIII, p. 341.)

But euery one in theyr gyfte ought to serue faythefully, and to thynke that by fathe for Christes sake they obtayne remission of sines, and by fayth be reputed ryghtuous before god. (ApolE, 1536, Fol. 134R.)

The paragraph speaking of the Encratites has the greatest difference between the texts. The Latin text claims that the Encratites are worse than the Dominicans and Friars, who still eat fish.¹²³ The important point is that Epiphanius, the Church Father, blames the Encratites above all for catching the attention of the minds of ignorant people with their display of celibacy and austerity.

Et Epiphanius queritur Encratitas hac commendatione præcipue cepisse imperitorum animos. (ApolL, 1531, XXIII, p. 342.)

And sachem were the Encrinites’, of whom we hake spoken before. (ApolE, 1536, Fol. 135R.)

Hi abstinebant a vino, etiam in cœna Domini abstinebant a carnibus omnium animantium, qua in re superabant fratres Dominici, qui piscibus vescuntur. Abstinebant et a coniugio, sed haec res præcipuam admirationem habuit. (ApolL, 1531, XXIII, p. 342.)

And it is vndoubted and evidently knowen, that monkes and freers haue ben wonte to sowe and sprede abrode euerywhere many superstitious sentences concerning single lyfe/ whiche sentences haue troubled many godly consciences, euen because of the lafull vse of matrimony. (ApolE, 1536, Fol. 135R.)

The English text does not elaborate on the Encratites but blames the monks and friars, who support the single life style. Their way of living also troubles consciences in choosing between marriage and single life. The English text explains the superstitious practices of monks who live celibate.¹²⁴ The Latin text elaborates on the Encratites and their abstinences and rejections of marriage in order to please God. The Latin text ends by saying that the Encratites’ abstinence

¹²² ApolE, 1536, Fol. 134R; ApolL, XXIII, 1536, p. 340.

¹²³ ApolL, 1531, XXIII, p. 342.

¹²⁴ ApolE, 1536, XXIII, Fol. 135R.

from marriage is the thing that drew the most attention. The English text says that the monks and friars have sown all kinds of superstitious beliefs around marriage, which have troubled the consciences of people who are legally married and should have no qualms.¹²⁵ The English is generalizing, whereas the Latin is focusing on specific practices; but both come back to the celibacy question.

In the next passage, the Latin phrase *opprimunt et cognitionem donorum et præceptorum Dei* (which means “they oppress the understanding both of God’s gifts and of his commandment”) is translated into English as “they oppresse also the knowlege of the comauddementes of god.”¹²⁶ The two main points are justification by faith, that is—knowing Christ—as opposed to justification by works that prevent the recognition of God. In other words, it runs counter to knowledge of Christ because it speaks against justification by faith and claims justification by works and it brings in new ceremonies that prevent direct recognition of God.

The Latin *se mundos ac iustos esse* is rendered in English “be reputed ryghtous.” The Latin *propter talem hypocrisin* is in English “for such maner obseruance.”¹²⁷ The English text stresses that justification is for Christ’s sake, not for any works of law as the adversaries claimed. In the same passage, the English adds a new clause, “newe ceremonies and seruices be deuised.” This phrase is not paralleled in the Latin text. The interpretation sets in opposition the authority of Scripture based on the Scripture alone principle as an authority, and ceremonies that would be accepted by those supporting the Scripture and Tradition principle; that is, the extra-scriptural tradition. The multiple ceremonies may distract from the realization that the doctrine of justification is the most essential in questions of defining adiaphora. The English phrase “such maner obseruances” is more euphemistic than the Latin phrase “*talem hypocrisin*,” which is more scathing.

Opprimunt enim cognitionem Christi, cum sentiunt homines se mundos ac iustos esse propter talem hypocrisin, opprimunt et cognitionem donorum et præceptorum Dei. (ApoLL, 1531, XXIII, p. 342.)

For they do oppresse the knowledge of Christe, when men do thike, that they be reputed ryghtous for suche maner obseruances, and nat for Christ sake/ they oppresse also the knowledge of the comauddementes of god, whan besides the precepts of god newe ceremonies and seruices be deuised, and preferred before the comauddementes of god. (ApoLE, 1536, Fol. 136L.)

One Latin passage does not have an English equivalent.

Vult enim Deus nos pie uti donis suis. Ac nos exempla commemorare possemus, ubi valde perturbatae sunt pie quaedam conscientiae propter legitimum usum coniugii. Id malum erat natum ex opinionibus monachorum superstitiose laudantium caelibatum. Neque tamen temperantiam aut continentiam vituperamus, sed supra diximus, exercitia et castigationes corporis necessarias esse. Fiduciam vero iustitiae detrahimus certis observationibus. Et eleganter dixit Epiphanius observationes illas laudandas esse διὰ τὴν ἐγκράτειαν καὶ διὰ τὴν πολιτείαν hoc est, ad

¹²⁵ ApoLL, 1531, XXIII, p. 342.

¹²⁶ ApoLL, 1531, XXIII, p. 342; ApoLE, 1536, Fol. 136L. ApoLL, 1531, XXIII, p. 342.

¹²⁷ ApoLL, 1531, XXIII, p. 342; ApoLE, 1536, Fol. 136L.

*cœrcendum corpus aut propter publicos mores; sicut sunt instituti quidam ritus, ad commonefaciendos imperitos, non quod sint cultus iustificantes.*¹²⁸

The English translation of the Latin text reads:

For God wants us to use his gifts piously. And we could give examples, when certain pious consciences were severely perturbed over the legitimate use of marriage. This evil was born from the opinions of the monks who were superstitiously praising celibacy. Now, we are not speaking ill of temperance or continence, but as we said above, practices and castigations are necessary for the body. But we withhold faith in their justification based on clear observations.

Epiphanius, too, elegantly stated that those observations are praiseworthy for control of the body and for polity—that is, for restraining the body or for the sake of public customs; just as certain rites have been established in order to teach the unskilled, not because they are acts of worship that justify.¹²⁹

The Latin text clearly puts the blame for celibacy on the monks who support celibacy, which Article XXIII calls superstitious practices. The English text elaborates on the sumptuous life style of the monks.

In the text below, there is conflict between those in favor of the marriage of priests and those who oppose it and wish that some kind of concord could be achieved. The English phrase speaking of the “lawes of peace”¹³⁰ has no equivalent in the Latin text.¹³¹ It says that certainly the present conditions displease God, and that there would not be a reconciliation between those who support priestly marriage and those who oppose it. The Latin *nihil doleamus* is translated into English as “let vs be sory neuer a deale.” The Greek word *σὺμμαχίαν* in the Latin text means, “help in strife” or “fellowship and partnership.” The Latin text says there should be no regret for the Reformers that they have no fellowship, complicity with their adversaries, in all these *parricides*. The equivalent in the English text is “we haue not felowshyp, not be partners,” but the English translates *parricidiorum* simply as “murders,” which is more literal and concrete than the Latin. *Parricide*, killing one’s father or a close relative, could be metaphorical and could refer to perversion of traditions, but it is hard to read “murders” as anything other than literal killings.

Cum autem certum sit has conditiones Deo displicere, nihil doleamus nos non habere σὺμμαχίαν¹³² tot parricidiorum¹³³ cum adversariis. (ApoL, 1531, XXIII, p. 345.)

But for asmoche as it is vndoubted, that these conditions and lawes of peace do displease god: let vs be sory neuer a deale though we haue not felowshyp, not be parteners with or (our) aduersaries of so many murders. (ApoE, 1536, Fol. 137R.)

¹²⁸ ApoL, 1531, XXIII, pp. 342–343.

¹²⁹ Ibid.

¹³⁰ ApoE, 1536, Fol. 137R.

¹³¹ ApoL, 1531, XXIII, p. 345.

¹³² Literally: body of friends/allies. *Greek-English Lexicon*. Eds. Henry Liddell. Robert Scott. Oxford. 1996, p. 1677.

¹³³ Literally *parricidium* means: murder of one’s close relatives, citizens. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Eds. R. C. Palmer, Sophie Trenkner et al. Oxford, 1968, p. 1299.

In the passage below, the English text omits *scientia rei militaris præstat agriculturæ*¹³⁴ (the science of military strategy surpasses that of agriculture). The Latin *eloquentia præstat architectonicæ*¹³⁵ is rendered in English as “eloquence is better than carpenters’ craft.”¹³⁶ The point is that none of these are causes of justification; instead, they are all gifts from God, although one might be seen as better than another. The point is clearly made in both texts, and although the Latin phrase on strategy versus agriculture is missing from the English, the logic of the comparisons is clearer because of the omission.

Sicut enim donum dono præstat, prophetia præstat eloquentiæ, scientia rei militaris præstat agriculturæ, eloquentia præstat architectonicæ: ita virginitas donum est præstantius coniugio. (ApoL, 1531, XXIII, p. 340.)

For lykewyse as one gyfte is better then another, as prophecy is better then eloquence/ eloquence is better than carpenters craft: so virginitie is a more excellent gyfte then wedlocke. (ApoE, 1536, Fol. 134R.)

Article XXIV: Of the Mass [De Missa]

For the Latin *ecclesia*, the English translates alternatively “Church” and “Congregation,” sometimes using both together.¹³⁷ The English also literally translates the Latin *catholicam ecclesiam* as “Catholic.”¹³⁸

Hic mos semper in ecclesiis fuit. (ApoL, 1531, p. 350.)

This hath ben the maner and custome alwayes in the churches and cogregations. (ApoE, 1536, Fol. 139L.)

After breaking from the pope, Henry insisted that the Church of England claimed to belong to the universal church. When using the word “Church” by itself, the English refers to the “Church” led by the “Bishop of Rome.” The pope’s power, in Henry’s mind, is only based on human law.¹³⁹

In the Mass ceremony, the consecration of the host and its misuse during the private Masses, together with the alteration in significance of the concept of “sacrifice,” was not acceptable to the Reformers.

Rem exposuimus, quid sacrificium isti nunc intelligent, quorum improbamus abusus. (ApoL, 1531, p. 353.)

We haue declared the thyng what these men do meane nowe by sacrifice, whose abuses we do repreue and speake agaynste. (ApoE, 1536, Fol. 141L.)

The article affirmed that the Reformers kept the common Mass of the early church, which included the consecration of bread and wine and Holy Communion; but they gave it a different interpretation, as it had been celebrated before as a rite in the church and interpreted as adiaphora, as seen below:

¹³⁴ *Scientia rei militaris*: literally, military practice. *Agricultura*: literally, farmer’s work. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, pp. 91, 1109.

¹³⁵ ApoL, 1531, XXIII, p. 340.

¹³⁶ ApoE, 1536, Fol. 134R.

¹³⁷ ApoE, 1536, Fol. 139L.

¹³⁸ ApoL, 1531, XXIV, p. 350.

¹³⁹ ApoL, 1531, XXII p. 332; ApoE, 1536, Fol. 128R.

Epiphanius scribit, in Asia synaxin ter celebratam esse singulis septimanis, nec cotidianas fuisse missas. (ApolL, 1531, XXIV, p. 351.)

Epiphanius wryteth, that in Asia thryse euery weke they dyd cosec ?[consecrated] and that there were no dayly masses. (ApolE, 1536, Fol. 140L.)

Article XXVII: Of the Monastic Vows [De Votis Monasticis]

Article XXVII of the Monastic Vows calls vows adiaphora in both texts, since they belong to the class of things that neither have God’s command nor His promise. The English translation of adiaphora is “exercises indifferent.”¹⁴⁰ God does not mandate vows. The text stresses the error of the view commonly held at the time that the perfection of the Gospel is dependent on human traditions. They are based on human law (*mandatis hominum*).¹⁴¹

The passage below exemplifies the concept of human tradition, neither God’s command nor his promise.

Furor est humanam traditionem, quæ neque mandatum Dei neque promissionem habet, æquare ordinationi Christi, quæ habet et mandatum et promissionem Dei. quæ continet pactum gratiæ et vitæ æternæ. (ApolL, 1531, XXVII, p. 384.)

It is playne madnes to make the tradition of man, whiche hath for it neyther the comaundement, neyther the promyse of god, egall to the ordinauce of Christ, whiche hath for it bothe the comaundement, and the promyse of god, and whiche conteyneth the couenaute of grace & of eternal lyfe. (ApolE, 1536, Fol. 161R.)

Both texts stress that righteousness is not earned with “monkish works,”¹⁴² even those works that are “more than be sufficient to them seluses,” literally “to surpass what is required of a person’s duty (Latin: *supererogatio*).¹⁴³

In the paragraph below, the Latin *supererogatio* is translated into English literally as “more than be sufficiente to them selues” and “to surpass what is requested of a person’s duty.”

Postea homines liberales, cum somnient se habere merita supererogatio’nis,¹⁴⁴ vendunt hæc aliis. (ApolL, 1531, XXVII, p. 385.)

Afterwards the liberall men, because they dreame that they haue merits, more than be sufficiente to them selues: they selle them unto other. (ApolE, 1536, Fol. 162L.)

Therefore what the monks regarded as “services and honoring of God” (Latin: *cultus*) and as bringing about perfection, which they thought would justify them to eternal life, turns out to be unprofitable, thus adiaphora.¹⁴⁵

Another interesting difference is that for the Latin word *cultus* the English has a much-expanded “seruices and honoryngs of god,” and in the Latin, the verb is third person plural whereas the English is first person plural. Once again, the English quotes the Latin for Christ’s words and then translates them.

¹⁴⁰ ApolL, 1531, XXVII, p. 384; ApolE, 1536, Fol. 161R.

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² ApolL, 1531, XXVII, pp. 384–385; ApolE, 1536, Fol. 162L.

¹⁴³ ApolL, 1531, p. 385; ApolE, 1536, Fol. 162L.

¹⁴⁴ Lat: *supero, are*=to rise or extend above; to be superior, excel, outdo (qualities).

¹⁴⁵ ApolL, 1531, p. 386; ApolE, 1536, Fol. 162R, 164L. ApolL, 1531, p. 389; ApolE, 1536, Fol. 164R.

At sentire, quod illæ observationes sint cultus, propter quos coram Deo iusti reputentur et per quos mereantur vitam æternam. (ApolL, 1531, XXVII, p. 384.)

Pugnat et cum dicto Christi: Frustra colunt me mandatis hominum. (ApolL, 1531, XXVII, p. 384.)

But to thinke y those obseruaces be seruices and honoryngs of god, by which we be copted ryghtuous before god, and deserue euerlasting lyfe. (ApolE, 1536, Fol. 161R.)

It is contrary to the sayenge of Christe, *Frustra me colunt mandatis hominum*. In vaine they worshyp me with traditions of men. (ApolE, 1536, Fol. 161R.)

The ceremonies performed in the monasteries that the monks regard as justifying to eternal life are not so, according Article XXVII. The article speaks of monks who think correctly regarding human traditions “as Scripture calls them,” but this clause is missing in the English text, and all of its contents are put in parentheses,¹⁴⁶ as if the matter is not as important as the Latin text has it.¹⁴⁷ The judgment, as *adiaphora*, is based on Scripture; that is, those things judged to be *adiaphora* either are not commanded in Scripture or not mentioned. In this passage, the concept of *adiaphora* is implicitly expressed.

In one passage regarding “indifferent things,” the Latin talks about things that are “said to be *adiaphora*,” as the English say, “which be indifferent.” But the common denominator of this passage is the reference to justice and life in the hearts and the trust in the mercy of Christ, not even the “indifferent things.” Again, the article stresses the core issue of the Gospel: the justification by faith.

In the sentence below, the idea of *adiaphora* is conveyed in the English text: all things that have neither God's command nor promise are “indifferent.” The Latin offers a transliterated form of Greek ἀδιάφορα (*adiaphora*),¹⁴⁸ while the English translation has “exercises indifferent.”

Secundo. Obedientia, paupertas et cœlibatus, si tamen non sit impurus, exercitia sunt adiaphora. (ApolL, 1531, XXVII, p. 384.)

Secondly, obediece, pouertie, & single lyfe, so that it be not vnclene, be but exercises indifferet. (ApolE, 1536, Fol. 161R.)

In the next text, in which the article argues that human traditions are not accounted as a way to righteousness, the Latin text speaks about “them,” meaning the adversaries, as the English text speaks of “we,” which can also be interpreted as inclusive—that is, the members of the church. In another passage, a Latin phrase is embedded into the English text: “Meat does not make us acceptable to God.” Embedded in the English text is the Latin phrase *Esca nos non commendat Deo*. Except for the omission of the word *nos* in the Latin text, it is an exact rendering.¹⁴⁹ It is included in the Latin quoted in the English text and is also translated. It is literally translated in the English text, in which *nos* is included: “Meate dothe not make vs acceptable to god.” The church (meaning the congregation in general), as opposed to monastic life, may be implied in this context.

¹⁴⁶ ApolE, 1536, Fol. 159L.

¹⁴⁷ ApolL, 1536, XXVII, p. 379.

¹⁴⁸ ApolL, 1531, p. 386; ApolE, 1536, Fol. 162R.

¹⁴⁹ ApolL, 1531, XXVII, p. 386. ApolE, 1536, Fol. 162R.

The article addresses the adversaries' claim regarding human traditions and justification. The English connotes the idea that the members of the church know that human traditions are adiaphora.

Hæ sunt traditiones humane, de quibus omnibus dictum est: Esca non commendat Deo. (ApolL, 1531, XXVII, p. 386.)

These be traditions of men, of all whiche it was sayde, *Esca nos non commendat deo*, Meate dothe not make vs acceptable to god. (ApolE, 1536, Fol. 162R.)

A phrase in the English passage below, in which the hypocrisy of the monks is highlighted in the fact that they claim to live closer to the Gospel (“Be you sure, with this hypocrisy and simulation religious men live more neare unto the rule of the Gospel”),¹⁵⁰ is a sarcastic one, as it is juxtaposed with another phrase (“And what is more certain & undoubted, than that men obtaine remission of sins for Christ’s sake by faith”),¹⁵¹ which shows the certainty of the remission of sins for Christ’s sake by faith. The Latin version is similarly sarcastic.

Scilicet hac simulatione propius secundum evangelium vivunt monachi. (ApolL, 1531, XXVII, p. 382.)

Be ye sure, with this hypocrisie and similation religious men lyue more neare vnto the rule of the gospell. (ApolE, 1536, Fol. 160R.)

Quid est autem certius, quam quod remissionem peccatorum consequuntur homines fide propter Christum? (ApolL, 1531, XXVII, p. 383.)

And what is more certein & vndoubted, than that men obtaine remission of synnes for Christis sake by faythe. (ApolE, 1536, Fol. 161L.)

The passage talking about “the justifying faith” does not present a doctrinal difference, even though the English text translates the Latin *de apprehendenda misericordia promissa in Christo*,¹⁵² as “concerning receiving the mercy promised in Christ” with an active rather than passive orientation.¹⁵³ This difference has mostly to do with idiomatic rendition of the gerundive into English.

Ita simpliciter obruunt evangelium de gratuita remissione peccatorum et de apprehendenda misericordia promissa in Christo, qui docent monasticam vitam mereri remissionem peccatorum aut vitam æternam, et fiduciam debitam Christo transferunt in illas stultas observationes. (ApolL, 1531, XXVII, p. 388.)

Thus they vtterly destroye and burye the gospell of free remission of synnes, and of receyuing the mercy, pmysed in Christ: who soeuer teache y the monkyshe lyfe dothe merite remission of synnes, or eternall lyfe, and they translate the truste, whiche is due to Christe: vnto those folyshe obseruaunces. (ApolE, 1536, Fol. 163R.)

In a passage that speaks of whom to obey when tyrants compel denial of the “Gospel,” the Latin only uses *evangelium*,¹⁵⁴ but the English adds in addition to “Gospel” the phrase “God’s commandments.”¹⁵⁵ This could be interpreted that it is important, as well as the “Gospel,” to adhere to the commandments. This could be referring to Henry’s laws of supremacy for obedient citizens, thus implying that Henry is not a tyrant but ruling under divine sanction.

In the passage below, there is a major difference in the texts when speaking of the ceremonies practiced in monasteries. In one passage, the English phrase “To whiche they be

¹⁵⁰ ApolE, 1536, Fol. 160R; ApolL, 1531, XXVII, p. 382.

¹⁵¹ ApolE, 1536, Fol. 161L; ApolL, 1531, XXVII, p. 383.

¹⁵² ApolL, 1531, XXVII, p. 388.

¹⁵³ ApolE, 1536, Fol. 163R.

¹⁵⁴ ApolL, 1531, XXVII, p. 390.

¹⁵⁵ ApolE, 1536, Fol. 165L.

boude” has no verbatim correspondent in the Latin text. The Latin text also lacks an equivalent to the English phrase “...of theyr vowe and profession...”¹⁵⁶ The Latin *sicut finxerunt*¹⁵⁷ is not directly represented in the English text either. In comparison, the Latin paragraph of *Dominicastris rosarium*¹⁵⁸ is quite different from the English paragraph corresponding to it. The English text mentions the Dominican monks and the Virgin Mary, as does the Latin text. By contrast, the English text has a phrase “but a longe paterynge (Greek: βαπτολογία), I wote not whether more folyshe, or more wicked, nouryshynge mooste vayne truste,”¹⁵⁹ which is not in the Latin. In the last paragraph, the only difference is the addition of a phrase in parentheses (I saye). The English phrase in the previous paragraph “I wote not” is not exactly paralleled in the Latin. The Latin phrase *Non minus stulta quam impia* translates “no less foolish than impious,” which the English equivalent expresses with “I wote not,” softening the statement. The English “Nourishing most vain trust” is equivalent to Latin *vanissimam fiduciam alens*.¹⁶⁰ The final paragraph, with both texts close to equivalent,¹⁶¹ is a useful summary, underscoring once again that none of this ceremonial will buy remission of sins.

Quarto. Liberant hos, qui vivunt in monasteriis, impii cultus, quales sunt profanatio missæ ad quæstum collatæ pro mortuis, cultus sanctorum, in quibus duplex vitium est, et quod sancti in locum Christi surrogantur et impie coluntur, sicut fixerunt

Fourthlye, wycked ceremonies and obseruaunces, to whiche they be boude, do delyuer them, whiche lyue in Monasteries, of theyr vowe and profession. As (for example) the abusynge of the Masse, whan it is for lucre applyed for deade men, honourynge of sayntes, in whiche is double synne, bothe because the sayntes be substituted in Christs place, and be wickedly honoured.

Dominicastris rosarium b. Virginis, quod est mera βαπτολογία non minus stulta, quam impia, vanissimam fiduciam alens.

As for exaple the freers of Dominikes ordre, haue made a Rosary of the blessed virgin Marie, which is nothig els (but a longe paterynge, I wote not wether more folyshe, or more wycked, nouryshynge mooste vayne truste).

Item, euangelium de gratuita remissione peccatorum propter Christum, de iustitia fidei, de vera pœnitentia, de operibus, quæ habent mandatum Dei, neque audiunt neque docent. (ApolL, 1531, XXVII, pp. 392-393.)

Also the goppell of free remission of synnes for Christis sake, and of the iustice of fayth, of true repentaunce, of the works, whiche god hath comauded. All these things (I saye) they neyther heare ne teache. (ApolE, 1536, Fols. 166R, 167L.)

In the English and the Latin texts, the most significant issue is a declaration of the difference between the monks and the Nazarenes. Both texts agree. The monks had the Word of God (as they say) to remit forgiveness through their vows. The Nazarenes also had the Word of God, but their vows were external to the ceremonial laws and did not merit forgiveness.¹⁶²

¹⁵⁶ ApolE, 1536, Fols. 166R, 167L.

¹⁵⁷ ApolL, 1531, XXVII, p. 393.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid.

¹⁵⁹ ApolE, 1536, Fol. 166R.

¹⁶⁰ ApolL, 1531, XXVII, p. 393; ApolE, 1536, Fol. 166R.

¹⁶¹ ApolL, 1531, XXVII, p. 393; ApolE, 1536, Fol. 166R, 167L.

¹⁶² ApolE, 1536, Fol. 167L.

In the paragraph below, The Latin *confertur* is translated with two English verbs, “compared and lykened.” The Latin *exercitium externum*¹⁶³ in English appears only as “exercise,” with *externum* being left untranslated.

Non igitur recte confertur monachatus sine verbo Dei excogitatus, ut sit cultus, qui mereatur remissionem peccatorum et iustificationem, cum ritu Nazaræorum, qui habebat verbum Dei, nec traditus erat in hoc, ut mereretur remissionem peccatorum, sed ut esset et exercitium externum sicut alie ceremonie legis. (ApolL, 1531, XXVII, p. 394.)

The Monasticall lyfe therfore, which without the worde of god hath ben deuised, to thentente that it shulde be a seruice, wherwith to merite remission of synnes & iustification: is not wel compared and lykened to the custome of the Nazareans, whiche had for it the worde of god, and was not gyuen to merite remission of synnes, but to be an exercise as the ceremonies of the law were. (ApolE, 1536, Fol.167L.)

Article XXVIII: Of the Power of the Church [De postestate ecclesiastica]

The article on the power of the church in the first edition of the English *Apologia I* is partly unreadable because the text was difficult to decipher, due to damage. In the second edition of the English *Apologia II*, the text of the article on the power of the church is almost the same as the first edition of the English *Apologia I*, with some variations. Both editions will be used, since each version is obscure in some places and one may decipher one text from the other.

Both editions agree that the bishops’ powers are based on the new doctrine. They should use their authority based on Scripture; they should use their jurisdiction so that any worship services should not involve practices that entangle consciences and so that, referring to Paul’s teaching, worshippers might stand firm in Christian liberty.¹⁶⁴

Et hae non debent laqueos iniicere conscientiis, tamquam praecipiant necessarios cultus, sicut Paulus docet, cum ait: In libertate, qua Christus vos liberavit, state, nec iterum iugo servitutis subiiciamini. (ApolL, 1531, XXVIII, pp. 400–401.)

And these ought nat to bynde and entangle consciences. as though they dyd comaunde necessarie honours and seruices/ as Paule teachith when he sayeth. Stande faste in the libertie, in whiche Christe hath deliuered you/ and be nat brought agayne under the yoke of bondage. (ApolE, I, 1536, Fol. 173L.)

And the [?] entangle consciences as tho [?] maude necessarie honours [?] teacheth when he saieth. Stande fast in the libertie, in whiche Christ hath deliuered you & be nat brought agayne under the yoke of bodage. (ApolE, II, 1536, Fol. BB 4R.)

Human traditions should not be an offense to one’s neighbor, since they are not necessary services. Christ’s Word is the authority, and traditions should not be made out of new doctrine such as the profanation of the Mass.¹⁶⁵

The bishops’ power is based on the new doctrine, and commands that the bishops should use their jurisdiction accordings to new doctrine instead of following the ordinances of the canons.¹⁶⁶ Both texts agree to the old division of the bishops’ power: the power of order, that is—ministry

¹⁶³ ApolL, 1531, XXVII, p. 394.

¹⁶⁴ ApolL, 1531, XXVIII, pp. 400–401; ApolE I, 1536, Fols. 173L; ApolE II, Fol. BB, 4R.

¹⁶⁵ ApolL, 1531, XXVIII, pp. 400–401; ApolE I, 1536, Fol. 173L, 175L; ApolE II, Fol. BB, 4R.

¹⁶⁶ ApolL, 1531, XXVIII, p. 400; ApolE I, 1536, Fols 172 R, L; ApolE II, Fol BB, 4L.

of the Word and administering sacraments, and the power of jurisdiction, that is—the authority to excommunicate and authority of absolution.¹⁶⁷

Et placet nobis vetus partitio potestatis in potestatem ordinis et potestatem iurisdictionis. (ApolL, 1531, XXVIII, p. 400.)

And that olde diuision of power/ into power of ordre, and power of iurisdiction, pleasith vs verie wel. (ApolE, I, 1536, Fol. 172 R.)

And that olde diuision of power, into power of ordre and power of iurisdiction, pleaseth us very well. (Apol II 1536, Fol., BB 4L.)

Habet igitur episcopus potestatem ordinis, hoc est, ministerium verbi et sacramentorum, habet et potestatem iurisdictionis, hoc est, auctoritatem excommunicandi obnoxios publicis criminibus, et rursus absolventi eos, si conuersi petant absolutionem. (ApolL, 1531, XXVIII, p. 400.)

The bysshop therfore hathe power of ordre, that is the ministracion of the worde and of sacraments. He hath also power of jurisdiction (that is to say) auctoritie to excommunicate those that haue committed open crymes/ and agayne auctoritie to assoile them if they wyll conuert & desyre absolution. (ApolE, I, 1536, Fol. 172 R, L.)

The byshop therfore hathe power of order, that is the ministracion of the worde and of sacrametes. He hathe also power of jurisdiction (that is to say) auctoritie to excommunicate those yf haue committed open crymes and agayne auctoritie to assoile them if they wyll conuert and desyre absolutio. (ApolE, II, 1536, Fol. BB 4L.)

In the passage below, the English *Apologia I* speaks of Martin Luther very favorably without a comparable Latin text.¹⁶⁸ The English *Apologia I* and *Apologia II* speak of wrongful condemnation of Martin Luther,¹⁶⁹ which sentence is missing from the Latin.¹⁷⁰ In the main paragraph, the English *Apologia I* and the Latin version speak of Pindar, but the *Apologia I* quotes and the Latin passage moves on to make a different point. The Latin phrase *Isti rationem schismatis...* corresponds to “the defalt may ryghtfully be layde on our aduersaries...,” in English *Apologia I*, although the correspondence is not precise. The Latin charges these aduersaries with causing schism, condemning the manifest truth and persecuting it very cruelly. The English charges them with causing schism, particularly of condemning Martin Luther, and of being cruel to men who teach aright. Part of this passage in English *Apologia I* seems to be a repeat of that passage, reflected also in English *Apologia II*. Both texts end with the statement of favor for Martin Luther.

Inquit Pindarus. Nos tamen neque deserere veritatem necessariam ecclesiae volumus, neque assentiri aduersariis condemnantibus eam possumus. Oportet enim Deo magis obedire quam hominibus. Isti rationem schismatis excitati reddent, qui manifestam veritatem initio condemnauerunt et nunc summa crudelitate persequuntur. (ApolL, 1531, p. 403.)

Thus as Pindarus sayth the olde fauour perysheth and slepeth and the mortall men be vnrememberful. Nowe if any troubles or seditios haue bene: the defalte may ryghtfully be layde on our aduersaries, whiche fyrst raysed vo? scisme and diuision/ & scatered the congregations in sundre by the wrongful codempnation of Martine Luther, and whiche nowe vse meruailous crueltie

wrongfull codempnation of Martine Lutherh & whiche nowe use meruailous crueltie gainst good me, them that teach godly doctrine. (ApolE, II, 1536, Fol. BB 6L.)

¹⁶⁷ ApolL, 1531, XXVIII, p. 400; ApolE I, 1536, Fol 172 R, L; ApolE II, 1536, Fol BB, 4L.

¹⁶⁸ ApolE I, 1536, Fol. 174L, R.

¹⁶⁹ ApolE I, 1536, Fol. 174R; ApolE II, 1536, Fol. BB 6 L.

¹⁷⁰ ApolL, 1531, XXVIII, p. 403.

Translation into English: So said Pindar. For our part, we neither wish to abandon the truth essential to the church, nor are we able to stand by as our adversaries condemn her. For one ought to obey God more than men. Those men give rationalization for the schism they have aroused, who first of all condemned the manifest truth and now persecute it with the height of cruelty.

agaynst good men, & them that teache godly doctrine. (ApoIE, I, 1536, Fol. 174R.)

The correspondence between English and Latin is minimal, and it looks like the Pindar quotation in the Latin ends before the passage starts, with “inquit Pindarus” signaling its end. In another paragraph, the English *Apologia I* and English *Apologia II* speak about the righteousness of faith for Christ’s sake and not for fulfilling the law, as in the article for the Latin *Apologia*.¹⁷¹

In the following passage, the *Apologia II* text is obscure. The first sentence seen in the manuscript begins “pretence and cloke of our doc[trine].” The first part of the *Apologia I* corresponds with the Latin. Only the explanatory part differs—quite substantially. As far as *Ad haec breviter respondemus*, they correspond closely. After that, they are different. The Latin text speaks of the remission of sins for Christ’s sake through faith. The English speaks of how it benefits the governor to have obedient people; this magnifies the ruler’s authority. The English is actually saying that it is well known that the citizens of the realm are obedient and that the kind of doctrine the writer espouses increases this kind of obedience, because it praises the authority of powerful men.

Obiiciunt et scandala publica et motus, qui exorti sunt praetextu nostrae doctrinae. Ad haec breviter respondemus. Si in unum conferantur omnia scandala, tamen unus articulus de remissione peccatorum, quod propter Christum gratis consequamur remissionem peccatorum per fidem, tantum affert boni, ut omnia incommoda obruat. Et hic initio conciliavit Luthero non tantum nostrum favorem sed etiam multorum, qui nunc nos oppugnant. (ApoIL, 1531, XXVIII, pp. 402–403.)

They obiecte also and lay to our charge the open offendynge of people, and the troubles and seditious whiche haue rysen vnder the pretence and cloke of our doctrine. To these we aunswere briefly. Fyrste this is evidently knowen that through the benefite of god our prynces haue obediente people in theyr lordshyppes and dominions. And this selfe same kynde of doctrine, whiche we folowe, because it dothe with moste large and hyghe prayse magnify the auctoritie of gouernours and rulers: dothe encrease reuerce towardses them. (ApoIE, I, 1536, Fol. 174L.)

pretence and cloke of our doc [trine] we answere bryetly. fyrst this []wen that through the benefite of []haue obedient people in theyr lordeshyppes and dominions. And this selfe same kynd of doctrine whiche we folowe, because it dothe with moste large and hyghe prayse magnifye the auctorytie of gouernours and rulers; doth encrease reuerce towardses them. (ApoIE, II, 1536, Fol. BB 5L.)

In the paragraph below, the English *Apologia II* is obscured from the sentence “but so it is that these be wycked teachyngs” on. The Latin *cultus Dei* is rendered into the English *Apologia I*

¹⁷¹ ApoIE I, 1536, Fol 174L, R; Apo E II, 1536, BB 5 L; ApoIL 1531, Article IV, p. 158; CAL 1530 Article IV p. 156; Grane Article 15, 1987, pp. 58–68.

as “honors and seruices of god.” For the Latin *ad hunc locum*, the English says more explicitly “this saying of Christe.” It is impious and wicked to teach that human traditions are honors of God that will earn remission of sins and justification.

Idem respondemus ad hunc locum: Quidquid dixerint, facite, quod constat non universaliter præcipi, ut omnia recipiamus, quia alibi iubet scriptura plus obedire Deo, quam hominibus. Quando igitur impia docet, non sunt audiendi. Hæc autem impia sunt, quod traditiones humanæ sint cultus Dei, quod sint necessarii cultus, quod mereantur remissionem peccatorum et vitam æternam.
(ApolL, 1531, XXVIII, p. 402.)

The same answee we make to this sayeng of Christe, what soeuer they say: do it/ because it is vndoubted that it is nat here uniuersally comaunded, that we shuld receyue almaner of thynges: for the Scripture in another place dothe bydde us obey god more than me. Therefore when they teache wycked thynges they be nat to beherde. But so it is that these be wycked teachings, that humayne traditios be honours and seruices of god/ and that they be necessary seruices/ and merite remission of synnes, and eternall lyfe. Ergo. & c. (ApolE, I 1536, Fol. 173R &174L.)

The same answee we make to this saieng of Christe, what soeuer they say: do it, because it is undoubted that it is nat here uniuersally comaunded that we shuld receiue almaner of thynges: for the Scripture in another place dothe bydde us obey god more then men. Therefore when they teche wycked thynges, they be nat to be herde, But so it is that these be wycked teaching [...?]
(ApolE, II, 1536, Fol. BB 5L.)

There is a lengthy section in the English document that has no corresponding Latin text. This section speaks about the authority of the governors and rulers and of obedience to them. It states the positions of the English bishops under the supreme head of the church. It adds to the text the essential position of the common weal, the English body politic under the rule of the laws of the governor, who is supreme head of the state and church. Their contents are quite different. The English *Apologia I* speaks of the tyrants who are against the teaching of the new doctrine; that those who oppose new doctrine cause wars and seditions and heresies in order to create hatred of the new doctrine. Wise men could easily distinguish between their threats to the new doctrine and the open seditions against it.¹⁷² The English *Apologia II* refers to Christ’s saying: “Blessyd is he which shall not be offended in me,” referring to the oppression against new doctrine and the open offense toward those who support it. These seem to be sentiments of the reform-minded clergy.¹⁷³

The text speaks of those persons who defile the “godly doctrine” with wicked opinions, writing of the canonists, including the pope. It also criticizes the superstition of the religious persons and warns against private Masses for the dead. The writer despises the Confutation and regards it as the chief cause of offense against Reformation. He then refers to the gospel of St. John and his apocalyptic vision of the kingdom of the pope (spelled “Pope”).¹⁷⁴ All this, in the translator’s opinion, is destroying the new doctrine (“godly doctrine”). This sounds like the opinions of the reform-minded clergy, who are trying to reform the doctrine of the church.

¹⁷² ApolE I, 1536, Fol. 174R, 175L.

¹⁷³ ApolE II, 1536, Fol. BB 6 L.

¹⁷⁴ ApolE I, 1536, Fol. 175R.

It also seems that the writer quotes the Catholic Confutation as the source of his defense.¹⁷⁵ The writer repeatedly says that he has no pleasure or delight in repeating his message against the Confutation. Both English texts agree that the doctrine should be based on the “Word of God,” a basis to judge religious controversies¹⁷⁶ and the writer stresses the fact that the reform-minded clergy is willing to maintain peace and concord, which must have been doubted by the conservative party in England.

The writer (either the translator or a copyist) does not disagree with the emperor,¹⁷⁷ but honors him and his virtues. It is as if the English reform-minded clergy will not dare to disagree with the Catholic emperor, but at the same time is adamant about pursuing the doctrinal change in the English Church, which it needs. Most probably the text refers to Henry’s position as analogous to that of an emperor in former times, who had the right to pursue religious change.

The translator blames discord on the adversary, which in this case is the pope, who spread idolatrous worship of saints and prohibited the marriage of priests.¹⁷⁸ He, the writer says, condemns the new doctrine—the truth of the Gospel.¹⁷⁹ This statement is only in *Apologia I*. It sounds like the voice of the reform-minded clergy, who would disagree with the pope’s dealings. The writer sees the reason for the church’s division as being due to the adversaries,¹⁸⁰ who have created the schism and division of the English Church. The writer expects changes to the polity of the state in England,¹⁸¹ which is how they wish to respond to the Catholic Confutation. The writer thinks that all “good men,” possibly referring to the supporters of reforms, have the same ability to judge as their opponents,¹⁸² and any defective opinions should be discussed

The translator concludes that the reform-minded clergy are willing to discuss and explain the disputed articles.¹⁸³ It seems that the reform-minded clergy agree with the Latin *Apologia*, even though it seems to be dangerous to translate it word for word, as seen with the major omissions of the Latin text. It was important to the reform-minded clergy to assure Henry that they, too, were sincere supporters of royal supremacy. Secondly they needed to approach reforms carefully in order to avoid the impression that it was their main goal.

The English text criticizes the superstition of religious persons and their traditions. It states that the office of the bishop is meant for the healing of conscience and to keep common order and peace. One section praises the Emperor Charles V,¹⁸⁴ a clear reference to the Catholic emperor of whom the text said: “the Pope kepe warre with our Emperours, for the moste parte in Italy.” The passage on the criticism of the priests is very Protestant in tone, according to the thinking of the reform-minded clergy during the time of the suppression of the monasteries.¹⁸⁵

¹⁷⁵ Ibid.

¹⁷⁶ ApolE I, 1536, Fol. 176R; ApolE II, 1536, BB 7L.

¹⁷⁷ ApolE I, 1536, Fol. 176R.

¹⁷⁸ ApolE I, 1536, Fol. 175L; ApolE II, 1536, Fol. BB 6 R.

¹⁷⁹ ApolE I, 1536, Fol. 175R.

¹⁸⁰ ApolE I, 1536, Fol. 176R; ApolE II, 1536, Fol. BB 7L.

¹⁸¹ Ibid.

¹⁸² Ibid.

¹⁸³ Ibid.

¹⁸⁴ ApolE I, 1536, Fol. 175L; ApolE II, 1536, Fol. BB 6 R.

¹⁸⁵ ApolE I, 1536, Fols. 174L, 174R; ApolE II, Fols. BB. 5R, 5L, 6L.

In summary, Article XXVII points out that the monks' life style, or their outward observances, are causes for justification; instead one should emphasize the different vocations that are all gifts from God. The ceremonies performed in the monasteries are intended for the monks, who regard them as justifying them to eternal life. The article speaks of monks who think correctly regarding human traditions, but, as the Latin text says, it omits scriptural authority while speaking of traditions as if the matter is not as important. Speaking of ceremonies, their interpretation sets in opposition the authority of Scripture based on the Scripture alone principle, and ceremonies, which would be accepted by those supporting the Scripture and Tradition principle—that is, the extra-scriptural tradition. The multiple ceremonies may distract from the realization that the doctrine of justification is the most essential in questions of defining adiaphora.

The doctrine of adiaphora is based on Scripture; that is, what is not commanded in Scripture or what Scripture is silent on. The concept of adiaphora is implicitly expressed in the English text as “indifferent things,” from the Latin adiaphora. Addressing the adversaries, the common denominator in this article is the emphasis on justice and life in the hearts of believers and trust in the mercy of Christ, not the “indifferent things,” since this article explicitly states that human traditions are not accounted as a way to righteousness. The English connotes the idea that the members of the church know that human traditions are indifferent. When the English text used the “Gospel” and “God’s commandments,” one could interpret the commandments referring to Henry’s supremacy laws to obedient citizens, thus implying that Henry is not a tyrant but ruling under divine sanction.

Article XXIII has a few differences in the texts, in one passage that speaks of the Encratites, Dominicans and friars in general. The English text omits the Encratites, but blames the monks and friars who support the single life style. Their way of living also troubles consciences in choosing between marriage and single life. The English text condemns their life style, stating that the monks and friars have sown all kinds of superstitious beliefs around marriage, which have troubled consciences. In other words, both texts indicate that speaking of celibacy runs counter to knowledge of Christ, because it speaks against justification by faith and instead claims justification by works, bringing in new ceremonies that prevent direct recognition of God.

In Article XXVIII, the English article agrees with the Reformers' conception of the bishops' duties. But the majority of this article deals with the conflict within the English Church—its new leadership, the king as supreme head of church and state. It takes the Confutation as its defense and puts the burden of schism on the pope.

The English translation of the Apologia follows that of the *Apologia* of the *Confessio Augustana*, except the article on the power of the church. Two English parallel texts have a section without a comparative Latin text, and the English text speaks of governors and rulers and one's obedience to them; that is, referring to King Henry as Head of the Church.

Summary Notes

The rich use of pleonasm in the English text seems at first to indicate that there are many differences from Latin. But the philological comparison indicates that this is not so. The Latin *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia* and their English translations are closely parallel in the

question of the doctrine of justification by faith, even though there are instances in which one may interpret the translator's opinion in light of some emphatic additions and interpretations. The doctrine of adiaphora in all the articles agrees with the view of the Latin *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia*. The English translation has various elements that are absent from the Latin text.

The most divergent was the *Apologia*'s article on the power of the church. There was a long section indicating the translator's own view on the specific discord caused by the pope.

The Latin and English *Confessio Augustana*, on Communion in both kinds included emphatic inclusion of titles and names related to the pope. It stated that the pope's title is translated as the Bishop of Rome and the pope's name and Nicholas Cusa's name omitted as indicating the break with Rome in England. Cardinals were not welcome by the English Church after the break with the pope, since even most conservative clergy would not support the pope because of fear of punishment. The Reformers could argue that communion in one kind was a "new" custom made by the pope, and was not decided according to the proper authority of Scripture. Otherwise, the Latin and English texts of the *Confessio Augustana* are parallel.

The Latin and English *Apologia* of the *Confessio Augustana*, on Communion both state that communion in both kinds is based on Christ's ordinance, against the opponents who regarded it as adiaphora. On the other hand, the English text acknowledges pontifical power as adiaphora, based on human law.

The Latin and English *Confessio Augustana* on the marriage of priests. The English text avoids using the word "celibacy" and instead prefers "sole and unmarried," as the English text rebukes celibacy and states that living without wives is unclean more explicitly than the Latin text. The conflict on who has the authority in the English Church to make a decision over celibacy or marriage is a conflict expressed in the English text. In referring to the magistracy's decision on the conflict over the marriage of priests, the English text refers to a governor—the king—and the Commonwealth, referring to the English body politic in the church and the state. At the same time, a question is raised: where does the English Church belong after breaking from the Roman Church? The "Church" with a capital letter refers to either the Western Catholic Church or the universal church. Referring to God's law, the English text agrees with the authority of Scripture Alone or to the division of laws—human and divine—as the English Church laws were parliamentary laws, and the king claimed obedience to him equal to obedience to God.

The Latin and English *Apologia* on the marriage of priests. The English text adds a thought that multiple ceremonies may blind the doctrine of justification by faith in questions of adiaphora. A paragraph in Latin *Apologia* is missing in the English *Apologia*, but the thought is implicitly stated when the English *Apologia* blames the monks for their single life style. The Latin *Apologia* says that pious consciences were disturbed as to the legitimate use of marriage because of the monks' praise of celibacy. This thought is implicitly expressed when the English *Apologia* blames the monks for their single life style and the Latin *Apologia* talks about the various different forms of abstinence and the praise garnered for it. In the end, both texts agree that justification is not on account of virginity or marriage but because of Christ; thus celibacy is understood as adiaphora.

The Latin and English *Confessio Augustana* on the Mass refer to the evangelical service of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper—that proclaims God's justifying action through Christ. Only private Masses were forbidden because of their misuse for gain. The English avoided using Mass vocabulary in their service books after the break from Rome; and that practice can be seen here too, for example, in translating the thought that the celebration is not the cause of justification *ex opere operato*. The Latin phrase, usually left not translated in English, is translated as “from work done.” The doctrine of justification in the English text implies a more active role for the recipient than the Latin text. In the Mass liturgy, all other related matters in the ceremony of the Mass have new contents: minister instead of priest officiating the Sacrament of the altar in both kinds; the Mass is not celebrated to earn righteousness before God, agreeing that the Mass is adiaphora based on the new doctrine of salvation.

The Latin and English *Apologia* on the Mass argues that, since we do not act against the Catholic Church—the early church—it is no longer necessary to celebrate private Masses, since the early church celebrated the Eucharist in a community and because lately the intention of the private Masses has been abusive. The text is ambivalent regarding the translation of the Latin word *ecclesia*. The point is made that the English Church repeatedly claims to belong to the universal church, before the separation of the eastern and western churches.

The Latin and English *Confessio Augustana* on Monastic vows. Both texts agree that monastic vows are adiaphora and that monks' works of supererogation do not earn justification. The doctrine of justification is presented in both texts. The Latin stresses the importance of faith in justification. The English stresses human cooperation in the process of justification, or a more active role of the recipient. The English text elaborates on the works the monks think of as meriting salvation to a greater extent than the Latin—that with their works they hinder the propitiation given and obscure the justification by faith. A major difference is seen when the English text speaks of monks putting their trust in their works. The Latin states that the monks do not need works of supererogation to earn justification. The emphasis of the English text is that nothing humans do can deserve justification, whereas the Latin emphasizes the importance of faith. The Latin emphasis is God's grace in the justification process rather than human cooperation, as in the English.

The Latin and the English *Apologia* on Monastic vows. Both texts agree that monastic vows are adiaphora. The English use of pleonastic expressions makes hard to detect essential differences. One may detect that the abuses practiced in monasteries are more vividly described by the English text than the Latin, referring to their rich and sumptuous life style. The description may be due to the beginning of the dissolution of the English monastic system.

The Latin and English *Confessio Augustana* on the Power of the Church. The doctrinal support for the Power of the Church is Article IV on justification. It is equal to the Latin Article IV. The mild differences need to be seen as the translators' interpretations in the other articles. Both texts agree with the division of ecclesiastical and secular power, and thus, separation of church and state. Both agree with the bishop's duty of the ministry of the word and administering of the sacraments, excommunicating and absolving. The English text adds that the bishop's task is to reject wrong doctrine and judge the right one, even though the king took away this right from the English bishops. Both texts speak of the need for obedience to the magistracy, even though the English speaks of lawful obedience to the prince and is expressed more

elaborately than the Latin. The English text accuses the pope of interfering in temporal power, which is omitted in the Latin. The English is milder when speaking of the separation of ecclesiastical and secular spheres, as the translator did not want to offend Henry's status as leader of both spheres. Both agree that establishing traditions or their meticulous observance is against Scripture. The English text skirts around the doctrine of justification due to the fact that it tends to interpret the doctrine of justification. Both texts agree that traditions cannot please God and merit justification. While the Latin speaks of the traditions burdening consciences, the English add that they also burden the churches. One may detect some vocabulary for the collegiate Roman Church in the text, such as "canonical hours." One may detect legalistic tendencies when referring to the Levitical laws, whether an interpretation by the translator or translation error. Both texts agree that Mosaic ceremonies are adiaphora, and therefore one should not fight with one's neighbor over them but instead support Christian liberty in matters not necessary to salvation. The English speaks of flexibility in matters of adiaphora as reasonable. Those traditions should be kept that can be kept with good conscience. Upholding the tradition of the Catholic Church means to the bishops that they should reject celibacy and teach the new doctrine. Bishops should not be lords over the church; sinful practices only cause schism.

The Latin and English *Apologia* on the Power of the Church. The article on the power of the church has to be compared with two separate editions of the English translation of *Apologia* 1536. "On the power of the Church" has two side-by-side editions and several sections are missing, leaving fragmentary texts. In the beginning of the article, the English *Apologia II* follows the Latin text more closely. The English *Apologia I* speaks of different things not mentioned in the Latin. At the end, both English texts are comparable, without a Latin correspondent.

At the end of the article, one may see some orthographic variations in the two editions, which makes one conclude that the English *Apologia I* and *Apologia II* had a different scribe to translate or copy them over. Then, in one place, the text of *Apologia I* 1536 stands alone without any reference to either text.

There are six pleonastic expressions. In one section, the Latin is more succinct than the English, without altering the meaning. While the *Apologia I* speaks of hearts made pure by faith, a subjective definition of justification, both *Apologia II* and the Latin text speak according to the very essence of the Reformers' teaching: how the adversaries are not interested in ensuring right teaching and the right handling of the sacraments in the churches.

Apologia II speaks of the intolerable tradition that the adversaries support—"intolerable burdens," the text calls it. Meanwhile, *Apologia I* refers to contention in the *Confessio Augustana*, Article XV, that the traditions do not merit eternal life. This same passage is later repeated with the comparable Latin text. Later in *Apologia I*, the tradition is questioned and confirmed that eternal life comes through believing in the new doctrine, "by the Word of God and the Holy Ghost." This is a direct reflection of the Latin *Apologia*.

The translator differentiates between the bishops who govern according to the Canon Law and those who govern according to the new doctrine ("Gospel"). The writer is not rebuking the former bishops, which proves Melancthon's mediating position while planning for a coalition among various princes and kings of his time. Melancthon stressed that the bishops of the

Roman Church, including the pope, do not execute their office according to the new doctrine (“Gospel”).

There is, however, a lengthy section in the English document that has no corresponding Latin text. This section speaks about the authority of the governors and rulers, and of obedience to them. The criticism is directed at the pope—that he did not teach faith in connection to remission of sins and did not speak of political and civil laws in a way the new doctrine teaches.¹⁸⁶ In another paragraph, both English *Apologia I* and *Apologia II* speak about the righteousness of faith for Christ’s sake and not for fulfillment of the law, as in Article IV of the Latin *Apologia*.¹⁸⁷ It is noteworthy that the translator represents the view of justification in the Latin *Confessio Augustana* by faith alone. Justifying faith means a new relationship to God, which is grasped by faith. God’s righteousness is imputed to the sinner who remain *simul iustus et peccator*.¹⁸⁸ Even though it did not belong to the article of the power of the bishop, it is noteworthy that the translator of this article wanted to make it clear that he wished to interpret the power of the bishop based on the new doctrine of salvation.

After concluding that the English translation of the *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia* were mostly parallel even though it had doctrinal and cultural emphases, we may say that it influenced the reform-minded clergy in England and strengthened their position to influence discussion on adiaphora, through ministry and interpretation of adiaphora in the English doctrinal articles, which we will discuss in Chapter Seven.

Conclusion

The power of the church in the English translation of *Confessio Augustana* follows the division of the Latin *Confessio Augustana* for the bishop’s ministry. The English translation supports the church as an institution rather than relating to one’s conscience on human traditions. The English and Latin texts agree that the doctrinal decisions belong to the bishops’ spiritual jurisdictions, but in practice the king had taken that right from the English bishops, which they should have had according to *Confessio Augustana*. In addition, the English *Confessio Augustana* clearly emphasizes that pontifical power is adiaphora, by human law, which is not in the Latin text. The disputed articles belong to adiaphora matters, and it is the bishop’s responsibility to make decisions on human traditions based on Scripture alone, as the reform-minded clergy understood the authority in the church. The English translation elaborates on the sumptuous life style of monks and denigrates them using a polemical tone. It is noticeable that all Latin liturgical phrases are omitted in the English translation, as was done in practice. Referring to civil magistracy, the king’s supremacy is stressed, as well as obedience to his laws. Repeatedly the English text stressed that the English Church is part of the universal church. The difference seen in the English translation is mainly that the text actively emphasizes human cooperation in the doctrine of justification by faith. The Latin text emphasizes faith in the

¹⁸⁶ ApoE I 1536, Fol. 174L, R.

¹⁸⁷ ApoE I, 1536, Fol. 174 L, R; ApoE II, 1536, BB 5L; ApoL 1531, Article 4, p. 158; CAL 1530, Article IV, p. 56; Grane 1987, pp. 58–68.

¹⁸⁸ Grane 1987, pp. 60–62.

doctrine of justification in the disputed articles, even though in the main body of the English text, Article IV follows the Latin *Confessio Augustana*. It is possible that in the conflicting articles, where most disagreement occurred during the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations, the translator had interpolated his own view on justification, or interpolated Melancthon's concept of the doctrine in the *Loci Communes* 1535, but translated the doctrinal Article IV following the Latin *Confessio Augustana*'s doctrine of justification by faith parallel with the Latin. It is also clear that the translator was aware that it would be dangerous to not write about the supremacy of and obedience to the king, and that that it was important to say that the king has a prominent role in civil magistracy. The translation follows the original text in the main issues, such as justification by faith and adiaphora, except in a few disputed articles—for instance, in monastic vows, in which one may detect human cooperation in justification. The article on the power of the church in the *Apologia* is not equivalent with the original text; it discusses the problem of English ecclesiastical power and the related problem of having the king as supreme head of state and church. We now turn to see how the king influenced the doctrine of the English Church in Chapter Seven.

Chapter 7:
***The Political Situation during the Genesis of
the Articles of Faith of the Church of England***

(April–November 1536)

Introduction

After the negotiations ended in Germany in April 1536, neither party came to a conclusion regarding the controversial articles. The English delegates attended the Schmalkaldic Diet at Frankfurt, wanting to discover how the allied states responded to Henry's Christmas Articles. The decision of the allied states at Frankfurt was deferred. When the delegates returned to England, they may have brought information from Germany that could have influenced the new articles.

Back in Germany, Melanchthon received distressing news about the fate of Queen Anne, and that domestic policy in England had changed. This news left Melanchthon undecided as to whether he should travel to England. The evangelical party was in decline and the possibility of the succession of Princess Mary, the daughter of Catherine, gave hope to the Catholics.

In addition, the Catholic threat in the person of Reginald Pole was real, as Henry commissioned one of his most conservative bishops, Tunstall, to respond to Pole's admonition that Henry should return to the unity of the church. It now became of utmost importance to prevent the pope from leading the General Council, because Henry did not want the pope to retroactively cancel his divorce with Catherine so that Princess Mary would become a legitimate heir.

Amid such turmoil in England, it was imperative for Henry to achieve unity in religion. And Parliament published the Ten Articles, the first doctrinal formula of the English Church.

This chapter begins with a delineation of the historical events leading to the writing of the Ten Articles. Because much of the intricacy of King Henry's divorce from Catherine and subsequent marriages relate to his split from Rome, some of the details of his private matters must be explored. As stated above, whether Princess Mary would succeed Henry was an important issue. Many of Henry's domestic and international political maneuvers also related to the succession and his split with Rome. Henry did not want the pope to lead the General Council and for it to meet without him present. In addition, internal and external politics occurring at the time of writing the Ten Articles of Faith are also reviewed. How these articles—especially on the doctrine of justification by faith—resemble the Wittenberg Articles and the *Loci Communes* is discussed in relation to ceremonies related to adiaphora matters and how the legislation affected their interpretation.

Faith and “Faithlessness”

With Queen Anne’s failure to produce a male heir, combined with the fact that Henry had his new mistress Jane Seymour, her life was in danger. By April 1536, Henry had decided to divorce her, and witnesses came forward to testify that she had married the Earl of Northumberland nine years earlier.¹

Then on May 2, Queen Anne was arrested for adultery and imprisoned in the Tower of London, as were Sir Henry Norris and Lord Rochforde.² Events moved quickly. On May 12, the king’s council condemned the gentlemen for high treason, adultery with the queen, and conspiring toward the king’s death.³ The two men were hanged. Anne was beheaded on May 19. After being allowed to give a farewell speech to her weeping audience, she said she “accused no man,” praised Henry, and commended her soul to Jesus Christ.⁴

On the same day, May 19, Thomas Cranmer gave his official dispensation for Henry to marry Jane Seymour. The irony is that Cranmer had been the Boleyn family chaplain and owed his promotion to archbishop to Anne. Thomas Cromwell also had her support in his rise to become the king’s favorite advisor, and Jane had been Anne’s lady-in-waiting. On May 20, the king married Jane Seymour in secret. Ten days later, on May 30, she took Anne’s place in Whitehall and was proclaimed queen on June 4. However, due to the pestilence in London, she was never crowned.⁵

These executions made the Protestant Reformers on the Continent cautious, because Anne had been central to the English Protestant reforms, and her death totally changed the atmosphere in England.⁶ In his letter to Joachim Camerarius written on June 9, 1536, Melanchthon said he deplored the execution of the queen. He told Camerarius that he was freed of his responsibility to leave for England, and that his plans had changed.⁷

Reginald Pole and *De Unitate Ecclesiastica*

The Catholic threat to Henry became real again. Reginald Pole was related to Henry and even though the king supported his studies in Italy, Reginald had his own ideas, opposing the supremacy law and becoming a formidable Catholic opponent. On May 27, 1536, Reginald Pole sent his book *De Unitate Ecclesiastica* to Henry VIII with “instructions,” as he called the attached letter. The letter does not have a date, but from its contents one may conclude that it had to do with his book. At the request of Thomas Cromwell, Pole wrote the letter to explain why he had written the book:

¹ L&P, X, No. 782, p. 330.

² Cott. Libr. Otho, C. 10; Burnet, Vol, 4, Book III, No. IV, p. 87; *Wriothesley’s Chronicle*, Vol. I, p. 36; L&P, X, No. 784, p. 331.

³ Anne’s organist Mark Smeaton, Sir Henry Norris, Sir Francis Weston and William Breton. L&P, X, No. 784, p. 331.

⁴ *Wriothesley’s Chronicle*, Vol. I, pp. 41–42; L&P, X, No. 911. p. 381; No. 919, p. 385; SP 1/104, Fols. 34–35.

⁵ *Wriothesley’s Chronicle*, Vol. I, pp. 43–44.

⁶ McEntegart 2002, p. 74.

⁷ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1752, p. 163. Kusukawa agrees that Melanchthon had abandoned his plans to go to England at this time. Kusukawa 2002, p. 238.

Wherin takyn my testimony off God, that only seyth the Hart of Man, was only the Manifestation off the Treuth in that Mattier, that by Master Secretaryes Letters I tooke as a Commandment to shew my Sentence herein.⁸

Pole admonished the king to acknowledge his errors and return to the unity of the church. If he did so, together with his realm and the church, he would gain higher honor than ever before. He also warned about the consequences if he did not attend the General Council, since it was the council's prerogative, according to the pope, to ultimately condemn him for his divorce and disobedience to the church.⁹

To prove the unity of his ecclesiastical bishops in supporting the supremacy laws, Henry commissioned Cuthbert Tunstall, a conservative bishop from the northern diocese of Durham, to respond to Reginald Pole regarding the letter and book.¹⁰ Assuming he would receive a favorable opinion from a Catholic bishop, it must have surprised Pole to hear the conservative bishop's opinion of the power of Rome.¹¹ Pole does not seem to have comprehended that even the most conservative bishops were obedient to the king, and not the pope.

Tunstall wrote that Pole's book, *De Unitate Ecclesiastica*, made him feel heavy in his heart, and Tunstall accused Pole of a lack of knowledge of the truth: "For in all your Boke, your Purpose is to bring the King's Grace, by Penance home unto the Church again, as a Man clerly separate from the same already."¹²

He also accused him of sending the book through means by which it could easily have ended up in other men's hands, and slandering the king's reputation.¹³ He blamed Pole for writing the book against the king, who had allowed him an opportunity for learning: "Wherin all the World shuld repute you to be unkind unto your Prince and Countre, who evermore so had lovyd you and broght you up in Lernygne, and ye to spend the same to his Reproche."¹⁴

The bishop wrote to Pole that his accusation that most English people were offended when the pope's power was abolished was incorrect, and that the claim made the king suspicious of him. He further mentioned the discomfort Pole brought to his mother, brothers and friends "to see you off obstinate Opinion against al your Countrey, you may by your Wisdom consider."¹⁵

Tunstall's main criticism was reserved for Pole's denial of the supremacy law. The bishop saw that Pole interpreted Henry's statutes as separating the Church of England from the whole body of Christendom and taking both spiritual and temporal offices upon himself, as if the king did not know what belonged to the priest and what to his temporal office as king. The bishop tried to convince Pole that God's law, by which he meant the supremacy law, would continue to be preached and taught in his realm, and that the king had no intention of separating from the

⁸ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P. 340; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. LI, p. 477.

⁹ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P. 340; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. LI, pp. 478–479.

¹⁰ Tunstall to Pole, July 13/14, 1536. Correspondence of Reginald Pole. No. 101, pp. 100–101.

¹¹ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E.6. P. 385; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. LII, p. 479; *Wriothesley's, Chronicle*, Vol. I, pp. 34–35.

¹² Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P. 385; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. LII, p. 479.

¹³ Tunstall to Pole. July 13/14, 1536. Correspondence of Reginald Pole. No. 101, p. 100.

¹⁴ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P. 385; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. LII, pp. 479–480; Tunstall to Pole, July 13/14, 1536. Correspondence of Reginald Pole, No. 101, pp. 100–101.

¹⁵ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P. 385; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. LII, pp. 479–480; Tunstall to Pole, July 13/14, 1536. Correspondence of Reginald Pole, No. 101, pp. 100–101.

unity of Christ's Catholic Church, but would obey the decrees of the eight universal councils. He argued that it was the Bishop of Rome who had alienated England from the ancient decrees and that he advanced his own power.¹⁶ Tunstall wrote that Henry was restoring the church to the condition in which the church had been in the beginning.¹⁷ "The King's Grace goeth about to reform his Realme and reduce the Church of England unto that state that both thys realme and all other wer in at the begynnyng off the Faith and many hundredth yere aftyr."¹⁸ The meaning of royal supremacy is best understood in the correspondence between Pole and the most conservative bishop. Chibi argues that Tunstall presented the standard position on royal supremacy. He further mentions that the response was not only from Tunstall, but that other committee members—John Stokesley, Thomas Cromwell, and Thomas Starkey—had written a letter as well.¹⁹ This author agrees with Chibi that the conservative bishops' response to Pole demonstrated their loyalty to the king in practice.²⁰

In his book, Reginald Pole, a relative of Henry, demanded that he return to Roman Church. At the same time, Queen Anne's death, Henry's marriage to Jane Seymour, and the succession had to be resolved. In the midst of the pope's threat, Henry's attitude towards the General Council also changed. He no longer thought it safe to attend a council in which the pope might overturn his divorce, which would be to his disadvantage. Even the English bishops supported Henry in this and agreed that the king should indict the council, not the pope, as the former emperors had done. All these factors influenced King Henry's decisions on whether to expect a positive outcome from the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations or to formulate a doctrinal position independently. The discussion of the General Council resulted in the Wittenberg Articles, to which Henry, advised by Stephen Gardiner, disagreed. Henry needed to make an independent statement in case the pope would indict the council.

The Succession and the General Council

The interpretation of the succession law became complicated after the deaths of the first two queens. After the death of Queen Anne, the succession question had to be resolved in favor either of Lady Mary or Princess Elizabeth.²¹ As the parliamentary session would end at the end of June 1536, there were still great hopes among the Catholic powers in Europe that the succession question could be resolved to Mary's benefit and that she would regain her legal right to the English throne. They drew their conclusion from the facts that the king was becoming friendlier toward her and corresponded with her, and that the English people universally loved

¹⁶ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P. 385; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. LII, pp. 480–481.

¹⁷ Tunstall to Pole, July 13/14, 1536. Correspondence of Reginald Pole, No. 101, p. 100.

¹⁸ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P. 385; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. LII, p. 481.

¹⁹ Chibi 2003, pp. 176–180.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 180.

²¹ Elton notes that this new Second Succession Act repealed the Act of 1534 and allowed the king to designate the heir at his will. The purpose of this Act was to defeat Princess Mary's party in their hope that by overthrowing Anne, Mary would be the legitimate heir. Elton sees the crisis of 1536 as a break-up of the anti-Boleyn alliance. Elton 1977, pp. 254–255. McEntegart sees that the Boleyn execution had caused England to enter a new phase in faction politics as the tensions became open in 1536–1537. If indeed anti-Protestant sentiment remained after the execution of Anne Boleyn, the Germans wanted to find out if there was enough support for Protestants in England. McEntegart 2002, pp. 74–75, 92.

her. In May 1536, Bailly of Troyes hinted to Cromwell that the possibility of a marriage between Mary and the Duke of Angoulême might be revived.²² Henry then requested Wallop and Gardiner, his ambassadors to France, to find out if Francis was sincere about this offer. But when the French made the proposal in earnest that November, Henry turned them down.²³

The issue of Lady Mary's succession will be examined closely in this chapter because it influenced Henry's relations with the European Catholic powers. Lady Mary promised obedience and fidelity, as seen in the letter quoted below.²⁴ But she opposed the succession law. While her letter of submission reconciled her with Henry, it still would not change her status from illegitimate as long as she refused the oath.²⁵

Bernard thinks that Mary's confession was aimed at reconciling with her father, stating that she admitted that her mother's marriage had been incestuous and unlawful, that she was a bastard, and her father was the supreme head of the church.²⁶ On June 10, Lady Mary wrote a submissive letter to Henry, imploring forgiveness:

And albeit I have alreedy (as I truste in God) upon myn humble and hartly sewte and submyssyon, requyryng mercy and forgiveness for myne offencys to Your Majestye, obtained the same, with lycence to write unto you; wherby I have also conceived great hope and confidence that Your Grace, of your inestimable goodness, wyll lyke[wyse]forgyve me my sayd offencys, and withdrawe your dyspleasur conceived upon the same.²⁷

Cromwell, the king's chief secretary, had a new title: Keeper of the Privy Seal, Baron Cromwell. He was at the height of his career, now the king's vice-regent in all ecclesiastical matters. He had the authority to request or force anyone to subscribe to the succession act, even Mary, as seen in his correspondence with her.²⁸ There were two different plans to exclude Princess Mary from succession. First, Cromwell wanted to have Mary declare the oath in order to secure Elizabeth's legal rights under the statute law, since Cromwell probably thought that there was a possibility that Mary would inherit her proper title after her mother, Queen Catherine.²⁹ His plan could not be realized since Henry had divorced Anne, and Elizabeth could not have succession rights either.

Lady Mary wrote that she had received letters from Cromwell, advising her to make "my homlte submyssyone immedyatly to your selfe." She wrote Henry that she had offended "Your most excellent Highenes," and that she had not submitted to the laws of the realm. Probably on June 15, 1536, Lady Mary submitted to the king in her confession:

Fyrst, I confesse and knowledge the Kynges Majesty to be my Sovereigne Lorde and Kyng, in the Emperialle Crowne of this realme of England; and doe submyte my selfe to His Higheness, and to

²² Thomas Cromwell to Bishop Gardiner and Sir John Wallop. May 14, 1536. Additional Mss. 24114, Fols. 160–161. Slavin, Arthur J., ed., *Thomas Cromwell on Church and Commonwealth: Selected Letters, 1523–1546*. 1969, No. 35, pp. 90, 92 (hereafter, Slavin 1969).

²³ L&P, XI, No. 304, p. 128; No. 445, p. 180.

²⁴ L&P, X, No. 908, p. 379; No. 1022, p. 424; No. 1212, p. 507.

²⁵ L&P, X, No. 1134, p. 475; No. 1212, p. 507; L&P, XI, No. 43, p. 26.

²⁶ Bernard argues that regardless of her submission, Mary remained a potential threat to Henry. Bernard 2005, p. 87.

²⁷ Princess Mary to King Henry VIII. June 10, 1536. St.P. Vol. I, Pt. 2, XLIV, pp. 455–456.

²⁸ L&P, X, No. 1134, pp. 475–476; No. 1212, p. 507; L&P, XI, No. 43, p. 26.

²⁹ Ibid.

all and synguler laws and statutes of this realme, as becomethe a true and faithfull subjecte to do. I doe recognize, accepte, take, repute and knowledge the Kynges Highnes to be Supreme Head in Earthe, under Christe, of the Church of Englande; and doe utterly refuse the Bushope of Romes pretended authority. I doe freely... recognise and knolledge, that the maryage, heretofore had between His Majestye, and my mother, the late Princess Dowager, was, by Godes lawe, and manes lawe, incestuous and unlawfull.³⁰

Henry and Cromwell had assured Chapuys, and in turn the emperor, that Mary would be declared Henry's legitimate heir.³¹ Second, Henry had an act passed that declared that he had the power to designate his successor at will.³² Another statute was also passed that made it treason for anyone with royal blood to marry without the king's consent.³³ Henry wanted to force Mary to swear to the Act of Succession after he had divorced Anne. All these maneuverings gave Chapuys the impression that by having Mary sign the statute of succession, Henry would make her the legitimate heir—but Henry's urgency to have Mary sign the act was only to deprive her of heirdom.³⁴ The succession act had terminated both Catherine's and Anne's offspring and replaced them with Jane's. The additional act, to designate a successor at will, replaced the succession act's provision during this transitional period.

In a July 5 letter to Bishop Gardiner, Cromwell mentioned Mary's new obedience to the king and that Lady Elizabeth, Anne Boleyn's daughter, had been declared illegitimate by Parliament.³⁵ It is important to note that Mary's succession would have meant that Henry had to retroactively rescind the divorce with Queen Catherine, a return to the Roman Church. Therefore it remained of the utmost importance for Henry to prevent the General Council, as he did not want the pope to have authority over his divorce. He also wanted to be the one convening it. A June 8 letter from Cromwell to Gardiner and Wallop revealed that Henry thought that the council should not be indicted by the pope, but should be convened in an indifferent place and should be free, so that all men could speak their opinions freely.³⁶

The political situation between the king of France, the Emperor Charles, the pope and Henry was filled with various agendas. Gardiner's main function in France was to maintain an alliance with England; and from Cromwell's perspective, this kept him out of the English court as a conservative bishop.³⁷ This was an important issue discussed in the convocation of July 20, 1536. The resolution of the convocation stated that the "Bishop of Rome nor any one prince may by his own authority call, indict or summon any General Council without the express consent, assent and agreement of the residue of Christian princes."³⁸ Shortly after July 23, Cromwell sent the

³⁰ St. P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, XLV, pp. 457–459.

³¹ L&P, XI, No. 219, p. 96; No. 285, p. 120.

³² L&P, XI, No. 40, p. 20; No. 219, p. 96; No. 359, p. 145.

³³ L&P, XI, No. 147, p. 64. The Second Succession Act repealed the Act of 1534, took the succession from the Boleyn faction and gave it to Queen Jane Seymour's heirs; but if heirs were lacking, added a clause that the king would determine the succession. Elton 1977, pp. 254–255.

³⁴ Thomas Cromwell to Bishop Gardiner, July 5, 1536. Additional Mss. 25114, Fols. 175–177. L&P, XI, No. 29, p. 153. Slavin 1969, No. 37, p. 100.

³⁵ Slavin 1969, No. 37, p. 100.

³⁶ Thomas Cromwell to Bishop Gardiner and Sir John Wallop. June 8, 1535. Additional Mss. 25114, Fols. 162–165. Slavin 1969, No. 36, pp. 95–96.

³⁷ L&P, XI, No. 149, p. 65; No. 150, p. 65.

³⁸ The Convocation of 1536 (27 Henry VIII). Session 10. *Records of Convocation*. VII. Ed. Gerald Bray. 2006, p. 241.

king's answer to Bishop Gardiner's letters, asking Gardiner to prevent Francis from agreeing to the General Council indicted by the pope.³⁹ Henry still needed Francis to prevent pressure from the emperor demanding Mary's legal succession.⁴⁰ It seems that Henry interfered in conflicts between Emperor Charles and King Francis for two reasons: 1) to safeguard his succession laws; and 2) to prevent the General Council from being convened by either the pope or the emperor. When Henry later received news that the pope had summoned a General Council at Mantua to which Francis had agreed, he demanded an explanation from the French king.⁴¹ He could not completely ignore the influence Francis had on the Holy See. Chibi argues that Gardiner's mission to Paris to convince Francis not to support the General Council was more detrimental to him as a conservative bishop, as it seemed that he did not uphold Henry's interests (i.e., royal supremacy), but Henry had the political power to demand an explanation when Francis acted against his interests.⁴² As will be seen later, Gardiner did not always support Henry's interests abroad under Catholic pressure.

Henry needed to give to the imperial ambassador Chapuys the impression that he was on the emperor's side; instead Henry declared neutrality between the two Catholic powers (France and the Empire) on August 19, 1536. In reality, he tended to side more with Francis because he needed him as support against the pope to repudiate convening a General Council without England's presence.⁴³

Melanchthon was aware of the pope's plans, as seen in his August 17 letter to Justus Jonas. He thought that the pope would make every effort to join Francis I and Charles V against the German princes. He also indicated that the Saxon Reformers had written a short discussion concerning the proposed synod as a response to the articles presented by the prince (the elector).⁴⁴

Again, Henry declared the abuses of the Bishop of Rome and announced his own supremacy. Chibi argues that the English bishops took a unified Catholic position toward the General Council and believed that its convening was necessary for unity and concord in religion. They agreed and concluded that, in the past, popes had used divine powers wrongly, and admitted that as the emperors had summoned the council, so the king should have the same power.⁴⁵ Thus the English bishops acknowledged the king's imperial powers as equaling those of the past emperors—another sign of their submission.

The discussions about the future council between Henry and the German theologians were interrupted. In the meantime, Henry was occupied with the new doctrinal decisions for the Church of England—the Ten Articles.

