

# Martin Bucer's Assessment of the Canon of the Mass in the Era of the Religious Colloquies

## 1. Introduction

On the eve of the Reformation the collection of prayers known as the “Roman Canon,” or simply “the Canon of the Mass” lay at the heart of the Eucharistic liturgy in the western church.<sup>1</sup> Both Luther and Zwingli detested these prayers. They rejected them as the mainstay of the received doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice and of the complex of related devotional practices (e.g. prayer and good works for the faithful departed; the private Mass; the invocation of the saints; indulgences).<sup>2</sup> For both reformers the Canon was an example of how the accretions of tradition – *verba hominum* – had concealed and perverted the Word of God. As a consequence, it was replaced with new prayers conducive to an evangelical administration of the Lord’s Supper.

In the early part of his career, the Strasbourg Reformer Martin Bucer shared this assessment of the Canon. In 1524 he recalled his puzzlement at the words he had whispered as a Dominican friar a few years earlier:

... often I celebrated Mass and read the Canon... but at the time I could not assess the meaning of the words *these offerings, the gifts*, and similar expressions found in the Canon. Thus I recited them and did not even know why, and though I was willing to explain and interpret them for someone else in accordance with the meaning given them by the papal teachers, yet my mind and heart could not appreciate or grasp them in the way in which they were presented.<sup>3</sup>

Now he felt only contempt for the Canon. In *De coena dominica* (1524) Bucer asked his adversaries why – if they held their Mass to have been instituted by Christ – they were not content to use Christ’s words. He continued:

Who do you imagine is the author of that whole sacrosanct Canon of yours? How is it that when Christ instituted this Supper as a celebration of his memorial, you have made it a remedy against all misfortunes and instituted the filthiest source of profit ever dreamt of in this world? The dung of human traditions and the stench of hell which emanate from that wicked Mass of yours, suggest who its author is.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> With the exception of the archdiocese of Milan where the similar Eucharistic prayer of the Ambrosian rite was used and a number of privileged churches in Toledo, Salamanca and Valladolid where Cardinal Ximénez had encouraged the use of the Mozarabic rite.

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. Luther, *De abroganda missa privata* (*D. Martin Luthers Werke, kritische Gesamtausgabe: Werke*; hereafter WA) 18:18—36); *Formula missae* (WA 12:211); Zwingli, *De canone missae epicheiresis* (*Huldreich Zwinglis sämtliche Werke* (= *Corpus reformatorum* 88—; hereafter Z) 2:556—808).

<sup>3</sup> *Kurtzer warhafftiger Bericht* (*Martin Bucers deutsche Schriften* (= *Martini Bucer opera omnia*, ser. I; hereafter BDS) 2:106).

<sup>4</sup> *Martini Buceri opera latina* (= *Martini Buceri opera omnia*, ser. II; hereafter BOL) 1:53.

The same hostility characterised the Strasbourg preachers' petitions for the abolition of the Mass between 1524 and 1529.<sup>5</sup> The early Evangelical "German Masses" which had retained elements of the ritual and structure of the old Canon were quickly replaced with a more radically reformed order for the celebration of the Lord's Supper.<sup>6</sup> Bucer's *Grund und Ursach* (1524), which defended this reform, justified the abolition of the Canon by referring readers to Zwingli's *De canone missae epicheiresis* (1523). Bucer said that he had nothing to add to what Zwingli had already said there.<sup>7</sup> A 1526 report by the preachers declared that, "almost the entire Canon is a blasphemy." By way of illustration, they analysed a number of its prayers (as Luther had done in *Vom Greuel der Stilmesse* and Zwingli in *De canone*).<sup>8</sup> Of the offertory prayer *Suscipe Sancte Pater* they wrote:

See, what a blasphemy it is: before the consecration he [i.e. the priest] offers up a bit of bread and wine to God for his own sins and those of all Christians, living and dead, for their salvation and eternal life. The death of Christ alone has effected and provided for all this. Is this not a mockery of God and an abominable blasphemy against Christ? He says the same sort of thing after the consecration [i.e. in the prayer *Unde et memores*] once he has elevated the sacraments.<sup>9</sup>

