
A table of contents for *Anvil* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_anvil_01.php

Martin Bucer (1491-1551) in England

DAVID WRIGHT

On November 12, 1991, a special service in Great St Mary's, Cambridge, marked the quincentenary of the birth of Martin Bucer, Reformer of Strasbourg, father of Calvinism[1], and one of the earliest Regius Professors of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. To John Bradford, Reformer and martyr, he was 'God's prophet and true preacher', to Matthew Parker, later Archbishop of Canterbury, 'a syngular gyft of God, a treasure hyddon, an incomparable ornament'[2], to Martin Luther 'that chatterbox' (and much worse besides) and to Margaret Blaurer a dear *'fanaticus* of unity' (the first 'ecumaniac'?). One whose 'remarkable piety and profound learning' produced, in Cranmer's words, 'not a transient but an everlasting benefit to the church' in England, merits some recognition on this half-millennial anniversary.

Yet at the same time, in the measured judgement of Professor Basil Hall in 1977, it would be difficult to say anything new about the influence Bucer exercised on the English Reformation.[3] Bucer lived in England for less than two years — from April 24, 1549 to his death overnight February 28 - March 1, 1551. These months have been thoroughly chronicled and catalogued by earlier investigators, especially Constantin Hopf (Hope) and Herbert Vogt.[4] Close concentration on this final span of Bucer's life has occasionally resulted in some loss of perspective, and an exaggeration of Bucer's impact in England. Can it be sustained that 'No professor ever taught at Cambridge for so brief a period and yet made so deep an impression'?[5] He did not know

1 'The type of church which we call Calvinistic or Reformed, is really a gift of Martin Butzer to the world.... It is quite evident that the so-called Calvinist type of church organisation originated very largely in Strassburg and in the mind of Butzer, whose ideas Calvin put into practice... during the years from 1538 to 1541, Calvin became in many regards Butzerian.... His views on predestination and on the Lord's Supper became more precise. In regard to these doctrines, he was, when he left Strassburg, a pupil or follower of Butzer'. W. Pauck, *The Heritage of the Reformation*, 2nd edn, OUP 1968, pp 91, 93, 90.

2 *Howe we ought to take the death of the Godly, a Sermon made in Cambrydge at the buriall of the noble Clerck. D. M. Bucer*, London 1551, C iii"; for the rest see the introduction to D. F. Wright (tr. and ed), *Common Places of Martin Bucer*, Courtenay Library of Reformation Classics 4, Sutton Courtenay, Appleford 1972.

3 'Bucer et l'Angleterre', in G. Livet *et al.*, eds, *Strasbourg au coeur religieux du XVIe siècle*, Librairie Istra, Strasbourg 1977, p 401.

4 C. Hopf, *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation*, OUP 1946, H. Vogt, *Martin Bucer und die Kirche von England*, Münster 1968.

5 W. S. Hudson, *The Cambridge Connection and the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559*, Duke University Press, Durham, NC 1980, p 59.

English, and although he preached in Latin with exemplary regularity, he was delighted when English-speaking preachers kept him out of the pulpit. Since they taught what they had learned from him, 'He it was that spake and preached... in other mennes parsones.'[6]

For most of his short time in Cambridge, Bucer was 'paynfully disquieted and broken with syknes'; 'his immoderate paines in the great rigour of the wynter' — despite the stoves provided by the generosity of Edward VI — almost certainly hastened his death. The domestic distractions of 'sattelyng and furnyshyng of hys howse and familie' added to his unhappiness.[7] Like Erasmus before him in Cambridge (who also complained of the cold), he was short of money — despite King Edward's trebling of the stipend granted by Henry VIII. There was much to remind him that he was an alien in exile. In his speech on receiving the University's Doctorate in Divinity, he referred to himself as 'an old, sick, and useless foreigner'.