³⁹ Thomas Cromwell to Bishop Gardiner, July 23, 1536. Additional Mss. 25114, Fol. 191; L&P, XI, Nos. 151–152, p. 156. Slavin 1969, No. 38, pp. 101–102.

⁴⁰ L&P, XI, No. 149, p. 65; No. 150, p. 65.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Chibi 2003, p. 170.

⁴³ L&P, XI, No. 151, p. 66; No. 305, p. 129.

⁴⁴ Philip Melanchthon to Justus Jonas. August 17, 1536. MBW R 2; MBW T 7, No. 1772, p. 201.

⁴⁵ Chibi 2003, pp. 171–172.

The Ten Articles of Faith

Negotiations between the German and English scholars had resulted in the formulation of the Wittenberg Articles, which never received official sanction either in Germany or England. Nevertheless, they represented an important link between Melanchthon's *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia*, on the one hand, and England's official church doctrine on the other. As seen in Chapter Six, soon after the publication of the Wittenberg Articles in 1536, Cromwell commissioned English translations of Melanchthon's *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia*. The English were unable to agree to all the doctrinal points in the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apologia*, especially issues having to do with doctrine and practices related to questions the Germans held as adiaphora: clerical celibacy, the Lord's Supper, Masses, monastic vows, and the power of the bishops.⁴⁶ Convocation records demonstrate that reforms against the traditional religion were prevalent.⁴⁷ This may partly be the effect of the *Confessio Augustana*, newly translated into English. The format of the Ten Articles follows that of the *Confessio Augustana*, numbering each article.

As the Church of England balanced its religious unity and uniformity as an independent national church during the Reformation, doctrinal compromise was a necessity. Ten Articles of Faith were proposed as a compromise between the conservatives, who followed the old doctrines (while still supporting the supremacy of the king), and the reform-minded clergy, who wanted doctrinal change.⁴⁸

The Ten Articles, officially known as "Articles Devised by the Kynges Highnes Majestie, to Stabylsbe Christen Quietnes and Unitie Amonge Us, and to Avoyde Contentious Opinions," were published on July 20, 1536. Henry wrote the preface himself, which began:

Henry the VIII, by the grace of God king of England and of France, defender of the faith, lord of Ireland, and in earth supreme head of the Church of England, to all, and singular our most loving, faithful, and obedient subjects, greeting.⁴⁹

The king subscribed to the Articles and he gave the reason for their publication:

That not only the most holy word and commandments of God should most sincerely be believed, and most reverently be observed and kept of our subjects, but also that unity and concord in opinion... may increase and go forward, and all occasion of dissent and discord touching the same be repressed and utterly extinguished.⁵⁰

⁴⁶ ApolE, 1536, Fols. 119–141, 158–168, 171–176; ApolL 1531, pp. 316–404; CAE 1536, Fols. 14–19, 24–28, 29–35; CAL 1530, pp. 85–135; WTA 1536, pp. 58–79. Mentz 1904, pp. 1–7.

⁴⁷ The Convocation of 1536. Session 4. June 1536. *Records of Convocation*. VII. Ed. Gerald Bray 2006, pp. 215–218.

⁴⁸ The reform-minded bishops included the Archbishop of Canterbury (Cranmer) and the Bishops of Ely, Hereford, Rochester, Salisbury, St. David's, and Worcester. The conservative bishops included the Archbishop of York (Lee) and the Bishops of Carlisle, Chichester, Durham, London, Norwich, and Winchester.

⁴⁹ A 10, 1536, p. 233.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

In the preface Henry acknowledged that the clergy in the convocation had done the work of the Articles.⁵¹ The preface clearly states that the king was the author of the Ten Articles; for him the unity in religion as Defender of the Faith was an essential feature of them.

The purpose of the Articles was to create unity and agreement in the church in the things expressly commanded by God, necessary to salvation; and things which God has not expressly commanded, not necessary to salvation, but nonetheless important for order and policy. It is quite remarkable that Henry deferred to his bishops.⁵² He delegated his supremacy to the bishops and allowed them to give their opinions on the final draft. But it was the king who subscribed to the articles and made them mandatory for his subjects to obey. On the eve of publishing the Ten Articles, the king wrote a letter, probably on June 25, 1536, against the pope's authority and his followers, setting forth their treasons.⁵³ The letter had two purposes: first, to repeat enumeration of the abuses of the Bishop of Rome and second, to unite Henry's imperial crown to his supremacy of the Church of England "immediately under God," to which the clergy had consented in convocation.⁵⁴ Schofield suggests that Cromwell and Cranmer were the authors of the Ten Articles.⁵⁵ This author disagrees, because the articles were designed for the purpose of unity, which repeatedly was Henry's theme during the early years of reforms, and based on the preface in which he stated the "divines of the kingdom had come together to design a new doctrine." King Henry must have heard the opinions of his bishops, and based on them accepted the final form of the Ten Articles. It was extremely important to declare the doctrinal position of the Church of England for the purposes of the king's foreign relations, as the threat of the pope's sentence of excommunication was still real. The king's resolve to have the Ten Articles published soon after the Wittenberg negotiations ended may indicate his disappointment in the Lutheran position regarding his divorce, and that the English ambassadors had been unable to find agreement on the conflicting articles regarding the Mass, communion in both kinds, marriage of the clergy, and monastic vows. Gardiner's negative opinion of Henry's joining the Schmalkaldic League may also have been a factor.

An additional motivation for Henry to speed up publication of the doctrinal position of the Church of England may have been the difficulty he had in maintaining uniformity of religion in the naval base at Calais, his farthest stronghold preventing foreign invasion. Even though it was part of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Canterbury, it had its own divisions in religious worship and extreme politics in religion was not uncommon.⁵⁶

The unity of religion was important for Henry. None of the conflicting articles appear in the Ten Articles. The doctrines presented are those of the sacraments and justification by faith. The doctrine of adiaphora is found in the section, "Not necessary to salvation" including "Rites and Ceremonies." Melancthon's influence was seen in the doctrine of justification by faith. Therefore it is possible to deduce the adiaphora, comparing the doctrine of justification with the

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 233–235.

⁵² A 10, 1536, pp. 233–234.

⁵³ The king wrote the letter after the executions of Fisher and More [June 26, 1535], probably written in 1536? Cott. Library, Cleop. E. 6. P. 214; Burnet, Book II, No. XXXII, pp. 455–457.

⁵⁴ Cott. Library, Cleop. E. 6. P. 214; Burnet, Book II, No. XXXII, pp. 455–457.

⁵⁵ Schofield 2006, pp. 60–61.

⁵⁶ Cromwell to Lord Lisle. March 3, 1536. Slavin 1969, No. 69, p. 186.

one in the *Loci Communes* and Wittenberg Articles. The proposal for the marriage of priests was in the convocation record, in which the reform-minded clergy had recommended marriage over celibacy. Information is lacking as to how it was implemented in practice.

Opinions differ as to how the Wittenberg Articles were used by English theologians in the formulation of the Ten Articles. Most probably, the reform-minded clergy were influenced by some of the Wittenberg Articles in their compilation of the Ten Articles. McEntegart's argument that the Wittenberg Articles were a source for the English settlement should be treated with caution.⁵⁷ He does not deny that they had some influence in English religious formularies of 1536 and 1537; he is open to the idea of the influence of the *Confessio Augustana*, but not so open to the conflicting articles, of which he says that even with the break with Rome, Henry was still suspicious of Lutheranism.⁵⁸ However, McEntegart does not present any comparison of the contents of those Wittenberg Articles that were not agreeable to the English. This author disagrees with McEntegart. This study will reveal that direct borrowing of ideas and even phrases from the *Confessio Augustana* through the Wittenberg Articles and *Loci Communes* influenced the format and contents of the Ten Articles. McEntegart finds that the Ten Articles borrowed from the *Loci Communes* and the *Confessio Augustana*.⁵⁹ Even though the Ten Articles closely follow the *Loci Communes*, they omit the forensic aspect of justification. McEntegart gives more value to the Wittenberg Articles contracted between the English embassy and the Schmalkaldic League. It is unclear whether the Wittenberg Articles were finalized by the time the Ten Articles were published. Certainly the ambassadors were able to influence some of the discussions held at Wittenberg and the opinions of the reform-minded clergy.⁶⁰

This author agrees with MacCulloch, who points out that the influence of the Wittenberg Articles was weaker in the latter part of the Ten Articles, namely, in the non-essential matters, but the first five closely followed the *Confessio Augustana*.⁶¹ Elton has a different view of the relationship between the Wittenberg Articles and the Ten Articles. He sees the Wittenberg Articles as a distinctly Protestant formulary with which the king had nothing to do. He regards the Ten Articles purely as an announcement of the king's title as Supreme Head of the Church. The Ten Articles showed the limit of what the king was willing to accept. This author agrees with Elton that the king was responsible for the definition of doctrine in the Ten Articles. Elton admits that even though in many points that were not Catholic there are touches of Lutheran teaching and an adiaphoristic position, as had been claimed by Thomas Starkey, they have a mostly conservative tone.⁶² John Schofield found that the Ten Articles were diplomatically timed with the queen's death and as a result of the fear of a setback to the Reformation. Schofield also says that they were purposefully ambiguous for the same reason. Henry was not ready to accept the *Confessio Augustana*, but Schofield points out that Cromwell took advantage of the recent Anglo-Lutheran rapport with Melanchthon to further the Reformation.⁶³ The present writer

⁵⁷ McEntegart 2002, pp. 59–60.

⁵⁸ Ibid., pp. 60–61.

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 59.

⁶⁰ Ibid., pp. 59–60.

⁶¹ MacCulloch 1996, pp. 161–162.

⁶² Elton 1977, pp. 256–257.

⁶³ Schofield 2006, pp. 68–70.

disagrees with Schofield, since at that time Melanchthon was disinclined to come to England after Anne's violent death. In this writer's view, with the threat of Catholicism with Pole and the succession question unresolved, Cromwell rather took advantage of the situation to challenge Mary's succession.

Richard Rex sees the publication of the Ten Articles as the first attempt to define what is real worship and what is superstitious. He notes that the Ten Articles did not provide a comprehensive doctrinal formula, but resolved some disputed doctrinal and ceremonial questions. In his opinion, the Ten Articles tries to solve disputed questions of practice and doctrine, and should be interpreted in the context of Cromwell's Injunctions of August 1536.⁶⁴ Cromwell as vice-regent would give independent Injunctions as far as Henry allowed him to do so, and if they were in accordance with Henry's aims as supreme head of the church. Rex also asserts that Cromwell modified the Ten Articles in a more radical direction; he sees the articles as the domestic resolution to the existing conflict between popular religion and official doctrine.⁶⁵ Furthermore, Rex points out that the content of the Ten Articles was cautious regarding adiaphora matters in the ceremonies; it was explained, in Erasmian fashion, that the purpose of the ceremonies was to put people "in remembrance" of the spiritual things they signify. In his Injunctions, Cromwell emphasized that the ceremonies were "not necessary to salvation." Rex regards the Ten Articles as Catholic, minus the doctrine of purgatory and the saints.⁶⁶ This author disagrees with Rex in that any strict confessional statement is inadequate to describe them, since they were influenced by various continental documents, combined with the traditional understanding of doctrine and practice in the English Church.

This author agrees with Bernard, who sees the Ten Articles as a middle position on ceremonies; they are to be used without superstition and interpreted in different ways. The Ten Articles were supposed to be the final definition of the king's doctrine, even if ambiguous and contradictory; any dissent from them would be heresy and treason.⁶⁷

Elton agrees, and further discusses the political ideas in Starkey's "An Exhortation to the people instructing them to unity and obedience," published in 1536. Starkey discussed the ideas of a national state and the church as subject to the rule of constitutional monarchy. He addresses finding the "middle way" between the radical reforms and conservative religion. The moderation, *via media*, as Starkey called his political ideal, depended on the principle that not all demands of religion were equally necessary to salvation. Elton sees the influence of Erasmus in the English discussion, but he ascribed more influence to Melanchthon and Bucer, whose ideas were worked out by Thomas Starkey. He further noted that the concept of adiaphora remained a center that balanced both unity and obedience when decisions concerning things not necessary to salvation were being made during the Reformation.⁶⁸ This author sees the Ten Articles as mostly Lutheran, especially in its doctrine of justification by faith and its format, having a similar structure to *Confessio Augustana*.

⁶⁴ Rex 2006, pp. 11, 72.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 73, 79.

⁶⁷ Bernard 2005, pp. 281–292.

⁶⁸ Elton 1977, pp. 165–167; Elton 1985, pp. 193–194.

During the negotiations, it was the reform-minded clergy, led by Thomas Cranmer, which was most influential in the formulation of the Ten Articles. Cromwell was the vice-regent of both temporal and spiritual affairs in the church and the state. The absence of Stephen Gardiner as ambassador to France enabled the reform-minded clergy to have more influence, both in convocation and Parliament.⁶⁹ Even though the reform-minded clergy were influential, the fact remains that King Henry made the final decisions on the articles.

The conservative clergy had a voice, even though the pope's authority in England had been rescinded by statute law. The conservatives still wished to maintain their Catholic beliefs and practices. But Cranmer strongly wanted to make doctrinal reforms in conformity with Scripture, and also reform the English Church away from old papal customs and practices.

The Ten Articles included three sacraments instead of the traditional seven, and comprised the following: (1) The principal article concerning our faith; (2) The Sacrament of baptism; (3) The Sacrament of penance; (4) The Sacrament of the Altar; (5) Justification; (6) Of images; (7) Of honouring of saints; (8) Of praying to saints; (9) Of rites and ceremonies; and (10) Of purgatory.

The articles discussed in this study are: (5) Justification; (6) Of images; (7) Of honouring of saints; (8) Of praying to saints; and (9) Of rites and ceremonies.⁷⁰

Articles Necessary and Not Necessary to Salvation

The purpose of the articles, wrote Henry, was to affirm the word and commandments of God, to provide unity in religion, and to extinguish any discord.⁷¹ In addition, the purpose was to distinguish between articles necessary to salvation—the first five, based on the canon of the Bible and the three Creeds, and the second five, those not necessary to salvation, called “the Laudable Ceremonies used in the Church,” involving only ceremonies and political order.⁷² The article on justification by faith belongs to the first part, i.e., the articles necessary to salvation; all other articles from the second part—not necessary to salvation except for the article on purgatory—will be examined later.

Concerned about the diversity of opinions on religious matters, Henry wanted to see a speedy resolution of these by the English bishops. Since the bishops had lost their power to define doctrine to Henry, it was important to note that Henry himself could be the final author of the doctrinal formulations of the English Church. In the discussions that followed, the conservatives, especially the Bishop of London, supported the principles of Scripture and Tradition, according to which oral tradition was regarded as equivalent in authority with Scripture. The opposing camp, the reform-minded bishops, supported the principle of Scripture alone, according to which

⁶⁹ See his correspondence to advise Henry of the matters concerning the Schmalkaldic League. Gardiner to Cromwell, c. middle of February 1536, Harl. 283, 137–141; Cleop. E, v, 226; L&P, X, No. 256, p. 93; *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, No. 53, pp. 71–75. See also his correspondence with Cromwell. Cromwell to Bishop of Gardiner and Sir John Wallop. May 14, 1536. Slavin 1969, No. 35, pp. 89–94.

⁷⁰ A 10, 1536, pp. 235–248.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 233.

⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 233–234.

the arguments of the Church Fathers were secondary to Scripture, and oral tradition was excluded.

The dispute eventually ended in a doctrinal compromise. The conservatives were able to retain the rituals of praying to and invoking the saints, as well as their belief in purgatory. The reform-minded bishops were able to reduce the seven sacraments to three (baptism, penance, and the Eucharist) and adopted features concerning justification by faith from both the Wittenberg Articles and the *Loci Communes*—in the latter case, almost verbatim.

The purpose of the Ten Articles—unification of the country—differed from the Wittenberg Articles. The Ten Articles did not attempt to remove any of the ceremonies or rites, but to explain their meaning. The most advanced position was the division of the articles into two sections: those necessary to salvation and those not necessary to salvation. Thus one may see the influence of Melancthon, from the *Confessio Augustana* through the Wittenberg Articles and the *Loci Communes*. One has to refer to Article X of the Wittenberg Articles to interpret Article Nine of the Ten Articles, “Rites and Ceremonies.” Since the doctrine of the sacrament of the altar was ambiguous, the Mass’s interpretative guidelines remained unclear. There were no changes of contents in the articles concerning the saints. They had been moved to a position of “articles not necessary to salvation.” Justification by faith was associated with the sacrament of penance, and followed the Wittenberg Articles. Since the Ten Articles were promulgated by parliamentary law, Melancthon found the interpretation of the doctrine of adiaphora problematic.

Article Five: Justification by Faith

In this section, the writer will present the article on justification in order to discern the similarities to and differences from Melancthon’s concept of justification by faith in *Loci Communes* of 1535, and the Wittenberg Articles of 1536.

Article IV of the Wittenberg Articles was called “penitence and justification.” As seen in Chapter Five, Melancthon demonstrated that he had not deviated from the old church’s threefold structure on the sacrament of penance, but only inserted new meanings—retaining “contrition,” but replacing “confession” with “faith,” and “satisfaction” with “newness of life,” or “new obedience.” Melancthon firmly believed this was the teaching and consensus of the Catholic Church.⁷³ When evaluating the doctrine of justification by faith in the Ten Articles, one may perceive that the sacrament of penance is not combined with the article on justification by faith, but is separate, the third of the Ten Articles.

Therefore it is necessary to compare the structure of the sacrament of penance with that of the Wittenberg Articles. The sacrament of penance in the Ten Articles has the words “contrition,” and “confession,” but replaces “satisfaction” with “the amendment of the former life, and new obedient reconciliation unto laws of God.” The structure is similar, but the third part follows the idea of “new obedience” expressed in the Wittenberg Articles and the *Loci*

⁷³ WTA 1536, Article IV, pp. 26–30; Bray 2004, pp. 124, 126.

Communes.⁷⁴ However, when we look at Article V of the Ten Articles there “contrition” is combined with “faith,” according to Article IV of the Wittenberg Articles.⁷⁵

The first part of Article V speaks of justification in terms of remission of sins and reconciliation or acceptance of the person to eternal life, because of Christ and renovation in Christ.⁷⁶ “Grace,” that is God’s favor, is imputed to the believer and she/he is accepted or reputed righteous. The external righteousness of God is imputed in the remission of sins and a person is reconciled. As seen below, the sentence describing the forensic aspect of justification in the *Loci Communes* is missing in the Ten Articles. Article IV of the Wittenberg Articles imputes a person as righteous, an extrinsic work of God, and emphasizes God’s grace as free gift.

Justification signifieth remission of our sins, and our acceptation or reconciliation into the grace and favour of God, that is to say, our perfect renovation in Christ. (A10 1536, V, p. 242.)

Justification signifies remission of sins and reconciliation or acceptance of the person to eternal life. For to justify is a forensic word among the Hebrews, so that when I say “the Roman people justified Scipio when he was accused by the tribunes,” that signifies that they absolved him, or pronounced him “just.” (LC 1535, Fol. 167L.)⁷⁷

The faith is necessary, whereby we believe that our sins are forgiven us by God and that we are justified and considered just, and become sons of God, not because of the worth of our repentance or our other works, but freely because of Christ. (WTA 1536, IV, p. 28.)⁷⁸

As seen above, the *Loci Communes*, the Wittenberg Articles and the Ten Articles all emphasize that justification is obtained by God’s grace without any works, not even *propter dignitatem contritionis*. The last phrase in the Ten Articles “our perfect renovation in Christ” eliminates the distinction between *iustificatio* and *regeneratio* in Article V of the Ten Articles.⁷⁹ Thus again the idea of the “renovation” in Article V, could be seen as an emphasis on the replacement of “satisfaction” as in Article III, on the sacrament of penance.⁸⁰ In that sense, the structure of the Ten Articles resembles the medieval process of justification in which new concepts are integrated and modified.

We look at how the gracious gift of God in reconciliation is accepted by the believer. The question arises from the statement of the Ten Articles in the phrase “faith conjoined with charity.” How are we to interpret “charity” with justification? Are “good works,” using Melancthon’s formulation, or “charity” as expressed in the Ten Articles, parallel or consequential to justification? This author agrees with Schofield, who points out that the phrase “faith joined in charity” is not quite the same as the Catholic concept of faith formed or perfected

⁷⁴ A 10, 1536, III, p. 238; Bray 2004, pp. 166–167; LC, 1535, Fol. 190L. WTA 1536, IV, pp. 26–30; Bray 2004, pp. 125–126.

⁷⁵ A 10, V, pp. 243; Bray 2004, p. 170; WTA 1536, IV, p. 28; Bray 2004, p. 125.

⁷⁶ LC 1535, Fol. 167L.

⁷⁷ *Iustificatio significat remissionem peccatorum & reconciliationem seu acceptationem personae ad uitam aeternam. Nam Ebraeis iustificare est forense uerbum, ut dicam populus Romanus iustificauit Scipionem accusatum a Tribunis, id est absoluit, seu iustum pronunciauit.* LC 1535, Fol. 167L.

⁷⁸ *Fidem necesse est, qua credimus, nobis ipsis, a Deo remitti peccata et nos iustificari ac iustos reputari et fieri filios Dei non propter dignitatem contritionis aut aliorum operum, sed gratis propter Christum.* WTA 1536, Article IV, p. 28; Bray 2004, p. 125.

⁷⁹ A 10, 1536, p. 242; LC, 1535, Fol. 167L; WTA 1536, IV, p. 28; McGrath 1998, p. 287.

⁸⁰ A 10 1536, III, Bray 2004, p. 167; A 10, V, p. 243; Bray 2004, p. 170.

by charity. If charity is a consequence of faith, it then can be read as Melanchthon wrote in *Loci Communes*.⁸¹

Faith is central to Article IV of the *Confessio Augustana*, as stated: “this faith God imputes as righteousness in his sight.” The central role of faith when men are imputed righteousness is seen in the documents below. At the same time the *Loci Communes* and the Wittenberg Articles speak of faith that receives “remission and reconciliation.” In the Wittenberg Articles the idea of imputation (*reputari*) is prevalent. Faith in the Wittenberg Articles is seen as the second part in the structure of penitence, with “contrition” being the first and “new obedience” the third part, as Melanchthon combined penance with the article of justification. Melanchthon closely follows the old church structure when explaining justification and penance.

That sinners attain this justification by contrition and faith joined with charity, after such sort and manner as we before mentioned and declared; not as though our contrition, or faith, or any works proceeding thereof, can worthily merit or deserve to attain the said justification. (A 10, 1536, V, p. 242.)

Therefore, it remains for us to gather the witnesses of this opinion, that we freely achieve remission of sins and reconciliation, not because of the worth of our works, but by faith because of Christ. (LC 1535, Fol. 181L.)⁸²

Therefore the second element of penitence must be faith, by which we believe that our sins are forgiven to us by God and we are justified and accounted just and become children of God not because of the worthiness of our contrition or of other works but freely for Christ’s sake. (WTA 1536, IV, p. 28.)⁸³

The third part is how each article looks at the consequences of justification. Good works are produced by the Holy Spirit, which Melanchthon called *regeneratio* in *Loci Communes*. The Ten Articles, the Bishops’ Book, and the Wittenberg Articles agree with the *Loci Communes*, which speaks of the Holy Spirit producing “inward good works and outward civil works, new motions, renovation and new obedience,” as a consequence of justification. Thus, neither document seems to have made any distinction between the aspects of “regeneration” and “renewal.” There is clear reference to good works as part of the state of being justified obtained during the Christian life. Even though the Ten Articles does not speak explicitly of “regeneration” but “renovation” instead, the former is implicitly expressed in the Article stating that the Holy Spirit produces new life. In the passages below, the *Loci Communes* and the Wittenberg Articles speak of justified faith producing “good impulses and new obedience.” The Ten Articles agrees, but explicitly states that renewal brings out “outward and civil works”; that particular phrase is not in the *Loci Communes* or in the Wittenberg Articles.⁸⁴

God necessarily requireth of us to do good works commanded by Him; and that not only outward and civil works, but also the inward spiritual motions

And unskilled folks are in error, when they dream that remission of sins accrues to the idle in this way, without any true of movement of the spirit, without

And since the Holy Spirit worketh with power, He then creates new promptings in our hearts, stirrings which agree with God’s Law, namely, faith, the

⁸¹ Schofield 2006, pp. 74–75.

⁸² *Restat igitur ut colligamus testimonia huius sententiæ, quod gratis propter Christum fide, non propter dignitatem nostrorum operum, consequamur remissionem peccatorum et reconciliationem.* LC, 1535, Fol. 181L.

⁸³ *Ideo secundum partem paenitentiae esse fidem necesse est, qua credimus, nobis ipsi a Deo remitti peccata et nos iustificari ac iustos reputari et fieri filios Dei non propter dignitatem contritionis aut aliorum operum, sed gratis propter Christum.* WTA 1536, IV, p. 28; Bray 2004, p. 125.

⁸⁴ A10 1536, V, p. 243; LC 1535, Fol. 190L; WTA 1536, IV, pp. 28, 30.

and graces of the Holy Ghost.
(A10 1536, V, p. 243.)

effort, without the consolation of faith for their souls. And since, as I will tell later, the Holy Spirit brings new life and new impulses with that consolation, this renovation is thus called renewal and regeneration, and new obedience ought to follow. (LC 1535, Fol. 190 L.)⁸⁵

love of God, the fear of God, hatred of sin, the steadfast purpose of avoiding sin, and the other good fruits... Therefore justification, which comes about through faith in the manner described, is renewal and regeneration. (WTA 1536, IV, pp. 28, 30.)⁸⁶

In summary, the doctrine of reconciliation by faith is stated in the Ten Articles; that is, by faith one is justified without works. Melancthon's forensic aspect of justification is missing in the Ten Articles, as the concepts of "renovation" and "new obedience" include "outward civil works." The last phrase is a modification of Melancthon's concept of "new obedience" in Christian life. The Ten Articles states that inner obedience is manifested in "inward motions" and "outward civil works."

The current debate on justification by faith has been transferred from the individualistic concept of the doctrine to include unity in the church. As the Second Anglican–Roman Catholic International Commission recognized the role of the church in Christ's saving work in an ecclesiastical context, within its ministry a man is both justified and a sinner *simul iustus et peccator*, through the transformation of the Holy Spirit.⁸⁷ Justification by faith is an individual matter, but also belongs to the church, a redeemed community of faith.

Article IV speaks of the sacrament of the altar, implicitly including both kinds in it and states that "under the form and figure of bread and wine is verily, substantially and really contained and comprehended the very selfsame body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ." The article states that "whoever eateth this body of Christ unworthily, or drinketh of this blood of Christ unworthily,"⁸⁸ would imply that the people received both elements. One may conclude with certainty that the Wittenberg Articles influenced the doctrine of the sacrament in the Ten Articles, including both kinds in the doctrine itself, away from the adiaphora position with which the Roman Church regarded it. The accepted new doctrine of the sacrament also influenced the understanding of the Mass as adiaphora.

Articles Six through Eight: Honoring of Saints, Praying to Saints, and Images

This section speaks of articles that are not necessary to salvation. These articles will be compared with the corresponding articles of the Wittenberg Articles of 1536; that is, Article XVI, "Of the saints" and Article XVII, "Of Images." Melancthon also spoke of the Article on the Invocation of Saints in his *Advice* of 1534.

⁸⁵ *Et errant imperiti, qui somniant remissionem peccatorum ita contingere ociosis, sine aliquot uero animi motu, sine certamine, sine fiducia consolante animos... Et quia Spiritus sanctus affert, ut postea dicam, in illa consolatione nouam uitam, nouos motus, ideo haec renouatio, uocatur regeneratio, & sequi debet noua obedientia.* LC 1535, Fol. 190L.

⁸⁶ *Et cum spiritus sanctus sit efficax, parit iam novos motus in cordibus consentientes legi Dei, scilicet fidem, dilectionem Dei, timorem Dei, odium peccati, propositum non peccandi et reliquos bonos fructus iuxta illud... Igitur iustificatio, quae fit fide hoc modo, ut dictum est, est renouatio et regeneratio.* WTA 1536, IV, pp. 29, 30.

⁸⁷ Wainwright 2004, pp. 252–253, 257–258, 261.

⁸⁸ 10 A 1536, IV, pp. 241–242; Bray 2004, pp. 169–170.

Article XVI of the Wittenberg Articles is called “Of the Invocation of Saints” (in German, *Von dem Heiligen*). The corresponding articles in the Ten Articles are Article Seven, “Of Honoring of Saints,” and Article Eight, “Of Praying to Saints.” Article XVII of the Wittenberg Articles is called “Of the Images” (in German, *Von Bildern*). The corresponding article in the Ten Articles is Article Six, called “And First of Images.”⁸⁹ Melancthon stated in his ecumenical articles in 1534 that worshipping of saints belongs to the human traditions and is adiaphora.⁹⁰

Articles XVI and XVII in the Wittenberg Articles were not among the disputed articles in the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations, because the Germans regarded them as adiaphora. Thus, when the English wrote Articles Six, Seven, and Eight of the Ten Articles, the compilers had accepted the German position on images and praying for the saints in the section called “Laudable Ceremonies of the Church,” which Henry, in the preface to the Articles, describes as “not necessary to salvation.”⁹¹ That these were regarded as adiaphora in the Ten Articles is itself evidence of the development in England from the traditional position concerning practice and doctrine to the reform-minded clergy’s position, even though their basic contents reflected Catholic beliefs.

Articles Six, Seven, and Eight still allowed images in the churches, but warned against their superstitious abuse.⁹² Article XVI of the Wittenberg Articles states that God gave the saints and their good virtues as an example to follow and one should be thankful for that. Article XVI stressed that the only mediator is Christ, and that invocation of saints is against Scripture and the old church.⁹³ In Article Six of the Ten Articles, bishops and preachers were ordered to instruct their parishioners in the right use of images so that no one would be misled into thinking that the purpose of kneeling down before images was to honor God or Christ. Similarly, Article XVII of the Wittenberg Articles warns against the abuse of images. Images were for the unlearned, to replace books for the purpose of learning. Images should not be worshipped or invoked, but should be recognized as adiaphora matters, indifferent to salvation. Article XVI stresses right spiritual worship of God alone in His Word and Sacraments.⁹⁴ Articles Six through Eight are in the section entitled “Articles Concerning the Laudable Ceremonies used in the Church,” and are in themselves an indication that the Ten Articles were part of a major change. The contents of the articles are mixed. They have Catholic traces with some warnings against abuse and idolatry as a positive direction toward adiaphora. Articles Six through Eight depart from Melancthon’s position in the *Advice* of 1534. Melancthon noted that in old prayers, God was invoked, not the saints. The saints, he said, pray for us just as pious men pray for the universal church.⁹⁵

Although Article Six allows images in the churches, it calls for bishops and preachers to warn their parishioners that the images do not have any power to persuade or control God.⁹⁶

⁸⁹ A 10 1536, VI, VII, VIII, pp. 243–245.

⁹⁰ Melancthon’s opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume de Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 135.

⁹¹ WTA 1536, XVI, XVII, pp. 77–79; A 10, 1536, VI, VII, VIII, pp. 243–245.

⁹² Schofield 2006, p. 69.

⁹³ WTA 1536, XVI, XVII, pp. 77–78.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 78–79.

⁹⁵ Melancthon’s opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, pp. 139–140.

⁹⁶ WTA 1536, XVI, XVII, pp. 78–79.

Also, although the images of saints have no power, they serve to remind people of the saints' virtues. Furthermore, praying to saints is allowed, as long as it is not "vain superstition." Article XVII especially rejects the concept of a patron saint.

Finally, salvation and the remission of sins could only be obtained from God through the mediation of Christ.⁹⁷ The adiaphoristic position is easy to detect in the English articles. As long as the contents of what is and what is not necessary to salvation are explained to the parishioners, the old ceremonies may stay; only their new contents will be explained. This stance is much the same as Melancthon had planned to discuss in his ecumenical articles to France in 1534, and what he had suggested in the Wittenberg Articles in 1536—a mediating position in adiaphora matters. Dickens agrees that the Ten Articles presented an adiaphoristic position.⁹⁸

Article Nine: Rites and Ceremonies

In this section, Article Nine, called "Rites and Ceremonies" in the Ten Articles, is compared to Wittenberg Article X, which was accepted by both parties during the negotiations regarding "Of Church Ordinances" at Wittenberg. It will also be compared with Article XV, "Ecclesiastical Rites" in the *Confessio Augustana* of 1530. The purpose is to determine how the corresponding articles on adiaphora matters were understood in the Ten Articles.

Article Nine does not discard adiaphoristic ceremonies, but rather retains them to remind people of the underlying spiritual purpose. Although these ceremonies do not remit sins, they remind people of God, who does. Thus, the practices that the Continental Reformers adamantly regarded as abuses remained in the Church of England much longer, but were gradually reduced to the level of adiaphora.⁹⁹

Article X of the Wittenberg Articles, on Church Ordinances [Ecclesiastical Rites] (*Von Kirchenordnungen*), speaks of the rites and ceremonies and that it is the bishop's duty to regulate adiaphora matters in the church. The purpose of these regulations was for ceremonies to be held without sin, to serve peace and order for the "sake of brotherly love." The Article stresses Christian freedom in order that the parishioners understand that the ceremonies are not necessary to salvation, as does Article Nine of the Ten Articles. According to Article X, consciences are not violated if the ceremonies are not kept. Whoever neglects them should do so in right understanding of the Spirit, not offending others but being moderate in order not to abuse the use of Christian freedom. One should hold onto the old customs, which can be kept without sin, for the sake of peace and unity. Article X of the Wittenberg Articles and Article Nine of the Ten Articles oppose the belief that any of the old ceremonies could earn forgiveness and satisfaction or be necessary for salvation, which is contrary to the new doctrine. Article X of the Wittenberg Articles teaches that regulations instituted by humans may differ from region to region, and will not violate the spiritual unity of the churches, as long as one is united with the correct teaching

⁹⁷ WTA 1536, XVI, p. 78; A 10, 1536, VII, VIII, pp. 244–245. Rex 2006, p. 72.

⁹⁸ Dickens 1991, p. 204.

⁹⁹ A 10, 1536, IX, pp. 245–246. The middle position is left open for interpretation by those who held them to be abuses and those who sought to retain some of them. See Bernard 2005, p. 289.

of the Gospel and the right use of the sacraments.¹⁰⁰ Article Nine of the Ten Articles is silent on this.

The essence of Article Nine of the Ten Articles is that the Church of England did not reduce the old ceremonies, but gave them an interpretation like “bearing of candles on Candlemas day, in memory of Christ the spiritual Light” or “giving of ashes on Ash Wednesday, to put in remembrance every Christian man in the beginning of Lent and penance.” It is further stated in the article that “all other laudable customs, rites and ceremonies be not to be condemned and cast away, but to be used and continued as things good and laudable to put us in remembrance of those spiritual things that they do signify.” At the end of the article, there is a warning that the ceremonies have no power to remit sin, and that it is God who forgives.¹⁰¹ This statement designates the ceremonies as adiaphora, not necessary to salvation.¹⁰² The article agrees with the article on human traditions in the *Advice* of 1534, and Article X on Church Ordinances (Ecclesiastical Rites) of the Wittenberg Articles of 1536. This position further reinforces the Lutheran position of the doctrine of justification as necessary to salvation, and interprets other church government matters such as rites and human traditions as adiaphora, not necessary to salvation. It also affirms what is essential to constitute a church. It undermines the supremacy in the sense that it implicitly states that sacraments and preaching of the Gospel are means to salvation for the communion of the saints in the church. At first it looks as if the only deviation would be the sacrament of penance in the Catholic sense in the Ten Articles. In a closer look at the article on contrition, confession follows the Catholic concept of penance, but “satisfaction” is replaced by “amendment of former life.”¹⁰³ The fact that the Catholic structure of penance had been modified somewhat, can be seen as Melanchthon’s influence stemming from the Wittenberg Articles. Melanchthon tried to apply new concepts to the old structure. Although the disputed subjects presented in the Wittenberg Articles are not discussed here, the major development was the division made between “things necessary to salvation” and “things not necessary to salvation,” in the doctrine of adiaphora in the Ten Articles.

It was unclear during the publication of the Ten Articles whether Melanchthon knew that the bishops did not have authority to define doctrine, and how his view of the civil magistracy in relation to the church would be worked out in England. The Ten Articles do not discuss the civil magistracy as do the Wittenberg Articles. Melanchthon believed that the magistracy teaches knowledge of God;¹⁰⁴ he also believed that civil law should prevent impious practices and

¹⁰⁰ WTA 1536, X, 56–57; A 10, 1536, IX, pp. 245–246.

¹⁰¹ A 10, 1536, IX, pp. 245–246.

¹⁰² The Ten Articles did not mention anything about the Mass, communion in one kind, celibacy, or vows. Schofield 2006, p. 69.

¹⁰³ A 10, 1536, III, Bray 2004, p. 167; Schofield 2006, p. 70.

¹⁰⁴ *Magistratus curare debent, ut pace bene utantur homines non ad luxum, libidines, & caetera uitia, sed regendi sunt mores legibus & disciplina. Item instituendi sunt homines ad pietatem & agnitionem Dei.* LC, 1535, Fol. 445L.

[Magistrates ought to take care that men make good use of peace not for extravagance, pleasures, and the other vices, but so that their conduct is ruled by laws and discipline. In the same way, men should be instructed in piety and acknowledgment of God.]

doctrines, and punish heretics.¹⁰⁵ He essentially assents to Henry's practice of using statutory laws (Acts of Parliament) to put religious persons on trial, and using secular court to punish heretics.¹⁰⁶

This researcher was able to discern Melanchthon's influence on the English in adiaphora matters in two manners: by the historical events delineated, in which the documents were produced; and how Melanchthon's thoughts were transmitted in the English documents above.

Henry Consolidates His Secular and Ecclesiastical Power

The Ten Articles, influenced by the Wittenberg Articles on the question of adiaphora, was promulgated by parliamentary statute. For the conservatives, the Ten Articles represented a compromise and, in their opinion, omitted many of their beliefs. For the reform-minded clergy, the question remained whether these articles would bind consciences, since they were enacted by parliamentary statute. In the final analysis, it was the king who had the power to define adiaphora. The publication of the Ten Articles ended the dispute over authority in doctrinal matters, the dispute between the pope and the king, and the dispute over things necessary to salvation and those unnecessary to salvation, or adiaphora. Verkamp has argued that Melanchthon did not deny the right of the church and civil authorities to legislate in the adiaphora matters, but rejected the notion that they could bind consciences. He supported an orderly procedure on adiaphora matters.¹⁰⁷ The king exercised his authority in both civil and church matters. One may question whether the statute laws are meant to interpret ecclesiastical law on adiaphoristic matters? Verkamp argues that any consideration of using civil legislation to bind consciences is related to the mixture of how civil and ecclesiastical powers were understood during the sixteenth century.¹⁰⁸ The combination of civil and ecclesiastical authority in one person—the king—made it even more difficult to distinguish between civil and ecclesiastical legislation on adiaphora matters. The Articles of Faith were sanctioned by Parliament.

As soon as Parliament had passed the Ten Articles, the convocation agreed to assent to the king in the question of the General Council. On July 20, 1536, the convocation gave its judgment concerning the General Council. It was signed by Thomas Cromwell, the Archbishop of Canterbury; the Bishop of London, John Stokesley; and 13 other bishops and 49 clergy. The main point of their declaration was that neither the Bishop of Rome nor any single prince had the authority to convene a General Council without the consent of other princes and “especially such as have within their own realms ... *imperium merum*, that is to say, of such as have the whole, entire and supreme government and authority over all their subjects, without acknowledging or

¹⁰⁵ Melanchthon's approach to history shows his character in either supporting good laws and the true church, or committed against injustice and persecution. He, however, stressed that God is above history and history is preserved in the church. Wengert 2010, V, pp. 20–21.

¹⁰⁶ *Debent igitur Magistratus prohibere impios cultus & impiorum dogmatum professionem, debent punire haereticos.* LC 1535, Fol. 457L.

[Therefore, magistrates ought to prevent impious cults and the declaration of impious dogmas. They ought to punish heretics.]

¹⁰⁷ Verkamp 1975, pp. 63, 72.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 72.

recognizing any other supreme power or authority.”¹⁰⁹ This indicated that it was very important that the clergy recognize the king’s authority in doctrine, and repudiate the Bishop of Rome’s authority as being above the king’s. The clergy’s declaration gave Henry authority over the pope and other princes to convene a General Council. It was also very important for the clergy to declare their submission to the king’s authority in doctrine in the Ten Articles, which was confirmed by parliamentary law.

Elton sees the influence of Erasmus in the English *adiaphora* discussion, but he ascribes more influence to Melancthon and Bucer, whose ideas were worked out by Thomas Starkey. He further notes that the concept of *adiaphora* remained a center that balanced both unity and obedience when decisions concerning things not necessary to salvation were being decided during the Reformation.¹¹⁰

Melancthon’s acceptance of Henry as Supreme Head of the Church of England, as he wrote in the preface to the *Loci Communes*, was an acknowledgment of both the king’s jurisdictions—secular and ecclesiastical. As the head of the Church of England, in conjunction with his vice-regent Thomas Cromwell, Henry had ultimate power to authorize statutes, injunctions, and proclamations, concerning doctrine necessary to salvation and ceremonies and rites not necessary to salvation (*adiaphora*). His secular powers, on the other hand, could be limited through laws enacted by Parliament. The question arose whether the king’s secular legislation could affect practices that would ordinarily be considered *adiaphora*, and require that they become necessary to salvation because one was required by God to be obedient to the king. Obviously, Henry thought so.

The king’s declaration of neutrality in August 1536 with both France and the empire is evidence of how much security Henry had gained from his new marriage, resolving the question of the succession, and the promulgation of church doctrine by the Ten Articles.¹¹¹ This was the beginning of the autonomous Church of England, still very much part of the universal church.

Following the publication of the Ten Articles, Cromwell issued his Injunctions in August 1536 to enforce them. The injunctions encouraged parishioners, especially children and servants, to recite the Pater Noster, the Articles of Faith, and the Ten Commandments, all in English. A special commission was established by Cromwell to enforce stipulations of the injunctions.¹¹² In his injunctions, he encouraged the parishes to act as patrons to Oxford and Cambridge scholars, to read the Bible, and to do charitable works. He also exhorted the clergy to clearly differentiate between things necessary to salvation and those ceremonies not necessary to salvation, but that were necessary for good political order. Cromwell went further in his instructions than what was written in the Ten Articles. He rejected images, relics, or miracles associated with them, and pilgrimages of saints as superstitious practices.¹¹³ He promoted the king’s supremacy and

¹⁰⁹ *Cranmer’s Miscellaneous*, Appendix, No. IV, pp. 463–464.

¹¹⁰ Elton 1977, p. 165–166.

¹¹¹ Announcing Neutrality with Both France and Empire. August 19, 1536. *Tudor Royal Proclamations*. Vol. I, No. 165, p. 242.

¹¹² L&P, XI, No. 377, p. 150.

¹¹³ The First Royal Injunctions of Henry VIII. 1536. Even the first Injunction is Cromwell’s, although it is called by the king’s name. *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of Reformation 1536–1538*. Vol. II. Ed. Walter

rejection of the pope's authority. He pursued an educational program to encourage the clergy to instruct and teach the parishioners the contents of the Ten Articles as mandated in Article Nine. This author agrees with Rex, who thinks that the injunctions modified the contents of the Ten Articles in a more radical direction. They thus undermined popular devotional practices, inventing a "new rhetoric" on superstition and idolatry taken on by the Reformers.¹¹⁴

Did Cromwell pursue his own policy when he published his injunctions in August 1536? Cromwell's main concern was to implement the reforms either with the help of the reform-minded party or the conservatives, whoever supported supremacy laws. He was expert in domestic policies and seemed to know how to run the government and reach his goals to reform the administration. He encouraged the clergy to teach the parishioners the contents of the Ten Articles, as mandated in Article Nine. The injunctions thus undermined popular devotional practices.¹¹⁵

Henry had delegated to Cromwell authority in spiritual matters, i.e., to formulate the injunctions. Henry's purpose was that the new religious changes be taught in parishes. It is possible that Cromwell went too far by implying things that Henry did not intend to teach at the early stage of reform. The injunctions were the first attempt to proceed with the *adiaphoristic* position of the Ten Articles to teach the difference between: (a) the articles concerning the doctrine of faith and sacraments necessary for salvation; and (b) the articles not necessary for salvation and not expressly commanded by God (called "the Laudable Ceremonies used in the Church"). All of the sections in the articles begin with the words: "We will that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed to their spiritual charge, how they ought and may use them."¹¹⁶ The injunctions may have had a negative effect in the parishes. Duffy finds that the negative effect of the enforcement of Cromwell's injunctions was growing hostility toward the cult of saints by attacking them as hypocritical. The clergy was not to extol any images of a superstitious nature or follow any pilgrimages of any saint; instead people were to provide for their families and the poor. Cromwell's tone in his injunction was more hostile than the Ten Articles had intended.¹¹⁷

After Henry suppressed the ecclesiastical authority of the English clergy and declared his supremacy over the English Church as well as the state, he had the power to decide what was and what was not *adiaphora*. After the Ten Articles became statute law, *adiaphoristic* questions became more complicated, since the head of state was also head of the church. The conservative party, which gave equal status to Scripture and Tradition, rejected the concept of *adiaphora*. The reform-minded clergy, on the other hand, who gave all authority to Scripture, regarded human law pertaining to matters that related to church policies as *adiaphora*, and that such policies did not bind consciences. Henry worked to keep a balance between these two sides. His main purpose was to maintain a church obedient to himself, and so he did not want to crush the old

Howard Frere and William McClure Kennedy. 1910, pp. 5–6 (hereafter, *Visitation Articles* 1536). *Cromwell's Injunctions to the Clergy*. August 1536. Cromwell's Letters. Vol. 2, No. 159, pp. 25–29.

¹¹⁴ Rex 2006, p. 73.

¹¹⁵ *Visitation Articles* 1536, pp. 1, 2–11. *Cromwell's Injunctions to the Clergy*. August 1536. Cromwell's Letters. Vol. 2, No. 159, pp. 25–29.

¹¹⁶ A 10, 1536, pp. 233–235, 235–247.

¹¹⁷ Duffy 1992, p. 398.

structures and customs too quickly. The ceremonial cult of relics was being abused. Therefore, the first step in reducing the abuses of the ceremonies related to relics and images was to educate the clergy and to differentiate what was abuse and what not.

Even though the Articles did not mention of the authority of clergy, the convocation records of 1536 demonstrated that the sacrament of holy orders was discussed by the reform-minded clergy, who deviated from the present practice and supported priestly marriage. It defined the ministers' duties to teach the new doctrine, administer the sacraments, loose and absolve sins of penitent persons, and bind and excommunicate,¹¹⁸ very much as the ministers' duty was expounded in the *Confessio Augustana*.¹¹⁹

Whether the Negotiations in Germany Influenced the Ten Articles

It would have been natural to continue the negotiations regarding unresolved issues that were left open in Wittenberg in April 1536. Certainly there was correspondence, and the Saxon Reformers wanted to know how much Henry was interested in adopting their confession. Melanchthon had formed a good opinion of Nicholas Heath, and it must have been reciprocal since Heath corresponded with Melanchthon later that year.

On August 29, 1536, Heath wrote to Melanchthon¹²⁰ that Christopher [Mont], who was left to handle their business after they had to leave Frankfurt in April 1536, must have told Melanchthon about how far they had progressed in Germany.¹²¹ They had not received any word regarding whether an embassy would be sent before they left. But the allied states promised to inform the king of their opinion after the embassy's departure. In Heath's opinion, the delayed response from the German princes hindered their mutual business.¹²² Since he and Fox were unable to obtain any response from the allied states, they had had to return to England. The princes promised to inform the king of the unified mind of their allies as soon as they were able to come to an agreement after their departure.¹²³ Heath wished that the allies had sent orators to the king immediately after the conference, since in his opinion it would have benefited the German princes as well as the king.¹²⁴ At that time, Heath reasoned, the king would have been more inclined to accept their offers, rather than after they had responded to his request with difficulty and delay. The allied princes should have accepted his offer with "open arms" and not made any hindrances to such great offers from the king, but the situation could no longer be changed, Heath wrote.¹²⁵ His opinion is based on their expectations of the negotiations, but decision making by the leaders of the Schmalkaldic League was a slow process, which required that each territorial prince agree to the leaders' proposal.

¹¹⁸ The Convocation of 1536. *Records of Convocation*. Ed. Gerald Bray 2006, pp. 215, 235.

¹¹⁹ CAL1530, XXVIII, pp. 123–124; CAE 1536, Fol. 30R.

¹²⁰ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1776, pp. 206–209.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 207.

¹²² *Ibid.*

¹²³ *Ibid.*

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*

¹²⁵ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1776, p. 207.

It is clear from Heath's letter that the English embassy felt that the Germans should have been more forthcoming and should have better arranged their communication with the English embassy, especially since they represented the king's wish to negotiate mutually beneficial doctrine; about which, according to Heath, the king would have been ready to compromise at that time. It may not have been clear to Heath how large the Schmalkaldic League was, with its southern and northern districts.¹²⁶

The league's decisions were based on the opinion of all the allied states. Besides, they were under the rule of the emperor, and decisions had to come from the princes, not just from the theologians. On the other hand, it was not clear at the outset to John Frederick that after the German and English meetings in Wittenberg, the leaders of the Schmalkaldic League—John Frederick and Philip of Hesse—could not make the final decision with the English without consulting the allied states.

Heath's letter gives more information on his movements after the Wittenberg negotiations ended in April. He describes the situation in England when the ambassadors returned on June 29, 1536, in great detail.¹²⁷ He must have been referring to the process of making the Ten Articles in London. First, he talked about the "the whole Kingdom" which had summoned Parliament. He mainly wrote about the question of who would be the heir if the king died.¹²⁸ Since the archbishop had made the marriage contract between Anne and the king null and void, Elizabeth also was illegitimate, which Heath could not comprehend.¹²⁹ The situation was confusing to others, since the king was maneuvering his political agenda for his benefit. The succession question and obviously hastily formulated first doctrinal statement guaranteed the stability of the English Church against its enemies: the pope and the emperor. For Henry, the Wittenberg Articles represented a disappointment regarding the German announcement on his divorce.

Heath also wrote about the convocation, which he called a synod. He wrote that there had been commotion among the public because of the disagreements among church leaders. The synod had responded to this situation by publishing the Ten Articles, which guided church leaders in how much they might speak of controversial matters in religion.¹³⁰ Heath's agent would bring Melancthon a copy of the articles translated into Latin; it was not a good translation in Heath's opinion.¹³¹ He wished that the articles had been translated word for word in order for Melancthon to get some sense of the actual words used in the text. Many disagreed with the articles, but because the king was present, they had to give their consent in order to calm the commotion among the public. Heath concluded with his wish that his letter would be shared with Martin Luther, Justus Jonas, Pomeranius, and Cruciger, to whom he sent greetings and whom he highly respected.¹³²

¹²⁶ Brady 1998, pp. 115, 120.

¹²⁷ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1776, pp. 208–209. McEntegart quotes the date of the embassy's arrival in England as July 4, 1536. McEntegart 2002, p. 73.

¹²⁸ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1776, p. 208.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*

¹³¹ Heath did not name his agent who had translated the Ten Articles into Latin. Wiederman thinks that Alesius did it and sent the Articles to Melancthon. Alesius resided in England at that time, but found it impossible to accept the Ten Articles. Wiedermann 1986, p. 19.

¹³² MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1776, p. 208.

It is clear from Heath's letter that the delay in decision making by the allied states caused him, at least, to depart from Germany too late to arrive in England in time to influence the formation of the Ten Articles. It is also clear that one reason for the speedy decision making over the Ten Articles was related to public commotion. It is possible that Fox had arrived earlier and was able to be present for the early discussions and brought a message from the negotiations in Germany. But it is evident that many did not approve the Ten Articles, and that it was left for the evangelicals to defend any doctrinal statement close to their beliefs.

McEntegart is cautious, and does not deny that the Wittenberg Articles could have had some influence on the discussions in the convocations of 1536 and 1537. He seems to support the idea that the Wittenberg Articles were kept in storage until a return embassy came to England. There were other writings by Melancthon available in English at that time, such as the *Loci Communes*, dedicated to Henry in 1535, and the *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia*, available in 1536.¹³³ Tjernagel has a different view. He thinks that some members of the convocation had the Wittenberg Articles, since much of their content is found in the Ten Articles, and since Cranmer and Cromwell were able to incorporate Wittenberg theology into the Articles in 1536.¹³⁴ Schofield asserts that the English embassy returning in May from Wittenberg gave the bishops more to talk about or disagree over.¹³⁵ His timing does not match Nicholas Heath's statement that he arrived in London on June 29, 1536. Whether Heath meant Edward Fox too is not clear, but they probably traveled together. It would be hard to imagine that there would have been time to present much of the material from the Wittenberg discussions, but the ambassadors' ideas could have been transmitted in the discussions in England.

At the same time as Henry was enforcing the stipulation of the Ten Articles in the north, Heath, representing the reform-minded clergy, tried to make sense of the failure of the German and English theologians to agree on the Wittenberg Articles. Agreement with the English would have given the Germans more hope as they, too, were pressed by the pope's demands, and unification would have been most welcome. It is obvious that Henry's political agenda differed from that of the Germans. The Ten Articles had just passed in the summer of 1536 and soon after, he was dealing with its aftereffects, the "Pilgrimage of Grace" in the north. On November 20, 1536, in the midst of the rebellion, Henry sent a circular letter to the bishops reprimanding them for their failure to read the Ten Articles and for even speaking against the ceremonies in their dioceses.¹³⁶ Henry asked the bishops to preach new doctrine, declare abuses, explain matters of indifference that were not necessary to salvation, and expound the Ten Articles. He demanded, under threat of punishment, that they teach obedience to God's law, and to the king. The letter specified that no one should act against the sovereign's commandment. The letter also forbade any contempt of ceremonies in private discussion. The threat of deprivation would fall on anyone who did not praise the indifferent ceremonies and read the Ten Articles, and beginning November 15, preachers would be licensed. Based on the custom of the church, the

¹³³ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1607, pp. 423–424; CR, II, No. 1310, pp. 919–920; McEntegart 2002, pp. 58–60. See also Kusakawa 2002, pp. 235–237; Pragman 1980, p. 83.

¹³⁴ CAE 1536, Fols. 2R, 3L. McEntegart 2002, pp. 58–60. Tjernagel 1965, pp. 164–165.

¹³⁵ Schofield 2006, pp. 78–79.

¹³⁶ Ex Biblioth. R. Harley, Armig. *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*. Vol. 9, XXXIX, pp. 150–153.

king indicated that priests who were married should be apprehended and brought to the king's presence.¹³⁷ Duffy notes that, through the letter, the king had acknowledged that the attachment to traditional religion was the reason for the pilgrimage.¹³⁸ Parish indicates that the lower house of Parliament regarded marriage of priests as heresy.¹³⁹ This was a strict, conservative reaction on the part of the king, possibly bending to the demands of the rebels.

On November 28, 1536, Melanchthon, in a letter to Vitus Theodoric, reported that they were awaiting the papal nuncio. He also told him that he had received the English articles, which must refer to the Ten Articles published in July 1536.¹⁴⁰ Alesius seems to have facilitated contact between Melanchthon and King Henry. He had brought Melanchthon's *Loci Communes* to King Henry a year earlier. Wiedermann points out that Alesius had translated the Ten Articles into Latin and sent them to Melanchthon to show him how badly things stood for the Reformation in England. Wiedermann also pointed out that the Ten Articles may have been too difficult for Alesius to accept, who while lecturing at Cambridge dedicated his exegetical work on the Psalms to Henry. Alesius criticized medieval exegesis and approached Scripture in a humanist fashion, close to Melanchthon in his hermeneutical method. At the same time, Melanchthon also gave his impression of the Ten Articles, which he said were disorganized in their composition.¹⁴¹ His estimation agrees with what Heath had written to him: the Articles were published hastily.

Conclusion

The news of Queen Anne's death left Melanchthon undecided as to whether he should travel to England. The evangelical party was in decline, domestic policy in England had changed, and Melanchthon's plans to travel were interrupted. Henry faced two threats from Rome. His attitude toward the General Council changed, and Henry needed to prevent it from meeting as he did not want the pope to retroactively cancel his divorce from Catherine, thus making Princess Mary a legitimate heir. The possibility of Princess Mary's succession increased the Catholics' hopes. Another threat was Reginald Pole's demand that Henry return to the Roman Church. Henry had to work with Cromwell to prevent Princess Mary's legitimacy, which was demanded by the emperor. To protect himself, Henry made succession laws to stipulate that he, as supreme head, had the power to designate a successor. Henry was left with two undesirable choices as far as the council was concerned: the pope leading the General Council, and for it to meet without him present. Henry's most conservative ambassador to France, Stephen Gardiner, who did not always uphold Henry's interest under Catholic pressure abroad, had the responsibility for obtaining the rescission of the pope's council. The English bishops, under the pressure of the situation, designated more authority to Henry and dictated that he had imperial powers, as did former emperors, to call forth a General Council. The bishops had already lost all their powers relating to the church, yet were willing to give even more authority to Henry.

¹³⁷ Ex Biblioth. R. Harley, Armig. *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*. Vol. 9, XXXIX, pp. 151–153.

¹³⁸ Duffy 1992, pp. 399–400.

¹³⁹ Parish 2000, p. 28.

¹⁴⁰ CR III, 1450, p. 104; Wiedermann, 1986, pp. 19, 21, 22.

¹⁴¹ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1813, p. 287.

From this perspective it is not surprising that a new doctrinal formula—the Ten Articles—was published to justify the English Church as independent from Rome, in order to avoid a Catholic threat. This was Henry’s independent statement regarding the doctrine of the Church of England. The influence of Melanchthon’s *Loci Communes* of 1535 and the Wittenberg Articles of 1536 can be seen.

As discussed in this chapter, the doctrine of justification by faith in the Ten Articles follows Melanchthon’s belief as laid out in the *Loci Communes* of 1535, with the omission of the forensic character of justification. The English articles also eliminate the distinction between justification and regeneration, as does *Loci Communes*, in a statement on good works and unjust power claiming divine authority. Thus Melanchthon’s concept of “new obedience” finds more concrete expression in the English articles. Melanchthon’s opinions can be perceived with the addition of the phrase “outward civil works,” further interpreting Melanchthon’s ideas of the civil magistracy being of divine origin.

The Wittenberg Articles influenced communion in both kinds in the doctrine of the sacrament, as it implicitly could be detected in the article on the sacrament of the altar. Thus “both kinds” was acknowledged as belonging to the doctrine of reconciliation, and no longer remained as one of the disputed articles on adiaphora.

The English bishops did not have the authority to make legal decisions about doctrine. Henry responded to the lack of agreement that occurred during the Wittenberg negotiations by writing the Ten Articles, which was the first doctrinal statement of the English Church to deal with adiaphora. It is evident the purpose in designing the Ten Articles was to find a balance between the two religious parties and their different outlooks on doctrine and practice. The human laws stipulated by Parliament complicated the interpretation of adiaphora for the reform-minded clergy. The problem, from Melanchthon’s point of view, was that the Ten Articles were sanctioned by the king in Parliament, which meant that as human laws they would bind consciences. In spite of Henry’s authority, Melanchthon’s influence is seen on adiaphora matters through the reform-minded clergy’s ministry preaching the new doctrine. Since Melanchthon stated in *Loci Communes* that civil magistracy is of divine origin, would that principle apply to the civil leader, who was head both of the state and church? Melanchthon accepted Henry as both leader of secular and ecclesiastical functions. However, his leadership of church and state became problematic, as seen in the interpretation of the Ten Articles. While ecclesiastical functions could not be limited by Parliament, secular powers could. This ecclesiastical environment in England changed the interpretation of the doctrine of adiaphora. Melanchthon accepted that civil laws could define adiaphora matters, but would bind consciences when promulgated by Parliament. However, in the English Church, if the civil magistracy as viewed by Melanchthon was of divine origin, then theoretically parliamentary laws combined with church laws became divine laws.

One may detect from Heath’s correspondence with Melanchthon that during the compilation of the Ten Articles, one could speak of the controversial issues that were left undecided at Wittenberg. Heath expressed the hope that a different course would be adopted after the Wittenberg negotiations. It seems that neither side understood the other, and each was disappointed for different reasons: Henry with the verdict that the Germans gave on his divorce; and the Germans in their hope that the English would adopt their confession. Based on the

doctrine of justification by faith, the adiaphora matters could be interpreted based on the principle of Scripture alone by the reform-minded clergy, not the conservative clergy.

The practical outworking of the Ten Articles was seen when Thomas Cromwell used injunctions to enforce their contents, but overstepped his boundaries and demanded more than the articles had stipulated. As a result, the demand to destroy what remained of medieval culture as superstitious was included in his injunctions. Two different outcomes on adiaphora issues were: 1) the reform-minded clergy adopted their stance on the controversial issue of celibacy and voted for the marriage of priests in the convocation, accepting it under civil rule. 2) A more conservative reaction came from the king, who punished married priests and demanded that they preach the Ten Articles and his supremacy.

As we shall see in Chapter Eight, the new order led to unrest in the northern counties of England, because the conservatives, especially those supporting the pope as supreme head, were unaware of the consequences of the changes in authority in church and state.

Chapter 8:

Rebellion Against Henry's Supremacy in England

(October 1536–March 1537)

Introduction

In this chapter, we examine the reaction in England to the publication of the Ten Articles. A rebellion broke out in the northern—primarily conservative—region of England, where the clergy remained faithful to the pope. As a consequence, the king's supremacy was tested. Local social grievances also played a role in the rebellion, along with the destruction of monasteries and old religious practices. The rebellion gave voice to the north's intolerance of the change in worship practice. Henry thought the rebellion constituted a challenge to his supremacy. Hence, in subduing the revolt, he was determined to destroy the monastic system because he believed that the monasteries were the primary instigators of the rebellion.

The Northern Rebellion

Henry's reaction to the Northern Rebellion was to overturn and dismantle the monasteries. The suppression of small monasteries (those worth less than £200) began in March 1536 and was confirmed by an Act of Parliament on April 24.¹ Rex claims that this was not an attack on monastic life in principle, as certain monasteries that were deemed in good order received a special license to continue.² The king gave assurances, based on an Act of Parliament, that he would not suppress any houses in which moral conduct was acceptable. Rather, Henry said that the act was intended for the "abominable" religious houses that enjoyed profits worth more than six times what the king spent for the defense of his subjects.³

The English writers Richard Morrison and William Tyndale, in "Obedience of a Christian Man," advocated obedience to the king and his laws. They claimed that obedience to even wicked rulers was not contrary to God's law and that resistance should be passive, not active. Richard Morrison observed that a true Christian was obedient, and that the most necessary obedience was to the king.⁴ The rhetoric of obedience to the king's supremacy had been effective in reducing opposition to Henry's reforms.

On the local level, Cromwell's injunctions probably made the new reforms concrete; he declared that the traditional Catholic practices were superstitious. As such practices were closely related to the religious houses, it is probable that the suppression of religious houses provoked

¹ Act for the Dissolution of the Lesser Monasteries, A.D. 1536; *Documents* LXI, pp. 257–268; L&P, XI, No. 385, p. 155; No. 573, p. 227; No. 721, p. 280.

² Rex 2006, p. 47.

³ St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, XLVIII, pp. 463–464.

⁴ Rex 2006, pp. 17–18.

the revolt in northern England. The revolt began in Lincolnshire, where gentry and nobles rebelled against the new order in an effort that Bernard, referring to both Lincolnshire and Yorkshire rebellions, terms the “Pilgrimage of Grace.”⁵ He also asserts that they were rebelling against the king’s supremacy.⁶ One may wonder if the Pilgrimage of Grace was an expression of hostility toward Cromwell’s injunctions, which forbade shrines, images, and relics as superstitious.⁷ In this writer’s view, Cromwell’s injunctions may have enforced exceedingly drastic changes at the local level.

The violent nature of the rebellion gave European Catholic powers the impression that there was all-out war in England’s northern counties.⁸ The rebels were very determined: “We will die in God’s quarrel and the King’s,” they cried. At the rebellion’s peak, the 40,000 rebels far outnumbered Henry’s royal forces,⁹ but despite these numbers, the royal forces would have been able to defeat them had all-out war begun. The king took command of the situation. He gave detailed instructions to both the Duke of Norfolk and the Earl of Shrewsbury on how to proceed in the north to protect “the King’s honor.”¹⁰ As long as the royal forces were able to maintain peaceful cooperation and prevent further confrontation, the king’s honor as supreme head would be maintained.¹¹ The king chose only leaders who would obey his commands without question, as will be seen below.

Henry must have realized that his supreme authority was at stake. Even though it appears that he was in command of the situation, he did not provide the proper means for defense. This shows that he did not take seriously the allegations of the rebels or the leaders he had sent to the north. As a result, the king may have contributed to the rebellion’s vigor by failing to supply the proper means for defense. When another rebellion broke out in neighboring Yorkshire and the king appointed the Duke of Norfolk as high marshal to defend the realm, the duke thought he had a minor task, but, soon learning the extent of the rebellion, he had to use his own resources to defend the king’s honor.¹²

The seriousness of the situation in Yorkshire was exacerbated when many conservative nobles and clergy sided with the rebels or sympathized with them. Lord Darcy, for example, who had been on the king’s side, saw himself not as a rebel, but as their spokesman.¹³ The situation became more confused when Lord Darcy complained to Henry that he had not received adequate money and guns to command the north. Instead of providing additional resources, the king

⁵ The Earl of Shrewsbury, &c. to the Commons of Lincolnshire. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, XLVII, p. 462. Bernard 2005, p. 326.

⁶ The Earl of Shrewsbury, &c. to the Commons of Lincolnshire. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, XLVII, pp. 462. Bernard 2005, pp. 326–328.

⁷ Cromwell’s Injunctions to the Clergy. August 1536. L&P, XI, 377; *Cromwell’s Letters*, Vol. 2, No. 159, p. 28.

⁸ St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, XLVIII, pp. 463–464; L&P, XI, No. 860, pp. 345, 347.

⁹ The Earl of Shrewsbury, & c. to the Commons of Lincolnshire. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, XLVII, pp. 462–463; L&P, XI, No. 585, p. 238; No. 828, pp. 321–325.

¹⁰ King Henry VIII to the Duke of Suffolk and Others. October 24, 1536. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXIII, pp. 493–495; King Henry VIII. to The Duke of Norfolk. October 27, 1536. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXII, pp. 491–493.

¹¹ King Henry VIII to the Duke of Suffolk, and Others. October 24, 1536. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXIII, pp. 493–495.

¹² Wriothesley to Cromwell [Cromwell]. 1536. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2 LIV, pp. 478–480; L&P, XI, No. 793, 308; No. 800, p. 309.

¹³ Bernard 2005, p. 326.

replaced Darcy with the Earl of Shrewsbury and put Darcy in charge of Pomfret Castle.¹⁴ Again, Darcy warned the king that, without prompt assistance, he and his men would be in extreme danger as they defended the castle. The king again dismissed Darcy's request, telling him simply to follow the orders of the Earl of Shrewsbury.¹⁵

Attempts to repair the situation caused more damage to the king, as his most conservative bishop, Edward Lee, was seen among the rebels with Darcy. The king then sent his representative from Lancaster, Herald Thomas Miller, to ask the rebels to lay down their arms. The king then declared a general pardon for 300 to 400 people in Yorkshire. However, Miller never had the chance to pardon the rebels who had occupied Pomfret Castle. Among them were Lord Darcy; Robert Aske, the true leader of the Yorkshire rebellion; and the Archbishop of York, Edward Lee.¹⁶ Of course, Archbishop Lee could not publicly side with the rebels because he was bound by oath to the king. The herald failed to forward the king's message to the rebels and knelt in front of Robert Aske, the leader of the rebellion in Yorkshire. These incidents were interpreted as betraying the king and supporting the rebellion.¹⁷ The herald was later indicted and convicted of high treason.¹⁸ The king was powerless against Bishop Lee and Lord Darcy, but he indicted Miller, who had failed in a mission that was nearly impossible to complete.

Negotiations with the Rebels' Demands

Robert Aske in Yorkshire presented the rebels' demands and grievances as follows:

“Furste, for the Suppression of relygyouse Howses.

The 2 for the Acte of Uses.

The 3 for the Furste Frutes.

The 4 for the payment of money of the Temporalte.

The 5 ys for the base Counsell abowte the Kynge.

The 6 ys for the new Byshopes.”¹⁹

The king responded to Aske's grievances with four points: 1) the rebels were disobedient to him; 2) he appealed to his supremacy laws; 3) the supremacy laws benefitted both the church and the commonwealth; and 4) the government executed only “God's laws” and the laws of the commonwealth, in which he, the king, was head of the church and state.²⁰

The rebels' list shows that they wanted the suppression of monasteries to cease, and they complained about the king's council and the bishops he had appointed. It has been noted that while their intention was to complain to the king, they never complained to him directly. Rather,

¹⁴ Darcy had previously opposed the king's policies in his correspondence with the Imperial ambassador to England. Elton 1977, p. 267.

¹⁵ Wriothesley to Cromwell [Cromwell]. October 1536. St. P., Vol. I, Pt 2, LIV, pp. 478–479; L&P, XI, No. 692, p. 268; No. 749, p. 288.

¹⁶ L&P, XI, No. 793, p. 308; No. 800, p. 309; Bernard 2005, p. 333.

¹⁷ Lancaster Herald's Report. October 1536. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LIX, pp. 485–487; Cranmer to Cromwell. July 21, 1537. Vol. I, Pt., 2, XCII, pp. 560–561.

¹⁸ Lancaster Herald's Report. October 1536. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LIX, pp. 485–487; L&P, XI, No. 793, p. 308; No. 800, p. 309; Bernard 2005, p. 333.

¹⁹ Robert Aske's Address. October 1536. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, XLIX, p. 467.

²⁰ Answer to the Demaundes of the Rebelles in Yorkshire. 1536?. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXVIII, pp. 506–510. The demands answered differ from those presented by Aske. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, XLIX, 1536, p. 467.

they directed their grievances to his appointees. Many of the grievances were social and economic in nature.²¹ From the king's point of view, the rebels were disobedient to his authority. He defended his supremacy laws, saying that the laws benefited both the church and the commonwealth, as "God's laws" were beneficial to both spheres.²² However, the rebels felt that the government, which established new laws and endangered the stability of their religious beliefs, betrayed them. These included serious allegations against the new learning and appeals to have the old church customs restored.

The rebels also wanted certain nobles removed from power, specifically Lord Cromwell, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor, the Bishop of Worcester, and others of the reform-minded party.²³ They noted that Henry's personal matters had motivated changes in the laws and were reflected in his policies. He almost had to enforce his supremacy laws to subdue opposition, as seen in his tactics with the rebels in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire. It is questionable whether he was explicitly defending the doctrine of new learning as he was a firm believer in Catholic doctrine; his stance was more that of a king acting against the violation of his laws.

Henry pursued his objective of persuading the rebels to accept his terms by offering pardons. He pointed out that it was unnatural to rebel against a ruler, because subjects should not demand anything from their king, their protector. Even though he felt that the rebels deserved punishment for their actions, Henry offered pardons to gain their cooperation. He wrote: "We shall take more mercy, pytye, and compassion of you and of your pore wyves, and innocent childern, then your desertes hath merytyd or deservyd; and suche as never Prince Toke of his subgiettes."²⁴ The rebels should trust their king who had ruled over them for twenty-eight years.²⁵

Acquiescence to the rebels' demand to restore the old order would have meant a reversal of Henry's present reform policies. The rebels saw themselves as a strong Catholic element supporting the reversal. Henry's ideas, on the other hand, were exactly the opposite. Even though he offered to pardon the rebels, he warned that he would punish the ringleaders: "To graunt unto you, all, our Letters Patentes of pardon for this rebellion; so that ye will delyver unto Us 10 suche of the ryng leders and provokers of you to this rebellyon."²⁶ Henry was making the point that they had rebelled against his kingly authority, and he was now leader of both the church and the commonwealth.

The major turning point was Shrewsbury and Norfolk's meeting with the rebels at Doncaster on December 5, 1536. The king had reminded the Duke of Norfolk of his strategy of peaceful negotiations: "We should however not to show indignation to them, even they assemble forces, but meet with them in a peaceable manner."²⁷ It would be the king's victory to have the rebels sue for peace, which would protect his shaken authority in the country. The king's appointed

²¹ Answer to the Demaundes of the Rebelles in Yorkshire. 1536? St. P. Vol. 1, Pt. 2 LXVIII, pp. 506–510; Robert Aske's Address. October 1536. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, XLIX, p. 467.

²² Answer to the Demaundes of the Rebelles in Yorkshire 1536?, St.P., Vol. I, Pt 2 LXVIII, pp. 506–510. The demands answered differ from those presented by Aske. St.P., Vol I, Pt. 2, XLIX, 1536, p. 467.

²³ Lancaster Herald's Report. October 1536. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LIX, pp. 486–487; L&P, XI, No. 826, p. 318; SP 1/108, Fols. 231–232; L&P, XI, No. 902, p. 358; SP 1/109, Fols. 245–246.

²⁴ King Henry VIII to the Rebels in Lincolnshire. October 1536. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LI, 1536, p. 470.

²⁵ Ibid., pp. 469–470.

²⁶ Answer to the Demaundes of the Rebels in Yorkeshire. October 1536. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXVIII, p. 509.

²⁷ King Henry VIII to the Duke of Norfolk, and Others. December? 1536. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXX, p. 513.

leaders had to establish a strategy to appease the rebels. Tactics were used and empty promises given in an attempt to calm the fury. Norfolk promised the northerners that the old order would be restored and that Parliament would convene, misleadingly as it turns out as neither promise was kept. Bernard argues that the rebels wished to be pardoned by the authority of Parliament.²⁸ The rebels apparently had more trust in parliamentary action, as it represented the entire nation, and less trust in the king, who demanded obedience to himself.

Prior to meeting with the rebels in Doncaster, Henry had advised his captains to keep the rebels from suspecting his plans.²⁹ The purpose of the meeting was to offer a free pardon and a promise to establish a parliament in the north if they would acknowledge the king's supremacy by oath.³⁰ Certainly the question of the succession played a considerable part in the rebels' claims.

The so-called Pontefract Articles showed the essential religious and social grievances.³¹ The rebels also insisted on twenty-four demands, including that the heresies of Luther, Wycliffe, Husse, Malangton [Melanchthon], Elicampadus [sic], Bucerus, Confessa Germanie, Apologia Melancton, [Melanchthon's *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia*], the works of Tyndall, of Barnys, of Marshall, Raskell, Synt Germaine, and the Anabaptists, should be destroyed.³² The list made by the rebels shows that their grievances referred to the reform-minded clergy and to Melanchthon. The rebels regarded the doctrinal and practical changes in the Church of England as heresy.