Thus, during the 1520s, Bucer's attitude towards the Canon – along with that of his milieu – was one of undifferentiated hostility. It is surprising then, to find him writing toward the end of the 1530s that there is:

nothing in the traditions and decrees of the fathers, nothing in these words which are said in the Mass, nothing in the teaching of the scholastics which suggests other than that, in the Masses, one celebrates the memorial of Christ offered on the cross, and, as it were, sets Christ before the Father in the priest's prayers in the name of the whole church, so that Christ's faithful may enjoy the fruits of the sacrifice consummated on the cross.<sup>10</sup>

At about the same time (in December 1540) we find Bucer collaborating with the Catholic theologian John Gropper (and a number of others) in the production of the *Worms Book* – the doctrinal statement that formed the basis for negotiations at the first

---

<sup>5</sup> The tone of these petitions is suggested by the title of Bucer's 1528 memorandum: *Das die Messß die schwerist gottischmach vnd abgottery vnd von keiner christlichen oberkeit zu dulden sey* (BDS 2:532–537).

<sup>6</sup> R. Bornert, *La réforme protestante du culte à Strasbourg au xv<sup>e</sup> siècle (1523–1598): approche sociologique et interprétation théologique* (Leiden, 1981), 110–118. See also *Correspondance de Martin Bucer* (= *Martini Bucerii opera omnia*, ser. III; hereafter BCor) 1:281–286, 288–289.

<sup>7</sup> BDS 1:237.

<sup>8</sup> BDS 2:488.

<sup>9</sup> *Predicanten Bericht der Messen halb* (BDS 2:489). Cf. *Offertorium*, "Suscipe, sancte Pater... hanc immaculatam hostiam, quam ego indignus famulus tuus offero tibi Deo meo... pro innumerabilibus peccatis, et offensionibus, et negligentis meis, et pro omnibus circumstantibus, sed et pro omnibus fidelibus christianis vivis atque defunctis: ut mihi et illis proficiat in vitam aeternam."

<sup>10</sup> *Consilium theologicum* (c1540) (BOL 4:149).

Colloquy of Regensburg in 1541.<sup>11</sup> The *Book* carried a qualified but positive assessment of the Canon. Its prayers were said to contain “nothing unsuitable,” as long as it were properly explained and as long as they excluded

the superstitious opinion whereby certain persons, badly instructed about the nature and energy of this most holy sacrament, used to think that they could draw off its power for themselves solely through the outward work which the priest performs, even if they brought no living faith, summoned no devotion, and offered their assent to the sacrifice by no formula of private or public prayer.<sup>12</sup>

What are we to make of these remarks? Bucer's letters to Phillip of Hesse at the time of the drafting of the Worms-Regensburg Book expressed his fear of serving the devil by conceding too much to the Catholics.<sup>13</sup> Yet in a report from the first Colloquy of Regensburg, the papal legate Cardinal Contarini recorded that after having listened to Gropper's explanation of the Canon and the invocation of the saints, Bucer had professed himself ready to “admit” the Canon.<sup>14</sup> If Contarini's report is accurate, what did Bucer think he was doing?

I propose to answer this question by examining Bucer's assessment of the Canon in two works written in the aftermath of Regensburg. The first of these is *Beständige Verantwortung*, first published 1543 and better known by the title of its Latin translation, *Constans defensio*.<sup>15</sup> At the end of the Imperial Diet which followed the first Colloquy of Regensburg, Cardinal Contarini had urged the bishops of Germany to

---

<sup>11</sup> For Gropper, see W. Lippens, *Kardinal Johannes Gropper, 1503—1559 und die Anfänge der katholischen Reform in Deutschland* (Münster, 1951), 9—51. BDS 9.1 distinguishes between the draft prepared by the secret colloquy of Worms (*Worms Book*) and the final amended draft presented to Charles V at the end of the Colloquy (*Worms-Regensburg Book*). Latin versions of both can be found in *Acta reformationis catholicae* (hereafter ARC) 6:21—88. A Latin version of the Regensburg Book is available in *Corpus reformationum* (hereafter CR) 4:190—238. See C. Augustijn, “Bucer und die Religionsgespräche von 1540/41” in *Martin Bucer and Sixteenth Century Europe: actes du Colloque de Strasbourg (28—31 août 1991)*, ed. C. Krieger & M. Lienhard, (*Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought* (hereafter SMRT) 53) (Leiden, 1993) 2:678.

