Tobias Jammerthal, *stud. theol.*
c./o. e.s.v. Tübinger Wingolf
Gartenstraße 38
D- 72074 Tübingen

Martin Bucer in Dialogue with the English Reformation:

from compromise to coercion?

dissertation

submitted for the *Hochschulpreis des Evangelischen Bundes Württemberg* 2013

under the supervision of

Prof. Dr. Alec Ryrie

(Department of Theology and Religion, University of Durham, United Kingdom)

Durham, September 2013

Contents

Abbreviations

Abbreviations follow: *The Year's Work in Modern Language Studies*, Vol. 72 (2012 [survey year 2010]), pp. 551-592.

Other abbreviations used:

BGLR	Beiträge zur Geschichte und Lehre der Reformierten Kirche
BSLK	Bekenntnisschriften der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche (see Bibliography, 1 Primary Sources)
CSEMBH	Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History
ET	*Epistolæ Tigurinæ de rebus potissimum ad Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Reformationem pertinentibus…* (see Bibliography, 1 Primary Sources)
ETh	Fecht, John, ed., *Historiae Ecclesiasticae Seculi a.n.c. XVI. Supplementum…* (see Bibliography, 1 Primary Sources)
LCC	The Library of Christian Classics
LSVR	Leben und Schriften der Väter der Reformierten Kirche
ODNB	Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (online edn.: http://www.oxforddnb.com/)
PCSEMB	Politics, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain
SA	Hubert, ed., *…Scripta Anglicana…* (see Bibliography, 1 Primary Sources)
SMHR	Spätmittelalter, Humanismus, Reformation (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007-)
SMR.NR	Spätmittelalter und Reformation, Neue Reihe (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990-2007)
SVRG	Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1883-).
StAndSRH	St Andrews Studies in Reformation History
SHCT	Studies in the History of Christian Traditions
ThR	Theologische Rundschau (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1898-).
UKG	Untersuchungen zur Kirchengeschichte
VIEG	Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz
WTJ	Westminster Theological Journal

1 Introduction[1]

This dissertation claims that Martin Bucer during his stay in England received the emphasis on obedience and external moderation particular to the English discourse on Reformation and that this reception changed the way in which he argued for Christian unity. In doing so, I intend to illustrate that the 16th-century Reformation was a phenomenon of a European dimension. Whilst it remains true that the Reformation in each context had characteristics peculiar to that context, it also is true, and becomes increasingly visible, that developments in, for example, Zürich, did have wider ramifications for the Reformation in other places.

The 20th century was a century in which ecumenical questions played an important role in Church and theology. Assemblies such as the 1910 Edinburgh Missionary Conference or the 1948 first meeting of the World Council of Churches and movements such as 'Faith and Order' and 'Life and Work' are but a few examples of this importance. Within Europe, the 1973 *Leuenberg Agreement* was the break-through for ecumenical relations within the family of Reformation churches, bringing to an end some 500 years of intra-protestant controversies with sometimes violent character, and leading to the formation of the Community of Protestant Churches in Europe. And so, as we celebrate forty years of protestant unity, it is utterly appropriate to look back at the Reformation era and Bucer (1491-1551), who 490 years ago entered the ministry. His efforts for a compromise between Wittenberg and Zürich on the matter of the Lord's Supper and his constant presence at Empire-level religious conferences mark him as an influential figure of the German Reformation and earned him fame as a moderate Reformer. A side-claim of this dissertation, in fact, is, that the *Leuenberg Agreement* itself is some sort of a Bucer-reception.

But the last two years of his life Bucer spent in English exile on invitation by Archbishop Thomas Cranmer of Canterbury. And it is with his time in England that this dissertation is concerned. It initially springs from a simple observation: Whereas Bucer is considered as being a moderate Reformer, the English Reformation has often been described as a *via media*, a moderate Reform. This alone would make it interesting to take a look at whether there was a dialogue between Bucer and the English discourse. Moreover, the importance of the 16th-century Reformation as a process that shaped both England and Germany, as well as Europe as a whole, not just religiously but culturally as well can scarcely be overestimated. And since the 20th century

---

[1] *Diese Arbeit ist eine erweiterte und auf die Leuenberger Konkordie bezogene Fassung des Textes, den ich im August 2013 dem Theologischen Seminar der Universität Durham zur Erlangung des M.A.-Grades vorgelegt habe und ist daher in englischer Sprache verfasst. Für die Betreuung der Arbeit bin ich Herrn Professor Dr. Alec Ryrie vom Theologischen Seminar der Universität Durham zutiefst verpflichtet.*

has seen a 'Bucer-renaissance'[2] and tried to find its ecumenical concern in this 16th-century theologian, a study in Bucer's theological perception of Christian unity and how it interconnected with and accommodated to the English perception with its peculiar stress on moderation is of some necessity.

An answer to this question has to be sought in Bucer's texts produced during his stay in England 1549-1551 for signs of such reception. The language he employs deserves particular attention; by the same token, it would have to be established what the features of the English discourses were that Bucer could receive. It would, in fact, be a success to be able to demonstrate that Bucer since mid-1549 increasingly employed language which characterises the English discourse; this would indicate that Bucer indeed did enter the English discourse and be an indication for a potential shift in Bucer's theology of Christian concord.

This dissertation needs to respect two areas of scholarship: the study of the English Reformation on the one hand-side, and the study of Bucer on the other. Scholarship on the English Reformation in the last century witnessed intensive controversies on principled issues. Ian Hazlett observes that, after the debates around the so-called 'revisionism' had dominated the scholarly discourse on the late 20th century, current scholarship is dominated by a new sensibility for the language both employed in the primary sources and in scholarly literature on these sources.[3] A prominent representative of this angle is Diarmaid MacCulloch with his seminal biography of Cranmer[4] and his monograph with the eloquent subtitle 'Europe's House Divided' on the Reformation.[5] For the English Reformation in particular, scholars have become increasingly aware of a characteristic use of language around the concepts of obedience and moderation.[6] Already in 1977, Bernard Verkamp's study of English adiaphorism argued that the so-called 'things indifferent' played a crucial role in establishing and securing the authority of the king in religious matters.[7] The importance of Royal Supremacy and its central role in early modern discourses has been stressed by Daniel Eppley[8] and others.[9] And in 2011, Ethan Shagan

---

[2] Cf. Thompson, Bard, 'Bucer Study Since 1918', *ChHis* 25 (1956), 63-82; Seebaß, Gottfried, *Bucer-Forschung seit dem Jubiläumsjahr 1991*, ThR 62 (1997), 271-300.

[3] Hazlett, Ian, *The Reformation in Britain and Ireland* (London: T&T Clark, 2003), pp. 29-34 (33).

[4] MacCulloch, Diarmaid, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996).

[5] MacCulloch, Diarmaid, *Reformation: Europe's House Divided* (London: Penguin, 2004).

[6] Cf. Scodel, Joshua, *Excess and the Mean in Early Modern English Literature* (Princeton: University Press, 2002); Racaut, Luc, and Ryrie, Alec, eds., *Moderate Voices in the European Reformation*, StAndSRH (Hants: Ashgate, 2005).

[7] Verkamp, Bernard J., *The Indifferent Mean: Adiaphorism in the English Reformation to 1554* (Ohio: University Press, 1977).

[8] Eppley, Daniel, *Defending royal supremacy and Discerning God's will in Tudor England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).

[9] Cf. Bernard, G. W., 'The Making of Religious Policy, 1533-1546: Henry VIII and the Search for the Middle Way', *HJ*, vol. 41. No. 2 (June 1998), 321-349; Marshall, Peter, 'Mumpsimus and Sumpsimus', *Religious Identities in Henry VIII's England*, StAndSRH (Hants: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 157-165; Rex, Richard, 'The Crisis of Obedience: God's Word and Henry's Reformation', *HJ*, vol. 39. No. 4 (Dec. 1996), 863-894; Ryrie, Alec, 'Divine Kingship and Royal Theology in Henry VIII's Reformation', *Reformation* 7 (2002), 49-77.

in a comprehensive study on the 'Rule of Moderation' could on the basis of an attentive analysis of early modern English texts successfully claim that not only the early modern use of the term 'moderation' was distinct from its modern use but that therefore a re-assessment of the English Reformation and classical scholarly narratives on this phenomenon was necessary.[10]

Bucer, on the other hand, still is in the process of being assigned his appropriate place in the history of the Reformation. Whereas Martin Greschat in 1990 published the long wanted biography,[11] and the edition at least of Bucer's German works and of his letters seems to be making good progress,[12] a comprehensive study in his theology still remains to be written. Bucer's time in England has been subject to considerable scholarly attention. After a doctoral dissertation by Edward Harvey had opened the floor,[13] Constantin Hopf's pioneering monograph published in 1946 mightily argued for a considerable influence of Bucer's on the English Reformation.[14] Thereafter, scholars mainly concentrated on Bucer's time in Cambridge, where he served as Regius Professor of Divinity[15] and his influence on the revision of the Book of Common Prayer.[16] The 500th anniversary of Bucer's birth in 1991 seems to have served as the most recent impulse for a number of new publications, amongst which the names of Basil Hall and David F. Wright are connected with the most comprehensive accounts on Bucer's time in England.[17] The perhaps most prolific scholar to be named here is Norton Scott Amos, whose study of Bucer encompasses manifold aspects not only but chiefly of Bucer's last two years.[18]

---

[10] Shagan, Ethan H., *The rule of moderation: violence, religion and the politics of restraint in early modern England* (Cambridge: University Press, 2011).

[11] Greschat, Martin, *Martin Bucer: Ein Reformator und seine Zeit* (München: C.H. Beck, 1990).

[12] Cf. Jammerthal, Tobias, *Research Proposal and Critical Literature Review for the MA in Theology and Religion: 'Martin Bucer's Concept of Moderate Reformation in Dialogue with the English Reformation'* (unpublished assignment, University of Durham, 2013), pp. 4f.

[13] Harvey, Edward, *Martin Bucer in England* (Marburg: Bauer, 1906).

[14] Hopf, Constantin, *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946).

[15] Harvey, *Bucer,* pp. 44-52; Hopf, *Bucer*, pp. 12-34. Cf. Amos, Norton Scott, 'The Alsatian among the Athenians: Martin Bucer, Mid-Tudor Cambridge and the Edwardian Reformation', *RRR* 4.1 (2002), 94-124.

[16] Apart form Harvey, *Bucer,* pp. 63-77and Hopf, *Bucer*, pp.65-98, cf. Amos, Norton Scott, 'Martin Bucer and the Revision of the 1549 Book of Common Prayer: Reform of Ceremonies and the Didactic Use of Ritual', *RRR* 2 (1999), 107-126; Jammerthal, Tobias, *Martin Bucer's Relationship to the Book of Common Prayer* (unpublished assignment, University of Durham 2013) (henceforth Jammerthal, *Bucer and the Prayerbook*); Frere, Walter Howard, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer with a Rationale of its Offices, on the basis of the former work by Francois Porter* (London: MacMillan, 1949), pp. 71-77.

[17] Hall, Basil, 'Martin Bucer in England', *Martin Bucer: Reforming church and community*, ed. Wright, David F. (Cambridge: University Press, 1994), pp. 144-160; Wright, David F., 'Martin Bucer and England – and Scotland', Krieger, Christian and Lienhard, Marc, eds., *Martin Bucer and Sixteenth-Century Europe: Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (28-31 août 1991)* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993), pp. 523-532.; Wright, David F., 'Martin Bucer in England', *ANVIL* 9.3 (1992).

[18] Amos, Norton Scott, '"It is fallow Ground here": Bucer as Critic of the English Reformation', *WTJ 61:1* (Spring 1999), 41-52; Amos, 'Revision'*;* Amos, 'Cambridge'; 'Bucer among the Biblical Humanists: The Context for his Practice in the Teaching of Theology in Strasbourg, 1523-1548', *RRR* 6.2 (2004), 134-154; 'Strangers in a Strange Land: The English Correspondence of Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr Vermigli', James III, Frank A., ed., *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, SHCT vol. CXV (Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 26-46; 'Bucer, Martin (1491-1551)', *ODNB* (Oxford: University Press, 2004; online edn., January 2008: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3822, accessed 10th July 2013); 'Protestant Exiles in England. Martin Bucer, the Measured Approach to Reform, and the Elizabethan Settlement – "Eine gute, leidliche Reformation"',

In much of this literature, a connection between Bucer's theology of Reformation and the principles of the English Reformation is presupposed. Hopf finds the *via media* in Bucer's Cambridge Lecture on Ephesians.[19] MacCulloch presumes that '[t]he middle ground he [Cranmer] sought was the same as was Bucer's'.[20] And Amos is convinced that Bucer came to England in order to pursue his 'measured approach' to the Reformation.[21] Yet, I have not been able to find a study in Bucer's reception of English Reformation discourse which takes into account the results of recent scholarship on the characteristics of this discourse. It has of course been argued that Bucer's late work *De Regno Christi* springs of a remarkable analysis of the economic and political situation of early modern England.[22] But this alone does not serve to demonstrate that he engaged in a dialogue with the themes of obedience and moderation so important for the early modern English discourse on Reformation.

In order to approach this question, I will at first try to establish the starting point for the development I claim, and therefore study a letter he wrote to Peter Martyr Vermigli in mid-1549, where he reflects on his efforts towards a religious concord in the 1530s and presents a rationale for these efforts. Contrasting this, chapter 3 will map out the landscapes Bucer encountered by looking at two characteristic representatives of the English discourse on Reformation. Thomas Starkey shall serve as an example for English emphasis on the importance of external moderation and Stephen Gardiner's *De Vera Obedientia* not only was a model defence of the Royal Supremacy but was also read by Bucer and, as I will show in the course of this dissertation, had some influence on his perception of the English Reformation. This chapter will also include a sketch of Bucer's German contexts in order to reveal that whilst partly similar questions were raised in both England and the Empire, each context had its distinctive character to which Bucer would have to accommodate.