The rebels wanted the authority of the Roman See restored. Elton argues that one of their grievances was the deprivation of Lady Mary's succession, and, hence, they wanted Lady Mary restored to legitimate succession. One of the northern magnates, Lord Hussey, had been Princess Mary's chamberlain, and his wife had been imprisoned for her loyalty to Mary.³³ Their demand for Mary's succession would have involved Henry in international politics with the emperor and the pope, who also insisted on restoring Lady Mary's right of succession.

They also wanted the suppressed religious houses restored and freed from payment of first fruits to the government. They demanded punishment for Lord Cromwell, Lord Chancellor, and the commissioners Drs. Legh and Layton. The rest of the demands were related to land rights, taxes, and social conditions in the north.³⁴ These demands reveal the citizens' confusion at both the parochial and local levels. For them, the question of leadership was unresolved. With the king replacing the pope as head of the church, the medieval structure of ownership had changed, and the monasteries that represented that culture were destroyed. Hence, the religious identity of the citizens had changed dramatically. It is no wonder that their inclination was principally to

²⁸ Bernard 2005, p. 350.

²⁹ King Henry VIII to the Duke of Norfolk, and Others. December? 1536. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXX, p. 513; Pardoning Pilgrimage of Grace. December 9, 1536. 28 Henry, VIII. Proclamation 169. *Tudor Royal Proclamations*. Vol. 1, pp. 246–247.

³⁰ Pardoning Pilgrimage of Grace. December 9, 1536. 28 Henry, VIII. Proclamation 169. *Tudor Royal Proclamations*. Vol. 1, pp. 246–247; Bernard 2005, p. 350.

³¹ Bernard 2005, pp. 338–339.

³² L&P XI, No. 1246, pp. 506–507; SP1/112, Fols. 118–127; Bernard 2005, pp. 338–339, 342.

³³ King Henry VIII to the Duke of Norfolk, and Others. December? 1536. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXX, pp. 511–512. Bernard 2005, p. 350; Elton 1977, pp. 263, 267.

³⁴ L&P XI, No. 1246, pp. 506–507; SP 1/112, Fols. 118–127.

blame the leaders—Cromwell, Layton, and Legh—who destroyed their culture. The rebels defended the old church structure and believed this to be what the king wanted. To advocate the restoration of Mary to lawful succession, they thought, was the legitimate way to rebel against anyone who tampered with their religion. They did not understand the change in the church's leadership.

In a letter to Bishop Gardiner and Sir John Wallop regarding putting an end to the Northern Rebellion, Cromwell reported that the rebels at first demanded articles, but eventually surrendered to the king, who then pardoned them. Bernard argues that Gardiner would advise Henry to compromise with the rebels in early 1537. He further argues that Gardiner's choosing such a position was not necessarily open opposition to the king.³⁵ As it turned out, the king did not make any concessions to the rebels, but false promises circulated among them, including that abbeys would not be closed, further taxation would be halted, Cromwell would be surrendered to the people, and heretical bishops would be deposed. Norfolk and Shrewsbury may have made these promises to calm the rebels, without any consultation or permission from the king.

Cromwell wrote to Gardiner and Wallop about the events in the most positive way.³⁶ He would not reveal to Gardiner that false promises were circulating that the old order would be restored, which Gardiner would have supported, or that Cromwell was accused of changing government policies to the disadvantage of the northerners.³⁷

It is quite plausible, as Rex argues, that the rebels became victims of their own good faith and the crown's propaganda, believing that the old religious order would be restored.³⁸ Bernard sees the situation differently. He argues that the king was aware that Norfolk had promised to reverse the closure of the abbeys, as if the king had intended it, to calm the rebels' fury.³⁹ The rebels took this as a royal pardon and promise from Parliament and believed Norfolk was negotiating in good faith.⁴⁰ It is possible that the king truly did not mind the tactics his leaders were using to attain his goal of suppressing the rebellion and quelling opposition to his supremacy.

Reasons for Rebellion

There was a change in obedience to King Henry's supremacy laws and how they were seen in the north. This was the first time that the supremacy laws had been questioned by Henry's own citizens, demonstrating that he could no longer take for granted that his laws would be accepted unconditionally.

Duffy finds that when Cromwell attacked the monasteries, he was attacking institutions that held a central place in popular religious practices. The dismantling of these shrines constituted a

³⁵ Bernard 2005, p. 193.

³⁶ Cromwell to Gardiner and Wallop. December 24, 1536. Add. Mss. 25, 114, f. 237; L&P XI 1363. Cromwell's Letters, Vol. II, pp. 40–42.

³⁷ Bernard agrees and argues that Gardiner would advise Henry to compromise with the rebels as early as 1537; he further argues that Gardiner's choosing such a position should not be seen as an open opposition to the king. Bernard 2005, p. 193.

³⁸ Rex 2006, p. 121.

³⁹ Bernard 2005, p. 352.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 352–353.

serious blow to popular culture, and the destruction was what the visitors hoped to see.⁴¹ People were not consciously aware of the change of leadership in the church or the politics of government and believed that they should defend their loyalty to local institutions, which had brought stability to their communities.

Bernard offers a plausible argument that the reasons for the rebellion were the abolition of saints' days and also the manner in which Cromwell's injunctions were written against shrines and religious images. The suppression of monasteries threatened people's objects of devotion. Bernard further points out that, in Tudor England, the spiritual and material realms overlapped; therefore, in defending the church, the rebels were also defending the commonwealth.⁴² The rebels realized that government policy had changed—although not to the extent of the legal jurisdictional changes made—and that Henry was the supreme head of the church. The rebels were actually opposing royal supremacy without consciously intending to do so. The rebellion proves how slowly the government's new laws had spread throughout the country in the early stages of the Reformation, and how ignorant the people were of the change in church leadership. The religious culture in the north was interrupted by ecclesiastical visitors representing a change in leadership. Eppley argues convincingly that dissatisfaction with central government policies was the primary motivation for the uprising, as the rebels felt that the ecclesiastical visitors, who represented the new government, had damaged the religious culture of the north.⁴³

Rex claims that the grievances were social rather than religious in nature. He does not think that the rebels' grievances were against the Ten Articles; however, the articles could not reassure the public of Henry's reforms, resulting in the rebellion.⁴⁴ Rex adds that people in general tended to defend popular attitudes toward the monasteries and maintain strong loyalty to local institutions.⁴⁵ On the other hand, Chibi and Elton attribute the northern rebellion to a reaction to the Ten Articles, the injunctions, and the presence of commissioners to carry out dissolution. Cromwell's injunctions emphasized obedience to supremacy rather than focusing on the need for bishops to provide instruction regarding the contents of the Ten Articles.⁴⁶ Bernard sees the rebellion as opposition to Henry's Reformation, with the major grievances having to do with religious practices. Furthermore, Bernard asserts that the Pilgrimage of Grace was not necessarily against the Ten Articles themselves.

Henry believed that ignorance and sedition were the root causes of the rebellion and was determined to send preachers to teach "God's Word." This was also one of the reasons he commissioned the clergy to compile the Bishops' Book. Social and spiritual problems were related to the change in doctrine and practice, and therefore overlapped, as Bernard argues.⁴⁷ In this writer's view, the Ten Articles were not the only problem that caused rebellion. Another cause was changes in doctrine and practice as seen in Cromwell's injunctions, which declared

⁴¹ Duffy 1992, pp. 385, 402.

⁴² Bernard 2005, pp. 326–327, 329.

⁴³ Eppley 2007, p. 14.

⁴⁴ Rex 2006, pp. 17, 77, 117–119, 121.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

⁴⁶ Chibi 2003, p. 201; Elton 1977, p. 260.

⁴⁷ Bernard 2005, pp. 293–294, 328, 475–476. Bernard 1998, pp. 335–336.

old religious practices to be superstitious. These were the practices that had maintained stability in the religious houses for years, but they were declared adiaphora by Cromwell's injunctions.

The Rebels' Opposition to New Learning

The rebels were not aware of what the implementation of the Ten Articles meant, and how continental ideas were linked to the new doctrinal changes in the Church of England. On a practical level, they were concerned that their old belief system would soon be gone due to the threat of the destruction of the monasteries. Some of the conservative clergy and religious were somewhat aware of the radical doctrinal changes related to what they called "heresy," including Luther, Wycliffe, Husse, Malangton [Melanchthon], Elicampadus [sic], Bucerus, Confessa Germanie, Apolugia Melancton, [Melanchthon's *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia*], the works of Tyndall, of Barnys, of Marshall, Raskell, Synt Germaine, and the Anabaptists.⁴⁸

The northern people had to understand that any doctrinal changes made in worship practices were to be accepted by Henry, not the pope. From their point of view, the changes were considerable. Originally, the Mass was ordered by the pope's canon law and necessary to salvation. Previous allegiance to the pope was now replaced by allegiance to the king. They must have questioned how they could obey the king, who, in their opinion, supported heretical doctrine and practice. The new practice would have affected the understanding of the doctrine of salvation, the core doctrine of Christ's presence in the sacrament. The doctrine of soteriology, based on the doctrine of salvation by faith alone, regarded the Mass as public worship and, thus, adiaphora.

The most crucial question was the demand to change the monasteries into institutes for education, abolishing the customary view of monastic life being a state of perfection as a result of doing outward "good works." This claim also required a new understanding of the doctrine of justification by faith.⁴⁹ Since the monastic system was gradually dissolved, monastic vows became part of civil legislation. Had the English monasteries remained, the vows still would have been transferred from ecclesiastical to civil legislation. Since the king was head of both church and state, civil legislation could also address either civil or ecclesiastical matters.

Thus it was impossible for the religious to comprehend the combination of ecclesiastical and secular power that Henry held. The conservative bishops had to proclaim obedience to Henry and no longer had the authority to define doctrine.⁵⁰ It was difficult to understand the separation of the church from the state, and to direct the religious person's obedience in matters of faith to the king instead of the pope. Northern conservative clergy had to submit to the supremacy laws discussing adiaphora matters. Although the church's authority had changed, its hierarchical structure remained the same. Changes on the parochial level were minimal; Melanchthon's idea was to retain as much of the old structure of the church as possible, only introducing new concepts into old doctrine and practice.

⁴⁸ L&P XI, No. 1246, pp. 506–507; SP1/112, Fols. 118–127; Bernard 2005, pp. 338–339, 342.

⁴⁹ A 10 1536, pp. 242–243; CAL 1530, XXVII, pp. 12–13; CAE 1536, Fol. 25L, R.

⁵⁰ Bernard 2005, pp. 68–77, 337; The Act of Supremacy, 1534. (26 Hen. VIII, c. I). Dickens & Carr 1967, pp. 64–65.

The dispute seem to have been of the power in the church. Quite the opposite was the opinion of new learning on their understanding on church's authority to the northern Catholics. In Melancthon's opinion, expressed in the *Confessio Augustana*, the disputed question of the bishops' power to ordain ceremonies could be resolved if the bishops maintained traditions that were adiaphora based on the authority of the Scripture. According to scriptural authority, traditions burdened not only consciences, but also the churches. As the ceremonies are not a matter of salvation, one should be agreeable to supporting the Christian liberty of one's neighbor in these matters, was not acceptable to the northern people.⁵¹ Bishops should discontinue those traditions that are against the customs of the true Catholic Church, and in doing so would not destroy the church's structure. The question remained whether to follow the Roman Church's authority or that of the universal Catholic Church, which the Reformers claimed to be the true church.

The Roman Church continued after the split between the East and West. The name "Catholic Church" referred to the patristic church. The universal Catholic Church was both a visible and invisible church that the Reformers referred to as the true church, based on their doctrinal understanding of it.

Henry Establishes His Supremacy in the North of England

It was of the utmost importance to Henry to secure the north and the borderlands under his rule. He feared that some of his own subjects were prepared to welcome his old enemies, including James V, the King of Scotland. There was also the threat of the papal bull. After the rebellion was over, Henry realized that the north needed to have a permanent administration, and he entrusted full authority to the Duke of Norfolk.

In December 1536, Henry prevented James V of Scotland, who was in France to marry Magdalen, the only daughter of Francis I, from passing through England on his way back to Scotland. Henry feared that James would stir up the rebels in the north. The reason he gave, however, was that Henry had promised to hold the coronation for his new queen, Jane Seymour, in York. That event would place heavy taxes on the nobles for the entertainment, and hosting a second royal procession would be an unfair financial burden for them. Consequently, Henry compelled James to return to Scotland from France by sea.⁵² From the decisions and movements he made, it is evident that the king's position had been weakened by the rebellion. He had to find an excuse to prevent any possibility of a Catholic presence in England. The king must have realized that, despite the remoteness of northern England, the compliance or noncompliance of the north impacted his domestic security and resources. Henry had to not only stabilize the northern administration, but also include the northern clergy in any further discussions on doctrinal change.

⁵¹ 10 A 1536, pp. 243–247; CAL 1530, XXVIII, pp. 126–129; CAE 1536, Fol. 31R, 32L, R, 33L; Bernard 2005, p. 337.

⁵² Minute of Council. King James V married Magdalen of France on January 1, 1537 or possibly after this date. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, No. LXXX, pp. 535–536; This is evidenced in the Duke of Norfolk's letter to Bishop Gardiner. The Duke of Norfolk to Bishop Gardiner and Sir F. Bryan. May 18, 1537. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXXXVII, p. 549; L&P, XII, Pt. 1, No. 12, p. 11; No. 399, pp. 198–199; SP 1/115, Fols. 261–262.

On January 26, 1537, Henry assembled the higher clergy and nobles in the Great Council of the North to try to stabilize the situation and maintain quiet and consensus after the suppression of the major rebellion.⁵³ MacCulloch notes that this did not achieve much and may have provoked new uprisings.⁵⁴ The northerners distrusted the king's conciliatory efforts. They felt that the government had created this situation, not them. Another reason for their dissatisfaction was that no date was set for the parliament of the north to meet. There were even rumors that the Duke of Norfolk would levy taxes again upon his return, contrary to the stipulations made at Doncaster.⁵⁵ The rebels believed that the king did intend to hold a parliament in the north, knowing full well that the rebels intended to revoke the laws of the previous parliament.⁵⁶ They also firmly believed Norfolk's promises at Doncaster that the monasteries would be restored. Henry never meant to convene a parliament in real terms, but probably offered a placatory promise, much like the others he had made. At the end of January, several short rebellions broke out in the north, a reminder of how delicate the balance still was. Sir Francis Bigot led one of the most notorious of the short rebellions. The new rebellions that broke out were a natural consequence of the distrust on both sides. The rebels were surely skeptical about Norfolk's promises at Doncaster and whether the old order would be restored.⁵⁷

At the same time, it became vitally important for Henry to move quickly and find the most influential leaders of the rebellion. The northern establishment had a long-term effect on Henry's supremacy. Any elements that had provoked the Catholic powers of Europe against King Henry had to be eliminated. In the case of the pope's aggression against Henry, his strategy involved eliminating any person or any institution that might have ties to the pope or emperor.

Henry did not think it advisable to travel to the north in person, nor did he think it was necessary to have a new permanent parliament. Besides, the rebels had already held their meeting at Doncaster, at which the king declared his pardon for the rebels. It appears that the king was waiting for all the ringleaders to be indicted and punished, and he decided to postpone his visit and the queen's coronation until the summer.⁵⁸

Henry's Dealings with the Ringleaders and the Monasteries

In an effort to gain time to find out more about the rebel leaders, Henry complimented them. On January 24, 1537, he wrote another letter to Robert Aske: "To our trusty and welbeloved servaunt Robert Aske, Escuyer." First, Henry thanked him for helping to subdue the insurrection caused "by the meanes of that traytour, Fraunceys Bigot, and his complice"; but his real intention was to capture Aske.⁵⁹ Henry's purpose in complimenting Aske was to discover the

⁵³ MacCulloch 1996, p. 185.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Answer to the Demaundes of the Rebelles in Yorkshire. November?, 1536. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXVIII, pp. 506–510; L&P, XII, Pt. 1, No. 67, p. 32; No. 137, p. 63.

⁵⁶ Bernard 2005, pp. 350–352.

⁵⁷ Sadleyr to Cromwell [Cromwell], January 23rd, 1537. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXXVI, pp. 526–528. Bernard 2005, pp. 359–362.

⁵⁸ Minute of Council [After January 1, 1537]. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXXX, p. 536.

⁵⁹ King Henry VIII to Aske. January 24, 1537. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXXVII, p. 529. See St.P., Vol. 1, Pt. 2, LXXIV, pp. 523–524. King Henry VIII to Aske. December 15, 1536.

rebels' strategy, which Aske would know from his own experience during the rebellion. Henry was so successful in eliciting all the information from Aske and Darcy in a peaceful way that both thought themselves to be on good terms with the king and that their demands to restore the old order would eventually be honored. However, the king's real intention was to subdue the rebel leaders. As soon as the situation calmed down, it became clear that the king's only purpose was to find the ringleaders of the rebellion and punish them, and make the rebels obey his supremacy.

Henry asked Robert Aske on December 15, 1536 to talk about the circumstances of the rebellion, promising him a reward.⁶⁰ After meeting with the king, Aske believed he was the king's man and announced that all reasonable petitions would be discussed in a parliament in York.⁶¹ Aske believed in the king's intentions,⁶² but, following Aske's positive report of his meeting with the king, the common people were skeptical. Then, the following month, on January 14, 1537, the king asked Lord Darcy to see him. That Darcy hesitated must have been a sign that he knew he was not in favor with the king. He cited his many years of service and excused himself due to a disease that prevented him from traveling. He defended himself for his role in the north, citing lack of supplies and difficulty handling the fury of the commoners, and summarized his view of the rebellion.⁶³ It is possible that he trusted that the king would pardon him, and he firmly believed that his past reputation would protect him.

Henry viewed the rebellion as being against his supremacy laws, and he became involved personally in the indictment of the rebels after investigating and identifying the ringleaders. On February 17, 1537, the king instructed the Duke of Norfolk as to the proceedings:

We shall not forget your services and are glad to hear also from sundry of our servants how you advance the truth, declaring the usurpation of the bishop of Rome and how discreetly you paint those persons that call themselves religious in the colours of their hypocrisy and we doubt not but the further you shall wade in the investigation of their behaviors the more you shall detest the great number of them and the less esteem the punishment of those culpable.⁶⁴

In addition to punishing the rebel leaders, Henry asked Norfolk to display a banner that proclaimed the execution of the rebels. Norfolk was to apprehend all traitors such as "Bygode, the Fryere of Gansborough, Leche ... Vicare of Penrithe, and Towneley, late Chauncelour of the Bisshop of Carlisle, who hath been a greate promoter and procurer of all these rebellions."⁶⁵ The religious were punished not because of their spirituality, but because they had rebelled against the supremacy.

King Henry's supremacy had been at stake, and he took the view that the rebels were challenging his authority. The culprits were punished and, in the course of punishment, many religious became victims. It is not clear from the sources whether the king held a preconceived

⁶⁰ King Henry VIII to Aske. December 15, 1536. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXXIV, pp. 523–524.

⁶¹ The king had announced a Parliament at York for the coming summer and Queen Jane Seymour's coronation. But the parliament was never held, as the king initially wanted to appease the rebels. Queen Jane was never crowned, either. Minute of Council. Possibly after January 1, 1537? St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXXX, p. 536.

⁶² Bernard 2005, pp. 379, 382, 385.

⁶³ Lord Darcy to King Henry VIII. January 14, 1537. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXXV, pp. 524–525.

⁶⁴ St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, No. LXXXI, pp. 537–540; L&P, XII, Pt. 1, No. 479, pp. 226–227.

⁶⁵ King Henry VIII to The Duke of Norfolk. [After February 16, and 17, 1537.] St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXXXI, pp. 537–540; L&P, XII, Pt. 1, No. 479, pp. 226–227.

grudge against the monks, whether the monks truly protected the rebels, or whether these were two separate issues.

On March 24, 1537, the king wrote to his leaders in the north to remind them to use extreme dexterity in finding out more about the rebels' dealings. Monks who refused to be moved to another house were to be given money and anything else they needed.⁶⁶ Monks and friars were also punished and their monasteries targeted because they were seen as a hindrance to the new order. Rex points out that Henry could no longer trust that monks and friars would become obedient subjects.⁶⁷ Duffy points out that discontent continued in various parts of country, since much of parochial religious practice was suppressed.⁶⁸ It still remains unclear how involved the monks were in the rebellion—whether they were caught in the middle or had actively incited the rebels. It was evident to Henry that the religious would be the most obstinate against his new order and position as the head of the church. He must have realized that they would uphold religious culture related to papal authority in the north and, therefore, had to be removed. The king was convinced more than ever that all monasteries needed to be suppressed. After the executions were completed, Norfolk was to offer justice to the people. He was to take care of the land and goods attained, as well as the religious houses that conspired or kept their houses by force during the rebellion.⁶⁹ Norfolk had overridden his authority at Doncaster in December 1536 when he promised that the monasteries would be allowed to remain. Although the king did not trust the conservative Norfolk, he had nothing but praise for his plans for the north. Norfolk had created a new relationship with the northern people. Therefore, a letter sent by Cromwell to Norfolk, advising how general surveyors should handle the land possessions of those indicted, was not welcome. Norfolk must have seen it as interference in his plans for the north.⁷⁰ This is just one instance of the conflict between Norfolk and Cromwell. Again, support for supremacy was more important than Reformation. Obedience to the king was equated with obedience to divine will.

Conclusion

This chapter addressed the reaction that occurred in England after the publication of the Ten Articles, including the rebellion, the destruction of monasteries and old religious practices, and interpretation of adiaphora. The change in church leadership from the pope to Henry via royal supremacy was not understood in the north. This is apparent from how slowly things changed and how attached the people were to their old beliefs.

Henry had to defend against the domestic and foreign infiltration of Catholicism while pursuing religious change in the church. The king's ultimate goal was suppression of the

⁶⁶ King Henry VIII, To Earl of Sussex and Others. [Paget's handwriting] March 24, 1537. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXXXIII, pp. 541–543.

⁶⁷ Rex 2006, p. 155.

⁶⁸ Duffy 1992, p. 397.

⁶⁹ King Henry VIII to the Duke of Norfolk. [After February 16–17, 1537.] St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXXXI, pp. 538–540.

⁷⁰ Thomas Cromwell to the Duke of Norfolk. May 22, 1537. L&P, XII, Pt. 1, No. 1257, pp. 574–575; SP1/120/165–166. Slavin, 1969, No. 26. pp. 62, 65.

rebellion. Henry did not succumb to the rebels' demands and opposition to his supremacy. He realized that in sheltering the rebels and defending the monastic system that the religious were, indirectly, the culprits in the rebellion and that his supremacy was being attacked. The rebellion brought to Henry's attention how entrenched Catholic beliefs were in the north. He saw the strength of monasteries and, therefore, decided that he needed to do away with them.

The first priority for Henry was to demonstrate to the rebels the change in church leadership. The problem remained as to how the conservative clergy and people in the north would interpret adiaphora in the Ten Articles. Members of the clergy were bound by oath to King Henry, but the lay people may have never abandoned their Catholic ways. For example, their interpretation of the Mass depended on the pope, as doctrine in Catholic ecclesiology, especially that of justification by faith, was related to the pope's leadership in doctrine and practice. As the clergy were now compelled to interpret adiaphora according to Henry's definition, it left them in conflict.

It was unclear to the rebels who was to define leadership and who was to define adiaphora. The northern clergy opposed the king's Ten Articles and the new reform-minded party's doctrinal reforms, and they still believed that the pope was the one to define doctrine and practice in the English Church. The rebels could be seen as creating instability in the religious practices of the northern people. Also, the monastic system became part of the administration under civil law. This is the first instance of how a disputed article—monastic vows—was to become a civil affair and an adiaphora matter. The rebels would not have accepted any of the doctrine and practice on adiaphora matters of the Ten Articles related to Melancthon's ideas in the *Confessio Augustana*.

In Chapter Nine, we will discuss the improvements Henry planned for new doctrinal formulation.

Chapter 9:

The Search for the Middle Way and the Bishops' Book

(March–December 1537)

Introduction

As shown in Chapter Eight, the northern clergy opposed the religious changes the Ten Articles brought about in 1536.¹ As discussed, the commoners at Doncaster had demanded a complete reversal of Henry's new church policies.² Henry suppressed the rebellion to preserve the supremacy laws and himself as head of the church. He would deal with the issue of royal supremacy according to the laws of the kingdom, leaving issues concerning heresy for the bishops to deliberate at a meeting he asked them to convene.³

The major complaint of the rebels was the modification of the seven sacraments, purgatory, and "touching our Lady," all of which had become offenses against the Ten Articles. After the publication of the articles in August 1536, Reginald Pole discussed their content from a doctrinal point of view with Cardinal Contarini. Pole concluded that the articles agreed with Catholic doctrine except "for the biggest matter of the king's authority."⁴ Pole would not agree to the change in the doctrine of church authority even though the doctrine did not depart from Catholic doctrine and practice.

As soon as the rebellion was subdued, Henry allowed the bishops to take the initiative in formulating doctrine and ceremonies that would be acceptable to both the conservative and the reform-minded clergy. Henry delegated his authority to define doctrine to the bishops after the northern rebellion. It was better for him to distance himself from the rebels' complaints. As he had destroyed much of the popular religious culture in which they believed, he authorized the bishops to modify the Ten Articles into the Bishops' Book.

In this chapter, we look at the reason for and the creation of the bishops' synod. It was composed of reform-minded and conservative bishops, which resulted in a book that allowed reform-minded clergy to free their consciences, as bishops would teach the parishioners about adiaphora matters. It also gave the reform-minded bishops the authority to regard Scripture as the sole authority on adiaphora matters. We then look at how the doctrine of justification by faith compares with the articles concerning the same in the Ten Articles, the Wittenberg Articles and

¹ A 10 1536, pp. 233–248; L&P, XI, No. 59, p. 30.

² L&P, XI, No. 1246, pp. 506–507.

³ L&P, XII, Pt. 1, No. 708, p. 315; SP 1/117, Fols. 91–92. "The king desires them to attend tomorrow to commune with the Bishops *de sanctis invocandis, de purgatorio, de celibatu sacerdotum, et de satisfactione* ... (concerning invocation of saints, purgatory, celibacy of priests and satisfaction) ... that the Kynges Hynesse wyll *expurgare qicquid est veteris fermenti* (that the Kynges Hynesse wyll expurgate whatever is left of the old upheaval)."

⁴ A 10, pp. 233–248; Pole to Contarini, Venice. August 31, 1536. *Correspondence of Reginald Pole*. No. 117. Vol. I, p. 114; L&P, XI, No. 376, p. 150; L&P, XII, Pt. 1, No. 789, p. 346; SP 1/117, Fols. 207–215.

Melanchthon's *Loci Communes*. And finally, we look at the adiaphoristic nature of the Bishops' Book. Since the Bishops' Book never fell under human statute laws, it remained a legacy of the doctrine of adiaphora during the early English Reformation, because its treatment of the doctrine was based on the principle of Scripture alone, and resembled the position of the reform-minded clergy. The conservative clergy wanted to maintain Catholic doctrine and practice based on exegesis using both Scripture and Tradition. How would the conservative bishops define adiaphora in the Bishops' Book, because it seems that the doctrine of justification agreed upon was the same as Melanchthon's in *Loci Communes*? Perhaps they would have accepted it because of a slight but significant difference in the wording of the doctrine, which stated that justification by faith is related to the sacrament of penance. Henry allowed both parties to decide about the adiaphora question, because his goal was to create a middle way.

The Bishops' Synod

The domestic situation in the northern counties pushed the emergence of the bishops' assembly, something Melanchthon had recommended in his *Loci Communes* two years ago. According to Melanchthon, a single individual could not resolve the pernicious disagreements in the church. Instead, he recommended that there should be synods wherein the best ecclesiastical minds could debate all the key points and longstanding disputes, and establish a lasting doctrinal consensus that would be beneficial to everyone, both now and in the future.⁵ After the rebellion was suppressed and the government was safe, vice-regent Thomas Cromwell convened the clergymen in a synod, because parishioners were in doubt as to what they should believe.⁶ For the first time, Henry allowed the bishops to handle doctrinal disputes between two opposing parties. MacCulloch notes that both southern and northern convocations must have attended this synod, and thus Cromwell as vice-regent broke the barriers between the two convocations of the English Church.⁷

The synod was to determine an alternative doctrinal formula. The political situation, with Henry as Supreme Head of the Church, needed to be amended to give more power to the clergy in decision making. The synod was divided into subcommittees, which designed drafts acceptable to both parties.⁸ The rebels were promised that instead of only three sacraments, four more would be added in the new book.⁹ This author disagrees with McEntegart, who finds that the Bishops' Book was a sign that the participants in the "Pilgrimage of Grace" were successful

⁵ LC 1535, Fol. 5R; MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1555, p. 339; "Famous Last Words: The Final Epistolary Exchange between Erasmus of Rotterdam and Philip Melanchthon in 1536," Wengert 2010, XII, p. 27. Therefore, since there is so much both difficulty and danger in putting together a method, it has often occurred to me that it should not be the work of a single individual, but of a synod. In a synod, the most learned and excellent men can diligently make judgment, after deliberation in common over all those articles concerning which controversies often arise and there is even some disagreement among the ancients, and can publish a clear and completer doctrine of religion. LC 1535, Fol. 3L, R; MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1555, p. 335.

⁶ *Cranmer's Miscellaneous*, CLXXXIV, p. 334.

⁷ MacCulloch 1996, pp. 185–186.

⁸ L&P, XI, No. 1363, p. 545.

⁹ L&P, XII, Pt 1, No. 789, p. 346. McEntegart sees the Bishops' Book as a sign that the pilgrims were successful in slowing down the reforms. McEntegart 2002, p. 103.

in slowing down the pace of the reforms.¹⁰ Eventually, the Bishops' Book was completed as a compromise between the reform-minded and conservative clergy. The book was published in homily form, unlike the Ten Articles.¹¹

The Bishops' Book was the result of the synod and should be seen as an expression of the English bishops' beliefs on adiaphora. Earlier they had had no voice expressing doctrinal statements, but the king delegated this authority to them after the rebellion. That the king allowed both parties to express their beliefs produced the "middle way," and thus the English adiaphora concept.

Bernard sees the Bishops' Book as a search for unity and agreement, in which the king authorized the bishops to seek concord based on what he believed was important. Taking a middle way, the Bishops' Book redefines doctrine in accordance with the ideas of Thomas Cranmer and Hugh Latimer, and at the same time maintained traditional ceremonies as desired by Cuthbert Tunstall and John Stokesley, with an adiaphoristic understanding of their use.¹² The point of division between the bishops was Scripture alone (supported by the reform-minded clergy), versus Scripture and Tradition (supported by the conservative clergy).

The Bishop of London, John Stokesley, was the principal defender of the conservatives, supported by the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of Bath, Chichester, Lincoln, and Norwich. Opposing them were the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer; and the Bishops of Ely, Hereford, Salisbury, and Worcester.¹³

It is remarkable that Cromwell invited Alexander Alesius, the Scottish Reformer, to attend the bishops' meeting as the king's scholar.¹⁴ Since Alesius agreed with Cranmer's concept of the sacraments—namely, that there are only two: baptism and the Lord's Supper, he defended the doctrine of the reform-minded clergy. His opinion was based on that of the early Church Fathers. McEntegart observes that Cromwell did not attend directly to the doctrinal discussion, but used Alesius to promote the Protestant cause.¹⁵ Even though the convocations did not have authority over doctrine, the king delegated his authority for them decide on the Bishops' Book.¹⁶ Cromwell did not want to commit publicly to either party, but he defended the king when doctrinal matters were in dispute. Alesius had been the link between the continental and English evangelicals, and was in agreement with Melanchthon. He is the one who brought Melanchthon's *Loci Communes* to Henry two years earlier.

The champions of the conservatives argued that there were seven sacraments. In addition to baptism and the Lord's Supper, there were also confirmation, matrimony, orders, and extreme unction.¹⁷ In essence, the position of Cranmer and his associates was to retain the other four

¹⁰ McEntegart 2002, p. 103.

¹¹ A 10, pp. 233–248; BB, pp. 23–211.

¹² Bernard 1998, pp. 333–334. Bernard warned that adducing the Ten Articles of 1536 and the Bishops' Book of 1537 in order to argue for fluctuation in Henry's religious policy can be misleading, and recommends caution in studying them. Bernard 1998, 334; Bernard 2005, pp. 475, 478–479; see also MacCulloch 1996, pp. 183, 193; Tjernagel 1965, p. 178.

¹³ BB 1537, p. 27; L&P, XII, Pt. 1, No. 790, pp. 347–348.

¹⁴ For discussion of Alesius' role in the Synod, see MacCulloch 1996, pp. 186–189.

¹⁵ McEntegart 2002, p. 106.

¹⁶ BB 1537, pp. 23–27; L&P XI, No. 1363, p. 545.

¹⁷ BB 1537, p. 27; L&P, XII, Pt. 1, No. 790, pp. 347–348.

rituals, but lower their status from obligatory sacraments to nonobligatory ceremonies.¹⁸ In this English *via media*, or middle way, both reform-minded and conservative opinions were valued by the church in defining the path towards adiaphora legislation and education.

This author concurs with Bernard, who asserts that when Henry VIII was confronted with religious diversity, he wanted to pursue unity based on the mean, which can be seen in the compromises he was prepared to make in all of his religious formularies of the 1530s. The middle way was also his answer to religious discord.¹⁹

Eventually, after debating the issues and various drafts for six months—from March to August 1537—the bishops compromised by retaining seven sacraments, but left room for interpretation of the importance of some of them.²⁰ The bishops stressed that everything in the treatise was written in English according to the authority of Scripture, and asked the king to make any corrections or changes as he saw fit.²¹ Forty-six bishops and clergy signed the book.²²

On July 20, 1537, the Bishop of Hereford, Edward Fox, wrote to Cromwell that the Bishops' Book seemed more comprehensive than initially planned. Having been a leading force in correcting it, he asked Cromwell's advice as to whether the book would be published under the king's or the bishops' name²³ and said that it was ready for printing.²⁴ Since the king had previously authorized the Ten Articles as official doctrine of the church, Bishop Fox wondered whether he would authorize the Bishops' Book as well.²⁵ Fox had been in London for three weeks and impressed on Cromwell that he would like the king to see the book.²⁶ In Fox's letter to Cromwell, he wrote:

Albeyt, Sir, we have doon, in your absence, the best we coulde, and have subscribed all our Books, and shall sende them unto your Lordshipp to morowe. Nowe there wanteth nothing, but certain notes concerning the Crede, which be already made and agreed upon, albeit my man hath not yet perfetely copied them owt. And nowe, if it shall be the Kinge's pleasour to put the same to printing, I beseeche your Lorshipp to knowe his pleasour for the prefaces, whiche shalbe putt unto the saied Booke.²⁷

Although the king did not give official authorization to the Bishops' Book, he wrote an answer, which was prefixed to it. According to the letter, the king appreciated the bishops' work and wished that the message of the book would reach all parts of the country. It was his hope that

¹⁸ L&P, XII, Pt. 1, No. 790, pp. 346–348.

¹⁹ Bernard 1998, pp. 322–325, 331, 333.

²⁰ BB 1537, pp. 82–129. Bernard 1998, pp. 325, 334, 336.

²¹ BB 1537, pp. 26–27.

²² BB 1537, p. 27; L&P, XII, Pt. 1, No. 790, pp. 347–348.

²³ St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, XC, p. 556; L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 330, p. 135. SP 1/123, Fols. 83–85. Bishop Fox may have brought information from the Wittenberg negotiations, but since the acceptance of the Wittenberg Articles was not concluded by the allied states, it is not probable that Fox could have had the final draft by the time the Ten Articles were discussed in 1536. See Nicholas Heath's correspondence with Melanchthon. Nicholas Heath to Melanchthon. August 29, 1536. MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1776, pp. 206–209; Elector John Frederick and Landgrave Philip of Hesse's letter to Henry VIII. September 1, 1536. MBW R 2; MBW T 7 1781, pp. 222–223. .

²⁴ Bishop Fox to Cromwell, August 25, 1537; St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, XCV, p. 562.

²⁵ MacCulloch notes that Simon Grynaeus, the Continental evangelical, wrote to Cranmer and expressed his dislike of the compromises made in the Bishops' Book. MacCulloch 1996, p. 235.

²⁶ BB 1537, pp. 23–211; L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 401, 404–409, pp. 162–165; SP 6/8, Fols. 24–172; L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 578, p. 216.

²⁷ Cranmer to Cromwell, July 21, 1537; *Cranmer's Miscellaneous*, pp. 337–338; St.P, Vol I, Pt. 2, XC, pp. 556–557.

the Bishops' Book would teach the parishioners their duties toward God, their king and their ministers. He also hoped that any errors and superstition would diminish as the clergy expounded the creed, the Ten Commandments, and the sacraments.²⁸ This may be the only time since the break from Rome that Henry commended the bishops for their work and gave them more ecclesiastical authority.

Tjernagel states that the Bishop of Hereford, Edward Fox, who had been one of the ambassadors in Germany and who had presented the Wittenberg Articles to the convocation in 1536, was one of the authors and wrote the preface to the Bishops' Book. Rex concurs and writes that Fox's leadership made the Bishops' Book possible. Bishop Fox may have brought information from the Wittenberg negotiations, but since the acceptance of the Wittenberg Articles was not concluded by the allied states, it is not probable that Fox could have had the final draft by the time the Ten Articles were discussed in 1536.²⁹

The Bishops' Book, officially called *The Institution of a Christian Man*, was published in September 1537 in the form of a treatise.³⁰ It was formatted differently than the Ten Articles. It was a book for the education of clergy and parishes in teaching the contents of Christian religion. The adiaphora matters, named "indifferent things," had to be found elsewhere in the text. The book could not be compared to any kind of doctrinal statement or conflicting articles found in the previous documents. It included, in the following order: The Apostle's Creed,³¹ The Seven Sacraments,³² The Ten Commandments,³³ The Lord's Prayer,³⁴ The Ave Maria,³⁵ and The Articles of Justification³⁶ and Purgatory.³⁷ The last two were the same as those in the Ten Articles of 1536.³⁸ The preface clearly stated that the work was initiated at the king's command in order to suppress all superstition and to establish unity and concord.³⁹ Richard Rex says that because of the seven sacraments, the Bishops' Book was regarded as conservative. However, the reform-minded clergymen interpreted the four new sacraments as not obligatory and having a lower status. In fact, since the Bishops' Book makes more concessions to the Lutherans than did the Ten Articles, it is not conservative. Its evangelical influence is distinct.⁴⁰ This author cautiously agrees with Rex, who argues that the evangelical influence is clearly seen in the Bishops' Book as it affirms the role of faith in justification and good works.⁴¹ The doctrine of justification by faith comes word for word from the Ten Articles.

²⁸ Minute of an answer of Henry VIII to a letter from the commissioners prefixed to the *Institution of a Christian Man*. *Cranmer's Miscellaneous*, No. IX, pp. 469–470.

²⁹ Tjernagel 1965, 173; Rex 2006, p. 122.

³⁰ BB 1537, pp. 23–24; L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 402, p. 163.

³¹ BB 1537, pp. 29–81.

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 82–129.

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 130–177.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 178–203.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 203–208.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 209–210.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 210–211.

³⁸ A 10 1536, pp. 242–243, 246; BB 1537, pp. 209–211; L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 289, p. 118; SP 1/123, Fols. 25–27.

³⁹ BB 1537, pp. 25–26.

⁴⁰ Rex 2006, p. 122.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 122–123.

Bernard opposes Rex and is cautious about picking out a single statement and using it to characterize a set of articles, such as the Ten Articles or the Bishops' Book. This author agrees with Bernard in the sense that the king accepted opinions from both parties in formulating the middle way, and that the king's views prevailed.⁴² Bernard also warns that adducing the Ten Articles of 1536 and the Bishops' Book of 1537 in order to argue for fluctuation in Henry's religious policy can be misleading, and recommends caution in studying them.⁴³ The preface also sets the authority of Scripture and the Lutheran tenet of faith as "that singular gift of God," as well as the somewhat ambiguous expression of original sin: "our natural reason and judgment (obscured and almost extinct by original and actual sins) is lightened and purified...."⁴⁴ One may agree with Bernard's opinion that the Bishops' Book represents the king's opinion by its compromising nature and search for a middle way. He argues that one cannot pick out particular subjects to characterize particular features.⁴⁵ McEntegart cautions against considering the Wittenberg Articles as the basis for the Ten Articles and the Bishops' Book. He suggests other independent sources such as the *Confessio Augustana* and Melancthon's *Loci Communes*, which he dedicated to Henry VIII.⁴⁶

In a letter to Cromwell, Hugh Latimer, the Bishop of Worcester, wrote that "we [Bishop Fox] hade fynnysshyd (I trow) the reste of our bowke." He praised Fox for his diligence in completing the book by August 27, 1537.⁴⁷ But in fact, Latimer hoped that books like this would not be published, citing the many controversial opinions and conflicts that arose during the compilation of the book. He wrote:

It ys a trubulosse thyng to agre uppon a doctryne, in thynges of such controversye, with jugmentes of such dyversite, every man (I truste) meannyng well, and yet natt all meannyng won way. Butt I dowght natt, butt now, in the ende, we shall agre both won with a nother, and all with the truthe, though sum wyll then mervell.⁴⁸

Furthermore, Latimer wrote that the book still contained ambivalences concerning doctrine, but he hoped that the king would remove anything uncertain and impure.⁴⁹ The greatest change must have been in the outward ceremonies, called "indifferent things," about which the clergy had to instruct parishioners.⁵⁰ Compromise was difficult for Latimer to accept. He would have preferred that each clergyman's individual opinion had prevailed. Nevertheless, during his diocesan visits, Latimer told the clergy to follow the king's Injunctions: read the Scriptures in English⁵¹ and have a copy of the Bishops' Book available,⁵² to suppress idolatry.

⁴² Bernard 1998, pp. 334, 336.

⁴³ Bernard 1998, pp. 333–334. Bernard 2005, pp. 475, 478–479. See also MacCulloch 1996, pp. 183, 193; Tjernagel 1965, p. 178.

⁴⁴ BB 1537, p. 25.

⁴⁵ Bernard 1998, pp. 334, 336.

⁴⁶ McEntegart 2002, pp. 59–60.

⁴⁷ Bishop Latimer to Cromwell. [1537, August?]; State Pt., Vol. I, Pt. 2, XCVI, p. 563.

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 563.

⁴⁹ State Pt., Vol. I, Pt. 2, XCVI, p. 563.

⁵⁰ BB 1537, pp. 115–116. Bernard 1998, p. 338.

⁵¹ The new order of August 1, 1537, was to read the Bible. MacCulloch thinks that having to read Scripture in English was suggested by the evangelical clergymen but many later copies of the Injunctions omitted this requirement. MacCulloch 1996, p. 166.

⁵² Latimer's Injunctions for Worcester Diocese. In *Visitation Articles 1537*, Vol. II, pp. 15–16.

Despite not authorizing the Bishops' Book, Henry ordered its use, as seen in his minutes to the bishops.⁵³ The preface states that the book was published on the authority of the northern and southern convocations and was signed by them.⁵⁴ This is the second time that Henry delegated his supreme authority to the bishops.

On September 16, 1537, the king wrote a letter to the bishops, directing that the book "should be read in every parish church every Sunday and festival day during the next three years." Cranmer also sent a mandate to the bishops, stating "the Dean is to warn all the clergy to read aloud from the pulpit every Sunday a part of the said Book."⁵⁵

The purpose of the Bishops' Book was to calm down the nation after the northern rebellion and show that the rebels' beliefs were respected. The king's position had changed, by giving authority to the bishops in doctrinal matters, which allowed the development of adiaphora in the English Church. This researcher was able to discern Melancthon's influence on the English adiaphora matters in two manners: by the historical events delineated above in which the document was produced; and how Melancthon's thoughts were transmitted to the English in the documents below.

The Article on Justification

The Bishops' Book included four additional sacraments to the three found in the Ten Articles. Similarly, the article on justification by faith will be compared with that of the Wittenberg Articles and *Loci Communes*. The Bishops' Book carried over the article on justification by faith from the Ten Articles of 1536.⁵⁶

Article IV of the Wittenberg Articles was called "penitence and justification." As seen in Chapter Five, Melancthon demonstrated that he had not deviated from the old church's threefold structure on the sacrament of penance, but only inserted new meaning—retaining the first part, "contrition," but replacing the second part, "confession," with "faith," and the third part, "satisfaction," with "newness of life," or "new obedience." Melancthon firmly believed this represented the teaching and consensus of the Catholic Church.⁵⁷ When evaluating the doctrine of justification by faith in the Ten Articles, one may perceive that the sacrament of penance is not combined with the article on justification by faith, but is separate, the third sacrament of the Ten Articles.

Therefore, it is necessary to compare the structure of the sacrament of penance with that of the Wittenberg Articles. The sacrament of penance in the Bishops' Book includes the first two parts of penance—"contrition," and "confession," but replaces the third part, "satisfaction" with the phrase, "the amendment of the former life, and new obedient reconciliation unto laws of God." The structure is similar, but the third part follows the phrase "new obedience," as

⁵³ Minute of an answer of Henry VIII to a letter from the commissioners prefixed to the Institution of a Christian Man. *Cranmer's Miscellaneous*, No. IX, pp. 469–470.

⁵⁴ L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 402, p. 163.

⁵⁵ L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 618, p. 228.

⁵⁶ A 10 1536, Appendix, pp. 242–243.

⁵⁷ WTA 1536, Article IV, pp. 26–30; Bray 2004, pp. 124, 126.

expressed in the Wittenberg Articles and the *Loci Communes*.⁵⁸ However, when we look at “Justification” in the Bishops’ Book, we notice that the first part of penance, “contrition,” is combined with “faith,” as in Article IV of the Wittenberg Articles.⁵⁹

The first part of “Justification” in the Bishops’ Book speaks of justification in terms of remission of sins and reconciliation or acceptance of the person to eternal life, because of Christ and renovation in Christ.⁶⁰ “Grace,” that is God’s favor, is imputed to the believer and she/he is accepted or reputed righteous. The external righteousness of God is imputed in the remission of sins and a person is reconciled. As seen below, the sentence describing the forensic aspect of justification in the *Loci Communes* is missing from the Bishops’ Book. Article IV of the Wittenberg Articles states that a person is imputed as righteous, an extrinsic work of God, and emphasizes God’s grace as free gift. *Loci Communes* called justification *regeneratio*, “regeneration,” and the Wittenberg Articles emphasize that justification is obtained without any works, not even *propter dignitatem contritionis*.⁶¹

The first part of the article in the Bishops’ Book speaks of the basis for justification in terms found in *Loci Communes*⁶² and in the Wittenberg Articles. Justification signifies remission of sins and reconciliation or acceptance of the person to eternal life:

Justification signifieth remission of our sins and our acceptation or reconciliation into the grace and favour of God and our perfect renovation in Christ. (A10 1536, p. 242; BB 1537, p. 209.)

Justification signifies remission of sins and reconciliation or acceptance of a person to eternal life. For to justify is a forensic word among Hebrews, so that when I say “the Roman people justified Scipio when he was accused by the tribunes,” that signifies that they absolved him, or pronounced him just. (LC 1535, Fol.167L)⁶³

The faith is necessary, whereby we believe that our sins are forgiven us by God and that we are justified and considered just, and become sons of God, not because of the worth of our repentance or out other works, but freely because of Christ. (WTA 1536, IV, p. 28.)⁶⁴

As seen above, the *Loci Communes*, the Wittenberg Articles and the Bishops’ Book all emphasize that justification is obtained by God’s grace without any works. The last phrase in the Bishops’ Book, “our perfect renovation in Christ” eliminates the distinction between *iustificatio* and *regeneratio*, as in Article V of the Ten Articles.⁶⁵ Thus again the belief in “renovation” in the Bishops’ Book replaces “satisfaction” in the sacrament of penance.⁶⁶ In that sense, the structure of the Bishops’ Book resembles the medieval process of justification, in which new concepts are

⁵⁸ A 10, 1536, Article III, pp. 8–9; Bray 2004, pp. 166–167; LC, 1535, Fol. 190 L. WTA 1536, Article IV, pp. 26–30; Bray 2004, pp. 125–126.

⁵⁹ A 10, Article V, pp. 243; Bray 2004, p. 170; WTA 1536, Article IV, p. 28; Bray 2004, p. 125.

⁶⁰ LC 1535, Fol. 167L.

⁶¹ WTA 1536, p. 28.

⁶² LC 1535, Fols. 167L, 171L, 181L.

⁶³ *Iustificatio significat remissionem peccatorum & reconciliationem seu acceptationem personae ad uitam aeternam. Nam Ebraeis iustificare est forense uerbum, ut dicam populus Romanus iustificauit Scipionem accusatum a Tribunis, id est absoluit, seu iustum pronunciauit.* LC 1535, Fol. 167L.

⁶⁴ *Fidem necesse est, qua credimus, nobis ipsis, a Deo remitti peccata et nos iustificari ac iustos reputari et fieri filios Dei non propter dignitatem contritionis aut aliorum operum, sed gratis propter Christum.* WTA 1536, IV, p. 28.

⁶⁵ A 10 1536, p. 242; LC, 1535, Fol. 167 L; WTA, 1536, p. 28; McGrath 1998, p. 287.

⁶⁶ A 10 1536, Article III, Bray 2004, p. 167; A 10, Article V, p. 243; Bray 2004, p. 170.

integrated and modified. The doctrine of grace can be seen in the article on justification by faith following Article IV of the Wittenberg Articles of 1536, tying the article on justification to penance, and placing new concepts in penance, such as “amendment of former life.” The reform-minded clergy thus accepted Melanchthon’s doctrine of grace.

We look at how the gracious gift of God in reconciliation is accepted by the believer. The question arises from the statement of the Ten Articles expressed as “faith conjoined with charity”—how are we to interpret “charity” with justification? The performance of good works is consequential to justification. This author agrees with Schofield, who points out that the phrase “faith joined in charity” is not quite the same as the Catholic concept of faith formed or perfected in charity. If charity is a consequence of faith, it then can be read as Melanchthon wrote in *Loci Communes*.⁶⁷

Faith is central to Article IV of the *Confessio Augustana*, as stated: “this faith God imputes as righteousness in his sight.” The central role of faith when men are imputed righteous is seen in the documents below. At the same time, the *Loci Communes* and the Wittenberg Articles speak of faith that brings about “remission and reconciliation.” In the Wittenberg Articles the idea of imputation (*reputari*) is prevalent. Furthermore, when comparing the articles concerning justification in the *Loci Communes* of 1535, the Wittenberg Articles of 1536, and the Ten Articles of 1536, the last-mentioned document maintains the sacrament of penance as one of three sacraments. But in the second document, Melanchthon combined penance with the article on justification. “Faith” in the Wittenberg Articles replaces the first part of penance, “contrition,” and also the third part of penance, as “satisfaction” is replaced by “new obedience.” The Bishops’ Book ties the sacrament of penance closely to the doctrine of justification, as do the Wittenberg Articles.⁶⁸ The sacrament of penance in the Bishops’ Book retains the first and second parts, “contrition” and “confession,” but replaces “satisfaction” with “amendment of former life,” as does the corresponding section in the Ten Articles, the renewal aspect of justification.⁶⁹ The forensic nature of justification, which we saw in the *Loci Communes*, does not appear in the Bishops’ Book.

That sinners attain this justification by contrition and faith joined with charity, after such sort and manner as we before mentioned and declared. Not as though our contrition or faith or any works proceeding thereof, can worthily merit or deserve to attain the said justification. (A10 1536, p. 242.)

Restat igitur ut colligamus testimonia huius sententiæ, quod gratis propter Christum fide, non propter dignitatem nostrorum operum, consequamur remissionem peccatorum et reconciliationem. (LC 1535, Fol. 181L.)

Ideo secundam partem poenitentiae esse fidem necesse est, qua credimus, nobis ipsi a Deo remitti peccata et nos iustificari ac iustos reputari et fieri filios Dei non propter dignitatem contritionis aut

That sinners attain this justification by contrition and faith joined with charity, after such sort and manner as is before mentioned *and declared in the sacrament of penance*. Not as though our contrition or faith or any works merit or deserve to attain the said justification. (BB 1537, p. 209.)

Therefore, it remains for us to gather the witnesses of this opinion, that we freely achieve remission of sin and reconciliation, not because of the worth of our works, but by faith because of Christ. (LC 1535, Fol. 181L.)

Therefore the second element of penitence must be faith, by which we believe that our sins are forgiven to us by God and we are justified and accounted just and become children of God not

⁶⁷ Schofield 2006, pp. 74–75.

⁶⁸ WTA 1536, Article IV, p. 26; Bray 2004, p. 124.

⁶⁹ A 10 1536, p. 238; BB 1537, pp. 97–99.

aliorum operum, sed gratis propter Christum.
(WTA 1536, IV, p. 28)

because of the worthiness of our contrition or of other works but freely for Christ's sake. (WTA 1536, IV, p. 28.)⁷⁰

The Bishops' Book incorporated the clause "justification by contrition and faith joined with charity." Even though the writers of the preface indicated that the justification by faith article was identical with that of the Ten Articles of 1536, there is a minor addendum that makes a difference, effectively tying "justification" to the sacrament of penance,⁷¹ as did the Wittenberg Articles. Melancthon closely followed the old church structure when explaining justification and penance. Rex argues that the evangelical influence is clearly seen in the article on justification, as shown by the role of faith—without excluding good works, but demoting them to a lesser role.⁷²

The third part concerns how each article treats the consequences of justification. Good works are produced by the Holy Spirit, which Melancthon called *regeneratio* in *Loci Communes*. The Ten Articles, the Bishops' Book and the Wittenberg Articles agree with the *Loci Communes*, which speaks of the Holy Spirit producing "inward good works and outward civil works, new motions, renovation and new obedience," as a consequence of justification. The documents do not differentiate between the "regeneration" and "renewal" aspects. There is clear reference to good works being linked to the justification obtained in the course of Christian life. Even though the Bishops' Book does not speak explicitly of "regeneration," but rather "renovation," the former is implicitly expressed in the article stating that the Holy Spirit produces new life. In the passages below, the *Loci Communes* and the Wittenberg Articles speak of justified faith producing "good impulses and new obedience." The Ten Articles and the Bishops' Book agree, but explicitly state that renewal brings out also "outward and civil works"—that particular phrase is not in the *Loci Communes* or the Wittenberg Articles.⁷³

Melancthon's concept of justification includes new emotions and new obedience produced by the Holy Spirit, which he called *regeneratio* in *Loci Communes*. The phrase "perfect renovation in Christ," indicates the connection of regeneration to the doctrine of justification in the Ten Articles and Bishops' Book, comparable to the renewal aspect of *Loci Communes*. All the statements below that speak of the Holy Spirit producing inward good works, outward civil works, new motions, renovation, and new obedience, should be regarded as a consequence of justification. The passages clearly speak of good works in the state of being justified, that is, during a Christian life.⁷⁴

God necessarily requireth of us to do good works commanded by Him; and that not only outward and civil works, but also the inward spiritual motions and graces of the Holy Ghost. (A10 1536, p. 243; BB 1537, p. 210.)

⁷⁰ WTA 1536, IV, p. 28; Bray 1994, p. 125.

⁷¹ BB 1537, pp. 25–26.

⁷² Rex 2006, pp. 122–123.

⁷³ A 10, 1536, p. 243; LC 1535, Fol. 190L; WTA, 1536, IV, pp. 28, 30.

⁷⁴ A 10 1536, p. 243.

Et errant imperiti, quia somniant remissionem peccatorum ita contingere ociosis, sine aliquot uero animi motu, sine certamine, sine fiducia consolante animos...Et quia Spiritus sanctus affert, ut postea dicam, in illa consolatione nouam uitam, nouos motus, ideo haec renouatio, uocatur regeneratio, sequi debet noua obedientia. (LC 1535, Fol. 190L.)

Et cum spiritus sanctus sit efficax, parit iam novos motus in cordibus consentientes legi Dei, scilicet fidem, dilectionem Dei, timorem Dei, odium peccati, propositum non peccandi et reliquios bonos fructus iuxta illud. Igitur iustificatio, quae fit fide hoc modo, ut dictum est, est renouatio et regeneratio. (WTA 1536, IV, pp. 28, 30)

And unskilled folks are in error, when they dream that remission of sins accrues to the idle in this way, without any true of movement of the spirit, without effort, without the consolation of faith for their souls. And since, as I will tell later, the Holy Spirit brings new life and new impulses with that consolation, this renovation is thus called renewal and regeneration, and new obedience ought to follow.(LC 1535, Fol. 190L.)

And since the Holy Spirit is effective, it gives rise, indeed, to new impulses in their hearts that accord with the law of God, that is faith, love of God, fear of God, hatred of sin, as resolve not to sin and other good fruits besides this. Therefore, justification, which comes about through faith in this way, as has been said, is renewal and regeneration. (WTA 1536, IV, pp. 28, 30.)

In summary, the doctrine of reconciliation as stated in the Bishops' Book is that by faith one is justified without works. Melancthon's forensic aspect of justification is missing, and new concepts emerge—such as “renovation” and “new obedience,” which includes “outward civil works.” The latter concept is a modification of Melancthon's concept of “new obedience” in Christian life. The Bishops' Book states that inner obedience is manifested in “inward motions” and “outward civil works.”

The connection of the article on justification by faith to the sacrament of penance in the Bishops' Book involves a significant doctrinal difference from that of the Ten Articles. The Ten Articles states: “As we before mentioned and declared.” The Bishops' Book states: “As is before mentioned and declared in the sacrament of penance,” using the passive form rather than the first-person plural, and adding the phrase “in the sacrament of penance.”

That sinners attain this justification by contrition and faith, joined with charity, after such sort and manner *as is before mentioned and declared in the sacrament of penance*. Not as though our contrition or faith, or any works proceeding thereof, can worthily merit or deserve to attain the said justification. For the only mercy and grace of the Father, promised freely unto us for his Son's sake Jesu Christ, and the merits of his blood and passion, be the only sufficient and worthy causes thereof.⁷⁵

This linkage of the article on justification by faith to penance follows the example of Article IV of the Wittenberg Articles, encompassing penance and justification in the same article. This demonstrates how Melancthon implemented new concepts in the old structure, and made it possible to convey his theological ideas to the English documents.

This researcher was able to disc

Henry responded to Cranmer's Annotations and made several notes in the margins during the months of November and December 1537.⁷⁶ MacCulloch points out that Queen Jane's untimely death made Henry turn more seriously to theology, and he was able to make his convictions known. His notes were sent to the evangelicals Cranmer and Heath, and to the conservatives—

⁷⁵ BB 1537, p. 209.

⁷⁶ MacCulloch 1996, p. 208.

the Bishop of Chichester, Richard Sampson; and St. Christopher German, the ecclesiastical lawyer.⁷⁷

Elton thinks that Cranmer's obstinate comments on the king's responses were the reason that the king was unwilling to authorize the Bishops' Book. This author disagrees, since the king respected Thomas Cranmer's views and did not change them. The king expressed his religious views in the "Annotations," but did not demand that they should be changed in the final version. Henry's purpose was to create the middle way in doctrine and practice.⁷⁸ Parish notes that, even in the Bishops' Book, the king's orthodox sentiment is seen in the article on priestly marriage: "to abstain from works of matrimony."⁷⁹

Schofield regards Henry's marginal notes in the "Annotations" as remarkable, because they demonstrate the discrepancies between Henry's and Cranmer's convictions. Henry had completed the notes by January 1538.⁸⁰ Cranmer must have received the book from Cromwell, with the king's marginal notes, in the same month.⁸¹

In Cranmer's annotations, Henry expressed his opinion on justification by faith as follows:

That the chief and first mean whereby sinners attain the same justification, was only by the great zeal and love which that Christ bare and beareth to us, undeserved on our behalf; for by his passion and death we attain our redemption and justification; wherefore he most worthily is to be of us honoured, and esteemed our sole redeemer and justifier.⁸²

Interestingly, Henry omits the clause "as is before mentioned and declared in the sacrament of penance." This way, he acknowledges the concept of justification compiled by both parties. Cranmer's changes in the annotations reveal his beliefs.⁸³ From the article on penance, it is clear that Henry believed that good works were the cause of receiving eternal life. "By penance and other good works of the same be made meet and apt and assured to receive the virtue of Christ's passion, which is our everlasting life."⁸⁴ After "I believe ... that he is my very God ... that I am his servant by adoption of grace and the right inheritor of his Kingdom," Henry added the phrase "as long as I persevere in his precepts and laws" before "the right inheritor of his Kingdom."⁸⁵ Henry wanted to add the word *only* to "not [only] for the worthiness of any merit" and the word *chiefly* to "but [chiefly] for the only merits" to Cranmer's statement of repentance:

the penitent must conceive certain hope and faith that God will forgive him his sins, and repute him justified, and of the number of his elect children, not for the worthiness of any merit or work done by the penitent, but for the only merits of the blood and passion of our Saviour Jesus Christ.⁸⁶

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Elton 1977, p. 274.

⁷⁹ Parish 2000, pp. 20–30.

⁸⁰ Schofield 2006, p. 75.

⁸¹ Cranmer to Cromwell. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, CV, pp. 574–575. Bernard 1998, p. 326.

⁸² *Cranmer's Miscellaneous*, 1537, p. 112.

⁸³ *Cranmer's Miscellaneous*, 1537, pp. 83–114. Bernard 1998, p. 326.

⁸⁴ *Cranmer's Miscellaneous*, 1537, p. 96.

⁸⁵ *Cranmer's Miscellaneous*, 1537, p. 84. Bernard 1998, p. 326.

⁸⁶ *Cranmer's Miscellaneous*, 1537, p. 95.

However, Cranmer did not allow the insertion of these words and commented that it would “signify that our election and justification comes partly from our merits, since it chiefly comes from the goodness of God.”⁸⁷

Cranmer’s annotations prove that he believed the opposite of Henry. Good works are a consequence of receiving Christ’s passion. “The penitent person ... is made partaker of Christ’s passion, and good works follow thereof, but they are not the cause thereof.”⁸⁸ Schofield indicates that Cranmer was a Lutheran as far as justification by faith is concerned, but Henry’s view was inconsistent and unclear.⁸⁹ It seems that in this instance it would be more appropriate to say that Cranmer’s belief in the consequential role of good works was the same as that expressed in Melancthon’s *Loci Communes* and in the Wittenberg Articles.⁹⁰ How much Cranmer’s view contributed to the final formulation of justification by faith both in the Ten Articles⁹¹ and in the Bishops’ Book, is evident from their similarity, since the aspect of merit is excluded in both statements. Henry’s private opinion on the doctrine of justification is clear. However, as seen above, he did not want to prevent the bishops from expressing their opinions, but, instead, wanted to allow a balanced document in which both opinions and beliefs were respected.

The doctrine of the sacrament of the altar parallels that of the Ten Articles. It implicitly includes communion in both kinds in the doctrinal part, accepting the sacrament as Christ’s ordinance according to the Saxon Reformers’ position, stating that “under the form and figure of bread and wine is verily, substantially and really contained and comprehended the very selfsame body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ.” The article continues that “whoever eateth this body of Christ unworthily, or drinketh of this blood of Christ unworthily.”⁹² The Bishops’ Book indicates that the bishops wished to include both kinds in the doctrinal section, and accept the Saxon Reformers’ position of both kinds as Christ’s ordinance. This further indicated the English bishops’ position on adiaphora matters—that communion in both kinds was excluded from adiaphora; and the remainder on the power of the church, monastic vows, celibacy of priests, and the Mass were regarded as adiaphora by the English bishops.

The Adiaphoristic Nature of the Bishops’ Book

The Book was a victory for the reform-minded bishops, even though it included seven sacraments, omitted in the Ten Articles of 1536. The Bishops’ Book states: “Yet there is a difference in dignity and necessity between them [sacraments] and the other three Sacraments, that is to say, the Sacraments of Baptism, of Penance, and the Sacrament of the Altar.”⁹³

The adiaphoristic position can be detected throughout the Bishops’ Book. There was no clear set of articles, except the doctrine of justification that followed the precedent of the Ten Articles.

⁸⁷ *Cranmer’s Miscellaneous*, 1537, p. 95. Bernard 1998, p. 326.

⁸⁸ *Cranmer’s Miscellaneous*, 1537, p. 96.

⁸⁹ See Schofield’s analysis of Cranmer’s ‘Annotations’ in *Philip Melancthon and the English Reformation*. 2006, pp. 75–78. See also Bernard 1998, p. 326.

⁹⁰ LC 1535, Fol. 181L. WTA 1536, Article IV, pp. 24–32.

⁹¹ A 10 1536, V, p. 242; BB 1537, p. 209.

⁹² BB 1537, pp. 100–101.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 129.

Since the purpose of the Bishops' Book was to calm down the parishes after the drastic changes of the Ten Articles and the consequent rebellion, its message was promulgated without the king's authority. The book became a tool for the reform-minded clergy to use in defense of their belief in freedom of conscience.

The tone of the Bishops' Book was that of a Lutheran catechism in various respects: regarding the Decalogue, the Lord's Prayer, and the Apostle's Creed. But in other places one may find Catholic tenets as well.⁹⁴ This shows the English Church's gradual change towards adiaphorism in exercising the power of the bishops in interpreting adiaphora. The sacramental section begins: "As touching the sacrament of holy orders, we think it convenient, that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach the people committed unto their spiritual charge."⁹⁵ The educational component of explaining the necessary and not-necessary doctrines regarding salvation is a recurrent feature in the Bishops' Book. Instruction was also an essential element in the Ten Articles.⁹⁶ On the question of adiaphora, the Bishops' Book does not use the philosophical term, as did Melancthon in his *Loci Communes*. When speaking of ceremonies, the Book uses the theological term "things indifferent," which it defines as "neither commanded expressly in scripture, nor necessarily contained or implied therein, nor yet expressly repugnant or contrary thereunto."⁹⁷

The Bishops' Book also points out that even though the bishops require obedience to their jurisdiction, they should show obedience to the people and to the Christian prince who gave them this power. But as for the ceremonies, the bishops were authorized to decide certain ones as adiaphora, for the maintenance of good order. Anyone following the rule of "things indifferent"

that men may lawfully omit or do otherwise than is prescribed by said laws and commandments of the priests and bishops, so that they do it ... despite of the said power and jurisdiction ... and offend not nor slander not their neighbours ... For in these points Christian men must study to preserve that Christian liberty, whereunto they be called.⁹⁸

The reform-minded party regarded the four other sacraments as adiaphora—not necessary to salvation. But the conservative bishops, who held that the unwritten traditions were equal to Scripture in authority, regarded those four sacraments as necessary to salvation. The Bishops' Book admitted, for example, that the sacrament of extreme unction was not expressed in Scripture. This clearly states that those believing the unwritten tradition regarded it as a sacrament, but for the reform-minded bishops it was only an adiaphoristic ceremony.⁹⁹ Whenever the scriptural principle is the authority for the term "necessary to salvation," the practices falling outside this scope remained adiaphora, as Melancthon indicated in his *Loci Communes* on human traditions. As long as the central doctrine of justification remains, one may compromise on the nonessentials, he said.¹⁰⁰ Verkamp finds that Melancthon and Luther tried to balance

⁹⁴ BB 1537, pp. 30–81, 130–203, 209–210. A 10 1536, V, pp. 242–243.

⁹⁵ BB 1537, p. 101.

⁹⁶ A 10 1536, pp. 234, 243–247.

⁹⁷ BB 1537, pp. 114–115.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ BB 1537, p. 123.

¹⁰⁰ BB 1537, pp. 28–211; LC 1535, 363L.

legalism on the one hand, and antinomian tendencies on the other.¹⁰¹ The Bishops' Book's stance on adiaphora reflected Melanchthon's position.

The second kind of tradition concerns things that are indifferent by nature, as in regard to keeping special days in the week, fasts, and clothing. The purpose must be considered, said Melanchthon, for if the end is political, the traditions are lawful. The proximate end is what God "requires... for order... not for salvation." Bishops and pastors can set down such ordinations for political ends, as Paul commands that "all things be done in the church with order."¹⁰² The Bishops' Book agrees: "Priests and bishops should, in the execution of all those things which appertain unto their jurisdiction by the authority of the gospel (as is aforesaid), attempt their doing and proceedings with all charity and mildness... as also of Christian charity and tranquility to be had among them."¹⁰³

On the question of obedience, the Bishops' Book says that the laws of the Christian princes authorize the bishops' jurisdictions. In the compilation of the Bishops' Book, the king had delegated his authority to the bishops. That he never subscribed to the book, but agreed to its contents, means that he accepted that doctrinal matters should be the bishops' responsibility. The bishops had been deprived of spiritual jurisdiction, and made clear in the book their belief that they should have spiritual jurisdiction. That Henry never subscribed to the Bishops' Book is indicative that he maintained that spiritual jurisdiction belonged to him. This was the only time the reform-minded bishops would acknowledge the power that Melanchthon had argued belonged to them in the *Confessio Augustana*.

The final say as far as adiaphora was concerned lay with the statute laws of king and Parliament—these human laws could contradict the ecclesiastical laws based on Scripture. The question remained of how to interpret "indifferent" concepts in the case of conflict between the human laws and ecclesiastical laws. Since the king was head of church and state, obedience to him was required in both spheres. As long as both types of law agreed on questions of adiaphora, there would not be a problem. But if the ecclesiastical laws, as opposed to Scripture, were made human laws, there would be a conflict of obedience for the bishops.

Since the Bishops' Book never fell under statute law, it remained a legacy of the doctrine of adiaphora during the early English Reformation. Its doctrine of adiaphora was based on the principle of Scripture, and both conservative and reform-minded bishops were able to accept its middle way.

This researcher was able to discern Melanchthon's influence on the English in adiaphora matters in two manners: by the historical events delineated, in which the documents were produced; and how Melanchthon's thoughts were transmitted in the English documents above.

Conclusion

The doctrinal statements of the Bishops' Book served as the grounds by which the reform-minded clergy could follow their consciences in teaching their parishioners about adiaphora

¹⁰¹ Verkamp 1975, p. 75.

¹⁰² LC 1535, Fol. 363L.

¹⁰³ BB 1537, p. 114.

matters. Even though it was never the official teaching of the English Church, it showed how the bishops viewed adiaphora matters. It also gave the reform-minded bishops the authority to regard Scripture as the sole authority on these matters. The influence of the *Confessio of Augustana* is seen in that for the first time, the king allowed the bishops to define doctrine in the English Church.

The adiaphoristic position of the English Church is clearly articulated in the Bishops' Book. Even though Henry never authorized it as the doctrine of the church, he consented to its contents as representing the "middle way" between conservative and reform-minded bishops. While it still contained seven sacraments, four of them had a lower status. It is also clear that the doctrine of justification by faith parallels the one in the Ten Articles, except for a slight but significant phrase connecting justification to the sacrament of penance. This practice is comparable to how Melanchthon combined penance with justification in the Wittenberg Articles; the difference being that Melanchthon gave new content to the medieval structure, in order to make the doctrine of justification more acceptable to the conservative clergy. The reform-minded clergy could retain their belief in the doctrine of justification by faith as presented by Melanchthon in the Ten Articles, the Wittenberg Articles, and *Loci Communes*. This meant that in practice, adiaphora questions—such as the power of the church, marriage of priests, monastic vows, the Mass, and communion in both kinds—as well as the doctrine of justification by faith, remained as formulated by Melanchthon. It also held that Christian liberty and free conscience prevail in adiaphora matters. Melanchthon had recommended that during the transitional period of the Reformation, customs concerning communion should be left open for each side to make their choice, although both kinds became a part of the doctrine of the sacrament in the Wittenberg Articles and implicitly included also in the Ten Articles and the Bishops' Book. Since the Bishops' Book never fell under statute law, its doctrine on adiaphora allowed Christian liberty in adiaphora matters that did not bind consciences. The Bishops' Book, more clearly than the Ten Articles, adopted the doctrine of grace from the Wittenberg Articles, modifying the old structure by adding the phrase "amendment of former life," and combining penance into the article on justification. The reform-minded clergy could hold to the Bishops' Book as their statement of faith, as it was not stipulated by parliamentary law. Melanchthon's view was that one should hold onto old church structure in doctrine and practice and explain the contents based on the new doctrine. Melanchthon's flexibility in not changing structure made it possible to transfer the new contents of the doctrine of adiaphora into the old structure of the English Church.

In the next chapter, we turn to see how the English and Germans responded to the General Council's invitation after they had formed their mutual strategy during the Wittenberg negotiations in 1536, and how they understood the council's authority over church doctrine and practice.

Chapter 10:

The General Council and Diplomacy between England and the Continental Powers

(February–November 1537)

Introduction

During the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations at Wittenberg in 1536, both the English and the Germans wanted to create a common strategy toward the General Council.¹ Other doctrinal matters distracted their attention from preparing a formal agreement and mutual strategy. Also, the problem of the General Council complicated the relationships among the European rulers, as it divided those who supported the pope's superiority over the council and those who opposed it.

Hoping that Henry would return to the Roman Church, the pope made Reginald Pole, a relative of Henry's, a cardinal and sent him to England as papal representative. Once again, Henry was able to manipulate political circumstances to his advantage and prevent Pole from entering England.

This chapter reviews the historical details of the German and English opposition to the General Council and their consequent arbitrations. Also discussed are the politics of the pope's threat to excommunicate Henry, as well as the effects of Henry's Law of Succession on European diplomacy.

German Opposition to the General Council

While Henry was occupied with the Northern Rebellion, John Frederick, the Elector of Saxony, invited the German lay leaders and theologians to a joint meeting at Schmalkalden in February 1537.² In December 1536, John Frederick had asked Luther to prepare articles of faith

¹ The second point that Fox presented in his instructions from Henry in 1536 was for the Germans and the English to agree on the actual place of the General Council. If the pope and emperor determined the place, it would, in likelihood, be prejudicial against other rulers. The place should allow for frankness and liberty so that the truth could be spoken and heard, concluded, and determined. Otherwise, Henry argued, the Council would not be a remedy but a mischief. If either the Bishop of Rome or the emperor were to decide the place, Henry feared that the truth would be in as great peril of oppression as it had been in like cases before. SP 1/96, 1535, Fol. 15R.

Henry and the Germans were suspicious of the council convened by Paul III: they wanted an independent free council at a neutral location. Henry's fears were that he would be attacked for his divorce and break from Rome and forming an independent church. The Germans feared that they would be condemned as heretics and their religion would be suppressed. McEntegart 2002, p. 26.

² Introduction to Schmalkaldic Articles 1537. *The Book of Concord*, p. 329.

to be discussed and decided at Schmalkalden in preparation for the General Council proposed for May 23, 1537, at Mantua.³

Luther wrote a preface to the Schmalkaldic Articles stating that, since Pope Paul III had called for a council at Mantua around Pentecost, Luther had composed articles of “our doctrine” to clarify what he would concede to the papists. He hoped that the pope would hold a free Christian council, but expected that the Roman court would be afraid of such a council. He said, “Not that we need it, for through God’s grace our churches are now enlightened and supplied with the pure Word and right use of the sacraments.”⁴ The German concern was that their new doctrine might be interpreted as heretical from the pope’s point of view. At the meeting, Luther’s document was not formally adopted, but most of those present signed it. Melanchthon’s response and qualification are discussed in the next section.