<sup>12</sup> BDS 9.1:467, l. 1—7, “Iam si canon ille misse, quem veteres solemnem et prolixam precem super panem et calicem trifarie digestam appellauerunt [Cf. *Decretum Gratiani* d.11, c.5 (*Corpus iuris canonici*, 2 v., ed. A. Friedberg (Leipzig, 1879; reprint Graz, 1959) (hereafter Friedberg) 1:24) citing “Augustine,” i.e. Basil, *De spiritu sancto* 27 (*Migne, patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca* (hereafter PG) 32:188)] in hunc quem diximus sensum intelligatur, nihil habet Incommodj, superstitiosa tantum absit opinio...”

<sup>13</sup> To Philipp of Hesse, 20.12.1540 (*Briefwechsel Landgraf Philipp's des Grossmüthigen von Hessen mit Bucer*, ed. M. Lenz (Leipzig, 1880) 1:278, no. 101) “... das gewissen seer getrucket, das wir mit disem gesprech nit dem teuffel dienen, da wir meinten Christo zu dienen.”

<sup>14</sup> To Cardinal Farnese, 23.5.1541 (F. Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe des Cardinals Gasparo Contarini*, (Braunsberg: von Huyes, 1881), 327), “Hanno poi conferito della messa et del canone, dove si parlo etiam dell'invocation [sic] de Santi. Il Gropperio certamente ha satisfato bene, et sciolse loro obietioni talmente, che il Bucero disse; Io per me admetterla il canone.”

<sup>15</sup> The following page references are to *Constans defensio ex s. scriptura, et vera catholica doctrina, atque observatione universalis christianae ecclesiae Deliberationis de christiana reformatione, quam publicavit Hermannus Archiep. Coloniensis...* (Geneva: Ian. Ant. Saracen and Alexander Pernet, 1613) (See “Bibliographia Buceriana” in H. Bornkamm, *Martin Bucers Bedeutung für die europäische Reformationsgeschichte*, 37—96 (Gütersloh, 1952); (hereafter Stupperich) 86ab). According to t.p. and dedicatory epistle (*ibid.*, ¶ 3b) this translation is taken from a ms. by Bucer, but according to W. Janse, *Albert Hardenberg als Theologe: Profil eines Bucer-Schülers* (SMRT 57) (Leiden, 1994), 19—20, 500, the translation was by Bucer's collaborator Albert Hardenberg.

institute a “Christian reformation” in their dioceses by making provision for better pastors, for better preaching, for the education of the youth, and for more modest living in their own households.<sup>16</sup> Charles V had also secretly signalled his readiness to tolerate the religious *status quo* by permitting the Protestant princes to act on their own interpretation of the articles agreed at Regensburg pending the decision of the promised general Council.<sup>17</sup> Claiming Contarini’s exhortation as warrant, the Archbishop of Cologne, Hermann von Wied, invited Bucer and Melanchthon to assist him in a programme of reform in his ecclesiastical territory. The Cologne Cathedral Chapter vehemently opposed the archbishop’s plans. Its members – including Bucer’s former collaborator Gropper – launched a series of literary attacks on Bucer’s character and teaching and on the programme of reform. *Constans defensio* was Bucer’s first defence of the programme itself.<sup>18</sup>

The second work to which I will refer is *De vera et falsa caenae dominicae administratione* (1546).<sup>19</sup> From the mid-1530s Bucer had sought to persuade Catholic moderates that the reformers’ teaching about the Mass was essentially the same as that of the Fathers and scholastics.<sup>20</sup> *De vera et falsa* is addressed to one such moderate, Bartholomaeus Latomus, from whom Bucer had expected support for the Cologne reforms.<sup>21</sup> It is clear as well that *De vera et falsa* is a second reply to the “sophists” of the Cologne Chapter.<sup>22</sup> The work is Bucer’s most systematic attempt to appropriate the available patristic and scholastic writing on Eucharistic sacrifice for the Reformation.