Yet Bucer's time in England remains intrinsically important. He was after all the most substantial foreign divine (if we exclude Erasmus) to be recruited to the service of church reform in sixteenth-century England, challenged only by Peter Martyr in Oxford. His appointment to one of the regius professorships at Cambridge sealed the ascendancy of Protestant reform in the University. He had a significant hand in the revision of the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*, thus contributing to the 1552 Book which embodied the genius of Anglican Protestantism.[8] In Cambridge, Bucer taught and counselled the present and future leaders of the English Church, and in *The Kingdom of Christ* he reserved for almost his last publication his most comprehensive manifesto for the Christian Commonwealth which had been his goal for a quarter of a century in Strasbourg.[9] The University had been the nursery of the English Reformation and would thereafter, under Elizabeth, again be its most vital intellectual centre. Bucer could not have been better placed to bring his wisdom and experience and scholarship to bear on a

---

6 Parker, *Howe we ought*, C ii^{v}.

7 Ibid., D ii^{v}, vi^{v}, iiii^{r}.

8 The 1549 *Book* was itself indebted to the Cologne church order of 1543 (Engl. transl., *A simple and religious consideration* ..., 1547), which was largely Bucer's work; see the little-known essay by Hopf, 'Lutheran Influences on the Baptismal Services... of 1549', in *'And Other Pastors of Thy Flock': A German Tribute to the Bishop of Chichester*, F. Hildebrandt, ed, CUP 1942, pp 61-100. Cranmer's copy of the Latin version *Simplex ac pia deliberatio*, Bonn 1545, is now in Chichester Cathedral Library; *Cranmer Primate of All England. Catalogue of a Quincentenary Exhibition...*, P. N. Brooks, ed., British Library, London 1989, no. 61 (and 57 and 74 for other Buceran items). On the Cologne book see Wright, *Common Places*, pp 465f.

9 See the interesting comments of J. N. King, *English Reformation Literature*, Princeton University Press 1982, on *De Regno Christi (Kingdom of Christ)*. As a New Year gift to Edward VI, it was a 'Protestant courtesy book' that ignored the traditional issues of court etiquette (p 169). The book's discussion of comedy and tragedy contributed to the development of Protestant theories of their right use (pp 275f). Bucer fused Erasmus's call for biblical drama with Protestant theology. He warned that when crimes were portrayed, 'some dread of divine judgement and a horror of sin should appear in them: no exultant delight in crime, or shameless insolence should be displayed' (*Kingdom of Christ* II: 54; cf. W. Pauck, *Melanchthon and Bucer, Library of Christian Classics 19*, SCM, London 1970, p 351).

critical phase in the Reformation of the Church in England. It was by God's decree, said Matthew Parker at his funeral, that Cambridge University had 'the last and moste learned part of his lyfe'. [10]

The Kingdom of Christ

Yet remarkably little of Bucer's corpus of writings was ever translated into English. 'The tally of Buceriana translated into English in the period covered by Pollard and Redgrave's *Short-title Catalogue* is so trifling as almost to suggest deliberate neglect.'[11] Even *De Regno Christi* (1550), which appeared in French in 1558 and in German in 1563, though written in and for England had to wait until 1969 for a complete English translation, by Wilhelm Pauck, who omitted the long section on divorce (chapters 22-46 of Book II) which John Milton had englished in 1644. But it would be rash to conclude that precisely this part made available by Milton appealed broadly to English minds (although Bucer's stipulations may have influenced the divorce provisions of the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticorum* of 1553). Bucer's attitudes towards divorce and remarriage were too radical by far not only for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[12] The liberalization of the late twentieth century makes him seem uncannily modern. He made daring use of texts such as Gen. 2:18 ('It is not good for man to be alone') and 1 Cor. 7:2 ('Each man should have his own wife and each woman her own husband') to justify divorce whenever a marriage relationship had in practice broken down. And anyone who lacked the gift of living chastely outside marriage must be able to re-marry, regardless of whose fault it was that the previous marriage collapsed. Underlying this apparent leniency was Bucer's recognition that biblical marriage was a compact, which not only infidelity could break.[13] Where its enjoyment was lost, divorce became necessary to enable it to be recovered, for solitariness was not 'good'.

The only other early translation from *The Kingdom of Christ* was of two chapters on poor relief.[14] Bucer's recommendations may have helped to shape English legislation on relief of poverty, although Hopf probably overstates the case.[15] Bucer proposed a ban on all begging, and indeed on all indiscriminate giving, i.e. private almsgiving. For the able-bodied poor work should be found, and if they shrank from labour they should be denied charity (cf. 2 Thess. 3:10). The poor who were unfit for work, on the other hand, should be maintained in an appropriate institution. Deacons were given a key role in monitoring the poor in the parish, and other officers should regulate the whole relief system. At his funeral, Matthew Parker bore

---

10 *Howe we ought*, B i^{r}.