Against this background, chapter 3 will examine some of Bucer's writings. I will proceed according to chronological order. This not only helps to draw lines of development within Bucer's thought but also serves to avoid the temptation of too ready systematisation. Naturally, the scope of this dissertation only permits the study of a small selection of texts, in all of which Bucer addresses an English audience. The letters to Edmund Grindal, William Bill and Cranmer

---

Wendebourg, Dorothea, ed., *Sister Reformations – Schwesterreformationen* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), pp. 151-174 (henceforth Amos, 'Exiles').

[19] Hopf, *Bucer*, p. 18, FN4.

[20] MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, p. 617.

[21] Amos, 'Exiles', pp. 153-154.

[22] Hopf, *Bucer*, pp. 99-100; the most important contribution is Pauck, Wilhelm *Das Reich Gottes auf Erden. Utopie und Wirklichkeit . Eine Untersuchung zu Butzers „De Regno Christi" und zur englischen Staatskirche des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1928). Cf. also his introduction to the work: *De Regno Christi, tr. Pauck, Wilhelm, and Larkin, Paul, Melanchthon and Bucer,* LCC, vol. XIX (London: SCM Press, 1969), pp. 155-173.

all share in that they are directed at members of the Edwardian establishment. And the *Censura* on the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer* has received considerable scholarly attention as probably Bucer's most influential text in connection to the English Reformation. Each text will be placed in its context and will be examined for traces of reception of the characteristics of the English discourse chapter 3 will have established.

2 Religious Concord in Bucer's Thought 1549:

His Letter to Peter Martyr Vermigli, Canterbury 20 June 1549

After his arrival in England, Bucer was received by Cranmer[23] and seems to have enjoyed the Archbishop's hospitality until early autumn, before settling in in Cambridge.[24] This letter was written in Canterbury,[25] and reacts to a letter by Peter Martyr Vermigli,[26] whom Bucer already had met at his arrival at Lambeth and whom he knew from Martyr's time as Italian refugee in Straßburg.[27] The issue at stake is the Lord's Supper, on which Martyr had had a disputation in Oxford.[28] In his letter dated 15 June, he had sent Bucer a copy of the acts of the disputation he wanted to publish. Within the more general framework of Edwardian England, the letter was written after the unrest in large parts of the country had already started, but before the start of the riots in Thames Valley and the Home Counties which would demand Cranmer's attention in the Privy Council.[29]

Bucer, after emphasising the personal friendship between them, voices general satisfaction with Martyr's theses. He however suggests alterations to some of them in order to better express the actual presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper without any impanatory aberrations[30] and strongly opposes allegations that either he himself or Philipp Melanchthon were advocating ubiquitous thoughts.[31] Relevant for this dissertation are the reasons Bucer puts forth in order to argue for changes to Martyr's propositions.

---

[23] Cf. Bucer's letters to the ministers of Straßburg and to Jacob Sturm of Straßburg, ET CCXLVIIIf, pp. 349-351. For reactions to Bucer's appearance in England, cf. Hopf, *Bucer*, pp. 14f.

[24] Greschat, *Bucer*, p. 240 unfortunately does not name a reference for his remarks that Bucer was in Cambridge in mid-June in order to look for a house, and Hooper's letter dating to the 25th June 1549 seems to suggest a continuing presence of Bucer's at the archiepiscopal court, cf. *ET* XXXIII, pp. 41-43 (43).

[25] *SA* pp. 546-550. English translation: *Gorham* XXIV, pp. 82-82 but note that Gorham p. 82 mistakenly translates *'Cantuariæ'* (*SA* p. 550) at the end of the letter as 'Cambridge', thereby suggesting that Bucer would have come to Cambridge briefly before going back to Cranmer.

[26] Martyr's letter: *SA* pp. 549f.

[27] Cf. Hopf, *Bucer*, pp. 4f. and Sturm, Klaus, *Die Theologie Peter Martyr Vermiglis während seines ersten Aufenthalts on Straßburg 1542-1547: Ein Reformkatholik unter den Vätern der reformierten Kirche*, BGLR vol. XXXI (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, des Erziehungsvereins, 1971), pp. 13-38. For the relationship between Bucer and Martyr in England, cf. Amos, Norton Scott, 'Strangers in a Strange Land: The English Correspondence of Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr Vermigli', James III, Frank A., ed., *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, SHCT vol. CXV (Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 26-46.

[28] Cf. Greschat, *Bucer,* pp. 240f.; Hopf, *Bucer*, p. 50. and Mullinger, *Cambridge*, pp. 115-117.

[29] Cf. MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, pp. 429-432 on these riots.

[30] This is hardly the place to present Bucer's own theology of the Lord's Supper. Cf. for a first orientation Hopf's 'Notes on Bucer's Eucharistic Conception' in *Bucer and the English Reformation*, pp. 41-50 and Neuser's study of the matter until the Wittenberg Concord, *Bucer*, pp. 212-218; see further MacCulloch's discussion of Cranmer's Eucharistic thoughts which pay ample reference to possible influence of Bucer's, *Cranmer*, pp. 386-392.461-471.490-492.614-617. For Martyr's thoughts on the Lord's Supper, cf. McLelland, Joseph C., *The visible words of God : an exposition of the sacramental theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli, A.D. 1500-1562* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1957), and Fuller, Donald, 'Sacrifice and Sacrament: Another Eucharistic Contribution from Peter Martyr Vermigli', James III, Frank A., ed., *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations*, pp. 215-237.

[31] *SA*, p. 550.

The guiding principle for Bucer is – as in many of his writings connected with the English Reformation – that of edification:[32] *'Quærendum nobis est summo studio, vt ædificemus in fide Christi & dilectione quoscunque omnino licet, & offendamus neminem'*, as he admonishes Martyr.[33] Recalling his own efforts in Germany on the matter of a consensus on the Lord's Supper, Bucer declares that he found almost no one who earnestly taught an 'impanation' of Christ in the elements, but that the overwhelming majority of his partners in dialogue hold a 'simple' (*simpliciter*) presence of Christ in the Sacrament, *'& de modo, quo præsens sit, animum penitus abstrahebant.'*[34] From his own involvement into the question of a concord, he deduces a rationale of religious unity:

> *Hunc etiam consensum equidem non possum videre citius & certius posse persuaderi omnibus, qui contentiosi non sunt, & ædificari hac in re possunt, quam si, sicut sentimus cum verbo Domini, & cum tota veteri Ecclesia; verbis etiam Scripturæ & veteris Ecclesiæ libenter vtamur; ac ita, quod est in hoc sacrum præcipuum, id etiam plenioribus & certioribus verbis exprimamus & prædicemus: sicut videmus in sanctis patribus Ecclesiam consueuisse.*[35]

This rationale of consensus is based on the assumption of an agreement in principle. Since all parties involved consent in the principle of *what* happens, they can tolerate there being various possibilities to express *how* it happens. What sounds like an easy compromise, however, involves a sacrifice of terminology. Bucer's high regard for Scripture, which would influence his views on English liturgy,[36] led him to demand that the language used in connection with the Lord's Supper should be strictly the scriptural language: he wants to drop all deliberations on *'istas voces, Realiter, Substantialiter, Carnaliter, Corporaliter'.*[37] He not only deemed them to be non-scriptural, but even regarded them as being *'nec etiam […] ad exprimandam Scripturæ veritatem adeo conducibiles'*[38].

This negative esteem of the terms theology had used hitherto when thinking about Eucharistic issues appears somewhat surprising – after all, the contemporary discourses rather tended to define or re-define orthodoxy by the use of a language as precise as possible. Bucer's letter to Martyr, however, does not seem to be aware of this problem: in Germany, the Alsatian writes to his friend, this *ratio concordiæ* had been practised with great success (*quæ concordiæ ratio in Germanicis ecclesijs pridem receptum est, & permultum profuit).*[39] Bucer here is referring to the 1536 *Wittenberg Concord* which indeed brought about communion between the adherents to Wittenberg

---

[32] Cf. the sources studied below, 4, in which Bucer frequently uses the triad *ordo, decentia* and *edificatio* he takes from 1 Corinthians 14.
[33] *SA*, p. 547.
[34] Cf. *SA*, p. 547.
[35] *SA*, pp. 547-548.
[36] Cf. Jammerthal, Bucer and the Prayerbook.
[37] *SA*, p. 548.
[38] Ibid.
[39] *SA*, p. 548.

and the South-Western Cities. What Bucer seemed to forget here, was the fact that his efforts in this respect earned him the long-lasting despises of the Zürich theologians.[40] But even with this *caveat*, we can find here Bucer's idea of how to achieve religious concord: realising a unity already given in principle, the parties involved lay aside the language which they have been using in conflicting with each other, to listen anew to God's Word as revealed in Holy Scripture. This hegemonial position of Scripture, of course, is by no means a merely Bucerian theologumenon; it was commonplace amongst the reformers and would perhaps most powerfully figure in the 1578 *Formula Concordiæ*.[41] But it is important for this dissertation to note that at the beginning of his time in England, Bucer's idea of religious concord was characterised by the notion of it being a theological process of understanding each other's position and of listening and learning together.

This concept of reaching religious concord by listening and learning together, thereto laying aside terminology which seems to be unhelpful and realising a unity already given, indeed seems to re-appear in the 1973 *Leuenberg Agreement*, as a look at paragraphs 1, 2 and 29 will show.

The first paragraph states that the churches signing the *Leuenberg Agreement* 'affirm, on the basis of their doctrinal discussions, a common understanding of the Gospel as elaborated below'.[42] This is followed in paragraph 2 by the declaration that 'the necessary and sufficient pre-requisite for the true unity of the Church is agreement in the right teaching of the Gospel and the right administration of the sacraments',[43] reflecting the teaching of article VII of the *Augsburg Confession*,[44] And after the spelling out which common understanding the participating churches have reached, paragraph 29 declares:

> [C]hurch fellowship means that, on the basis of the consensus they have reached in their understanding of the Gospel, churches with different confessional positions accord each other fellowship in word and sacrament.[45]

Whereas it has to be acknowledged that these parts of the *Leuenberg Agreement* receives to a great extent phrases and ideas most prominently expressed in Philipp Melanchthon's 1530 *Augsburg Confession*, the rationale equally seems to echo the one Bucer describes in his letter to Martyr: the

---

[40] Cf. e.g. Greschat, *Bucer*, pp. 149-152.

[41] Cf. *BSLK*, p. 767: 'Wir glauben, lehren und bekennen, dass die einige Regel und Richtschnur, nach welcher zugleich alle Lehren und Lehrer gerichtet und geurteilet werden sollen, seind allein die prohpetischen und apostolischen Schriften Altes und Neues Testamentes' / '*Credimus, confitemur et docemus unicam regulam et normanm,, secundum quam omnia dogmata omnesque doctors aestimari et iudicari opporteat, nullam omnino aliam esse quam prophetica et apostolica scripta cum Veteris tum Novi Testamenti*'.

[42] *Agreement between the Reformation churches in Europe (The Leuenberg Agreement)*, online edn.: http://www.leuenberg.eu/de/node/640, accessed 23 August 2013, § 1.

[43] *Leuenberg Agreement*, § 2.

[44] Cf. *BSLK*, p. 61.

[45] *Leuenberg Agreement,* § 29.

unity which is expressed in the *Agreement* is not achieved, it is realised as given. The common understanding of the Gospel, which according to paragraph 1 enables the signatory churches to declare their fellowship, is affirmed – but, most important, it has been realised through 'doctrinal discussions'.[46] And the traditional differences between the protestant denominations[47] are described as rooting in 'real differences in style of theological thinking and church practice'[48] and as 'historically conditioned thought forms'.[49] To me, this resembles Bucer's warning not to mistake the terminology used in discussing an issue with the issue itself in his letter to Martyr – *'omissas mallem omnes istas voces, Realiter, Substantialiter, Carnaliter, Corporaliter'*, as he puts it.[50] Moreover, and crucially, the importance ascribed unto the process of theological discourse by the *Leuenberg Agreement* echoes the central role Bucer's letter ascribes to the conjoint listening to and learning from God's Word as revealed in Scripture. This in my opinion suffices to conclude that Bucer's concept of realising unity by learning together pioneers the method of concord used in the *Leuenberg Agreement*. And whilst it would be interesting to compare this concept to the ones by his Bucer's fellow German reformers, and to trace down how it would have manifested itself in his earlier writings, this dissertation will seek to study how the man who wrote this down in 1549 would write about religious controversies in the following two last years of his life.

---

[46] *Leuenberg Agreement,* § 1.
[47] The official translation 'confession' for the German 'Konfession' occurring in the English version of the *Leuenberg Agreement* is unfortunate, because it wrongly suggests a penitential character, whereas the German term means 'denomination'.
[48] *Leuenberg Agreement,* § 3.
[49] Ibid., § 5.
[50] *SA*, p. 548.