In the following discussion I will confine myself to Bucer’s understanding of the history of the Canon and its sacrificial vocabulary. His views on the Canon’s

---

<sup>16</sup> ARC 4:5–7.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid. 3:391; CR 4:623ff; *Concilium Tridentinum: diariorum, actorum, epistularum, tractatum nova collectio* (Freiburg i. Breisgau, 1976) 4:200f (Latin text).

<sup>18</sup> See M. Köhn, *Martin Bucers Entwurf einer Reformation des Erzstiftes Köln: Untersuchung der Entstehungsgeschichte und der Theologie des Einfältigen Bedenkens von 1543* (Wittenberg, 1966), 44–46; M. de Kroon, “Bucer und die Kölner Reformation,” in *Martin Bucer and Sixteenth Century Europe*, 1: 493–506; J. V. Pollet, *Martin Bucer: Études sur les relations de Bucer avec les Pays-Bas, l’Électorat de Cologne, et l’Allemagne du Nord, avec de nombreux textes inédits* (Leiden, 1985), 1:105ff; and the texts recently published in BDS 11.1.

<sup>19</sup> *De vera et falsa caenae dominicae administratione libri II* (Neuberg: Johannes Kilianus, 1546 (Stupperich 88).

<sup>20</sup> See eg. W.I.P. Hazlett, ed., *Defensio adversus axioma catholicum...* (1534) (BOL 5:70–71) “Hisce de causis non solum prisci patres, sed scholastici quoque sacram coenam Domini ‘sacrificium’ vocaverunt”; *Consilium de pace ecclesiae* (1534–1535) (BOL 5:147–148); *Consilium theologicum* (BOL 4: 95ff, 148ff).

<sup>21</sup> For an account of the relationship between the two men, see, L. Keil, ed., *Bartholomaeus Latomus: zwei Streitschriften gegen Martin Bucer (1543–1545)* (*Corpus Catholicorum* (hereafter CCath) 8) (Münster, 1924), xi ff. Latomus, a teacher of Latin rhetoric at the Collège Royal in Paris, had been introduced to Bucer in 1539 by Jean Sturm and Johann Sleidan.

<sup>22</sup> *De vera*, 144, “... iactare singulari confidentia, ne dicam impudentia soletis, S. Patrum auctoritatem, quod ad sacrificium Missarum uestrarum attinet, stare omnino a uobis contra nos. Quam falsam gloriationem prae alijs adornare conati sunt mei Coloniensi Sophistae.”

commemoration of the faithful departed and on the private Mass are discussed in detail elsewhere.<sup>23</sup>

## 2. Interpretations of the Canon in the Reformation Era

Before going any further though, I would like to look at what the Reformers and their opponents thought the Canon was. St. Ambrose's commentary on a similar Eucharistic prayer in *De sacramentis* 4.5—6, suggests that the core of the Canon, from the prayer *Quam oblationem* to the *Unde et Memores* had taken more-or-less its present shape at the end of the fourth century (c 378).<sup>24</sup> Additions continued to be made over the course of the next four centuries.<sup>25</sup> Late mediaeval commentators were accustomed to distinguish between the "Minor" Canon (the offertory prayers through to the Preface and *Sanctus*) and the "Major" Canon which included the consecration of the sacramental elements and ended with the doxology *Per ipsum* (or, in some estimates, with the dismissal at the end of the Mass).<sup>26</sup> The "Major" Canon from the *Te igitur* to the *Per ipsum* continues in use as an optional Eucharistic prayer in the revised Roman Rite of 1970.