11 P. Collinson, 'The Reformer and the Archbishop. Martin Bucer and an English Bucerian', *Journal of Religious History*, vol. 6 (1970-71), p 311 (reprinted in his *Godly People*, Hambledon Press, London 1983, p 25). Collinson would have found a slighter longer list in my *Common Places*, pp 461f.

12 P. Collinson, *The Birthpangs of Protestant England*, Macmillan, Basingstoke 1988, p 66.

13 H. C. E. Midelfort, 'Social History and Biblical Exegesis...', in D. C. Steinmetz, ed., *The Bible in the Sixteenth Century*, Duke University Press, Durham NC 1990, pp 19f.

14 *A Treatise, how by the Worde of God...*; see my *Common Places*, p 468. A facsimile reprint appeared in 1976 in 'The English Experience' series (Amsterdam and Norwood, N.J.).

15 Hopf, *Martin Bucer*, pp 116-22.

witness to 'his charitable importunitie and counsayll', in frequently calling for adequate provision for the poor of Cambridge.[16]

Popular Piety

The standard history by A. G. Dickens, *The English Reformation*, which appeared in a revised and enlarged form in 1989, continues to defy the trend that regards the impact of the Reformation on the people of England as slow, late, patchy and somewhat superficial. Dickens had earlier warned that

> Scholars who seek an historical understanding of the English Reformation would be wise to think a little less about Bucer, Bullinger, and even Cranmer, and somewhat more in terms of a diffused but inveterate Lollardy, reunited by contact with continental Protestantism.[17]

Anne Hudson has recently pointed out how minds imbued with Lollard ideas would have received imported works of continentental Reformers. One such was William Marshall's translation of Bucer's *Non esse ferendas in templis Christianorum imagines et statuas...* (1530): *A treatise declaryng & shewing dyvers causes taken out of the holy scriptur, of the sentences of holy faders... that pyctures and ymages... ar in no wise to be suffred in the temples or churches of Christen men...* (London, 1535). It reads, says Hudson, 'like any fifteenth-century tract from the unorthodox side of the images argument'. It illustrates 'the "Lollardy" of "Reformation" texts'.[18]

Protestant lay piety in England was partly shaped from 1530 onwards by selections from Bucer's Gospels and Psalms commentaries, translated by George Joye, William Marshall and John Rogers and printed in the early English primers and psalters.[19] In these primers Bucer's paraphrastic harmonies of the four Gospels' accounts of Christ's passion and resurrection, published originally in his Latin *Commentary on the Gospel of John* (Strasbourg, 1528), became the first Gospel harmonies on these subjects to be printed in English. And a handful of distinctive Buceran renderings of the Psalms persisted as far as the King James Version of 1611.

Prayer Book Revision

But Bucer's most lasting influence on English religion undoubtedly flowed from his part in the production of the 1552 *Book of Common Prayer.* At the request of Bishop Goodrich of Ely (not Thomas Cranmer, as is often asserted), Bucer compiled a detailed critique (*Censura*) of the 1549 *Book.*[20] Although as many of Bucer's proposals were rejected as accepted — and some of the latter were in any case urged by others like Peter Martyr (who

16 *Howe we ought*, C ii^{v}.

17 *Lollards and Protestants in the Diocese of York 1509-1558*, OUP 1959, p 243.

18 *The Premature Reformation. Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History*, Clarendon, Oxford 1988, pp 501, 503. For the text see my *Common Places*, pp 464f.

19 See my *Common Places*, pp 461-4. The basic studies are Hopf, *Martin Bucer*, and C. C. Butterworth, *The English Primers (1529-45): Their Publication and Connection with the English Bible and the Reformation in England*, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 1953.

20 E. C. Whitaker provides the text of the *Censura* with a translation in *Martin Bucer and The Book of Common Prayer* (*Alcuin Club Collections*, 55; Mayhew-McCrimmon, Great Wakering 1974).