3 English Discourse on Moderation in the Mid-Sixteenth Century

I now propose to look at two chief characteristics of the discourses in early modern England in connection to the Reformation. These are the high appraisal of a *via media* and, related to that, the question of obedience. Both questions are connected through the term 'moderation' in its contemporary sense, and all this has recently been the focus of considerable scholarly efforts.[51] For the purposes of this dissertation, I will show the importance of the *via media* by looking at Starkey's *Exhortation to the people*; the question of obedience I want to study in Gardiner's *De Vera Obedentia*. Both were written by key figures of the Henrician Reformation, and both are model texts for the concepts of obedience, the mean, and the role of moderation therein. Their context cannot be described but as being encouraging for deliberations in connection with the Reformation: 1534 had seen the *Act of Supremacy* and 1536 was a year full of both ambiguity and possibilities for the Reformation with Henry VIII's negotiations with the Schmalkaldic League and the *Ten Articles*, accompanied by the *First Henrician Injunctions,* as a royal doctrinal statement accompanying these negotiations. The *Ten Articles* themselves are a rather ambiguous text,[52] more eloquent in what they do not express than what they express.[53]

3.1 Thomas Starkey: The Salutary Mean

When Starkey in 1536 published his *Exhortation to the people, instuctynge theym to Unitie and Obedience*, he was by no means an unimportant figure – after a career as a humanist which led him to Italy with Reginald Pole, in early 1535 on Thomas Cromwell's initiative he became a royal familiar and chaplain, before in 1536 being appointed master of the collegiate church of St Laurence Pountney in London. In 1537, he even was involved in the preparations for the *Bishops' Book*.[54] His influential position is reflected in his preface to the king where he recalls a personal encounter with the king dealing with the hypothesis he was about to put into his treatise. The importance of his *Exhortation* can easily been assessed by the interest taken in it by Cromwell, who already in 1535 had asked Starkey to write an oration on Aristotle's opinion of policy.[55]

---

[51] Shagan, *Moderation*; Scodel, *Excess and Mean*; Marshall, Peter, and Ryrie, Alec, 'Introduction', Marshall/Ryrie, *Beginnings*, pp. 1-13; Racaut, Luc, and Ryrie, Alec, 'Introduction: Between Coercion and Persuasion', Racaut/Ryrie, *Moderate Voices*, pp. 1-12.

[52] Bray, Gerald, ed., *Documents of the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Clark & co., 1994), pp. 162-174.

[53] Cf. Bray's short characterisation: Bray, *Documents*, p. 162.

[54] For biographical details, see Mayer, Thomas Ferdinand, 'Starkey, Thomas (c. 1498-1538)', *ODNB* (Oxford: University Press, 2004; online edn., January 2008: http://oxforddnb.com/view/article/26318, accessed 10th July 2013) (henceforth Mayer, 'Starkey') and Mayer's *Thomas Starkey and the Commonweal: Humanist politics and religion on the reign of Henry VIII*, CSEMBH (Cambridge: University Press, 1989) (henceforth Mayer, *Starkey and the Commonweal*), cf. here particularly the introduction pp. 1-13 for Starkey's significance.

[55] See Mayer, *Starkey and the Commonweal*, pp. 139-168 for Aristotelian influence on Starkey. For Cromwell's interest in the *Exhortation*, see ibid., pp. 204-206.216-218 (on p. 228/229 even suggesting direct involvement of the king's) and Verkamp, *Indifferent Mean,* pp. 157f.

The *Exhortation* has a fairly simple point to make: England's society is in discord because people are unable to differentiate between things necessary and things indifferent to salvation. This incompetence or 'blyndnes' can take several forms, the most serious being superstition and arrogance. Whereas superstition leads to an inappropriate valuing of church customs and therefore potentially is disloyal to temporal authority, arrogance despises all and every one of these customs as contradicting Christian liberty and thus is prone to undermine the very foundations of religion and therefore of civil unity.

Against these extremes, Starkey holds, a middle way has to be taken. Both superstition and arrogance in the end leading to a public discord and disorder, it is necessary to affirm the mean, of which he can speak almost hymnically:

> This meane we muste followe and ensewe, if we wyl attayne to our felycyte, of the whiche dere frendes maruayle you nothing at all. For by a certain meane the armoure of this hole worlde is conteyned in this natural order & beautie: […] And by a meane all trewe religion without impyetye or superstytion, is stablysshed and sette forth to goddis honour and glorye in all chrysten natyons and countreyes: ye and soo by a meane we shall, mooste christyan people, chiefely auoyde this daungerous diuisyen growen in amonge us[56]

Two things are noticeable here. On the one hand, Starkey characterises the mean as not simply useful in civil matters: it is necessary for attaining felicity. On the other hand, he emphasises that the exact content of this *via media* is not at the discretion of the individual. And in both aspects, he seems to vocalise ideas which were widespread amongst his contemporaries.[57]

The middle way in early modern England is far more than a useful concept for civil peace.[58] Due to the prominence of Aristotle's ethical texts within the universities, the idea that a middle way between two extremes is a principal virtue dominates the discourses. And the theological discourses do not form an exception but rather affirm this suspicion, as Starkey proves. It is in context of religious controversies between those who are superstitious and those who are arrogant, that he raises his claim 'that as of the one syde we shall auoyde al blynde supersticion, so we shal of the other syde eschewe all arrogant opinion.'[59]

---

[56] Starkey, Thomas, *An Exhortation To the people, instructynge theym to Unitie and Obedience (*London: Thomas Bertholet , 1536, online edn. http://eebo.chadwyck.com/search/full_rec?ACTION=ByID&SOURCE=pdfdownload.cfg&ID=99840324, accessed 29th June 2013)*, sigg. Y.ii.v-Z.r.

[57] Cf. Shagan, *Moderation*, pp. 79-85.

[58] Cf. Marshall, 'Mumpsimus and Sumpsimus', pp. 157-165 for Henry VIII's 1545 Christmas Eve address to Parliament where he perhaps most notably employed the program of a *via media*. Cf. also Bernard, 'Middle Way', esp. 322 and 333f.

[59] Starkey, *Exhortation*, sig. Y.ii.v.

The capability to maintain this eminently important *via media*, however, is not given to everyman. Rather, Starkey emphasises that man is 'a body frayle and corruptible, subiecte to affectes and all corruption.'[60] With this negative anthropology, he was in company with the Continental reformers. And if man is such a corruptible being, it does not surprise that Starkey does not entrust the mean to the care of the individual. The *via media* is far too important to place it in the hands of unstable people! Instead, it is 'common authority', a term in itself highly ambiguous, because it does not explicate which kind of authority Starkey actually has in mind,[61] which is responsible for discerning what the mean would be and for enforcing conformity to this very mean. The role of the individual in this system is to accept what has been decided to be the mean and to follow this middle way.[62]

With this formal determination of who defines the *via media*, however, no material definition has been made. And this is not accidental: the theoretical basis of Starkey's whole hypothesis is a remarkably broad definition of things indifferent. Maintaining a strict division between spiritual and temporal, he can argue that all temporal matters are things indifferent to salvation. He thus is able to establish a remarkably open definition of things indifferent: 'al thynges beside the gospel and doctrine of god receiued among christen nations, be of this sorte and nature, that they be not of necessite to be recyued.'[63] This does not pertain to ceremonial issues alone: Starkey's list of *adiaphora* includes purgatory,[64] prayers to the saints[65] and charitable works.[66] The presence of these issues, which were key issues at least to the Continental Reformers, suggests that Starkey regarded much of the controversies around the Reformation as mere fights for words – and, indeed, his analysis of the situation in the Holy Roman Empire concludes that the divisions there have their reason in the inability to distinguish between necessary and indifferent things.[67]

It is important to note that Starkey's approach very much represents the context of his treatise, inasmuch as his list of *adiaphora* includes things which figure ambiguously in the *Ten*

---

[60] Ibid., sig. K.iv.r.
[61] On the one hand, he does explicitly refer to the king's religious policy: cf. Starkey, *Exhortation*, sigg. B.iv.v-F.iv.v. This, however, only furthers the dilemma what his 'common authority' would be – given his other works, it is not likely that he thought of a personal regime by the king, cf. Mayer on Starkey's *Dialogue* and on his letters to Pole: Mayer, 'Starkey'. For a far more explicit theory of the Crown in Parliament as supreme authority, see Christopher St German as portrayed by Eppley, *Defending and Discerning*.
[62] This remains Starkey's theory as presented in his *Exhortation*, notwithstanding the limits Eppley sees, cf. Eppley, *Defending and Discerning*, pp. 49-53.
[63] Starkey, *Exhortation*, sig. U.r.
[64] Ibid., sig. X.iii.v.
[65] Ibid., sig. X.v.
[66] Ibid., sig. X.iv.v.
[67] Ibid., sig. A.iv.r.

Articles – most notably purgatory and all pious exercises emerging thereof.[68] Moreover, Starkey's care to not make statements in clear favour of either pre-Reformation religion or indeed evangelical demands in itself clearly reflects the ambiguity of the *Ten Articles*.[69] And finally, when looking at the *First Henrician Injunctions*, one might wonder whether Starkey's *Exhortation* left its traces in Cromwell's directions to the clergy, most notably in the second article of his *Injunctions* with its directive that the clergy shall teach the people to distinguish between things 'which be necessary to be believed and observed for their salvation, and which be not necessary, but only do concern the decent and politic order of the said Church'.[70] Taken together with the correspondence of Cromwell and Starkey on the topic, which suggests that Cromwell indeed was shown an earlier draft of the *Exhortation*,[71] this opens up the possibility that Starkey was not only reproducing the ruling opinion at court, but also influenced two important legal texts of the Henrician Reformation.

This broad definition of things indifferent, however, did not mean that they became arbitrary for the individual. In fact, such a conception Starkey explicitly denounces as being 'arrogant'. Rather, the widespread tableau of things indifferent allows the regime to discern what in which situation would be the golden mean.[72] Likewise, the fact that the mean was formulating a salutary way of how to behave in things per se indifferent to salvation for Starkey does not mean that the thus discerned *via media* was a thing indifferent itself. Since Christ according to Starkey taught 'neuer to dispyse, nor to be disobediente to suche thynge as by common authorite is commonly receyued, but euer with humble and meke obedience, thereto contende, and desire to attain the fruition of suche thinges as neuer shall fythe nor decaye',[73] conformity to the governmentally decided middle way was vital. The things government has to rule upon might be indifferent in themselves. The authority-made decision, however, is not. On the contrary, because maintaining a mean is seen as so important for attaining felicity, conformity to the officially appointed mean becomes necessary to salvation in itself. 'Here, then was a doctrine that gave civil

---

[68] Cf. article 10, Bray, *Documents,* pp. 173f where purgatory is not directly denied nor really affirmed, but the prayer for the death regarded as pertaining to 'due order of charity'.

[69] Cf. esp article 4 on the Lord's Supper, Bray, *Documents*, pp. 169f, which leaves room for interpretation from either side; cf. furthermore the mentioning of only the three sacraments baptism, penance and Lord's Supper (art. 02-04, Bray, *Documents*, pp. 165-170). Cf. Ryrie 'Divine Kingship', 49-77 for a possible agenda behind this general pattern for Henry's religious policy.

[70] Article 2, ibid.

[71] This is aptly summed up by Verkamp, *Indifferent Mean*, pp. 157f. Cf. also Mayer, *Starkey and the Commonweal*, pp. 204-206.216-218

[72] And here, he goes in clear (but not explicit) opposition to William Tyndale, for whom the individual with Bible in hand determined whether the regime's actions are orthodox. Cf. Eppley, *Defending and Defining*, pp. 29-31.

[73] Starkey, *Exhortation*, sig. N.iii.v.

authorities virtually infinite discretion to set rules for "indifferent" things, and gave them an abiding motivation to enforce those rules', as Shagan puts it.[74]

3.2 Stephen Gardiner: True Obedience

The importance Starkey puts upon conformity to governmental decisions in *adiaphora* supplies the topic of an entire treatise by another author: 1535 the bishop of Winchester published *De Vera Obedientia*. Gardiner, again, is an important person in the context of early modern England. In addition to his position as master of Trinity Hall, Cambridge up to 1549, he served as a diplomat for Henry VIII especially during the negotiations on the king's divorce and, most crucially, as the king's secretary 1529 to 1534. Since 1531 bishop of Winchester, he soon became one of the champion conservatives at court.[75] His *De Vera Obedientia* can be seen as laying out the theological framework for Henry VIII's secession from Rome in insisting on the separate character of national churches.[76] Gardiner's strong support for the Royal Supremacy – at least in this treatise – as a personal regime is beyond any doubt:[77] The church within the English realm consists of subjects of the King of England, therefore the same king is by virtue of his supreme headship over his subjects supreme head of the Church of England: *'ecclesiæ Anglicanæ supremum in terris caput'.*[78] The precisation *in terris* can be seen as limiting royal supremacy, but in fact is presented as being a complaisance to over-cautious people.[79] It is, however, not his opposition against the papal jurisdiction which is of the main concern for this dissertation. More important is his concept of obedience inasmuch as it provides a theologically sound reflection, whereas Starkey later would produce a predominantly juridical notion.

Obedience, according to Gardiner, is at the very heart of Christian religion: Christ himself has through his obedient suffering prepared a model for his church and, indeed, every individual.[80] The appropriate reaction to this salutary obedience can only be the same Paul had shown at Damascus: *'qui simulatque a deo prostratus cecederit, uocem obedientiæ protinus emisit, dicens, Domine, quid uis me facere?'*[81] It is its relation to God which makes obedience true, Gardiner

---

[74] Shagan, *Moderation*, p. 83.

[75] For further details, see Armstrong, C. D. C., 'Gardiner, Stephen (c. 1495X8-1555)', *ODNB* (Oxford: University Press, 2004; online edn., January 2008: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10364, accessed 10th July 2013) .

[76] For the high importance of the treatise, see Armstrong, 'Gardiner'.

[77] Cf. my problematisation of Starkey's 'common authority' above, 2.1.1. Armstrong, however, draws attention to enduring suspicions on Gardiner's crypto-papist tendencies, cf. Armstrong, 'Gardiner'. A distinction between the king as defender of the faith and the Crown in Parliament as definer of the faith as Eppley sees it for St German (*Defending and Defining*, pp. 117f.) to my knowledge is alien to Gardiner.

[78] Gardiner, Stephen, *STEPHANI VVINTON. Episcopi De Vera Obedientia Oratio* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1535), p. 18v.

[79] Cf. Gardiner, *De Vera Obedientia,* pp. 18r-v.

[80] Cf. Ibid., p. 5r.