Neither the Reformers nor their opponents had a clear sense of the Canon's origins. No Catholic apologist suggested that Christ had handed down its *ipsissima verba*. However, they alleged (on the authority of Isidore of Seville) that St. Peter had established the fundamental shape of the present Mass when at Antioch.<sup>27</sup> Following Augustine, the Catholics found evidence for the structure of the Eucharistic liturgy in 1 Tim 2:1 (*obsecrationes, orationes, postulationes ac gratiarum actiones*).<sup>28</sup> They also followed Augustine in citing 1 Cor 11:16 (*caetera cum venero disponam*) as evidence that elements of the church's Eucharistic tradition had been passed on to subsequent generations by word of mouth.<sup>29</sup>

The Catholics recognised, nonetheless, that papal legislation recorded additions to the Mass of the Roman Rite from the late fifth century onwards. Their evidence for this came from the *Decretum Gratiani*, from commentaries such as the *Rationale divinarum officiorum* of William Durand (c1237–1296) or Gabriel Biel's (d. 1495) *Sacri canonis missae*

<sup>23</sup> N. Thompson, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Patristic Tradition in the Theology of Martin Bucer, 1534—1546* (Ph.D. diss., University of Glasgow, 2000).

<sup>24</sup> *Migne, Patrologiae cursus completus*. Series Latina (hereafter PL) 16:462—4 available in the Middle Ages by way of *Decretum Gratiani* 3 de consecr. dist.2 c.55 (Friedberg 1:1334). Regarding the authorship of this work see B. Botte, *Ambroise de Milan: Des sacraments: Des mystères*, new ed. (Sources chrétiennes, 25bis) (Paris, 1961), 7—25.

<sup>25</sup> J. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite: its Origins and Development*, transl. F. Brunner (New York, 1951) 1:49—60.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:97 & n. 2.

<sup>27</sup> Isidore, *De ecclesiasticis officiis* 1.15 (PL 83:752). See e.g. John Eck, *De sacrificio missae* 2.1 (CCath 36:80); Jerome Emser, *Missae christianorum assertio* (CCath 28:8).

<sup>28</sup> Augustine, *Epistola* 149.2.12—16 (PL 33:635—637). See e.g. Emser, *Missae christianorum assertio* (CCath 28:8).

<sup>29</sup> Augustine, *Epistola* 54.8 'ad Ianuarium' (PL 33:203) via *Decretum Gratiani* 3 de consecr. dist.2 c.54 (Friedberg 1:1334). See e.g. Eck, *De sacrificio missae* (CCath 36:83).

*expositio*, and from the anti-Wyclifite *Doctrinale de antiquitate fidei* by Thomas Netter “Waldensis” (1375—1430).<sup>30</sup> Josse Clichthove, however, spoke for all of the Catholics when he wrote that – despite the variety of the Canon’s authors – “the Holy Spirit, the same supreme architect and builder of the whole structure was in them all.”<sup>31</sup>

A more contemporary source of information on the history of the Mass was found in Jacques Lefèvre d’Étaples’ *scholia* for a Latin edition of the Ps.-Dionysian *De hierarchia ecclesiastica*. Working on the assumption that Dionysius was the disciple of Paul (Acts 17:34) Lefèvre claimed that the contemporary Roman rite conformed in most instances with the “apostolic” liturgy which Dionysius described. He demonstrated this in a table which set summaries of the two rites along side each other.<sup>32</sup> Even though Lorenzo Valla and Erasmus had both called the identity of Dionysius into question, Catholic apologists such as Eck continued to cite Lefèvre’s table against their adversaries.<sup>33</sup>

Catholic appeals to “Dionysius” cut no ice with Zwingli, however.<sup>34</sup> He also disputed the Ambrosian authorship of *De sacramentis*.<sup>35</sup> Even if *De sacramentis* was the work of Ambrose, Zwingli claimed, that father had left it to other bishops to alter the Canon as they saw fit.<sup>36</sup> Zwingli described the Canon as a *congeries*: an accumulation of the work of various writers who lived after the time of Gregory the Great. The Canon’s Latin was so barbarous and coarse, he wrote, that Gregory would either have rejected it entirely and started afresh or he would have left the prayer unchanged precisely because of its status as “canon.”<sup>37</sup>