also drew up a *censura*)[21] — nevertheless

> it cannot be denied that the second Edwardine *Prayer Book*, and consequently also the 1662 *Book*, bears many traces of Bucer's mind and hand, both in what it prescribes and in what it excludes. Omissions include the baptismal use of chrism, unction and the blessing of the water, and in the Communion the signing of crosses over the bread and wine and references to the departed in the Prayer for the Church and to the ministry of angels in the Prayer of Oblation. Among Bucer's contributions, whether direct or indirect, are numbered the prescribed choice of lessons, the bishop's address and the questions asked of the candidates in the Ordering of Priests, in the baptismal service parts of the initial rubric, the opening exhortation and the first two prayers, the addressing of the questions to the godparents instead of the child and the location of the whole action at the font, and in the Communion the delivery of the bread into the hand and not the mouth, much of the General Confession, the Comfortable Words and parts of the Prayer of the Whole State of Christ's Church. Bucer was also responsible for a heightened emphasis on congregational presence and participation.[22]

His suggestion, however, that the Prayer of Humble Access be said by the whole people was not incorporated. Bucer's orders for the visitation of the sick insisted that, whether or not they requested and received private instruction and comfort,

> absolution must nevertheless always be imparted to them as a corporate act of the Church and therefore not without the presence of the rest of the gathering to represent the Church of Christ, and only after a confession of sins has been publicly recited to them, and they have made a public petition for grace.[23]

Such an emphasis expressed something of Bucer's fundamental commitment as a Reformer to the renewal of the Christian community.

The indebtedness of the revised *Prayer Book* to Bucer's contributions should not, however, be exaggerated. Samuel Leuenberger vastly overstates Bucer's role when he claims that the revised 1552 *Book* 'is scarcely imaginable without the proposals of Bucer... . Surely it was through his participation that [it] developed into a book useful both to a congregation and for faith awakening.'[24] Leuenberger draws attention to several points in Bucer's *Censura* without demonstrating their impact on the revised *Prayer Book*. A new discovery may allow a more precise measure of Bucer's imprint on the *Book*. In a copy of the 1549 *Book* in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, Francis Higman of Geneva has recently noted marginalia recording both the changes made in 1552 and the relevant advice in Bucer's *Censura*. It may yet prove

---

21 See the judicious assessment by G. J. Cuming, *A History of Anglican Liturgy*, 2nd edn, Macmillan, London 1982, p 73.

22 Wright, *Common Places*, p 27.

23 Ibid., p 437.

24 *Archbishop Cranmer's Immortal Bequest. The Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England: An Evangelical Liturgy*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids 1990, p 47. Leuenberger illustrates Bucer's basic theology from his *Censura* of the 1549 *Book* (pp 28-47), and characterises it as 'revivalistic' (pp 85f) and hence close to pietism, (pp xxviiif).

to have belonged to one of the revisers.[25]

Bucer, Cranmer and the Lord's Supper

In the second edition of his fine little book, *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist*, Peter Brooks highlights the successful opposition of Bucer's *Censura* to any notion of the consecration or sanctification of the elements.[26] The revised *Book*'s avoidance of such concepts should probably be viewed as one further evidence of the close affinity between Cranmer's and Bucer's understandings of the Lord's Supper. It is also borne out by their common insistence that the godless, as distinct from unworthy believers, do not receive the Lord's body and blood at the table.[27]

Past controversies have shown that the character of Cranmer's eucharistic doctrine is of more than scholarly interest. They have not only thrown up an extraordinary historical 'howler' but also betrayed an almost xenophobic suspicion of continental Reformation influences.[28] The issue seems no longer to evoke such keen passions. The nature of Bucer's mature eucharistic views — during the months in England when he was in a position to influence Cranmer directly — is not open to doubt. This must be emphasized in the face of the stubborn persistence — in the 1989 edition of Dickens' *The English Reformation*, for example — of the story of Bucer's re-conversion to a Zwinglian understanding in the last months of his life. The only evidence, such as it is, derives from Bucer's critics and opponents.[29] It collapses immediately when confronted by his aphoristic *Confession* on the eucharist written in late 1550, and by his further treatise on the sacraments left unfinished on his death (and, like the *Confession*, compiled in response to John à Lasco).[30]

The distinguished French Reformation scholar, François Wendel, regarded Bucer's 1550 *Confession* as probably the nearest of all his eucharistic writings to Calvin's position.[31] This is yet another reason for quoting some paragraphs of this work.[32]

> 8. There is imparted and received in the eucharist when administered and received aright, that communion with the Father and the Son and with all the saints of which John speaks in the first chapter of his Epistle, and that unity with the Father, the Son, and all the saints which the Lord prayed for us in John 17, the unity whereby Christ is in us as the Father is in him, and we in them, Father and Son. Of this communion the Lord said also, 'He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me and I in him'....