[81] Ibid., p. 2v.

observes: *'nihil esse aliud puto uere obedire, quam obedire ueritatem. Deus autem ueritas est'*.[82] Characteristic for this true obedience is that it comes not out of secondary motivation, but is obedience to God for God's sake.[83] And this obedience to God is realised in *'fidere enim deo atque illi firmissime adherere, quam iusti uitam appellat scriptura.'*[84]

To this leading of a just life belongs, Gardiner argues, the realisation that God has appointed certain men *'tamque uicaria potestate obedientiam exacturos […]. Quo certe in loco principes posuit, quos tamque ipsius imaginem mortalibus referents, summon, supremoque loco uoluit haberi'*.[85] This strong concept of monarchy forms the backbone of the rest of Gardiner's oration, especially regarding his argumentation against papal supremacy. If the monarch is God's vicar, the pope is not.[86] Gardiner does not cease to hammer home his conviction that for his subjects, the monarch represents God. The obedience due to God, therefore, is realised as obedience to the monarch: *'quicunque quibuscumque subiecti sint, praeceptis illis etiam obedient propter deum'*.[87]

This brings us to a different legitimation of external moderation. Whereas Starkey comes from a negative anthropology and thus sees external moderation as being a necessary mean to prevent chaos and catastrophe,[88] Gardiner does not need the human condition in his claim. For him, on the contrary, it is God who institutes the monarch and his power: *'principi obediendum esse ex precepto dei: et obediendum quidem sine exceptione'*.[89] This different approach to the question of authority – on the one hand from below, that is, from man's own incapability, and on the other hand from above, that is, from God's divine law – gives reason to situate both writers in different religious camps: Starkey's negative anthropology together with his humanistic inclinations places him within a rather evangelical context,[90] Gardiner's implicit positive anthropology prefigures his problems with evangelical positions during the later reign of Henry VIII and Edward VI. It is, however, remarkable that both authors come to the same conclusion that it is an integral part of secular authority, as Gardiner puts it, *'caput esse corpori [, id est] preesse uniuerso, ac singulis membris, quod in usum cederet uniuersi mandare, remittere nonnumquam et indulgere, **sicque moderari, et temperare**, ut*

---

[82] Ibid., p. 3v.

[83] Cf. Ibid., p. 6v.

[84] Ibid., p. 5r.

[85] Ibid.*,* p. 9r.

[86] Cf. Gardiner's argumentation: Ibid., pp. 10r-31v. Cf. Eppley's analysis of St German's similar ideas, *Defending and Defining*, p. 115.

[87] Gardiner, *De Vera Obedientia*, p. 9v. Gardiner's claim for unlimited royal power parallel the first article of the First Henrician Injunctions, cf. Bray, *Documents*, pp. 175f.

[88] Cf. Starkey, *Exhortation*, sig. K.iv.r.

[89] Gardiner, *De Vera Obedientia*, p. 13v. The arguments Eppley brings together (*Defending and Defining*, pp. 35-37) that Gardiner taught a concept that subordinated obedience to the monarch to the congruity of his actions with divine will to me are not convincing.

[90] Cf. Mayer's estimation in Mayer, 'Starkey'. It has, however, to be remarked that this terminology is a rather unhappy one, since confessional identity as 'evangelical' or 'protestant' only emerges much later.

dei Gloria fideisque profession indies augentur'.[91] For the purpose of my dissertation, this means that in key English discourses on Reformation in the 1530s, reformation was the exercise of authority in the realm of *adiaphora* to the end that a salutary mean be achieved. This exercise was necessary because the human condition is unable to avoid the extremes, and it was godly because the king was God's vicar upon earth. And this authoritative enforcement of a *via media* – whose content is at the discretion of the authorities – is phrased as moderation.[92]

Excurse: Bucer's German Contexts

I now want to briefly sketch Bucer's German contexts. It would, however, be an impossible task to do this sufficiently – and it would be superfluous, since the existing biographies and a number of articles provide the necessary information in depth.[93] My purpose is instead to provide a rough general overview in order to illuminate the differences as well as some similarities between the English and the German discourses on Reformation. This purpose also is the reason why I chose to separate this sketch from the treatment of Bucer's thought on religious concord in chapter 2.

Bucer's involvement in the case of religion in the Holy Roman Empire is manifold and includes almost all political levels existing within it. He was involved in the reformation in Hessen as a secular territory as well as the eventually unsuccessful reformation in the spiritual territory of Cologne. It is difficult to find a major conference on religious matters *without* Bucer being present. He had the most experience, however, with regard to the phenomenon of the urban reformation particular to the Empire. In Ulm, he was involved in institutionalising the Reformation, in Augsburg his advice was sought for organising an already changing church and in Straßburg Bucer can be seen as the major promoter of the Reformation.

The discourses Bucer was involved in mostly reflect his contexts. To the level of conferences and meetings, the question of the Lord's Supper is crucial. Here, Bucer's determined efforts aiming at establishing communion between the followers of Wittenberg and the ones of other approaches might not have been ubiquitously appreciated, as the example of Zürich shows. They form, however, an important part of his work in the Empire and it might be of some significance that the 1536 Wittenberg Concord between the Lutherans and the Southern German

---

[91] Gardiner, *De Vera Obedientia*, p. 20r, my bold letters.
[92] This connection between moderation and exercise of power has especially been argued by Shagan, *Moderation*. Cf. also Rex, 'Crisis'.
[93] Cf. Amos, 'Bucer' and Greschat, *Bucer*. Cf. for the different contexts in which Bucer worked Wolgast, Eike, 'Bucers Vorstellungen über die Einführung der Reformation', Krieger, Christian and Lienhard, Marc, eds., *Martin Bucer and Sixteenth-Century Europe: Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (28-31 août 1991)* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993) (henceforth Wolgast, 'Bucer'), pp. 145-159.

Cities emerged largely due to his efforts.[94] This text is very revealing for Bucer as the 'moderate Reformer'. His efforts to find a formula on which all could agree left the theologians in Zürich in doubt on his reliability and on a long-term basis had devastating effects on his reputation there, with consequences up to his time in England.[95] It is not least due to these doubts that the Wittenberg Concord never came to be ratified by the Swiss and thus missed its most ambitious goal.[96]

Other theological discourses include the question of justification, where Bucer has been accused of teaching a double justification.[97] This is especially important for this dissertation as it pertains most prominently to Bucer's conduct at the Diet of Regensburg 1541.[98] Here, again, we see Bucer trying to bring together different parties by means of formulae. And, again, these efforts come to no satisfying end but cast sincere doubts on Bucer's reliability and theological convictions in the eyes of other theologians, this time especially in Saxony.

His strong emphasis on Scripture certainly is one of his key characteristics as is, perhaps most important for this dissertation, his view on the question of the *ius reformationis*.[99] Here, Bucer, coming from the concept of the *cura religionis* as the most noble task of civil authority, developed a notion neatly suited for urban contexts with any form of lower authority (as opposed to the Emperor as higher authority) being called to ensure the preaching of the right doctrine and proper administration of the sacraments within their territory. Bucer upheld this magisterial approach to Reformation over against the individualistic concept of his Straßburg colleague Anton Engelbrecht;[100] however, he also was opposed to an all-too-ready use of governmental instruments against extreme reformers, as his dialogues with the Anabaptists in Hessen and his correspondence with Basel on the question of church discipline show.[101]

---

[94] Cf. for a good summary of the process leading to the Concord Neuser, *Bucer,* pp. 212-218 and for a more biographically orientated account Greschat, *Bucer*, pp. 142-152.

[95] Cf. his letter to Martyr treated above, 2, where Bucer, already in England, reflects on his efforts to bring Lutherans and Swiss together as a Sisyphean task: '*explaraui autem ex scriptus, & coram verbis quamplurimos toto illo seprennio, quo quasi saxum Sisyphi voluens, concordiam ecclesiarum sum, quod ad hanc causam* [the Lord's Supper] *attinet, molitus*', *SA*, p. 547.

[96] Cf. Greschat, *Bucer*, pp. 149-152. Cf. however Bucer's own high regard of this agreement in his letter to Martyr, above, 2.

[97] Neuser, *Bucer*, pp. 219-220.

[98] Cf. Greschat, *Bucer*, pp. 188-192.

[99] Cf. most comprehensively Kroon, Marijn de, Studien zu Martin Bucers Obrigkeitsverständnis: evangelisches Ethos und politisches Engagement (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1984).

[100] Cf. ibid., pp. 8-23.

[101] Cf. for the correspondence with Basel Hamm, Berndt, 'Martin Bucers zwei Gesichter: ausgrenzende Unduldsamkeit und integrative Toleranz', Simon, Wolfgang, ed., *Martin Bucer zwischen den Reichstagen von Augsburg (1530) und Regensburg (1532)*, SMHR 55 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), pp. 125-136. For the question of church discipline, cf. Burnett, Amy Nelson, *The Yoke of Christ: Martin Bucer and Christian Discipline,* SCES 26 (Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 1994.

Perhaps the most important aspect of Bucer's work in the Empire for his reception in England is his involvement in the attempted Cologne Reformation of 1542-43.[102] Archbishop-elector Hermann von Wied had called Bucer along with Philipp Melanchthon to help him in a careful reform of his archdiocese and territory. The result was the Cologne Church Order in which Bucer was responsible for the liturgical section and Melanchthon for the doctrinal parts.[103] Although Cologne would come to be another failure for Bucer due to von Wied's deposition by imperial troops in 1543, the texts composed in this matter were highly appreciated by Archbishop Thomas Cranmer of Canterbury, who saw in von Wied a role model for himself. With the Cologne Communion Order being of great importance for the liturgical work of Cranmer,[104] it is justifiable to see Bucer's work in Cologne as one of the key factors leading to his being invited to England in 1548.

3.3 Intermediary Conclusion: Different Landscapes

Drawing a summary to this chapter, I have to deduce that early modern England and the Holy Roman Empire were indeed two different landscapes which presented different challenges to Bucer.

In the Empire, Bucer was confronted with a complex political situation of the Emperor struggling against lower authorities on the question of religious changes. Whilst the Reformation at a local level was making progress, the Emperor remained opposed to it. This forced Bucer to develop a theory of the *ius reformationis* as belonging to every authority irrespective of their level. Whereas the question of authority in the Empire therefore was at stake, this cannot really be argued for England. Notwithstanding a probably deliberately imprecise nomenclature in Starkey, it has to be conceded that for the English context, the power to enact religious changes, if at all, belonged to the central authority – whether that be the king alone or the king in parliament is not important for that matter.

Quite apart from these political backgrounds, there also is an important difference within the theological landscape. In the Empire, Bucer got involved into theological controversies on questions which for Starkey belonged into the realm of *adiaphora*. And whereas Bucer's theological counterparts within the Empire always demanded the least possible ambiguity, the English official documents were, if anything, deliberately ambiguous, thereby leaving all the more

---

[102] Cf. Greschat, *Bucer*, pp. 192-203;

[103] Cf. Köhn, Mechthild, *Martin Bucers Entwurf einer Reformation des Erzstiftes Köln*, UKG 2 (Witten: Luther-Verlag, 1966).

[104] Cf. Hopf, *Bucer*, pp.94-98 and more specific in Brightman, F. E., ed., *The English Rite: Being A Synopsis of the Sources and Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer with an Introduction and an Appendix*, 2 vols. (London: Rivingtons, 1915), vol. I, pp. xlvff.; Cuming, Godly Order, pp. 68-88; for the personal importance for Cranmer cf. MacCulloch Cranmer, pp. 392f and Amos, 'Exiles', p. 159.

room for the discretion of the proper officials to determine what the respective salutary mean was.

This brings me to a final distinction. Bucer's efforts to achieve religious unity within the Empire as seen particularly in his involvement into several colloquies and conferences always was characterised by the strive for compromise. He sought to find a formula on which all parties involved could agree – and regularly failed to receive that agreement. In England, religious unity was a matter of obedience towards the God-given authority. Whereas both contexts are shaped by the notion that extreme positions are undesirable, this leads for Bucer in his German contexts to the attempt to reconcile the extremes by matters of vocabulary. For England, this does not fit. The overwhelming conviction is that the salutary *via media* is not achieved by compromise between two parties but by order from a third party which enjoys the power to enforce conformity to this ordered mean.

4 A change in Bucer? 1550-1551

After the previous chapters have set the stage for Bucer's sojourn in England, this chapter will examine some of his writings produced during that time, namely three letters to important figures of the Edwardian establishment and his critique of the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*. In all four texts, Bucer engages with questions of religious controversy and concord. All texts shall be examined regarding their context, content and the traces of reception of English discourse. In doing so, I want to look at the means Bucer seeks to employ for achieving religious concord and to find out whether they differ from his rationale as he had sketched it in his letter to Martyr as examined in chapter 2.

4.1 Bucer to Edmund Grindal, Cambridge, 31 August 1550[105]

4.1.1 Context

Bucer's letter to Edmund Grindal marks the climax of his controversy with John Young.[106] Since Bucer, on his return from his vacation in Suffolk and later Oxford in late July, had learned that Young had, following his disputation with Bucer on the doctrine of justification at the end of June, continuously attacked him *coram publicam universitatis*, he had made increased but vain efforts to stop Young. After Young even declined to take part in the publication of the acts of their disputation on 8 August, Bucer had met the Vice-Chancellor and the Heads on the 23rd, and, confronted with Young's accusations regarding his orthodoxy, written to John Cheke, the king's tutor, on the 29th.