The status and meaning of the Canon proved one of the most intractable questions in the negotiations between Evangelicals and Catholics at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530. The Catholic party in the Committee of Fourteen made it clear that a religious settlement in Germany would be impossible without the Canon’s reimposition in

<sup>30</sup> See e.g. Gulielmus Durandus, *Rationale divinatorum officiorum* 4.1.3.—8, 6.1; Innocent III, *De sacro altaris mysterio* 3.2 (PL 217:840); Netter, *Doctrinale* 3.4.38 (*Thomae Waldensis Carmelitae Anglici Doctrinale...* ed. F. Blanciotti (Venice: Antonio Bassanesio, 1757) 3:261); Biel, *Expositio* 15C (*Gabrielis Biel Canonis Misae expositio*, ed. H. Oberman & W. Courtenay (Wiesbaden, 1963) 1:121—122).

<sup>31</sup> *Antilutherus* (Paris: Simon Colineus, 1524) 2.17.2 (85b) “Tum quod in illis omnibus, vnus & idem erat supremus architectus & author totius fabricae, spiritus sanctus.”

<sup>32</sup> *Theologia vivificans, cibus solidus: Dionysii Coelestis hierarchia, Ecclesiastica hierarchia... Polycarpi Epistola vna.* (Paris: in alma Parisiorum academia, 1515), 63b. In this anthology, Ambrogio Traversari’s Latin translation was published with Lefèvre’s *scholia* and Clichtove’s *annotationes ad literam*. See J. P. Massaut, *Critique et tradition à la vielle de la Réforme en France.* (Paris, 1974), 179—189.

<sup>33</sup> See e.g. Eck, *De sacrificio missae* 2.8 (CCath 36:113); Clichtove, *Antilutherus* 2.8.4—6 (69a—b). Cf. Erasmus, *In Nouum testamentum... adnotationes...* (Basel: Froben, 1519) 225 on Acts 17:34.

<sup>34</sup> See *Christliche Antwort* (CR 90:219). Ps.-Dionysius had been cited by the theologians of Bishop Hugo of Constance. Here Zwingli cites Erasmus.

<sup>35</sup> *De canone* (CR 89:567). His ultimate source for this was probably Augustine, *Retractationes* 4 (PL 16:427—435); cited e.g. in Oecolampadius, *Ad Billibaldum Pyrkaimerum de re eucharistiae responsio* (Zurich: Froschauer, 1526) d3a), which rejected the Ambrosian authorship but endorsed the work’s catholicity. This, of course, suggested that a prayer like the Canon was at least as old as Augustine.

<sup>36</sup> *De canone* (CR 89:567)

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 564—565, 569.

Protestant territories. Towards the end of August 1530, Melanchthon wrote to George Spalatin to scotch rumours that the Protestants had accepted this condition subject to the following “suitable and godly interpretation”: the Mass was a memorial sacrifice, and the Canon’s references to “victim” and “sacrifice” should be understood in this way. It seemed to Melanchthon, however, that to concede this would be like handing the massing-priests a sword with which they would, in time, re-introduce their impostures. “What,” he asked, “does the peasant know of a ‘figurative,’ ‘passive,’ and ‘representative,’ sacrifice?”<sup>38</sup>

One of the sources of this “suitable” interpretation seems to have been the Catholic Johann Eck. In a *Iudicium de Augustana confessione* written for Albrecht of Mainz and George of Saxony, Eck wrote that agreement on the Mass would be possible if the Evangelicals “did not deny that Christ was offered *figuratively* in the Old Testament, *passibly* on the cross, and *mystically* in the Mass, and that this mystical offering was the memorial of the victim offered on the cross.”<sup>39</sup>