25 *Martin Bucer, Strasbourg et l'Europe. Exposition...*, Strasbourg 1991, pp 170f.
26 *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist*, 2nd edn, Macmillan, Basingstoke 1992, pp 156-62.
27 Ibid., pp 148f.
28 See Patrick Collinson's introduction to Brooks' second edition.
29 See my *Common Places*, pp 385-7.
30 This treatise was published for the first time by J. V. Pollet, *Martin Bucer: Etudes sur la Correspondance, avec de nombreux textes inédits*, vol. 1, Paris 1958, pp 285-96.
31 In his edition of *De Regno Christi*, in *Opera Latina*, vol. XV, Paris 1955, p xxxi n 121.
32 Wright, *Common Places*, pp 388-98.

19. So then, when we are treating of this mystery, whether of the eucharist or more generally of Christ's presence with us (for why should we not say he is present when he dwells in us and stands in our midst?), it is irrelevant to advance those passages of Scripture which assert that Christ has left this world and abides in the heavens, and this as true man, possessing a real body and therefore a circumscribed body, which cannot be dispersed in all or many places at the same time.

20. For the presence of Christ in this world, whether offered or attested by the word alone or by the sacraments as well, is not one of place, or sense or reason, or earth, but of spirit, of faith, and of heaven, in so far as we are conveyed thither by faith and placed together with Christ, and apprehend and embrace him in his heavenly majesty, even though he is disclosed and presented by the dim reflection of words and sacraments discernible by the senses. . . .

42. And when it is asserted that one cannot receive what one has already, and moreover that the person who approaches the eucharist not having Christ already in himself receives there not Christ but death, I think the reply is simple: Christ must be given and received by us until there remains in us nothing of ourselves, but he is all things to us and we are wholly in him and not one whit in ourselves. For the communion of Christ that we have received by baptism is, we declare, strengthened and increased by the eucharist. But does this not happen also by means of the gospel when it is read and heard in faith? Indeed, it does, nor does the eucharist contain or confer anything extra, except that in it the visible words of Christ are used as well, and these are not devoid of effect upon the saints. For they are used by the ordinance of the Lord whose every word and ordinance is life and spirit. . . .

44. Since I am asked, therefore, who it is who gives and imparts the Lord's body and blood, that is, life-giving communion in them and in the whole Christ, I state that it is Christ, who is in the midst of his own and who spoke these words 'Take and eat'; he is the chief and effectual giver of himself, yet the minister serves as his minister for this imparting of himself, just as he does for that giving of himself which takes place through the gospel and baptism. . . .

45. But if I am asked about the use here of the bread and wine, my reply is that they are presenting signs whereby the Lord presents and imparts himself as bread from heaven, the bread of eternal life, in exactly the same way as he bestowed the Holy Spirit on the disciples by the sign of the breath of his mouth, and as he conferred healing of body and mind on many by the touch of his hand, and sight by clay made from spittle, and circumcision of heart by circumcision of the flesh, and regeneration by baptism. . . .

46. ...Accordingly, the Lord was pleased to use here these symbols of food and drink and to give his flesh to be eaten spiritually by means of the symbol of bread to be eaten physically, and his blood to be drunk spiritually by means of the symbol of wine to be drunk physically. . . .

47. If I am asked what conjunction can possibly exist between the glorified body of Christ in heaven — and at a particular place in heaven

— and perishable bread confined to earth and to a discernible position, I give the answer, the conjunction of a covenant, so that those who physically partake of these signs with true and living faith truly receive in a spiritual manner the strengthening and increase of communion in the body and blood of the Lord, that communion whereby they are members of Christ, flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones, to the end that they may become more perfectly his members. . . .

50. If I am asked in connection with the Lord's words 'This is my body', what 'This' denotes here, I maintain that to the sense it denotes the bread but to the mind of the body of the Lord, as in the case of every term which presents insensible realities by means of sensible signs. So this is the meaning: 'This that I give you by this sign is my body which is delivered up for you'. . . .

52. And So I consider it settled that in the eucharist three things are given and received by those who rightly partake of the Lord's table: (i) the bread and the wine, which in themselves are completely unchanged but merely become symbols through the words and ordinance of the Lord: (ii) the very body and blood of the Lord, so that by their means we may increasingly and more perfectly share in the imparting of regeneration — or, if you prefer, what we receive is more perfect communion, or the greater perfecting in us of communion, in the body and blood of the Lord; and hence (iii) the confirmation of the new covenant, of the remission of sins, and of our adoption as the children of God.