The controversy between Bucer and Young which produced the letter to Grindal fell in a period of time which saw Cranmer and other magisterial reformers struggling against both conservatives and radical reformers. After Ridley's crackdown on stone altars in the diocese of London in June, negotiations with the imprisoned Gardiner on an end of his opposition to further reform finally failed on 19 July, leading to his trial from 15 December onwards.[107] In August Bishop Tunstall of Durham was put under house arrest in London. On the other side, Hooper's continuing ill-disposition towards the Ordinal led to Cranmer's and Ridley's refusal to consecrate the obstinate to the bishopric of Gloucester until he conformed.[108] Bucer could thus

---

[105] *SA,* pp. 803f. English translation: *Gorham* XLVII, pp. 163-167.
[106] The perhaps most comprehensive account of this controversy can be found as note 'a' to *Gorham* XLII. A more recent account is Greschat, *Bucer,* p. 242.
[107] Cf. MacCulloch, *Cranmer,* pp. 484-486 for Gardiner's trial.
[108] Cf. Ibid*.,* p 473.

suspect that his struggle with Young would be taken seriously – and indeed, his complaints led to Cheke's intervention, putting Bucer's opponents in their place.[109]

4.1.2 Content

The letter is exclusively concerned with the controversy between Bucer and Young, opening with Bucer's remark that he had already sent the documents concerning the issue to Ridley, but also wants Grindal to bring the matter to the attention of Ridley, who as visitor of the university, as head of Pembroke College and as doctor of theology ought to intervene.[110] The ultimate reason for Bucer to write is the boldness of Young before the university authorities: *'Præterea Iungus coram concilio uniuersitatis dixit, & cum stomach, me esse in graui errore'*.[111] The accusation being heresy, Bucer affirms that he believed, acknowledged and taught exactly according to the homily on the good works.

The main problem, however, according to Bucer, is not Young's accusation of heresy. At the end of his letter, he reports that Young and his associates had to concede that Bucer were teaching in line with the *Book of Homilies*. What upsets Bucer more, is a principal issue of mentality:

> *Principium illud agenda apud quosdam, Ne quem offenderis, vel* CHRISTI *quoque & Ecclesiæ causa: possunt enim res mutari, & ab ea vbi offensio obest, facit, vt satis lente & remisce agatur in hac causa a quibusdam.[112]*

Bucer observes a lack of enthusiasm to defend orthodoxy. Instead of starting to oppose the deviating views of Young and others, far too many remain silent for the fear to open a controversy. This, Bucer fears, will leave the field entirely to Young and his erroneous teaching, and thereby cause severe damage to the official doctrine of the English Church. And indeed: the passiveness of the authorities has already allowed Young and his friends to launch numerous attacks against Bucer's position, which have been not without considerable effect, and even encouraged Bucer's opponents to actively attack the homily on good works.[113] Bucer, on the contrary, is not prepared to yield to this principle of theological politeness: *'Atque tam principem religionis Articulum prodere in nullius creaturæ gratiam debeo: nec momento in hoc me munere conuenit tolerari, si*

---

[109] Cf. Greschat, *Bucer*, p. 242.
[110] *SA,* pp. 803.804.
[111] Ibid. p. 803.
[112] Ibid., p. 803.
[113] Ibid., p. 804.

in hoc Christianæ doctrinæ capite erro.'[114] He is convinced that his controversy with Young is more than just a mere academic clash: *'Causa CHRISTI agitur & Ecclesiæ eius atque Academiæ'.*[115]

4.1.3 Reception of English Discourses?

Two aspects of this letter appear to be of interest here: Bucer's use of the *Book of Homilies* as an authoritative doctrinal statement and his analysis of the reactions on Young's teaching.

Bucer was familiar with the First *Book of Homilies* since it had been sent to him in 1547. The work, alongside Gardiner's *De Vera Obedientia* and his correspondence with Cranmer, had produced Bucer's literary image of the English Reformation.[116] This image, however, had suffered strongly, since Bucer's arrival at England's shores.[117] Bucer's harsh reaction to Young's criticism, therefore, cannot be rooted in astonishment that a single theologian doubted a unanimously preached doctrine. For him the *Book of Homilies* was a doctrinal statement of the English Church, enacted by royal authority and therefore binding to all theologians and preachers. This is why he himself was most alarmed by Young's earlier accusations that he was not in accordance with the Homilies and this is the reason for his emphatic assertion that he taught according to the Homilies. The combination of the verbs *credere, confiteri* and *docere* is very revealing here, since this tripartite opening of a sentence in the first person can be seen as characteristic for doctrinal statements especially in the Reformation era.[118] This shows that Bucer had started to accommodate to the idea that secular authority could prescribe the framework of doctrine – an idea familiar to the reader of Starkey's *Exhortation*. Whereas Bucer always had acknowledged the *ius reformationis* of secular authority, he usually associated it with the initiation of church reforms, the details of which then would be entrusted to theologians.[119] Here, Bucer seems to come from a different point of view: Whilst the emphasis on solafideism as the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae* would be familiar to any German reformer, the insistence on conformity to the *Book of Homilies* is not. Rather, it shows the acceptance of the principle that the discernment of what is orthodox belongs not to the individual, but to authority – and that is, secular authority. Thus Bucer's hint to Young's vocalised opposition to the Homilies[120] is more than the pointing out of

---

[114] Ibid., p. 803.
[115] Ibid., p. 804.
[116] Above, 3.1.
[117] Cf. esp. his letters to John Brenz (*ET* CCLII) and John Calvin (*ET* CCLIII).
[118] Bucer would have encountered the triad in the German text of the Apology of Article 4 of the Augsburg Confession: 'daß wir halten, lehren und bekennen…', *BSLK*, p. 158, ll. 25f. Cf. also Ulrich Zwingli's employment of the similar enumeration 'I firmly believe, teach, and maintain' in his 1530 *Reckoning of the Faith,* Pelikan, Jaroslav, and Hotchkiss, Valerie, eds., *Creeds & Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition: Volume II, Part Four: Creeds and Confessions of the Reformation Era* (Hew Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), p. 269. An interesting later occurrence of this triad is the Latin translation of the Epitome of the Lutheran 1578 Book of Concord, where *credomus, confetemur et docemus* appears throughout the positive articles: *BSLK*, pp. 767, 770-815.
[119] Above, 3.1.
[120] *SA*, p. 804.

argumentative inconsistency: it is an accusation of disobedience to royal authority. And this, in turn, shows that Bucer had understood that obedience to secular authority was a crucial point for the English Reformation.

This view of the matter in turn explains Bucer's being alarmed at the lax reaction Young's manifest disobedience evokes in many scholars at Cambridge. For him, Young's dissenting from what he perceives to be the official doctrine of the English Church – which is, given the *First Edwardian Injunctions*,[121] a plausible view – endangers the whole English Reformation. Together with the high regard of the article of justification Bucer brought with him from Germany and with the perception that the Homilies as set forth by royal authority define orthodoxy, the lack of support he encounters leads to his dramatic estimation that the case of Christ is at stake. It is interesting to compare this with his already mentioned letter to Martyr.[122] There, Bucer had entreated Martyr to by all means avoid a greater controversy on the Lord's Supper;[123] here he condemns all who follow the principle not to offend anyone.[124] To me this does not mean that the issue of the Lord's Supper were less important to Bucer than the article of justification – Bucer's own efforts in Eucharistic controversies strongly oppose such a view. Rather, his letter to Martyr suggests that Bucer still had been under the impression of his literary view of the English Reformation, which led him to suppose that Martyr's opponents formed only an unimportant minority. This impression has since disappeared: his first year in England has revealed to Bucer that the doctrine which is expressed in the *Book of Homilies* is far from ubiquitously acknowledged and taught.[125] The lukewarm reactions to Young's heretical teaching for him affirm this suspicion that firm steps have to be undertaken to ensure the endurance of Reformation teaching in England. The fact that he appeals to the authorities shows that he had come to accept the particular English situation: Bucer's call for Ridley to crack down on Young is something different from his emphasis on fraternal admonition which is so characteristic for his German time.[126]

---

[121] Cf. Injunctions 32 and 36, Bray, *Documents*, pp. 256.257.

[122] Above, 2.2.

[123] Cf. *SA*, p. 547.

[124] Ibid., p. 803.

[125] Cf. again the letters to Brenz (*ET* CCLII) and Calvin (*ET.* CCLIII), but also to Guilaume Farel (Hopf, *Bucer*, pp. 253-256); *De Regno Christi* II.1 = Bucer, Martin, *De Regno Christi Libri Duo,* ed. Wendel, François, *Martini Buceri Opera Latina, vol. XV* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1955), pp. 98f.

[126] Cf. Hamm, Berndt, 'Bucers zwei Gesichter', pp. 125-136.

4.2 Bucer to William Bill, Cambridge, 17 November 1550[127]

4.2.1 Context

This is an answer to Bill's letter from the 5th, asking Bucer about the competences of secular authorities in matters of ecclesiastical praxis and for his opinion on the question whether the king might by law assign church goods to other proprietors.[128] Bill at this point was successor of Cheke as Master of St John's College, Cambridge, predecessor of Walter Haddon as Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cambridge and used to preach both at court and at St Paul's Cross.[129] Bucer, having obtained the desired prolongation of his leave from Straßburg in October,[130] was in the middle of his correspondence regarding the Vestiarian Controversy[131] and had just sent his treatise *De Regno Christi* to King Edward VI.[132]

4.2.2 Content

Bucer's answer to Bill's first question is based on two governing principles. Secular authority, if understood correctly, is the supreme power by God's grace: *'Quodcirca in horum esse officio agnoscimus, ut de religion in primis constituent, sed ex verbo Dei'.*[133] The second principle is already embodied in the restriction 'but from the word of God'. In exercising their power, secular authority has to focus on the enhancement of faith of the individual Christian: *'oportere etiam, ut cunctis utare rebus as salute, et commodum proximi'.*[134] For Bucer this second principle, deriving from 1 Corinthians 14, means that in matters of ceremonies, the magistrate always ought to work toward the establishment of *decentia* or the pursuing of the profession of piety and the glory of Christ's cross, *ordo* or the ordering of human conduct in ceremonies to the use of the Church, and *aedificatio* or the orientation of the church's ministry towards the furthering of the people's understanding of their religion.[135] These three categories both legitimate and limit the magistrate's authority in religious matters.[136] To discern what serves to *decentia, ordo* and *aedificatio* for Bucer does not belong to the individual, but to *'summis cuiusque populi magistratibus'.*[137] But the decision of secular authority has to be based on these three categories. Bucer declines the demands that every ecclesiastical ordinance needed an explicit biblical warrant or that the pure fact that a ceremony

---

[127] Harvey, *Bucer,* Archivalische Beilage X, pp. 143-159.
[128] Bill's letter is partly printed in Harvey, *Bucer*, Archivalische Beilage IX, pp. 142f.
[129] Cf. Knighton, C. S., 'Bill, William (*d.* 1561), *ODNB* (Oxford: University Press, 2004; online edn. January 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2386, accessed 20th July 2013).
[130] Cf. his letter of thanksgiving to the Chapter of St Tomas, *ETh. P.II, p. 17.*
[131] Cf. the letters assembled by Hopf, *Bucer*, pp. 148-170.
[132] Cf. his accompanying letter to Edward VI, Harvey, *Bucer*, Archivalische Beilage XI, pp. 159-162.
[133] Harvey, *Bucer*, p. 144.
[134] Ibid., p. 145.
[135] Cf. Ibid., pp. 145f.
[136] Ibid., p. 146.
[137] Ibid., p. 148.

has been used under papal supremacy would make it impossible to be used under royal supremacy.[138] Rather than abolishing outward ceremonies which in themselves are indifferent, Bucer characteristically demands that the real problems of the English Church be addressed, and this mainly concerns the lack of suitable ministers in the parishes.[139]

With regard to the question of church goods, Bucer at first maintains that, according to divine order, the ministers of the gospel should live from the gospel and that Christians ought to donate liberally to the Church, not only for the upkeeping of the ministry of the word, but also for the ministry to the poor and for the education of the youth, which plays a particularly important role for the supply of apt ministers who in turn are crucial for the restitution of true religion.[140] Furthermore, Bucer reminds Bill of the example of the Old Testament kings who always donated generously to the temple.[141] All this together leads Bucer to disapprove of the despoliation of churches, which in his view makes it impossible for the Church to serve her tasks. This is, as Bucer affirms, no denial of royal authority: *'Rex habet certe eam potestatem, ut si vident plus esse congestum ad usus ecclesiasticos, quam opus sit, ut id ad alios usus publicos, vel privatos, pro Gloria Dei, et salute populi transferat'*.[142] The current situation, however, rather suggests that the Church has not enough means to fulfil her tasks.

4.2.3 Reception of English Discourses?

It has already been observed that Bucer's correspondence shows an increasing reliance on secular authority.[143] The more he realised that the actual situation did not correspond to the literary image he had of it before coming to England, and the more he got accustomed to the realities of the English situation, the more he emphasised the role of the regime. In this letter, Bucer on the one side indeed did affirm that secular authority had the power to regulate the life of the Church: it is, after all, the magistrate who has to discern what is decent, orderly and edifying. In this aspect, Bucer's arguments clearly reflect the English discourse on moderation as I have illustrated on the example of Starkey.[144] The letter to Bill almost completely remains silent on a role of the bishops in the reform of the Church,[145] which suggests a deliberate decision to lay more practical importance in the hands of secular authority and less into the hands of the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

---

[138] Ibid., pp. 150-152.
[139] Ibid., pp. 153f.
[140] Ibid., pp. 154f.
[141] Ibid., p. 156.
[142] Ibid., p. 158.
[143] Above, 3.2.1
[144] Above, 2.1.1.
[145] The only time the word *episcopus* appears is when Bucer laments the lack of suitable ministers, as part of an enumeration what is missing, cf. Harvey, *Bucer*, p. 155.