Luther became seriously ill, and was unable to attend the Schmalkalden meeting. One can see in Melanchthon’s letter to Luther of February 27–28, 1537, that he saw Luther as central to the Reformation and regarded his recovery as a sign that God was looking after his church.⁵ He reported that the princes had discussed what to say to the emperor’s orator and also that they had been unable to reach the papal nuncio regarding the General Council.⁶ The emperor and the pope’s representatives were putting pressure on the German theologians to attend the pope’s council. Since they were subjects of the emperor, they were in a difficult position, but, on the other hand, the Schmalkaldic League was strong enough at this time to protect its members from papal intrusion.

The German princes decided to send Henry an explanation of their position on the General Council after their debate at Schmalkalden in February 1537.⁷ Instead of sending their position to Henry with the major embassy that they had promised in 1536 after the Wittenberg negotiations, they sent a letter via a Hamburg sailor.⁸ This insensitivity offended Henry, who only received the

³ Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope 1537. *The Book of Concord*, pp. 329–344. Introduction to the Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope 1537. *The Book of Concord*, p. 329. Introduction to Schmalkaldic Articles 1537, *Concordia*, pp. 255–257.

⁴ The Schmalkaldic Articles, 1537. The Preface of Martin Luther. *The Book of Concord*, pp. 297–299.

⁵ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, No. 1855, p. 357. Melanchthon to Martin Luther. February 27/28, 1537. [M. an Martin Luther [in Gotha], Schmalkalden [February 27/28], 1537.

⁶ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, No. 1855, p. 356. Melanchthon to Martin Luther, February 27/28, 1537. [M. an Martin Luther [in Gotha], Schmalkalden, [February 27/28], 1537.

⁷ Elector John Frederick of Saxony and the Landgrave Philip of Hesse in the name of the Schmalkaldic League to King Ferdinand and others. [Kf. Johann Friedrich von Sachsen und Lgf. Philipp von Hessen in name des Schmalkaldischen Bundes an Kg. Ferdinand und andere.] March 26, 1537. MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1877, pp. 400–401 (German response to refuse the Council).

⁸ Elector John Frederick of Saxony, Landgrave Philip of Hesse and other members of the Schmalkaldic League to King Henry of England; Melanchthon’s script. [Kf. Johann Friedrich von Sachsen, Lgf. Philipp von Hessen und die übrigen Schmalkaldischen Bundesgenossen an Kg. Heinrich VIII von England. Von Melanchthon formuliert.] September 1, 1536. MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1781, pp. 222–224. The present author agrees with McEntegart 2002, p. 78.

McEntegart gives a detailed description of the renewed contacts with the English and the letter that was lost. See McEntegart 2002, pp. 79–85; Schofield 2006, p. 85.

Saxon response much later, as evidenced by the elector's apology.⁹ Meanwhile, Henry had published his own writing against the pope, which was distributed in Germany.¹⁰

On March 5, 1537, soon after the Schmalkalden conference, Melanchthon wrote to Francis I in the name of Elector John Frederick and Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, appealing to him and to James V, the King of Scotland, to join the German princes against the pope's General Council planned for Mantua. The German princes refused to attend this council of Pope Paul III, as it would be neither fair nor useful to the church unless there was an agreement on procedure by impartial men. They suggested having a free synod in Germany. By this time, the Germans had responded to the papal nuncio and the emperor's orator with their refusal to attend. They also confirmed that they supported the true doctrine of the Catholic Church of Christ (*catholicae ecclesiae Christi*)—the universal church (*universa ecclesia*).¹¹ Their request was exactly the same as Henry's. The question of attending the pope's council was also political and involved most of the European monarchs and princes.

The division may be seen as a change from the pope's position as the prime authority in religious matters toward that of the leadership and authority of national states now able to decide their religious affairs independently from the pope. Later, Francis I told the Elector of Saxony and Landgrave of Hesse that, while he was for an agreement designed for consensus in the entire church, he would not approve a "gathering of this kind." He was ambiguous in his support of the council.¹² His response could be interpreted to mean that he only supported a council free to discuss matters concerning the national sovereigns and princes of principalities. If it were not free in this manner, he would agree with the Germans in refuting it and consider a national synod in a neutral place.

On March 12, 1537, Melanchthon wrote to both Vitus Theodoric and Joachim Camerarius that the "old treaty" had been renewed. He must have been referring to the Schmalkaldic League: "If war was waged on those who professed the Gospel because of their doctrine, the rest, even if they did not feel the same way, would not help their enemies."¹³ It is clearer in his letter to Joachim that, after the Schmalkalden meeting, there was tension over how their doctrine would stand in the face of the future synod. Melanchthon had "fears of tragic things."¹⁴ Even though the Schmalkaldic League was strong, the independent stance against imperial and papal authority caused apprehensions about the possibility of armed conflict. He noted in the letter to Theodoric that he had not heard any news from the English.¹⁵ Melanchthon must have hoped that they would have a mutual protestation toward the pope's council.

⁹ Melanchthon's Design of the Writing of Elector John Frederick of Saxony and Landgrave of Hesse to King Henry VIII of England. [M.:Entwurf für en Schreiben de Kf. Johann Friedrich von Sachsen und Lgf. Philipp von Hessen an Kf. Heinrich VIII. von England.] November 14, 1538. MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1964, 559.

¹⁰ Melanchthon to Frederick Myconius [M. an Friedrich Myconius in Gotha]. October 6, 1937. MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1948, p. 526.

¹¹ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1866, pp. 379–381.

¹² CR III, 1542, p. 312; *Epistola regis Galliae, qua respondit his litteris, legitur in eodem...* Kal. Iunias 1537. Codex Coth. 451, p. 283; CR III, 1542, p. 312.

¹³ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1884, p. 418.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 416.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 418.

On March 26, 1537, the Elector John Frederick and Philip the Landgrave of Hesse wrote a letter to King Ferdinand in the name of the Schmalkaldic League about their refusal to attend the General Council to be convened at Mantua on May 23, 1537, which they gave to the imperial orator along with a published refusal. They wrote that the pope had already condemned their doctrine without letting them have any chance to acknowledge or examine it in a general, free, and Christian synod. They also wrote that the pope was trying, under pretext of a synod, to obligate other kings and potentates to accept his bull that, in reality, extirpated the pious and Catholic doctrine they professed that was clearly stated in the new doctrine, but which the pope tried forcefully to excise. If they attended the pope's synod, they would be implicitly condemning their own doctrine by testifying against it. At the same time, a refusal to attend might be interpreted by the pope as if they were not supporting the common good. Their reasons were based on both scriptural and natural law to protect the common safety of the church, in which abuses needed to be corrected.¹⁶

This was a daring announcement by the Schmalkaldic leaders. They officially set scriptural authority above the civil magistracy and the pope, whom they acknowledged as ruling by human, not divine, law. They defended the new doctrine against the abuses in the church led by the pope. They felt that the true doctrine, which they supported, had not been officially declared as true by any larger church organization. Most important was that the pope had condemned their doctrine and wished to make this official in a larger council, without giving them right of response. Their refusal was based on the rights of the territorial princes, whose responsibility was to defend their subjects' doctrine.

Melanchthon, in his letter to Vitus Theodoric, wrote of his dream regarding the council. While the emperor waged war with the Turks, he would hold a council in Nicaea where it was first held by Constantine and bring peace and reconciliation to the Latin and the Greek Churches. The Greeks did not disapprove the rites that he would institute in the Latin Churches.¹⁷ Church division was Melanchthon's concern, and he hoped that a free council would be established in which the controversial church polity issues could be discussed with bishops, monarchs, and princes.

Unfortunately, due to the lack of coordination between various parties, Melanchthon became a pawn in the Anglo-Schmalkaldic negotiations and the prospect of the General Council. This author agrees with McEntegart, who asserts that the leaders of the Schmalkaldic League made a condition that if Henry would accept the League's religious principles and defend them at a council, Melanchthon would be sent with the next embassy.¹⁸

The communication between the Saxon Reformers and Henry failed as both had quite different motivations toward the pope's council. The new doctrine was in danger of being repudiated by the pope if the Germans attended; therefore, it was necessary to have a statement

¹⁶ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1877, pp. 400–401. At the same time back in Germany, a letter was dispatched on March 26, 1537. This letter was the one meant to reach Henry before the Council in Mantua. But due to a delay in sending it through private citizens, it reached the King much later than intended, for which both the Elector and Francis Burchard apologized, when they received a response. MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1964, pp. 558–559; CR III, 1629, pp. 448–451.

¹⁷ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1968, p. 565; CR III, No. 1631, p. 453.

¹⁸ McEntegart 2002, p. 100.

as soon as possible, but Henry's domestic situation had delayed his communication with the Saxon Reformers. They were also cautious toward him because Henry had made no commitment to their doctrine or responded to their communication. Before looking more closely at King Henry's opposition to the General Council, we will discuss Melancthon's ecclesiastical views.

Melancthon's Ecclesiastical Views

Melancthon's concept of the Church had been developed in the course of publication of the Schmalkaldic Articles. The authority of the true church consisted of both the visible and the invisible church, based not on a person but on the new doctrine and faith. The true church was the invisible manifested by the visible, which followed the authority of the new doctrine. When signing Luther's preface to the Schmalkaldic Articles, Melancthon added this qualification:

I, Philip Melancthon, approve the above articles as pious and Christian. However, concerning the Pope I judge that, if he admits the Gospel, it would be possible for us, too, to permit him the superiority over bishops that he otherwise holds on the grounds of human law, for the sake of peace and general tranquility of Christians who are under him now and will be under him in the future.¹⁹

Melancthon had accepted the pope's superiority over bishops by human right²⁰ in his treatise on the "Power and Primacy of the Pope," which became an appendix to the Schmalkaldic Articles.²¹ Melancthon gives a Lutheran view of the authority of the church and its foundation.²² The treatise is divided into two parts: 1) an analysis of the claim that the pope is the supreme head of the church by divine right and that it is necessary to believe this; 2) a description of the jurisdiction of the bishops.²³

Melancthon rejected the pope's power by divine right, his right to exercise secular jurisdiction, and his authority as necessary to salvation. He relied on the testimony of the Scriptures and of history, while rejecting Roman arguments. He contrasted Christ with the pope and warned that the pope's authority had signs of the Antichrist.²⁴ For Melancthon, divine authority based on the Scripture alone principle and any bishop's jurisdictional authority come from divine, not human right. Even though Melancthon's addendum to the Schmalkaldic

¹⁹ *Ego, Philippus Melancthon, supra positos articulos approbo ut pios et Christianos, De pontifice autem statuo, si evangelium admitteret, posse ei propter pacem et communem tranquillitatem Christianorum, qui iam sub ipso sunt et in posterum sub ipso erunt, superioritatem in episcopos, quam alioqui habet, iure humano etiam a nobis permitti.* In *De Potestate et Primatu Papae*, 1537, pp. 502–527. "Introduction to the Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope" 1537. *Concordia*, pp. 291–292.

²⁰ Of the Power and Primacy of the Pope. 1537. *The Book of Concord*, pp. 330–344.

²¹ The "Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope" was an expansion to the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apologia*. This was important topic for the impending Council. "Introduction to the Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope." *The Book of Concord*, p. 329. Of the Power and Primacy of the Pope [*De Potestate et Primatu Papae*] 1537. *Concordia Triglotta*, pp. 503–529.

²² Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope. 1537, pp. 329–324. Introduction to the Treatise on the Power and Primacy of the Pope 1537, *The Book of Concord*, pp. 329–330.

²³ *Concordia*, pp. 294–305.

²⁴ Of the Power and Primacy of the Pope [*De Potestate et Primatu Papae*] 1537. *Concordia Triglotta*, pp. 502–527.

Articles appears to be open to the Roman Church, Wengert argues that his using the phrase, “by human right,” was to be interpreted as unifiable, diplomatic language.²⁵

Melanchthon then defined his view of the correct understanding of the power and jurisdiction of bishops. The duties of bishops included preaching the Gospel, administering sacraments, and excommunicating persons guilty of public sins. The distinction of grades in the duties of bishops and ministers are human ordinances, not divine institution. He warned that bishops who followed the pope were defending false doctrines.²⁶ In the course of formulating the Schmalkaldic Articles, Melanchthon’s concept of ecclesiology developed and it became clear to him that the foundation of the church is not a person but faith.²⁷

At approximately the same time, Melanchthon made an alternative proposal in his treatise as to what he thought would benefit the churches in place of a papal council.²⁸ First, he dealt with issues such as civil magistrates, who are neither against natural law nor the Ten Commandments, but have the right to use force. On the other hand, ecclesiastical power does not exercise force. He then defined their reciprocal tasks and concluded that synods express the judgments of the church when bishops and laity dissent. Kings ought to interpose their authority when the church is in danger, which is different from what the bishops would do. Both bishops and kings select suitable men to make judgments that are relevant for the church. Bishops are the shepherds of the church, and their jurisdiction is a civil matter, but their ordination includes vocation and election by the people. They judge doctrine and convene a synod twice a year. For the purpose of solving doctrinal controversies, suitable men should be chosen from the whole body of the church. Then, emperors and kings should call for these synods. At the same time, civil power (in the hands of the magistrate) protects the church.²⁹ The implications of civil power and the Reformation Church orders in Germany give some examples of how Melanchthon proposed they coexist with some of his specific ideas.

Moving from Melanchthon’s thoughts on the bishops’ authority in the church, we will examine the politics in England and how the General Council was opposed.

English Opposition to the General Council

After his divorce, Henry appealed the pope’s decision against him to the General Council. The conclusion he drew from his experience was that even the popes and their councils could make mistakes in doctrine and practice.³⁰ However, he still feared the pope’s power because of his having broken with Rome and formed an independent church. Henry’s rejection of the pope’s authority led to the constant threat of a papal bull to depose him.

²⁵ Beyond Stereotypes: The Real Philip Melanchthon. Wengert 2010, I, p. 30.

²⁶ Of the Power and Primacy of the Pope [*De Potestate et Primatu Papae*] 1537. *Concordia Triglotta*, pp. 520–529.

²⁷ Lexutt 2006, p. 36.

²⁸ Boniface rightly established that the pope should hold both swords by divine right, that is, both the highest ecclesiastical power and the highest power or mandate or right of conferring temporal kingdom and empires. CR III, No. 1642, pp. 466–471.

²⁹ CR III, No. 1642, pp. 466–467, 469, 470–472.

³⁰ Dingel 2006, pp. 147–148.

As early as 1536, King Henry's plans for the pope's General Council had changed, and his appeal to the General Council regarding his divorce changed. He thought that if the pope indicted the council he might reverse Henry's divorce. Possibly Henry's speed in having the Ten Articles published in summer 1536 had to do with the issue of the General Council and to protect himself and the English Church. Earlier, opposition to the General Council had become common ground for negotiations between Henry and the German princes as stated in Chapter Five. When the pope suggested the location for the council, Henry and the evangelical princes objected it and repudiated any other location the pope might choose.³¹ Chibi argues that the king's interest in the General Council waned when Charles V insisted on having the council under the pope's leadership.³²

In May 1537 Henry published *Illustrissimi ac potentissimi Regis, senatis populi que Angliæ sententia, et de eo concilio quod Paulus Ep'us Romanus Mantuæ futurum simulavit, et de ea bulla quæ ad calendas Novembres id prorogavit* [The opinion of the most illustrious and powerful King, senate and people of England both about the council, which Paul, the Bishop of Rome pretended would occur at Mantua and about the bull he suspended to the first of November] written on the subject.³³ This book was nearly simultaneously translated into English. A copy was printed in Wittenberg, and at least three German translations appeared over the next two years. Richard Morison, one of Henry's agents, sent a copy of the book to Melanchthon.³⁴

It appears from Henry's writings that the General Council was the main focus of the power struggle between Henry and Pope Paul III. At some point after the pope proposed his council, Henry responded; at the same time, however, the purpose of his statement was to repudiate the papal bull that was suspended in 1535, but this threat became real again during the publication of the Ten Articles in 1536.

Henry convinced the pope that he was willing to reform errors and abuses of the church, on the condition of having a free and pious council ". . . in which the tranquility of the Catholic Church may be restored." Henry suggested that a council should be held between Paul III, the Catholic princes, and other Christians with the consent of emperors, kings, and princes.³⁵ Since, in Henry's estimation, Pope Paul was equal to, but not above, other bishops, even if he had the authority to call a council, in Henry's thinking, he did not have the right to predetermine its date and location until harmony among princes had been established over such a council.³⁶ In Henry's opinion, the pope's council would not solve religious divisions as long as he claimed to be above other princes and bishops. Convinced that the Church of England belonged to the universal church and that the English Church would never depart from the unity of the true Catholic Church,³⁷ Henry thought that the invitation to a universal council should be initiated by an

³¹ Even though Henry had first appealed to the General Council, he refused the one the pope had planned in Mantua in 1537. Elton 1977, p. 276.

³² Chibi 2003, p. 170.

³³ L&P, XII, Pt. 1, No. 1310, p. 594.

³⁴ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, No. 1948, p. 526; L&P, XII, Pt. 1, Nos. 1310, 1311, p. 594. McEntegart 2002, p. 84.

³⁵ *Responsio H.8. Regis Angliæ ad bullam Papalem Pauli tertii*. Paper-Office, XXXVIII, *Ecclesiastical History*, pp. 142–143.

³⁶ *Ibid.* pp. 144–145.

³⁷ *Responsio H.8. Regis Angliæ ad bullam Papalem Pauli tertii*. Paper-Office, XXXVIII, *Ecclesiastical History*, p. 150. Henry refers to the Catholic Church of the Church Fathers.

emperor, and he suggested that each individual prince should have oversight of a synod in his own domain.³⁸ He also assured the pope that the English Church would never depart from the unity of the true and Catholic Church. Furthermore, Henry criticized Paul's selection of Mantua as unsafe.³⁹ He also accused Paul of hostility, flattery, and promises, using bribes and rewards that were proof of his tyranny toward England, and said that the English should not subject themselves to the Bishop of Rome's tyranny even by sending representatives to the council.⁴⁰ This is the same argument with which Stephen Gardiner had responded to the pope's letter to Henry. Again, Henry wished to insist that the Church of England did not belong to the pope's jurisdiction.

In a letter to Henry on April 7, 1537, the German princes stated that the emperor had asked whether they were willing to attend the pope's council. According to the emperor, its main purpose was to correct abuses. The German princes stated that the pope's invitation announced the opposite. Instead, they said, the pope had already condemned their doctrine, and the council would only confirm this condemnation. The princes said that if they accepted the invitation, the pope would succeed in having the kings and princes agree with him. It would also mean that he would eradicate the new doctrine professed by the Germans.⁴¹

At about this time, the English bishops gave their opinion of the General Council. The emperor alone had invited the Church of Christ to hold four yearly councils, but the Roman pope never had such authority. Therefore, they said, the emperors, princes, and the Bishop of Rome should have called the council in agreement with one another, as the princes had absolute power in their own realms.⁴²

Furthermore, the bishops stated that the ancient councils dealt with matters of faith and interpretation of Scripture. Bishops were the ministers of the "Word of God," to teach new doctrine, to loose and bind and protect from false teachers. They believed that the Christian prince had power over all, including bishops and priests, to observe that they fulfilled their duties. The prince's conduct should be judged by the principles of the new doctrine in faith and practice, which the reform-minded clergy supported. Out of nine bishops who signed, six were reform-minded and three were conservative bishops.⁴³ The English bishops, the conservatives, and even the reform-minded firmly believed that Henry was above the pope. They believed that Henry had authority, as a Christian king, to call for a council and to define doctrine.

³⁸ *Responsio H.8. Regis Angliae ad bullam Papalem Pauli tertii*. Paper-Office, XXXVIII, *Ecclesiastical History*. pp. 148–149.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 145.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 146–147.

⁴¹ A Letter written to the king by the Princes of the Smalcaldick League. Cott. Lib. Cleop. E. 6. P. 283. Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, XLVII, p. 475.

⁴² St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXXXIV, p. 543; *Cranmer's Miscellaneous*, 1537, Appendix, No. VII, pp. 467–468.

⁴³ The opynyon of certen of the Busshoppes and Clergie of this Realme, subscribed with their handes, touching the Generall Counsaile. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXXXIV, [1537?], p. 544. The date is not clear, but it probably is before the Council was planned to meet in May 1537 and after John Hilsey became bishop of Rochester in 1535. Nine bishops and four other clergy signed this opinion. T. Canterbury, [Thomas Cranmer], John of London, [John Stokesley], Cuthbert of Durham, [Cuthbert Tunstall], John of Wells, [John Clerk], Thomas of Ely, [Thomas Goodrich], John of Bangor, [John Salcot], Nicholas of Salisbury, [Nicholas Shaxton], Hugh of Wygorn, [Hugh Latimer of Worcester], John of Rochester, [John Hilsey], Robertus Aldrydge, [Robert Aldrich], Canon of Windsor, Richardus Coren, Archdeacon of Oxford and Colchester, Edoardus Leyghton, Archdeacon of Sarum. St.P. Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXXXIV, [1537?], p. 544.

Henry had been waiting for an embassy from Germany since the beginning of 1537, as promised in their letter of September 1, 1536.⁴⁴ As none had arrived, Henry published his own opinion regarding the council, as evidenced in a letter sent by Melanchthon to Frederick Myconius on October 6, 1537. Morison wrote to Cromwell that the king's answer against the council in Mantua had spread all over Europe and, therefore, that its contents should not be changed nor its printing postponed.⁴⁵

The interval between the Saxon Reformers and Henry can be seen from the background of the Pilgrimage of Grace, the sudden death of the queen, and Henry's political maneuverings with the European monarchs and the pope. Henry's opposition toward the council was his private matter, which eventually affected his policies at home and abroad.

Henry had written his protest against the council unilaterally because of the possibility that he would remain isolated if Francis and the emperor agreed to attend.⁴⁶ MacCulloch proposes that such a protestation by Henry must have been the result of the English clergy's synod's work that designed the "Bishops' Book."⁴⁷ For the first time since the break from Rome, the king delegated authority to the bishops to consider doctrine, as Henry must have felt more confident that the conflict was over in England and doctrinal settlement almost completed. The idea of replacing the pope's council with the English bishops' synod must have appealed to Henry, even though he would have accepted a council without the pope. Melanchthon and other Reformers also preferred national councils of bishops.

On June 1, 1537, Henry sent Edmund Bonner and Simon Heynes to Spain to appeal to the emperor's resident ambassador, Thomas Wyatt, to dissuade the emperor from assenting to the General Council, which had been moved from Mantua to Vicenza. In his letter to Cromwell, Bonner wrote that the king should have liberty to withdraw from the council.⁴⁸ Cromwell agreed with Henry on the matter of the council, and stated that the council was seeking only the pope's glory and authority,⁴⁹ and that only Henry's mediation in regards to the council would ensure universal peace.⁵⁰

The Bishop of Modena, who was the papal nuncio, wrote that Henry's vehement opinion of the council was being read everywhere and was greatly alienating people from the pope. He further stated that the Germans were planning to convene a provincial council without the pope. An agent of the emperor, he said, was blaming the pope for the delay in holding the council, as well as for all the wars going on and the disputes over matters of faith.⁵¹ Melanchthon was aware

⁴⁴ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1781, pp. 222–224; McEntegart 2002, p. 78.

⁴⁵ L&P, XII, Pt. 1, Nos. 1310, 1311, p. 594. L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 844, p. 297.

⁴⁶ Bernard argues that Henry supported a free General Council to reform abuses, but opposed a pope's council, which he regarded as an overextension of papal authority. Bernard 1998, p. 327.

⁴⁷ MacCulloch 1996, pp. 193–194. See also Tjernagel 1965, p. 171.

⁴⁸ Boner to Cromwell, June 1, 1537. St.P. Vol. I, Pt. 2, LXXXVIII, p. 550.

⁴⁹ Cromwell to Michael Throgmorton, September 1537, *Cromwell's Letters* Vol. 2, No. 218, pp. 89–90; L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 795, p. 280; SP 1/125, Fols. 71–73.

⁵⁰ Cromwell to Sir Thomas Wyatt, October 10, 1537. Harl. Mss. 282, f. 208; *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. 2, No. 222, p. 94.

⁵¹ L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 1001, p. 347.

of Henry's excuse regarding the pope's synod, but was surprised at the king's vehement hatred of the pope and his caustic writings.⁵²

The German princes decided to send Henry an explanation of their position on the General Council after their debate at Schmalkalden in February 1537.⁵³ As stated earlier, instead of sending their communication to Henry with the major embassy that they had promised in 1536 after the Wittenberg negotiations, they sent a letter via a Hamburg sailor.⁵⁴ This is evidence of the German princes' cautious approach toward King Henry after negotiations broke down in 1536 and the lack of communication between the parties since then.

The Saxon reformers must have been unaware that Henry had not received their response. The Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse apologized for not expressing their opinion on the council sooner—that is, in May 1537, when Henry published his announcement against the General Council. They asked pardon for not sending a copy of their text through the same messenger earlier.⁵⁵ Their excuse was that they sent copies to all kings of Christian name asking them to forward a copy to him. Once they saw that Henry wrote with such liberty, they decided to confer with him.⁵⁶ Cromwell hoped that the Germans and the English would have had a united protest against the pope's council, but the papal representatives visited the German princes frequently; hence the Germans were under constant pressure to accept the pope's invitation.

Henry was annoyed with the Germans for sending the letter by general shipping (a letter of apology to Henry was sent in November 1537), and, therefore, Henry had published his own tract as to why he refused the General Council. Even if he meant it as an insult to the Protestants, it did not have the expected reaction. Instead the Protestants were impressed, and they published it in Germany. Melancthon was surprised both that the letter of apology to Henry was sent in November 1537 and at the vehemence with which Henry wrote and his bitterness toward the pope.⁵⁷

The Germans were quite assured, after publishing the Schmalkaldic Articles, that they had plans in case the council were to be indicted. However, their communication demonstrated a lack of trust of Henry and an unwillingness to work with him after he had turned down their proposal to become Protector of the Schmalkaldic League and subscribe to *Confessio Augustana*.

In a letter, the German princes said they were pleased about Henry's opinion of the council that "we also agreed to," and they hoped that Henry's opinion would benefit the universal church

⁵² MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1948, p. 526.

⁵³ Elector John Frederick of Saxony and the Landgrave Philip of Hesse in the name of the Schmalkaldic League to King Ferdinand and others. [Kf. Johann Friedrich von Sachsen und Lgf. Philipp von Hessen in name des Schmalkaldischen Bundes an Kg. Ferdinand und andere.] March 26, 1537. MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1877, pp. 400–401 (German response to refuse the Council).

⁵⁴ Elector John Frederick of Saxony, Landgrave Philip of Hesse and other members of the Schmalkaldic League to King Henry of England; Melancthon's script. [Kf. Johann Friedrich von Sachsen, Lgf. Philipp von Hessen und die übrigen Schmalkaldischen Bundesgenossen an Kg. Heinrich VIII von England. Von Melancthon formuliert.] September 1, 1536. MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1781, pp. 222–224. The present author agrees with McEntegart 2002, p. 78. Schofield 2006, p. 85.

⁵⁵ Writing by Melancthon for the Elector John Frederick of Saxony and Landgrave Philip of Hesse to King Henry VIII of England. [M.: Entwurf für ein Schreiben des Kf. Johann Friedrich von Sachsen und Lgf. Philipp von Hessen an Kg. Heinrich VIII. von England.] MBW T 7, 1964, pp. 558–559.

⁵⁶ MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1964, pp. 558–559; L&P, XII, Pt. 2, Nos. 1088–89, p. 382.

⁵⁷ See McEntegart 2002, pp. 84–85.

on Earth. In their view, Henry's authority would benefit the church, prevent papal oppression, and conserve "pious doctrine." They said that the pope held the synod only to stabilize his unjust power, but that they should present a united front concerning the religious controversies and ecclesiastical doctrine. They did mention the dangers their refusal would bring to their churches and to themselves, but considered it a necessary danger in defense of their principles, and they commended the outcome to God.⁵⁸

Their apology must have assured the king of their attitude toward the council. Certainly the king was occupied with the aftermath of the "Pilgrimage of Grace," but the lack of communication and trust between Henry and the Schmalkaldic League is still puzzling. Both approached the situation independently, even though the initial purpose of their negotiations in 1536 had been to form a common strategy toward the council.

It is surprising that the Germans, who sent letters to Francis and Ferdinand, did not do better at sending them to England sooner, even though they had witnessed Henry's refusal of the pope's council throughout their negotiations.

The Pope Threatens to Depose Henry VIII

As stated in Chapter Eight, the threat of reinstatement of the papal bull as an attempt to excommunicate King Henry became concrete after the publication of the Ten Articles in 1536. The Catholics did not trust that Henry sincerely intended a northern parliament, suspecting him of wanting to sway the people to his will. From their perspective, this was an opportune time to consider the passing of the papal bull of excommunication. Some English citizens who opposed the king were circulating copies of the bull to arouse the people against the king.⁵⁹ Even though the bull had been suspended in 1535, it still represented a continuous threat to Henry. Henry must have been aware that the rebels would have joined any intruders into the country.

Another threat to Henry came from Reginald Pole, a royal relative. As discussed in Chapter Seven, Pole had written a book entitled *De Unitate Ecclesiastica* in 1536, in which he attacked Henry vehemently for all his atrocities toward the Catholic Church, especially the executions of More and Fisher. Then, on December 22, 1536, the pope made Pole a cardinal⁶⁰ and, somewhat naively assuming that Pole would be protected because he was a representative of the pope, in February 1537, made Pole his legate in the hope that Pole could persuade Henry to return to the faith.⁶¹ At the end of March, Pope Paul III wrote to Pole that even though he doubted Henry could be brought back to the church by any means other than force, he encouraged Pole to persevere.⁶² The pope's plan was to convene the General Council in Mantua and use Pole to

⁵⁸ Elector of Saxony John Frederick of Saxony and Landgrave Philip of Hesse to King Henry VIII of England by Melancthon. [M. Entwurf für ein Schreiben des Kf. Johann Friedrich von Sachsen und Lgf. Philipp von Hessen an Kf. Heinrich VIII. von England] November 14, 1537. MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1964, pp. 558–559.

⁵⁹ L&P XII, Pt. 1, No. 463, p. 221.

⁶⁰ L&P, 1536, XI, No. 1353, p. 542; SP 1/113, Fols. 3–4. "Decree of consistory at Rome creating him a cardinal. Among the cardinals created Reginald Pole, an Englishman, who has requested the pope that he might be passed over."

⁶¹ L&P, XII, Pt. 1, No. 367, p. 162; No. 399, pp. 198–199; SP 1/155, Fols. 261–262.

⁶² L&P, XII, Pt. 1, No. 779, p. 338.

depose Henry.⁶³ Bernard says that the pope wanted to negotiate with Francis I and Charles V in order to take forceful action against the schismatic king.⁶⁴ It was important for Henry to capture Pole before he entered England as the pope's legate. It appears that the Duke of Norfolk used the threat of Pole as one reason why it was important that he, Norfolk, stay in the north.⁶⁵ Henry needed Norfolk in the north because he needed those borders protected from the pope's agents.

At the end of March, Gardiner, the resident English ambassador in France, was given the task of telling Francis that allowing Pole to enter France would be a violation of their mutual treaty.⁶⁶ Gardiner had to convince Francis that, in order to maintain Henry's friendship, he should apprehend Pole. In April 1537, Francis prevented Pole's travels in France, but refused to send him to England as a traitor as Henry had requested.⁶⁷ Henry's diplomacy with Francis was a repetition of his actions when he diverted Melanchthon's trip to France two years previously, in 1535.⁶⁸ At this time, Henry was able to prevent his archenemy, even a relative of his, from entering England as a papal legate. Henry then urged Queen Mary of Flanders to prevent Pole from entering the emperor's dominions.⁶⁹ Pole assumed a disguise and was hidden by Cardinal Liège in Cambrai, informing the pope that it was dangerous for him to stay abroad as the imperialists also denied his access to Flanders.⁷⁰ Pole must have realized that he could not accomplish the pope's mission in England.

In a letter to Cromwell, Pole made the purpose of his trip sound as if the pope only wished to reconcile the kings of France and England and to increase the wealth of Christendom. However, his message did not reach the king because the English ambassadors intercepted it. Pole, in acknowledging his failure, added that it was due to his unwillingness to offend the King of England.⁷¹

Hence, the pope's plan for the bull was prevented and the threat of the council postponed. Both these factors meant that, for the time being, the pope could not prevent Henry's church reforms, and he had to balance the European diplomatic situation with other Catholic sovereigns.

The Succession Law and its Effects on European Diplomacy

The interpretation of the Succession Law became particularly complicated after the death of Queen Anne. Who would succeed Henry VIII, Lady Mary or Princess Elizabeth?⁷² There were still great hopes among the Catholic powers in Europe that Mary would regain her legal right and

⁶³ Thomas Cromwell to Reginald Pole, April 1535. Slavin, No. 29, p. 72.

⁶⁴ Bernard. 2005. pp. 404–407.

⁶⁵ L&P, XII, Pt. 1, No. 809, p. 358; SP 1/117, Fols. 233–235.

⁶⁶ L&P, XII, Pt. 1, No. 760, p. 332.

⁶⁷ L&P, XII, Pt. No. 760, p. 332; No. 939, p. 425.

⁶⁸ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. p. 330; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. XLII, pp. 468–469; L&P, VIII, No. 1062, p. 418.

⁶⁹ An Original Letter of Pole to Cromwell justifying himself. May 2, 1537. Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P. 355; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. LIII, pp. 482–483.

⁷⁰ L&P, XII, Pt. 1, No. 1242, p. 569. Bernard 2005, p. 405.

⁷¹ An Original Letter of Pole to Cromwell justifying himself. May 2, 1537. Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 6. P. 355; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. LIII, p. 484.

⁷² Elton notes that the Second Succession Act was to defeat Princess Mary's party in their hope that, overthrowing Anne, Mary would become the legitimate heir and this would also legitimize Henry's marriage to Catherine. Elton sees the crisis of 1536 as a break-up of the anti-Boleyn alliance. Elton 1977, pp. 245–255. McEntegart 2002, p. 74.

succeed to the English throne. Lady Mary promised obedience and fidelity, but she opposed the Succession Law and, consequently, her status as illegitimate would remain as long as she refused the oath.⁷³ Then, on October 12, 1537, Queen Jane Seymour, Henry's latest wife, gave birth to a son, Edward, whose birth and christening were announced throughout the country. The long-awaited possibility of a male heir to the throne became reality, clearing Henry's succession question once and for all. Circumstances were not favorable for a new queen, however, because an epidemic was spreading throughout London.

Our prince our lord be thanked is in good health and sucketh like a child of his puissance whiche you my lorde William canne declare Our Mastres thorough the faulte of them that were about her which suffred her to take greate cold and to eat thinges that her fantazie in syknes called for, is departed to god. The kings Maiested pleasure is that you shal [adu]ertise the frenche king of this her graces departure.⁷⁴

In the midst of the joyous announcement of the birth of Prince Edward on October 24, 1537, Jane Seymour died suddenly⁷⁵ and was buried at Windsor Castle.⁷⁶ Henry's conservative chaplain, Cuthbert Tunstall, wrote him a comforting letter, reminding him of the joy the new prince brought to all Englishmen.⁷⁷ Finally the long and arduous struggle over the succession was finished, and with it, one of the conflicts with the Catholic powers in Europe.

At the same time, the power struggle between Henry, the pope, and the emperor continued regarding the General Council, and Henry used the birth of his son and the demise of his wife as an excuse to confer with the Catholic powers.

On October 31, Henry sent Lord William Howard to France, along with the resident English ambassador Gardiner, to announce the birth of Edward and the death of the queen to Francis. The purpose of Henry's embassy was to balance his foreign relations after the rebellion was subdued. It was important for Henry that both Francis and the emperor formally include Henry in their mutual negotiation. Even though Henry's divorce struggle and the problem of succession were over, the authority question between Henry and the pope was unresolved. Henry VIII and the German princes manifested the struggle for authority anew in the convening of the General Council.

Henry wanted the Catholic powers to regard him, not the pope, as the peacemaker in the church. Two weeks before the Queen's death, Cromwell wrote Thomas Wyatt, the imperial

⁷³ Rory McEntegart notes that the Boleyn execution had caused England to enter a new phase in faction politics in 1536–1537. There was anti-Protestant sentiment after the execution of Anne Boleyn. What was left was the common opposition to the General Council. McEntegart 2002, pp. 74–75, 92.

⁷⁴ Add. Mss. 6113, 1537, Fols. 81RV, 82R, 83RV, 84R, V, 85RV; Harl. Mss. 282. F. 211; *Cromwell's Letters* Vol. II, No. 233. Cromwell to Sir Thomas Wyatt, 1537; the Dowager Marchioness of Dorset to King Henry VIII. October 14, 1537. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, C. 570; L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 889, p. 310; No. 891, 311; SP 1/125, Fols. 157–158; L&P XII, Pt. 2, No. 892, p. 311; SP 1/125, Fols. 158–159; L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 893, p. 311; No. 894, p. 311; No. 911, p. 318.

⁷⁵ The Earl of Rutland and Others to... October 24?, 1537. St.P., Vol. I, Pt. 2, CII, p. 572; *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. II, No. 226, p. 96; L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 970, p. 339; No. 977, p. 342; No. 988, p. 345.

⁷⁶ L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 1012, p. 355; SP 1/126, Fols. 46–48. L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 1023, p. 358; SP 3/8, Fols. 52–54.

⁷⁷ A Conciliatory Letter to Henry VIII, from the Bishop of Durham, after the Death of Queen Jane November 13, 1537. Cott. Libr. Titus B 1. P. 121; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. LVI, pp. 486–487.

ambassador, and requested that he find out the emperor's opinion of Henry's offer to be the peacemaker of Christendom and of his attitude to the council.⁷⁸

For that reason, it was important for Henry to try to maintain neutrality between the emperor and Francis because of the urgency of his struggle with Pope Paul III. He used the birth of his son, Edward, as a reason to visit the emperor, sending the Vice-Admiral, Sir John Dudley, on a mission to inform Emperor Charles as to the birth of his son, and to discuss the emperor's relations with France and the possibility of his becoming the mediator between Francis and the emperor. On October 10, he sent a letter to his resident ambassador in Spain, Thomas Wyatt, requesting any information on the ambassador's conference with the emperor.

However, Dudley found out that Charles and Francis had agreed to a three-month truce, which resulted in the immediate withdrawal of the armies on both sides in Savoy and Piedmont,⁷⁹ and an announcement of peace on November 16, 1537.⁸⁰ The emperor had not been as frank with Wyatt as he might have been; hence Wyatt was not aware of the truce.⁸¹

The truce between Francis and Charles was, of course, a disappointment to Henry. He would have preferred Charles and Francis to be at odds to preserve neutrality rather than form a Catholic coalition and leave him isolated. Hence, although he had resident ambassadors in both courts, he sent additional agents constantly, such as Dudley, on missions to gather information and make fresh offers.

When Wyatt met with the emperor, he asked about the time and place of the General Council. The council had been deferred to the beginning of the next year, since the emperor had to deal with the Turks first. When Wyatt expressed his concern that the pope would attend the council, which would automatically exclude Henry, the emperor assured him that he would do everything in his power to serve Henry's interests.⁸² Henry took the emperor's promise as a fact. In Cromwell's letter to Wyatt on December 26, 1537, he wrote how eagerly the king wanted reconciliation, and authorized Wyatt to make decisions for him. Cromwell requested Wyatt to write as soon as any decision was announced from the emperor's court:

There was neuer a better inclynacion in the kings Maieste both to forget all thinges passed, to entre a perfite reconciliacion, and to doo in all thinges that may turne to Themperours honour or commoditie.⁸³

Henry must have realized that, in order to have legitimate authority, he needed other Catholic powers to support his goal. There was a mix-up concerning Dudley's return to England, and he was detained in France. This left Francis in a difficult position. He was unable to rectify the situation and tried to convince Henry that he would not violate mutual treaties between them.

⁷⁸ Cromwell to Sir Thomas Wyatt, October 10, 1537. Harl. Mss. 282, Fol. 208; *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. II, No. 222, pp. 92–93; L&P, No. XII, Pt. 2, No. 870, p. 306.

⁷⁹ L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 1104, p. 388; No. 1203, p. 422.

⁸⁰ Harl. Mss. 282, F. 208; *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. II, No. 222, 1537, pp. 92–94; L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 967, p. 338; SP 1/126, Fols. 3–4; L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 987, p. 344; SP 1/126, Fols 18–19; L&P XII, Pt. 2, No. 1053, p. 368.

⁸¹ L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 1053, pp. 367–368.

⁸² L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 1053, p. 368; No. 1249, p. 438; No. 1253, p. 439.

⁸³ Harl. Mss. 282, Fol. 223; *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. II, No. 234, pp. 110–111; L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 1264, p. 443.

But Gardiner interpreted the whole affair as an attempt by Francis to exclude England from a peace agreement between two Catholic sovereigns.⁸⁴

After the truce between Charles and Francis, Cromwell wrote to Thomas Wyatt on November 29 and 30, 1537, instructing him to start a new conference with the emperor and let Henry be mediator in the affairs of Christendom.⁸⁵ However, the emperor's agreement with Francis had been decided in November 1537, and Henry was left out.⁸⁶ As peace between the two European Catholic powers was now a reality, it was the right time for Henry to return to the Schmalkaldic League to make sure that they had not turned against him.

While questioning the authority of the Roman Church was common to both, the German and the English attitudes toward the General Council were different from the outset. They needed to come to an agreement on these questions: Was the council the highest authority in questions of doctrine and practice, and could the council be called by kings and princes or only by the pope?

Because Henry and the Germans regarded the pope's power as based on human, not divine, law, both parties refused to attend a council that the pope had indicted. Henry regarded the position of king as including being head of the church and entailing authority even above the pope. The English bishops believed that Henry was above the pope and should call a council whose task would be to define doctrine. They also wished Henry to have even more power over doctrine than he already had in England, and be the head of the General Council. This is an indication of how far they considered their position as bishops to have been suppressed. They would have elevated Henry even above the council, but Henry did not want to have rivalry with the pope to avoid having his divorce revoked.

Conclusion

Initially, the Germans and the English discussed a common front to the pope's council, but their goals changed. It became a matter of refusal to attend the council. The question of church authority and how it affected the various parties has been the subject of this chapter. Both the Germans and the English opposed the General Council proposed by the pope, and both parties accepted the pope's supremacy as being obtained by human, not divine, law. The Germans made their statement at Schmalkalden. Melancthon's concept of the Church had been developed in the course of publication of the Schmalkaldic Articles. The authority of the true church consisted of both the visible and the invisible church, based not on a person but on the new doctrine and faith. The true church was the invisible manifested by the visible, which followed the authority of the new doctrine. It was important for the Germans to defend their new doctrine and nascent churches. Melancthon elaborated further that kings ought to interpose their authority when the church is in danger, which is different from what the bishops would do. Both bishops and kings select suitable men to make judgments that are relevant for the church. Bishops are the shepherds

⁸⁴ L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 1253, p. 439.

⁸⁵ Cromwell to Sir Thomas Wyatt, Nov 29 and 30, 1537; Harl. Mss. 282, Fol. 219; *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. II, No. 229, pp102–105; L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 1143, p. 400.

⁸⁶ Cromwell to Lord William Howard and Gardiner October, 1537; *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. II, No. 226, p. 97; L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 950, p. 332; No. 1004, p. 348.

of the church, and their jurisdiction is a civil matter, but their ordination includes vocation and election by the people. They judge doctrine and convene a synod twice a year. The Saxon Reformers were convinced that a General Council indicted by the pope would declare their new doctrine heretical. They presented a public refusal to attend the pope's council. Even though the Schmalkaldic League was strong, the Reformers faced constant pressure from the emperor and papal agents. Putting forth Scripture's authority versus that of a papal council showed how convinced they were of the territorial princes' rights to protect new doctrine. The League used also a questionable tactic to demand Henry defend the League's principals in the council, as a condition of allowing Melanchthon to travel to England.

Henry, unaware of the Germans' articles published at Schmalkalden against the pope's council, wrote his own defense independently, in which he did not accept that the pope should be the head of the council. Henry was fearful of the pope's retribution after his break from Rome and foundation of an independent church—he feared that the pope could reverse his divorce and depose him. Henry felt that the emperors should call forth a universal council, and the kings a national local synod of bishops, as he did when he asked the bishops to define the Bishops' Book. Henry regarded the pope as equal to the bishops, not above them. He believed that he should have the authority to indict the council as former emperors had done. He also defended the claim that the English Church was part of the universal church. The effort for a united stand against the pope's council between Henry and the German princes failed, because the elector's letter regarding the Schmalkaldic Articles arrived too late. Henry was offended, and the Germans apologized for the delay, but the damage had been done. Of course, Henry's own domestic situation after the Pilgrimage of Grace delayed the communication. Therefore, the common strategy that the German and English ambassadors had negotiated at Wittenberg in 1536 regarding the pope's council had drastically changed. Both parties made their statements unilaterally refusing to attend the council.

At the same time, Henry was able to use Francis to keep Reginald Pole, the papal legate, out of England, and the succession question was resolved with the birth of Edward. With the renewed threat of the papal bull, Henry soon learned that the pope would be the mediator in Christendom, and that he, Henry, was excluded from the real negotiations between the emperor and Francis. In this European political climate, it proved quite impossible for Henry to be the mediator in Christendom, but his political maneuvering can be understood from his awareness of the threat that the pope could succeed in deposing him. To begin with, he appealed to the council and suggested formulating a common strategy toward the council with the Germans, but this was not realized. He successfully prevented Mary's succession in order to curtail Catholic influence. Then, the Germans and the English both gave independent opinions against holding a council and failed to present a common front. Hence, Henry had to make sure its convening was prevented to avoid the possibility that the pope would rescind Henry's divorce to the disadvantage of the succession, because then Mary would be the rightful successor.

The Germans and the English opposed the General Council for different reasons. Because of the English bishops' position vis-à-vis the king, they supported the council's authority in doctrinal matters, as they believed that in doing so, they would regain some of their lost authority. The English bishops' awareness of their authority can be seen as another influence of the *Confessio Augustana*. If that were to happen, the bishops would also gain more authority in

adiaphora matters and Henry would lose some. Defining adiaphora again became an important and significant issue in this new setting, in which all that was revered in church culture—shrines, images, and relics—was replaced by a literate culture. As a result, neither party was able to diminish the council's authority, partly because of their difference of opinion, and partly because the Germans could not free themselves completely from papal rule due to the authority of the Emperor Charles. However, the English bishops were prepared to acknowledge the council's authority as being above the king's when defining doctrine. In the next chapter, we will turn to Henry's domestic policies, including the dissolution of the monasteries and its consequences.

Chapter 11:

Henry's Domestic Relations

(January–December 1538)

Introduction

Henry concentrated on domestic policies in 1534-1537, realizing that the Northern Rebellion and the monasteries had been challenges against his supremacy. In his eyes, these factors represented papal opposition. Henry's difficulty in compelling the monasteries and other religious houses to submit to the king's supremacy and repudiate the pope's authority had been an obstacle to his reforms. The result was the dissolution of the monasteries, increased royal power, new lay patronage, and increased government wealth. In this chapter, we will discuss how the initial reform and taxation of the religious houses led to their dissolution. We will also discuss the timeline, motivation, and consequences of the dissolution. While the question of monastic vows was included in the Anglo-German negotiations at Wittenberg, even though the English embassy had no authority to decide on them, the issue became irrelevant, as Henry proceeded with dismantling the monasteries in England.

The purpose of Cromwell's Injunctions was to establish a new humanistic, literate culture at the parochial level, to teach the parishes about obedience to the supreme head, and to instruct the clergy on adiaphora matters so that old practices would fade away, a new understanding on adiaphora would arise, and superstitious practices would be avoided. There was some ambiguity around the identification of heretics because this was based on Henry's decision as Defender of the Faith. At the same time, Henry wished to destroy all remnants of the pope's power. For example, destruction of the cult of St. Thomas à Becket had both domestic and international consequences because he announced the proclamation to protect national unity against outside influences and prevent domestic dissent. This infuriated the pope and led him to publish the deposition of the bull.

The Suppression of the Monasteries and Friaries

After subduing the Northern Rebellion, failing to become the sole peacemaker among the Catholic powers, and refusing to attend the pope's General Council, Henry concentrated on domestic policies to strengthen his supremacy in London, stabilizing his supreme power in the country by activating every possible defense against the threat of foreign invasion. He had one task left: to eradicate all of the monasteries. This was the most dramatic development of the Reformation in England.¹

¹ Rex 2006, p. 56.

Henry had discovered during the rebellion that the religious among his subjects were the most reluctant to acknowledge the king's supremacy in the church. The general dissatisfaction of the people and rumors against the king disseminated among the religious led to suppression of the monasteries as a means of ensuring the king's royal supremacy, to which all the religious had to take an oath and which they could no longer resist legally.²

This author agrees with Bernard that one may trace the dissolution back to the new laws stipulating the taxation of monasteries, which led to visitations as a background for the dissolution of the monasteries. The Act Annexing First Fruits and Tenths to the crown, a new parliamentary law enacted in 1534,³ stipulated that the first year's profits on new benefices, formerly paid to the pope, were now due to the crown, and that any clergy entering ecclesiastical office, either secular or religious, had to pay one tenth of their income annually.⁴ Behind the visitations, one needs to see the consequences of this act as taxation of the monasteries rather than outright plunder of monastic wealth.⁵

Bernard also argues that the initial purpose of the visitations was to reform monasteries, ensure that the supremacy law was implemented and the quality of leadership maintained, that the religious moral conduct was acceptable, and that they sincerely exercised their vocations in chastity.⁶

According to Knowles, the monasteries were not aligned with Henry on the following four matters: 1) erroneous teaching of salvation, 2) enormous wealth and possessions, 3) laxity of the monastic lifestyle, and 4) the king's marriage to Anne Boleyn.⁷ Hence, the first phase of the dissolution began in 1536 with general visitations⁸ and formal inquiries of lesser clergy and the bishops,⁹ followed by the initiation of the suppression of the lesser monasteries—those with a yearly income of less than £200.¹⁰

The survey resulted in a large-scale confiscation within the monasteries, producing a new source of revenue for the government. To manage this revenue, the Court of Augmentation was established, led by the attorney Robert Southwell, whose first two appointments were Dr. Legh and Dr. Layton as commissioners. Cromwell appointed additional commissioners, including Dr. Peters and Dr. London.¹¹

² David Knowles: *Christian Monasticism*. Vol. III. 1969, p. 146 (hereafter, Knowles 1969).

³ Act Annexing First Fruits and Tenths to the Crown, 1534. 26 Hen. VIII, c. 3. Dickens & Carr, 1967, pp. 65–68; Dickens 1991, p. 144.

⁴ Dickens & Carr 1967, pp. 65–66.

⁵ Bernard 2005, pp. 244–245.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 247–255.

⁷ Knowles 1969, pp. 142, 145.

⁸ Knowles aptly notes that the purpose of the visitation was to reveal the weaknesses of the religious houses, make them discontented and hinder new recruitment. Knowles 1969, p. 145.

⁹ Act For the Dissolution of the Lesser Monasteries, A.D. 1536, 27 Henry VIII, Cap. 28. *Documents*, LXI, pp. 257–268; Dickens & Carr 1967, pp. 98–102; *Concilia Magnae III*, pp. 789–791. Joyce Youings: *The Dissolution of Monasteries*. 1971. Document No. 7, pp. 149–152 (hereafter, Youings' Documents 1971).

¹⁰ The Act of 1536, 27 Hen VIII, c. 28. Statutes III, 575–578; Youings' Documents 1971, pp. 155–159. Knowles reports 800 religious houses at the beginning of dissolution and their net income exceeded that of the Crown and government. Knowles 1969, p. 144. L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 102, p. 35; SP 1/128, Fols. 87–89; L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 893, p. 331; SP 1/132, Fols. 3–4.

¹¹ L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 102, p. 35; No. 893, p. 331; SP 1/132, fol. 3.

The commissioners were instructed to make an inventory of all lands, goods, and chattels, based on the articles designed for the purpose and consequently annexed to the commissioners' report. The articles included the number of persons, how many were priests and how many servants, the quantity and value of lead, bells, their charters, farms, and rental properties, and the profits from their common land and parks. Eventually the surveyors were to send the charge in the form of a certificate of all the houses surrendered to the Court of Augmentation.¹²

In the beginning, the commissioners accepted the voluntary surrender of monasteries that were decaying or in debt, or where monks had spread rumors against the king. The preamble of surrender from Langey monastery in Kent is a typical example:

[Greetings] To all faithful Christians, and so forth. William Dyer, Abbot of the Monastery of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of St. Thomas the Martyr, at Langden, in the county of Kent, and of the Convent of the same place, the Directors of the Order forming the full Chapter of the said house, who have so far considered and pondered about the state of same house (which, in its income and tithes providing fortune and profit, has deteriorated to a not moderate degree and is almost entirely diminished, and is ruined, oppressed and burdened by a huge debt) with mature deliberation and diligent handling, thinking that unless fast help and royal provision soon comes to the aid of and provides for this Monastery or the Priorate (since it exists through his foundation and his own person), it will be annihilated from the ground up in matters both Spiritual and Secular, we, through the agency of those present, give and concede, and so forth.¹³

Dr. Legh reported to Cromwell on the monastery of Mochelney: "I found the abbot very negligent and also defamed of incontineny and ten brethren all very ignorant. . . . After examination they all subscribed to the instrument of their surrender." Dr. London reported that most of the northern friars' houses were in debt and made a summary of them: "Whyte Fryers in Northampton, wher all they have ys nott able to pay ther detts."¹⁴ Those religious who stayed in the houses were to be reported to the governor of their shire and those religious who opted to go as seculars to be informed the Archbishop of Canterbury,¹⁵ so as to present them as candidates for priesthood or bishops.¹⁶ Some of the ex-monks became reform-minded bishops, or part of the parish clergy, as many monastery sites were natural locations for new dioceses. The surveyors discovered strong Catholic sentiment as there was also little resistance by the religious. Their hope was that, eventually, the pope would be able to persuade the king to be reasonable and that these unhappy events were only a brief interlude. Hence, the commissioners found many valuables hidden in the monasteries by monks who had expected to return.¹⁷

One means of dealing with the monasteries was for the friars to take off their habits and mix with the secular clergy. At first this was resisted. One prior of Christchurch wrote to Cromwell, requesting to wear his habit "because he made his profession to serve God in a religious habit.

¹² Ex. MSS. Nob. D.G. Pierpoint; Burnet, Book III, pp. 89–90.

¹³ The Preamble of the Surrender of the Monastery of Langden. Burnet, Book III, No. III, Section I, p. 80.

¹⁴ Original Letters, Letter CCCVII, pp. 130–134. October 29[1538?]; L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 27, p. 10; No. 33, p. 11; SP 1/128, fols. 34–35; No. 42, p. 14.

¹⁵ Ex. Mss. Nob. D.G. Pierpoint; Burnet, Book III, pp. 89–90.

¹⁶ Instructions for the King's Commissioners, for a new survey, and an Inventory to be made of all the Demesnes, Lands, Goods, and Chattels appertaining to any House of Religion of Monks, Cannons, and Nuns within their Commission, according to the Articles hereafter following. The number of which Houses in every County limited in their Commission, being annexed to the said Commission. Ex. MSS. Nob. D.G. Pierpoint; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. VI, pp. 89–90.

¹⁷ L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 926, p. 342; No. 1287, p. 473.

Begs him to allow keeping their habit a custom 900 years or more.” However, some friars welcomed the change. Richard Thornden, the warden of manors belonging to the prior of Christchurch, wrote to Cromwell that, “for his own part [he] would gladly leave off his habit all my progress time and specially when that I come to London.” “This yere also, after Michelmas, all the orders of fryers in London changed the[ir] habits to secular preistes habits, and divers houses of fryers were suppressed in divers shyres of England.”¹⁸

The dissolution went on throughout the year. From January through April 1538, twenty-five monasteries were confiscated: seven in January, six in February, seven in March, and five in April.¹⁹ Between May and October 1538, thirty-four additional monasteries surrendered: fourteen to Dr. Legh, nine to Dr. Peters, six to Dr. Layton, one to Dr. London, one directly to Cromwell, one to the Bishop of Landoff (an alternative commissioner), one to a commissioner named Cave, and one to a commissioner who is not named.²⁰

During the month of October, Dr. Legh suppressed ten priories and seven abbeys; Dr. Layton suppressed three priories; and Dr. Peter suppressed one abbey.²¹ Twenty-six priories were confiscated in October in the southern part of the country.²² Eighteen priories were confiscated during that month in the north, mostly in York.²³ When the suppression was completed, nearly one hundred monasteries, abbeys, and priories had been closed and their estimated values returned to the state. To disguise their intention to suppress all monasteries, the authorities exempted two small nunneries from suppression: the Cistercian priories of St. Mary of York and St. John of York.²⁴ Many of the priories that remained became supporters of the reforms, as they became new dioceses and parishes, but some continued to support conservative views.

Cromwell had determined to suppress all monasteries as they were not only strongholds against the king’s supremacy, but also represented papal power that had to be extinguished. He also wanted to suppress superstitious practices. The stability of the parochial structure changed in the process, and this was also one of the causes of the Northern Rebellion. The religious were either apprehended and punished or became secular priests. Some of the ex-monks became

¹⁸ *Wriothesley’s Chronicle* Vol. I. pp. 87; *Rymer* Vol. xiv. P. 590; L&P, XIII, Pt. 2, No. 49, pp. 16–17; No. 139, p. 51; No. 465, p. 181; SP1/137, fols. 51–63.

¹⁹ L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 27, p. 10; No. 33, p. 11; No. 42, p. 14; SP 1/129, fols. 9–10; No. 85, p. 28–29; No. 91, p. 30; No. 102, p. 35; SP 1/128, ff. 82; No. 173, p. 56; SP 1/129, fols. 139–141; No. 199, p. 68; No. 218, p. 75; No. 221, p. 75; No. 229, p. 78; No. 242, p. 84; No. 369, p. 127; SP 1/129, fols. 121–; Nos. 393–394, p. 149; SP 1/129, fols. 139–141; No. 396, p. 149; Nos. 530–531, p. 197; No. 542, p. 201; SP1/130, fols. 79–80; No. 551, p. 204; SP 1/130, fols. 93–; No. 575, pp. 212–213; No. 625, p. 232; No. 660, p. 253; No. 698, p. 266; No. 764, pp. 288–289; *Rymer* XIV, p. 603. L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 776, p. 291; SP 1/131, fols. 101–; No. 779, p. 292.

²⁰ *Rymer* XIV, pp. 603–604, 606–608, 610, 615–619, 624, 639.

²¹ For priories, e.g. *Rymer* XIV, pp. 604, 607, 609, 619–620, 624, 627; for abbeys, e.g. *Rymer* XIV, pp. 625–626, 628.

²² Four Black Friars’ priories were confiscated. L&P, XIII, Pt. 2, No. 519, p. 204. Seven Grey Friars’ Priories. *Rymer* XIV, p. 611. Two Austin Friars. *Rymer* XIV, p. 613. Two White Friars. *Rymer* XIV, p. 612; Two Augustinian Friars. *Rymer* XIV, p. 613.

²³ Four Augustinian, e.g. *Rymer* XIV, pp. 621, 623, 627, 631. Three Black Friars, Grey Friars and White Friars each, e.g. *Rymer* XIV, pp. 621–624, 627. One Trinitarian Friar, e.g. *Rymer* XIV, p. 624. Four priories in London, e.g. *Rymer* XIV, 609–610.

²⁴ L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 1115, p. 410. Cromwell to the Bishop of ----. June 1538. Cleop. E. iv, Fol. 9; Cleop. E. v, Fol. 344; L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 1304 (1, 2), p. 480. *Cromwell’s Letters*, Vol. 2, No. 266, pp. 144–147.

reform-minded bishops or part of the parish clergy, as monastery sites were natural locations for new dioceses.

The Redistribution of the Monasteries' Wealth

It is noteworthy that not much was done about the ruthless suppression of the monasteries and the many complaints made about the commissioners' behavior towards the religious. Cromwell, as the representative of both spiritual and temporal power, used his authority as vice-regent to take advantage of the suppression to benefit himself and his relatives. For example, in a letter sent to Bishop Roland Lee, Cromwell asked for permission to nominate a friend of his nephew, Richard Cromwell, to a vacant ecclesiastical benefice.²⁵

Henry VIII's royal power was manifested in the dissolution of the monasteries, and it simultaneously increased the lay patronage and wealth of the crown,²⁶ producing needed revenue for both state and church.²⁷ Bernard opposes the traditional view that financial considerations were the most significant factor influencing the dissolution.²⁸ However, the king also misused this monastic wealth for himself and his men.²⁹ He took the Abingdon monastery for himself, and Cromwell's many residences were former priories.³⁰ Cromwell also acted according to expectations of a representative of the crown and lay patron of the church. Rex notes that major shrines throughout the country were closed down and their images and relics transferred to Cromwell's London residence.³¹

It was known that those taking the inventories of the monasteries were able to see and exchange properties or make repairs in the king's name. Richard Cromwell wrote to his uncle, Thomas, that he had taken possession of "the effects of Thomas Bedyll," who was one of the commissioners of the religious houses, as it was important to safeguard whatever information he had obtained during his mission to the houses. In connection with the suppression, the common people surrounding the friars' houses plundered monastic properties, as Dr. London informed Cromwell from Warwick. One Thomas Thacker asked for a farm belonging to Repton Priory in Derbyshire and also asked for a farm from the Priory of DarLekh from Cromwell.

²⁵ Cromwell to Roland Lee, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield. April 1538. Cromwell's Letters, Vol. II, No. 256, p. 137; L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 765, p. 289.

²⁶ Richard Rex has pointed out how Henry VIII's Royal Power was manifested in the dissolution of the monasteries to extend royal patronage, which augmented the wealth of the crown. Rex 2006, p. xiv. Guy Fitch Lytle: *Religion and the Lay Patron in Reformation England. Patronage in the Renaissance*. 1981, p. 72 (hereafter, Lytle 1981).

²⁷ The Act of Establishing the Court of Augmentation, 1536. Henry VIII, c. 27, Statutes III, 569–574. Youings' Documents 1971, No. 25, pp. 197–205.

L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 102, p. 35; SP 1/128, Fols. 87–89; L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 893, p. 331; SP 1/132, Fols. 3–4; L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 926, p. 342.

²⁸ Bernard 2005, p. 247.

²⁹ October 16, 1538. L&P, XIII, Pt. 2, No. 629, p. 244. SP 1/137, Fols. 212–214.

³⁰ *Original Letters*, Letter, CCXC, pp. 89–91, August 15, [1538?], Letter CCXCI, pp. 92–94, August 15, [1538?], Letter CCXCVII, pp. 104–105, September 5, [1538?], Letter CCC, pp. 109–110, September 23, [1538?], Letter CCX, p. 138, November 5, [1538], Letter CCCXXI, p. 170, February 22, [1538?], Letter CCCXXII, p. 172, February 22, [1538?].

³¹ Rex 2006, pp. 77–78.

Consequences for Matters Related to the Dissolution

Gradually, even doctrine became a government target, since doctrinal matters such as the sacraments and matters of adiaphora were to be decided by Henry. The king opposed the disputed article of monastic vows. Although in practice he agreed that they were adiaphora, by taking the monasteries' possessions he acknowledged that the system belonged to civil law. At the same time, Melancthon supported the monasteries and thought that they could remain schools of learning as long as they did not teach the superstitious doctrine of work righteousness.³²

The dissolution of the monasteries also changed the English landscape as buildings were destroyed and lands divided. It changed the parishes, and new priests were recruited from the ranks of the monks, who then became secular clergy.³³ The popular culture prior to the Reformation was manifested in the foundations, images and shrines supported by lay patrons. Guy Lytle points out that remnants such as shrines were also a reminder of a particular person who had founded and supported them as places of worship.³⁴ Only through radical destruction of these physical remnants could any change become possible.

The dissolution of monasteries served to destroy the images of that culture, which was replaced with a literate culture. Those in charge of popular shrines and images lost their property and became a new social class that benefitted from the wealth that they donated to the government in the course of the destruction of their properties. The many religious who became secular clergy influenced the mostly conservative clergy in the latter part of 1530s.

Along with the dissolution of the monasteries, most of the images adorning them, which represented medieval culture, were either sold or destroyed, even though the clergy were instructed as to the proper place of the images and had only been warned against their idolatry and abuse. At the same time, the reform-minded clergy may have interpreted the warning of the injunctions differently and were eager to tear down all images to mark the beginning of the true reform of the church and the end of monkish idolatry, which they thought the images represented.³⁵

Cromwell's Injunctions

In addition to enforcing royal supremacy, Thomas Cromwell enforced uniformity of religion. On September 5, 1538, he wrote the Injunctions, stipulating that priests had to be licensed by the

³² Article XXVII of the *Confessio Augustana* agrees that the monastic foundation was rightly used for its educational goal which was profitable to the church, but states that there is a controversy, since they assert that the monastic lifestyle is to merit grace and righteousness and a state of perfection. CAL 1530, XXVII, p. 112; Grane 1987, p. 235. Article XV of the Wittenberg Articles addressed the responsibility of kings and princes to support studies in the monasteries, which in the past had educated the leaders of the church. WTA 1536, XV, pp. 68, 70; Apoll, 1531, XXVII, p. 378.

³³ Lytle 1981, p. 67.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Cromwell's Injunctions to the Clergy. Sept. 5, 1538. *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. II, No. 273, pp. 151–155.

king, the Archbishop of Canterbury, or a bishop of a diocese.³⁶ Henry delegated that authority to the archbishop and other bishops, which they had lost during first year of his reign.

The injunctions encouraged works of charity based on scriptural principles. They further stipulated the difference between images honored and those abused. The injunctions discouraged trust in pilgrimages, offering money for candles to be lit before images or relics, and “kissing or lickyng the same, saying over a nombre of beades not vndrestanded ne mynded on or in suchelike superstition,” which was, according to the Injunctions, regarded as idolatry. The purpose of images was to “serve for no other purpose but as to be books of unlearned men that can no letters.”³⁷ Official iconoclasm was not opposed since the injunctions forbade any veneration of images, and most churches retained statues and paintings.³⁸

Duffy notes that the Injunction of 1538 was starker against traditional culture than that of 1536, making all manifestations of the cult of saints illegal and, at the same time, opposing any critic of the government’s policies against traditional religion.³⁹

Many of the images and relics were connected to pilgrimages to the shrines and also to the monastic lifestyle. Therefore, Cromwell specified in his injunctions the difference between idolatry and the superstitious use of images and shrines to that of having them as “indifferent things.” The abolition that occurred during 1538 was directed to the total destruction of all images.

The most famous of the images that were completely destroyed were the images of Rood of Grace in February, Darvel Gathern in April, the Virgin Mary in June, and the Miracle of Blood of Hales in October.⁴⁰ This can be seen in a letter from one Johannes Hokerus to Heinrich Bullinger, a Protestant reformer in Switzerland, describing what a German visitor saw, which he called, “a wooden god in Kent.”⁴¹ Many relics were confiscated, but unless they had great monetary value, their suppression was less urgent. On the other hand, for the bishops of the new learning, all relics were regarded as superstitious and had to be removed. Many relics had immense monetary value, while others were worthless copies. Wriothesley, Pollard, and Williams wrote to Cromwell about a shrine in Winchester: “There was no gold, nor ring nor true

³⁶ The Second Royal Injunctions of Henry VIII. 1538. *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of Reformation*. Vol. II. Eds. Walter Howard Frere and William McClure Kennedy. 1910, pp. 34–43. Cromwell’s Injunctions to the Clergy. *Cromwell’s Letters*, Vol. 2, No. 273, pp. 153–154; L&P, XIII, Pt. 2, No. 281, p. 114; SP 6/3, Fols. 1–4.

³⁷ Cromwell’s Injunctions to the Clergy. *Cromwell’s Letters*, Vol. 2, No. 273, pp. 153–154; L&P, XIII, Pt. 2, No. 281, p. 114; SP 6/3, Fols. 1–4; Rex 2006, pp. 77–78.

³⁸ Rex 2006, pp. 77–78.

³⁹ Duffy 1992, pp. 407–408, 410.

⁴⁰ Original Letters, Letter CCCXX, February 7, [1538?], pp. 168–169; Letter CCCXXX, April 28, [1538?], 194–202; Letter, CCCXXXIII, June 13, [1538?] pp. 205–211; Letter CCCXXXIX, September 23, [1538?], pp. 223–224; Letter CCCLIII, November 26, [1538?], pp. 249–251.

⁴¹ A Letter to Bullinger from one of Maidstone, giving an Account of an Image, which seems to be the Rood of Boxley in Kent. [At Zurich] Johanne Hokeurs Maydstanenses. Burnet, Book III, No. LV, pp. 485–486. The letter continued that the king himself seeing the impostor is uncertain whether “to rejoice more over exposing the impostor or rather to grieve from his heart that he had been imposed on the unhappy populace for so many centuries. What need there is for many words?” He referred it to the Council. The figure was finally smashed into pieces and thrown into a fire.

stone in it, but all great counterfeits. . . . Have also received the cross of emeralds, the cross called Jerusalem, another gold cross, two gold chalices and other plate.⁷⁴²

Monastic life, with its visual images, relics, shrines, and pilgrimages, was gradually replaced by a culture with a humanistic educational program of intellectual pursuits for the parishioners. In June 1538, Cromwell published a circular letter to instruct the bishops to place English Bibles in houses and churches so that the truth of Scripture might be available to everyone. In addition to his letter, Cromwell also sent the royal injunctions to curates on how to teach the Bible in order to avoid controversial explanations, and to appoint instructors who could judge its contents.⁴³ In addition, in the September 1538 Injunction, Cromwell again appealed to clergy⁴⁴ to instruct parishioners to recite the Paternoster and the Creed in English, provide English Bibles for each church, examine their knowledge every Lent, and preach at least every quarter.⁴⁵

The purpose of the injunctions was to enforce further obedience to the royal supremacy and educate parishioners about vices and right Christian living. Cromwell's injunctions were in line with the reform-minded clergy and supported by them. One has to understand that the erroneous beliefs targeted were all those that threatened the king's supremacy and his beliefs. During the dissolution, the commissioners also paid much more attention to heretical opinions and erroneous beliefs.

The next program by the government was to proceed with heresy trials. Throughout 1538, anyone known to have non-conforming beliefs concerning the sacrament of the altar or other heretical opinions was sought out and arrested. The change to English religious life was radical, so much so that the search for erroneous opinions began. Heresy trials became an everyday occurrence, as Henry had to find a moderate course to prevent the total destruction of old ceremonies and preserve what he believed was right Catholic doctrine and practice of the early church. What seems to be his more conservative outlook may only be a result of filling the vacuum left in the wake of the dissolution and the destruction of images with doctrine and practice that could be understood and communicated by both conservative and reform-minded clergy.

The presence of any person with beliefs different from Henry's would shake his authority as supreme head with the sole power to defend the faith, but there was hardly any resistance after the rebellion and continued dissolution. Cromwell's approach varied. Sometimes he went against the Catholics ruthlessly, as seen during the dissolution; at other times he willingly punished those with erroneous beliefs. It appears that he was capable of using any party for government reform.

On September 30, 1538, Cromwell wrote to Archbishop Cranmer to execute the Injunctions of September 5. As Vice-Regent, Cromwell had authority in the ecclesiastical jurisdiction to give orders on doctrinal matters, but the clergy had to execute these orders even if they were not part

⁴² L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 1177, p. 437; L&P XIII, Pt 2, No. 345, p. 134; No. 401, p. 155; SP 1/136, Fols. 164–166.

⁴³ Cromwell to the Bishop of ----. June 1538. Cleop. E. iv, Fol 9; Cleop. E. v, Fol. 344; L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 1304 (1, 2), p. 480. *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. II, No. 266, pp. 144, 147; L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 1115, p. 408.

⁴⁴ Cromwell's authority extended now also to all ecclesiastical jurisdiction: "I Thomas lorde Crumwell, lorde privie seale Vice-regent to the kynges said high for all his Jurisdiction ecclesiasticall within this realme." *Cromwell's Letters* No. 273, p. 151; L&P, XIII, Pt 2, No. 281, p. 114; SP 6/3 fol. 1.

⁴⁵ *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. II, No. 273, pp. 152–153; L&P, XIII, Pt. 2, No. 281, p. 113; SP 6/3, f. 1.

of the legislation. In practice, Cromwell executed kingly authority to define doctrine on adiaphora that appeared to be contrary to Henry's beliefs, but it coincided with the king's conservative bent to unify the country. Henry agreed to the injunctions, even though it is not quite clear whether he saw in the execution an opportunity to establish true religion as against the pope's "untrue religion."

It also appeared that the king had become very concerned about the various opinions, especially heretical ones, as he wrote, "Whereas the King's Highness being informed as well of the negligent observation of the former injunctions, exhibited to the clergy of that diocese, as also of the further continuance of superstition and idolatry in the same, and minding, like as to his office most appertaineth, the expurgation of untrue religion, and the abolishment of all abuses, crept into the same."⁴⁶ A hard line was taken against anyone who endorsed the Bishop of Rome's authority, and they were immediately detected and reported to the king, his council, the vice-regent, and the justices of the peace.⁴⁷

Official Iconoclasm Replaces Superstition

The Ten Articles were influenced by the Wittenberg Articles—which regarded saints and images as adiaphora—but they were more conservative in their ideas.⁴⁸ The resulting destruction of the images and shrines was not based solely on adiaphora, but was also a campaign by the government to destroy any last traces of papal power. The difference between acceptable images and those to be destroyed was not always clear, just as there was no well-defined distinction between what was regarded as idolatry or abuse and what simply represented the artistic remains of the past medieval culture.

Henry was convinced that idolatry, superstition, and hypocrisy were associated with papal power⁴⁹ and should therefore be eliminated. Rex offers two explanations for his attack on popular religion: 1) as a triumph of "the word of God" and 2) as Erasmian concern to purify popular Catholicism.⁵⁰ There is evidence that King Henry wished to retain many Catholic ceremonies such as the Mass, especially private Masses in shrines for the royal family, but many of the images and relics were connected to pilgrimages, shrines, and the monastic lifestyle.

Rex offers the additional explanation that the changes occurred during the latter part of Cromwell's reign as vice-regent, as well as his leaning toward Protestantism.⁵¹ The educational program instituted by Cromwell differed from Henry's personal beliefs. Therefore, in his injunctions, Cromwell specified the difference between idolatry and the superstitious use of images, and shrines having them as "indifferent things." The abolition that occurred during 1538

⁴⁶ Cromwell to Cranmer, September 30, 1538; *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. II, No. 275, pp. 156–157.

⁴⁷ Cromwell's Injunctions to the Clergy. *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. II, No. 273, pp. 153–154; L&P, XIII, Pt. 2, No. 281, p. 114.

⁴⁸ A10, 1536, p. 243.

⁴⁹ Bernard 1998, p. 327.

⁵⁰ Rex 2006, p. 81.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 56.

was directed at the total destruction of all images.⁵² Barbara Harvey also notes that the monks who were priests said Masses daily for the king and queen, but Cromwell said nothing about Masses for the dead, which were a well-established feature of monastic life. He was also silent on purgatory, which was associated with prayers for the dead and was not supported by Scripture.⁵³

During this time, orders came that every parish had to have an English Bible. Once again the rhetoric of “Word of God” became evident, and literate culture replaced superstitious practices. Rex explains that Henry presented himself as the Old Testament Josiah, smashing idols.⁵⁴ Hence, both his supremacy and his iconoclasm were justified by his appeal to the Bible, as he had claimed in his policies. Again, Henry’s position was ambiguous, as some of the features of the destruction fit well with his image as Defender of the Faith.