53. Together with Irenaeus I call the symbols an earthly reality, and communion in the Lord and its effect, the confirmation of the new covenant, I call a heavenly reality, and therefore one to be laid hold of by faith alone, and not to be entangled in any conceptions drawn from this world.

54. And because we are here not merely reminded of our Christ or of communion in him but also receive him, I prefer to say, in accordance with the Lord's words, 'Take and eat...', that by the bread and wine the Lord's body and blood are given rather than just signified, and that the bread is here a presenting sign of his body and not simply a sign.

This doctrine of the Supper has high claims to be regarded as one of the most balanced biblical accounts of this storm-centre of inner-Protestant debate given during the sixteenth century.

Bishops and Archbishops

Edward VI died two years after Bucer, and there followed the short-lived Catholic revival under Queen Mary. Further effects of Bucer's sojourn in Cambridge were inevitably delayed until the reign of Elizabeth, when several of the reforming scholars he had attracted to his pattern of mediating Protestantism became leaders of the English Church.[33] His three executors all became archbishops, Matthew Parker of Canterbury, Edwin Sandys of

33 C. Cross, *Church and People 1450-1660*, Glasgow 1976, p 86.

York and Edmund Grindal of both. Professor Patrick Collinson has argued impressively for a markedly Buceran character to Grindal's archepiscopate, partly as a consequence of discovering Grindal's copy of the first edition of Bucer's *De Regno Christi* (Basel 1557), extensively highlighted at Book II:12, on 'The Restoration of the Ministries of the Church'.[34]

Collinson is less convinced of Matthew Parker's dependence upon Bucer:

> Bucer was Parker's colleague, not his spiritual father.... On Parker's side there is no evidence of the filial devotion which Bradford and Grindal expressed, no suggestion of a theological response. He stayed in England under Mary, corresponded with the continent hardly at all, and as Archbishop of Canterbury was to find more to inspire him in the antiquities of the British Church than in the current practice of what others knew as 'the best reformed churches overseas'.[35]

Other estimates have varied,[36] but we now have the first edition, by Pierre Fraenkel, of the patristic *florilegium* that Bucer established and Parker expanded, so that Fraenkel presents it over both their names.[37] And Collinson's judgement may not do full justice to the warmth of Parker's tribute in his sermon at Bucer's funeral.

But the general point is well made. Bucer, the prince of mediators and 'an olde tryed Capitayn'[38], was tailor-made to instruct the post-Edwardian, post-Marian Church in how best to work out patterns of decided Protestantism amid clamours for more rigorous Reformation. The lead was given by men schooled in principled but moderate reform in Bucer's circle at Cambridge, among whom were several members of Pembroke Hall, a college whose 'place... in the Edwardian Reformation has never been duly acknowledged'.[39] Bucer would posthumously become the champion of England's *via media*, which lay between conservative and radical varieties of Protestantism, not, as nineteenth-century propagandists would assert, between Romanism and Protestantism.

In the judicious phrase of Professor Basil Hall, Bucer was *'anima naturaliter Anglicana'*.[40] Reformation had come a long way since Bucer's first recorded opinion on England, given at the very end of 1531, 'This people is wretchedly destitute both of Christ and of all sacred understanding of the Scriptures.'[41]

---

34 'The Reformer and the Archbishop. Martin Bucer and an English Bucerian', *Journal of Religious History*, vol. 6 (1970-71), pp 305-30 (=*Godly People*, pp19-44), and *Archbishop Grindal 1519-1583. The Struggle for a Reformed Church*, Cape, London 1979, especially pp 49-56. See also my 'Martin Bucer and England — and Scotland', forthcoming in the papers of the Colloque Bucer.

35 'The Reformer', pp 320f. (=*Godly People*, pp 34f).

36 V. J. K. Brook, *A Life of Archbishop Parker*, Clarendon, Oxford 1962, gave considerable weight to the Buceran formation of Parker's churchmanship, but the case made in 'Archbishop Parker's Efforts Toward a Bucerian Discipline in The Church of England', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol. 8 (1977), pp 85-103, by Mark VanderSchaaf, seems to me unconvincing.