On the other hand Bucer sets clear boundaries for the exercising of this power. Whilst it pertains to secular authority to discern *decentia, ordo* and *aedificatio*, secular authority is also bound to act according to these categories. The actions of the magistrate in religious affairs must strive to enhance the profession of the Christian faith, according to the word of God.[146] This suggests that, despite all importance Bucer places on secular authority, he still does not see most parts of religion as being *adiaphora*, as would Starkey.[147] The power to discern good religious practice is an obligation rather than a right. In other words, the role Bucer describes for secular authority in his letter to Bill more echoes Gardiner's description of the royal supremacy as a vicarious position.[148] The king has supreme power as vicar of Christ to regulate religious practice – but being a vicar also means that he is responsible for good religion. His power therefore ought to be exercised according to his mandate, namely to discern what is decent, orderly and edifying, and to make sure religious practice adheres to these categories.[149] His opposition to the despoliation of church goods, finally, sees Bucer joining a conviction shared across the English religious spectrum, from traditionalists to evangelicals.[150]

4.3 Bucer to Thomas Cranmer, Cambridge, 8 December 1550[151]

4.3.1 Context

The last letter to be examined in this dissertation is Bucer's 'official' verdict on the issue of vestments. Dating to 8 December, it is the answer to Cranmer's letter from 2 December.[152] Cranmer, who together with Ridley had been refusing the consecration of Hooper since the end of July 1550 and maintained his intransigence towards the matter of Hooper's complaints about the Ordinal,[153] had asked Bucer whether the prescribed vestments could be worn without sin, and whether one who refused to wear them was a sinner by virtue of disobedience to the

---

[146] Cf. Harvey, *Bucer*, p. 146.

[147] Above, 2.1.1.

[148] Above, 2.1.2.

[149] Cf. Davies, Catharine, *A religion of the Word: The Defence of the Reformation in the Reign of Edward VI,* PCSEMB (Manchester: University Press, 2002), pp. 140-168 on general English protestant concepts of the competences and duties of the magistrate.

[150] Space does not permit an appropriate treatment of Bucer's attitude towards Church goods. Cf. MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, pp. 522f, who suggests that the statements of foreign divines on the matter were supported or even prompted by the archbishop's circle.

[151] *SA*, pp. 681-684. English translation: *Gorham* LVIII, pp. 214-220.

[152] Cranmer's letter is printed in Hopf, *Bucer*, pp. 169f.

[153] The Vestarian Controversy need no ample treatment in this dissertation, for the facts are well established already by Hopf, *Bucer*, pp. 131-170, Greschat, *Bucer,* pp. 243f., MacCulloch, *Cranmer,* pp. *471*-485, the most intensive study in the matter being Primus, J. H., *The Vestments Controversy* (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1960).

magistrate.[154] Bucer at about the same time as his answer was occupied with drafting his judgment on the Prayerbook, where he also would include a statement on vestments.[155]

4.3.2 Content

Bucer opens his letter with a *caveat*: these kind of questions tend to evoke bitter controversies, and therefore prevent the Church from engaging with the more important questions – this has led to the current situation in Germany and must not come into effect in England as well.[156] That being said, Bucer nevertheless turns to Cranmer's questions. Regarding Cranmer's first question, Bucer at first sets another *caveat*: What he is going to rule can only pertain to such ministers as *'veri, fideique sunt omnium mysteriorum Dei dispensatores'* and earnestly purposed to preach and teach Christ's gospel and discipline and be an example to the people in their own conduct.[157] These Bucer claims *'posse vestibus illis, quarum hodie usus est, vti cum gratia Dei'*.[158] They will, however, have to make clear that the traditional apparel does not signify adherence to the Pope. Whereas the simple have to be taught that the vestments symbolise the celestial glory of God and not obedience to Rome, others will have to be reminded that vestments play a necessary part in the edification of many Christians.[159] In both cases, Bucer demands, as an important part of the instruction of the people, that

> *cum itaque visum nunc sit Regiæ Maiestatis utque primo Regni consilio, vt harum adhuc vsus vestium hactenus retinentur: debere ipsos ad gloriam Dei, & honorem Regiæ Maiestatis, impium Papistarum abusum, & in his bonis per se Dei creaturis, pio vsu commutare, atque re ipsa declarare, sanctis & puris hominibus omnia sancta esse & pura.*[160]

The use of traditional vestments thus being established as a proper act of obedience to the Crown, Bucer can proceed to answer Cranmer's second question. If these vestments are not *per se* nefarious but are only possibly subject to abuse, this means that all who refuse to wear them on a principled basis are in error, because they fail to realise that vestments, worn in the right spirit as described, are not sinful. Moreover:

---

[154] Hopf, *Bucer*, p. 169.
[155] Below, 3.3.
[156] *SA*, pp. 681f.
[157] Ibid., p. 682.
[158] Ibid., p. 682.
[159] Ibid., p. 682.
[160] Ibid., p. 682.

Idem affirmo de ijs, qui ex eadem causa vestibus illis noluit vti: cum public Regni decreto, & ecclesiarum consensus, vsus earum, & non superstitiosus nec leuis, sit suspectus. […] Fateor etiam, eos Magistratibus pijs suum honorem imminuere, qui eorum negant in his rebus iudicio esse deferendum[161]

Having said all that, Bucer concludes, it would indeed be a desirable option to do away with the traditional vestments because it is obviously true that they are overly likely to evoke either superstition or contempt. But this cleansing of the apparel of the ministers for Bucer can only be a final step in the restitution of true religion and must be preceded by the abolition of more severe abuses and doctrinal inaccuracies.[162]

4.3.3 Reception of English Discourse?

In this letter, Bucer's reception of the English discourse on moderation appears to be particularly manifest. His defence of the traditional vestments rests on the two pillars of theological plausibility and obedience to secular authority. And whereas the claim that vestments belongs to the things indifferent was generally acknowledged, his strong emphasis on wearing vestments as an act of obedience to the magistrate seems to come from his reception of English concepts. Having said that, it has of course to be accepted that Cranmer's questions were quite explicit. Bucer must have noticed that the Archbishop wanted the vestments-issue to be dealt with from the point of authority and obedience rather than theology.[163] This certainly explains why Bucer's remark that an abolition of said vestments were a good option after all appears rather weak: he sensed that this was not the right moment to demand further reform.

But even with this clear 'order situation', it is striking how Bucer argues for the use of traditional vestments. For it belongs to the nature of *adiaphora* that they do not necessitate their use or not-use; thus it became an identity-marker for theologians where they situated the decision in things indifferent, with magisterial reformers ascribing this discretion to secular authority and what came to be known as more radical reformers to the individual conscience.[164] An important characteristic for the English discourse on adiaphorism, as I have established earlier,[165] is that an *adiaphoron* ceases to be indifferent if secular authority has ruled on it: obedience to that decision is necessary to salvation. Bucer does not explicitly argue that those who do not confirm to the regime's prescription of certain vestments endanger the salvation of their souls. He however does affirm: vestments as per se indifferent are subject to the discretion of secular authority.

---

[161] Ibid., p. 683.
[162] Ibid., p. 683.
[163] Note the characterisation of the vestments as prescribed by the magistrate in the first question and the focussing on offending against the magistrate in the second question: Hopf, *Bucer*, p. 169.
[164] Cf. Verkamp, *Indifferent Mean*.
[165] Above, 2.1.2; 2.3.

Whosoever therefore refuses to wear the vestments prescribed by the magistrate does attack the honour of the magistrate. That he gives this conclusion a biblical warrant is revealing, inasmuch as he had in his earlier letter to Bill declined that the use of vestments needed a particular biblical legitimation:[166] he thus follows the principal argument as found for example in Starkey that whereas religious practice usually is not ruled upon in Scripture, obedience to the magistrate is clearly commanded and therefore necessary to salvation. In this letter therefore, Bucer shows that he is familiar with English concepts of authority and obedience – and that he knows that those who represent authority are not opposed to religious reform, but rather want it to develop slowly.[167]

4.4 The Censura[168]

4.4.1 Context

Bucer's critique of the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer* was the last work he wrote; about a fortnight after finishing it on 5 January 1551 he died in Cambridge. The work is, as are the letters to Bill and Cranmer studied above,[169] a commissioned one, written for Goodrich of Ely,[170] Bucer's diocesan bishop and a member of the Privy Council.[171] The importance of the treatise for the Prayerbook revision is generally established and does not need further treatment.[172] As to its context, it might be of some significance to note that in Lambeth, Gardiner's trial was being held during the winter 1550-1551,[173] whilst Hooper in mid-January 1551 would suffer imprisonment for his continuing refusal to conform to the Ordinal.[174] It is in this on-going war on two fronts against both conservatives and more radical reformers that the *Censura* is situated.

4.4.2 Content

Whereas Bucer in the first part of his *Censura* more or less follows the course of the Prayerbook, commenting on each section with his approval or disapproval together with suggestions,[175] and

---

[166] Above, 3.2.2.2. Note also, that the biblical *loci* which Bucer produces for his theological argument that the use of vestments was theological sound altogether belong to the Pauline argument which usually serves to legitimise adiaphorism. The warrant Bucer gives here is according to *SA*, p. 683 Romans 14 – possibly a misprinting for Romans 13.

[167] Cf. MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, p. 481.

[168] Cf. Jammerthal, Bucer and the Prayerbook.

[169] Above, 3.2.f.

[170] Cf. the title page and the preface, Whitaker, E. C., *Martin Bucer and the Book of Common Prayer* (Great Wakering: Mayhew-McCrimmon, 1974) (henceforth *Censura*), pp. 11-13.

[171] Cf. Heal, Felicity, 'Goodrich, Thomas (1494-1554)', *ODNB* (Oxford: University Press, 2004; online edn. October 2005: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10980, accessed 2nd August 2013).

[172] Cf. Jammerthal, *Bucer and the Prayerbook*, pp. 2f. and the literature given there in footnotes 12-14.

[173] Cf. MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, pp. 484-487.

[174] Cf. Ibid., p. 482.

[175] *Censura*, pp. 13-137 for a short description of the most important suggestions of Bucer's, see Hopf, *Bucer*, pp. 65-81.

there is circumstantial evidence for such a reception within this first part of the *Censura*, it will prove more expedient for this dissertation to study the second part of Bucer's work.[176] It is here that he comments on Cranmer's treatise 'On Ceremonies' and raises systematic thoughts on the necessity of suitable ministers. And just as Cranmer's text is concerned with the liturgico-theological principles underlying the compilation of the Prayerbook, so Bucer's comments found in this part of the *Censura* are of a principled nature.[177]

Bucer demands obedience from the ministers: He wants them to adhere to the practical rules set forth in the rubrics of the *Book of Common Prayer*[178] and reminds them that Paul's command to obey the magistrate also refers to clergymen by stating *'Ad publicas necessitates, ut omnis anima gerentibus potestatem gladii, subiecta esse debet: utque in republica et ipsa Ecclesiae continentur, conferant et singuli ex Ecclesiarum ministris, atque ipsa Ecclesiae, sed pro suis facultatibus, uti & alii'*.[179] This interesting uniting of church and commonweal Bucer pursues when he addresses Goodrich as both bishop and member of the Privy Council[180] and admits the ringing of bells for secular public purposes.[181] Ensuring the obedience of the parochial ministry to the liturgical reforms of the Prayerbook, as well as their adherence to the doctrine as found in the Homilies,[182] is for Bucer the primary task of bishops and archdeacons, as he had argued in the first part of his *Censura*.[183] Given, however, his perception of the church as part of the state and his acknowledging that Goodrich's double role as bishop and privy councillor was a positive situation,[184] it can be suspected that Bucer was not entirely opposed to the fact that the 1549 *Act of Uniformity* provided for secular officials ensuring conformity to the Prayerbook, merely allowing higher clergy to join the secular courts.[185]

Bucer nevertheless seems to suggest that the clergy's conformity to the Reformation was primarily a matter of time, provided the academic preparation for the ministry be reformed according to his suggestions.[186] Less optimistic is his analysis of the laity. Already in the first part, he had lamented the inability of the lower classes to restrain themselves[187]. This self-restraint,

---

[176] *Censura*, pp. 137-173.
[177] Cf. Jammerthal, *Bucer and the Prayerbook*, p. 10.
[178] *Censura.*, pp. 143-145.
[179] Ibid., p. 163.
[180] Ibid., pp. 171-173.
[181] Ibid., p. 141.
[182] On the crucial role of the *Book of Homilies* for Bucer's considerations regarding the English Reformation, cf. above, 3.2.1.
[183] *Censura*, pp. 33.83.
[184] Cf. Ibid., pp. 171-173.
[185] Cf. Bray, *Documents*, p. 270.
[186] Cf. *Censura*, pp. 153f.
[187] Ibid., p. 87.

Bucer holds, is necessary not for civil matters only, but it is a universally accepted virtue, a virtue the neglect of which will have serious ramifications:

> *[S]i non potest a nostris hominibus tanta expectari continentia, in rebus Ecclesiasticarum, tantaque cura, pro restituendo nobis Regno Christi, in quo solo salus nostra, praesens, & futura, continetur, quantam praestiterun viri Ethnici, in rebus, et pro dignitate suarum rerumpublicarum: poterunt illi certo expectare, ut eiusmodi Domino poenas persolvant, et graviores, quales nunc infoelix luit Germania*[188]

It is especially order during the service which Bucer sees as unattainable unless the authorities exercise coercive measures.[189] In the same way, he holds that the sanctification of Sundays and holy days can only be maintained if the people are coerced to abstain from their contrary customs.[190] The secret continuing adherence to the sacrificial idea of the mass is another issue Bucer is determined to solve by magisterial coercion,[191] although he also hopes that a reform of the universities will provide for suitable ministers able to teach their flocks proper piety.