Unity in Religion

Dissension among the people alarmed Henry, and his conservative leanings became evident. On November 16, 1538, Henry issued a proclamation against any kind of heresy or diversity of opinion. All literature could be printed only with the authority of the Privy Seal, and printers were held responsible for the contents of books they published. Furthermore, no one was allowed to speak seditious words against the doctrine of the sacrament without due punishment of the forfeit of their goods to the King’s Majesty.⁵⁵ Henry had not definitely agreed with the German embassy regarding the controversial issues of the Mass, communion in one or both kinds, priestly celibacy, and vows, and he was adamant that his belief in the real presence in the Lord’s Supper would remain the official doctrine. The proclamation proved to be his final stand on the controversial issues.

Concerning the commendable ceremonies and rites in the Church of England, the king stipulated that the rites were to be allowed. However, he specified that they only remind us of the things of higher perfection, but one cannot trust in them for one’s salvation; that is, they are not necessary for salvation. This is how far Henry was willing to define adiaphora matters. Customary ceremonies were to be used without superstition, as their purpose was instruction and it was the clergy’s task to instruct people in the true meaning of these rites and ceremonies and to secure calm and peace throughout the kingdom. All heresies, especially Anabaptism, were outlawed.⁵⁶ This is how far the king was willing to allow the concept of adiaphora. As long as his

⁵² *Original Letters*, Letter CCCXX, February 7, [1538?], pp. 168–169; Letter CCCXXX, April 28, [1538?], pp. 194–202; Letter, CCCXXXIII, June 13, [1538?], pp. 205–211; Letter CCCXXXIX, September 23, [1538?], pp. 223–224; Letter CCCLIII, November 26, [1538?], pp. 249–251. Bernard 1998, p. 330.

⁵³ Barbara Harvey: *Living and Dying in England (1100–1540)*. 1993, pp. 211–212 (hereafter, Harvey 1993).

⁵⁴ Rex 2006, pp. 81–82.

⁵⁵ Prohibiting Unlicensed Printing of Scripture, Exiling Anabaptists, Depriving Married Clergy, Removing St. Thomas à Becket from Calendar. Westminster, November 16, 1538, 30 Henry VIII; *Tudor Proclamations*, Vol. I, No. 188, p. 27.

⁵⁶ Prohibiting Unlicensed Printing of Scripture, Exiling Anabaptists, Depriving Married Clergy, Removing St. Thomas à Becket from Calendar. Westminster, November 16, 1538, 30 Henry VIII; *Tudor Proclamations*, Vol. I, No. 188, p. 274. L&P, XIII, Pt. 2, No. 848, p. 353.

proclamation did not become state law passed by Parliament, one could speak of adiaphoristic freedom.

The most vehement attack in Henry's proclamation was prohibition of marriage for clergy. As seen earlier, Henry based his decision on Scripture, especially on Paul's letters to Timothy and the Corinthians, and the expositors of the old fathers. The king further commanded that such clergy as were married should not administer the "Holy Sacrament," only celibate clergy. Married clergy would be deprived of their ministries and treated as lay persons.⁵⁷ This proclamation definitely made a statement disagreeing with the German position during the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations.

Henry took a leading role in determining what constituted heresy and what constituted interpretation of correct doctrine. Heresy was defined as any practice that threatened the King's vulnerable position as head of the church and Defender of the Faith such as Sacramentaries and Anabaptists. The various beliefs in the old customs were revealed in the increased number of these trials. Sir William Nicholson, alias Lambert, was condemned for his erroneous beliefs about the sacrament of the altar and also for the Anabaptists' opinion of baptism. He was burned at the stake in Smithfield on November 16, 1538, on the same day the proclamation was issued.⁵⁸ This is an extreme case and shows how far the king's supremacy would extend to his right to formulate doctrine intertwined with the vulnerable political situation, which was threatened by the imperial coalition in Europe.

Bernard asserts that the dissolution of the monasteries represents the king's reforming zeal and that Henry saw himself as an Old Testament king implementing the law of God in England as head of the church. In his role as Defender of the Faith, the sacrament of the altar with ceremonies played a central part and may have been the reason for enforcing celibacy among the priests.⁵⁹ Of course the sacrament of altar had enhanced the power of the clergy in the past.

As described in Chapter One, Henry had denounced the preaching of items of either popular religion or too-extreme Reformation doctrines, so as to set the pace for reform as Defender of the Faith. He became more suspicious of any erroneous doctrine infiltrating the country or subjects who held erroneous beliefs in the country.

The most extraordinary change of events was Henry's vehement attack in his proclamations order not to call Thomas à Becket a saint. The order further stipulated that Becket's images and pictures should be taken down and his name should not be celebrated in festivals or in any services, "offices, antiphones, collectes and prayers."⁶⁰ Becket's life and martyrdom received much publicity in the last quarter of the twelfth century and his murder in the cathedral was a significant event throughout Western Christendom. His cult had international dimensions, spreading geographically from Normandy all the way to Norman kingdom of Sicily. The

⁵⁷ Prohibiting Unlicensed Printing of Scripture, Exiling Anabaptists, Depriving Married Clergy, Removing St. Thomas à Becket from Calendar. Westminster, November 16, 1538, 30 Henry VIII; *Tudor Proclamations*, Vol. I., No. 188, p. 274.

⁵⁸ *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, Vol. I, p. 89.

⁵⁹ Bernard 1998, pp. 329–330.

⁶⁰ Prohibiting Unlicensed Printing of Scripture, Exiling Anabaptists, Depriving Married Clergy, Removing St. Thomas à Becket from Calendar. Westminster, November 16, 1538, 30 Henry VIII; *Tudor Proclamations* Vol. I., No. 188, pp. 270–276; *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, Vol. I, pp. 89–90.

Cistercian Order promoted Becket's cult throughout the network of monasteries.⁶¹ Duggan states that, for Henry, Becket was concerned about the church but not the commonweal, and that his death was his own fault. He was made a saint by the pope because he upheld the pope's authority. In Henry's opinion, nothing that Becket did in his life justified naming him a saint. Bernard argues that Henry's supremacy was in action to decide the sainthood.⁶² This was a symbolic act to end the belief in the miracles related to saints in popular religion. Aside from its domestic influence on the people, it also reflected Henry's policies, as Henry knew that it would be a symbolic blow to the pope's authority. This act also finally drove the pope to take action against Henry VIII, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

Henry's proclamation reveals his increasing suspicion of foreign threats and somewhat exaggerated fear of heresy, so much so that he took control over deciding what heresy was and what was not. It appears to this author that heresy was related less to the idea of right doctrine and more to suspicion of a threat to Henry's supremacy. Henry had declared that ceremonies were not necessary to salvation, but given that human laws stipulated ceremonies, they bound consciences. According to Melancthon, laws should not bind consciences on adiaphora matters, but should allow freedom of conscience in outward ceremonies and rites.

Cromwell's policies differed somewhat from Henry's. Cromwell was the leading agent in suppressing the monasteries, replacing the old monastic culture with humanistic education and implementation at the local level as to what constituted adiaphora. Cromwell's own beliefs were never clearly articulated, but he supported Henry's goals vis-à-vis the government's financial concerns. His absence was evident during the Northern Rebellion, and the conservative clergy, together with the reform-minded clergy, attacked him over the doctrinal changes in the English Church. One may see Cromwell's religious leaning toward that of the continental Reformers, as he authorized many continental books to be translated into English, among them Melancthon's *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia*.

Conclusion

The dissolution also had consequences for monastic vows, which in theory were acknowledged as adiaphora as they became part of the civil legislation. The use of monastic vows became irrelevant as Henry proceeded with dismantling the monasteries in England.

The threat to supremacy was a major reason for the suppression, and the taxation of monasteries led to visitations, which led, in turn, to voluntary surrender and dissolution. Moreover, monastic teaching was erroneous, as was their lifestyle. Most religious opposed the royal supremacy and Henry's new marriage, and some thought that the visitation was only a short episode and that there would be reconciliation with the pope. The dissolution began the most radical change in England's religious scenery. Many of the religious became secular priests and some even reform-minded bishops. The monastic lands changed into new dioceses, which showed how large their establishments were. Monastic wealth changed hands, and a special division—Court of Augmentation—was established to manage it. It became evident that both the

⁶¹ Anne Duncan: *Thomas Becket: A Textual History of his Letters*. 1980, pp. 225–226.

⁶² Bernard 2005, pp. 489–490.

king and Cromwell misused the revenues for their own private purposes. Evidently, however, they had different goals, and Cromwell went further than Henry wished, destroying everything. The dissolution continued through every quarter of 1538, and most of the monasteries and friaries were in the king's hands by the end of the year. Henry's attention to the dissolution was mainly directed to the prevention of any dissension and might have distracted his attention from communicating with the Germans when they left London in September 1538.

Cromwell's Injunctions were designed to teach on adiaphora issues, but they went even further, and the result was to replace the old culture of images and shrines with a humanistic, erudite culture. Henry complied, and it appears that he also used the situation to eradicate shrines. He was suspicious of foreign influences and wanted all those elements destroyed that would foster the pope's influence in England. His motivation was different from Cromwell's, but both men's goals to protect the country from outside influences coincided, while Cromwell was eager to push through domestic reform. The reform-minded clergy took a leading role in judging what constituted heresy and the interpretation of correct doctrine. As a result, their definition of heresy was defined as any practice that threatened the king's vulnerable position as head of the church and Defender of the Faith; this benefited Henry's position. After allowing the destruction of the statue of Thomas à Becket, Henry announced the authority of supremacy to define sainthood, and confirmed his views that he had recently discussed with the Germans in the proclamation of November 1538, which was to prevent all foreign influences for fear of the papal bull. Thus Henry also demonstrated the power of his supremacy over doctrine and practice.

We have now seen how the adiaphora matters were discussed in the English Church through the publication of the Ten Articles of 1536, the Bishops' Book of 1537, and Cromwell's Injunctions of 1536 and 1538. The dissolution of monasteries and foreign relations with the Germans coincided and mutually influenced each other. We now turn, in Chapter Twelve, to the next phase: looking at the political background that led to renewed Anglo-Lutheran negotiations in London, which produced the Thirteen Articles.

Chapter 12:
***Foreign Relations That Led to New Negotiations
with the German Theologians and the Thirteen Articles***

(January–December 1538)

The first part of this chapter will deal with the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations in England in 1538 concerning adiaphora matters, which led to the writing of the Thirteen Articles. The second part of this chapter compares the Thirteen Articles of 1538 (the document on church policy matters of adiaphora) with *Loci Communes*, the Wittenberg Articles, the *Confessio Augustana*; and the Ten Articles, regarding the article on justification by faith; Article XI, The Rites of the Church; and Article XII, Civil Affairs. The last-mentioned article was published in the *Confessio Augustana* as Article XVI, Civil Affairs and Concerning Civil Magistrates; the Dignity of Political Matters in the *Loci Communes* of 1535; and Article X, Civil Affairs, in the Wittenberg Articles of 1536.

***Part I: Foreign Relations That Led to New Negotiations
with the German Theologians***

Introduction

Melanchthon had been waiting since September 1536 for King Henry to respond to the *Confessio Augustana*. Before responding, Henry asked the elector to send scholars to London to discuss its contents. Both sides still desired an agreement on doctrine and practice, despite the breaking off of the Wittenberg negotiations in 1536; so the Schmalkaldic party discussed sending an embassy to England in 1538 to bring copies of the agreement made two years earlier. For both personal and political reasons, Melanchthon was not a member of this party, and this disappointed Henry. The Anglo-Lutheran negotiations that took place in England in 1538 did not conclude successfully for either the Germans or the English, who each had their own agenda for the meeting. The Germans were hoping that an agreement would be reached on the controversial articles during preliminary negotiations; that both parties would accept the Wittenberg Articles; and that the king would approve them. The reform-minded English bishops, like the Germans, also wished for an agreement on the controversial issues; however, the more conservative bishops were unwilling to oppose the king, who took a conservative stance overall. Complicating matters, the Germans did not understand that the English bishops did not have the power to decide, and wrote directly to Henry concerning these articles. King Henry then made the bishops work on those issues with his conservative advisers, which became an opportunity for these advisers to gain influence. In the end, when Henry revealed his thoughts, it became apparent that

he did not accept that the church practices the Germans referred to as “abuses” were indeed such; rather, the king believed that such practices were supported by the arguments of the Church Fathers.

Discussed will be how Henry objected to the *Confessio Augustana* and how the German Reformers’ perception of the Reformation in England differed from how Henry saw it. Destroying papal remains for Henry meant the protection of his supremacy. For the Germans, it meant that Henry truly reformed his church.

Foreign Politics with Catholic Europe

English diplomacy had failed both the Imperial-French and Franco-Scots alliances during the period of 1536–1537.¹ The preliminary peace negotiations between Francis and Charles posed a threat to Henry.² So he sent Sir Francis Brian to France in January 1538 to discover if anything detrimental to England had been negotiated, and to remind Francis to include Henry as a third party in any agreement made with Charles.³

Henry’s goal was to keep a balance of neutrality between the two sovereign Catholic monarchs, in order to avoid aggression from the pope. McEntegart challenges the idea that Henry was interested in the German princes only because he depended on an alliance with Francis or Charles, and that he was not interested in long-term commitments with the German princes. This author concurs with McEntegart, who also challenges the view that this time it was Cromwell who connected England with the Lutherans.⁴ This author thinks that the king’s decision was final on any foreign policy issues. This author also agrees with McEntegart’s suggestion that Henry’s policies concerning Charles and Francis should not be seen as influencing his relations with the Schmalkaldic League, since Henry was truly interested in their political as well as religious goals.⁵ Rather, one should see Henry trying to prevent papal aggression.

One method used to achieve alliances was to interfere in the emperor’s and Francis’s peace negotiations. Henry knew well that Francis insisted on taking Milan from the emperor’s possession, and was willing to give up some lands in Savoy in exchange. Charles, on the other hand, wanted to keep Milan for three years, and told Thomas Wyatt, Henry’s ambassador in Spain, that he wanted Henry to be the third party in deciding Milan’s fate. In that way, the emperor argued, Henry would be supporting the peace of all Christendom.⁶ Henry was pleased, especially with the consideration that he, not the pope, would be responsible for the peace.

Henry firmly believed that the emperor would not conclude any treaties with Francis until his negotiations with England had been concluded. As Henry did not fully trust the emperor, he

¹ Slavin, 1969, No. 40, p. 106.

² L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 69, p. 22.

³ L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 155, p. 52; SP 3/2, Fols. 92–94; L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 386, pp. 143–144.

⁴ Elton 1977, pp. 276–277. In fact, Elton sees the policies of 1538 as Cromwell’s machinations in response to the threat of the Franco-Imperial alliance. Elton’s view has been challenged by McEntegart. McEntegart 2002, pp. 1–5.

⁵ McEntegart 2002, p. 6.

⁶ Henry VIII, to Sir Thomas Wyatt, January 15th, 1538; *Letters of Henry VIII*, No. III, pp. 187–188; L&P, 1538, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 273, pp. 93–94.

demanded that Wyatt send him letters signed by the emperor “for a furtherance of the rest of the purposes in treaty between us.”⁷

Another method Henry used to achieve alliances was through marriage proposals, such as to the Dowager Duchess of Milan, the daughter of the emperor’s sister. Even though such an alliance would have been politically unwise, since it would have involved having to deal with her inheritance in Denmark,⁸ Hans Holbein presented her a proposal from Henry.⁹

Cromwell also proposed two possible French choices¹⁰—Francis’s daughter Margaret, and Mary of Lorraine, even though King James of Scotland had already proposed to her. Nothing came of these proposals.¹¹

First the same laboring to get knowledge where the young Duke of Longville loath shall with diligence by post repaired thither where he shall find, as it is said, the two daughter of [Monish] [euro] de Guise, whom at his commingle he shall salute and so declare unto them that having certain business in those parties he could not preterit to visited the one of them, of whom he hath by his late being there some acquaintance.... To whom at his access unto him he shall deliver my letter of credence, and to the same say, that I doubt not but he hath heard with how and propane a good will I have travailed to advance some personage of his house and families to the marriage of the kings majesties my master ... and assume as he shall have gotten her physiognomy and known the Dukes pleaser he shall take his leave and return with all possible diligence.¹²

Henry’s objective with the French proposal was not only to come closer to Francis, but also to disrupt Scottish-French relations. Henry used these proposals to find out how he stood in respect to other European powers. In February, the resident French ambassador to England, Louis de Perreau, Sieur de Castillon, wrote to Francis that Henry was trying several marriage proposals.¹³ After Jane died, Henry sought to have more potential heirs than his one son.

Henry’s alliance with Francis was not what he had hoped. In March 1538, Francis sent the Bishop of Tarbes to England as his emissary to confirm the amity between the kings, to determine whether Henry would take Francis’s or the emperor’s part in their peace negotiations, to give assurance that the French king would not make a treaty without having Henry as third

⁷ Henry to Sir Thomas Wyatt, February 22, 1538. *Letters of Henry VIII*, No. IV, p. 189. See Elton 1977, p. 277.

⁸ Henry VIII to Sir Thomas Wyatt, January 22nd, 29th of our Reign [1538]; *Letters of Henry VIII*, No. II, pp. 185–186. Henry knew that previously the Duchess of Milan had been negotiating marriage with the Duke of Cleves, which had failed. Henry VIII to Sir Thomas Wyatt, January 22nd, 29th of our Reign [1538]; *Letters of Henry VIII*, No. II, pp. 185–186. Elton sees the marriage alliances as part of Cromwell’s policy to protect the country from foreign danger. In the course of 1538–1539, some nine candidates were considered. Elton 1977, p. 276. Henry VIII to Sir Thomas Wyatt April 5, 1538; *Letters of Henry VIII*, No. V, pp. 193–196.

⁹ Henry sent the painter Hans Holbein to Flanders to paint a portrait of the Duchess of Milan in order to impress her, and then he had Holbein present his proposal speech. Henry VIII to Sir Thomas Wyatt, January 22nd, 29th of our Reign [1538]; *Letters of Henry VIII*, No. II, pp. 185–186. pp. 185–186. Cromwell’s Instructions to Philip Hoby. II, III, February 1538; Add. Mss. 5498. Fols. 1–2. *Cromwell’s Letters* No. 243. pp. 121–122. L&P, 1538, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 380. p. 130. Elton 1977, p. 276.

¹⁰ Cromwell to Peter Mewtas, February, 1538. *Cromwell’s Letters*, Vol. 2, No. 242, pp. 117–119. L&P, XII, Pt. 2, Nos. 1201–02, pp. 505–506. Mary was the oldest daughter of the Duke of Guise and recently widowed from the Duke of Longueville. Henry preferred her, since he knew that his nephew, the recently widowed King James of Scotland, had already proposed marriage to her. L &P, XII, Pt. 2, Nos. 1201–02, pp. 505–506.

¹¹ Cromwell’s Instructions to Philip Hoby. I. February 1538; Add. Mss. 5498, Fols. 1–2; *Cromwell’s Letters*, Vol. 2, No. 243, p. 119–120. Elton 1977, p. 276.

¹² Additional Manuscripts 5498, Fols. 5–11, 18–22, 45–47.

¹³ Henry VIII, to Sir Thomas Wyatt, February 22nd, 1538; *Letters of Henry VIII*, No. IV, pp. 190–191; Harl. MSS 282, Fols. 159, 167; *Cromwell’s Letters*, Vol. 2, No. 238, pp. 113–114; L&P, 1538, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 273, p. 94.

party, and to express hope that the emperor would agree to that as well.¹⁴ The French were willing to arbitrate between the emperor and Henry, even though Henry had not sent the financial aid he had promised, to pay for a third of the expenses of Francis's war with Charles.¹⁵

Henry gave his ambassador to France, Gardiner, the authority to negotiate for him as a third party in the truce, but when Gardiner arrived in France, he did not follow Henry's instructions. Francis had assured Gardiner that he would not negotiate anything with Charles to Henry's disadvantage. When the truce negotiations were in their final stages, a third party, Tarbes—not the French ambassador—informed Henry that the mediator would not be the English king, but the pope.¹⁶ How much could Henry rely on Gardiner's willingness to support his interests abroad? The present author concurs with Rex, who notes that Gardiner may also have had secret hopes of reconciliation between the king and the pope, as seen in his risky contacts with papal diplomats during the 1530s.¹⁷

Henry questioned whether Gardiner was supporting his interests or the pope's. One may wonder if Gardiner compromised under Catholic pressure, realizing that Henry's political situation was too vulnerable to proceed further with the negotiations. Gardiner supported royal supremacy and even wrote a letter against the pope, but in his foreign mission he failed to support England's interests abroad, or defend Henry's interests in negotiations with the Schmalkaldic League.

This raises the question of whether Henry could trust his agents, since many of them had strong Catholic beliefs and were unable to freely express their religious views in England. These foreign assignments offered opportunities to connect with Catholic monarchs. Henry used his bishops also for political negotiations. Stephen Gardiner, Henry's ambassador to France, assured Cromwell that he would uphold Henry's interests in France.¹⁸ He assured Henry that he was his man and a supporter of his supremacy, and wrote to Cromwell that he was distressed about the present diplomatic situation, and believed that Francis did not accept Henry as peacemaker.¹⁹

The political situation changed in 1538. The truce between the emperor and Francis alarmed Henry, and he questioned the emperor's promises. He also had doubts about the Schmalkaldic League, and wanted to know what the Germans would do if the pope's council were indicted. Henry's main interests in the negotiations were his own supremacy, and English and German relations regarding the council. It was also important to discuss mutual defense, which clearly indicated that Henry was looking for a military alliance with the League due to fear of papal aggression. The foreign policy situation alarmed Thomas Cromwell, who interfered in the king's politics and considered the Germans good partners to support the supremacy.

¹⁴ L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 386, pp. 143–144; Nos. 389–390, pp. 145–147; Nos. 576–577, p. 213; No. 583, p. 215.

¹⁵ Cromwell to Sir Thomas Wyatt, March 1, 1538; Harl. Mss. 282, f. 178; *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. 2, No. 282, pp. 122–125.

¹⁶ L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 386, pp. 143–144; No. 390, p. 147; Nos. 576–577, p. 213.

¹⁷ Rex 2006, p. 26.

¹⁸ Gardiner to Cromwell, January 23, 1538, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, No. 58, pp. 79–80.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 70–80.

In May 1538, when Henry found out how cold the emperor had become towards England and how favorable to the pope,²⁰ he desperately launched an even larger network for gathering information from both Francis and the emperor concerning a treaty between Christian princes. His bishops were his pawns, defending the supremacy laws in international negotiations. Perhaps Henry misinterpreted the Catholic monarchs' political views from his own legal perspective, as they still believed in the authority of canon law.

Renewed Attempts to Negotiate with the Germans

Another way for Henry to protect himself against the alliance between Francis and Charles and against the pope was to renew his negotiations with the German Protestants. Whether or not he was seriously considering agreement with the Schmalkaldic League, at least his contact with them gave the impression that he was. This author concurs with Richard Rex, who finds that Cromwell was behind the renewed negotiations, since the German stance agreed with his ecclesiastical policy.²¹ It may be interpreted that in the latter part of the 1530s, Cromwell perceived imminent danger from abroad while he pursued foreign contacts with the Cleves. He may also have wanted to stabilize his position as vice-regent.

Rex explains that Cromwell saw the Lutheran doctrinal position of Scripture alone as an alternative to papal authority and best suited for the royal supremacy, which demanded obedience to human authority of divine origin.²² Rex thinks that Henry formed his foreign policy of the 1530s, based on his fear of imperial invasion and domestic rebellion.²³ Elton argues that the negotiations with the Schmalkaldic League in 1538 were Cromwell's, and questions Henry's interest in them.²⁴ Bernard refutes Elton's opinion, asserting that while the king may have discussed it with Cromwell, it was he who led the foreign policy.²⁵ Rory McEntegart opposes Rex's interpretation that it was only the truce between the emperor and Francis that brought about the negotiations. McEntegart also disagrees with the idea that the king had shown no interest in the negotiations between the years 1536–1538.²⁶ According to McEntegart, it is wrong to connect Anglo-Schmalkaldic relations to the actions of Charles, Francis, or the pope. It is equally wrong to deny any of their influences on these relations.²⁷

There were other factors that delayed Henry's contact with the Schmalkaldic League. Henry awaited the embassy's return on September 1, 1536. The Germans contacted the English to resume negotiations, which had been broken off by the Boleyn affair during a time of domestic disturbance and under the mounting pressure of the pope's summoning of a General Council. In

²⁰ Cromwell to Sir Thomas Wyatt, May 4, 1538. *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. 2, No. 257, pp. 137–138 No. 258, pp. 138–139, No. 261, pp. 140–141; Add. Mss. 24, 114, Fol. 302; Harl. Mss. 282, Fols. 191, 200; L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, Nos. 916, p. 338; No. 918, p. 340; 967, p. 353.

²¹ Rex 2006, p. 162.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 149.

²³ Rex 2006, p. 149. Elton 1977, p. 276.

²⁴ Elton 1977, p. 276.

²⁵ Bernard 2005, pp. 534–536.

²⁶ Rex 2006, p. 13; McEntegart 2002, pp. 1, 77–79.

²⁷ McEntegart 2002, p. 86.

1537, both parties were busy planning responses to that council.²⁸ This author thinks that it was in Henry's personal interests to continue the Anglo-Schmalkaldic relations but that other factors, such as the unresolved succession problem and Henry's strained relations with the Catholic monarchs delayed his involvement. This author concurs with Bernard that the king controlled foreign policy.

The German princes decided to send Henry an explanation of their position on the General Council after their debate at Schmalkalden in February 1537.²⁹ But their message was delayed and caused a rift between them and Henry. A year later, on February 25, 1538, Henry was planning to send Christopher Mont to Germany to explain his views on various doctrinal matters.³⁰ Mont was an excellent choice of ambassador to the German princes,³¹ as he was a native German and understood the language, politics, and geography; and as a Protestant scholar, he could competently introduce Henry's proposals to the German rulers and scholars. He also could negotiate military alliances with the princes.

Melanchthon had been waiting since September 1536 for Henry to respond to his *Confessio Augustana*.³² Henry also asked the elector to reciprocate by sending scholars to London to discuss its contents.³³ It is important to keep in mind that both sides wanted an agreement on doctrine and practice after the Wittenberg negotiations broke off in 1536. The Schmalkaldic party discussed sending an embassy to England in 1538, to bring copies of the agreement made two years earlier.³⁴

Melanchthon himself was cautious about traveling to England after learning of the execution of Queen Anne,³⁵ and there might have been general wariness toward Henry on the part of the Schmalkaldic League after such a tragic event.

The new attempts at making contact could be viewed as Henry's continuation of negotiations with the Schmalkaldic League over abuses back in 1536. Religious matters seem to have been the central focus. The embassy was to ascertain religious differences and Henry's view of the *Confessio Augustana*.³⁶

²⁸ McEntegart 2002, pp. 78–79.

²⁹ Elector John Frederick of Saxony and the Landgrave Philip of Hesse in the name of the Schmalkaldic League to King Ferdinand and others. [Kf. Johann Friedrich von Sachsen und Lgf. Philipp von Hessen in name des Schmalkaldischen Bundes an Kg. Ferdinand und andere.] March 26, 1537. MBW R 2; MBW, T 7, 1877, pp. 400–401. (German response to refuse the Council.)

³⁰ L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 352, p. 122.

³¹ Christopher Mont, German-born agent, was sent with Nicholas Heath to gain the German princes' support for Henry's divorce. He was sent to Germany initially to prevent Melanchthon's trip to France in 1535. Esther Hildebrandt: "Christopher Mont, Anglo-German diplomat," *Sixteenth Century Journal* XV:3. 1984. Elton sees that beside Mont, Robert Barnes was also arranging the negotiations. Elton 1977, p. 276.

³² Elector John Frederick of Saxony, Landgrave Philip of Hesse and other members of Schmalkaldic League to Henry VIII of England, designed by Melanchthon. [Kf. Johann Friedrich von Sachsen, Lgf. Philipp von Hessen und die übrigen Schmalkaldischen Bundesgenossen an Kg. Heinrich VIII. von England; Von M. formuliert.] September 1, 1536. MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1781, pp. 222–223; CR III 1463, pp. 144–146; L&P, XII, Pt. 2, No. 1088, p. 382.

³³ L&P XIII, Pt. 1, No. 352, p. 122.

³⁴ WA VII, No. 3003, p. 381–383 = LW, L, No. 271, p. 133.

³⁵ Melanchthon to Joachim Camerarius in Tübingen. [M. an Joachim Camerarius in Tübingen.] June 6, 1536. MBW R 2; MBW T 7, 1752, pp. 163–164.

³⁶ McEntegart 2002, pp. 95–96.

Henry had instructed Mont to first visit the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse to deliver the king's letters, and then to attend the assembly at Brunschweig, where all the princes of the Schmalkaldic League would be meeting.³⁷ McEntegart thinks that at Brunschweig, the league defended itself against the claim that the pope had the right to call a council, as Henry had suggested. Sending an embassy to England by the Germans was conditional on the further deferral of the General Council.³⁸ This author concurs with McEntegart, who notes that the initial purpose of the meeting at Wittenberg in 1536 was to formulate a common strategy concerning the council. Henry wanted Mont to make clear to the Germans that he had tried to further the new doctrine in England, and to liberate the English from the tyranny of the pope. He was also to remind the Germans that the pope's council was aimed at suppressing the principles of Scripture, and furthering the power of Rome. The king asked the Germans what they would do if they were forced to attend the council.³⁹ Both Henry and the Saxon Reformers had refused to attend the council in 1537, but the situation was different since it seems that both parties still were apprehensive about the council and the possibility that the pope may force them to attend.

Mont was also instructed to ask how many princes had joined the league, whether they were united on religious grounds and for mutual defense, and whether the King of Denmark was one of them. In aiding the league, Henry did not want to break his treaties with the emperor.

If the German princes asked about the Wittenberg Articles of 1536, which Edward Fox, Nicholas Heath, and Robert Barnes had negotiated with them, Mont was instructed to say that the controversial issues would be settled when the Germans sent their delegation of scholars to England. Moreover, Mont was told to stress that Melanchthon should be included in the delegation.⁴⁰ Mont was also instructed to encourage the princes to read the writings of the conservative bishops of London and Durham on the supremacy issue.⁴¹ The king's supremacy and English and German attitudes toward the General Council were Henry's main interests in negotiations.

The trust between the Schmalkaldic League and Henry had to be repaired, and the previous year's failure to communicate with King Henry had to be renewed. The Germans were looking to an alliance with Henry to defend their doctrinal stance—the Schmalkaldic Articles—at the pope's council. They had to reassure Henry about rumors that had spread that they had changed their mind concerning the General Council. Certainly, Henry's domestic troubles—the death of Queen Jane and continuous threat of a papal bull—influenced Henry's motivation. He repeatedly requested that Melanchthon be sent with the delegation. But the Germans felt that they needed to keep their chief theologian at home, for fear that he would be needed at the pope's council. It is not clear from the sources whether Melanchthon's reason for passing up the opportunity to travel with the embassy was ever conveyed to King Henry.

³⁷ L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 648, pp. 248–249; SP 1/130, Fols. 225–235; McEntegart 2002, p. 89.

³⁸ McEntegart 2002, p. 89.

³⁹ L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 648, pp. 248–249; SP 1/130, Fols. 225–235.

⁴⁰ The king had asked for Melanchthon to be sent to England in 1538. McEntegart, p. 100. Bernard 2005, p. 539. The present writer agrees.

⁴¹ L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 367, p. 126; SP 1/129, Fols. 108–121.

In the middle of April 1538, the German princes responded to Mont's questions⁴² by expressing their gratitude that Mont was sent to visit them. They stressed that deliberations should be held between them concerning the council, and that after meeting with their allies, they would consider sending an embassy. Before they sent ambassadors, King Henry should relay his thoughts and send his own ambassadors to Germany.⁴³ They were pleased to hear that the king promoted the "doctrine of Christ in his kingdom, and threw out impious traditions, superstitions and papal impostures."⁴⁴

The German princes continued to refuse to attend the council, which Pope Paul III had called at Vicenza, as they had when he called it at Mantua. Again they wrote that their objections, which the king had read last year, were legitimate, and they approved the king's "splendid text" concerning the synod. The pope's council would not judge controversies of the church, but its aim would be to confirm the attitude of the Bishop of Rome toward the Reformation doctrine. Holding the council in Italy would only entrench his position and the abuses he condoned.⁴⁵

In this new situation, a new trust between Henry and the Saxon Reformers had to be established. The princes defended themselves against rumors that they would consent to the pope's synod. Even though the emperor and other princes agreed, they had not signed the decree at Regensburg. On the contrary, they argued that evil men had spread harmful messages from Germany to England, but they would prove their innocence to the king at a more appropriate time.⁴⁶

Lastly, they asked the king whether they were allied for the defense of religion or for war in other causes. They informed the king of the form and articles of the treaty. They preferred to send a preliminary embassy that could relate their position in detail and hold discussions with the king about the doctrine of religion and correcting abuses in the churches until a larger embassy could be sent, which could explain things more clearly. The minor embassy would gather necessary information, so that the later embassy would be better instructed and informed and the whole mission could be accomplished more efficiently. The theologians should stay at home in case sudden disputes concerning the synod came about.⁴⁷

McEntegart says that this embassy was to bring copies of the agreements reached in 1536.⁴⁸ The present embassy was to state the remaining disagreements and prepare a major embassy for later. The ambassadors were to consult on the four points on which they could not agree at

⁴² MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2019, pp. 93–98. Response of the Duke of Saxony, the Elector John Frederick, and Ernest, Duke of Brunswick and Luneburg, and Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, etc., to the mandates of the Most Serene Prince and Lord Henry, King of England, our lord and kinsman, that were made known to us at the convention at Brunswick through the royal ambassador Christopher Mont. Melancthon's Latin translation for the Elector John Frederick of Saxony in Brunswick. M.: [Lateinische Übersetzung für Kf. Johann Friedrich von Sachsen in Braunschweig]. April 14/15, 1538. MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2019, pp. 92–93.

⁴³ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2019, p. 93.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 93–94.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 95–96.

⁴⁶ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2019, pp. 96–97; L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 648, pp. 248–249; No. 650, pp. 249–250.

⁴⁷ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2019, pp. 97–98.

⁴⁸ McEntegart 2002, pp. 94–95.

Wittenberg in 1536.⁴⁹ This author concurs with McEntegart that the future meeting was to discuss the controversial issues that were left open in 1536.

From the German point of view, it seemed clear that they wanted to discuss the articles disagreed upon in 1536, and even ask Henry to reconsider becoming defender and protector of the league and subscribing to the *Confessio Augustana*. It also seemed that the elector himself was adamant that this embassy would not deviate from the doctrine of the *Confessio Augustana* in their discussions with the English.

On April 23, 1538, Melanchthon wrote to Vitus Theodoric and mentioned that an English messenger named Christopher [Mont] attended the conference for a couple of days and “He asked us to send men to England [to converse about religion there with the king and called upon me.”⁵⁰ It seems that Melanchthon did not take up the opportunity, since he must have been aware that the elector would not favor his traveling to foreign countries, either as a private person or as a representative of the electorate, as had been the case when Melanchthon attempted to go to France (see Chapter Three). McEntegart believes that Melanchthon did not go to England, due to the need for prominent theologians at home because of the possibility of a General Council. MacCulloch agrees with McEntegart, but argues that Melanchthon represented the acceptable face of Lutheranism and King Henry was quite ambitious to meet him in person.⁵¹

McEntegart and Schofield note that Henry was disappointed because the elector had decided that he would not let Melanchthon go.⁵² Both opinions have merit, but this author thinks that Melanchthon voluntarily passed up the opportunity to go to England.

The Elector John Frederick and the Landgrave of Hesse sent the German ambassadors George of Boyneburg, Francis Burchard, and Frederick Myconius to King Henry VIII.⁵³ A full delegation was not sent because of the approaching synod at Vicenza. The princes felt it necessary to keep their theologians at hand in order to publish and promulgate their defense against the Bishop of Rome and the decrees of his cardinals, and they would send the most learned and eminent ones to England at an undetermined future date.⁵⁴ The Germans believed that an evangelical alliance was needed to defend the new doctrine. They wanted the king’s opinion of Melanchthon’s *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia*, as well as regarding the synod;⁵⁵ and also wanted the king to agree with the *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia*, and join the Christian League as its defender and protector.⁵⁶ They hoped that the king, having established doctrine and ceremonies according to the new doctrine, and having destroyed the universal

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 95.

⁵⁰ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2022, pp. 103–104; CR III, 1665, p. 512; L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 815, p. 301.

⁵¹ McEntegart 2002, pp. 94–95; MacCulloch 1996, p. 215.

⁵² McEntegart 2002, pp. 94–95. Schofield 2006, p. 86.

⁵³ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2029, pp. 111–114. Elector John Frederick of Saxony, Duke Ernst of Braunschweig-Lüneburg, Landgrave Philip of Hesse: Instruction for George of Boyneburg, Francis Burchard and Frederick Myconius for King Henry VIII of England. Latin translation by Melanchthon. [Kf. Johann Friedrich von Sachsen, Hz. Ernst von Braunschweig-Lüneburg, Lgf. Philipp von Hessen: Instruktion für Georg von Boyneburg, Franz Burchard und Friedrich Myconius an Kg. Heinrich VIII von England. Lateinische Übersetzung von M.] May 12, 1538.

⁵⁴ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2029, pp. 112–113.

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 113.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

influence of the Bishop of Rome, would propagate the new doctrine in other nations.⁵⁷ They would make sure that the king knew the decrees of Brunschweig, and wanted him to respond so that they could convey his word to the princes in order to conclude the discussions before the next embassy was sent.⁵⁸

It is clear that the German princes mainly wished to discuss doctrinal matters and had great hopes that the king would finally agree to the *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia*. The decision not to send a major embassy was contrary to Henry's expectations. Henry wished to find a common strategy for the pope's upcoming council.

The Germans demanded outright that Henry subscribe to the *Confessio Augustana* and did not explain their position for sending only a minor embassy. Henry wanted to form a common strategy regarding the council, which had become unnecessary as both parties refused to attend at Mantua in the previous year. The elector was cautious because of the political alliance with the emperor, but was also interested in Henry joining the powerful Schmalkaldic League for the purpose of defense. He must have chosen the most cautious approach and reasoned that he sent agents that he could fully trust.

In 1538, Francis Burchard, not Melanchthon, had been chosen as one of the German scholars to go to England. Melanchthon wrote to Henry asking him to look after the universal church, the "true church." He also asked Henry to prevent other kings from joining the pontifical councils. He said that "private men can offer help to the Kings."⁵⁹ It was Melanchthon's leading idea to unify the churches in the matter of church policy, which he wished he could have done had the elector not prevented him from doing so in 1535. So Melanchthon voluntarily replaced himself by sending Burchard.

Anglo-Lutheran Negotiations Resume

The German emissaries, comprised of Francis Burchard, the Vice-Chancellor of the Elector of Saxony, George of Boyneburg, Doctor of Law and Hessian nobleman, and Frederick Myconius, Superintendent (an overseer) at Gotha, arrived in England in May 31, 1538.⁶⁰ Wriothesley mentions that the king allowed Robert Barnes to negotiate with the Germans.⁶¹ On the English side, Wriothesley mentions that the Archbishop of Canterbury; Richard Sampson,

⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 112.

⁵⁸ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2029, p. 114. L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 648, pp. 248–249; No. 650, pp. 249–250; No. 815, p. 301; No. 1305, p. 481; SP 1/133, Fols. 254–262.

⁵⁹ Philip Melanchthon to Henry VIII [Melanchthon to Kg. Heinrich VIII. von England]. May 12, 1538. MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2030, p. 115; Cleopatra, E.6. p. 332, Strype, Vol. VI, No. XCIV, pp. 137–139; L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 985, p. 364.

⁶⁰ After the Diet at Augsburg in 1530, the Reformation Church assigned the episcopal functions to visitors, superintendents and consistories throughout 1520s, 1530s, and 1540s. See Estes 2005, p. 174.

⁶¹ *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, Vol. I, p. 81. *Wriothesley's Chronicle* omits Bernard of Mila from the list of ambassadors. *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, Vol. I, p. 81.

Bishop of Chichester; and the king's chaplain, Dr. Wilson, attended.⁶² The rest of the English theologians were: Archdeacon Nicholas Heath, and three more doctors he did not name.⁶³

On June 18, 1538, Myconius, one of the German ambassadors, wrote to the elector and conveyed a positive picture of the religious situation in England. By this date, the negotiations had started, since Myconius wrote of how Bishop John Stokesley (an "evil papist," he wrote) opposed the doctrines original sin and justification as presented in the discussions.⁶⁴ McEntegart discerns that the king set up the negotiations with the intent of balancing various factions, as he had done in 1536.⁶⁵

The Germans did not see any major obstacles in the negotiations since their plan was that the parties would meet over a three- to four-week period.⁶⁶ They hoped that an agreement would be reached on these controversial articles during the preliminary negotiations, that both parties would accept the Wittenberg Articles and that the king would approve them.⁶⁷

On June 8, Castillon, French ambassador to England, wondered whether the Germans and the English were planning a defensive alliance in case either of them was attacked for their refusal to obey the pope.⁶⁸ This was not an unfounded speculation, for on June 18, Francis and Charles concluded a ten-year truce at Nicaea.⁶⁹ The Catholic monarchs were interested in finding out what kind of relationship Henry was pursuing with the Germans, since the Schmalkaldic princes were under the jurisdiction of the Catholic emperor.

Burchard and Mila point out that Cromwell and Cranmer had promoted reform. The only disagreement still remaining was over the question of whether priests should be allowed to marry. They regretted that the Bishop of Hereford, Edward Fox, had died two weeks earlier (on May 8, 1538). Certainly, from the English point of view, it was unfortunate that Fox would not be present. He had been a strong supporter of the 1536 negotiations between the German and English theologians and had agreed with the Wittenberg Articles.⁷⁰ On June 1, 1538, Bernhard of Mila⁷¹ and Francis Burchard wrote to the Elector of Saxony from London about their reception in England, and that the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Apology* and Bible had been published in English. "The abuses and ceremonies have been abolished, and there is free preaching of the new

⁶² *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, Vol. I, pp. 81–82. McEntegart mentions Nicholas Heath, George Day, and John Stokesley on the English side. McEntegart 2002, p. 108.

⁶³ Friedrich Myconius [Frederick Myconius] and Kurfürst Johann Friedrich [John Frederick], June 18, 1538, *Aktenstücke*, No. 10, Prüser, 1968, pp. 310–311. *Wriothesley's Chronicle* does not mention the Bishop of London.

⁶⁴ Friedrich Myconius [Frederick Myconius] and Kurfürst Johann Friedrich [John Frederick], June 18, 1538, *Aktenstücke*, No. 10, Prüser, 1968, pp. 310–311. *Wriothesley's Chronicle* does not mention the Bishop of London.

⁶⁵ McEntegart 2002, pp. 104–105.

⁶⁶ *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, Vol. I, pp. 81–82.

⁶⁷ MacCulloch finds that much of the draft resembles the Wittenberg Articles of 1536. The *Confessio Augustana* was the primary source for the negotiations. MacCulloch 1996, p. 217.

⁶⁸ Castillon to Montmorency. L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 1147, p. 429. Schofield 2006, p. 86.

⁶⁹ L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 1356, p. 506; No. 1415, p. 523. Elton 1977, p. 277.

⁷⁰ SP 1/96, Fols. 12r–29r; L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 213, pp. 69–71; WTA, 1536, pp. 58–79; Bernhard von Mila [Bernhard of Mila] und Franz Burchard [Francis Burchard] an Kurfürst Johann Friedrich [John Frederick], June 1, 1538, *Aktenstücke* No. 8, Prüser, 1968, pp. 310–311. MacCulloch 1996, p. 216.

⁷¹ Bernhard of Mila was omitted from the Letters of Papers, *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, Hardwick's and Schofield's list, but included as one of the envoys by the German sources. Bernhard von Mila [Bernhard of Mila] und Franz Burchard [Francis Burchard] an Kurfürst Johann Friedrich [John Frederick], June 1, 1538, *Aktenstücke* No. 8, Prüser, 1968, pp. 310–311.

doctrine,” they wrote and noted that they were to be having an audience with the king to discuss religious reform in England.⁷²

On the same day, the ambassadors had an audience with the king and met the next day, on June 2, to discuss the articles. They wrote, “Cromwell assured that the king will certainly agree with us, and we will follow the instructions given by the elector.”⁷³ Rory McEntegart notes that both Cromwell and Cranmer had assured the embassy that their presence pleased the king, and promised further Christian unity and that they would promote the new doctrine.⁷⁴ McEntegart notes that Henry wished Melanchthon had been sent because his presence would have been beneficial in promoting unity in the controversial articles, since the league did not offer any compromise beyond the *Confessio Augustana*.⁷⁵ Melanchthon would be sent if Henry would accept the league’s religious principles and defend them in the council. The crucial question came from Henry, who wanted to discuss the principles and get an explanation directly from Melanchthon.⁷⁶ Bernard is unable to see the connection supported by McEntegart, which acknowledges Henry’s refusal to accept the Lutheran confession. However, based on McEntegart’s factional model, Bernard agrees that Henry could have been persuaded on this issue, but that the king (not, as McEntegart argues, Cranmer and Cromwell) wanted Melanchthon to visit England.⁷⁷ It seems that the Germans took a unilateral approach toward Henry’s request. Bernard believes that McEntegart’s position would lead to an assumption that Henry could be persuaded to accept the Lutheran confessional writing. Bernard argues that Henry was consistent in expressing the wish to meet Melanchthon and discuss doctrine.⁷⁸

Two key persons were missing from the negotiations from the start—Bishop Fox and Philip Melanchthon. It continued to be a problem and disappointment to King Henry that Melanchthon was not one of the delegates. Bishop Fox’s absence complicated matters on the English side. It seemed that Cranmer was left without support from the reform-minded clergy and Thomas Cromwell’s absence from the negotiations was questionable.

Bernard and McEntegart think that the king must have been disappointed that Melanchthon was not part of the delegation. His presence was crucial for the results of the discussions, but as noted earlier he decided voluntarily to pass up the opportunity.⁷⁹ The German ambassadors were probably inclined to side with Archbishop Cranmer and the reform-minded clergy’s interest in defending the theological ideas of the Wittenberg Articles. Cromwell seemed to side with the reform-minded clergy, and promised the unity for which they were hoping.⁸⁰ One may ask

⁷² Bernhard von Mila [Bernhard of Mila] und Franz Burchard [Francis Burchard] an Kurfürst Johann Friedrich [John Frederick], June 1, 1538, *Aktenstücke*, No. 8, Prüser 1968, pp. 310–311.

⁷³ Bernhard von Mila [Bernhard of Mila] und Franz Burchard [Francis Burchard] an Kurfürst Johann Friedrich [John Fredrick], June 1, 1538, *Aktenstücke*, No. 8, Prüser 1968, pp. 311–312.

⁷⁴ McEntegart 2002, p. 98.

⁷⁵ McEntegart 2002, pp. 100–101.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷⁷ McEntegart 2002, pp. 100–101; Bernard 2005, p. 539.

⁷⁸ Bernard 2005, pp. 538–539.

⁷⁹ Bernard 2005, p. 538. McEntegart 2002, p. 100; Melanchthon to Veit Dietrich April 23, 1538. MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2022, pp. 103–104.

⁸⁰ Bernhard von Mila [Bernhard of Mila] und Franz Burchard [Francis Burchard] an Kurfürst Johann Friedrich [John Frederick], June 1, 1538, *Aktenstücke*, No. 8, Prüser 1968, pp. 311–312.

whether at that time Cromwell was more interested in political rather than religious unity. Certainly the king was to make the final decision on doctrinal matters.

On June 10, 1538, Melanchthon wrote to his friend Camerarius that he had been corresponding with Cranmer, Francis Burchard, and George of Boyneburg, a friend of Camerarius.⁸¹ It is evident that Melanchthon was apprehensive about the result of the negotiations in the absence of Bishop Fox, the lead ambassador in Germany in 1536.

The first two weeks of negotiations went smoothly, since most of the conservative bishops were elsewhere: the fate of the Bishop of London, Stokesley, was problematic since he had been indicted for *praemunire*, for consecrating two nuns in the name of the pope, and he was also critical of the new doctrine that the reform-minded clergy supported.⁸² John Stokesley's compliance was questioned, especially his support for royal supremacy, since he had a mistress, the Abbess of Wherwell, at a time when bishops were supposed to be celibate. Bernard questions Stokesley's compliance because of the risk that his personal behavior would also discredit his support of royal supremacy.⁸³ Stephen Gardiner was still serving as ambassador in France.⁸⁴ The most conservative bishop available, Cuthbert Tunstall, the Bishop of Durham and the president of the North, was called to London to represent the conservative party.⁸⁵ McEntegart discerns that the king set up the negotiations with the intent of balancing various factions as he had done in 1536.⁸⁶

Even though the Germans believed that the conservative bishop's presence was annoying, it was part of Henry's tactics. He knew that none of the bishops could make any decisions on doctrine or practice, so even his presence was not necessary. Did Henry intend to leave the negotiators to discuss matters while knowing that they would not be able to reach any conclusions without his presence?

On the same day, June 18, 1538, the other two German ambassadors—Bernhard of Mila and Francis Burchard—wrote to John Frederick. Even though they shared the good news that the Wittenberg Articles would be the basis of these negotiations, they also said that they had met with resistance because of a messenger who came from the emperor with false rumors, and also because of the conservative English bishop,⁸⁷ probably Bishop John Stokesley. They wrote that the emperor's ambassadors came to disturb the meeting, handed over a letter against the Lutheran religion and advised that the king should not ally with them. The German ambassadors thought that the letter could harm not only themselves but also the elector and the landgrave.⁸⁸ The emperor's involvement on English soil was not only a threat to the Lutheran ambassadors,

⁸¹ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2051, p. 144; CR III, 1686, p. 540.

⁸² *Wriothesley's Chronicle* Vol. I, p. 81. Bernhard of Mila and Francis Burchard [Franz Burchard] to Elector John Frederick [Johann Friedrich], June 1, 1538. *Aktenstücke*, No. 10, Prüser, 1968, p. 314.

⁸³ Bernard 2005, p. 192; McEntegart 2002, p. 102.

⁸⁴ McEntegart 2002, p. 103; Schofield 2006, p. 87.

⁸⁵ Schofield 2006, pp. 88–89; MacCulloch 1996, p. 219. Tunstall was the last conservative bishop who finally delivered papal bulls to the king when requested. Cott. Lib. Cleop. E. 6. P. 246; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. XL, p. 466. Schofield 2006, pp. 88–89; MacCulloch 1996, p. 219.

⁸⁶ McEntegart 2002, pp. 104–105.

⁸⁷ Bernhard von Mila [Bernhard of Mila] an Kurfürst Johann Friedrich [John Frederick], June 18, 1538, *Aktenstücke*, No. 11, Prüser, 1968 pp. 317–318. Tjernagel 1965, p. 184.

⁸⁸ Bernhard von Mila [Bernhard of Mila] an Kurfürst Johann Friedrich [John Frederick], June 18, 1538, *Aktenstücke*, No. 11, Prüser, 1968 pp. 318–319. *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, Vol. I, pp. 81–82.

but also to Henry. However, the Schmalkaldic League was very strong at that time,⁸⁹ and the imperial ambassadors could not have prevented the mutual negotiations.

Their correspondence showed that the Germans had difficulties with the conservative bishops, since the Germans argued for acceptance of the German confession to the letter, and obviously wanted the same agreement from the English. The Germans were concerned that the English had not abolished their abuses: pilgrimages, consecrated salt, water, healing, and exorcism. They also said that only some images to which people were praying had been burnt.⁹⁰ The focus had been turned away from the most essential issues of the negotiations—the conflicting articles.

The communications between the German embassy, the Schmalkaldic leaders, and Melanchthon reveal that they were looking for signs of whether the doctrinal and practical questions of the Wittenberg Articles and *Confessio Augustana* were the chief points of discussion. What they saw in England made them apprehensive, since the outward signs did not conform to the Reformation as they understood it. In addition, the appearance of the emperor's agents was disturbing. The Germans were negotiating on their own with a foreign potentate and the emperor wanted to know what kind of issues were discussed.

On July 22, 1538, Melanchthon wrote to his friend Joachim Camerarius about the negotiations. He knew that the first meetings had been promising, since they had some learned men there, and continued with “Francis and Myconius are writing only positive things from Britain. They are discussing dogma with the English bishops.” However, he added ominously (in Greek and Latin), “καταστροφην *expectemus* [We expect a catastrophe].”⁹¹ This proved correct, because Henry never officially accepted the results of the negotiations, as we shall see when we discuss the Thirteen Articles.

On the same day, Melanchthon also wrote to Vitus Theodoric that, based on his correspondence with Francis and Myconius, the king promised all his efforts for correction of the churches. The ambassadors had told Melanchthon that many educated men in England would help them to agree on doctrine.⁹² Four days later, on June 26, Melanchthon wrote again to Vitus Theodoric. He made a brief comment that he knew that Myconius was still in England.⁹³ Melanchthon must have been pleased because of Myconius' evangelical outlook, hoping for agreement on the controversial articles.

The Germans also appeared to have a need to explain their political affiliation with the emperor to Henry; that the Schmalkaldic League was protecting them against any aggression by the emperor. It seems to have been important to the German ambassadors at least to acknowledge that they worked under the emperor's rule. The German scholars explained to Henry that they were unhappy that the emperor supported the pope, whose rule was tyrannical to

⁸⁹ Brady notes that the second half of the 1530s (the Apogee 1535–1542) were the best days of German Protestantism, and security from the imperial courts made it possible to advance Protestantism, since Charles V's policy was conciliatory. Brady 1998, pp. 117–118.

⁹⁰ Friedrich Mykonius [Frederick Myconius] an Kurfürst Johann Friedrich [John Frederick], June 18, 1538, *Aktenstücke*, No. 10, Prüser, 1968, p. 315.

⁹¹ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2066, pp. 170–171; CR III, 1699, p. 557; L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 1437, p. 531.

⁹² MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2067, p. 173.

⁹³ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2053, pp. 148–150; CR III, 1691, pp. 547–548.

them. Therefore, they wished to unite with other states of the empire that professed evangelical doctrine, and have their scholars, including Melanchthon, publish writings in their defense. Furthermore, they said, the league was defensive in nature, and they hoped Henry would be its protector, which was clearly a secondary political appeal.⁹⁴ The ambassadors appealed to Henry to accept their confessional writing that had been offered at Christmas 1535.

The negotiations over doctrine were going smoothly; the Bishop of Chichester referring to “great matters with the Germans” in a letter to John Branghugh and others on August 4, 1538.⁹⁵ But the clergy realized that on controversial issues the king had the sole power to make decisions, which further complicated the negotiations.

By August 5, 1538, the German scholars, who had been in England for two months, approached the king directly and wrote that they had completed their discussions with the English bishops and scholars on the articles of religion, and that they had no doubt that the king and the German princes would eventually come to an agreement on all the articles discussed.⁹⁶ It seems that the German ambassadors concluded that their presence was not necessary in England. McEntegart offers an explanation that the German ambassadors did not want to continue prolonged talks on abuses and therefore wrote directly to the king.⁹⁷ This author concurs, since the question of the abuses was a major reason for their negotiations, and they found out that the English bishops did not have authority to make a decision; thus they took matters directly to the king.⁹⁸

The reform-minded clergy tried to persuade the ambassadors to stay. On August 18, 1538, Cranmer wrote to the German ambassadors to await the king’s intervention. The Germans told Cranmer that if the king would write an excuse to their princes, they would consider prolonging their stay one more month.⁹⁹ Cranmer must have hoped for some positive results from the negotiations and appealed to the king, who asked them to stay two more months.¹⁰⁰ The reform-minded bishops wished very much to obtain agreement, even on the controversial issues. McEntegart argues that Cromwell still hoped for face-to-face discussions with the Germans.¹⁰¹ The more conservative bishops were unwilling to oppose the king, who took a more conservative stance after consultations with them. Cranmer realized that nothing more could be done without

⁹⁴ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2029, p. 113; Proposition made to the King, by the German Princes. Paper-Office, Burnet, Vol 4, Book III, XLIV, pp. 471–472. Cleopatra E. 5.173; *Strype Ecclesiastical Memorials*. Vol. VI [?]; L&P XIII, Pt. 1, No. 650, p. 250.

⁹⁵ SP 1/135, Fols. 35v, 36, 36v; L&P, XIII, Pt. 2, No. 33, p. 11.

⁹⁶ A Letter written by the German Ambassadors to the King, against taking away of the Chalice, and against Private Masses, and the Celibate of the Clergie, &c. Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VII, pp. 178–187. L&P, XIII, Pt. 2, No. 37, p. 13. Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5, Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VII, pp. 178–179. McEntegart notes that the first phase of negotiations had taken longer than expected and they wished to return to Germany in three weeks. McEntegart 2002, p. 115.

⁹⁷ McEntegart 2002, pp. 115–116.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 115–118, 127–128.

⁹⁹ St. P. Vol. 1, CIX, pp. 579–580.

¹⁰⁰ Cranmer to Cromwell [Cromwell]. August 18, 1537. St.P. Vol. I, CIX, pp. 579–580. Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. P. 212; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. XLVIII, pp. 475–476.

¹⁰¹ McEntegart 2002, p. 127.

the king's special command.¹⁰² He still tried to persuade the Germans to stay, and pleaded with Cromwell to improve their accommodations so they might change their plans to stay longer.¹⁰³

The German envoys were willing to wait one more month, hoping that Henry would enter into the discussions, since the English negotiators did not appear to have any real power to make decisions.¹⁰⁴ The envoys adamantly defended their position concerning the controversial articles.

Agreement had been reached on all major doctrinal articles, as George of Boyneburg wrote to Philip on August 22, 1538. The king wanted them to stay another month, and the Archbishop of Canterbury persuaded them to do so in order to discuss the controversies on the Mass, communion in both kinds, the marriage of priests, and monastic vows. The archbishop believed that the discussion would end in a good result and receive a positive answer from the king.¹⁰⁵

As Diarmaid MacCulloch sees it, the committee did not want to contradict what the king had told the ambassadors, and the political climate was disadvantageous, since Cromwell was dealing with the Pole and Courtenay families in the Exeter conspiracy, and with an evangelical preacher Adam Damply's case at Calais. He also sees Cromwell's absence as having serious consequences for the evangelical alliance.¹⁰⁶ McEntegart also expresses surprise at Cromwell's ineffectual role in the negotiations.¹⁰⁷ Cromwell's position was in decline, which may explain his absence from the negotiations and why he did not want to commit himself to either side. It seems that his position was uncertain as early as 1538, and he was cautious and interested in maintaining political unity rather than actively participating in religious discussions.

Agreement was reached on the doctrinal articles but not on the conflicting articles, and the Germans wished to leave. Whether they understood that the bishops did not have authority on doctrinal matters was unclear. If the parties were able to agree on doctrinal matters, the king had to have delegated some authority to the bishops. The prolonged negotiations did not appeal to them any longer and they informed the English reform-minded clergy that they were to leave the country. As soon as Henry became aware of their plans and received their private letter, he consulted with his conservative bishops. It is probable that the Germans' approach of writing directly to the king forced him to express ideas he did not want to make public to them, which annoyed him further and prevented him from supporting doctrinal unity with the Schmalkaldic League.

Henry had not contradicted any of the previous articles the ambassadors discussed with the German theologians, since none of them concerned the disputed articles.¹⁰⁸ But when the

¹⁰² Ibid., pp. 115–116.

¹⁰³ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. p. 212; Burnet, Vol 4, Book III, No. XLVIII, pp. 475–476. Cranmer requested the German embassy to stay another month in August 23, 1538. They returned to Germany by November 1, 1538. Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. P. 212; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, XLVIII, pp. 475–476; CR III, 1745, pp. 601–602.

¹⁰⁴ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5; Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VII, pp. 178–187; L&P, XIII, Pt. II, No. 37, p. 13.

¹⁰⁵ Georg von Boineburg [George Boyneburg] an Landgraf Philipp [Philip, Landgrave of Hesse], August 22, 1538; *Aktenstücke*, 1538, No. 12; Prüser, 1968, pp. 320–321.

¹⁰⁶ MacCulloch 1996, pp. 215, 218–219. Pole had attacked Henry for his atrocities toward the Catholic Church, and since then Henry regarded all Cardinal Pole's family members as his enemies—despite the fact that Pole was Henry's relative and of noble blood. He was the son of Lady Margaret Plantagenet, Countess of Salisbury, who was the daughter of George, Duke of Clarence, brother of Edward IV. Eventually, his family was indicted in the autumn and executed in 1538. See Bernard 2005, pp. 407–432; Schofield 2006, p. 114.

¹⁰⁷ McEntegart 2002, pp. 104–105.

¹⁰⁸ Schofield 2006, p. 87.

Germans wrote to him directly, he made the bishops work on those issues with his conservative advisers, Bishop Tunstall and the Bishop of London, John Stokesley. This situation was an opportunity for the conservative bishops.¹⁰⁹ McEntegart rightly sees the circumstances of the king's court as he and his court remained isolated from communication during summer 1538. These circumstances surely influenced the result of the negotiations, especially the influence of the conservative clergy, as the king had asked Bishop Tunstall to advise him.¹¹⁰ Consequently, Henry's ability to respond to the Germans was inadequate. Even though the English bishops were unable to decide on the controversial issues, in the final analysis, the king delegated his supreme authority to them to decide on doctrine as he had done previously with Cranmer (see Chapter Four).

As a result, the negotiators made no decision regarding the controversial articles. MacCulloch points out that the Germans' resort to the king for the final answer was unwise,¹¹¹ and John Schofield argues that Henry's connection to the Lutherans was over after the 1538 negotiations,¹¹² when agreement was not reached on controversial issues. One may ask, had Henry shown enough interest in Lutheran doctrine, would the German ambassadors' approach have changed his mind? Henry did not accept the Wittenberg Articles in 1536. The first English doctrinal articles passed Parliament soon after, in 1536.¹¹³ Bernard argues that Henry's religious policy was essentially his own, and even if undecided as to the direction to take, had firm religious convictions.¹¹⁴ Melancthon's influence had reached England through other channels, such as the translation of the *Confessio Augustana*, *Apologia*, and his *Loci Communes*, the Ten Articles of 1536 and the Bishops' Book of 1537.

The King's Response to the German Ambassadors

The king's intervention caused another unexpected delay. It seems that Henry answered the Germans' letter on the abuses much later than when it had been received, that is—"after their ship had already arrived to take them," at the beginning of September.¹¹⁵ In reference to the discussions held with bishops and theologians, Henry wrote that there was good hope that true doctrine would prevail and the "Roman Antichrist" would be destroyed. "Since you honestly disclosed your opinion on these articles, we will open our bosom to you frankly,"¹¹⁶ the king wrote. MacCulloch sees the king's involvement as a disaster for the Germans because Henry had

¹⁰⁹ Schofield 2006, pp. 88–89; MacCulloch 1996, p. 219; McEntegart 2002, pp. 116–117.

¹¹⁰ McEntegart 2002, pp. 116–117.

¹¹¹ The first English doctrinal articles passed Parliament in 1536. His doctrinal stance was clear as early as 1537, when the Bishops' Book was published and he wrote his opinion on Cranmer's Annotations. WTA 1536, pp. 58–77; A10, 1536, p. 233.

¹¹² Schofield 2006, p. 89.

¹¹³ MacCulloch 1996, p. 220, McEntegart 2002, pp. 116–117, 161. Schofield 2006, pp. 88–89.

¹¹⁴ Bernard 2005, pp. 595–600.

¹¹⁵ McEntegart notes that the Germans wanted to avoid protracted discussion and therefore sent a letter to the king to discuss the abuses with his theologians. McEntegart 2002, p. 115.

¹¹⁶ The King's Answer to the former Letter. Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VII, 187. [A Letter written by the German Ambassadors to the King, against taking away of the Chalice, and against Private Masses, and the Celibate of the Clergie, &c. Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. Burnet, Vol 4, Addenda, No. VII, pp. 178–187.]

relied on his most conservative bishop, Cuthbert Tunstall.¹¹⁷ McEntegart thinks that Tunstall replied to the Germans' letter.¹¹⁸ This author disagrees, since the king rarely delegated authority in doctrinal matter to the bishops. Furthermore, McEntegart states that monastic vows were probably excluded, since the Germans had seen the dissolution of monasteries and a discussion of vows was no longer necessary.¹¹⁹

The king finally summarized his theological opinions on the abuses to the German ambassadors.¹²⁰ He stated that he wished that the Germans would have been able to stay until the articles on abuses had been discussed,¹²¹ and pointed out that only he, and not the bishops, had authority to make decisions on abuses. In his letter to the Germans, Henry's religious opinions are delineated clearly.

McEntegart notes that even if the king could not agree with the disputed articles, the ambassadors needed to discuss them with him in preparation for a major embassy, which would arrive later. Most likely, the German ambassadors did not have the authority to promise that another embassy would arrive to discuss these points. They had stayed in England long enough to see that no conclusion to the articles concerning abuses would be possible without the king's authority, so they decided to put them in writing.¹²²

Instead of letting the English bishops decide without him, as he had once intended, Henry now made his own opinions known. Most importantly, he did not accept that the church practices the Germans called "abuses" were actually so. In fact, he believed that they were supported by the arguments of the Church Fathers.¹²³

In November 1538, a royal proclamation forbade the marriage of clergy. Parish argues that despite the proclamation, clergy continued to appeal for marriage, challenge the king, and continue to marry.¹²⁴ Henry did not admit that there was a great difference between himself and the Germans in their interpretation of the authority of Scripture and Tradition and divine and human laws. Henry repeatedly assured the Germans that he had worked hard to overthrow the abuses of the Roman Bishop, but could not accept further suggestions of anyone who, as he saw it, only pretended their hatred of the pope (i.e., the Germans). Henry would do whatever was required to purge the English Church and root out its abuses to enhance the new doctrine. He closed his letter with a promise to handle further the articles that the embassy and the English bishops had negotiated in London.¹²⁵ This author thinks that Henry admitted that his opinion differed from the ambassadors regarding what constituted abuses, but would not admit that their basic concept of authority was different. The negotiations had resulted in no decision regarding the controversial articles. Henry made the reform-minded bishops work on the controversial

¹¹⁷ MacCulloch 1996, p. 219.

¹¹⁸ McEntegart 2002, pp. 116–117.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

¹²⁰ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VII, 179–180; VIII, pp. 187–195.

¹²¹ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VIII, pp. 187–188.

¹²² McEntegart 2002, pp. 115–116.

¹²³ L&P, XIII, Pt. 2, Nos. 165–166, pp. 65–66.

¹²⁴ Parish 2000, p. 30.

¹²⁵ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VIII, p. 195.

issues with his conservative advisers, Bishops Tunstall and Stokesley, in order to balance both sides.

Disputed Articles

The abuses on which, in the Germans' view, there was not yet agreement included: (1) communion in only one kind, (2) private Masses, and (3) enforced clerical celibacy. In order to root out the power of Rome, the Germans were opposed to these three practices, whereas the English conservative bishops were in favor of them.¹²⁶ The ambassadors wished that the king not reject the advice of the allied princes concerning these three abuses. This was the only way that the pope's tyranny would be abolished.¹²⁷ Henry insisted on the validity of canon law and did not accept these articles as adiaphora.

The German theologians argued that concerning communion in both kinds, the doctrine of Christ and the commandments and ordinations should be preferred to human traditions. The authority of Scripture, the institution by Christ, and the early church's practice had higher authority than the present church's pontifical canon laws. These laws were derived from human authority, which stipulated an inappropriate distinction between priests and laypeople not permitted to drink from the cup in the Lord's Supper, contrary to Christ's commandment "all should drink of the cup." Even the Greek churches did not submit to the tyranny of the pope. This custom of communion in both kinds had prevailed until the pope vanquished it. They claimed that the pope had departed from Scripture and from the articles of Christian faith.¹²⁸ The Germans' main arguments for communion in both kinds were based on Scripture and the example of the early church. Schofield notes that the distinction between priests and laity, problems with large congregations, and fear of spilling the wine were human considerations.¹²⁹

The king, in reference to communion in both kinds, wrote that he understood from the Scripture that the bread is actually and substantially the true and living body of Christ together with the true blood—otherwise, one would have to admit that the body is drained of blood—and that in the form of wine there is not only the living and true blood of Christ, but in fact also the living and true flesh of the body.¹³⁰ It was the king's opinion that those who only took a single form of communion would receive both the blood and body of Christ. He supported the opinion of the scholastic teaching of concomitance, the tradition of the medieval church.

The practice of communion in one kind in the Lord's Supper was customary in England since the Council of Constance of 1415. It is evident that the king argued what he believed was right. Schofield finds that the king uses more scriptural passages than council decrees in support of his arguments.¹³¹ Henry interpreted Christ's saying the words of institution separately to mean that

¹²⁶ A Letter written by the German Ambassadors to the King, against taking away of the Chalice, and against Private Masses, and the Celibate of the Clergie, &c. Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. Burnet, Vol 4, Addenda, No. VII, pp. 178–187. L&P, XIII, Pt. 2, No. 37, p. 13. Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5, Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VII, pp. 178–179.

¹²⁷ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5, Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VII, p. 179.

¹²⁸ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5, Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VII, pp. 179–180. Schofield 2006, pp. 90–91; McEntegart 2002, p. 118.

¹²⁹ Schofield 2006, p. 91.

¹³⁰ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VII, 179–180; VIII, p. 188. Schofield 2006, pp. 90–91.

¹³¹ Schofield 2006, pp. 91–92.

the elements should be divided, as in Christ's breaking bread with the disciples at Emmaus after his resurrection, when he did not offer the chalice. Henry interpreted the Eucharist in the Acts of the Apostles, when men persisted in the teaching of the Apostles and sharing and breaking of bread.¹³²

But Henry did not deny that the elements could be offered in two forms, according to Scripture. He referred to a passage in Paul's Letter to the Corinthians, which speaks of the elements jointly and then separately.¹³³ Henry based his argument for communion in one kind on the following Scripture passages: Paul's Letter to the Corinthians, the Acts of Apostles, and the Old Testament example. He refuted the German claim that Scripture gave no authority for communion in one kind.¹³⁴ Unconsecrated wine was given to facilitate swallowing bread. Some people received the blood of Christ with consecrated wine in some countries and in smaller churches.¹³⁵

The major dispute concerned the private Mass. It consists of the re-enactment of the Last Supper and Calvary for the souls living and departed, helping them through purgatory celebrated by the priest alone. God's gift to humankind in the promise of grace and forgiveness was obliterated and was in the midst of the controversy between the doctrines of justification by faith or by works.¹³⁶ In the article about the private Mass, the Germans wrote that the Roman pontiff had obscured the Christian religion and introduced an idolatrous cult for the removal of sins. The church was in error because its papal parties claimed that grace was earned from the practice of the Mass and that it removed the sins of the living and the dead.¹³⁷ The Germans would have accepted private Masses once the abuses were eliminated, which included their use for gain, such as indulgences, and applying them to another's sins on behalf of the living and the dead against the "Word of God." This abuse of the Mass affected the understanding of the doctrine of justification by faith and therefore departed from Scripture, since the practice of private Masses meant that justification arose from the performance of the Mass and not from faith. The Germans stressed the doctrine of the righteousness of faith because of Christ.¹³⁸

The Germans claimed that private Masses were not practiced either in the early church or in the Greek church.¹³⁹ The usage of the Masses came from the Apostles.¹⁴⁰ A true public Mass would be celebrated in vernacular language, which would restore it to the true rite of *synaxis* (bringing-together) and conforming to the old church. Because the private Mass was introduced contrary to the "Word of God," it became only human practice.¹⁴¹

Henry was aware that the Germans regarded the private Mass as an abuse. He claimed that any other practice established by Christ could be abused. He believed that what had been

¹³² Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VII p. 188. Schofield 2006, p. 91.

¹³³ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VIII, p. 188. McEntegart 2002, pp. 118–121.

¹³⁴ See detailed analysis in McEntegart 2002, pp. 118–121; Schofield 2006, p. 91.

¹³⁵ Schofield 2006, p. 91.

¹³⁶ Ibid., pp. 92–93.

¹³⁷ Ibid., p. 92.

¹³⁸ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VII, pp. 180–181. McEntegart 2002, pp. 121–122; Schofield 2006, pp. 92–93.

¹³⁹ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5., Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VII, pp. 180–181.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 181.

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

divinely ordained should not be rejected because of the fear of abuse.¹⁴² Discussing the private Mass, Henry did not say anything of its real purpose, to benefit the dead in purgatory, or about the priest celebrating it alone. Henry turned the subject around. He also believed that the Germans made this accusation about every Mass, not only private Masses; hence all types of Masses should be abolished. He made the defense that, by virtue of performing the sacrament, one earned grace, and that the Mass would remove the sins of living and dead. He criticized the Germans for thinking this kind of doctrine was impious.¹⁴³ Schofield believes that one reason the Lutherans called the private Mass an abuse was because it was celebrated for a departed soul and often the priest communed alone. According to Luther, it was not only a matter of abuse, since one could not interpret the real presence in private Masses. When criticizing public Masses, Henry may not have been aware that the Germans meant that the Mass had been transformed into public worship by preaching and administering communion based on the new doctrine.¹⁴⁴

Henry defended the private Mass as a sacrament of penance for confession of daily sins in a private gathering, even if no consumption of the bodily sacrament occurred. The confession and absolution were essential components. Henry asked whether a priest should perform a public Mass if no one joined in communion. He referred to the Greeks, who had a public Mass every Sunday, and to Epiphanius, whom the Germans had cited as an example for using the Mass three times per week. More frequent celebration of the Mass would guarantee that Christ's memory could be revisited in the sacrament more regularly, and for this, the celebration of the private Mass was helpful.¹⁴⁵ McEntegart finds that Henry opposed the regular celebration of the Mass as the Germans had suggested, and defended the private Mass by raising the question of Christian liberty to choose more frequent celebration.¹⁴⁶

Henry supported his claim by quoting Paul, who held private assemblies (churches) in private houses. The participants were members of a larger church and they belonged to the Catholic and universal church. He also referred to the practice of the early church. Christ did not specify where and when this sacrament was to be practiced, as it says in the Acts of Apostles: "Daily they remained in the temple and breaking bread at home." The custom of public communion, according to Chrysostom, was more frequent in the beginning, but he nowhere prohibits private Masses.¹⁴⁷

Henry based his argument on the decisions of early ecumenical councils and the Church Fathers (Basil, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine). Henry confessed his personal belief that the sacrament of the Eucharist is a sacrifice, an enactment of the propitiatory death of Christ who died once for the world, and the only sacrifice remaining was spiritual worship, which he called justification by faith. The consequences of faith were the virtues that were the fruits of the

¹⁴² Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5, Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VII, p. 190.