37 In the *Opera Latina* section of Bucer's *Opera Omnia*, vol.III, Brill, Leiden 1988.

38 Parker, *Howe we ought*, C iii^{r}.

39 Collinson, 'The Reformer', p 317 (=*Godly People*, p 31).

40 In a chapter, 'Martin Bucer in England', to appear in a commemorative volume from Cambridge University Press.

41 Pollet, *Martin Bucer: Etudes*, vol. 2 (1962), p 439.

He ended his days resisting demands for more drastic purification of religion from 'the Zurich people', represented variously by John à Lasco of the strangers' church in London and by John Hooper. His contribution to Anglican adiaphorism, both during the Edwardian vestments controversy and when strife recurred in the 1560s and again in the 1570s (when Whitgift quarried extensively from Bucer against Cartwright), has been ably charted. Against John Hooper Bucer refused to acknowledge that the disputed vestments were in themselves anti-Christian and could not be used piously by the pious. He did not concede the principle that precise scriptural warrant was required for all such usages. Rites and ceremonies which had belonged to the church from antiquity and could be preserved without detriment to true religion should not be abandoned. The church's liberty in such matters was not to be constrained.[42]

Bucer knew how to commend reformed episcopacy with a range of vocabulary that could always draw the sting of the offensive term *episcopus*, and while rejecting any difference of order between bishops and presbyters.

> Among the elders to whom ecclesiastical administration is chiefly committed, one exercises singular care for the churches... . For this reason, the name of bishop has been especially attributed to these chief administrators of the churches, even though these should decide nothing without the consultation of the other presbyters, who are also called bishops in the Scriptures because of this common ministry... . It is therefore necessary that bishops before all other ministers and caretakers of the churches... devote themselves totally to the reading and teaching of the Holy Scripture.[43]

The practical, ethical thrust of Bucer's reformism helped to blunt the cutting edge of an insistence on the most rigorous application of the loftiest principles, while his passionate commitment to the 'common good' of the whole *respublica* warned against yielding to reformist sectarianism.

'Bucer was Bucer in Cambridge'

Matthew Parker believed that, for all his ailments and preoccupations, Bucer was at the height of his powers during his English period. After 'his trauersyng with the best learned in Christendome', 'if Bucer was euer Bucer, certeynly in my iudgement he was Bucer in Cambridge: that is pithy in learnyng, & euident in order'.[44] 'Order and facilitie'[45] have not been the most widely recognized qualities of Bucer's writings (Calvin commented that 'he does not know how to take his pen off the paper'), but language narrowed his sphere of operation (in Strasbourg he had been a pastor) which in turn may have clipped his more normal effusiveness. Parker gives no impression that Bucer was ever relaxed in Cambridge;[46] he may even have been holding

42 Hopf, *Martin Bucer*, pp 131-70; B. J. Verkamp, *The Indifferent Mean. Adiaphorism in the English Reformation to 1554*, Ohio UP, Athens, Ohio and Wayne State UP, Detroit 1977, and Collinson, 'The Reformer', p 323 (=*Godly People*, p 37).

43 *The Kingdom of Christ*, II:12 (tr. Pauck, pp 284f).

44 *Howe we ought*, C iii^{v}, D vi^{r}; cf. D viii^{v}, 'in reding and disputing, Bucer was Bucer'.

45 Ibid., D v^{r}.

46 Ibid., D viii^{r}: 'His grauitie could not bere childis trifeling in weighty causes.' A. N. Burnett connects his various distresses at Cambridge with 'his increasingly strident

himself in, as it were. For all his professed diligence in trying to capture the man, Parker had to confess: 'I could not saye that as yet I euer knewe Bucer. He was not knowen by a daye or two, as most part of men maye sone be'.[47]

Was this why Parker called him 'a treasure hyddon'? He has remained too long an unknown — and often misrepresented — Reformer. He deserves better, at least from a Church of England that is mindful of its Reformation heritage.

David Wright is Dean of the Faculty of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh.

The author's essay on 'Martin Bucer and England - and Scotland', forthcoming in the papers of the commemorative Colloque Bucer held at Strasbourg in August 1991, deals more fully with some topics noted in this article, as well as surveying other issues.

calls for repentance and reform of life', even '*ad nauseam et fastidium*', as one student put it ('Penance and Church Discipline in the Thought of Martin Bucer', Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison 1989, pp 387f).

47 *Howe we ought*, C iii^{v}.