4.4.3 Reception of English Discourse?

Bucer's comments on the treatise 'On Ceremonies' bear distinctive traces of a reception of English discourses: a closer look at the text has revealed the frequent employment of the motives of obedience, external moderation and even coercion, together with an emphasis on (secular) authority. All these seem to be part of what Bucer names *restauratio procurationis Ecclesiae*,[192] and the frequency with which they appear signals that they have gained some importance in Bucer's thought and that he indeed did receive the particular emphasis on these points when his contemporaries in England were writing about Reformation.[193]

It is part of Bucer's concept of *procuratio ecclesiae* that Church and state are not really separated; this echoes Gardiner's argument for the Royal Supremacy in *De Vera Obedientia*.[194] It also is reflected in the fact that, when the *Censura* speaks of authority, Bucer does not clearly specify which kind of authority he wants to enforce his suggestions. That he clearly employs the language of external moderation and coercion in this text is another point of reception – his legitimation of coercive means by the magistrate in order to ensure obedience to the rules of the Prayerbook is more or less the same emphasis on the incapability of the vast majority of ordinary

---

[188] Ibid., p. 161.
[189] Ibid., p. 145, and already pp. 17.33.
[190] Ibid., p. 143.
[191] Ibid., p. 143.
[192] Ibid*.,* p. 171.
[193] Below, 4.
[194] Above, 2.1.2.

people to restrain themselves I have shown with Starkey.[195] Finally, the connection of the ideal of Christ's Kingdom with moderation of the people by authority suggests that Bucer here received the notion, important for English discourses, that the attaining of everlasting felicity cannot be left to the rude masses but that the vast majority of people due to their inability to moderate themselves have to be coerced into that which the authorities have realised to be profitable thereto. In this, Bucer does not follow Gardiner's legitimation of moderation, but receives the negative anthropology I have demonstrated in Starkey, which is theologically reasonable if we take Bucer's theology of salvation into account. The connection of external and if necessary forcible moderation with the Kingdom of Christ gives the actions of the magistrate the same place of salutary necessity they occupy within English discourses.[196]

---

[195] Above, 2.1.1.
[196] Above, 2.1. On the coercive aspect of moderation, cf. especially Shagan, *Moderation*, pp. 29.73-110..

5 Conclusion

This dissertation has been looking at signs for possible developments in Bucer's thought on religious concord, starting with his letter to Martyr written shortly after his arrival in England, where he presents the rationale behind his conciliatory efforts in the 1530s. Chapter 2 has looked at this rationale. I have argued that the concept of laying aside controversial terminology and attaining to religious concord through a process of theological learning is echoed in the 1973 *Leuenberg Agreement.* Chapter 3 has shown how Starkey and Gardiner as prominent figures in the English Reformation discourse wrote about questions of moderation and obedience. It has mapped out the landscape of English thought on Reformation as opposed to Bucer's German contexts in several aspects: whereas the particular political situation of the Empire had produced various different authorities claiming a *ius reformationis*, the English political situation was much more clear. Whereas Bucer in Germany was expected to be as precise as possible, deliberate ambiguity characterises the official documents of the English Reformation at least under Henry VIII. And whereas Bucer, as he recalls in the letter to Martyr, was used to the attempt to achieve religious unity through debate and compromise, religious unity in early modern England was achieved through obedience to the decisions of secular authority.

Before this background, chapter 4 has followed Bucer's writings chronologically in order to observe how he reacted to these different circumstances and indeed established a development: Bucer, after his first year in England, had realised that his earlier image of the English Reformation, was far from reality. The letters I have examined together with the *Censura* show the employment of a rationale of achieving religious unity quite different from 1549. Bucer now seemed to be convinced that secular authority not only could decide on doctrinal matters, but that obedience to secular authority in matters of things indifferent was necessary to salvation. His letter to Bill almost ignored the existence of bishops in England and his letter to Grindal gave the *Book of Homilies* – set forth by secular authority – the status of an authoritative source of doctrine. Perhaps most striking, however, appears Bucer's employment of the language of obedience, external moderation and even coercion, most visible in his letter to Cranmer on the Vestments Controversy and in the *Censura*. Bucer could maintain that an *adiaphoron* ceased to be indifferent once the magistrate had ruled on it, and would hold that here as in any other question, obedience to the magisterial decision was God's command, which, if ignored, would endanger salvation. The *Censura* finally, under the programme of *procuratio Ecclesiae,* connected external moderation with the restoration of the Kingdom of Christ, which is of high significance: the Kingdom of Christ is one of the most important *theologumena* of Bucer's, the aim to which his efforts in the Reformation in the end are directed at. This is particularly visible in his monograph

De Regno Christi, which is generally regarded as summing up Bucer's theology.[197] In combining external moderation with the Kingdom of Christ, Bucer's *Censura* marks yet another step from the concept of religious concord he had sketched in the letter to Martyr to another concept. The *Censura* not only integrates the clergy in the regime but also gives far more room to secular authorities in what before was the task of the clergy. The *procuratio Ecclesiae* therefore is far more that the general *cura religionis* with the *ius reformationis* as Bucer knew it from his German contexts – it is the description of a church even in its interior life governed by the secular regime.

Whereas therefore Bucer's rationale for achieving religious concord in the 1530s is that of a theological process of conjoint learning from Scripture – and learning anew – on which the *Leuenberg Agreement* seems to draw, the texts studied in this dissertation suggest a shift. The texts studied here remain quiet of any resemblances of the 1530s concept but instead adopt the 'English' language of external moderation and, indeed, coercion as the means by which religious conformity is achieved. One has, of course, to bear in mind the limited scope and the nature of the texts studied here: the works of Bucer's studied in this dissertation are but a small extract of two years of high literary activity by Bucer. In order to prove an actual change of mind, one would have to study *all* letters, councils and monographs he produced during his stay in England. Moreover, all three letters and the *Censura* are written for an audience not just English, but belonging to the religious-political establishment of Edwardian England. The presumption that Bucer only used the language of the English Reformation in order to obtain a more ready audience can only be sufficiently confuted by a more exhaustive study in more, if not all, texts he wrote between mid-1549 and early 1551. Further research would moreover have to look at Bucer's 1530s efforts and establish whether the letter to Martyr studied here is a correct representation of Bucer's rationale in these earlier years. This dissertation cannot do more but hint at what some sources seem to suggest.

This suggestion, however, is a powerful one. The texts clearly show a change of language. From compromise to obedience, and from concord to conformity – this is at least the impression Bucer's language evokes. The Bucer who died at Cambridge in early 1551 wrote differently about religious unity than the Bucer who reflected on his earlier efforts in 1549.. The dialogue with the English Reformation had shaped his own vocabulary. And should we not suspect that Bucer had his reasons for choosing his words?

But where, if this suggestion of a shift from compromise to conformity were to be followed, does this leave the *Leuenberg Agreement?* If Bucer, who in the 1530s so inexhaustibly had

---

[197] Cf. Hopf, *Bucer*, pp. 99-130.

pursued the concept he described to Martyr in 1549, moved away from this concept, which conclusions have to follow out of that shift? One could, of course, argue that obviously the misfortune of so much of his earlier work for unity had led Bucer to altogether disregard the entire idea of unity through conjoint learning and compromise. If followed, this line would end in a sinister prognosis for the future of the *Leuenberg Agreement*: if not even Bucer could maintain the concept *Leuenberg* follows, then the entire idea was futile. Rather than in endless discussion, one would have to conclude, the future of ecumenism ought to be sought in the use of secular power.

This line, however, is not sustainable. Even within the English framework (and that would be to remain silent of similar attempts in Continental Europe!), the approach to achieve unity among Christians through the use of coercive measures by secular authorities failed spectacularly, as the English (Church)history of the 17th century shows. Rather than uniting a people within a national Church, the coercive policy of Elizabeth I's successors led to Civil War and in the end only hardened the parties to the extent that nonconformity had to be tolerated as a phenomenon separate from the Church of England.

I would instead suggest a different conclusion: the fact that Bucer, or at least his language, moved away from the concept of unity through learning and compromise does not render this concept insufficient or non-valid. If Bucer, after long years of religious negotiations, controversies and failed attempts to achieve unity through discourse, on the account of yet more controversies yielded to the temptation which manifested itself in an undoubtfully evangelical secular regime, and advocated the use of the means which this very regime was accustomed to, this does not invalidate his earlier strife for compromise.

Rather, it serves to show just how difficult compromise is and how easy it is to stop to talk to each other. If even such notorious a promoter of religious dialogue as Bucer gave into the temptation to coerce rather than to convince his opponents, it becomes clear just how grateful we ought to be for now forty years of the *Leuenberg Agreement* – forty years of victorious compromise and conjoint learning.

Bibliography

1 Primary Sources

Agreement between the Reformation churches in Europe (The Leuenberg Agreement), online edn.: http://www.leuenberg.eu/de/node/640, accessed 23 August 2013.

Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche, hg. vom Deutschen Evangelischen Kirchenausschuss (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 7th edn., 1976).

Bray, Gerald, ed., *Documents of the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Clark & co., 1994).

Bucer, Martin, *METAPHRASES ET ENARRATIONES PERPETVAE EPISTOLARUM D. Pauli Apostoli, quibus singulatim Apostoli Omnia, cum argumenta, tum sententiæ & uerba, ad authoritatem D. scripturæ, fidemque Ecclesiæ catholicæ tam priscæ quam præsentis, religiose ac Paulo fusius excutiuntur* (Straßburg: Wendelin Rihel, 1536).

——, *De Regno Christi Libri Duo,* ed. Wendel, François, *Martini Buceri Opera Latina, vol. XV* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1955).

——, *De Regno Christi*, tr. Pauck, Wilhelm, and Larkin, Paul, *Melanchthon and Bucer*, LCC, vol. XIX (London: SCM Press, 1969), pp. 174-394.

Cummings, Brian, ed., *The Book of Common Prayer: The Texts of 15949, 1559, and 1662* (Oxford: University Press, 2011.

Epistolæ Tigurinæ de rebus potissimum ad Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Reformationem pertinentibus conscript A.D. 1531-1558: Ex schedis manuscriptis in bibliotheca Tigurina aliisque servatis Perkerianae Societatis auspiciis editæ (Cambridge: University Press, 1848; repr. 1968 London: Johnson).

Fecht, John, ed., *Historiae Ecclesiasticae Seculi a.n.c. XVI. Supplementum, plurimorum et celebberiorum ex illo ævo Theologorum Epistolis* (Durlach: Martin Müller, 1684).

Gardiner, Stephen, *STEPHANI VVINTON. Episcopi De Vera Obedientia Oratio* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1535).

——, *Stephani VVinton. Episcopi, Angli, de uera Obedientia oratio* (Straßburg, 1536).

Gorham, Georg Cornelius, ed., *Gleanings of a few scattered ears during the Period of the Reformation in England and of the times immediately succeeding, A.D. 1533 to A.D. 1588* (London: Bell and Daldy, 1857).

Harvey, Edward, 'Archivalische Beilage', *Martin Bucer in England* (Marburg: Bauer, 1906).

Hubert, Conrad, ed., *Martini Buceri Scripta Anglicana fere Omnia* (Basel: Petrus Perna, 1577).

Pelikan, Jaroslav, and Hotchkiss, Valerie, eds., *Creeds & Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition: Volume II, Part Four: Creeds and Confessions of the Reformation Era* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).

Pocock, Nicholas, ed., *Troubles connected with the Prayer Book of 1549: Documents now mostly for the first time printed from the originals…* (Westminster: Nichols and Sons, 1884).

Scheible, Heinz, ed., *Melanchthons Briefwechsel: Kritische und kommentierte Gesamtausgabe* (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: frommann-holzboog, 1977-).

Starkey, Thomas, *An Exhortation To the people, instructynge theym to Unitie and Obedience (*London: Thomas Bertholet , 1536, online edn. http://eebo.chadwyck.com/search/full_rec?ACTION=ByID&SOURCE=pdfdownload.cfg&ID=99840324, accessed 29th June 2013).

Whitaker, E. C., *Martin Bucer and the Book of Common Prayer* (Great Wakering: Mayhew-McCrimmon, 1974).

2 Secondary Sources

2.1 Bibliographies and Research Reviews

Jammerthal, Tobias, *Research Proposal and Critical Literature Review for the MA in Theology and Religion: 'Martin Bucer's Concept of Moderate Reformation in Dialogue with the English Reformation'* (unpublished assignment, University of Durham, 2013).

Köhn, Mechthild, 25 Jahre Bucer-Forschung 1951-1976. Vingt Cinq Annees De Recherches Buceriennes, de Kroon, Marijn; Lienhard, Marc, eds., *Horizons Européens de la Réforme en Alsace. Das Elsass und die Reformation im Europa des XVI. Jahrhunderts. Mélanges offerts à Jean Rott pour son 65ᵉ anniversaire* (Strasbourg: Librairie Istra 1980), pp. 161-175.

Seebaß, Gottfried et al., *Martin Bucer (1491-1551). Bibliographie* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2005).

——, 'Bucer-Forschung seit dem Jubiläumsjahr 1991', *ThR 62 (1997)*, 271-300.

Stupperich, Robert, 'Bibliographia Buceriana', *SVRG* Nr. 169 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1952).

——, 'Stand und Aufgabe der Butzer-Forschung', *AR* 42 (1951), 244-259.

Thompson, Bard, 'Bucer Study Since 1918', *ChHis* 25 (1956), 63-82.

2.2 Other Secondary Literature

Amos, Norton Scott, 'Bucer among the Biblical Humanists: The Context for his Practice in the Teaching of Theology in Strasbourg, 1523-1548', *RRR* 6.2 (2004), 134-154.

——, 'Bucer, Martin (1491-1551)', *ODNB* (Oxford: University Press, 2004; online edn., January 2008: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3822, accessed 10th July 2013).

——, 'Martin Bucer and the Revision of the 1549 Book of Common Prayer: Reform of Ceremonies and the Didactic Use of Ritual', *RRR* 2 (1999), 107-126.

——, 'Protestant Exiles in England. Martin Bucer, the Measured Approach to Reform, and the Elizabethan Settlement – "Eine gute, leidliche Reformation"', Wendebourg, Dorothea, ed., *Sister Reformations – Schwesterreformationen* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), pp. 151-174.

——, 'The Alsatian among the Athenians: Martin Bucer, Mid-Tudor Cambridge and the Edwardian Reformation', *RRR* 4.1 (2002), 94-124.

——, 'Strangers in a Strange Land: The English Correspondence of Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr Vermigli', James III, Frank A., ed., *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, SHCT vol. CXV (Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 26-46.

——, '"It is fallow Ground here": Bucer as Critic of the English Reformation', *WTJ 61:1* (Spring 1999), 41-52.