¹⁴³ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5, Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VII, p. 190; McEntegart 2002, pp. 122–124; Schofield 2006, p. 94.

¹⁴⁴ Schofield 2006, pp. 93–94.

¹⁴⁵ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5, Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VIII, pp. 190–191. Schofield 2006, p. 94. McEntegart 2002, pp. 123–124.

¹⁴⁶ McEntegart 2002, p. 124.

¹⁴⁷ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5, Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VIII, p. 191.

Spirit.¹⁴⁸ McEntegart states that Henry believed that the sacrifice of which the Fathers spoke, referring to Chrysostom, is in the sacrament.¹⁴⁹

Henry's views on the Mass were conservative, and he cited both the Greek and Latin churches in his defense. However, he did not mention that private Masses were celebrated for the dead, which was the Germans' major contention against them. Henry believed that the consecration of the body and blood of Christ represented Him as victim for the sins of the world. The congregants then offered themselves as a living sacrifice to God, which Henry called a bloodless sacrifice.¹⁵⁰ McEntegart finds that the exclusion of the "prayers made for the dead" from the final draft is evidence that its inclusion would have prevented any common ground with the Lutherans. Henry, however, did not give up the private Mass so long as it was carried out "properly."¹⁵¹

This author concurs with Schofield's idea that Henry combined the two kinds of sacrifice, propitiatory and thanksgiving, which Melanchthon also taught.¹⁵² Furthermore, Schofield notes that Henry's concept was neither medieval Catholic nor Lutheran, but a somewhat vague middle way and rather patristic, relying on Cyprian, Augustine, and Chrysostom.¹⁵³ He kept the private Masses for devotional rather than propitiatory purposes and maintained a "sacrifice" that was less offensive to Lutherans and probably close to the ideas in Melanchthon's Wittenberg Articles.¹⁵⁴

The Germans stated that the prohibition on the marriage of priests was against Scripture and natural law. Celibacy as a pretext for holiness without a special gift from God was not historically church practice, since all bishops had been married men in the early church.¹⁵⁵ They then appealed to the decision of princes to allow each priest who did not have the gift of chastity to marry and let their consciences be free.¹⁵⁶ The German letter ended by saying that celibacy had only brought many scandals and they wished that the king would abolish the pope's abuses.¹⁵⁷ Even papal law condemned the prohibition against priestly marriage. Schofield observed that since the marriage of priests did not directly touch the question of salvation, the Germans did not see that additional arguments were necessary.¹⁵⁸

The Germans demonstrated that they not only had a different understanding of various ceremonies but differed in doctrine. They appealed to Henry that supporting the new doctrine would ensure peace in his kingdom. They then claimed that in order to maintain the unified practice of the sacraments given by Christ's ordinance, not the pope's, the authority of the princes and allied states is based on "Divine Word," the doctrine that the Catholic (=universal)

¹⁴⁸ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VIII, p. 191. Schofield 2006, p. 95. McEntegart 2002, pp. 123–124.

¹⁴⁹ McEntegart 2002, pp. 123–124.

¹⁵⁰ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VIII, p. 192. McEntegart 2002, p. 122.

¹⁵¹ McEntegart 2002, pp. 122–123.

¹⁵² Schofield 2006, p. 95.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 101–102.

¹⁵⁴ WTA 1536, Article XII, p. 62; Bray 2004, p. 148; Schofield 2006, p. 102.

¹⁵⁵ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VIII, pp. 185–186.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁷ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VII, pp. 178–187.

¹⁵⁸ Schofield 2006, p. 112.

Church confesses.¹⁵⁹ The Germans supported practices based on Scripture. It seems clear that they were divided on the doctrine of soteriology, the exegetical understanding of the authority of Scripture, and their doctrine of justification by faith, and consequently on the question of adiaphora.

In his response, Henry discussed the vows related to the ordination of priests, and accepted marriage before ordination. Henry avoided any discussion about monasteries, instead demanding similar vows for the priesthood. He also pointed out that in the early church, there were both married and celibate priests by necessity, but that anyone who married after entering the priesthood, according to the Nicene Council, broke his oath and had to be deposed from the priesthood. Marriage would have taken place during the subdiaconate. Lectors and cantors who had married should not be cast away when they became priests.¹⁶⁰ Even though the Germans excluded monastic vows, Henry included them when discussing priestly marriage.¹⁶¹

Henry connected the prohibition of priestly marriage to the celebration of the Mass. Since a priest constantly prays during the Mass, he should be free from marital obligations. His example is Paul's comment to Timothy, who says that anyone involved in worldly business is hindered from prayer and must be chaste. Henry did not accept the Germans' argument¹⁶² that many sins resulted from celibacy as a reason to allow priests to marry.¹⁶³ He based his argument on Scripture and the Church Fathers.¹⁶⁴

Henry had expressed his religious views first during the compilation of the Bishops' Book in 1537. This was the second time that he refuted the exegetical authority of Scripture in doctrinal matters. The core of the matter was the doctrine of the sacraments, the ceremonies related to the celebration of the Mass, communion in one kind, priestly ordination, private Masses, and the doctrine of justification by faith, i.e., the doctrine of reconciliation. He maintained that Tradition had equal authority with Scripture, and held firmly to the old medieval practices in his beliefs, although he argued that his beliefs were those of the early church.

The Germans supported the authority of Scripture alone. Henry made several references to the Church Fathers in support of the old Catholic tradition being equivalent to Scripture.¹⁶⁵ Thus, he supported Tradition as equal to Scripture and interpreted its decrees as divinely ordained. The Germans based their arguments on Scripture alone and regarded the prohibition on marriage as being against Scripture, and the marriage of priests as adiaphora. This author concurs with Rex, who points out that although Henry's religious outlook contained elements that appeared Lutheran or evangelical, they were not adopted on evangelical principles. The only Catholic principle for Henry was *consensus ecclesiae*. Royal supremacy, modeled on Old Testament kingship, was the central point in his church.¹⁶⁶

¹⁵⁹ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VII, p. 186.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., pp. 192–193.

¹⁶¹ McEntegart 2002, p. 118.

¹⁶² Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VIII, pp. 193–194. McEntegart 2002, pp. 124–127.

¹⁶³ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VIII, p. 195. McEntegart 2002, p. 125.

¹⁶⁴ McEntegart 2002, p. 125.

¹⁶⁵ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VIII, pp. 190–192.

¹⁶⁶ Rex 2006, p. 150.

The German ambassadors also pointed out that the articles they discussed with Henry were the same issues (along with monastic vows) that had divided the two sides in the earlier negotiations at Wittenberg in 1536. As Rory McEntegart has shown, all the way throughout the negotiations, Henry was committed to the traditional doctrine of the Mass,¹⁶⁷ as well as the soteriological component of priestly celibacy and communion in one kind. Schofield finds that, even though Melanchthon would not have accepted clerical celibacy, he was unwilling to attack many traditional views too strongly. One may see his conciliatory statement in Wittenberg Article XIV on the marriage of priests, where he praises virginity as “good work” for studies, meditation, and ecclesiastical office. Schofield notes that Henry looked for answers to his argument for communion in one kind from Scripture, and added that the whole Christ is present in either kind. He personally wanted to maintain the private Mass for devotional reasons and argued for the superiority of celibacy.¹⁶⁸ Melanchthon’s approach to church policy issues had been conciliatory, and he recommended that one party should not condemn the other until the bishops and kings had agreed about these controversies. The results may be seen as a failure of this German embassy to compromise.

It also seems that the parties had different expectations. Henry initially wished to discuss common strategy regarding the pope’s council. The Germans wished to pursue doctrinal agreement with Henry and his acceptance of their confessional writings. Like the Germans, Henry had repudiated the power of the pope and asserted that papal power was human, not divine. Because Henry was the head of the church as well as the state, disobedience to him was not only a crime, but also a sin. In the religious context, this was true whether the disobedience related to doctrine or to adiaphora. To Melanchthon and the Germans, however, disregarding adiaphora was not a sin. Although Melanchthon had earlier supported Henry’s title of the Supreme Head of the Church of England, he had not anticipated Henry’s assumption of total ecclesiastical authority. In fact, he had stated that princes, even when supreme heads of their churches, should be ecclesiastically neutral.¹⁶⁹

The Aftermath of the Negotiations in London

The evangelical bishops, especially Cranmer, had wanted the German ambassadors to stay in London for another month to further discuss the abuses, and there is evidence that pressure was put on the Germans. McEntegart believes that the Germans and the English did continue with discussions, but the conservative bishops did not want to commit anything in writing against the king’s opinion. Cranmer saw this as a means to distract from the issue.¹⁷⁰

In the beginning of September 1538, Frederick Myconius wrote to Cromwell that he was ill and could no longer attend the conferences with the other German scholars. He noted that the principal points had already been agreed upon and that the so-called abuses could be discussed in

¹⁶⁷ For Rory McEntegart’s extensive analysis of Henry’s views, see McEntegart 2002, pp. 120–127, 161.

¹⁶⁸ Schofield 2006, p. 112.

¹⁶⁹ LC, 1535, Fol. 5L.

¹⁷⁰ McEntegart 2002, p. 129.

his absence, especially “since the English bishops and teachers do not agree with us.” He did not have much hope that the two sides would agree on the abuses, either.¹⁷¹

Melanchthon was anxiously awaiting the return of the German ambassadors, especially his good friend Francis Burchard, to learn the results of the negotiations. In his letter to Joachim Camerarius on August 31, 1538, Melanchthon wrote, “Franciscus has not yet returned from England, as they had been persuaded by Cranmer to stay on.”¹⁷²

Ongoing unresolved negotiations caused the German theologians to become impatient and they wrote directly to the king, as the bishops did not have authority to decide the controversial articles. The king wrote that he disagreed with the bishops, and the envoys left London in September 1538.¹⁷³

On September 15, Melanchthon, in a letter to Johannes Brenz, expressed his hope that the right doctrine and rites would be established in England, since he thought the discussions were still going on between the ambassadors and the English bishops. It is evident from Melanchthon’s letter that the German ambassadors had not yet returned,¹⁷⁴ and that he still had hopes that the German doctrine set forth in the *Confessio Augustana* would be adopted in England. He must have been unaware that the king had intervened in the negotiations.

On September 25, the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse wrote a letter to Henry in which they explained the danger of Anabaptists spreading their doctrine in Germany, to indicate to Henry that he should not associate with them.¹⁷⁵ Correspondence on September 25 between the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse is further evidence that the ambassadors were not yet back in Germany in late September.

There is no evidence of further communication with Henry after the Germans’ return. The elector’s letter warning of Anabaptists influences was seen by Henry as distasteful, and one may even surmise that the failed negotiations contributed to Henry’s distaste for any foreign influence in doctrine and practice. Hence Henry launched a full-scale investigation looking for any heretics who threatened his supremacy. He assumed his title as Defender of the Faith and presided in heresy trials to wipe out dissent in England using strong measures. From this time on, he made his religious opinions publicly known in proclamations.

Henry’s domestic policy had become very conservative. The elector’s warning about the Anabaptists, momentarily only increased Henry’s apprehension toward the Saxons, even though the elector’s warning may have simply been an attempt to show that they knew what was right and wrong concerning doctrine. Henry was campaigning against the pope’s power and in favor of his own goals in his domestic policy. The final stance against the pope was the destruction of the statue of Thomas à Becket, to which the pope responded by publishing his bull.

On October 1, Henry sent a letter of praise to the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse. He told them that the German scholars had “given evidence of sound Christian piety and erudition,” and that he was hopeful of good results, but the matter needed further discussion.

¹⁷¹ Cleopatra, E.5. p. 227; Strype, Vol. VI, No. XCV, pp. 139–140; L&P, XIII, Pt. 2, No. 298, p. 118.

¹⁷² MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2086, p. 198; CR III, 1714, p. 572.

¹⁷³ McEntegart 2002, pp. 115–116, 127–130.

¹⁷⁴ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2092, p. 218; CR III, 1724, p. 587.

¹⁷⁵ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2098, pp. 225–228.

Once again, he expressed his hope that Philip Melanchthon and other learned men would conduct the discussions.¹⁷⁶ This author agrees with Bernard, McEntegart, and MacCulloch, who conclude that Henry hoped that Melanchthon would come with a larger embassy to England.¹⁷⁷ Henry was unaware of Melanchthon's personal and political reasons for not traveling to England.

The German embassy must have returned from England between October 6 and November 1, since Melanchthon noted to his friend Joachim Camerarius on October 6, 1538, that "our men have not gotten back from England." On November 1, 1538, Melanchthon mentioned to Vitus Theodoric that the scholars had returned to Germany.¹⁷⁸

Because the negotiations had ended without any further conclusions on the issues that divided the two parties, Henry turned to some urgent domestic troubles, to the danger of the Anabaptist heresy spreading in England, as the elector had warned him. A commission was put in place against the Anabaptists' errors.

Since, as we have heard, there are some who, incited by the error, or rather, the madness of the Anabaptists, have secretly infiltrated into this our kingdom of England, and are attempting to infect our subjects with their poison from this pestiferous heresy, we have decided that it would be especially expedient, in such a crisis, both public and threatening to our souls, to take steps to meet this at the first opportunity.¹⁷⁹

The commission was to order penance for those whose opinions erred from Scripture and the doctrine of the Catholic Church. The most obstinate were to be delivered to the secular magistrate and punished according to the law.¹⁸⁰ McEntegart shows that Cromwell founded a royal commission to search for the Anabaptists and receive them back to church or punish them for their errors.¹⁸¹ This is evidence of how the crown had delegated doctrinal authority to a lay leader, who in turn used the bishops' judgment to decide about erroneous beliefs.

Soon after the negotiations, it became evident that the English and Germans had different perceptions of what constituted superstitious activities or abuses. In a letter of November 1, 1538, Melanchthon wrote to Vitus Theodoric that pilgrimages had been abolished in England, the statue of Thomas à Becket of Canterbury had been knocked down, and many others were overturned.¹⁸² The English and the Germans perceived the outward signs of casting off papal abuses. For Henry, these actions constituted his negation of the pope's power. He had

¹⁷⁶ L&P, XIII, Pt. 2, No. 497, p. 194; McEntegart 2002, pp. 127-130.

¹⁷⁷ Bernard 2005, p. 539. McEntegart 2002, pp. 26-28, 88, 130; MacCulloch 1996, p. 221.

¹⁷⁸ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2100, p. 231; CR III, 1740, p. 597; MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2111, p. 244; CR, III, 1745, p. 602.

¹⁷⁹ *Cum nonnulli, uti accepimus, Anabaptistarum errore seu potius furore perciti, in hoc nostrum Angliae regnum clam irrepserunt, nostrosque subditos suo pestiferae haereseos veneno, inficere moliantur; nostri praesertim muneris esse censemus hujusmodi tam publico tamque praesenti animarum discrimini, cum primum obviam ire, &c.* A Commission granted to Archbishop Cranmer and others against the Anabaptists. Regist. Cranmer, Fol. 67. October 15, 1538. *Ecclesiastical History*, XLVI, p. 161.

¹⁸⁰ A Commission granted to Archbishop Cranmer and others against the Anabaptists. Regist. Cranmer, Fol. 67. October 15, 1538. *Ecclesiastical History*, XLVI, pp. 161-162.

¹⁸¹ McEntegart 2002, p. 133.

¹⁸² MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2111, p. 244; CR III, 1745, p. 602; L&P, XIII, Pt. 2, No. 741, p. 287.

proclaimed¹⁸³ that the shrine of Thomas à Becket should be pulled down and that he would no longer be considered a saint, nor his feast day honored. The pope responded by publishing his bull.

The unity of the country, threatened by the papal bull, was essential to Henry, and his actions and legal decisions in religion could be interpreted accordingly. Clearing the country of superstitious practices did not mean “Reformation” as the Germans interpreted it.

The Germans believed that the prohibition on icons and superstitions was proof that Henry seriously intended to abolish any remaining papal practices in his kingdom. However, Henry’s abolition of images and icons was intended to purify the country of all memory of papal practices, as part of his demand for total obedience to himself. It did not mean that he was ready to agree to all the Germans’ positions, especially those that related to adiaphora.¹⁸⁴

In the interim, Henry’s concern was the doctrinal stability he had achieved through various laws and doctrinal formulations. He had subdued the rebellion and had to do everything in his kingly power to maintain doctrinal stability and prevent any erroneous beliefs. In order to prevent Anabaptist literature from spreading to England, Henry issued a proclamation.

The proclamation of November 1538 indicated that seditious—that is, Anabaptist and Sacramentarian—books were forbidden in England and that no one was allowed to print or translate any books without royal license—*cum privilegio regali*. Any books printed in England had to be examined by the king, the king’s council, or a bishop. Priests and religious persons were not allowed to be married without the king’s consent. He also indicated that priests who married would lose their right to administer the sacrament of the altar or otherwise tend to their ministry, and would be punished.¹⁸⁵ The purpose of his proclamation was to bring unity and concord to religion with respect to sacraments and ceremonies. Thus, anyone bringing in books from outside the country could face imprisonment.

Conclusion

Henry had failed the Franco-Scottish alliance and tried to ensure a policy of neutrality between the Catholic monarchs. Cromwell suggested one of many marriage proposals, which later became the reason for his demise. In addition, Henry found out that he could not trust his conservative bishops, whom he often used as pawns in the diplomatic missions. The general lack of communication between the English and the Germans after the Wittenberg negotiations was evident in the Germans’ approach to the pope’s council, its prolongation and renewed negotiations. The elector sent a minor embassy with the excuse that the theologians were needed at home in case the pope’s council was indicted. Henry and the Saxon Reformers assumed that a common strategy was no longer necessary, since they had unilaterally refused to attend the pope’s council in 1537. The situation had changed. Even though they had made a decision not to

¹⁸³ A Part of a Proclamation, chiefly concerning Becket. Cott. Libr. Titus, B. 1; Burnet, Vol. 4, Book III, No. LXI, pp. 494–495; Prohibiting Unlicensed Printing of Scripture, Exiling Anabaptists, Depriving Married Clergy, Removing St. Thomas à Becket from Calendar. Westminster, 16 November 1538, 30 Henry VIII; *Tudor Proclamations Vol. I*, No. 186, pp. 270–276.

¹⁸⁴ “Things indifferent,” i.e., practices not necessary to salvation.

¹⁸⁵ Cleopatra, E. v. [321]; *Cranmer’s Memorials*, 1538, Appendix, No. VIII, pp. 256–260.

attend, there was still apprehension about the pope forcing them to attend, since the location of the council was transferred to Vicenza. This was one reason for renewed negotiations in London. The prospect of the council was one reason given to Henry that leading theologians were needed at home, and therefore Melanchthon was not sent. The German approach was straightforward, in demanding that Henry accept the *Confessio Augustana* and become the defender and protector of the league.

It was probably not a good idea to send a minor embassy with directions and the expectations that Henry would consider subscribing to the *Confessio Augustana* and become the defender of the league. The embassy did not have Melanchthon's experience in reaching a consensus. While Henry had invited Melanchthon to England on several occasions, he again did not attend, and Francis Burchard was chosen instead as one of the ambassadors for the negotiations. It seems that the elector wanted men whom he could trust to present the views of the *Confessio Augustana*, and not offer concessions as Melanchthon had done in the past. German delegates were not aware of the cultural and ecclesiastical environment of the English. This lack of understanding influenced the result of negotiations. Initially the negotiations went smoothly, but the Germans were not pleased about the prolonged discussions. Ongoing unresolved negotiations caused German theologians to become impatient, and they wrote directly to the king because the English bishops did not have authority to decide on the controversial articles. The direct communication of the German embassy with the king is evidence of their inexperience and literal interpretation in demanding Henry's subscription to their expectation that the English would agree to all the articles in the *Confessio Augustana*. They had pushed the king to declare his personal opinion on the disputed articles and so prevented the agreement for which they had hoped. The king disagreed with the Germans; his domestic policy had become very conservative and he was suspicious of any potential heretics. Henry was campaigning against the pope's power and for his own goals in domestic policy. The destruction of the statue of Thomas à Becket provoked the publication of the papal bull, as will be discussed in Chapter Thirteen. Part II of Chapter Twelve discusses the Thirteen Articles.

Part II: The Thirteen Articles
(June-September 1538)

Introduction

The result of the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations was the Thirteen Articles. To see the difference in the article on justification by faith, as well as to compare the article on “Rites and Ceremonies” with the corresponding article in the Ten Articles, this author discusses the Thirteen Articles in relation to the Wittenberg Articles, the Ten Articles, and the Bishops’ Book, along with the discussion of justification by faith in the *Confessio Augustana* and the *Loci Communes*. The Thirteen Articles also included four additional articles, which is evidence that the bishops had discussed among themselves (without the king) the Mass, the veneration of saints, images, and the order of ministry of priests and bishops.

As a result of the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations, a theological treatise on the articles agreed upon by the Germans and the English was published in September 1538, commonly known as *Thirteen Principal Articles of the Christian Faith*, but whose formal name was *A Book Containing Divers Articles, De Unitate Dei et Trinitate Personarum, De Peccato Originali, &c.*¹⁸⁶

This researcher was able to discern Melanchthon’s influence on the English and German negotiations on adiaphora matters in two manners: by the historical events in which the documents were produced in Chapter Thirteen, Part I and through Melanchthon’s thoughts expressed in the documents produced in Part II..

History, Contents, and Transmission

As seen below, none of the disputed articles discussed in the *Advice* of 1534 and the Wittenberg Articles of 1536 appeared in the Thirteen Articles, except Article XI on the Rites of the Church—comparable to Article XVI of *Confessio Augustana*, Article Ten of the Wittenberg Articles and Article Nine on Rites and Ceremonies of the Ten Articles.¹⁸⁷ This proves that the doctrinal discussions were agreed upon unanimously, but not the ceremonies that were the subject of the disputed articles. However, the Germans sent a letter to King Henry to get answers

¹⁸⁶ State Paper Office, Ecclesiastical Papers. Archbishop Cranmer’s Papers on the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church, 2. B. No. 19. Original. *Cranmer’s Miscellaneous*, Appendix, No. XIII, pp. 472–480. L&P, XIII, Pt. 1, No. 1307, p. 481; The XIII. Articles of 1538, Appendix No. II, Hardwick, pp. 259–276.

When the additional four were included, the total number of the articles was seventeen, as McEntegart points out. McEntegart 2002, p. 114.

¹⁸⁶ The Thirteen Articles of 1538. Appendix No. II, Hardwick, pp. 259–276; *Cranmers’ Miscellaneous*, Appendix, No. XIII, pp. 472–480.

¹⁸⁷ CAL 1530, pp. 83b–83d, 85–95, 110–119; Grane 1987, pp. 205–206, 215–216, 217–219, 221–224, 234–239; MBW R 2; T 6, 1467, pp. 138–140; WTA 1536, pp. 58, 68–74, 78–79; A 10 1536, pp. 243–245. Archbishop Cranmer’s Papers on the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church, 2. B. No. 19. *Cranmer’s Miscellaneous*. Appendix. XIV, pp. 480–484.

directly from the King regarding them. There is evidence that the disputed articles were discussed among the English bishops after the official discussions were over.

The Thirteen Articles include: (I) The Unity of God and the Trinity of Persons [*De Unitate Dei et Trinitate Personarum*]; (II) Original Sin [*De Peccato Originali*]; (III) The Two Natures of Christ [*De Duabus Christi Naturis*]; (IV) Justification [*De Justificatione*]; (V) The Church [*De Ecclesia*]; (VI) Baptism [*De Baptismo*]; (VII) The Eucharist [*De Eucharistia*]; (VIII) Penitence [*De poenitentia*]; (IX) The Use of the Sacraments [*De Sacramentorum Usu*]; (X) The Ministers of the Church [*De Ministris Ecclesiae*]; (XI) The Rites of the Church [*De Ritibus Ecclesiasticis*]; (XII) Civil Affairs [*De Rebus Civilibus*]; (XIII) The Resurrection of the Body and the Last Judgment [*De Corporum Resurrectione et Iudicio Extremo*].¹⁸⁸

The articles discussed in this chapter are: Article IV, Justification; Article XI, The Rites of the Church; and Article XII, Civil Affairs. The last-mentioned article was published in the *Confessio Augustana*, Article XVI; Civil Affairs and Concerning Civil Magistrates and the Dignity of Political Matters in the *Loci Communes* of 1535; and Article X, Civil Affairs, in the Wittenberg Articles of 1536.

McEntegart argues that based on the contents and evidence of the discussion in both English and German sources, the most debated article was that concerning penance. The remaining articles aroused less debate and were relatively uniform in content. He adds that the article on free will and the doctrine of justification were faithful to Lutheran doctrine, whereas confession followed the conservative line.¹⁸⁹

McEntegart has argued that the final copy of the 1538 articles in the Weimar archives shows that seventeen articles were discussed and none of them were signed, but they were a summary of the discussions that provided a basis for the subsequent embassy from the league to make a final agreement.¹⁹⁰ Gerald Bray has printed the thirteen articles similarly to Hardwick, but added three additional ones: Private Mass [*De Missa Privata*], The Veneration of Saints [*De veneratione sanctorum*], and Images [*De imaginibus*].¹⁹¹ He does not include the Power and Ministry of Priests and Bishops, which Cranmer had included.

This author concurs with McEntegart that there were seventeen articles. This author also finds that the question of the bishop's authority was important for the bishops in relation to royal supremacy, and how they understood their present position as far as the failed negotiations were concerned. There were discussions concerning the controversial articles following primary negotiations on the Thirteen Articles, which included the four articles in Cranmer's library: on Private Mass, Veneration of Saints, Images, and the Power and Ministry of Priests and Bishops. There had been extensive discussions between English and German scholars about the pope, whom they called an Antichrist who promoted false doctrines, but these points were not included in the final version of the Thirteen Articles. The German negotiators also stated that the authority of bishops was only equal to that of ordinary priests, essentially following arguments that

¹⁸⁸ A 13 1538, pp. 260–276; Bray 2004, pp. 184–209.

¹⁸⁹ McEntegart 2002, pp. 109–114.

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 114.

¹⁹¹ Bray 2004, pp. 209–221.

Melanchthon had made in his *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia*. The format also follows the *Confessio Augustana*.¹⁹²

In the next section, the article on justification from the Thirteen Articles will be compared with passages from the *Loci Communes* of 1535, the Wittenberg Articles, the Ten Articles and *Confessio Augustana* to discern the influence of Melanchthon.

Article IV: Of Justification [*De Justificatio*]

Article IV of the Thirteen Articles, on the Justification of Faith, closely follows Melanchthon's section on grace and justification in the *Loci Communes*. Some of the phrases are copied verbatim from the *Loci Communes*, and many others are similar. Both documents agree that justification signifies remission of sins and acceptance to eternal life, as can be seen in the following passages:

<i>Iustificatio significat remissionem peccatorum & reconciliationem seu acceptationem personæ ad uitam æternam.</i> (LC 1535, Fol. 167 L.)	Justification signifies remission of sin and reconciliation or acceptance of a person to eternal life. (LC 1535, Fol. 167 L.)
<i>De justificatione docemus, quod ea proprie significat remissionem peccatorum et acceptationem seu reconciliationem nostram in gratiam et favorem Dei, hoc est veram renovationem in Christo.</i> (A 13, 1538, IV, p. 252.)	Concerning justification we teach that it properly signifies remission of sins and our acceptance or reconciliation into the grace and favor of God that is genuine renewal in Christ. (A 13, 1538, IV, p. 252.)

Both documents also agree that neither penance nor contrition is the cause of justification, which is given freely through Christ:

That we freely achieve remission of sins and reconciliation, not because of the worth of our works but by faith because of Christ. ¹⁹³ (LC 1535, Fol. 167L.)	Nevertheless, they are justified not because of the worthiness or merit of their repentance or of any works or of their own merits... but freely for Christ's sake through faith. ¹⁹⁴ (A 13, 1538, IV, p. 252.)
---	--

It is our faith that justifies us before God, according to both documents; the forensic aspect is omitted and the emphasis is on faith in the Thirteen Articles:

And he contends this way that we are pronounced just if we believe that our sins are remitted. ¹⁹⁵ (LC 1535, Fol. 169L.)	God regards this faith as justice in His sight. ¹⁹⁶ (A 13, 1538, IV, p. 252.)
---	--

Furthermore, it was Melanchthon's belief that after people are justified, their hearts are moved to virtue. This concept also appears in the Thirteen Articles:

¹⁹² Archbishop Cranmer's Papers on the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church, 2 B. No. 19. *Cranmer's Miscellaneous*, Appendix. XIV, pp. 480–489. McEntegart 2002, p. 114. When the additional four were included, the total number of the articles was seventeen, as McEntegart points out. McEntegart 2002, p. 114.

¹⁹³ *Quod gratis propter Christum fide, non propter dignitatem nostrorum operum, consequamur remissionem peccatorum et reconciliationem.* LC 1535, Fol. 167L.

¹⁹⁴ *Non tamen propter dignitatem aut meritum pœnitentiæ, aut ullorum operum seu meritorum suorum justificantur, sed gratis propter Christum per fidem.* A 13, 1538, IV, p. 252.

¹⁹⁵ *Et contendit ita pronuciari nos iustos, si credamus nobis remitti peccata.* LC, 1535 Fol. 169 L.

¹⁹⁶ *Hanc fidem imputat Deus pro justitia coram ipso.* A 13, 1538, IV, p. 252.

Vt promissionem Spiritus accipiamus per fidem. Non igitur de ociosa aliqua noticia loquimur. Et errant imperiti, qui somniant remissionem peccatorum ita contingere ociosis, sine aliquot uero animi motu, sine certamine, sine fiducia consolante animos. Et quia Spiritus sanctus affert, ut postea dicam, in illa consolatione nouam uitam, nouos motus. (LC 1535, Fols. 179R, 181L.)

That we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith. Therefore it is not some useless knowledge of which we are speaking. The unlearned err, when they dream that remission of sins comes about for the lazy in this way without some true motion of the soul, without struggle, without faith consoling their souls. And because, as I shall tell later, the Holy Spirit brings new life and new impulses with that consolation. . (LC 1535, Fols. 179R, 181L.)

Et quod peccatores, licet non assequantur hanc justificationem absque poenitentia, et bono ac propenso motu cordis quem Spiritus Sanctus efficit erga Deum et proximum. (A 13, 1538, IV, p. 252.)

That sinners, even though they do not obtain this justification without repentance and without that good and willing activity of the heart toward God [and one's neighbor] which the Holy Spirit effects. (A 13, 1538, IV, p. 252.)

The *Loci Communes* refers to the consequences of justification as *fructus Spiritus* ("fruits of the spirit"), whereas the Ten Articles and the Thirteen Articles call these consequences *bona opera* ("good works").

Deus remittit peccata, simul donat nobis spiritum sanctum, qui nouas uirtutes in piis efficit.... Oportet in piis existere non tantum fidem, sed etiam alios fructus Spiritus. (LC 1535, Fol. 167 L.)

God remits sins, and at the same time he endows us with the Holy Spirit, which produces new virtues in the pious... In the pious, there should be not only faith, but also the other fruits of the Spirit. (LC 1535, Fol. 167 L.)

Id uocat donationem Spiritus sancti & uitae aeternae. Etsi autem interdum gratia...significat auxilium Spiritus sancti, seu actionem diuinam. (LC 1535, Fol. 171 L.)

He calls that the gift of the Holy Spirit and of eternal life. For although meanwhile grace ... signifies the aid of the Holy Spirit and divine action. (LC 1535, Fol. 171 L.)

Et haec fides vere justificat, vere est salutifera, non ficta, mortua, aut hypocritica, sed necessario habet spem et charitatem...et bene operatur pro loco et occasione. Nam bona opera ad salutem sunt necessaria, non quod de impio iustum faciunt..., sed quia necessum est, et qui iam fide justificatus est et reconciliatus Deo per Christum, voluntatem Dei facere studeat. (A 13, 1538, IV, pp. 252–253.)

And it is this faith that truly justifies, and is truly salutary, not imaginary, dead, or hypocritical, but faith which by necessity has hope and love...which acts aright in any given place and on any given occasion. For good works are necessary for salvation, not because they make a sinner just, but because it is necessary that he who has now been justified by faith and reconciled to God through Christ strive to do the will of God. (A 13, 1538, IV, pp. 252–253.)

The Thirteen Articles also contain direct quotes from the Wittenberg Articles of 1536 on the doctrine of justification by faith:

Haec autem fides, de qua loquimur, non tantum est noticia in intellectu, sed etiam est fiducia. (WTA 1536, IV, p. 30.)

This faith of which we are speaking is not only a matter of knowledge in man's intellect, but also trust. (WTA 1536, IV, p. 30.)

Christiana fides de qua hic loquimur, non sola notitia articulorum fidei, aut credulitas doctrinae Christianae duntaxat historica, sed una cum illa notitia et credulitate, firma fiducia. (A 13, 1538, IV, p. 252.)

The Christian faith of which we speak here, not merely knowledge of the article of faith or belief in Christian doctrine as historical fact; but together with that knowledge and belief... a firm trust. (A 13, 1538, IV, p. 252.)

The concept of justification as renewal and regeneration comes directly from the Wittenberg Articles: “Therefore justification, which comes about through faith in the manner described, is renewal and regeneration.”¹⁹⁷

Et cum spiritus sanctus sit efficax, parit iam novos motus in cordibus consentientes legi Dei, scilicet fidem, dilectionem Dei, timorem Dei, odium peccati, propositum non peccandi et reliquos bonos fructus iuxta illud ... Igitur iustificatio, quae fit fide hoc modo, ut dictum est, est renovatio et regeneratio. (WTA 1536, IV, pp. 28, 30.)

And since the Holy Spirit worketh with power, He then creates new promptings in our hearts, stirrings which agree with God’s Law, namely, faith, the love of god, the fear of God, hatred of sin, the steadfast purpose of avoiding sin, and the other good fruits... Therefore justification, which comes about through faith in the manner described, is renewal and regeneration. (WTA 1536, IV, pp. 28, 30.)¹⁹⁸

The Ten Articles also speaks of justification as remission of sins and renovation, but not in exactly the same terms as the Wittenberg Articles. Both relate good works as a consequence of justification by faith. The Wittenberg Articles clearly states *renovatio* and *regeneratio*. The Ten Articles contains the idea implicitly when it speaks of the civil works and “spiritual motions.”

God necessarily requireth of us to do good works commanded by Him; and that not only outward and civil works, but also the inward spiritual motions and graces of the Holy Ghost... to love God, to have firm confidence and trust in God... to hate sin, and have certain purpose and will not to sin again. (A 10, 1536, V, p. 243.)

Item de iustificatione docemus, quod ea proprie significat remissionem peccatorum et acceptationem seu reconciliationem nostrum in gratiam et favorem Dei; hoc est, veram renovationem in Christo; et quod peccatores, licet non assequantur hanc iustificationem absque paenitentia, et bono ac propenso motu cordis quem Spiritus Sanctus efficit erga Deum et proximum. (A 13, 1538, IV, p. 252.)

Likewise concerning justification, we teach that properly speaking it signifies the forgiveness of sins and our acceptance, i.e. reconciliation into the grace of God, that is, true renewal in Christ; and that sinners, although they cannot obtain this justification without penitence and right and proper movement of the heart towards God and their neighbor which is the work of the Holy Spirit. (A 13, 1538, IV, p. 252.)¹⁹⁹

The Thirteen Articles relates justification and new living. “This faith justifies and saves us... It has hope and love each joined to it, as well as a concern for right living. Justification signifies the forgiveness of sins and our acceptance, i.e. reconciliation, into the grace of God: that is, true renewal in Christ.” The sacrament of penance and the “proper movement of the heart” as work of the Holy Spirit parallels the ideas in the *Loci Communes* of 1535. The aspect of renewal parallels the Wittenberg Articles, the Ten Articles, and *Loci Communes*, except the word “regeneration.”

Et errant imperiti, qui somniant remissionem peccatorum ita contingere ociosis, sine aliquot uero animi motu, sine certamine, sine fiducia consolante animos. Et quia Spiritus sanctus affert...nouam uitam, novos motus, ideo haec

And unskilled folks are in error, when they dream that remission of sins accrues to the idle in this way, without any kind of movement of the Spirit, without effort, without the consolation of faith for their souls. And since, as I will tell later, the Holy

¹⁹⁷ *Igitur iustificatio, quae fit fide hoc modo, ut dictum est, est renovatio et regeneratio.* WTA 1536, p. 30.

¹⁹⁸ Bray 2004, p. 126.

¹⁹⁹ A 13, 1538, *De Iustificatione*. Bray 2004, p. 187.

renouatio, uocatur regeneratio sequi debet noua obedientia. (LC 1535, Fol. 181L.)

Spirit brings new life and new impulses with that consolation, this renovation is thus called renewal and regeneration, and new obedience must follow. (LC 1535, Fol. 181L.)

Article IV of the Thirteen Articles also follows closely Article IV of the *Confessio Augustana*:

De justificatione docemus, quod ea proprie significat remissionem peccatorum et acceptationem seu reconciliationem nostram in gratiam et favorem Dei, hoc est veram renovationem in Christo; et quod peccatores, licet non assequantur hanc justificationem absque poenitentia, et bono ac propenso motu cordis quem Spiritus Sanctus efficit erga Deum et proximum non tamen propter dignitatem aut meritum poenitentiae, aut ullorum operum seu meritorum suorum justificantur, sed gratis propter Christum per fidem, cum credunt se in gratiam recipi, et peccata sua propter Christum remitti, qui sua morte pro nostris peccatis satisfecit. Hanc fidem imputat Deus pro justitia coram ipso. (A 13 1538, IV, p. 252.)

Item docent, quod homines non possint iustificari coram Deo propriis viribus, meritis aut operibus, sed gratis iustificentur propter Christum per fidem, cum credunt se in gratiam recipi et peccata remitti propter Christum, qui sua morte pro nostris peccatis satisfecit. Hanc fidem imputat Deus pro iustitia coram ipso. (CAL 1530, IV, p. 56.)

We teach concerning justification, that properly speaking, it signifies the forgiveness of sins and our acceptance, i.e. reconciliation into the grace of God, that is, true renewal in Christ; and that sinners, although they cannot obtain this justification without penitence, and the right and proper movement of the heart towards God and (their) neighbor, which is the work of the Holy Spirit, are yet not justified on account of any worth or merit of repentance or other works or merits of their own, but freely by faith on account of Christ, when they believe that they have been received in to grace and that their sins have been forgiven on account of Christ, who by his death has made satisfaction for our sins, God reckons this faith as righteousness in his sight. (A 13 1538, IV, p. 252.)

Likewise, they teach that men cannot be justified before God by their own strength, merits, or works but are freely justified for Christ's sake through faith when they believe that they are received into favor and that their sins are forgiven on account of Christ, who by his death made satisfaction for our sins. God imputes this faith for righteousness in his sight. (CAL 1530, IV, p. 56.)²⁰⁰

While renovation and justification are closely linked to each other, Article IV of the Thirteen Articles clearly states the concept of the doctrine of justification by faith according to *Confessio Augustana*, starting from the phrase *propter Christum per fidem*. It also carries over the ideas of the Wittenberg Articles, the Ten Articles, and the Bishops' Book regarding renovation related to justification, not as a condition but a consequence.

Nam bona opera ad salutem sunt necessaria, non quod de impio justum faciunt, nec quod sunt pretium pro peccatis, aut causa justificationis; sed quia necessum est, ut qui jam fide iustificatus est et reconciliatus Deo per Christum, voluntatem Dei facere studeat. (A 13, IV, pp. 252–253.)

For good works are necessary to salvation, not because they justify the ungodly, nor because they are a price paid for sin or a cause of justification; but because it is necessary that one who is already justified by faith and reconciled to God through Christ, should strive to do God's will. (A 13, IV, pp. 252–253.)²⁰¹

Schofield agrees that the article on justification by faith has two points: “the free divine gift and the good works necessary to Christian living” and closely follows the versions in the *Loci Communes*, the Ten Articles, the Bishops' Book and the Wittenberg Articles. He also argues that the parties reached agreement over the article on justification by faith quickly. Unlike the controversial issues, Schofield argues that regarding the doctrine on justification by faith, Henry

²⁰⁰ Grane 1987, p. 58.

²⁰¹ A 13 1538, pp. 252–253; Bray 2004, p. 188.

could be manipulated against his will.²⁰² This may explain the variety of positions found in the article on justification by faith. This author concurs with Dugmore, who sees the resemblance of the Wittenberg Articles to the Bishops' Book of 1537 and the Thirteen Articles of 1538 in the doctrine on justification by faith.²⁰³

The viewpoints of the embassy are evident in the composition of the article on justification. Francis Burchard seemingly insisted on Melancthon's ideas on the doctrine of adiaphora. The rest of the ambassadors represented the elector's viewpoint on the teaching of *Confessio Augustana*. This is evident also in the doctrinal statement that follows the outward composition of the *Confessio Augustana*. Both viewpoints are prevalent in the article on justification of the Thirteen Articles.

The influence of the English translation of the *Confessio Augustana* was seen in the mutual negotiations between the German and the English theologians. The push towards the acceptance of the *Confessio Augustana* was stronger through the elector's ambassadors than the Wittenberg Articles of 1536.

Article XI: Of Rites and Ceremonies [*De Ritibus Ecclesiasticis*]

The Article on Rites and Ceremonies was the only article that was added to the final batch of the Thirteen Articles. In the Thirteen Articles it was stated that rites and ceremonies were adiaphora. The question remained, which rites and ceremonies were not included under this article. Article XI clearly stated that Christian liberty should remain, and either keeping or omitting the rites should not bind conscience.²⁰⁴ The English adiaphoristic position was dependent on the king. The reform-minded clergy accepted the controversial articles as adiaphora, but the conservatives regarded them as doctrinal, with the exception of communion in both kinds. Because the king never authorized the Thirteen Articles as a legal document, neither did the Germans. Its teachings on rites and ceremonies remained adiaphora, parallel to those of the *Loci Communes*.²⁰⁵ The only disputed point made in the Thirteen Articles was concerning rites and ceremonies, which from the German point of view were adiaphora that do not bind consciences. The bishops did not dare to touch any of the disputed articles because they had no authority to make decisions on them. Article Nine of the Ten Articles opposes the belief that any of the old ceremonies could earn forgiveness and satisfaction or be necessary for salvation, which is contrary to the new doctrine taught with the concept of the justification by faith.

Article X on Church Ordinances or Ecclesiastical Rites, (*Von Kirchenordnungen*) of the Wittenberg Articles speaks of the rites and ceremonies that the bishop has the duty to regulate as adiaphora matters in the church. The purpose of these regulations was for ceremonies to be held

²⁰² Schofield 2006, pp. 86–87.

²⁰³ Dugmore 1958, pp. 106–107.

²⁰⁴ A Book Containing Divers Articles, *De Unitate, Dei et Trinitate Personarum, de Peccato Originali*, & c. State Paper Office, Ecclesiastical Papers. Archbishop Cranmer's Papers on the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church, 2. B. No. 19. *Cranmer's Miscellaneous*. Appendix. XIII, pp. 472–480.

²⁰⁵ A Book Containing Divers Articles, *De Unitate, Dei et Trinitate Personarum, de Peccato Originali*, & c. State Paper Office, Ecclesiastical Papers. Archbishop Cranmer's Papers on the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church, 2. B. No. 19. *Cranmer's Miscellaneous*. Appendix. XIII, pp. 472–480. LC 1535, Fols. 361R, 365R, 367R, L, 369L.

without sin, and to serve peace and order for the “sake of brotherly love.” Article X stresses Christian freedom in order that parishioners understand that the ceremonies are not necessary to salvation, as stated in Article Nine of the Ten Articles.²⁰⁶

Article XI of the Thirteen Articles states that ceremonies and rites are instituted by men as follows: 1) for good order in the church; 2) rites and ceremonies are not required by divine law in Scripture; 3) Christian liberty should remain and no one should offend one’s neighbor; 4) justification is not attributed to rites; 5) the order of the church requires rites and ceremonies; 6) traditions against the Word of God, harmful or superstitious, should be removed from the church; 7) there is a distinction between traditions according to God’s commands, which always take preference over traditions instituted by men; and 8) God’s commandment orders us to obey authorities.²⁰⁷ The statements of Article XI parallel the ecclesiastical polity of the *Loci Communes* of 1535. Melancthon stated that Scripture, not papal laws, decides on adiaphora. Adiaphora ceremonies maintain order in the church and Christian liberty and concern for one’s neighbor should be exercised as stated in Article XI.²⁰⁸ The article also states that the ceremonies that are adiaphora are not necessary to salvation. The rites and ceremonies article of the Thirteen Articles parallels ideas in Article X of the Wittenberg Articles. It even more closely parallels the *Loci Communes* and Melancthon’s understanding of the doctrine of adiaphora, as stated above.

Article XII: Of Civil Affairs [*De Rebus Civilibus*]

The article on civil affairs is longer than the corresponding Article XI of the Wittenberg Articles, to which comparison is made. Bray sees the length as indicative of the concerns Cranmer had during the time the king’s conservative beliefs became prevalent. Cranmer adapted it to fit the situation in England in which the king was head of church and state. According to Bray, the influence of the Wittenberg Articles is clear, but that of the *Confessio Augustana* is even greater on Article XII.²⁰⁹

Article XII of the Thirteen Articles states that the magistracy is God’s ordination, who gave legitimate authority to it in order to maintain equity, piety, and religion, and restrain the wicked and oversee clergy.²¹⁰ It states that obedience to its authority is necessary for human affairs,²¹¹ as stated in Article XI of the Wittenberg Articles and Article XVI of the *Confessio Augustana*. Obedience to the magistrate is good work and will be honored by God.²¹² This is a departure from Article XI of the Wittenberg Articles and Article XVI of the *Confessio Augustana*. Article XII of the Thirteen Articles further states that a subject must endure abuses from authority.²¹³ Article XI of the Wittenberg Articles and Article XVI of the *Confessio Augustana* agree that “if the prince commands what is sin one should not obey.” The statements “keeping peace since the

²⁰⁶ A 10, 1536, pp. 245–246.

²⁰⁷ A 13, 1538, Bray, 2004, pp. 200–203.

²⁰⁸ LC 1535, Fols. 361R, 365R, 367R, L, 369L.

²⁰⁹ Bray 2004, p. 184.

²¹⁰ A 13, 1538, p. 203.

²¹¹ A 13, 1538, p. 261; Bray 2004, p. 205.

²¹² A 13, 1538, pp. 263–264; Bray 2004, p. 207.

²¹³ A 13, 1538, p. 262; Bray 2004, pp. 206–207.

princes are ordained by God” and “a subject must obey and endure almost to the point of abuse in fear of authority” do not appear in either Article XI of the Wittenberg Articles or Article XVI of the *Confessio Augustana*.²¹⁴ Article XII of the Thirteen Articles gives the impression that one should not resist the English king’s supremacy laws but rather keep them, since statute laws are of divine origin. Article XII of the Thirteen Articles agrees with Article XI of the Wittenberg Articles and Article XVI of the *Confessio Augustana* that it is divine right for a Christian to hold public office.²¹⁵ Article XII of the Thirteen Articles adds “following the laws of God and of princes and the honest customs of particular countries.”²¹⁶ The Bishops’ Book of 1537 states that there will be a conflict in adiaphora legislation if the ecclesiastical laws are in conflict with human laws. That means that if the king uses human legislation in adiaphora matters, it is in conflict with Scripture or should be left to one’s conscience to decide. The reform-minded clergy was aware that adiaphora matters are matters of conscience, and consciences cannot be bound by human laws.

Cranmer’s position required him to set an example to English clergy in the civil realm. He demonstrated in his statement how to practice adiaphoristic freedom while choosing the path of peace rather than opposing tyrannical laws, if that became necessary.

Melanchthon differentiated between the spiritual function of the church and secular political life.²¹⁷ He based the function of civil magistrates on the law of nature, which judges both good and bad works. Both natural and civil law, he argued, are equal.²¹⁸ Melanchthon praised obedience to civil law, referring to Paul’s teaching that one must obey not only outwardly but also in mind and will.²¹⁹ Civil law, according to Melanchthon, maintains discipline and piety by its rules and laws. He took the position of obedience to civil rulers as protectors of religion. This author concurs with Verkamp, who finds that for Melanchthon adiaphoristic freedom was not exempt from ecclesiastical and civil authorities, and should go through proper channels as long as they do not contradict the new doctrine.²²⁰ In this respect, it is more important that

²¹⁴ A 13, 1538, p. 262; Bray 2004, pp. 205–206; CAL 1530, XVI, pp. 70–71; WTA 1536, Bray 2004, p. 144–145.

²¹⁵ A 13 1538, p. 263; Bray 2004, p. 207; CAL 1530, XVI, p. 70; Grane 1987, p. 166; WTA 1536.

²¹⁶ *Licet insuper Christianis unversis, ut singuli quique pro suo gradu ac conditione, iuxta divinas ac principum leges et honestas singularum regionum consuetudines... quae omnia, queadmodum unversis Christianis, pro sua cuiusque conditione ac gradu, dvina iure licita sunt.* A 13, 1538, p. 207.

²¹⁷ *Euangelium docet de quadam spirituali & aeterna iusticia in corde, nec abolet interim in uita corporali oeconomiam aut politiam, sed docet oeconomiam et omnes politias ratione constitutas, bonas ordinationes Dei esse.* LC 1535, Fol. 435L .

[The gospel teaches a certain spiritual and eternal justice in the heart, but in the meanwhile it does not do away with economy and organization in physical life, but teaches that economy and all organizations that are reasonably established, are good ordinances of God.]

²¹⁸ *Iam quæ sint bona, quæ sint mala opera iudicat ratio naturalis seu Lex naturæ & Magistratus.* LC 1535, Fol. 447R.

[Now which are good and which are bad works is decided by the magistrate and natural reason or Law of nature.]

²¹⁹ *Deinde studium obedientiæ maius in nobis esse debet, cum intelligimus haud dubie poenas Deo daturos esse eos qui non obediunt, ut maxime putent se Magistratum iracundiam clu? [elu] uros esse. Deinde Paulus non solum de externis officiis, seu obedientia externa concionatur, sed etiam de animi iudicio ac uoluntate.* LC 1535, Fol. 451L.

[Therefore the pursuit of obedience ought to be greater in us, when we understand that those who do not obey will be punished by God without any doubt, even if they think that they can escape the wrath of the magistrates. Thus, Paul does not only preach about external duties or external obedience, but also about the judgment and will of the mind.]

²²⁰ Verkamp 1975, pp. 71–72.

Melanchthon and the German Reformers included the article on civil magistracy on the Wittenberg Articles and the German emissaries included the same in the Thirteen Articles.

While Melanchthon believed that the magistracy teaches knowledge of God,²²¹ he also believed that civil law should prevent impious practices and doctrines and punish heretics.²²² He essentially assented to Henry's practice of using statute laws (Acts of Parliament) to put religious persons on trial and using secular court to punish heretics.²²³ Melanchthon stated that every vocation is as good as any other, and each serves God.²²⁴ This is in agreement with Article XII of the Thirteen Articles.²²⁵

Since the meeting in London did not produce a consensus, one needs to return to current debates on the doctrine of justification to find out the reasons why the parties could not agree. During the sixteenth century debates, justification was the central doctrinal issue from which all others were defined. In the present time, the Joint Declaration between Roman Catholics and Lutherans declared a consensus between the two traditions with respect to the doctrine of justification, and no longer reason for condemnation.²²⁶

In the dialogue between Lutherans and Roman Catholics, the most popular differences have been defined as justification by faith versus works. The joint declaration does not discuss the importance of the imputation of Christ's righteousness; it undermines grace and the power of the gospel and faith alone. Justification was a doctrine on which the church stood or fell. To be able to have a meaningful dialogue one needs to include other doctrines too—such as knowledge of God, Christological inferences, incarnation, and resurrection—to produce a fully meaningful declaration.²²⁷ The one-sided push on their doctrinal stance by the German Reformers created a gap in which mutual negotiations could not continue, and the conflicting issues were handled by the English bishops in their private conference, as seen in the next section.

²²¹ *Magistratus curare debent, ut pace bene utantur homines non ad luxum, libidines, & cætera uitia, sed regendi sunt mores legibus & disciplina. Item instituendi sunt homines ad pietatem & agnitionem Dei.* LC, 1535, Fol. 445L.

[Magistrates ought to take care that men make good use of peace not for extravagance, pleasures, and the other vices, but so that their conduct is ruled by laws and discipline. In the same way, men should be instructed in piety and acknowledgment of God.]

²²² Melanchthon's approach to history shows his characters either supporting good laws and true church or committed to injustice and persecution. He, however, stressed that God is above history and history is preserved in the church. Wengert, 2010, V, pp. 20–21.

²²³ *Debent igitur Magistratus prohibere impios cultus & impiorum dogmatum professionem, debent punire hæreticos.* LC, 1535, Fol. 457L. [Therefore, magistrates ought to prevent impious cults and the declaration of impious dogmas. They ought to punish heretics.]

²²⁴ *Secunda Regula est: Opera uite oeconomicæ & politicæ, quæ quisque pro sua uocatione facit, sunt bona opera & in piis sunt ueri cultus Dei, sunt enim opera a Deo præcepta.* LC 1535, Fol. 435R.

[This is the second rule. The works of the economic and political life, whichever each man does according to his own vocation, are good works and among the pious, are true acts of worship of God, for they are works prompted by God.] LC, 1535, Fol. 435R.

²²⁵ A 13 A 1538, XII, p. 263; Bray 2004, p. 207.

²²⁶ Kenneth J. Collins: *The Doctrine of Justification.* In *Justification: What's at Stake in the Current Debates.* 2002, p. 196 (hereafter, Collins 2002).

²²⁷ Molnar 2002, p. 248. Collins 2002, pp. 198–201.

The Remaining Four Articles

During the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations, the bishops did not dare to discuss their opinion on any of the controversial articles since they did not have authority to decide on doctrine, and they were afraid to state their true opinions in Henry's presence. There is evidence that the bishops discussed these issues, because four additional articles on controversial issues were found in Archbishop Cranmer's library, as follows: articles on the Mass, the veneration of saints, images, and the power of bishops and priests.²²⁸ Even though these articles do not deal directly with the conflicting issues, one may discern the English bishops' opinions on the adiaphoristic matters throughout the negotiations. Thus, these four additional articles bring the total to seventeen, and are what McEntegart is speaking of when he denies the existence of the Thirteen Articles.²²⁹

Some of the beliefs expressed in these articles were clearly those of the reform-minded bishops; some were not.²³⁰ Since not all the controversial articles were included in these drafts, their existence at least suggests that the bishops discussed them and expressed various opinions, during or right after the negotiations with the Germans. They had discussed controversial issues in the Wittenberg Articles of 1536 and the Ten Articles of 1536. The change in the concept of the power of the bishop [the pope] and the increase in the king's power can be discerned throughout. Melancthon also acknowledged the king's authority as custodian of both tables of law as head of the church.

These articles raise the possibility that during further negotiations, the opinions of some conservative and reform-minded bishops added a new aspect to an existing disagreement over the prohibition of the cup in the Lord's Supper, prohibition of the marriage of priests, and the use of private Masses. It is possible that the English bishops had corresponded directly with the king but had been given no authority to publish. These discussions may have influenced the king's response to the German envoys.²³¹

The article "On Private Masses"²³² urges that the satisfactory Masses should be abolished and discontinued, or reduced and restrained. The article speaks of a genuine use of the Mass as having common prayers in common language, and thanksgiving with the celebration of the Eucharist. The impious, profane use of private Masses for profit should be replaced with the right doctrine of justification by faith.²³³ This seems to be the language of the reform-minded bishops in agreement with the German envoys and Melancthon's beliefs.

²²⁸ A Book Containing Divers Articles, *De Unitate, Dei et Trinitate Personarum, de Peccato Originali, & c.* State Paper Office, Ecclesiastical Papers. Archbishop Cranmer's Papers on the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church, 2. B. No. 19. *Cranmer's Miscellaneous*. Appendices XIV and XV, pp. 480–489.

²²⁹ McEntegart 2002, p. 114, note 184.

²³⁰ A Book Containing Divers Articles, *De Unitate, Dei et Trinitate Personarum, de Peccato Originali, & c.* State Paper Office, Ecclesiastical Papers. Archbishop Cranmer's Papers on the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church, 2. B. No. 19. *Cranmer's Miscellaneous*. Appendix. XIV, pp. 480–484.

²³¹ Cott. Libr. Cleop. E. 5. Burnet, Vol. 4, Addenda, No. VII, pp. 178–195.

²³² A Book Containing Divers Articles, *De Unitate, Dei et Trinitate Personarum, de Peccato Originali, & c.* State Paper Office, Ecclesiastical Papers. Archbishop Cranmer's Papers on the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church, 2. B. No. 19. *Cranmer's Miscellaneous*. Appendix. XIV, pp. 480–482.

²³³ State Paper Office. *Ecclesiastical Papers*. Archbishop Cranmer's Papers on the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church, 2 B. No. 19. *Cranmer's Miscellaneous*. Appendix. XIV, pp. 481–482.

In the article concerning veneration of saints and images,²³⁴ the conservative opinion dominates, as the article states that veneration is a necessary usage in the church, and then relates that it is useful for commemoration, as it displays God’s outstanding work through the saints and their example. The saints’ gifts are praiseworthy, the prayers of saints to God should be remembered, and prayers to the saints obtain their intercession, while their healing powers arouse faith. The article stresses that intercession is part of the usage of the Catholic Church, but it repudiates men’s prayers to saints, which strip away “the glory of God.”²³⁵ As compared with the article on “Invocation of Saints” in the *Advice* of 1534 that warns of the abuses of the worship of saints, this article regards their “veneration” as necessary usage in the church, which is congruent with the position of the Roman Church that they have power to influence devotion. The article mentions that the saints act as examples, which is a Reformation view. Interestingly, it agrees with *Advice* that men should offer prayers to saints. As Melanchthon noted, in old prayers, invocation was made to God and not to saints.²³⁶ This article does not explicitly refer to Christ’s mediating help or abuses practiced, as did the *Advice*.²³⁷

This article states that the veneration of saints should be used in the church, opposing Melanchthon’s belief and hope that the abuses of the worship of saints would disappear when consensus was reached on doctrine.²³⁸ In the *Advice* Melanchthon indicated that as long as we honor Christ as our mediator, saints can be imitated and honored. In the past, Christ’s role had been obscured because of the abuses in the worship of saints.

The English bishops’ opinion on saints was conservative. Instead of correcting abuses related to veneration, they stated that veneration is necessary, but they are somewhat cautious that men should not offer prayers to saints. The “necessary” demand never fell under statute law, but foreshadowed the more conservative bent among the English bishops.

In the Wittenberg Articles of 1536, “Of Saints,” Article XVI, Melanchthon discussed the misuse of the invocations of saints, in which was stated that Christ’s honor as the only mediator between God and man should be preserved, and related the misuse to erroneous doctrine. Melanchthon believed that when consensus was reached on doctrine, the abuses in the worship of saints would disappear.²³⁹

In the Ten Articles of 1536, “Of Honoring of Saints” and “Of Praying to Saints” were interpreted as adiaphora. Articles Six, Seven and Eight still allowed images in the churches, but

²³⁴ Ibid., pp. 482–483.

²³⁵ Ibid.

²³⁶ *Postremo si omnino intercessio aliqua propter receptam consuetudinem videretur retinenda esse, etsi est periculosa, tamen de ea deliberare docti possent: an talis forma intercessionis constituenda esset in publico, quae est in veteribus ecclesiae orationibus, ubi invocatio fit ad deum, non ad sanctos... Certum est enim sanctos in caelo orare pro tota ecclesia in commune, sicut et in hac vita homines pii orant pro unversa ecclesia.* Melanchthon’s opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, p. 140.

²³⁷ *De cultu sanctorum docent, quod memoria sanctorum proponi potest, ut imitemur fidem eorum et bona opera... Sed scriptura non docet invocare sanctos seu petere auxilium a sanctis, quia unum Christum nobis proponit mediatorem, propitiatorium, pontificem et intercessorem.* CAL 1530, XXI, p. 83b; Grane 1987, p. 205.

²³⁸ Melanchthon’s opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, pp. 139–140.

²³⁹ Melanchthon’s opinion for de Langey [M. Gutachten an Ulrich Geiger für Guillaume du Bellay]. August 1, 1534. MBW R 2; MBW T 6, 1467, pp. 139–140.

warned against their superstitious abuse.²⁴⁰ The position in the Ten Articles on saints is closer to the position taken in 1538, as it allowed images in the churches, but warned of abuse. But the mediating position of Christ is explicitly stated in the Ten Articles and implicitly expressed in the Thirteen Articles.

The article “Of the Order and Ministry of Priests and Bishops”²⁴¹ clearly defends the power of priests and bishops as divine, reflecting the conservative clergy’s belief in the pope’s divine authority. Bishops’ duties include the preaching of right doctrine and consecrating the sacrament of the altar. The Holy Spirit conveys the gift of justification through this ministry,²⁴² as the German Reformers taught. Other duties include: ordination, demoting errant priests, guarding against erroneous dogmas, binding, excommunicating without physical force, and establishing laws or canons, such as rites and ceremonies, with the agreement of the prince, as the head of the church.²⁴³ The bishops have power in agreement and laws of men.²⁴⁴ Bishops were ambivalent regarding their office—they did not know whether the king’s claim for divine origin applied to them as well. They represented two beliefs: the Roman position and the reform-minded position according to German example.

The question of authority in the English Church was a delicate subject to discuss with the German envoys. In the private meeting one may observe two opposing opinions: the conservative bishops held the pope’s power to be of divine origin; the reform-minded clergy’s opinion was stated implicitly that the bishop’s powers exist through ministry of the new doctrine. The bishops then discussed the legitimacy of their authority in relation to the king’s.

Having established the power of the bishops in an agreement among men, the article claims that the pope’s power was never legitimately given to him. The article states that it would be called injury and tyranny if any bishop followed the pope’s example and wielded power over another bishop without legitimate agreement.²⁴⁵ This shows that the English bishops believed that the power given to them by the king was legitimate, even though King Henry did not allow them to define doctrine.

The Roman popes claimed to be heads and rulers both of all bishops and of the whole Catholic Church, but neither the sacred scriptures nor the Holy Fathers of ancient General Councils ever allowed this power to the Roman popes.²⁴⁶ The writer of this article presents two reasons: Christ never gave universal power either to St. Peter or to any other apostle; neither was this power given by any of the General Councils. Therefore, the Bishop of Rome had no universal power of this kind, neither by the authority of divine law, nor by the ancient Catholic Councils.²⁴⁷ The pope claimed his universal title in the Sixth Council of Carthage.²⁴⁸ The

²⁴⁰ Schofield 2006, p. 69.

²⁴¹ State Paper Office. *Ecclesiastical Papers*. Archbishop Cranmer’s Papers on the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church, 2 B. No. 19. *Cranmer’s Miscellaneous*. Appendix. XV, pp. 484–489.

²⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 484–485.

²⁴³ *Ibid.*

²⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 486.

²⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁴⁷ State Paper Office. *Ecclesiastical Papers*. Archbishop Cranmer’s Papers on the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church, 2 B. No. 19. *Cranmer’s Miscellaneous*. Appendix. XV, pp. 486–487.

²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

consequences of the dispute with the Council Fathers at Carthage were that the Roman pope had no such primacy by divine right, as he falsely boasted. The Roman bishops did not hold universal primacy in those days as they presently claim.²⁴⁹ The English bishops repudiated the legitimacy of the pope's power by denying that it was ever granted to him by any of the early ecumenical councils. In the final analysis, both conservative and reform-minded bishops denied the pope's divine authority in their private meeting even though the conservative clergy had initially admitted to it. Even among the bishops the changes were slow. The private meeting demonstrated that a few conservative bishops still supported the pope's divine power.

The bishops further elaborated on the later councils such as those of Constance, Basel, and Florence, which took place during times of schism. It was mostly the scholastically educated monks who took the pope's side, not knowing the texts of the ancient writers. The result was that the Easterners and Greeks were unwilling to approve the universal primacy of the pope. It seems that the Roman Bishops claimed fictitious universal primacy against Scripture, the Catholic Church, and against the decrees of the councils, even though they promised, in their pontifical ceremonies, to observe all canons of the first eight General Councils, among which were those canons that clearly disagreed with their universal primacy.²⁵⁰

Since the kings have supreme government over people, their power surpasses that of other powers and potentates, including that of the Roman pope. The king should be the supreme head of state. Christian princes should lead the civil government, and oversee and defend Christian doctrine in order to abolish idolatry, the article concluded.²⁵¹ The English bishops defended the king's supremacy against the pope's universal claim. The bishops tried to clarify among themselves the justification of the king's supreme position as head of the church, against the pope's claim. The discussion demonstrated that the change from the authority of the pope to King Henry in church leadership was a controversial topic for the bishops.

The four articles reflect the positions of both the conservative and reform-minded clergy. It is obvious that the two parties had a different understanding of Scriptural authority. The conservative bishops held the unwritten verities as equally authoritative with Scripture, but the reform-minded bishops believed in Scripture as the sole authority. In the final analysis, these negotiations make it clear that it was left to the king to make decisions concerning adiaphora, not the bishops.

The Germans regarded human traditions as subject to abuse, but the English concept of abuses differed. For them, the medieval culture, with its relics, images, pilgrimages, and all the past paraphernalia of the church, including monasticism, were remnants of papal power. When the injunctions were published in September 1538, they specifically gave instructions to the clergy to teach parishioners the difference between right and wrong worship: which rites and ceremonies were adiaphora and therefore not necessary to salvation.

Henry had clearly stated his view on adiaphora. He equated Scripture with Tradition. His view influenced the conservative clergy. It is also clear that the reform-minded clergy's views were present in the Thirteen Articles, and in the remaining four on adiaphora. The German and

²⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 487.

²⁵⁰ Ibid., pp. 487–488.

²⁵¹ Ibid., pp. 488–489.

English views on the abuses differed, since their exegetical approach to authority on adiaphora was different.

After the Negotiations: The Pope's Bull against Henry

The situation changed in December 1538, as the pope finally decided to publish his bull of deposition against Henry for another blasphemy against the Catholic faith—the desecration of the relics of St. Thomas á Becket of Canterbury.²⁵² On December 17, 1538, the pope issued the bull of excommunication against Henry, which had been suspended in 1535.²⁵³ Henry must have known that a papal bull meant destruction to his government and supremacy, and a return to the pope's authority. The pope declared himself head of the church, and although he previously had named Henry as “Defender of the Faith” against Luther, stated that Henry had now deviated from his faith and had sinned by divorcing Catherine, even though the previous pope had asked him to put Anne away, claiming that he had committed adultery because of marrying Anne.²⁵⁴

Because Henry had declared himself head of the church, and had forced the ecclesiastics to approve his decrees and had imprisoned and killed those who refused, the pope declared him schismatic and heretic. The pope requested that Henry revoke his constitution and threatened excommunication if he refused. The letter attached punishment—deprivation and excommunication penalties—not only to the king, but all his secular magistracy and ecclesiastics.²⁵⁵

At the same time, the Anglo-Schmalkaldic negotiations were inconclusive, due to disagreement between conservative and reform-minded bishops. Cranmer tried to persuade the English bishops to discuss the abuses further, but the bishops themselves were not willing to decide against the king. Henry had already expressed his view of the abuses, basing his arguments on the Church Fathers. Since Henry had more urgent matters to consider, neither the Germans nor the English sanctioned the Thirteen Articles.²⁵⁶

The Germans did not offer any comments after the embassy had returned. Even though both parties were in agreement with doctrinal points presented in the Wittenberg Articles and the Thirteen Articles, they did not reach agreement on the conflicting issues concerning Mass, communion in both kinds, priestly celibacy, monastic vows, and the powers of the bishop. Henry and the German envoys had made their positions clear soon after the negotiations broke down. In the next chapter will discuss what position Henry took regarding the conflicting articles, while further reforming the Church of England.

Conclusion

The Thirteen Articles constitute a document based on Melancthon's ideas on the doctrine of adiaphora in England. Its doctrine of justification by faith and adiaphora equals that of

²⁵² L&P XIII, Pt. 2, No. 684, p. 259; No. 741, p. 287.

²⁵³ *Concilia Magnae*, pp. 792–797, 840–841; L&P IX, No. 207, p. 67; L&P XIII, Pt. 2, No. 1087, p. 459.

²⁵⁴ *Concilia Magnae*, p. 792.

²⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 793–796.

²⁵⁶ Tjernagel 1965, p. 184.

Melanchthon's in the *Loci Communes* of 1535 and also parallels the one presented in the *Confessio Augustana* of 1530 and its English translation of 1536. Article IV speaks of grace, favor, and free gift in a manner reminiscent of the *Confessio Augustana*. Article IV picks up the concept of "necessary to salvation" from Article IV of the Wittenberg Articles, but immediately expands it in the direction of the concept of the *Confessio Augustana*, saying that "one strives to do the will of God," that is, the heart's willing activity to God and neighbor. One may interpret it as representing the doctrine of *Confessio Augustana*.

In the matter of ecclesiastical rites, the Wittenberg Articles state that it is the bishop's duty to teach adiaphoristic ceremonies and that the bishop should not burden consciences by leaving ceremonies out. The Thirteen Articles follow the Wittenberg Articles and the *Loci Communes* in defining adiaphoristic ceremonies as those not necessary to salvation, and add that parishioners needed instruction about their spiritual meaning. This was left to the clergy, who did not have authority to define adiaphora matters, which were under the king's authority. According to Melanchthon, as long as the adiaphora matters do not conflict with divine laws in Scripture, consciences are free, but when human laws regulate adiaphora matters, they will bind consciences.

The authority of the civil magistracy in relation to the church was discussed in the Wittenberg Articles and again in the Thirteen Articles. The position of the Wittenberg Articles closely follows Melanchthon's *Loci Communes* of 1535. The civil magistracy is essential for the function of the church. Civil law, according to Melanchthon, is divine in origin and should prevent impious practices and doctrine and punish heretics; and obedience to it was essential. Departure from the Wittenberg Articles is seen in the Thirteen Articles, which state that obedience to princes is necessary for human affairs and that one should endure in it. The latter part reflects the English bishops' position on the supremacy of the king and obedience to the point of abuse without resistance. The king truly believed that his position as head of church and state was of divine origin.

The four additional articles included in Bray's edition of the Thirteen Articles demonstrate the English bishops' opinions on the controversial issues. Melanchthon discussed private Masses in the *Advice* of 1534, but neither the Wittenberg Articles of 1536 nor the Ten Articles of 1536 addressed private Masses. The Thirteen Articles take the reform-minded clergy's position on private Masses, and states that private Masses should be replaced by the doctrine of justification by faith; declaring that the Mass is adiaphora, in agreement with the Saxon Reformers.

The "Veneration of Saints and Images" shows the most conservative position, recommending their use as necessary in the church. The *Advice* of 1534 and the Wittenberg Articles of 1536 had warned against their misuse; the Ten Articles stated that images should stay as long as they are not superstitiously abused.

The bishops excluded monastic vows, which was one of the controversial issues during the negotiations in 1536. Henry did not mention it either in his letter to the Germans, since at that time the monasteries had almost been dissolved in England. Instead of applying vows to monks, Henry connected them to priests, who were not allowed to marry according to his belief. It is evident that his position had somewhat changed, as he must have understood that monastic vows were obsolete and acknowledged that from now on they belonged to civil legislation.

The Thirteen Articles constitute the most Lutheran document composed on English soil, even using quotes directly from the *Confessio Augustana*. The adiaphoristic position of the Saxon Reformers could be followed from the article on rites and ceremonies. The contents of the article on civil affairs were reminiscent of the corresponding article in the Wittenberg Articles, but differed in that obedience was required. One of the reasons that the Thirteen Articles never became an officially accepted document was the interference by the king in discussing the controversial issues with the German embassy, without the presence of the English bishops. The English bishops could only state their opinions on the controversial articles in a private gathering after the negotiations. The English bishops acknowledged the legitimacy of the King. Their private discussions on adiaphora matters showed the influence of the English translation of the *Confessio Augustana* on the bishops' power. The bishops wished to have back their lost authority to define doctrine and practice from the king. They even preferred the council have authority to define doctrine and practice, rather than the king.

In the article "Of the Order and Ministry of Priests and Bishops," it is first stated that the bishops accepted the pope's divine authority. However, the bishops acknowledged their duties as bishops but realized that the king had taken away their authority over doctrine. The bishops' duties were to preach doctrine and administer sacraments, through which the Holy Spirit conveys justification by faith; ordain and demote priests; guard against erroneous dogma; bind and excommunicate; and establish laws and canons, such as rites and ceremonies, in agreement with the prince. The English bishops hoped that their most important duty of defining doctrine could be exercised in agreement with the king; and that the General Council, rather than the king, would define doctrine.

The bishops agreed that the pope's power was not legitimately given to him by divine law or the ancient decrees of the councils, and that he could not claim universal primacy. The English bishops defended the king's supremacy against the pope's universal claim and acknowledged his authority as legitimate leader of both government and doctrine in order to abolish idolatry. The bishops wished that their proper authority would be granted to them by the king, but they were willing to cooperate and ultimately acknowledged the king's supremacy as the legitimate authority over both church and state.

Henry's personal beliefs became clear in his correspondence with the German envoys. He upheld private Masses, rejected communion in both kinds in the Lord's Supper, and rejected the marriage of the priests, but supported the use of vows in the ordination of priests. It was the doctrine of reconciliation in the Mass and his belief in Catholic tradition that separated the Germans and Henry. Possibly during the negotiations of 1536 through 1538, it became clear to Henry that the Germans demanded that he subscribe to the *Confessio Augustana* and the principle of *sola scriptura*. He firmly declined the Germans' offer and was disappointed that Melancthon would not be part of the embassy.

The struggle for the church's authority between Henry and the pope and its consequences for the English interpretation of adiaphora in the Six Articles will be discussed in Chapter Thirteen.

Chapter 13:

Religious Unity and the Genesis of the Six Articles

(January–June 1539)

Introduction

The pope and the Catholic monarchs took action against Henry's policies directed against the Roman Church. Cromwell made attempts at alliances between the English king and the Continent, through marriage proposals and by inviting the German theologians to England. When the German embassy left London in 1538 after the negotiations on the Thirteen Articles ended, there was no further correspondence between the Saxon Reformers and Henry. He became involved in domestic matters, attempting to bring unity to his church by protecting the country from divisions due to religious differences. The final English and German negotiations of the Thirteen Articles of 1538 resulted in a compromise expressed in the publication of the Six Articles, which contained the adiaphora matters on which the Germans and the English could not agree. Instead of leaving the adiaphora matters to individual conscience, Henry published the Six Articles as law, so that adiaphora matters fell under the jurisdiction of both secular and ecclesiastical laws and became binding on consciences. Melancthon wrote several times to Henry and the Archbishop of Canterbury urging them to rescind this action, to no avail. Hence, it became clear to the German Reformers how much their thoughts differed from Henry's. The situation in England became thus: the reform-minded clergy considered the ceremonies in the Six Articles as adiaphora and a matter of individual conscience—and harsh tyranny at that—while the conservative clergy considered them as binding consciences, as they had believed when the pope sanctioned ceremonies by canon law as binding.