Anrich, Gustav, *Martin Bucer* (Straßburg: Verlag von Karl Trübner,1914).

Armstrong, C. D. C., 'Gardiner, Stephen (*c.* 1495X8-1555)', *ODNB* (Oxford: University Press, 2004; online edn., January 2008: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10364, accessed 10th July 2013).

Austin, Kenneth, 'Immanuel Tremellius and the Avoidance of Controversy', Racaut, Luc, and Ryrie, Alec, eds., *Moderate Voices in the European Reformation*, StAndSRH (Hants: Ashgate, 2005), pp. 70-89.

Baum, Wilhelm, 'Capito und Butzer, Straßburgs Reformatoren', *LSVR* (Elberfeld: Friedrichs, 1860).

Baur, Jörg, 'Martin Greschat, *Martin Bucer.* Ein Reformator und seine Zeit 1491-1551. C.H. Beck Verlag München 1990, 308 S.', *ThR 57 (1992)*, 442-445.

Beard, Charles, *The Reformation Of the Sixteenth Century in its relation to Modern Thought and knowledge: Hibbert Lectures* (London: Constable & Co, new impression with an introduction by Ernest Parker, 1927).

Benedict, Philip, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), pp. 230-254.

Bernard, G. W., 'The Making of Religious Policy, 1533-1546: Henry VIII and the Search for the Middle Way', *HJ* , vol. 41. No. 2 (June 1998), 321-349.

——, *The King's Reformation: Henry VIII and the Remaking of the English Church* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005).

Bornkamm, Heinrich, 'Martin Bucers Bedeutung für die europäische Reformationsgeschichte', *SVRG Nr. 169* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1952).

Brightman, F. E., ed., *The English Rite: Being A Synopsis of the Sources and Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer with an Introduction and an Appendix*, 2 vols. (London: Rivingtons, 1915).

Bucer-Forschungsstelle, website of: http://www.bucer-forschungsstelle.theologie.uni-erlangen.de, accessed 23th January 2013.

Burnett, Amy Nelson, '2: Contributors to the Reformed Tradition', in: Whitford, David M., ed., *Reformation and Early Modern Europe: a guide to research*, SCES 79 (Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 2008), pp. 25-56.

——, *The Yoke of Christ: Martin Bucer and Christian Discipline,* SCES 26 (Kirksville: Truman State University Press, 1994).

Campbell, Louise, 'A Diagnosis of Religious Moderation: Matthew Parker and the 1559 Settlement', Racaut, Luc, and Ryrie, Alec, eds., *Moderate Voices in the European Reformation*, StAndSRH (Hants: Ashgate, 2005), pp. 32-50.

Collinson, Patrick, 'The Fog in the Channel clears', Ha, Polly and Collinson, Patrick, eds., *The Reception of Continental Reformation in Britain*, PBA 164 (Oxford: University Press, 2010), pp. xxvii-xxxvii.

——, 'The Reformer and the Archbishop: Martin Bucer and an English Bucerian', *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1983), pp. 19-44.

——, *Archbishop Grindal 1519-1583: The Struggle for a Reformed Church* (London: Jonahan Cape, 1979), 49-56.

Cuming, G.J., *A History of Anglican Liturgy* (London: MacMillan, 1969).

——, *The Godly Order: Texts and Studies relating to the Book of Common Prayer* (London: SPCK, 1983).

Davies, Catharine, *A religion of the Word: The Defence of the Reformation in the Reign of Edward VI,* PCSEMB (Manchester: University Press, 2002).

de Kroon, Marjin; Krüger, Friedhelm, eds., *Bucer und seine Zeit. Forschungsbeiträge und Bibliographie. Festschrift Robert Stupperich zum 70. Geburtstag,* VIEG 80 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1976).

Duffy, Eamon, *The stripping of the altars: Traditional religion in England, c.1400-c.1580* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992)

Eells, Hastings, *Martin Bucer* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1931).

Elton, G. R., 'The Reformation in England', Elton, G. R., ed., *The New Cambridge Modern History. Volume II: The Reformation, 1520-1559* (Cambridge: University Press, 1965), pp. 226-350.

Eppley, Daniel, *Defending royal supremacy and Discerning God's will in Tudor England* (Aldershot : Ashgate, 2007).

Frere, Walter Howard, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer with a Rationale of its Offices, on the basis of the former work by Francois Porter* (London: MacMillan, 1949).

Fuller, Donald, 'Sacrifice and Sacrament: Another Eucharistic Contribution from Peter Martyr Vermigli', James III, Frank A., ed., *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, SHCT vol. CXV (Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 215-237.

Greengrass, Mark, 'Conclusion: Moderate Voices: Mixed Messages', Racaut, Luc, and Ryrie, Alec, eds., *Moderate Voices in the European Reformation*, StAndSRH (Hants: Ashgate, 2005), pp. 196-212.

Greschat, Martin, 'Das Profil Martin Bucers', Krieger, Christian; Lienhard, Marc, eds., *Martin Bucer and Sixteenth-Century Europe: Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (28-31 août 1991)* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993), pp. 9-17.

——, *Martin Bucer: A Reformer and His Times*, trans. by Stephen E. Buckwalter (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004).

——, *Martin Bucer: Ein Reformator und seine Zeit* (München: C.H. Beck, 1990).

Ha, Polly, 'Reformation and the uses of Reception', Ha, Polly and Collinson, Patrick, eds., *The Reception of Continental Reformation in Britain*, PBA 164 (Oxford: University Press, 2010), pp. xv-xxv.

Hall, Basil, 'Martin Bucer in England', *Martin Bucer: Reforming church and community*, ed. Wright, David F. (Cambridge: University Press, 1994), pp. 144-160.

Hamm, Berndt, 'Martin Bucers zwei Gesichter: ausgrenzende Unduldsamkeit und integrative Toleranz', Simon, Wolfgang, ed., *Martin Bucer zwischen den Reichstagen von Augsburg (1530) und Regensburg (1532)*, SMHR 55 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), pp. 125-136.

——, 'Toleranz und Häresie: Martin Bucers prinzipielle Neubestimmung christlicher Gemeinschaft', Arnold, Matthieu, and Hamm, Berndt, eds., *Martin Bucer zwischen Luther und Zwingli*, SMR.NR 23 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), pp. 85-106.

Harvey, Edward, *Martin Bucer in England* (Marburg: Bauer, 1906).

Hazlett, Ian, 'Bucer', Bagchi, David, and Steinmetz, David, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology* (Cambridge: University Press, 2004), pp. 100-112.

——, *The Reformation in Britain and Ireland* (London: T&T Clark, 2003).

Hobbs, Gerald, 'Bucer and the Englishing of the Psalms', *Martin Bucer: Reforming church and community*, ed. Wright, David F. (Cambridge: University Press, 1994) pp. 161-175.

——, '"Quam Apposita Religioni Sit Musica": Martin Bucer and Music In the Liturgy', *RRR* 6.2 (2004), 155-178.

Hopf, Constantin, *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946).

Howard Dellar, 'The Influence of Martin Bucer on the English Reformation', *Churchman* 106/4 (1992).

Hudson, Winthorp S., *The Cambridge Connection and the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1980).

James III, Frank A., ed., *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, SHCT vol. CXV (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

Jammerthal, Tobias, *Martin Bucer's Relationship to the Book of Common Prayer* (unpublished assignment, University of Durham 2013).

Knighton, C. S., 'Bill, William (*d.* 1561), *ODNB* (Oxford: University Press, 2004; online edn. January 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2386, accessed 20th July 2013).

Köhn, Mechthild, *Martin Bucers Entwurf einer Reformation des Erzstiftes Köln,* UKG 2 (Witten: Luther-Verlag, 1966).

Kroon, Marijn de, *Studien zu Martin Bucers Obrigkeitsverständnis: evangelisches Ethos und politisches Engagement* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1984).

Lohse, Bernhard, 'Kapitel V. § 2 Der interimistische Streit', Andresen, Carl, and Ritter, Adolf Martin, eds., *Handbuch der Dogmen- und Theologiegeschichte. Band 2: Die Lehrentwicklung im Rahmen der Konfessionalität* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2nd edn 1998), pp.108-113.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996).

——, *A History of Christianity* (London: Penguin, 2010).

——, *Reformation: Europe's House Divided* (London: Penguin, 2004).

Marshall, Peter, and Ryrie, Alec, 'Introduction: Protestantisms and their beginnings', Ryrie, Alec, and Marshall, Peter, eds., *The Beginnings of English Protestantism* (Cambridge: University Press, 2002), pp. 1-13.

——, 'Evangelical conversion in the reign of Henry VIII', Ryrie, Alec, and Marshall, Peter, eds., *The Beginnings of English Protestantism* (Cambridge: University Press, 2002), pp. 14-37.

——, 'Mumpsimus and Sumpsimus', *Religious Identities in Henry VIII's England*, StAndSRH (Hants: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 157-165.

Mayer, Thomas Ferdinand, 'Starkey, Thomas (*c.* 1498-1538)', *ODNB* (Oxford: University Press, 2004; online edn., January 2008: http://oxforddnb.com/view/article/26318, accessed 10th July 2013).

——, *Thomas Starkey and the Commonweal: Humanist politics and religion on the reign of Henry VIII*, CSEMBH (Cambridge: University Press, 1989).

McLelland, Joseph C., *The visible words of God : an exposition of the sacramental theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli, A.D. 1500-1562* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1957).

Mullinger, James Bass, *The University of Cambridge from the Royal Injunctions of 1535 to the Accession of Charles I* (Cambridge, University Press, 1884).

Neuser, Wilhelm, 'Kapitel IV: Selbständige Weiterbildung zwinglischer Theologie – Martin Bucer', Andresen, Carl, and Ritter, Adolf Martin, eds., *Handbuch der Dogmen- und Theologiegeschichte. Band 2: Die Lehrentwicklung im Rahmen der Konfessionalität* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2nd edn 1998), pp. 209-224.

Pauck, Wilhelm, *Das Reich Gottes auf Erden. Utopie und Wirklichkeit . Eine Untersuchung zu Butzers „De Regno Christi" und zur englischen Staatskirche des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1928).

Pelikan, Jaroslav, *Credo: Historical and Theological Guide to Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).

Porter, H.C., *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Cambridge: University Press, 1958).

Racaut, Luc, and Ryrie, Alec, 'Introduction', Racaut, Luc, and Ryrie, Alec, eds., *Moderate Voices in the European Reformation*, StAndSRH (Hants: Ashgate, 2005), pp. 1-12.

Rex, Richard, 'The Crisis of Obedience: God's Word and Henry's Reformation', *HJ* , vol. 39. No. 4 (Dec. 1996), 863-894.

Ryrie, Alec, 'Counting Sheep, counting shepherds: the problem of allegiance in the English Reformation', Ryrie, Alec, and Marshall, Peter, eds., *The Beginnings of English Protestantism* (Cambridge: University Press, 2002), pp. 84-110.

——, *The Age of Reformation: The Tudor and Steward Realms 1485-1603* (Edinburgh: Pearson Longman, 2009).

——, 'Divine Kingship and Royal Theology in Henry VIII's Reformation', *Reformation* 7 (2002), 49-77.

Scarisbrick, Jack, *The Reformation and the English People* (Oxford; New York: Basil Blackwell, 1985).

Scodel, Joshua, *Excess and the Mean in Early Modern English Literature* (Princeton: University Press, 2002)

Shagan, Ethan H., *The rule of moderation : violence, religion and the politics of restraint in early modern England* (Cambridge: University Press, 2011).

——, 'Clement Armstrong and the godly commonwealth: radical religion in early Tudor England', Ryrie, Alec, and Marshall, Peter, eds., *The Beginnings of English Protestantism* (Cambridge: University Press, 2002), pp. 60-83.

——, 'The Battle for Indifference in Elizabethan England', Racaut, Luc, and Ryrie, Alec, eds., *Moderate Voices in the European Reformation*, StAndSRH (Hants: Ashgate, 2005), pp. 122-144.

Steinmetz, David, 'Martin Bucer (1491-1551): The Church and the Social Order', *Reformers in the wings: From Geiler von Kaysersberg to Theodore Beza* (Oxford: University Press, 2001), pp. 85-92.

Stupperich, Robert, *Martin Bucer: Der Reformator des Elsasses und Einiger des deutschen Protestantismus*, Heliand Hefte 70 (Berlin: Heliand Verlag, 1941).

Sturm, Klaus, *Die Theologie Peter Martyr Vermiglis während seines ersten Aufenthalts on Straßburg 1542-1547: Ein Reformkatholik unter den Vätern der reformierten Kirche*, BGLR vol. XXXI (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, des Erziehungsvereins, 1971).

Thompson, Nicolas, 'Martin Bucer and Early 17th century Scottish Irenicism', Ha, Polly and Collinson, Patrick, eds., *The Reception of Continental Reformation in Britain*, PBA 164 (Oxford: University Press, 2010), pp. 167-191.

Trocmè-Latter, Daniel, 'Martin Bucer: A South-German Reformer in an English Reformation', http://www.anglican-lutheran-society.org/AGM%202012%2001%20 Trocme-Latter.pdf, accessed 29th December 2012.

Verkamp, Bernard J., *The Indifferent Mean: Adiaphorism in the English Reformation to 1554* (Ohio: University Press, 1977).

Vogt, Herbert, *Martin Bucer und die Kirche von England* (PhD Münster, 1966).

Wolgast, Eike, 'Bucers Vorstellungen über die Einführung der Reformation', Krieger, Christian and Lienhard, Marc, eds., *Martin Bucer and Sixteenth-Century Europe: Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (28-31 août 1991)* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993), pp. 145-159.

Wright, David F., 'Martin Bucer and England – and Scotland', Krieger, Christian and Lienhard, Marc, eds., *Martin Bucer and Sixteenth-Century Europe: Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (28-31 août 1991)* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993), pp. 523-532.

——, 'Martin Bucer in England', *ANVIL* 9.3 (1992), 249-259.