While Henry sought alliances with Charles, Francis, and the German Reformers, Melancthon continued to urge the king to remove the Roman laws from England and maintain right doctrine in his church. Melancthon supported rites that were motivated by conscience or that maintained the tranquility of the church and were not against Scripture. Human laws, he insisted, could not make divine mandate obsolete. At the same time, the pope was taking action against Henry in a papal bull. This is discussed in detail before delineating the enactment of the Six Articles.

The Papal Bull

Although Henry had made several attempts to mediate between Charles and Francis, the pope became their mediator when the truce between France and the Holy Roman Empire was completed in the summer of 1538. Henry did not give up on his negotiations with the emperor and sent his agents to visit the Regent of Flanders, interfering with the emperor's enterprise against the Turks to advise him about Milan. Henry's aim was to prove how a union with

England would benefit the emperor.¹ This author concurs with Bernard that, in negotiating with the Germans, Henry wanted to give Charles and Francis the impression that an Anglo-German alliance was in the making. At the same time, Henry would not accept the Lutheran doctrinal statement to avoid giving to the German ambassadors the impression that he agreed with the articles.²

The conflict between Pope Paul III and Henry VIII entered its final stages. The destruction of shrines reflected the annihilation of papal power. The pope confronted King Henry and published the bull with the stated reasons: disobedience, deviation from faith, and adultery. The situation had changed since the threat of the previous bull of 1535. Even though the reasons were the same, the fundamental question had to be resolved once and for all: who was the head of the church? On December 17, 1538, the pope issued the bull of excommunication against Henry for another of Henry's blasphemies against the Catholic faith, the desecration of the relics of St. Thomas á Becket of Canterbury.³ The pope declared himself head of the church. Although he previously had named Henry Defender of Faith against Luther, the pope now stated that Henry deviated from his faith, had sinned because of his divorce from Catherine and remarriage to Anne, and had committed adultery.⁴

Since Henry had declared himself head of the church and forced the ecclesiastics to approve his decrees and had imprisoned and executed those who refused, the pope declared him a schismatic and heretic. The pope demanded that Henry revoke his constitution, threatening excommunication if he refused. After the pope's ninety-day ultimatum, an action of deprivation would follow, and three days after the ultimatum expired, Henry would be deprived of his kingdom, including all of his family and supporters. After this ultimatum, whoever still recognized Henry as head of the church would be interdicted. The pope would threaten military attack and punish Henry's disobedience. The letter attached punishment, deprivation and excommunication penalties not only to the king but also to all his secular magistracy and ecclesiastics.⁵

From Henry's point of view, the present situation was much more severe than when the bull was first threatened in 1535. Henry knew that if the pope were successful in getting the Catholic monarchs to side with him, Henry would be left in isolation. Henry's remarriage to Anne and the death of John Fisher were the pope's initial reasons for publishing the suspended bull of 1535.⁶ The fundamental reason still remained, but more significant was the question of who was the head of the church. There was a battle for authority between Henry and the pope.

The German Reformers were primarily interested in church reform and getting rid of abuses. Henry's destruction of shrines represented to Melanchthon and other German theologians the hope that the English were truly reforming their churches. On the other hand, Henry's

¹ Instructions to Sir Thomas Wyatt and Philip Hoby, one of his Graces' Privy Chamber. October 16, 1538. *Letters of Henry VIII*, No. VII, pp. 202–210.

² Bernard 2005, p. 541.

³ *Concilia Magnae*, pp. 792–797, 840–841; L&P IX, No. 207, p. 67; L&P XIII, Pt. 2, No. 1087, p. 459. L&P XIII, Pt. 2, No. 684, p. 259; No. 741, p. 287.

⁴ *Concilia Magnae*, p. 792.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 793–796.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 840–841.

destruction of the shrines reflects his belief that the only way to get rid of popish tyranny would be the total annihilation of the persons supporting his power; part of his plan was realized in December 1538.⁷ The author agrees with Bernard and Schofield who think that the destruction of the images and shrines was closely connected to the dissolution of the monasteries. They were seen as abuses, and therefore their destruction was not considered a reform in the sense that the Germans had interpreted the official iconoclasm. The purpose was destruction of papal power. Soon after, Henry made a proclamation to observe laudable ceremonies of the church, as he interpreted the practice and doctrine of the church.⁸

On December 27 1538, Cardinal Reginald Pole left Rome on a mission to see the emperor on behalf of Pope Paul III. Pole's mission was to inform the emperor that the pope was now seriously planning to proceed against Henry by excommunicating him and to ask Charles and Francis to blockade all commercial links between England and the Continent, and to recall their ambassadors from Henry's court.⁹ In addition to Pole's mission, the pope had launched a secondary plan for executing the bull against Henry by sending his legate Latino Juvenile to Scotland to give the bull to King James, who would in turn pass it on to Henry.¹⁰ When Henry learned of this, he was more determined than ever to assassinate Pole.¹¹

Pole's mission to Charles and Francis set off alarms in England, and Henry began to fortify the country.¹² Whether or not this new bull would be executed depended on Charles. This was also the French sentiment, as noted by the imperial ambassador in France, Scepperus. If the emperor broke off diplomatic relations with England, Francis would do the same. The language of the emperor was very clear to Francis: "Neither party shall make any alliance by marriage, league or otherwise with the king of England."¹³ This was devastating news for Henry, who was still hoping for a coalition with the emperor against the pope. Hence, as 1538 drew to a close, Henry experienced increased isolation.¹⁴ When Charles and Francis concluded their ten-year truce on January 12, 1539, they bound themselves to make no new agreements with Henry except by mutual consent. This included any marriage arrangements with Henry or Princess Mary.¹⁵ Henry must also have been disappointed that he did not hear from the Germans after their embassy left in 1538, when the negotiations on the Thirteen Articles ended. Schofield notes that Henry must have been waiting for a major Lutheran embassy led by Melancthon, as promised a year earlier.¹⁶ The negative outcome of the negotiations in London in 1538 must have made the Saxon Reformers hesitant to approach Henry on religion. Henry also became impatient waiting answers from the Reformers.

⁷ Melancthon to Vitus Theodoric. November 1, 1538. MBW T 8, 2111, p. 242; CR III, 1745, p. 602; L&P XIII, Pt. 2, No. 684, p. 259; No. 741, p. 287.

⁸ Bernard 1998, pp. 330–331. Schofield 2006, pp. 113–114.

⁹ L&P, XIV, Pt. 1, No. 36, pp. 14–15.

¹⁰ L&P, XIII, Pt. 2, No. 1108, p. 465; L&P, XIV, Pt. 1, No. 536, pp. 208–209.

¹¹ L&P, XIV, Pt. 1, No. 200, pp. 80–83.

¹² L&P, XIV, Pt. 1, Nos. 21–22, p. 10.

¹³ L&P, XIII, Pt. 2, No. 794, p. 307; No. 1053, p. 450.

¹⁴ L&P, XIII, Pt. 2, No. 1111, p. 465.

¹⁵ L&P, XIV, Pt. 1, No. 62, p. 26. Schofield 2006, p. 115.

¹⁶ Schofield 2006, p. 115.

Regardless, Henry's agents continued their abortive attempts to negotiate with the emperor and with Queen Mary of Flanders.¹⁷ On January 19, 1539, after receiving a coded letter from Wyatt, Henry concluded that the emperor had no plans for further negotiations or any alliance with him.¹⁸ Henry requested political help from the Lutherans. McEntegart believes that the lack of German response made Henry impatient and caused Cromwell to pursue the Cleves marriage.¹⁹ Cromwell sent Christopher Mont to the German princes to negotiate a marriage alliance between the Duke of Cleves and Lady Mary and between Henry and Anne, the Duchess of Cleves.²⁰ This action is evidence of how inexperienced Cromwell was with England's foreign relations. McEntegart sees the English offer of alliance in 1539 related to the marriage affair with the Cleves as the operation of an evangelical faction.²¹ This author disagrees with McEntegart and does not consider Cromwell as leading the evangelical faction, but rather acting frequently and independently for the best solution for his king. From Cromwell's point of view, the international situation seemed more dangerous than it really was. Two things ensued: it prompted new negotiations with the Germans and damaged Cromwell's political career.

At that time, Henry learned that Cardinal Pole was on his way to the emperor's court to make plans against him. On February 13, Henry asked Thomas Wyatt to tell the emperor not to receive Pole.²² On the same day, Henry also wrote to the emperor to request that he not allow Pole access to his court.²³ Charles responded that he could not refuse to receive anyone sent by the Holy Father.²⁴ Yet, as a result of Wyatt's intervention, on February 13, the emperor gave Pole a much colder reception than he would have done otherwise. After his cool reception from Charles, Pole wondered how Francis would receive him. "I may compromise my own life," he wrote to Cardinal Farnese, "and the honor of the Apostolic See." Therefore, he wrote ahead to Cardinal Lorraine and Grand Master Montmorency in Paris expressing the hope that they would influence the French king to give him a good reception. However, Francis's response was as unsatisfactory as that of Charles, and Pole returned to Rome.²⁵

The emperor also had his hands full with both the Turks and the German Lutherans; the latter of whom he feared might form an alliance with Henry. As for the papal bull, the emperor went so far as to tell Pole that, before issuing it, the pope should have made sure he would be able to execute it. Concerning commerce with England, the emperor said he would not cut it off unless France did likewise.²⁶ So the pope was not supported either by Charles or Francis in executing the bull, and Henry was successfully able to avoid the outcome he had been trying to prevent. On March 10, 1539, the emperor had all English ships arrested, as well as those of other nations, on

¹⁷ Henry VIII to Wriothesley, [Vaughan and Carne, his ambassadors in Brussels], December 23, 2538; *Letters of Henry VIII*, No. VIII, pp. 211, 218–220.

¹⁸ Henry VIII, to Sir Thomas Wyatt, January 19, 1539; *Letters of Henry VIII*, No. IX, pp. 218–219, 221–220.

¹⁹ McEntegart 2002, pp. 144–145, 147–148.

²⁰ Cromwell to Christopher Mont; *Cromwell's Letters* Vol. 2, No. 287, pp. 174–175; Vit. B. XXI, Fol. 174; L&P, XIV, Pt. 1, No. 103, p. 40; No. 103, pp. 40–41; No. 157, p. 57; SP 1/142, Fols. 71–73.

²¹ McEntegart 2002, pp. 144–145, 147–148.

²² Henry VIII to Sir Thomas Wyatt, February 13, 1539; *Letters of Henry VIII*, No. X, pp. 223–224.

²³ Henry VIII, to Charles V, February 13, 1539; *Letters of Henry VIII*, No. XI, p. 226.

²⁴ L&P, XIV, Pt. 1, No. 28, p. 12; No. 36, pp. 14–15; No. 46, p. 22; No. 126, p. 48; No. 405, p. 166; SP 1/143; Fols. 208–209.

²⁵ L&P, XIV, Pt. 1, No. 603, pp. 235–238.

²⁶ L&P, XIV, Pt. 1, No. 13, pp. 8–9; No. 14, p. 9; No. 279, p. 108; No. 280, pp. 108–109.

the pretext that he did not have sufficient marines to go against the Turks in Antwerp. Henry was convinced that underlying this was the Bishop of Rome's intent to provoke other nations to war against England. Nothing came out of this short provocation. Through correspondence between Cromwell, Henry VIII, and Thomas Wyatt, Henry learnt that the French and Imperial ambassadors were being recalled.²⁷

Henry took this isolation very seriously, and he arranged musters in England for defense.²⁸ It also forced him to earnestly consider a revised doctrinal statement on church practices that would unify his nation under his supremacy against any religious dissension. This was therefore an opportune time for Henry to implement his theological position on adiaphora.

Schofield notes that the international situation was favorable for Henry. The execution of the bull was dependent on the cooperation of these two European monarchs, which the pope had failed to achieve.²⁹ There was a peace agreement between Francis and Charles, which did not last very long as Francis reinstated his ambassador to England. Charles experienced religious divisions within the empire and an outside threat from the Turks. And the situation in England prompted new discussions with the Lutherans along with an opportunity for Melanchthon to convey his thoughts and discussions on adiaphora within, what he called, a true church.

Melanchthon on the Power of the Church

Since Melanchthon's previous statements on adiaphora matters, he further developed church policy that had to be understood within his new formulated concept of church. Melanchthon changed his view on the church and delineated his concept of the relationship of the church and secular magistracy. From this time on, Melanchthon refused to compromise, realizing the centrality of the doctrine of reconciliation to the doctrine of the church. At the same time, Melanchthon was aware of the latest developments in England and the publication of the proclamation in February 1539. Very concerned about the church's situation in England, Melanchthon cultivated relationships with reform-minded clergy. Defining this concept of the church, Melanchthon was willing to relate his ideas to the reform-minded envoys he had met in Germany in 1536 in the hope that these ideas would influence the English developments on adiaphora matters.

At this time, Melanchthon was preparing a treatise on the church "On the Authority of the Church and the Writings of the Ancient Fathers," which was a timely discussion on the authority of the church.³⁰ Melanchthon was no longer willing to compromise on doctrine.³¹ Keen sees Melanchthon as more conservative than conciliatory in his refusal to compromise for the sake of

²⁷ Henry VIII to Sir Thomas Wyatt, March 10, 1539; *Letters of Henry VIII*, No. XII, pp. 228–231. Cromwell to Henry VIII, March 17th, 1539; Titus B. i. f. 265. *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. 2, No. 298, pp. 196–199; L&P, XIV, No. 538, pp. 209–210. L&P, XIV, Pt. 1, No. 144, pp. 52–53. Cromwell to Henry VIII, March 17th, 1539; Titus B. i. f. 265. *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. 2, No. 298, pp. 196–199; L&P, XIV, No. 538, pp. 209–210.

²⁸ Cromwell to Henry VIII, March 17th, 1539; Titus B. i. f. 265. *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. 2, No. 298, pp. 196–199; L&P, XIV, No. 538, pp. 209–210.

²⁹ Schofield 2006, p. 115.

³⁰ Ralph Keen: "Political Authority and Ecclesiology in Melanchthon's *De Ecclesiae Autoritate*." 1996, p. 1 (hereafter, Keen 1996).

³¹ Keen 1996, p. 6.

peace.³² Melanchthon's attitude had changed from the time he initiated his unification plans between the European monarch and princes five years earlier. (See Chapters Two, Three, and Five.) The background for his writing was the 1537 meeting at Schmalkalden, when Luther refused to attend the pope's council at Mantua.³³

Melanchthon's changed views were due to his past experiences confronting the questions raised in the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations, opposing the pope's council, writing the Schmalkaldic Articles, and the elector's response when attempting to negotiate with foreign countries. All this made Melanchthon change his approach to defining doctrine and practice in church policy, speaking of the adiaphora issues in the context of ecclesiology. Furthermore, Keen asserts that the evangelicals' refusal to attend the pope's council also changed the perspective of this writing that was implicitly published in the Schmalkaldic Articles in 1537. Melanchthon represented the whole position of the Schmalkaldic League on the authority of the church. He notes that, in order for them to preserve jurisdiction over ecclesiastical affairs, Protestant princes were also members of the church, and urges one to preserve evangelical faith and restrain impiety, thus replacing the papal church as an institution by local Protestant churches.³⁴ As early as in 1530, in the *Confessio Augustana*, Article V, "the Ministry of the Church," he states "the characteristics of the Church were seen in the doctrine of the justifying faith is obtained through the ministry of preaching the Word and administering the sacraments as means of grace. The Holy Spirit working through word and sacraments creates faith. Thus, the ministry of the Word and the Sacraments are signs of the true Church."³⁵

According to Keen, while rejecting the Catholic initiative of a compromise between dogma and practice, Melanchthon defended the visible church and the centrality of the new doctrine, which is expressed in the articles of faith that the church teaches.³⁶ One may observe that Melanchthon included all other doctrines in addition to the doctrine of justification in *Loci Communes* of 1535.³⁷ He wished to demonstrate that the doctrine of reconciliation was central to understanding the church and that the church can only be defined from this doctrine.³⁸

In the *Loci Communes* of 1535, Melanchthon uses keys to symbolize ecclesiastical administration, drawing an analogy between running a church and running a household. Following Scripture, he divides ecclesiastical administration into ministry, which includes preaching the Gospel and administering the sacraments, and jurisdiction, which includes making legal judgments based on the words of Christ. The power of the church, Melanchthon argues, derives from Christ and is not tyrannical—unlike the situation envisaged by the pope and the Anabaptists, who used the power of the sword, thereby debasing their ecclesiastical power into earthly power.³⁹

³² Ibid.

³³ Keen 1996, p. 9.

³⁴ Keen 1996, p. 10.

³⁵ CAL 1530, Article IV, pp. 58, 61; Grane 1987, pp. 69–71, 73, 75; 89–90.

³⁶ Keen 1996, pp. 2, 13.

³⁷ LC 1535, Fols. 23, 25L. Grane 1987, pp. 89–92.

³⁸ Wainwright 2004, p. 249.

³⁹ LC, 1535, Fols. 341R, 343L.

The characteristic of the church was the new doctrine and its authority. Melanchthon differentiates between the hidden (true) and visible church. The true church consists of the community of believers with the Word and Sacraments sanctified by the Holy Spirit. Melanchthon argued against the visible structure of the Roman Church, but speaks of the proper authority of the church—the Word, which guides the visible church. Melanchthon’s concept of the church had shifted, and his emphasis became church as a communion of believers.⁴⁰ Furthermore, Melanchthon modified his stance on the councils, as he now preferred regional councils to a General Council. The experience with the English ambassadors forming a common strategy toward the pope’s council changed his position. The new doctrine would probably have been condemned in the pope’s council. Melanchthon preferred that the new doctrine would be safeguarded through regional or national councils. Their main task was to agree with theologians formulating creeds to the separate secular and ecclesiastical spheres. Obedience to secular rule was essential in order to safeguard the new doctrine. However, Melanchthon did not take the same position for Charles’ situation, since the power of the Holy Roman Empire rested on the pope.⁴¹ Melanchthon defended the *sola Scriptura* principle and wrote that the Fathers are witness to the Gospel in the same way as the Reformers, who believed that they were continuing the traditions of the Fathers.

Henry had also refused to attend the pope’s council because he held hopes of calling a General Council himself. Melanchthon’s unification goal all along had been to have monarchs hold national synods, in which statements of faith would be formed, heretics punished, and abuses reformed. In Henry’s reign, there had been one instance when he delegated doctrinal reform to his bishops, which was after the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1537. But Henry’s general practice was to have Parliament enforce practices that Melanchthon considered papal abuses. Verkamp argues that Melanchthon indicated that sometimes it might be necessary to limit one’s adiaphoristic freedom and bear the tyranny in order to maintain peace.⁴² Were these thoughts in Melanchthon’s mind when he corresponded with the reform-minded clergy in England?

Melanchthon was no longer willing to make such extensive compromises on doctrine and practice. When he published the *Advice* in 1534, he affirmed that the secular princes were protectors of the visible church in German principalities and the new doctrine was based on exegetical tradition of Scripture and on his teaching in the *Loci Communes* of 1535. He also emphasized that other ecclesiastical and political authority came from God to advance new doctrine in the church.⁴³ Melanchthon wished to convey this concept of the church to the English evangelical whom he met at Wittenberg. Melanchthon and Archdeacon Nicholas Heath corresponded again on April 1, 1539 in response to the lack of a timely response from the Germans to Henry.⁴⁴ Melanchthon’s beliefs are made clear from this correspondence, as follows: He wrote that the church should be loved even more than one’s own country and judged based

⁴⁰ Lexutt 2006, pp. 36–38.

⁴¹ Keen 1996, p. 12.

⁴² Verkamp 1975, p. 65.

⁴³ Keen 1996, pp. 10, 15.

⁴⁴ Philip Melanchthon to Archdiakon Heath. April 1, 1539. MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2174, pp. 382–384; CR III, 1791, pp. 679–681. Schofield 2006, p. 116.

on the Scriptures written by the prophets and apostles. He wrote of the difference between the authority of the church that is based on the prophets and apostles, and the authority derived by the church from the Roman Church.⁴⁵ He made it clear that his interpretation of the power of the church was based on Scripture alone, rather than Scripture and Traditions. Melanchthon indicated that the “future edict” (he must have been referring to the Act of Six Articles) that was supported by the conservatives was based on Scripture and Tradition. In his letter, Melanchthon declared the difference between those who interpreted the church from the exegetical perspective of Scripture and Tradition, and those who based their interpretation on Scripture alone. This exegetical statement separated Melanchthon from the Roman Church. Greschat argues that Melanchthon was ambivalent about tradition and stressed that it was essential to scrutinize traditions in the light of the true, biblically documented doctrine of the church. Using the Church Fathers as his example, Melanchthon argued that the Reformation stood within the tradition of true doctrine and therefore represented the true church.⁴⁶ Estes argues that Melanchthon wrote “On the Authority of the Church,” to defend the Lutheran view of the church and the supremacy of Scripture.⁴⁷

On March 30, 1539, Melanchthon wrote to Thomas Cranmer, the Archbishop of Canterbury. It seems from Melanchthon’s letter that he knew of the reform-minded party’s efforts to add a clause for public correction of the abuses in the law.⁴⁸ Melanchthon appealed to the archbishop to prevent adiaphora matters from being held under secular law because once adiaphora matters became laws, they would bind conscience. Melanchthon criticized the conservative bishops Gardiner and Stokesley for defending impious rites and other empty traditions which were based on human wisdom and confused religion.⁴⁹ The useful rites, he believed, were those in agreement with Scripture, not “in the new interpretation of laws.”⁵⁰

Melanchthon wrote to the king on April 1, 1539 and praised England for being a source of Christian doctrine that had been propagated to the greater part of Germany. He also praised Henry for his heroic spirit in supporting the truth against the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome. At the same time, he asked Henry to abolish the laws of Roman authority “that act as the bulwark of the Roman Bishop; there is a risk that they might come back.”⁵¹ McEntegart regards Melanchthon’s letters of March 26, April 1, and April 10, 1539 as a response to the royal proclamation of February 1539, complaining about the prohibition of priestly marriage and enforced ceremonies. Melanchthon wrote about the Proclamation in the April 1 letter and agreed to it. He also mentioned that he opposed the statute law of the Six Articles.⁵²

Melanchthon believed that if Henry undertook corrections of church practices, he would safeguard his church and the German Reformation church from the power of the Catholic

⁴⁵ MBW T 8, 2174, pp. 383–384; CR III, 1791, p. 680.

⁴⁶ Greschat 2010, p. 126.

⁴⁷ Estes 2005, pp. 143–144.

⁴⁸ This is either a reference to the February Proclamation of 1539, which included the same points as the Act of Six Articles, or that the reform-minded bishops had had discussions in the preparation of the Act before it became a bill in Parliament in May, 1539.

⁴⁹ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2170, pp. 373–375; CR, III, 1790, pp. 677–679.

⁵⁰ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2170, p. 375; CR III, 1790, p. 679.

⁵¹ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2175, p. 389.

⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 385–388; McEntegart 2002, p. 148.

monarchs. He reminded Henry that retaining the abuses could bring the Bishop of Rome's power back.⁵³ Melanchthon also said that even new interpretations would not justify the use of papal rites, because one might interpret them as necessary to salvation.⁵⁴ Melanchthon's warnings to Henry have to be interpreted from the perspective that in Germany territorial churches were still vulnerable, surrounded by Catholic monarchs. Melanchthon might not have realized that Henry had secured his position toward the Catholic powers within the Church of England.

Melanchthon also had demanded that rites and ceremonies should not be separated into categories. There must be a clear understanding on the doctrine of adiaphora within the ecclesiology; who has power to set consciences free, and also the correct understanding of the doctrine of reconciliation in order to interpret the adiaphora matters. It is evident that Melanchthon's letters to Henry VIII and Archbishop Thomas Cranmer influenced the mitigation of the publication of the Act of Six Articles and its effects in England and made future negotiations possible for the Schmalkaldic League.

Henry's Proclamations and Melanchthon's Response

Henry made a Proclamation on February 26, 1539 that was a repeat of the one of November 1538. While he was in the midst of foreign danger from the emperor and the pope, Henry published an additional Proclamation in April 1539.⁵⁵ The reason for the proclamation was to educate the people in the difference between those ceremonies that were necessary for salvation and those that were not. The Royal Proclamation of February 26, 1539 began by blaming the king's subjects for trying to restore the Bishop of Rome's "hypocrite religion."⁵⁶ While in his February proclamation, Henry had welcomed diversity by pardoning the Anabaptists and Sacramentaries, in his April proclamation Henry declared that his plan was to extinguish diversity of opinion by parliamentary law.⁵⁷ The publication of proclamations can be interpreted as the crown making church reforms without the authority of Parliament. It also demonstrates that the English preferred to avoid drastic changes on adiaphora, as long as subjects could differentiate what was necessary and what was not necessary to salvation. As far as ceremonies not necessary for salvation and those necessary to salvation, the king wished the clergy to instruct the people in the proper use of ceremonies. He gave a detailed meaning to each rite or ceremony, for instance, "Holy water is sprinkled to put us in remembrance of our baptism, and the blood of Christ sprinkled to put us in remembrance of our baptism." Henry seemed to think that retaining the old rites with proper explanation would prevent the misunderstanding of their

⁵³ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2175, p. 385.

⁵⁴ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2175. pp. 385–389; CR III, 1792, pp. 681–685.

⁵⁵ "Catholic Church" refers to the universal church, not the Roman Church led by the pope, as mentioned in one of the King's Proclamations "Limiting Exposition and Reading of Scripture." Henry refers to "the hypocrite religion" when talking of restoring "into this realm the old deviation of the usurped power of the Bishop of Rome, the hypocrite religion, superstitious pilgrimages, idolatry, and other evil and naughty ceremonies and dreams justly and lawfully abolished and taken away by authority of God's word..." Limiting Exposition and Reading of Scripture. April 1539, 30 Henry VIII. *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, Vol. I. No. 191, p. 284.

⁵⁶ Limiting Exposition and Reading of Scripture. April 1539, 30 Henry VIII. *Tudor Royal Proclamation*, Vol. I. No. 191, pp. 284–286.

⁵⁷ Prescribing Rites and Ceremonies, Pardoning Anabaptists. Westminster, 26 February 1539, 30 Henry VIII. *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, Vol. I. No. 188, p. 280.

purpose. He repeatedly ordered that none of the ceremonies should be understood as works of salvation, but only as outward tokens to remember Christ's doctrine of salvation. The proclamation specified that being obedient would create concord among the citizens in one God.⁵⁸ This was the first step in creating uniformity in belief.

There was confusion concerning the exposition of Scriptures, and the proclamation stipulated that reading and meditating on Scripture should be done for the purpose of unity of opinion, for the increase of charity and love among the citizens, and to avoid the usurped power of the Bishop of Rome, referred to as "the hypocrite religion." It stated that all diverse opinions should be extinguished and that Parliament would take action to remove those things that caused division. Only graduates of Oxford and Cambridge, bishops, or holders of the king's license were allowed to expound the Scriptures. The purpose of reading the Scriptures in English was to increase virtuous living for the glory of God.⁵⁹ The second step in creating unity of religion was the inclusion of Parliament's legislation.

Melanchthon was pleased with the Proclamation of February 1539, but also expressed sadness at the publication of the new decree that mandated observation of all accustomed rites and that of priestly celibacy, which he professed as going against the doctrine of the Catholic Church.⁶⁰ Melanchthon urged the king to remove the Roman laws from England and exhorted the king to maintain right doctrine in his church.⁶¹ He warned of the dangers of enforced celibacy and the prohibition on priestly marriage, which he claimed were laws instigated in Rome. He reiterated German histories, in which priests were allowed to marry, and he saw a similar situation in England.⁶² This is the same argument that the German ambassadors had used to Henry in August 1538. It did not seem that the Lutherans were demanding change on priestly marriage, as it was not an article necessary to salvation. Melanchthon blamed those who violated human traditions and concluded that it was not only the public peace of the state, but also the fragile consciences of believers that had to be considered.⁶³ Even though human law forbids marriage of priests, the reform-minded clergy in England would regard Scripture's stipulation as above human law and consider priestly marriage as adiaphora, as did the continental Reformers. Henry wanted to be Catholic, not in the Roman sense but in the sense that "Catholic" was understood in the early church based on patristic authority.

Melanchthon wrote to Henry on March 26, 1539, asking the king to condemn the pope's tyranny and to form a consensus of doctrine as the Reformation churches had done. This would encourage other nations to join the reform and preserve tranquility in the churches. Melanchthon assured Henry that, if he defended a just cause, God would protect him.⁶⁴ First, Melanchthon praised the king for removing many impious idols from England and then he encouraged Henry

⁵⁸ Prescribing Rites and Ceremonies, Pardoning Anabaptists. Westminster, 26 February 1539, 30 Henry VIII. *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, Vol. I. No. 188, pp. 278–280.

⁵⁹ Limiting Exposition and Reading of Scripture. April 1539, 30 Henry VIII. *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, Vol. I. No. 191, pp. 284–286.

⁶⁰ MBW R 2: MBW T 8, 2175, pp. 385–386.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 389.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 387.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 386.

⁶⁴ Cleopatra, E. 5, p. 239; Srype, Vol. VI, No. CI, pp. 148–150. CR III, 1788, pp. 671–672. Schofield 2006, p. 115.

to do the same with other papal abuses. In a diplomatic way, he criticized the king for allowing the rites as described in the Ten Articles and dismissed them as nonsensical superstition.⁶⁵ However, Melanchthon did tolerate rites that might be motivated by conscience or those that maintained the tranquility of the church and were not against Scripture.⁶⁶ Melanchthon argues that human laws cannot make divine mandate obsolete; for instance, celibacy cannot be made law to those who are not suited to it. In England, the reform-minded clergy would regard Scripture as above human law and regard marriage of priests as adiaphora, as did the continental Reformers. Thus, Melanchthon appealed directly to Henry to again consider the adiaphora issues: the doctrine of adiaphora can be practiced only in a true church in which human traditions do not bind consciences. He accepted Henry's educational program, the purpose of which was to teach the difference between things necessary and not necessary to salvation and was much less committed to compromises. At first Henry had introduced some of the adiaphora matters in his proclamations, as if not answering the question on "binding conscience."

Melanchthon claimed that it would be prudent for the governors of churches, referring to Henry as the head of the church, to obstruct new sophistries or bring additional interpretations to rituals. He also said that divinely established rites and useful human ordinations for good order should be kept, but that useless and foolish rituals should be rejected.⁶⁷ Monastic vows, according to Melanchthon, were against the divine commandment and should not be defended. The abuse of the Mass, the worship of saints, and priestly celibacy had increased the wealth of monasteries, which had given rise to moral corruption. Melanchthon compared this custom to the practice of the kingdom of the Antichrist, whose laws were to be opposed.⁶⁸ Most of the English monasteries were being dissolved, vows had become invalid in the process, monks had become secular clergy, and many of them became reform-minded bishops. Melanchthon pleaded for the proper use of old customs, not their abolition.

Melanchthon also reminded Henry of ancient kings who had removed superstitious and ominous rituals and gained great victories, and exhorted Henry to remove the Roman impiety from the English Church. Melanchthon reminded Henry of a danger that the fanatical opinions of the Anabaptists in Belgium had caused when attempting to extinguish true religion.⁶⁹ Melanchthon was truly concerned with the well-being of the English Church. Again Melanchthon recognized Henry as the supreme head of the church and he appealed to Henry's kingly powers as a God-appointed governor with the authority to decide on the correct rituals according to the custom of the universal church (what they called the Catholic Church).

Melanchthon's vehement attack on Roman abuses at this time should also be seen in the context of the discussions taking place in Germany. The princes and their Erasmian counselors were confessionally neutral and interested in negotiated settlement. Their aim was to have the Church Fathers as the standard for doctrine and practice. Melanchthon refused, as he was too well aware of how the "papal abominations" were cloaked with the authority of the ancient

⁶⁵ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2175, pp. 385–389; CR III, 1792, pp. 681–685.

⁶⁶ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2175, pp. 382–384; CR III, 1792, pp. 679–681.

⁶⁷ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2175, p. 387.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 387–388.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 388–389.

church, instead of the supremacy of Scripture over the traditions of the Church Fathers. Melanchthon was even invited to a meeting to rethink the abuses, based on humanist, jurist, and theologian Johannes Gropper's *Enchiridion Christianae Institutionis* (1538) at Cologne. Gropper proposed reunion of the churches, but Melanchthon declined to attend.⁷⁰

Renewed Contacts with the Germans

In considering various reasons why Henry changed his position in the course of the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations, one must consider the initial reasons for Henry's interest in the German Lutherans—to maintain a traditional outlook in religion and reform on his terms.⁷¹ He wanted support from those who opposed the pope to prevent the General Council. As has been seen in his discussions with Cranmer in 1537 and his subsequent correspondence with the German embassy in 1538, he made his opposing beliefs known.

The religious negotiations ended in 1538. The new attempt to connect with the Germans was political. In March and April, Cromwell turned again to the Schmalkaldic League for help. This time, Robert Barnes was sent to the King of Denmark, and Christopher Mont and Thomas Paynell were sent to the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse to negotiate for war supplies, and to ask the Germans to provide war experts. Cromwell instructed Mont to tell the Germans that he would try to persuade Henry to join the Schmalkaldic League and that they should send another legation to England.⁷² At this same time, Edward Carne and Nicholas Wotton were sent to continue marriage negotiations with the Duke of Cleves regarding his daughter, Anne.⁷³ At this time, it seems that Cromwell's connection to the Schmalkaldic League was politically motivated. Schofield finds that the timing of the embassy to Germany was not favorable, since the Schmalkaldic League was not accepting new members for eighteen months, which would exclude Henry even if he subscribed to the *Confessio Augustana* as the Germans had hoped all these years. Another setback was Cromwell's illness at the time of their arrival.⁷⁴

The renewed negotiations have to be seen as Cromwell's initiative to gain political support against possible aggression of the emperor and the pope. It is also clear that both religion and politics were intertwined. New proposals were presented, and there was no further discussion of the issues that the English and Germans disagreed on and had left unresolved in 1538. The changed political situation dictated the things that needed to be discussed. Cromwell's motivation and hope was that Henry would still join the Schmalkaldic League; he dismissed Henry's insensitive request and protected his own weakened position and his unfamiliarity with the previous negotiations. It was clear that the Schmalkaldic League would not take new members, and the condition to accept the *Confessio Augustana* was not agreeable to Henry anyway.

⁷⁰ See Estes 2005, pp. 140–144.

⁷¹ Schofield 2006, p. 117; See also Bernard 2005, pp. 228–243, 281–291.

⁷² L&P, XIV, Pt. 1, No. 103, pp. 40–41; No. 157, p. 57.

⁷³ Cromwell to Christopher Mont and Thomas Paynell. March 22, 1539; Vit.B. xxi, f. 159. *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. 2, No. 300, pp. 202–207; L&P, XIV, Pt. 1, Nos. 441–444, p. 176. No. 445, p. 177; No. 489, p. 191; No. 490, pp. 191–193; No. 738, p. 359.

⁷⁴ Schofield 2006, pp. 116–117.

Melanchthon had firm hopes that the German ambassadors would be able to change the religious situation in England, even though he also knew the obstacles that might hinder them. He wrote about these obstacles to his friends Joachim Camerarius and Justus Jonas on April 5, 1539. There were plans for a convention at Nuremberg to discuss doctrinal matters and the corrections needed in the churches, but Melanchthon wrote that all these plans were full of fraud and pretext on the enemy's side. The emperor's orator had declared that no one should allow the Saxon Reformers into the meeting.⁷⁵ Melanchthon paid equal attention to the current political situation in his correspondence, as he was aware of the discussions in Rome regarding war plans against Germany or England. He closely monitored the peace negotiations between the emperor and the French king. He was also well aware of the political implications for church life and practices, not only in Germany but universally, and mentioned to Justus Jonas that Christopher Mont and his colleague had left for England.⁷⁶

Johan Frederick, The Elector of Saxony, pursued again an alliance for political reasons, as he needed to know Henry's contribution for defense and what the king expected from them. He had to convince Henry that the emperor did not like him to lead foreign policy as it caused mistrust on both sides. The Germans, especially Melanchthon, indicated that the Saxon Reformers had hoped that the four disputed articles would be discussed in England. He also made Henry aware of the changed situation in Germany and assured him that the Saxon leaders continued to profess new doctrine and that they opposed the pope in case Henry had any doubts about it. The Saxon Reformers clearly wished to conclude the religious negotiations that began in 1536, but each player had a different goal and, without proper coordination, the discussion did not produce any tangible results on religious matters.

Melanchthon knew that permission to send a German embassy to England depended on the elector and, on April 4, 1539, the Elector of Saxony wrote to Henry explaining his political position, that the emperor was not pleased with their doctrinal stance. He dispelled any doubts that the Germans supported the pope's tyranny, even though in public affairs they had to revere the emperor and that the papal faction had tried to incite the emperor against the princes who professed the Christian doctrine. Upon their return in the fall of 1538, the German ambassadors told of Henry's doubts regarding the constancy of the Saxon Reformers because they had been delayed in replying to the king due to the possibility of war. The German ambassadors had praised the king's willingness and responsibility in reforming his church and his good will towards them. The elector, however, stressed the point that the most recent act published in England⁷⁷ did not include any of the articles they had mutually agreed upon during the previous year's negotiations—that the church should be established on the proclamation of the new doctrine to benefit the whole universal church and other nations. He hoped that their disagreements in 1538 and discussions at their initial conference back in 1536 would be resolved regarding the four controversial issues the Mass, the celibacy of priests, monastic vows, and the prohibition of both kinds of the sacrament.⁷⁸

⁷⁵ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2184, pp. 407–408.

⁷⁶ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2185, p. 409; CR III, 1795, p. 688.

⁷⁷ He refers probably either to the April Proclamation or the early stages of the Act of Six Articles.

⁷⁸ Cleop., E. 6, p. 285; Strype, Vol. VI, No. CIII, pp. 151–157.

Approximately three days later, on April 7, Melanchthon wrote to Henry on behalf of the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse regarding the peace negotiations with His Imperial Majesty and King Ferdinand. Since Henry's ambassadors were in Germany, they could report the results of these negotiations upon returning.⁷⁹ Melanchthon's two main exhortations to the king were to protect the well-being of the church and to conserve pious doctrine. If the doctrines were correct, he said, the ceremonies would fall into place.⁸⁰ He assured the king that the Saxon Reformers defended themselves against accusations of disobedience to the emperor while professing their true belief in the authority of the new doctrine and repudiating the authority of the Bishop of Rome. The orator had promised to ratify a treaty with them, but the Reformers soon realized that the orator represented the Bishop of Rome's interests. In their resolution, they promised not to ally themselves or make treaties with anyone else. They assured Henry that they would never have given consent for such a proposal. They asked the king how much he was willing to contribute to their defense and to ascertain what kind of help the king expected of them.⁸¹ This phase of the negotiations seems to have been politically motivated on both sides.

Christopher Mont was still in Germany on April 20, 1539, as is revealed in a letter from Melanchthon to Joachim Camerarius.⁸² Three days later, Melanchthon also wrote to Justus Jonas that peace had been ratified in Nuremberg for a fixed time, as both sides would gather there to negotiate ecclesiastical harmony for the whole of Germany. Melanchthon hoped that the emperor, without the pope's approval, would approve ecclesiastical harmony for the Germans.⁸³ Melanchthon's enthusiasm in his letter seemed to signal that he no longer thought it necessary for a larger embassy to be sent to England, since the Germans had reached a temporary ecclesiastical peace with the Catholics. McEntegart believes that the Germans decided to send only a minor embassy to England because they faced the threat of a Catholic coalition and so, in early April, they opened up the negotiations (which were based on the Cleves' marriage proposal). The minor embassy left for England on April 8, 1539. McEntegart supports the view that Mont tried to secure Melanchthon for the mission to England. Also, Jacob Sturm of Strasbourg still hoped that a delegation would be sent a month earlier and that Melanchthon would join.⁸⁴ He also believes that, even though the Germans were unwilling to send a major embassy to England at that time, both the Landgrave of Hesse and Elector John Frederick were still in favor of establishing an alliance, but not necessarily a religious one.⁸⁵ Political and religious goals intertwined, and the changed political situation in England and on the Continent influenced the end result of negotiations. Thus, Henry pursued his goals based on what he saw as best for the English Church.

⁷⁹ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2187, pp. 411–413.

⁸⁰ Philip Melanchthon to Henry VIII, April 10, 1539. Cleop., E. 5, p. 267; Strype, Vol. VI, No. CII, pp. 150–151.

⁸¹ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2187, pp. 411–413.

⁸² MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2190, pp. 417–418.

⁸³ Philip Melanchthon to Justus Jonas. April 23, 1539. MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2191, pp. 420–421.

⁸⁴ McEntegart 2002, pp. 145–147.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 145–146.

On April 24, 1539,⁸⁶ Cromwell told Henry that the German ambassadors had arrived on the previous day. The delegation included the ambassadors from the Elector of Saxony, Francis Burchard, and ambassadors from the Landgrave of Hesse. Cromwell assured Henry of their friendliness, although he did not yet know their instructions.⁸⁷ It seems that the request for an embassy from Germany had been initiated by Cromwell and was closely related to the arrangement of the Cleves marriage proposal. This is one example of Cromwell's calculated foreign policy that displeased Henry, and may be a reason that Henry lost interest in negotiating further. Cromwell wrote that the Landgrave was content when Henry had promised to abolish abuses, except that the prohibition on the marriage of priests was against true doctrine.⁸⁸ The Landgrave must have referred to the contents of the Proclamation that Henry had published on February 26, 1539. Furthermore, Cromwell told the king that Mont had explained to the ambassadors the reason for the prohibition of priestly marriage and that the king would mitigate its prohibition when the people grew spiritually stronger, as the common people might perceive priests who were not prohibited from marriage as licentious. This could affect the message the priests had to give until the people became stronger in their knowledge of the new doctrine.⁸⁹ This explanation of Mont's seemed to satisfy the German ambassadors, Cromwell said.⁹⁰ He also made Henry aware that the ambassadors did not agree with what Melanchthon had written earlier; namely, those who soften the abuses this way make the abuses grow stronger.

Melanchthon observed that the English bishops followed this kind of pernicious sophistry in the church. "It is important that this sophistry would obscure the truth, which is more useful for lasting peace," Cromwell quoted Melanchthon as saying.⁹¹ Cromwell quoted from two separate opinions: those of the Landgrave's ambassadors and Melanchthon. It was easier for Cromwell to have the ambassadors agree with the position Henry took regarding priestly marriage and have them believe that corrections would be made later, rather than to agree with Melanchthon. Cromwell also mentioned the idea of celibacy being regarded as adiaphora, noting that this position would give no offense to the common people, who were weak in their knowledge of the Scriptures. Furthermore, he passed on to Henry the wishes of the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse that the negotiations not be prolonged. At this point, Cromwell still hoped that Henry would join the Schmalkaldic League, for he felt that the German delegates would be formidable opponents to the Bishop of Rome.⁹² However, Cromwell's hopes were unrealistic and seemed more aimed at protecting his own position, whether or not he was aware of the decision of the Diet of Frankfurt to not take new members. Unfortunately, Cromwell was indisposed at this point and unable to entertain the German ambassadors effectively. The Elector John Frederick had not even received news of their arrival in England and sent a letter to Cromwell on

⁸⁶ Schofield indicates April 23 1539 as the arrival date. Schofield 2006, p. 116.

⁸⁷ Cleop. E. v, f. 185; *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. 2, No. 310, pp. 219–222; L&P, XIV, Pt. 1, No. 844, p. 394; Strype, Vol. VI, No. CIV, pp. 157–160.

⁸⁸ Cleop. E. v, f. 185; *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. 2, No. 310, pp. 220–221; L&P, XIV, Pt. 1, No. 844, p. 394.

⁸⁹ Cleop. E. v, f. 185; *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol. 2, No. 310, pp. 220–221; L&P, XIV, Pt. 1, No. 844, p. 394; Schofield 2006, p. 116.

⁹⁰ Cleop. E. v. f. 185; *Cromwell's Letters*, Vol 2, No. 310, pp. 220–221; L&P, XIV, Pt. 1, No. 844, p. 394.

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Cleop., E. 5, p. 172; *Strype*, Vol. VI, No. CIV, pp. 157–160.

May 18 saying that he had not heard from either of his ambassadors, Francis Burchard and Ludwig von Baumbach, and asked Cromwell to write.⁹³ Henry had really hoped that the delegation sent from Germany would finally include Melanchthon, but it did not. Schofield considers the reasons for this breakdown in Anglo-Lutheran negotiations and ascribes it to what he sees as the Germans' insensitivity to Henry's requests. He finds an additional reason in Tjernagel's arguments that the Germans insisted on Henry's acceptance of the *Confessio Augustana* as the only condition—an-all-or-nothing approach.⁹⁴

In spite of Melanchthon's urging and other negotiations that were taking place regarding adiaphora, Henry used his authority as supreme head of the English Church to wipe out heresy and create uniformity in religion in the unresolved issues of the previous Anglo-Lutheran negotiations. He did not accept the *Confessio Augustana* nor would he agree to any compromise on the conflicting issues, as seen in his letter to the German ambassadors in September 1538. He decided his own course of religious unity, necessitated by the prevailing diversity of opinions and religious factions in the country. McEntegart believes that the one-sided directions of the minor German embassy in 1539 irritated Henry, and that under the Frankfurt Interim, the League could not admit any new members, even though the ambassadors explained that they could arrange a supplementary agreement with Henry.⁹⁵ The rapprochement of Francis and the Saxon Reformers at the Diet of Frankfurt certainly alarmed Henry. The Diet's decision meant that Henry could not join the League even if Henry were to accept the *Confessio Augustana*.⁹⁶ As seen from Henry's statement to the Germans in 1538, it was not likely that Henry would have considered accepting the doctrine of the *Confessio Augustana*, but it seems that the rapport between the emperor and the Germans was alarming to him for political reasons.

This researcher was able to discern Melanchthon's influence on the English on adiaphora matters in two ways: by the historical events in which the documents were produced; and through Melanchthon's thoughts expressed in his correspondence with the king and how it influenced the reform-minded clergy's concept of Christian liberty and ecclesiology when facing tyrannical laws in adiaphora matters.

The Act of Six Articles and Its Implications

When the domestic situation became more alarming after the 1538 negotiations, Henry made up his mind how to proceed to maintain stability in religion and void extreme dissension. In addition, when he again heard the German theological position and their demand that he accept the *Confessio Augustana*, he decided to embark on his own religious course and was personally involved in the final drafting of the bill of the Six Articles. It is clear that the main motivation for publishing the Six Articles was to maintain uniformity in the church. Most of the questions were related to the articles disputed during the Anglos-Lutheran negotiations. The Six Articles should

⁹³ MBW R 2; MBW T 8, 2203, p. 433. McEntegart regards the Imperial peace with the League, i.e. the Frankfurt Interim, as a setback to Henry. The League had diminishing interest in sending a major embassy to England. McEntegart 2002, p. 146.

⁹⁴ Schofield 2006, p. 117.

⁹⁵ McEntegart 2002, p. 157; Schofield 2006, p. 116.

⁹⁶ Schofield 2006, p. 116.

not be seen as a confession of faith, as was the Ten Articles. These questions were acute problems in the English Church at the time, and Henry wanted a quick resolution to them. Diversity of opinion was in evidence on most of those issues that the Germans and the English ambassadors had negotiated in 1536 at Wittenberg and 1538 in London. Ultimately, the debate came down to six issues: 1) Transubstantiation; 2) Marriage of priests; 3) Chastity; 4) Auricular confession; 5) Private Masses; and 6) Communion in both kinds.⁹⁷

On May 5, Parliament appointed a committee of clergymen to settle these religious issues. The committee included bishops who represented both the old and the new learning. Presided over by Cromwell, the committee was unable to reach agreement on the doctrinal and ceremonial issues.⁹⁸

The debate was phrased as follows:

1. Whether there be in the Sacrament of the Altar the substance of bread and wine into the substance of flesh and blood or not.
2. Whether priests may marry by the law of God or not.
3. Whether the vow of chastity of men and women bindeth by the law of God or not.
4. Whether auricular confession be necessary by the law of God or not.
5. Whether Private Masses may stand with the word of God or not.”
6. Whether the word of God made it necessary for the sacrament of the altar to be ministered under both kinds or not.⁹⁹

Parliamentary laws were the king’s stronghold to root out any heretical opinions in religion and maintain his supremacy as head of the church, and the purpose of the proclamation in November 1538 was to unify the nation in religion.¹⁰⁰ It was repeated in February 1539 and again in April 1539, by exhorting his subjects to read the Scriptures in English so that they could understand the adiaphora matters for themselves and avoid hypocritical superstitious papal rites.¹⁰¹ However, the conservatives had a majority voice in the court, led by Thomas Howard, the Duke of Norfolk, who wished to keep the old religious ceremonies and customs unchanged. Meanwhile, Cromwell worked hard to get a subservient Parliament that would vote for the king’s cause.¹⁰² When Parliament met from April 28 to June 28 1539, a bill was introduced to “extinguish diversities of opinions by law.”¹⁰³

⁹⁷ An act abolishing diversity in opinions, 1539. St. 31 Hen. VIII, c. 14. *English Historical Documents 1485–1558*, vol. 5, pp. 815–816; L&P, XIV, Pt. 1, No. 1063, p. 489.

⁹⁸ L&P, XIV, Pt. 1, No. 1015, p. 468.

⁹⁹ An act abolishing diversity in opinions, 1539. St. 31 Hen. VIII, c. 14. pp. 815–816; L&P, XIV, Pt. 1, No. 1065, pp. 489–490.

¹⁰⁰ Prohibiting Unlicensed Printing of Scripture, Exiling Anabaptists, Depriving Married clergy, Removing St. Thomas à Becket from Calendar. November 16, 1538, 30 Henry VIII. *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, Vol. I. No. 186, pp. 270–276.

¹⁰¹ Prescribing Rites and Ceremonies, Pardoning Anabaptists, February 26, 1539. *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, Vol. I, No. 188, pp. 278–280; Limiting Exposition and Reading of Scripture. April, 1539. *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, Vol. I, No. 191, pp. 284–286.

¹⁰² L&P, XIV, Pt. 1, No. 538, pp. 209–210.

¹⁰³ An act abolishing diversity in opinions, 1539. St. 31 Hen. VIII, c. 14. *English Historical Documents 1485–1558*, vol. 5, pp. 815–816; L&P, XIV, Pt. 1, No. 867, pp. 402–404; No. 868, p. 403.

The Contents of the Six Articles

On June 23, Parliament published the Statute of Six Articles.¹⁰⁴ The king dictated the terms as he wished because he was secure both domestically and internationally, since all the Catholic elements had been destroyed in the country and the pope had failed to issue his bull. No foreign power would have had access to England.

The six articles are as follows:

First, that in the most blessed sacrament of the altar, by the strength and efficacy of Christ's mighty word, it being spoken by the priest, is present really, under the form of bread and wine, the natural body and blood of our Saviour Jesu Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary, and that after the consecration there remaineth no substance of bread and wine, nor any other substance but the substance of Christ, God and man.

Secondly, that communion in both kinds is not necessary *ad salutem*, by the law of God, to all persons, and that it is to be believed, and not doubted of, but that in the flesh, under the form of the bread, is the very blood; and with the blood, under the form of the wine, is the very flesh; as well apart, as though they were both together.

Thirdly, that priests after the order of priesthood received, as afore, may not marry, by the law of God.

Fourthly, that vows of chastity or widowhood by man or woman made to God advisedly, ought to be observed by the law of God, and that it exempteth them from other liberties of Christian people, which without that they might enjoy.

Fifthly, that it is meet and necessary that Private Masses¹⁰⁵ be continued and admitted in this the King's English Church and Congregation, as whereby good Christian people, ordering themselves accordingly do receive both godly and goodly consolations and benefits; and it is agreeable also to God's law.

Sixthly, that auricular confession is expedient and necessary to be retained and continued, used and frequented in the Church of God. For the which most godly study, pain and travail of his Majesty and determination and resolution of the premises, his most humble and obedient subjects, the Lords spiritual and temporal and the Commons in this present Parliament assembled not only render and give until his Highness their most high and hearty thanks.... but also being desirous that his most godly enterprise may be well accomplished and brought to a full end and perfection, and so established that the same might be to the honour of God, and after to the common quiet, unity and concord to be had in the whole body of this realm for ever, most humbly beseechen his royal Majesty that the resolution and determination above written of the said articles may be established and perpetually perfected by authority of this present Parliament.¹⁰⁶

The first article omits the word "transubstantiation," but preserves its content. The second article says that communion in both kinds is not necessary to salvation and presents the doctrine of concomitance, which he wrote to the Germans in 1538. Prohibition of priestly marriage is the third article. In the fourth article, Henry could not speak of monastic vows since most of the monasteries had been dissolved, but he replaced the monastic vows with vows of chastity (to widows); that is, giving a higher regard to virginity, whether a religious or lay person. The fifth article states that private Masses were said to be for the purpose of consolation and benefit of the

¹⁰⁴ Elton 1977, p. 287.

¹⁰⁵ An act abolishing diversity in opinions, 1539. St. 31 Hen. VIII, c. 14. *English Historical Documents 1485–1558*, vol. 5, pp. 815–816.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

receiver. The sixth states that auricular confession is necessary and should be continued. All the articles state that they agree with “God’s law.” Henry had to equate his supremacy law to “God’s law,” another instance that proves his kingship was divinely ordained, as he had claimed.

The belief in the practice of receiving communion in both kinds was a matter of interpretation by both parties based on their exegesis, either grounded in Scripture alone or Scripture and Tradition (extra-scriptural tradition). Although Melanchthon would have taken a different position on three of the articles (Of Both Kinds, Marriage of Priests, and Vows of Chastity), as seen in his ecumenical proposal to France in 1534, he probably would have accepted that Henry’s present position was necessary at that time for political reasons in England. Since these articles, in his mind, concerned only ceremonial matters and did not affect the core doctrine of salvation, he would have interpreted them as “things indifferent” based on church law. The complication was that both secular and church laws were intertwined and submitted to parliamentary decision, which Melanchthon opposed. In fact, Melanchthon did not explicitly deny transubstantiation in the *Advice* of 1534. He also accepted communion in either kind during the transitional period of Reformation. Vows were obsolete because monasteries were being dissolved. Celibacy and private Masses were stipulated under parliamentary law. English adiaphorists believed that government would handle adiaphora matters. As seen from Melanchthon’s discussions with the king, he opposed the idea that human law can stipulate adiaphora matters. According to Melanchthon, human laws bind consciences. This is a shift in his position from 1534, when he was willing to compromise on adiaphora matters for the sake of peace and unity.

Some of the content of the Six Articles includes: In the Sacrament of the Altar article, the word “transubstantiation” was dropped, giving a wider view of opinions on both sides. Henry had not said that communion in both kinds was wrong—under certain conditions he had approved the practice; but it was not the only way of communion “by God’s law.” He focused on whether God required communion in both kinds or whether there was an element of choice. Concerning priestly marriage, he said that man could not have a divided allegiance to wife and God. Thus, priests may not marry by the law of God. This decision based on vows made to God already appeared in the November proclamation (1538) and was probably influenced by the conservative Bishop Tunstall. Vows had been connected to the prohibition of the marriage of priests since the monasteries had been dissolved.¹⁰⁷ Concerning the private Mass, one of the main obstacles for Henry was the fact that he would not accept reform doctrine. The question was whether private Masses were necessary by divine law. It included a clause “to stande with the law of God.”¹⁰⁸ Schofield notes the addition “by the law of God,” reflecting Henry’s beliefs that he was more Scriptural than the Lutherans.¹⁰⁹ The addition “by God’s law” made the interpretation even more complex as Parliament law promulgated the prohibition of priestly marriage.

¹⁰⁷ Schofield 2006, p. 120.

¹⁰⁸ An act abolishing diversity in opinions, 1539. St. 31 Hen. VIII, c. 14. *English Historical Documents 1485–1558*, pp. 815–816.

¹⁰⁹ Schofield 2006, p. 120.

The Articles concerned those issues that the English and German negotiators could not agree upon in 1536 and 1538.¹¹⁰ McEntegart argues that the Six Articles were the end point of the Schmalkaldic negotiations, and Bernard sees it as a mistake to consider the Six Articles as a reversal of royal policy or a result of factional policy. He sees the publication of the Six Articles as evidence of Henry VIII seeking unity and concord,¹¹¹ and this author agrees with him. McEntegart speaks of a conservative reaction already evident in the November proclamation in 1538, plus Henry's unchanging views of the other disputed articles, but he does not imply that the Act of Six Articles was motivated by outside international pressures. He further points out that initially the Act began life as a one-article piece of legislation against popular heresies concerning the Sacrament of the Altar. Therefore, he calls the act an evolution of one plus five articles. The most severe penalties were attached to the first article. But unlike the first article, the other five articles represented some degree of conservative reaction. Bernard questions the factional interpretation of the Six Articles. This author agrees with Bernard, who also sees the articles as evidence of the king's purpose to seek unity and concord.¹¹²

For the reform-minded clergy, the Six Articles could be tolerated if justification by faith had not been obliterated. The article of justification by faith was in effect in the Ten Articles and in the Bishops' Book. Based on their belief in it and confessing the authority of Scripture, they could bear the difficult situation and tolerate the Catholic ceremonies and traditions. But at the same time, they continued to maintain the Christian liberty of *adiaphora* in the things that had yet to be resolved.

Referring to content, McEntegart regards Henry's insistence on private Masses as a sign of his Catholic orthodoxy.¹¹³ Eppley has the opposite view, quoting Starkey, that the Act dealt with questions of *adiaphora* that had been made compulsory by statute law. In his opinion, indifferent beliefs and practices were to be regulated by government authorities in each Christian nation. Indifferent things belonged to the worldly and political realm and were to be regulated by human laws enacted by the king and Parliament. Starkey further regards uniformity in matters of *adiaphora* as political unity, which is maintained through obedience to civil authorities in all matters of *adiaphora*. Eppley quotes St. German, saying that the validity of the king in Parliament ordering the affairs of the church is the same as conformity to divine law.¹¹⁴ The questions presented in the Act of Six Articles dealt with specific issues on which the English and the Germans disagreed. McEntegart further argues that the Act was only a phase in the Anglo-Schmalkaldic relationship and not a conservative reaction.¹¹⁵ Tjernagel finds that Henry failed to keep the agreement made four years earlier, in 1536.¹¹⁶ Schofield notes that Henry did not hold the orthodox view of the medieval private Masses, but in his letter to the Germans discussed their use for confession of sins, prayers for mercy, and an opportunity to make offering as a

¹¹⁰ WTA 1536, pp. 58–79; Thirteen Articles, 1538, Hardwick, 1895, Appendix II, pp. 261–276; The Six Articles, 1539. *Cranmer's Memorials*, Vol. I, No. XIX, pp. 103–109.

¹¹¹ McEntegart 2002, pp. 163–166; Bernard. 2005, pp. 498–500.

¹¹² Bernard 2005, 497–498; McEntegart 2002, pp. 140, 166.

¹¹³ McEntegart 2002, pp. 159–161.

¹¹⁴ Eppley 2007, pp. 44, 46, 76.

¹¹⁵ McEntegart 2002, p. 166.

¹¹⁶ Tjernagel 1965, pp. 194–195.

living sacrifice to God to correct one's life and confirm faith in Christ. He changed the purpose of the private Masses.

Discussion on Implications of the Six Articles

Schofield thinks that, in publishing the Six Articles, Henry comes across as ecumenical.¹¹⁷ This author concurs, as Henry allows latitude as how to enforce each of these articles, thus giving opportunity to the conservatives and the reform-minded clergy to interpret the Mass according to their respective beliefs. Indicating that both kinds of belief are not necessary left the doors open, as did Melancthon in 1534 (Chapter Two). The private Masses are to be for consolation and not a specific doctrinal statement. Vows refer to widowhood and priests, and not monastic vows. The orthodox article of prohibition of the marriage of priests remained as one of the medieval customs prevailing during Henry's reign until 1539. Schofield has competently analyzed each of the diverse points of the Six Articles. From the political perspective, Schofield thinks this shows that Henry did not want to depart from the Lutherans, but did not wish to show orthodoxy either.¹¹⁸ This author disagrees, since neither the negotiations in 1536 nor in 1538 produced an official form of doctrine that the parties had agreed upon. In fact, only the first of the Six Articles, namely, the Sacrament of the Altar, had caused domestic disturbances (especially at Calais),¹¹⁹ which could have been interpreted as heretical opinion. Redworth supports that the Six Articles was direct response to unrest in Calais.¹²⁰ The rest of the Articles concerned those issues that the English and German negotiators could not agree upon in 1536, 1538, or 1539.¹²¹ McEntegart argues that Henry's own views and interpretations had not been clearly seen in the first two years after the break from Rome because the divorce and succession questions dominated his mind.¹²² The Sacrament of the Altar may have been connected to the Lambert and Calais cases, but the other five were opposed by a small group of people around the king.¹²³

McEntegart believes that neither foreign Catholic pressure nor foreign authority had anything to do with English religious affairs during the publication of the Act of Six Articles. He considers interpretations adducing foreign influence as reflecting a deterministic view of historiography, and argues further that the Six Articles were the end point of the Schmalkaldic negotiations.¹²⁴ Bernard sees it as a mistake to consider the Six Articles a reversal of royal policy or a result of factional policy, but it is evidence of Henry's search for unity and concord.¹²⁵ Eppley finds a connection between the Act of Six Articles and the Supremacy Act identifying

¹¹⁷ Schofield 2006, pp. 121–122.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ Cromwell to Lord Lisle, May 27, 1539. Slavin 1969, No. 74, pp. 194–197; SP 1/151, No. 151, Fols. 16–162.

¹²⁰ Glyn Redworth: "A Study in the Formulation of Policy: The Genesis and Evolution of the Act of Six Articles." In *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 37(1) 1986, 53 (hereafter, Redworth 1986).

¹²¹ WTA 1536, pp. 58–79; Thirteen Articles, 1538, Hardwick, 1895, Appendix II, pp. 261–276; The Six Articles, 1539. *Cranmer's Memorial*, Vol. I, No. XIX, pp. 103–109.

¹²² McEntegart 2002, pp. 38–39.

¹²³ Ibid., p. 164.

¹²⁴ Ibid., pp. 6, 163–166.

¹²⁵ Bernard. 2005, pp. 498–500.

the king's responsibility to promulgate right doctrine and maintain unity.¹²⁶ The Act affirmed the issues that had divided the church into opposing opinions in doctrine and practice. The crown in Parliament had settled such disputes before. Henry used this same technique in order to maintain orthodoxy. McEntegart finds that the Act of Six Articles was published as a result of Cromwell being ill and the German delegation being willing to discuss religious issues. In his opinion, the promulgation of the law addressed a domestic problem, with diversity of opinion (especially in Calais) that required legislation. He also thinks that the king was influenced by his councilors. It may have been a short-term solution, but Henry had also decided the long-term course by which he would lead his kingdom into adiaphora legislation.¹²⁷ Redworth rightly argues that the Act of Six Articles was a culmination of a developing policy of conservatism, after Henry had made clear his position to the German embassy in 1538, and considers that Tunstall designed them as he was well aware of the articles that were discussed with the Lutherans.¹²⁸

Tjernagel asserts that the intention of this Parliament was to correct abuses that had sprung up in the diversity of opinion over Scripture. The king did not intend to take sides, and a commission was chosen that represented both old and new learning. Since no agreement was reached, the Duke of Norfolk presented the six questions to Parliament on May 16, 1539. All the questions were issues on which Henry and the Lutherans had taken widely divergent views. Tjernagel sees the Act of Six Articles as a failure to create an alliance through the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations. This view is opposed by modern scholarship, including this author. Henry did not seriously attempt an alliance on the German terms; that is, subscribing to the *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia*.¹²⁹ McEntegart strongly suggests that Henry VIII was still interested in consultation on disputed points of doctrine, intending to reach agreement, but was waiting for a more impressive legation to be sent to England.¹³⁰ This author agrees that the Six Articles were connected to the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations and expressed Henry's views on the disputed points. McEntegart argued that the conservative essence of the Act emerged as a culmination of the negotiations with the Germans—Henry's consequential legislative decision on the abused articles that was not agreed upon. He argues that the conservative essence of the act emerged as a result of those negotiations with the Schmalkaldic League. Because the Germans sent only a minor embassy to England in 1539, Henry was persuaded that the Germans had no further interest in theological negotiation and led him to put forward a parliamentary settlement of the five controversial issues that had surfaced in 1538.¹³¹ This author disagrees, since after the 1538 negotiations, Henry made up his mind how to proceed, as the domestic situation had become more alarming.

The proposal for the Six Articles was not reinforced by doctrinal statements. Henry's very conservative view is seen in enforcing vows on religious who had left monasteries as the monastery system fell under civil legislation; therefore, vows should not have bound them any

¹²⁶ Eppley 2007, pp. 6–7, 9.

¹²⁷ McEntegart 2002, pp. 155, 157.

¹²⁸ Redworth 1986, pp. 45–46, 54.

¹²⁹ Tjernagel 1982, pp. 107–108, 137–138.

¹³⁰ McEntegart 2002, p. 151; Schofield 2006, pp. 118–124.

¹³¹ McEntegart 2002, p. 166.

longer. Even though most of the articles included the points that the English and the Germans had negotiated throughout 1536-1538, without a doctrinal statement one could not ascribe a confessional value to them. Melanchthon opposed them because parliamentary law promulgated them, and he argued that human laws could not bind consciences. The reform-minded clergy experienced the Articles as a tyrannical law to one's conscience. The publication of the Six Articles must have changed Melanchthon's belief as to how far the king should involve civil magistracy to influence doctrinal and practical changes in the church. Initially Melanchthon endorsed great powers for Christian kings to maintain right doctrine and practice in the church. As seen in his correspondence with Henry, his attitude had changed and he warned the king of impious practices that were quite the opposite of what he believed the king should have done. Interpreting the Six Articles as a confessional statement, as Schofield has suggested, would not give full value to the historical development.¹³² The articles need to be evaluated within the historical context of the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations and within the framework of the situation in England in 1539. Henry's goal was unification in religion, and as Defender of the Faith he saw it as his responsibility to make a statement that would prevent further dissenting opinions in the English Church.

At the time of the publication of the Six Articles, Henry's purpose was to unite the nation in religion. The reform-minded clergy regarded the ceremonies published in the Act as adiaphora, according to their belief in the authority of Scriptures in matters of faith and practice. The conservative clergy, who held the authority of Scripture and Tradition, accepted the stipulations of the law. Since in the Mass ceremony the *lex orandi–lex credendi* principle remained in church practice, both parties could interpret the Mass based on their belief in either Scripture alone or Scripture and Tradition. Certainly the reform-minded clergy's understanding of adiaphora was at stake.¹³³ They would still hold on to their belief in justification by faith, as expressed in the Bishops' Book, but at the same time had to tolerate the burden of the prohibitions of the Six Articles, with ceremonies against their understanding of the authority of Scripture. The conservative clergy would accept the Six Articles as part of their belief in Tradition, which they regarded as equal in authority to the Scriptures. One can see that the Six Articles were the first phase in the development of the Anglican *via media*. In the interpretation of the Six Articles, both reform-minded and conservative clergy were able to locate their respective beliefs, since the articles tried to unite two opposing views on the practice of adiaphora. Melanchthon's influence can be seen in the pressure that reform-minded clergy used to influence Henry to find a balance between both parties' opinions while holding on to his doctrine and practices on adiaphora.

The Act of Six Articles has been traditionally interpreted as a Catholic reaction, as international isolation and domestic conditions prompted the king to take a more inflexible stance against radical religious innovations, seeking a more traditionalist image. English isolation had again been reinforced in early 1539 by yet another treaty between Charles V and Francis I—the Treaty of Toledo.¹³⁴ This McEntegart calls a deterministic historiography, in which Henry's maneuverings were dictated by the other monarch's political moves. However, as

¹³² Schofield 2006, pp. 90–112.

¹³³ MBW R 2; MBW T 6, No. 1467, pp. 137–139; CR II, 1205, pp. 743–745.

¹³⁴ See Andrew Chibi: *Henry VIII's Conservative Scholar*. 1997, pp. 151, 164, 166.

stated above, the interpretation of the Act as moving the English Church closer to Catholic orthodoxy has been challenged by recent historiography, which draws attention to the issues of domestic and foreign discontent, continental pressure, and the need to placate the conservatives and thereby strengthen the national front against the pope.¹³⁵

The Act of Six Articles demonstrated a conclusion of the current phase of Anglo-Lutheran negotiations. Since the Germans sent only a minor embassy to London in 1538, its theologians were too inexperienced to discuss concessions, as Melanchthon did in 1536, and probably did not know that the English bishops did not have the authority to define doctrine, so negotiations were prolonged in vain. Hence they appealed to the king, who had to declare his beliefs in the face of pressure from the Germans to accept their new doctrine in the *Confessio Augustana*.

The articles that Melanchthon sent to France in 1534 were possibly in use in England in 1539. Whether any of those articles were available to either party remains to be studied, especially on the question of communion in both kinds. Melanchthon stressed a freedom of opinion in its use during the transitional period of doctrinal development of the Reformation. He suggested that the kings of England and France hold a synod and discuss at least the most controversial issues, such as private Masses and marriage of the priests. Melanchthon's position on communion in both kinds was freedom of practice—that is, a leniency on both sides because he did not want offend either side, as long as there was agreement in doctrine. As long as the doctrine of justification by faith—published earlier in 1536 in the Ten Articles and transferred with a slight bent toward the Catholic view into the Bishops' Book in 1537—remained in effect during the discussions in 1539, the English Church had established its doctrinal position on justification favorable to Melanchthon.¹³⁶

Conclusion

The German and the English negotiations concluded with the publication of the Six Articles. The political matters leading to the publication of the Six Articles are manifold. The lack of communication between Henry and the Saxon Reformers, after the negotiations in London 1538, caused misunderstanding of the expectations on both sides. Henry faced the threat of the pope's bull and had to deal with Catholic monarchs to prevent the bull. Cromwell, whose goals were political, miscalculated the foreign threat and initiated discussions with the Saxon Reformers. Even though the Schmalkaldic League would not take any new members, Cromwell still hoped that Henry would accept the *Confessio Augustana*. Henry wanted a major embassy to discuss the issues that led to breakdown of negotiations in 1538. Melanchthon changed his views on adiaphora as a result of his further negotiations with the Catholics, and wrote several letters to Henry and the reform-minded clergy to demand the reversal of the politics that eventually led to the publication of the Six Articles. Melanchthon wrote that the adiaphora matters could only be understood within the context of the ecclesiology that had developed. The Six Articles did not have sufficient doctrinal reinforcement, if one does not include the three sacraments from the Ten Articles of 1536. The Ten Articles implicitly included both kinds as part of the sacrament of

¹³⁵ McEntegart 2002, p. 6.

¹³⁶ A 10 1536, p. 243; BB 1537, p. 209.

the altar; now Henry rescinded the previous doctrine of the sacrament but did not substantiate any new doctrine in the Six Articles. Henry's conservative stance is evidenced by the enforcement of vows on religious that became obsolete during the dissolution. He especially saw the marriage of priests as the greatest obstacle in England and the fact that parliamentary laws dictated adiaphora matters. Even though Melancthon's letters mitigated the effects of the Six Articles, they would not change the course of Henry's actions. Melancthon had been lenient in his former negotiations and may have accepted many of the Six Articles. However, when the English Parliament made rulings on adiaphora into statute law and things not necessary to salvation became necessary and binding on conscience, he would no longer accept the controversial issues, as they had become binding on consciences. His view was opposite to the view of many English adiaphorists, who allowed the government to decide on adiaphora. In addition, the Parliament and ecclesiastical laws intertwined, and, in each case, their interpretation had to be seen within the context of the particular situation.

The articles that the German and English envoys discussed and failed to agree upon during the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations demonstrated Henry's position on adiaphora matters. The adiaphora matters had previously been stipulated by canon law, but now were covered by secular law. To the reform-minded clergy, the law was a burden to their consciences and against Christian liberty. The conservative clergy believed in Scripture and Tradition for exegetical purposes; therefore the ceremonies were part of doctrine and bound consciences by law. The ceremonies were interpreted according to the *lex orandi—lex credendi* principle, and both sides could interpret their doctrine on adiaphora based on belief in justification by faith as stated in the Ten Articles and in the Bishop's Book. The reform-minded clergy believed in the doctrine of justification by faith in the Ten Articles of 1536 and the Bishops' Book of 1537. They held on to Melancthon's understanding of adiaphora and Christian liberty in matters of human traditions and church laws, and hence had to bear Henry's tyrannical law. The Six Articles were not a doctrinal statement because the doctrine of Ten Articles was still held as the official doctrine of the English Church. The General Council remained the highest authority for the church's belief and practices, and its authority was not eliminated by the Anglo-Lutheran discussions from 1536 through 1539. Reasons for this conclusion can be traced to a lack of communication between the English and the Germans, and the different concepts regarding the church's authority in the use of ecclesiastical law, influencing decisions on doctrine and practice. Any new innovations in doctrine and practice could also be seen as a threat, as the national churches experimented with their cultural, political, and confessional identities, while at the same time integrating doctrinal innovations.

Conclusions

This study addressed Philip Melanchthon's consistent contribution to English theological thought on the doctrine of adiaphora in the framework of justification by faith, and the disputed articles on which Catholics and Protestants could not agree at Augsburg. I addressed the following topics in which Melanchthon made significant contributions: the disputed articles of the power of the bishops, the marriage or celibacy of priests, monastic vows, the Mass, and communion in both kinds in the Lord's Supper. All of these articles are viewed within the framework of the exegesis of Scripture and Tradition and the doctrine of justification by faith. All other questions involve worship and church law.

A major theme of this research concerned who had authority and how authority affected matters of the church in England and Germany. Henry declaring himself Supreme Head of the Church of England, combined with the effects of the Saxon Reformation, created various issues of authority in continental Europe and in England. Historically, the pope had authority over the church, including matters such as doctrine and liturgy. Church authority became secular in the German territorial churches and there came to be a sharper division between secular and ecclesiastical. Since the country was divided into small city-states and principalities under the Holy Roman Emperor, the Reformation churches were under the secular rule of princes. Therefore, post-Reformation, all the small principalities remained under the rule of the emperor in jurisdictional matters. As a result of Henry's Act of Supremacy and the German Reformation, the pope's divine right became human right. In England, King Henry now had the authority the pope once had. As a result of the new laws in England, the bishops lost ecclesiastical authority, including the right to define doctrine. All doctrine and practice on adiaphora was now determined by the king, who acted as Defender of the Faith. In addition, the English bishops and theologians had no authority to make decisions during the negotiations with the Germans. This prolonged the final discussions regarding adiaphora, so that eventually neither party subscribed to the Wittenberg Articles or the Thirteen Articles. From the perspective of both the German Reformers and the reform-minded clergy in England, justification by faith belonged to scriptural authority and was necessary for salvation. For them, the remainder of church law had become secular and was not of divine authority.

In this dissertation, I compared the article on justification by interpreting the disputed articles within the theological aspect of law that included civil law. I uncovered what is necessary for salvation from both the German Reformers' point of view and that of the reformed-minded clergy in England. It was also necessary to include the articles on veneration of saints and images, as they played an essential role in reorganizing the Mass and on adiaphora. I then discussed the civil magistracy's relation to the church authority in articles that address civil affairs, such as the Wittenberg Articles of 1536 and the Thirteen Articles of 1538. The Ten Articles also spoke of civil works, which were included in the article on justification, and the articles on good works and civil magistracy that were modified from Melanchthon's Wittenberg Articles and *Loci Communes*. I then compared what Melanchthon wrote about these matters in the *Confessio Augustana* of 1530 and the *Loci Communes* of 1535. As author of the *Confessio*

Augustana and the Wittenberg Articles, Melanchthon influenced the English Ten Articles and the Bishops' Book.

In addition, I examined the position of the doctrine of justification by faith and how it was transmitted to the English articles. The doctrine of justification by faith was the central doctrine for understanding the doctrine of adiaphora. The doctrine of justification by faith was transferred from the *Loci Communes* and the Wittenberg Articles; transmitted with additions, omissions, and modifications. The *Loci Communes* was in the possession of the English envoys, who were at Wittenberg in 1536. The Ten Articles of 1536 and the Bishops' Book of 1537 both adopted the doctrine of justification by faith from Melanchthon's *Loci Communes*.

I demonstrated that the conservative bishops in England, when interpreting the doctrine of justification by faith and adiaphora, still believed in Scripture and Tradition. In addition, I also conveyed that the purported conservative reaction from England shown in the Act of Six Articles was, in fact, not meant to be a comprehensive doctrinal statement, but was decided by the king to enforce unity of religion on those who held opposing views and enforced Henry's supreme headship—as the Old Testament kings and former emperors had done. I concluded that Henry actually wanted to be Catholic, in a non-Roman sense, as it was in the early church before the schism between East and West.

Throughout the study, the doctrine of ecclesiology was discussed in the framework of the doctrine of adiaphora. Adiaphora was important for Melanchthon to include when negotiating with various parties, and his own views developed as he faced problems during the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations—opposing the pope's council, writing the Schmalkaldic Articles, and the elector's response when attempting to negotiate with foreign countries. All this made Melanchthon change his approach to defining doctrine and practice in church policy, speaking of the adiaphora issues in the context of ecclesiology. Furthermore, the evangelicals' refusal to attend the pope's council also changed the perspective of Melanchthon's writing, which was implicitly published in the Schmalkaldic Articles in 1537. Melanchthon represented the whole position of the Schmalkaldic League on the authority of the church. Melanchthon noted that, in order for them to preserve jurisdiction over ecclesiastical affairs, Protestant princes were also members of the church, who would protect the faith and restrain impiety. Hence, the idea of "church" changed as the papal church was replaced by local Protestant churches.

Melanchthon's ideas on the doctrine of justification by faith based on the *Loci Communes* were transmitted to the English articles during their mutual conferences that produced both the Wittenberg Articles and the Thirteen Articles. I delineated how Melanchthon's new ideas influenced the reform-minded clergy in England. This influence coincided with the freedom Henry allowed for preaching the new doctrine. Henry had taken away the clergy's power to define doctrine and thereby had weakened the church's overall authority. Furthermore, the push from the German Reformers, especially Melanchthon, created a wider gap between the conservative and reform-minded bishops in England. Melanchthon came to change his position and later stressed that good works were to be seen as significant in the doctrine of justification. He also equated civil magistracy with divine origin, thus approaching and lending strength to Henry's claim that his kingship was of divine origin. It was evident that Melanchthon took a more conciliatory approach in the Wittenberg Articles and in the *Advice*. He still believed that

the Roman Church could be saved if the pope were willing to change the contents of the conflicting ceremonies.

Melanchthon's experience within French, German, and imperial politics, as well as Protestant and Catholic confessional groups, prompted him to write the *Loci Communes* so as to formulate a firm foundation for negotiations between these groups and to avoid misunderstandings. Melanchthon explained his doctrine of justification, his understanding of what constituted the doctrine of adiaphora, and his understanding of law and civil magistracy in this work. Melanchthon differentiated between the spiritual function of the church and secular political life. He based the function of civil magistrates on the law of nature, which judges both good and bad works. Both natural and civil law, he argued, are equal. Melanchthon praised obedience to civil law. Civil law, according to Melanchthon, maintains discipline and piety by its rules and laws.

In the *Loci Communes*, Melanchthon wrote extensively about the power of the church. One of the most important questions during the negotiations between the German and English theologians concerned ecclesiastical power and its relationship to the magistracy. The questions were: which laws defined ecclesiastical power? and how did they relate to secular power? The Saxons were subjects of the Catholic Emperor, but constituted independent electoral principalities in the Holy Roman Empire. The Saxon local churches were emerging under the new leadership of ministers and theologians, under the secular rule of the Elector of Saxony. Melanchthon supported a territorial church system, and in order to resolve any conflict between reformation churches on ecclesiastical power, he divided ecclesiastical administration into ministry, which includes preaching the Gospel and administering the sacraments, and jurisdiction. Ecclesiastical polity encompasses questions related to adiaphora, "things indifferent" and neither necessary to salvation nor binding on consciences, but done in order to preserve good order in the church. Speaking of charity and Christian liberty in relation to various customs and traditions in the church, Melanchthon defined human traditions as those not required by Scripture, those involving order in the church, and erroneous opinions. In matters of salvation humans have to rely on God and true freedom, forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. The Christian liberty to love one's neighbor stems from the true freedom given by the Gospel and defines the adiaphora matters.

In the section on the law, Melanchthon demonstrated the interrelationship of the power of the church to the magistracy, and how the adiaphora matters were interpreted in the context of the church, within the framework of the most essential doctrine of reconciliation. The Wittenberg Articles demonstrated that the duty of the civil magistracy was to protect the right doctrine.

Significant to this study are Melanchthon's understanding of justification by faith and the influence of his writings on the various articles and negotiations. The doctrine of justification by faith that Melanchthon presented in the Wittenberg Articles was to demonstrate to the English that he did not deviate from the old church doctrine; instead he used new concepts in the old structure. For instance, he called the article on justification "Justification and Penance." For the threefold structure of Catholic penance, Melanchthon replaced the second by "faith" and the third by "new obedience."

Melanchthon's doctrine on justification in the *Loci Communes* should be seen the context of other doctrines concerning salvation. In the article called "Grace and Justification," Melanchthon presented the doctrine of salvation in contrition, faith, and new obedience. Melanchthon

presented the forensic nature of justification, which showed that his position had shifted since writing Article IV of the *Confessio Augustana*. This shift was due to the historical situation in which he had to demonstrate that the Reformers had not abandoned the concept of good works when negotiating with their Roman opponents. Christian liberty should prevail in the consciences of the clergy who upheld the doctrine of adiaphora. All this demonstrates that adiaphora matters needed to have a solid doctrinal foundation in the doctrines of reconciliation and ecclesiology. For instance, he did not demand changes in the Mass ceremony. Melanchthon did not deviate from his position in the *Confessio Augustana*, but his experience gave him new insights into how to negotiate this central doctrine with his opponents. Melanchthon followed the medieval church structure in his doctrine of justification, while keeping enough flexibility to allow for new ideas in the English Church.

Melanchthon and the Saxon Reformers believed justification by faith was essential for an individual to achieve reconciliation through grace, and receive forgiveness of sins in Christ and hence God's mercy. The church's power over one's conscience was essentially eliminated, and so adiaphora could be interpreted differently. Instead of believing that the Roman Church or any church had authority to impose a doctrine, divine authority was recast as a reflection of an individual's belief in reconciliation and God's mercy.

Melanchthon rejected the pope's power by divine right, his right to exercise secular jurisdiction, and his authority as necessary to salvation. He relied on the testimony of the Scriptures, while rejecting Roman arguments. He contrasted Christ with the pope and warned that the pope's authority showed signs of the Antichrist. For Melanchthon, divine authority was based on the Scripture alone principle. Even though Melanchthon's addendum to the Schmalkaldic Articles appeared to be open to the Roman Church, it has been argued that his use of the phrase "by human right," was to be interpreted as unifiable, diplomatic language.

Melanchthon then defined his view of the correct understanding of the power and jurisdiction of bishops. The duties of bishops included preaching the Gospel, administering sacraments, and excommunicating persons guilty of public sins. The distinction of grades in the duties of bishops and ministers are human ordinances, not of divine institution. He warned that bishops who followed the pope were defending false doctrines. In the course of formulating the Schmalkaldic Articles, Melanchthon's concept of ecclesiology developed, and it became clear to him that the foundation of the church is not a person, but faith.

It was important for the development of the doctrine of adiaphora to formulate other doctrines besides that of justification by faith. The adiaphora questions could be discussed within the right understanding of ecclesiology. Preferably Melanchthon also wished to include other doctrines, such as reconciliation, pneumatology, and Christology in order to understand the other party's views on those topics. It is worth noting Pannenberg's emphasis, which combines soteriology and Christology as the action of the triune God in reconciliation: the Son and the Spirit cooperated in the act of reconciliation. As the Son offering himself for reconciliation and the Son being offered by the Father are one event, the same divine action of reconciliation. There are three distinct centers of action within God, since the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are the three distinct beings and actions of God. The Spirit completes reconciliation through faith, so that we can accept our finite existence in Jesus Christ and have filial union through Christ with God. The current debate on justification by faith has been transferred from the

individualistic concept of the doctrine to include unity in the church. As the Second Anglican–Roman Catholic International Commission recognized the role of the church in Christ’s saving work in an ecclesiastical context, within its ministry a man is both justified and a sinner *simul iustus et peccator*, through the transformation of the Holy Spirit. Justification by faith is an individual matter, but also belongs to the church, a redeemed community of faith.

In the present-day debates on the doctrine of justification in different cultural and theological traditions, finding a vocabulary that does justice to the original text and its translation requires more thorough knowledge of the theology of both parties. For example, the Joint Declaration of 1999 between Lutherans and Roman Catholics on justification could say the breakthrough occurred when the doctrine of justification was placed in the context of the doctrine of the Trinity. Justification was a doctrine on which the church stood or fell; and must be included in a theological method that includes such doctrines as the knowledge of God, and the Christological components of the incarnation and resurrection. A fully meaningful declaration should include these doctrines—if consensus could be achieved on these issues, practical unity becomes not only symbolic, but also a real possibility.

For instance, the Joint Declaration between Roman Catholics and Lutherans declared a consensus between the two traditions with respect to the doctrine of justification, and no longer reason for condemnation. In the dialogue between Lutherans and Roman Catholics, the most popular differences have been defined as justification by faith versus works. The joint declaration does not discuss the importance of the imputation of Christ’s righteousness; it undermines grace and the power of the gospel and faith alone.

The forensic aspect of Melanchthon’s understanding of the doctrine of justification is seen in the article on justification in the *Loci Communes*. Melanchthon interpreted justification as “reputed righteousness,” and using forensic terms, narrows the concept and insists on the necessity of good works or good conscience; that is, exercising the faith of the justified. The function of law was an integral part of Melanchthon’s thinking. Melanchthon’s division of law influenced his understanding of how good works were related to the doctrine of justification by faith. He divided divine law into three parts, of which he regarded *leges morales* as binding and indicated that it was related to natural law and the Decalogue, as well as moral philosophy. Under divine law, Melanchthon referred to law revealed in Scripture. According to Melanchthon, law reveals what perfect obedience to God should be, although it can only be partially fulfilled because of the Fall. For him the Decalogue is the unchanging part of divine law and shows the principles of natural law. Therefore, one sees good works as necessary, not for salvation, but for Christian life, based on his understanding of natural law. The function of civil magistrates is also based on the natural law, as civil law prevents impious practices and punishes heretics. Here it is shown how Melanchthon assented to Henry’s use of statutory law, using secular courts to punish heretics. In England, however, the use of civil law was an anomaly because one person—the king—had authority over both, which complicated the interpretation of law in doctrine and practice. The third use of law needs to be seen in this context, as belonging to the righteous to practice obedience, but does not threaten consciences and at the same time excludes human works from salvation. The law had lost its accusatory voice, but reveals the remnants of sin and the will of God. Conscience that is made good by God’s gracious declaration follows the law to please God, and for this purpose the third use of law was established.

This interpretation of law was essential for understanding how Melanchthon's influence was detected in the English articles. Understanding Melanchthon's concept of law is reflected in the concept of good works as moral mandates for a justified person. Natural law was key in Melanchthon's concept of law manifested in the Decalogue. His influence was seen as good works were called civil works in the article on justification by faith in the English Articles, as "faith joined with charity." Melanchthon, when speaking of good works as necessary, did not mean them as a condition of salvation but as a consequence. Good works, good conscience, and freedom to love one's neighbor manifested faith in action. Melanchthon's insertion of new concepts into the old structure is seen in his interpretation of the doctrine of justification by faith in a new ecclesiastical environment.

Melanchthon stressed that because of faith in Christ, we freely receive forgiveness and are reconciled with God. It is the promise of the Holy Spirit through faith. The sinner is granted forgiveness because of Christ, not because of works. The inner motion of the soul, or its renewal, Melanchthon calls regeneration. Because Christ satisfied the Father's wrath, the Father imputes righteousness to a believer by trust in the mercy promised on account of Christ. Melanchthon's emphasis was on Christology, even as he emphasized faith alone. The renewal aspect combined with the doctrine of justification easily could be interpreted as a pledge for salvation and not as its consequence, which he actually meant. In his view, the Holy Spirit connects to Christ, and Melanchthon stated that along with justifying faith, there will be other "fruits of the Spirit," including a "new kind of virtue," or a gift of grace. The presence of grace, in his opinion, is evidence that the believer has received the free gift of Christ, or mercy promised through Christ.

The Wittenberg Articles repeats that a sinner is reputed righteous and that justification is total renovation, which both the *Loci Communes* and Wittenberg Articles refer to as *regeneratio*. The Holy Spirit produces a new motion called new faith, new love, and the fear of God, in which one avoids sin and produces good fruit.

The justification by faith in the Ten Articles is seen in the first part of Article V, which speaks of justification in terms of remission of sins and reconciliation or acceptance of the person to eternal life, because of Christ and renovation in Christ. The external righteousness of God is imputed in the remission of sins and a person is reconciled. The sentence in the *Loci Communes* describing the forensic aspect of justification is missing in the Ten Articles, but the renovation aspect is included in a phrase "perfect renovation in Christ." Article IV of the Wittenberg Articles also imputes a person as righteous, an extrinsic work of God, and emphasizes God's grace as free gift. The Bishops' Book follows the Ten Articles' doctrine of justification—that is, "perfect renovation in Christ." The opponents to the new doctrine could accuse the Reformers of the total exclusion of good works from justification. Therefore, Melanchthon's phrase "good works" included within the article on justification should be understood as a defense that the Reformers had not abandoned it altogether. The English Reformers may not have grasped the Saxon Reformers' unique doctrine of justification by faith alone, but at least they accepted the very nature of the doctrine of justification, as Melanchthon stated in the *Loci Communes*: "Justification signifies remission of sins."

We look at how the gracious gift of God in reconciliation is accepted by the believer. The question arises from the statement of the Ten Articles in the phrase "faith conjoined with charity." How are we to interpret "charity" with justification? Are "good works," using

Melanchthon's formulation, or "charity" as expressed in the Ten Articles, parallel or consequential to justification? The phrase "faith joined in charity" is not quite the same as the Catholic concept of faith formed or perfected by charity. If charity is a consequence of faith, it then can be read as Melanchthon wrote in *Loci Communes*, implying that the third use of law is modified in the English ecclesiastical environment. It also connotes obedience to the civil laws and love for one's neighbor.

Therefore it is necessary to compare the structure of the sacrament of penance with that of the Wittenberg Articles. The sacrament of penance in the Ten Articles uses the words "contrition," and "confession," but replaces "satisfaction" with "the amendment of the former life, and new obedient reconciliation unto laws of God." The structure is similar, but the third part follows the idea of "new obedience" expressed in the Wittenberg Articles, the and the *Loci Communes*. However, in Article V of the Ten Articles, "contrition" is combined with "faith," according to Article IV of the Wittenberg Articles. The Bishops' Book follows the Ten Articles, except that the connection of the article on justification by faith to the sacrament of penance in the Bishops' Book involves a significant doctrinal difference from that of the Ten Articles. The Ten Articles states: "As we before mentioned and declared." The Bishops' Book states: "As is before mentioned and declared in the sacrament of penance," using the passive form rather than the first-person plural, and adding the phrase "in the sacrament of penance." The Bishops' Book had adopted the structure from the Wittenberg Articles, as the bishops were able to freely express their belief in the doctrine of reconciliation..

Article IV of the Thirteen Articles, on Justification by Faith, closely follows Melanchthon's section on grace and justification in the *Loci Communes*. Some of the phrases are copied verbatim from the *Loci Communes* and many others are similar. Both documents agree that justification signifies remission of sins and acceptance to eternal life, and the renewal aspect is emphasized. The forensic aspect is omitted, and faith is emphasized similar to the Wittenberg Articles. The Holy Spirit brings new virtues and good works, renewal and regeneration. The Thirteen Articles also derived directly from the *Confessio Augustana*; that is, God imputes faith righteousness in his sight. This is remarkable, since in this doctrine, one sees the elector's ambassadors demanding the doctrine of the *Confessio Augustana* as a basis for the negotiations in 1538. The one-sided push for a doctrinal stance by the German Reformers created a gap in which mutual negotiations could not continue. However, the German influence via the English translation of the *Confessio Augustana* was evident in the private conferences of the English bishops on adiaphora matters.

The doctrine of justification was important in reinforcing the doctrine of adiaphora during the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations, and eventually its influence was transmitted to the English articles. The concept of good works that Melanchthon included in the doctrine of justification was changed in England because the law was understood differently. As the citizens had to obey the supremacy laws, good works became civil works that were included in the articles of justification by faith. The Ten Articles states that inner obedience is manifested in "inward motions" and "outward civil works."

I now address adiaphora matters and who had authority to decide on them. The major focus of Melanchthon's work was adiaphora, or those human traditions and rites that are not necessary to salvation, as noted in his *Confessio Augustana*. He concluded that only the rituals of religious

practice divided Roman Catholics and Protestants. The adiaphora of interest are the five disputed articles: the power of the bishops; the marriage or celibacy of priests; monastic vows; the Mass; and communion in both kinds. These were examined within the framework of Scripture and Tradition and the doctrine of justification by faith.

The question of authority in each phase of negotiations influenced the acceptance or rejection of adiaphora matters. The authority question had to do with whether parliamentary laws bound consciences and to what extent they allowed individual liberties in the church. In the Ten Articles, the king was supreme head, with power over bishops, and used parliamentary law to enforce his decisions on doctrine and practice. The reform-minded clergy's position, along with the German Reformers, was that authority should remain with Scripture alone as divine law in the doctrine of adiaphora. The *Confessio Augustana* may have influenced the English bishops to conduct a private meeting without the king, in which they expressed their views on adiaphora matters after the 1538 conference in London. In the end, Henry allowed English bishops to define doctrine based on the *Confessio Augustana* in the Bishops' Book. This process is delineated below.

In the first year of Henry's reign, he had sole power to decide doctrine and practice in the English Church. He had delegated the authority also to lay leader Thomas Cromwell. The problem arose of how to interpret the Mass, as now statute laws replaced canon laws; however, Mass ceremony remained the same. The change of laws influenced the authority of the General Council, of the pope, the English bishops, and reform-minded clergy on adiaphora questions and their interpretation in various situations of the negotiations. Safeguarding his authority in the newly formed English Church, Henry did not allow clergy to preach any of the adiaphora matters. Two religious factions had different understandings of authority, and Henry had to maintain balance between supremacy and religious reform. In order to learn more about how to reform and at the same time maintain this balance, Henry contacted Melancthon because he found him the ablest of the Reformers; he had helped Henry personally in private matters of conscience, and believed that he could advise on the problem of adiaphora interpretation in the English Church.

During negotiations with the French, Melancthon diplomatically indicated that the Church's divine authority should be changed by the authority of the new doctrine, in which the bishops should have authority to decide adiaphora matters. It is possible that during the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations in Wittenberg in 1536, the English bishops might have accepted the Saxon Reformers' position on adiaphora, since agreement was reached on the doctrinal part, which substantiated the adiaphora matters and was expounded in the articles. But the English bishops at that time had no authority to decide on doctrine or practice. The Wittenberg Articles certainly influenced the discussion of adiaphora in England after their return. According to Melancthon, right understanding of the doctrine of justification by faith was a prerequisite for understanding the nature of the church, its authority through ministry, and the bishops' ultimate power over adiaphora matters.

The dispute seems to have been over the power in the church. Two religious factions maintained opposing authorities when defining the church's power over conscience. Any matters outside this elemental delineation of faith were adiaphora. Melancthon stated that ceremonies that are neither commanded nor forbidden should be kept for order's sake. He made clear any

misunderstanding of adiaphora matters, thus safeguarding freedom of conscience and stating that liberty should prevail in relationship with one's neighbor. Quite the opposite view was held by the conservative clergy in England—that the king's authority had replaced the pope's. As the conservative clergy defended the authority of Scripture and Tradition, many Catholic practices bound their consciences.

While searching for a common strategy toward the pope's council's authority on the conflicting articles, their willingness to have the strategy formulated failed, as they would not agree on the Wittenberg Articles. Initially, the council was supposed to unite the English and the Germans on conflicting adiaphora matters. Eventually, the plan to attend the council changed, and instead unilateral statements were produced refusing to attend. Interestingly, the English bishops—suppressed by supremacy—preferred the council's authority to that of Henry, as they had become aware of their rights during their contacts with the German Reformers and from the teachings of the *Confessio Augustana*.

Melanchthon's concept of the church had developed in the course of publication of the Schmalkaldic Articles. The authority of the true church consisted of both the visible and the invisible church. The true church was the invisible one that followed the authority of the new doctrine; that is, of faith, not a person. Melanchthon elaborated further that the king ought to intervene to protect the church, whereas the bishops are the shepherds of the church. During this time, the Saxon Reformers did not trust their new doctrine to be evaluated at the pope's General Council and put forth that Scripture had authority, rather than a papal council.

Melanchthon had also expressed leniency regarding communion in one or both kinds and agreed to leave the practice open during the transitional period. His influence was manifest in the success he had in convincing the English that old structures could remain, while inserting new concepts. This resulted in communion in both kinds being accepted as part of the doctrine of the sacrament by Christ's ordinance in the Wittenberg Articles, and the idea was implicitly expressed in the Ten Articles and the Bishops' Book. The Saxon Reformers' understanding of the doctrine of justification allowed for freedom of conscience in adiaphora matters. For them, divine Scripture bound consciences on whether one kept or omitted old ceremonies; that is, Scripture constituted divine authority on the doctrine of adiaphora. Justification by faith alone became essential when comparing what the documents said on adiaphora matters.

Melanchthon was very clear on adiaphora matters, and, in the *Loci Communes*, he emphasized that the new doctrine was the ultimate authority to use in judging erroneous teaching of adiaphora. Melanchthon supported retaining as many old ceremonies as possible. He also emphasized that adiaphora matters should be substantiated within the context of ecclesiology and its relations to civil magistracy. He stated that ecclesiastical power is not tyrannical, but as one is obedient to divine law in new doctrine, one should be obedient to bishops to whom adiaphora matters are entrusted. Because Melanchthon did not have doctrine supporting his argument for communion of both kinds in the *Advice*, he wrote the *Loci Communes*. He wanted to make clear which were matters of church and which were matters of conscience; the *Loci Communes* defines everything necessary related to adiaphora. It is the first time Melanchthon clearly stated what "church," civil magistracy, the doctrine of justification, and human traditions are. Essentially he wanted to keep old church structures and insert new concepts.

Henry regarded the pope as equal to the bishops, but not above them. While initially the English bishops had lost their power to define adiaphora matters, the influence of the *Confessio Augustana* is seen when Henry gave the bishops power to define adiaphora matters in the Bishops' Book. After the initial meeting in London, the English bishops had another private meeting in which their adiaphoristic position was expressed on almost all disputed articles, except for the veneration of saints. It became clear that they wished to have the authority to define doctrine; but if not themselves, then give authority to the council rather than to the king.

How far the supremacy could reach was seen amidst foreign and domestic turmoil. Henry announced the authority of supremacy to define even sainthood. While interpreting heresy, he prevented all foreign influences in England. At that time monastic vows became irrelevant through the dissolution; but at the same time, Henry threatened married clergy with penalties in the Proclamation of November 1538, in order to maintain what for him were the right ceremonies and practices of the old religion.

The Bishops' Book demonstrated how the English bishops viewed adiaphora matters. Even though it never became an official teaching of the English church, the reform-minded clergy could free their consciences based on their belief in justification by faith, and thus could regard Scripture as the highest authority in interpreting adiaphora matters. Therefore, the reform-minded clergy could hold onto the doctrine of justification by faith in the Wittenberg Articles, *Loci Communes*, the Bishops' Book, and the Thirteen Articles. The doctrine of justification is closely related to the power of the church; marriage of priests, monastic vows, and the Mass were considered adiaphora by the reform-minded clergy, who thought that Christian liberty should prevail in the consciences of clergy who upheld this view of adiaphora.

I now discuss how Melanchthon's doctrine of adiaphora changed when interpreted in different cultural and ecclesiastical environments. Melanchthon's hope was to use other doctrinal statements when interpreting adiaphora matters between the various confessional parties. He reinforced his adiaphora statements using the doctrine of justification by faith, and other doctrines included in the *Confessio Augustana*. He diplomatically recognized the pope's authority by human right, suggesting that the pope mediate on non-essential matters. He clearly set the limits between the divine authority of Scripture versus the authority of the Roman Church. He demonstrated that he wanted to keep the old church structure. Therefore, he combined good works into the article on justification as having a consequential role. He allowed most old ceremonies to remain, as long as the abuses were eliminated and they were not opposed to Scripture.

The negotiations at Wittenberg in 1536 were an example of when the English negotiated with the German Reformers in German ecclesiastical and cultural environments. The elector took the leadership of the negotiations. He had rebuked Melanchthon for interfering with the elector's foreign policy with the emperor, which gave Melanchthon an opportunity to develop his mature doctrine of civil magistracy. The German theologians might not have understood that Henry took away the bishops' authority to define adiaphora matters. The delegates of the Schmalkaldic League may have exceeded their authority in discussing the response to the Christmas Articles, which had made the German negotiators suspicious and caused them to wait for answers from Henry. The allied states were under the emperor's rule and afraid to become involved in decision making on the Wittenberg Articles. The conflict between the elector and Melanchthon and the

elector's demand that Henry subscribe to the *Confessio Augustana* influenced the end results. Since Henry followed the conservative bishops' recommendations in his final decision, their position was strengthened. However, Melanchthon's ideas entered England as a result of the reform-minded clergy's connections to the Saxon Reformers, in their belief in reliance on Scripture and faith alone. The intention of forming a unified front against the pope regarding adiaphora matters failed, because Henry expected more concessions. The English theologians had the German version of the *Loci Communes* with them. Henry published the English Church's first doctrinal formula in the Ten Articles, in which the influence of the Wittenberg Articles and the *Loci Communes* is seen.

The problem of interpreting adiaphora changed in a different ecclesiastical and cultural environment. Even though Melanchthon stated that civil laws were of divine origin and could define adiaphora matters, they would bind consciences when stipulated under parliamentary laws. If indeed civil law were of divine origin, then theoretically parliamentary law combined with church laws became of divine origin, and not binding on consciences from the English perspective.

The Ten Articles on justification by faith follows the Wittenberg Articles and the *Loci Communes* of 1535, omitting the forensic nature. It also eliminates the distinction between justification and regeneration, as does the *Loci Communes* in a statement of good works as being civil works. Thus Melanchthon's concept of "new obedience" finds more concrete expression in the English articles, which adopted Melanchthon's view on natural law and the third use of law in Christian conduct. Melanchthon's opinions can be perceived with the addition of the phrase "outward civil works," further interpreting Melanchthon's ideas of the civil magistracy being of divine origin.

The last negotiations between the English and German theologians in London created a very Lutheran document of the Thirteen Articles. It carried Melanchthon's ideas on adiaphora to English soil, which was reinforced with sound doctrinal statements. As long as adiaphora matters do not conflict with divine laws of Scripture, consciences are free. However, when they are regulated by human laws of Parliament, they bind consciences. The doctrine of justification by faith follows Melanchthon's doctrine in the *Loci Communes* and also that of the *Confessio Augustana*. The authority of civil magistracy comes from the Wittenberg Articles and the *Loci Communes*, adapted by Cranmer to the English ecclesiastical environment, in which obedience to the king without resistance was expected. The influence of the *Confessio Augustana* is also seen in the four articles that the English bishops discussed after the conference in a private meeting. The bishops suggested that private Masses be replaced by the doctrine of justification by faith, in agreement with the German Reformers.

The Six Articles demonstrated how the king expressed his personal beliefs in his letter to German Reformers in London in 1538. As a result, his views were prominent when he published the controversial articles as parliamentary law on the sacrament of the altar, prohibition of communion in both kinds, vows, celibacy, and confession. The sacrament of the Ten Articles was replaced by a different ceremony but not reinforced by any new doctrine. Vows that became obsolete during the dissolution were enforced on religious who had left monasteries.

Melanchthon influenced the English through the documents that were produced during the negotiations at Wittenberg in 1536, the Wittenberg Articles; and in London in 1538, the Thirteen

Articles. The Thirteen Articles also corresponded with the reform-minded bishops' views. The transfer of power in England from canon law to secular parliamentary law was a drastic change in church and state, and became problematic when interpreting church law because Henry had both jurisdictional and spiritual power over church laws and doctrine. The new ecclesiastical environment in England changed the interpretation of the doctrine of adiaphora. Melanchthon accepted that civil laws could define adiaphora matters, but they could bind consciences when promulgated by Parliament. The laws of each country needed to be interpreted from their ecclesiastical perspective. As Henry's kingship was of divine origin, so were parliamentary laws. Saxon Reformers did not accept his view, since both civil and ecclesiastical functions were in the hands of one person. As stated earlier, while Melanchthon agreed that Henry was head of the church, he did not realize that Henry would take away the power to define doctrine from his bishops. According to Melanchthon, since the Ten Articles and the Six Articles were officially ordered by the king and confirmed by statute law, the doctrine of adiaphora presented in them was to be interpreted as binding consciences.

Since parliamentary laws in England related to doctrine and practice, the Ten Articles and Six Articles belonged to both state and church. One body politic could interpret both civil and ecclesiastical laws on adiaphora, and a new definition regarding the power of the church created a new concept of church in England. In one respect, it was constructive for Melanchthon to support the king's reforms because Melanchthon did not work directly with the bishops but with the king. It was destructive in another respect, since Melanchthon should have known that the bishops had no authority over doctrine, and this made the interpretation of adiaphora matters problematic, especially in the Six Articles.

As noted previously, Melanchthon expressed changes from some of his prior positions, especially in stressing good works as a consequence of justification. Melanchthon was willing to recognize the pope under human authority, as long as the worldly and spiritual spheres were separated. It also proved to be important in negotiations with the English to not demand that they change their church structure, which was essentially Catholic.

German Reformation ideas on adiaphora penetrated and developed slowly in the English parochial system. Henry did not push these ideas in England because he had rebellions that needed to be quieted. Many of the reform-minded clergy had connections to Wittenberg and were strongly influenced by Melanchthon, and brought these reforms to England by preaching the new doctrine.

As long as there was a necessary doctrine of salvation based on Scriptural principles, it was possible for the reform-minded clergy to maintain freedom of conscience in the ceremonies called adiaphora, even during the time of the publication of the Six Articles. As mentioned before, the Six Articles was not a confessional formula, but represented Henry's beliefs on the disputed articles on which the German and the English would not agree. Henry stated his doctrinal stance in London in 1538, as to what he believed was the position of the early church in those matters. He believed in unwritten traditions and consistently was influenced by that belief. It was his responsibility, as Defender of the Faith, to lead the nation to uniformity. It was not so much the doctrinal contents of these articles that mattered to him, but rather the long tradition that he and his royal household valued—the medieval ceremonies in the church. The sacrament

of the altar was to decide all the other ceremonies related to correct celebration of the Mass, especially private Masses for devotional purposes.

I now discuss how the doctrine of adiaphora in the *Confessio Augustana* 1530 and in *Loci Communes* 1535 influenced the English Articles. A major influence on English theological thought on adiaphora was the translation of the *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia* into English. The power of the church in the English translation of *Confessio Augustana* follows the division of the Latin *Confessio Augustana* for the bishop's ministry. The English translation has traces of emphasis on the concept of church as institution, rather than relating to one's conscience on human traditions. The English and Latin texts agree that the bishops should define doctrine; but in practice, the bishops were aware that the king had taken away the right they should have, according to the English *Confessio Augustana*. In addition, the English *Confessio Augustana* clearly emphasizes that pontifical power is adiaphora, by human law, which is not in the Latin text. The disputed articles belong to adiaphora matters in the church, and it is the bishop's responsibility to make decisions on human traditions based on Scripture alone, as the reform-minded clergy understood the authority in the church. It is noticeable that all Latin liturgical phrases are omitted in the translation, as was done in practice. Referring to civil magistracy, the king's supremacy and obedience to his laws is stressed. Repeatedly, the English text stresses that the English Church is part of the universal church, referring to the church before division of East and West. The difference seen in the English translation is mainly that the text, emphasizes human cooperation in the doctrine of justification by faith, while the Latin has a greater emphasis on grace in the disputed articles. It is possible that the translator interpolated his own views on justification, or interpreted Melancthon's concept of the doctrine in the *Loci Communes* of 1535 in the disputed articles (where most disagreement occurred during the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations). But then he translated the doctrinal Article IV following the Latin *Confessio Augustana*'s doctrine of justification by faith parallel with the Latin. It is also clear that the translator was aware that it would be dangerous to not write about the supremacy of and obedience to the king, and that it was important to say that the king has a prominent role in civil magistracy. The translation follows the original text in the main issues, such as justification of faith and adiaphora, except in a few of the disputed articles. For example, in the monastic vows, one may detect the characteristic of human cooperation in the doctrine of justification. The article on the power of the church in the *Apologia* is not equivalent to the original text; it discusses the problems of English ecclesiastical power and the related problem of having the king as supreme head of state and church. The influence of the *Confessio Augustana* on the English articles is seen in the format. The Ten Articles and the Thirteen Articles followed the format of the *Confessio Augustana*, numbering the articles.

The Wittenberg Articles' doctrine of justification follows the *Confessio Augustana* and it resembles also the *Loci Communes*. The article on ecclesiastical rites stipulating that the bishops should not burden consciences by leaving ceremonies out, agrees with Article X of the Wittenberg Articles. The articles agreed with Melancthon's statement that as long as adiaphora matters are not in conflict with Scripture, consciences are free; but if human laws regulate adiaphora, they would bind consciences. This document was officially accepted neither by the Germans nor the English. In the article on civil magistracy, its position closely follows Melancthon's position stated in the *Loci Communes*. Civil law, according to Melancthon, is

divine in origin and should protect the church and punish heretics, and obedience to it was essential. The departure in the Thirteen Articles is seen in that it states that obedience to princes should endure to the point of abuse without resistance.

As stated earlier, the doctrine of justification presented is the same as in the *Loci Communes*. Christ's righteousness imputed to man included remission, reconciliation, and acceptance. The total renovation and the renewal aspect resemble the medieval nature of justification, without division between justification and regeneration. The doctrine of justification by faith in the Ten Articles and the Bishops' Book closely followed Melanchthon's *Loci Communes*, except for the omission of the forensic aspect.

One cannot give any real confessional value to the Six Articles. It seems that the articles tried to find answers to the conflicting questions that separated the English and German theologians in 1536 and 1538, while also addressing the domestic situation in England. This is also seen in the correspondence between Henry and Melanchthon, and enabled Melanchthon to influence the adiaphoristic position of the church in England, as seen in the publication of the Six Articles of 1539.

The Articles should not be seen as a reaction to Catholicism, but rather as a step toward the Anglican *via media*, since Melanchthon accepted that during the transitional period of the Reformation, one should use moderation and leave some practices free for each party to decide without condemning one another. The articles Melanchthon published to establish the unification goals for his own time should be evaluated and assessed as part of the unification discussions of the period.

I now discuss how matters of conscience and matters of the church were seen in the articles when substantiated by doctrinal reinforcements, and what the German and English saw as binding consciences.

Matters of conscience and matters of church in England became a complex situation due to Henry's proclamation that made him head of the English Church. Henry had both ecclesiastical and civil authority over the Church of England. In the first year of Henry's reign, adiaphora matters fell under the king's jurisdiction that he delegated to Thomas Cromwell. Meanwhile, the two religious parties in England had different goals. Both acknowledged supremacy, but the reform-minded clergy wished to reform doctrine. The reform-minded clergy could follow their conscience when the king allowed them to define adiaphora matters in the Bishops' Book, as influenced by the English translation of the *Confessio Augustana* and *Apologia*.

The Northern Rebellion can be seen as an indication of why it was necessary to bring adiaphora to the parochial level. A parochial distrust and misunderstanding regarding who was head of the church and what constituted agreed-upon doctrine were contributing factors in the rebellion. Since the clergy now had to interpret adiaphora according to Henry's definition, it left them in conflict. Cromwell's injunctions may have gone too far in spelling out the doctrine of adiaphora on the parochial level, by also asking the clergy to eliminate old practices and avoid the superstition of old habits. With the dissolution of the monasteries, vows became obsolete and the monasteries were transferred to civil magistracy. In his position as Defender of the Faith, Henry was to determine who was a heretic and who was not. Henry's supremacy was demonstrated to the extent that that he did away with feast days of saints in liturgy, as he did with Thomas à Becket.

During the negotiations at Wittenberg, Melanchthon and the Saxon Reformers discussed the controversial adiaphora issues that were matters of conscience, not matters of the church. They believed in a doctrine—justification by faith—as essential to an individual’s belief in God’s mercy and reconciliation. Hence, the church’s power over one’s conscience became obsolete, and adiaphora matters would be interpreted differently. Instead of believing that the Roman Church had authority to impose a doctrine, divine authority was recognized as coming from Scripture alone. Any matters outside faith are adiaphora. The doctrinal articles were accepted—that is, the Wittenberg Articles, which closely followed the *Confessio Augustana*—and indicated how close the English Reformers came to the new doctrine presented in Germany. The doctrine of the sacraments was transferred to the Ten Articles and the Bishops’ Book from the Wittenberg Articles, and sacraments were reduced to three in the Ten Articles and increased to seven in the Bishops’ Book, even though a lower status was given to the other four. Even though the Wittenberg Articles included a section on communion in both kinds, there is no separate section in the Ten Articles; but one may assume that the practice was accepted as part of the doctrine of the sacrament because the Ten Articles implicitly stated that “under the same form and figure of bread and wine the very selfsame body and blood of Christ exhibited which receive the sacrament.” Both article collections had substantiated the doctrine of adiaphora with sound doctrinal statements, which reinforced that adiaphora matters belong to church ordinances in England and within the territorial Reformation churches in Germany.

The difference between the Ten Articles and the Bishops’ Book was that the latter followed more closely the idea of combining justification and penance, from the Wittenberg Articles of 1536, excluding its forensic aspect and emphasizing good works as consequence of justification, as it was in the *Loci Communes*. The writings in the Bishops’ Book, influenced by the English translation of the *Confessio Augustana*, convey how the English bishops viewed adiaphora matters. This was the first time that Henry had delegated doctrinal matters to the bishops. The reform-minded clergy could free their consciences based on their belief in justification by faith, even though it never became an official teaching of the English church. Thus the reform-minded clergy regarded Scripture as the highest authority in interpreting adiaphora matters. The Bishops’ Book represented the “middle way” between the conservative and reform-minded clergy, which is seen, for instance, in the doctrine of justification that was closely linked to the sacrament of penance. We see the influence of the Wittenberg Articles in the Bishops’ Book, which had altered the threefold structure of penance and replaced the third part, called “satisfactions,” with a phrase “amendment of former life.” Therefore, the reform-minded clergy could also hold onto the doctrine of justification by faith in the Wittenberg Articles, as well as the Thirteen Articles, which were never officially sanctioned by the Germans or the English.

It is of the utmost importance to see how Melanchthon reacted to the Six Articles. He believed that since the articles had been accepted by Parliament as statute law, the adiaphora in them was binding on consciences. During the publication of the Six Articles in 1539, he appealed to the king and the reform-minded clergy to repeal the papal ceremonies from the church. He was concerned that the doctrine related to multiple Roman ceremonies was unclear. If the Ten Articles remained the official doctrine of the church, justification by faith and the sacrament of the altar remained official doctrines. However, the other doctrinal positions were not clearly substantiated in the Six Articles and one could not give them a confessional position

and the concept of ecclesiology was not clear. Five of the Six Articles were related to questions that were left undecided during the negotiations in 1536 and 1538. The first article, the most essential one, was the sacrament of the altar, which had been explained by the reform-minded clergy in the Ten Articles. For Henry it was essential to settle the controversial matters in the English Church in order to maintain uniformity. This is the second time Melanchthon declared that adiaphora should be understood within the right concept of church. His response to the Six Articles demonstrates that Melanchthon was no more willing to compromise in doctrine and practice than he had been in 1534, when he compiled the *Advice*. Even then, he was silent on the position of transubstantiation. Melanchthon expressed leniency on communion in both kinds and agreed to leave the practice open during the transitional period, and at the publication of the Six Articles he would not agree to his previous position. As seen above, the English Articles (The Ten Articles and the Bishops' Book) followed the Wittenberg Articles in adopting both kinds in the doctrine of the sacrament.

I now address how the Reformers reacted to tyrannical laws in the framework of freedom of conscience and Christian liberty, after the publication of the Six Articles. The supremacy was a tyrannical law not only to the English Reformers, but also to those in the north who did not understand the change in leadership in church and state. This is apparent from how slowly things changed, and how attached the people were to their old beliefs. Henry had to defend against the domestic and foreign infiltration and invasion of Catholicism while pursuing religious change in the church, as seen in his response to the Northern Rebellion, in which Henry did not succumb to the rebels' demands and opposition to his supremacy. This is seen also when Henry published the Act of Six Articles. The act bound consciences of the reform-minded clergy.

Melanchthon's main concern on the publication of the Six Articles was that the doctrine of the sacrament of the altar was altered by parliamentary laws. The ceremonies Henry included in the Six Articles were without any substantiation or doctrinal reinforcement. The reform-minded clergy could still believe the doctrine of justification by faith in the Bishops' Book, and also the doctrine of the sacrament of the altar that implicitly included both kinds. It seems as if Henry was not so much concerned about the doctrine, but mostly the outward ceremonies in which each religious party was able to interpret the Mass based on their individual beliefs: *lex orandi—lex credendi*. The act replaced the doctrine of the sacrament, including the statement regarding both kinds in the Lord's Supper, with the tyrannical article forcing belief in the real presence in the sacrament of the altar, different from that in the Ten Articles. While the Ten Articles, also sanctioned by parliamentary law, bound the consciences of the reformed-minded clergy, they could believe the same doctrine stated in the Bishops' Book and have adiaphoristic freedom, since the Bishops' Book included the same doctrines as the Ten Articles.

With the publication of the Six Articles, the reform-minded clergy could still hold on to their belief in justification by faith as expressed in the Bishops' Book, which did not have parliamentary sanction, and could maintain Christian liberty under the tyranny of the king's laws. The justification by faith article of the Bishops' Book and the Ten Articles still remained ecclesiastical doctrine in the Six Articles. The Six Articles mainly included ceremonies related to the traditions of the church. As long as there was a necessary doctrine of salvation based on scriptural principle, it was possible for the reform-minded clergy to maintain freedom of

conscience in the ceremonies called adiaphora, even during the time of the publication of the Six Articles.

In conclusion, while Melanchthon and Henry corresponded extensively, due to political exigencies and pressure from various religious parties, Melanchthon did not travel to meet Henry in person. As explicated in the course of this research, Melanchthon's influence is seen in the English articles that were influenced by the articles produced during the Anglo-Lutheran negotiations. In addition, the adoption of much of his thinking from the *Loci Communes* formed the main doctrinal framework used to evaluate the characteristics determining the doctrine of adiaphora, and what constituted the main issues in the doctrines of adiaphora and justification by faith as well as exegetical interpretation of Scripture alone, and the correct understanding of ecclesiology.

Bibliography:

Sources and Literature

Archive Sources

Berkeley

Graduate Theological Union Library

Melanchthon, Philip, 1535. *Loci Communes. Theologicirecens collecti & recogniti a Philippo Melantheone*. Impresse Vitebergæ: Wittenberg

London

British Museum

Additional Manuscripts 5498, 6113

Kew

National Archives

Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae ab anno MCCCL et annum MDXLV. Volumen Tertium. Londini MDCCXXXVII

Rymer Collections

Foedera Conventiones, Literae, Acta Publica inter Reges Angliae. Thoma Rymer. Tomus XIV. Londini. MDCCXXXVIII

Original State Papers

SP1, series of Henry VIII

Printed Sources

Aktenstücke. 1538

1971 *England und die Schmalkaldenen: 1535–1540*. Prüser, Friedrich. New York.

An Act Abolishing Diversity in Opinion

1539 St. 31 Hen VIII, c. 14. *English Historical Documents 1485–1558*, vol. V. Ed. C. H. Williams. Eyre & Spottis Woode Publishers, Ltd. London (1971).

Burnet, Gilbert

1843 *The History of the Reformation, with the Collection of Records and Copious Index*, vol. 4. D. Appleton & Company. New York:

Concordia. The Lutheran Confessions

2006 Ed. Paul Timothy McCain. Concordia Publishing House. Saint Louis, MO.

The Book of Concord

2000 Eds. Timothy J. Wengert & Robert Kolb. Fortress Press. Minneapolis, MN.

Convocation 1536

2006 *Records of Convocation*. VII. Canterbury 1509–1603. Ed. Gerald Bray. The Boydell Press. Woodridge, Suffolk, UK.

The Correspondence of Reginald Pole, vol 1

2002 Ed. Thomas F. Mayer. Ashgate Publishing Company. Aldershot, Hants, England.

Cranmer, Thomas

1846 *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters*. Ed. John Edmund Cox. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Cranmer, Thomas

1853 *Memorials of Thomas Cranmer. The History of the Church*, vol. 1. Ed. John Strype. London.

Cromwell, Thomas

1902 *Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell*, vols. I. and II. Ed. Roger Bigelow Merriman. Clarendon Press. London, Edinburgh, New York, Oxford.

Dickens, A. G., & Carr, Dorothy, eds.

1967 *The Reformation in England: Documents of Modern History*. Edward Arnold, Ltd. London.

Documents Illustrative of English Church History

1910 Eds. Henry Gee & William John Hardy. Macmillan & Co., Ltd. London.

Documents of the English Reformation.

2004 Library of Ecclesiastical History. Ed. Gerald Bray. James Clarke & Co. Cambridge.

Dissolution of the Monasteries

1971 Joyce Youings. Documents 1–40. *The Dissolution of Monasteries*. Historical Problems. Studies and Documents. Ed. G. R. Elton. George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. London.

An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, vol 9

1852 Collected by Jeremy Collier. London.

Gardiner, Stephen

1535 *Obedience in Church and State. Three political Tracts by Stephen Gardiner*. Ed. Pierre Janelle. Greenwood Press, Publishers. New York. 1968.

Grane, Leif

1987 *The Augsburg Confession*. Augsburg Publishing House. Minneapolis, MN.

Institution of a Christian Man

1537 [Informally known as *The Bishops' Book*]. In *Formularies of Faith Put Forth by Authority during the Reign of Henry VIII*. Ed. Charles Lloyd. Oxford University Press. Oxford. 1856.

The Letters of King Henry

1968 Ed. Clare Byrne. Cassel and Company Ltd. London, Melbourne, Sydney, Toronto.

The Letters of Stephen Gardiner

1933 Ed. James Arthur Muller. Cambridge University Press. London.

Luther, Martin

1537 *Articuli Smalcaldici*. Concordia Triglotta. 1921. Concordia Publishing House. St. Louis, MO.

Luther, Martin

1531–33 *Dr. Martin Luther's Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe*. Briefwechsel. 6. Band Hermann Böhlhaus Nachfolger/Weimar. Hof-Buchdruckerei und Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1935.

Luther, Martin

1534–36 *Dr. Martin Luther's Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe*. Briefwechsel. 7. Band Hermann Böhlhaus Nachfolger/Weimar. Hof-Buchdruckerei und Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1937.

Luther, Martin

1975 *Luther's Works*, vol. 50. Eds. Gottfried G. Krodel & Helmut T. Lehman. Fortress Press. Philadelphia.

Melanchthon, Philip

1530 *Confessio Augustana*. In *Die Bekenntnisschriften der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche*, 6th ed. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Göttingen. 1967.

Melanchthon, Philip

1531 *Apologia Confessionis Augustanae*. In *Die Bekenntnisschriften der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche*, 6th ed. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Göttingen. 1967.

Melanchthon, Philip

1536a The confession of the faith of the Germaines exhibited to the most victorious Emperour Charles the V. in the Councill or assemble holden at Augusta the yere of our lorde. 1530. To which is added the *Apologie* of Melancthon. Cvm privilegio regali. Robert Redman. London.

1536b The *Apologie* that is to say the defence of confessyon of the Germaines made by Philip Melanchthon and translated by Richard Tauerner of the commandment of his Mayster, the ryght honorable Mayster Thomas Cromwell. Cvm privilegio regali. Robert Redman. London.

Melanchthon, Philip

1537 *De Potestate et Primatu Papae*. Concordia Triglotta. 1921. Concordia Publishing House. St. Louis, MO.

Melanchthon, Philip

1835 *Corpus Reformatorum. Philippi Melanthonis Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia*, vol. II. Ed. Carolus Gottlieb Bretschneider. Halis Saxonum. Apud. C. A. Schwetschke et Filium.

Melanchthon, Philip

1836 *Corpus Reformatorum. Philippi Melanthonis Opera Quæ Supersunt Omnia*, vols. II, III. Ed. Carolus Gottlieb Bretschneider. Halis Saxonum. Apud. C. A. Schwetschke et Filium.

Melanchthon, Philip

1978 *Melanchthon's Briefwechsel*. Kritische und kommentierte Gesamtausgabe. Eds. Heinz Scheible et al. Band 2, Regesten 1110–2335 (1531–1539). Ernst Kieser KG Augsburg. Friedrich Frommann Verlag Günther Holzboog GmbH & Co. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt.

Melanchthon, Philip

2005 *Melanchthon's Briefwechsel*. Kritische und kommentierte Gesamtausgabe. Eds. Heinz Scheible et al. Band T 6, Texte 1395–1683 (1534–1535). Offizin Chr. Scheufele, Stuttgart, Fromman-Holzboog Verlag. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt.

Melanchthon, Philip

2006 *Melanchthon's Briefwechsel*. Kritische und kommentierte Gesamtausgabe Eds. Heinz Scheible et al. Band 7, Texte 1684–1979 (1536–1537). Offizin Chr. Scheufele, Stuttgart, Fromman-Holzboog Verlag. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt.

Melanchthon, Philip

2007 *Melanchthon's Briefwechsel*. Kritische und kommentierte Gesamtausgabe Eds. Heinz Scheible et al. Band 8 Texte 1980–2335 (1538–1539). Offizin Chr. Scheufele, Stuttgart, Fromman-Holzboog Verlag. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt.

Original Letters Illustrative of English History, vol. III

1846 Ed. Sir Henry Ellis. Richard Bentley. London.

Slavin, Arthur J., ed.

1969 *Thomas Cromwell on Church and Commonwealth: Selected Letters, 1523–1546*. Harper Torchbooks. Harper & Row. New York, Evanston, London.

State Papers, vol. I. *King Henry the Eighth. Parts I. and II*

1830 Under the Authority of His Majesty's Commission.

State Papers Online & the Government of Britain 1509–1714

2010 *The Tudors 1509–1603*. Pt. 1. State Papers Domestic. *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII* (1534–1539). University of California, Berkeley. galeadmin-SPOL@galegroup.com.

Strype, John

1816 *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, vol. VI. London.

Tudor Royal Proclamations, vol. I

1964 Eds. Paul L. Hughes & James F. Larkin. Yale University Press. New Haven; London.

Ten Articles devised by the Kinges Highnes Majestie

1536 In Charles Hardwick, *A History of the Articles of Religion*. George Bell & Sons. London. 1851.

Thirteen Articles: A book containing divers articles, de unitate Dei et Trinitate personarum de peccato originali, &c.

1538 In Charles Hardwick, *A History of the Articles of Religion*. George Bell & Sons. London. 1851.

Visitation Articles and Injunctions, vol. II. 1536–1538.

1536 Eds. Walter Howard Frere & William McClure Kennedy. London: Alcuin Club Collections, No. XV. (1910). Longmans, Green & Co. New York, Bombay, Calcutta.

Die Wittenberger Artikel von 1536

1536 [*The Wittenberg Articles of 1536*]. Ed. Georg Mentz. [1905]. Reprografischer Nachdruck der 1. Auflage. Leipzig. 1905. (Quellenschriften zur Geschichte des Protestantismus. 2. Heft) Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. Darmstadt, Germany. 1968.

Wriothesley, Charles

1875 *A Chronicle of England during the reigns of the Tudors*, vol. 1. Ser. XI. Ed. William Douglas Hamilton. Camden Society. J. B. Nichols and Sons. Westminster.

Interviews

The Interview of Dr. Helmut Rohlfing, Director of Manuscripts and Rare Books 10.6. 2004. University of Göttingen, Germany.

The Interview of Prof. Timothy Wengert, Professor of the History of Christianity at the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia. 14. 8. 2011.

Web Sites

galeadmin-SPOL@galegroup.com, <http://go.galegroup.com> Visited January 2010–May 2011.
<http://www.friesian.com/coins.htm/> Visited November 11, 2007.

British Coins Before the Florin, Compared to French Coins of the Ancien Régime.

Retrieved on November 28, 2007, from <http://www.friesian.com/coins.htm/>.

Literature

Althaus, Paul

1972 *The Ethics of Martin Luther*. Translated by R. C. Schultz. Philadelphia.

Backus, Irena

2003 *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation (1378–1615)*. In *Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought*, vol. XCIV. Ed. Andrew Golin Gow. E. J. Brill. Leiden, Boston.

- Bernard, G. W.
1998 "The Making of Religious Policy, 1533–1546: Henry VIII and The Search for the Middle Way." In *The Historical Journal*, 41, 2.
- Bernard, G. W.
2005 *The King's Reformation*. Yale University Press. New Haven, London.
- Bowker, Margaret
1975 "The Supremacy and the Episcopate: The Struggle for Control, 1534–1540." In *The Historical Journal*, 18.
- Brady, Thomas A., Jr.
1998 *Phases and Strategies of the Schmalkaldic League Perspective after 450 years. Communities, Politics, and Reformation in Early Modern Europe*. In *Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought*, vol. LXVIII. Ed. Heiko A. Oberman. E. J. Brill. Leiden; Boston; Köln.
- Brady, Thomas A., Jr.
2000 *The Holy Roman Empire's Bishops on the Eve of the Reformation. Continuity and Change. The Harvest of Late Medieval and Reformation History*. Eds. Robert J. Bast & Andrew C. Gow. E. J. Brill. Leiden; The Netherlands, Boston; Köln.
- Brady, Thomas A., Jr.
2009 *German Histories in the Age of Reformation, 1400–1650*. Cambridge University Press. New York.
- Bray, Gerald, ed.
2004 *Documents of the English Reformation*. Library of Ecclesiastical History. James Clarke & Co. Cambridge.
- Cameron, Euan
2012 *The European Reformation*. 2nd Ed. Oxford University Press. New York.
- Cameron, Euan
2004 *The Possibilities and Limits of Conciliation: Philipp Melancthon and Inter-confessional Dialogue in the Sixteenth Century*. Conciliation and Confession. Eds. Howard P. Louthan & Randall C. Zachman. University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, IN:
- Cargill Thompson, W. D. J.
1980 *Studies in the Reformation: Luther to Hooker*. Ed. C. W. Dugmore. The Atholone Press. Bemrose, UK.
- Carleton, Kenneth
2001 *Bishops and Reform in the English Church, 1520–1559*. Studies in Modern British Religious History. The Boydell Press. Woodbridge, UK.
- Carson, D. A.
2004 *The Vindication of Imputation*. In *Justification. What's at Stake in the Current Debates*. Eds. Mark Husbards & Daniel J. Treier. Apollos. Leicester, England.

- Chibi, Andrew A.
2003 *Henry VIII's Bishops*. James Clarke & Co. Cambridge, Great Britain.
- Chibi, Andrew A.
1997 *Henry VIII's Conservative Scholar*. Peter Lang AG. European Academic Publishers. Bern, Germany.
- Clebsch, William A.
1964 *England's Earliest Protestants 1520–1535*. Yale University Press. Binghampton, N.Y., New Haven, London.
- Collins, J. Kenneth.
2002 *The Doctrine of Justification*. In *Justification. What's at Stake in Current Debates*. Eds. Mark Husbards & Daniel J. Treier. Apollos. Leicester, England.
- Dickens, A. G.
1964 *Thomas Cromwell and The English Reformation*. London: English Universities Press. Lowe and Brydone. Ltd. London.
- Dickens, A. G., & Carr, Dorothy, eds.
1967 *The Reformation in England: Documents of Modern History*. Edward Arnold, Ltd. London.
- Dickens, A. G.
1991 *The English Reformation*. 2nd ed. First published by Pennsylvania State University Press. University Park, PA.
- Dingel, Irene
1998 *Melanchthon and Western Europe*. In *Philipp Melanchthon als Politiker zwischen Reich, Reichstanden und Konfessionsparteien. Themata Leucoreana*. Eds. Günther Wartenberg und Matthias Zentner. Wittenberg, Germany. Stiftung Leucorea an der Marin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg. Leucorea Wittenberg.
- Dingel, Irene
2006 "Philip Melanchthon and the Establishment of Confessional Norms." In *Lutheran Quarterly*, 20:2.
- Dingel, Irene
2012a *Melanchthon's Paraphrases of the Augsburg Confession, 1534 and 1536, in the Service of the Smalcald League*. In *Philip Melanchthon*. Refo500 Academic Studies, vol. 7. Ed. Herman J. Selderhuis, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Bristol, CT.
- Dingel, Irene
2012b *Melanchthon and the Establishment of Confessional Norms*. In *Philip Melanchthon*. Refo500 Academic Studies, vol. 7. Ed. Herman J. Selderhuis. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Bristol, CT.
- Doernberg, Erwin
1961 *Henry VIII and Luther*. Stanford University Press. Stanford, California. Printed in Great Britain by Western Printing Services, Ltd. Bristol.

- Duffy, Eamon
1992 *The Stripping of the Altars*. Yale University Press. New Haven. Avon. Great Britain.
- Duggan, Anne
1980 *Thomas Becket: A Textual History of his Letters*. Oxford University Press. Clarendon Press. Oxford.
- Dugmore, C. W.
1958 *The Mass and the English Reformers*. Macmillan & Co, Ltd. London. St. Martin's Press. New York.
- Elton, G. R.
1977 *Reform and Reformation England, 1509–1558*. Harvard University Press: Harvard, MA.
- Elton, G. R.
1985 *Policy and Police*. Cambridge University Press. Great Britain.
- Eppley, Daniel
2007 *Defending Royal Supremacy in Discerning God's Will in Tudor England*. Printed in Great Britain by MPG Books, Bodmin, Cornwall. Ashgate Publishing Company. Burlington, VT.
- Estes, James M.
1998 "The Role of Godly Magistrates in the Church: Melanchthon as Luther's Interpreter and Collaborator." In *Church History*, 67:3.
- Estes, James M.
2005 *Peace and Order and the Glory of God. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions*, vol CXI. Ed. Andrew Colin Gow. E. J. Brill. Leiden, The Netherlands, Boston.
- Farge, James K.
1985 *Orthodoxy and Reform in Early Reformation France. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought*, vol. XXXII. Ed. Heiko Oberman. E. J. Brill. Leiden, The Netherlands.
- Grane, Leif
1987 *The Augsburg Confession. A Commentary*. Augsburg Publishing House. Minneapolis, MN.
- Graybill, Gregory B.
2010 *Evangelical Free Will*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford University Press. Oxford, New York.
- Green, C. Lowell
1980 *How Melanchthon Helped Luther Discover the Gospel*. Verdict Publications. Fallbrook, CA.

Green, Lawrence D.

- 2001 *Melanchthon, Rhetoric, and the Soul*. In *Melanchthon und Europa*. Teilband 2. Hrg. Günter Frank und Kees Meerhoff. Melanchthon-schriften der Stadt Bretten. Hrg. Günter Frank und Johanna Loehr. Band. 6/2. Germany. Jan Thorbecke Verlag. Stuttgart.

Greschat, Martin

- 2010 *Philipp Melanchthon. Theologe, Pädagoge und Humanist*. Palmedia Publishing Services GmbH, Berlin. Verlagsgruppe Random House GmbH, München.

Hall, Basil

- 1979 *The Early Rise and Gradual Decline of Lutheranism in England (1520–1600)*. In Derek Baker, ed., *Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent, ca. 1500–ca. 1750*. Basil Blackwell for the Ecclesiastical History Society. Oxford, Great Britain.

Hardwick, Charles

- 1851 *A History of the Articles of Religion: A Series of Documents from A.D. 1536 to A.D. 1615*. George Bell & Sons. London.

Harvey, Barbara.

- 1993 *Living and Dying in England (1100–1540)*. Oxford University Press. New York.

Hildebrandt, Esther

- 1984 “Christopher Mont, Anglo-Saxon Diplomat.” In *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 15(3).

Horst, Jesse

- 2005 *Leben und Wirken des Philipp Melanchthon*. Deutschen National Bibliografie. <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar. Literareon im Herbert Utz Verlag GmbH. Germany.

Jaquette, James L.

- 1995 *Discerning What Counts. The Function of the Adiaphora Topos in Paul's Letters*. Society of Biblical Literature. Dissertation series. No. 146. Scholars Press. Atlanta.

Jacobs, Henry Eyster

- 1894 *The Lutheran Movement in England. A Study in Comparative Symbols*. G. W. Frederick. Philadelphia.

Keen, Ralph

- 1996 “Political Authority and Ecclesiology in Melanchthon's *De Ecclesiae Autoritate*.” In *Church History*, 65:1.

Keen, Ralph

- 1997 *Divine and Human Authority in Reformation Thought*. Bibliotheca Humanistica & Reformatorica, vol. LV. Nieuwkoop De Graaf Publishers. Iowa City.

Knowles, Dom David

- 1961 *The Religious Orders in England*, vol. III. The Tudor Age. Cambridge University Press. Great Britain.

Kohnle, Armin

- 2011 *Philipp Melanchthon und die Bündnisverhandlungen mit Frankreich und England 1534 bis 1536*. Philipp Melanchthon. Hrsg. Irene Dingel, Armin Kohnle. Leucorea-Studien zur Geschichte der Reformation und der Lutherischen Orthodoxie. Hrsg. von Irene Dingel, Armin Kohnle und Udo Sträter. Band 13. Leipzig. Germany. Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.

Kuropka, Nicole

- 2012 *Philip Melanchthon and Aristotle*. Philip Melanchthon. Refo500 Academic Studies. Ed. Herman J. Selderhuis, vol. 7. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Bristol, CT.

Kusukawa, Sachiko

- 1995 *The Transformation of Natural Philosophy*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge; New York.

Kusukawa, Sachiko

- 2002 *The Reception of Melanchthon in Sixteenth-Century Cambridge and Oxford*. In *Melanchthon und Europa*. Teilband 2. Hrg. Günter Frank und Kees Meerhoff. Melanchthon-schriften der Stadt Bretten. Hrg. Günter Frank und Johanna Loehr. Band. 6/2. Germany. Jan Thorbecke Verlag. Stuttgart.

Lexutt, Athina

- 2006 *Verbum Dei iudex. Melanchthon's Kirchenverständnis*. In *Konfrontation und Dialog*. Herausgegeben von Günter Frank und Stephan Meier-Oeser. Schriften der Europäischen Melanchthonakademie. (SEMA). Band 1. Evangelische Verlagsanstalt. GmbH. Leipzig. Germany. Die Deutsche Bibliothek.

Lloyd, Charles

- 1856 *Formularies of Faith Put Forth by Authority during the Reign of Henry VIII*. Oxford University Press. Oxford.

Lytle, Guy Fitch

- 1981 *Religion and the Lay Patron in Reformation England. Patronage in the Renaissance*. Eds. Guy Fitch Lytle & Stephen Orgel. Princeton University Press. Princeton, NJ. Guildford, Surrey, UK.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid

- 1996 *Thomas Cranmer*. Yale University Press. New Haven, London.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid

- 2003 *Reformation*. Penguin Books. London.

Mannermaa, Tuomo

- 2005 *Christ Present in Faith. Luther's View of Justification*. Ed. Kirsi Stjerna. Fortress Press. Minneapolis, MN.

Manschreck, Clyde L.

- 1948 *A Critical Examination of Philip Melanchthon's Doctrine of Adiaphora*. Diss. Yale University.

- Martinez, German
2003 *Signs of Freedom. Theology of Christian Sacraments.* Paulist Press. Mahwah, NJ.
- Maurer, Wilhelm
1986 *Historical Commentary on the Augsburg Confession.* Philadelphia.
- Maxcey, E. Carl
1980 *Bona Opera.* Bibliothecah Humanistica & Reformatonica, vol. XXXVI. B. De Graaf. Nieuwkoop.
- McCormack, Bruce
2004 *What's at stake in current debates over justification? In Justification. What's at Stake in the Current Debates.* Eds. Mark Husbands & Daniel J. Treier. Apollos. Leicester, England.
- McEntegart, Rory
2002 *Henry VIII, The League of Schmalkalden and the English Reformation.* Studies in History New Series. The Royal Historical Society. The Boydell Press: Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK.
- McEntegart, Rory
2010 *Henry VIII and the German Lutherans: Three Examples.* In *Sister Reformations [Schwesterreformationen]*. Ed. Dorothea Wendebourg, Mohr Siebeck. Tübingen.
- McGrath, Alister E.
1987 *The Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation.* Basil Blackwell. New York.
- McGrath, Alister E.
1998 *Iustia Dei. A History of the Doctrine of Justification.* Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, UK.
- Mentz, G.
1905 *Die Wittenberger Artikel von 1536. [The Wittenberg Articles of 1536].* Ed. Georg Mentz. Reprografischer Nachdruck der 1. Auflage. Leipzig. 1905. (Quellenschriften zur Geschichte des Protestantismus. 2. Heft) Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. Darmstadt, Germany. 1968.
- Merriman, Roger Begelew, ed.
1902 *Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell,* vols. I. and II. Clarendon Press. London, Edinburgh, New York, Oxford.
- Methuen, Charlotte
2000 "Lex Naturae and Ordo Naturae in the Thought of Philip Melanchthon." In *Reformation and Renaissance Review: Journal of the Society for Reformation Studies.* June 3.
- Meyer, Carl S.
1966 "Melanchthon, Theologian of Ecumenism." In *Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 17(2).

Molnar, Paul D

2004 *The Theology of Justification in Dogmatic Context. In Justification. What's at Stake in the Current Debates.* Eds. Mark Husbards & Daniel J. Treier. Apollo. Leicester, England.

Moss, Ann

2002 *Truth and Fiction: Melancthon as Medium for Change. In Melancthon und Europa. Teilband 2.* Hrg. Günter Frank und Kees Meerhoff. Melancthon-Schriften der Stadt Bretten. Hrg. Günter Frank und Johanna Loehr. Band. 6/2. Germany. Jan Thorbecke Verlag. Stuttgart.

Oberman, Heiko A.

1967 *Forerunners of the Reformation.* Holt, Rinehart and Winston. New York, Chicago, San Francisco.

Ohst, Martin

2010 *Martyrdom in the German and English Reformations. In Sister Reformations [Schwesterreformationen].* Ed. Dorothea Wendebourg, Mohr Siebeck. Tübingen.

Ozment, Steven

1980 *The Age of Reform, 1250–1550.* Murray Printing Company. Westford, MA. Yale University Press: New Haven, London.

Pannenberg, Wolfhart

1994 *Systematic Theology, vol. 2.* Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. Grand Rapids, MI.

Pannenberg, Wolfhart

1998 *Systematic Theology, vol. 3.* Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. Grand Rapids, MI.

Parish, Helen L.

2000 *Clerical Marriage and the English Reformation.* Farnham. Surrey, Great Britain. Ashgate Publishing Company. Burlington, Vermont.

Pragman, James H.

1980 "The Augsburg Confession in the English Reformation: Richard Taverner's Contribution." In *Sixteenth Century Journal* 11(3).

Prüser, Friedrich.

1971 *England und die Schmalkaldenen: 1535–1540.* New York.

Redworth, Glyn

1986 "A Study in the Formulation of Policy: The Genesis and Evolution of the Act of Six Articles." In *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 37(1).

Redworth, Glyn

1990 *In Defence of the Church Catholic. The Life of Stephen Gardiner.* Basil Blackwell. Oxford, UK.

- Rex, Richard
1993 "The New Learning." In the *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*. 44.
- Rex, Richard
1999 *The Role of English Humanists in the Reformation up to 1559*. Eds. Scott Amos, Andrew Pettegree, & Henk Van Nierop. (1999). *The Education of Christian Society*. Chippenham, Wiltshire. Great Britain: Ashgate Publishing Company. Brookfield, Vermont. Aldershot, Hants, England.
- Rex, Richard
1999 *A Reformation Rhetoric Thomas Swynnerton*. Renaissance Texts from Manuscript. No. 1. Ed. Jeremy F. Maule. RTM Publications. Cambridge, England.
- Rex, Richard
2006 *Henry VIII and the English Reformation: British History in Perspective*. Palgrave Macmillan. Basingstoke, Hampshire.
- Rummel, Erika
2004 *Erasmus and the Restoration of Unity in the Church*. Conciliation and Confession. Eds. Howard P. Louthan & Randall C. Zachman. University of Notre Dame Press. Notre Dame, IN.
- Rupp, E. G.
1953 *The Righteousness of God: Luther Studies*. Birbeck Lectures in Ecclesiastical History 1947. Hodder & Stoughton.
- Scheible, Heinz
2002 *Melanchthon's ökumenischer Einsatz in Frankreich*. Melanchthon und Europa. Teilband 2. Hrg. Günter Frank und Kees Meerhoff. Melanchthon-schriften der Stadt Bretten. Hrg. Günter Frank und Johanna Loehr. Band. 6/2. Germany. Jan Thorbecke Verlag. Stuttgart.
- Schneider, John R.
1990 *Philip Melanchthon's Rhetorical Construal of Biblical Authority*. Texts and Studies in Religion, vol. 51. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Schofield, John
2006 *Philip Melanchthon and the English Reformation*. Ashgate Publishing Company. Burlington, VT.
- Seifrid, Mark A.
2004 *Luther, Melanchthon and Paul on the Question of Imputation*. In *Justification. What's at Stake in the Current Debates*. Eds. Mark Husbards & Daniel J. Treier. Apollos. Leicester, England.
- Selderhuis, Herman J.
2011 *Melanchthon und das Kirchenrecht*. In *Philipp Melanchthon*. Hrsg. Irene Dingel, Armin Kohnle. Leucorea-Studien zur Geschichte der Reformation und der Lutherischen Orthodoxie. Hrsg. von Irene Dingel, Armin Kohnle und Udo Sträter. Band 13. Leipzig. Germany. Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.

- Shedd, William G. T.
1888 *A History of Christian Doctrine*. 2 vols. T&T Clark. Edinburgh.
- Slavin, Arthur J., ed.
1969 *Thomas Cromwell on Church and Commonwealth: Selected Letters, 1523–1546*. Harper Torchbooks. Harper & Row. New York, Evanston, London.
- Strehle, Stephen
1995 *The Catholic Roots of the Protestant Gospel: Encounter Between the Middle Ages and Reformation*. In *Studies in the History of Christian Thought* LX. E. J. Brill. Leiden, The Netherlands.
- Stupperich, Robert
1955 *Kirche und Synode bei Melanchthon*. In: Beiträge zur historischen und systematischen Theologie: Gedenkschrift für Werner Elert/hrsg. von Friedrich Hübner; Ernst Kinder; Wilhelm Maurer. Berlin.
- Tjernagel, Neelak Serawlook
1965 *Henry VIII and the Lutherans*. Concordia Publishing House. Saint Louis, MO.
- Trueman, Carl R.
2010 “Early English Evangelicals: Three examples.” In *Sister Reformations [Schwesterreformationen]*. Ed. Dorothea Wendebourg, Mohr Siebeck. Tübingen.
- Vainio, Olli-Pekka
2008 *Justification and Participation in Christ. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions*, vol. 130. Ed. Andrew Colin Gow. E. J. Brill. Leiden, The Netherlands. Koninklijke NV.
- Verkamp, Bernard J.
1975 “The Limits upon Adiaphoristic Freedom: Luther and Melanchthon.” In *Theological Studies*, vol. 36:1.
- Verkamp, Bernard J.
1977 *The Indifferent Mean. Studies in the Reformation*, vol. I. Ohio University Press. Athens, OH.
- Wainwright, Geoffrey
2004 *The Ecclesial Scope of Justification*. In *Justification, What’s at Stake in Current Debates*. Eds. Mark Husbards & Daniel J. Treier. Apollos. Leicester, England.
- Watanabe, Morimichi
1993 *Nicholas of Cusa and the Reform of the Roman Curia. Humanity and Divinity in Renaissance and Reformation*. Eds. John W. O’Malley & Thomas M. Izbicki. Gerald Christianson. *Studies in the History of Christian Thought*. Vol. 51. Ed. Heiko A. Oberman. E.J. Brill. Leiden, New York, Köln.
- Wendebourg, Dorothea
2010 *The German Reformers and England*. In *Sister Reformations [Schwesterreformationen]*. Ed. Dorothea Wendebourg, Mohr Siebeck. Tübingen.

- Wengert, Timothy J.
1997 *Law and Gospel*. Baker Books. Grand Rapids, MI.
- Wengert, Timothy J.
1998 *Human Freedom, Christian Righteousness*. Oxford University Press. New York.
- Wengert, Timothy J.
2000 “Philip Melancthon on Human and Divine Freedom.” In *Dialog: A Journal of Theology*, 39:4.
- Wengert, Timothy J.
2010 *Philip Melancthon, the Speaker of the Reformation*. Variorum Collected Studies Series. Ashgate Variorum. Burlington, VT.
- Wengert, Timothy J.
2012 *Philip Melancthon and the Origins of the “Three Causes” (1533–1535): An Examination of the Roots of the Controversy over the Freedom of the Will*, vol. 7. Refo500 Academic Studies. Ed. Herman J. Selderhuis. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Bristol, CT.
- Whiting, Michael S.
2010 *Luther in English*. Princeton Theological Monograph Series. 142. Pickwick Publications. Eugene, OR.
- Wiedermann, Gotthelf
1986 “Alexander Alesius Lectures on the Psalms at Cambridge, 1536.” In *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 37(1).
- Youngs, Joyce
1971 *The Dissolution of Monasteries*. Historical Problems. Studies and Documents. Ed. G. R. Elton. George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. London.
- Yost, John K.
1970 “German Protestant Humanism and the Early English Reformation: Richard Taverner and Official Translations.” In *Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance*, 32.