This discussion seems to have occasioned the sharp distinction between “sacrament” (what God offers to us) and “sacrifice” (what we offer to God) in Melanchthon’s *Apologia Confessionis Augustanae* (1531). According to Melanchthon, the *sacrificium eucharistikum* of the faithful (i.e. their thanksgiving, praise, confession, almsgiving) was rightly *associated with* the celebration of sacrament of the Lord’s body and blood, but was not of its essence.<sup>40</sup> However, as Melanchthon pointed out in his letter to Spalatin, the Canon’s words *offerimus pro* seemed to blur this boundary. The proper distinction between the church’s work and God’s unique and unrepeatable work in Christ was lost. The church’s *opus* itself became a propitiatory sacrifice able to gain the remission of sins for the offerer and others by its mere performance (*ex opere operato*). “Suitable interpretations” which appealed to types, memorial, mystery and “threefold distinctions” were worthless until the proper distinction between the sacrifice of Christ and that of the Church had been clarified.<sup>41</sup>

### 3. The Worms-Regensburg Book

---

<sup>38</sup> CR 2:296, 20/21.8.1530. For the Catholic proposals see F. Schirmacher, *Briefe und Acten zu der Geschichte des Religionsgespräches zu Marburg 1529 und des Reichstages zu Augsburg 1530*. (Gotha, 1876), 234 (hereafter Schirmacher); E. Honée, *Der Libell des Hieronymus Vebus zum Augsburger Reichstag, 1530: Untersuchung und Texte zur katholischen Concordia-Politik* (Reformationsgeschichtliche Studien und Texte, 125) (Münster, 1988), 229—230.

<sup>39</sup> *Iudicium doctoris Eccii de Augustana confessione* (Schirmacher, 207), “Concordari posset cum ecclesia, quod non esset uocanda eucharistia, sacrificium, uictima. Victima. Sic fuit in ara crucis. Si tamen non negarent, sic corpus Christi fuit oblatum in ueteri testamento figuraliter et in cruce passibiliter, ita in missa misterialiter. Quae misterialis oblatio esset memoria oblationis uictimalis in cruce.”

<sup>40</sup> *Bekennnisschriften der ev.-lutherischen Kirche*, ed. Deutscher Evangelischer Kirchenausschuß, 8<sup>th</sup> ed. (Göttingen, 1979) (hereafter BSELK), 354, para. 19, 356, para. 25ff., 368, para. 66f.

<sup>41</sup> CR 2:292, 296.

Nevertheless, even the faint prospect of a rapprochement on the Canon seems to have appealed to Bucer and to have shaped the treatment of the Mass in the *Worms Book* submitted to the first Colloquy of Regensburg ten years later. The *Book* considered the sacrifice of the Mass in its twentieth article. The article defined the Mass as an “unbloody” and “spiritual sacrifice” in which there were four offerings.<sup>42</sup>

- (i) The offering of Christ himself. He who offered himself once on the cross was also offered in the Mass in a “representative sacrifice.” This sacrifice took place when the church “through devout prayer, sets Christ and his true body and blood before the Father for the sins of the world.”<sup>43</sup>
- (ii) The church’s offering of itself, through Christ, as his mystical body. This offering included the church’s prayer for those who have died in faith but were “not yet fully cleansed.”<sup>44</sup> It also included the commemoration of the saints in order that the church may be stirred by their example and “associated” with their “merits.”<sup>45</sup>
- (iii) The church’s offering of thanksgiving and praise.<sup>46</sup>
- (iv) The offering of bread and wine as an outward token of the church’s self-offering.<sup>47</sup>

This division of the Mass seems intended to meet Melanchthon’s objections to the “suitable interpretation” proposed at Augsburg. Yet his anxieties about the

<sup>42</sup> BDS 9.1:461, 1—3, “Adhaec omnis Ecclesia missam, in qua verum corpus et verus sanguis christi conficitur, sacrificium esse consentit, sed incruentum, spirituale. In ea enim, modo pie et religiose agatur, Deo quatuor spiritualiter offeruntur...”

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., 4—16, “Initio enim christus, qui seipsum patris in mortali corpore cruentam, sufficientem et beneplacentem pro totius mundi peccatis hostiam cruci affixus obtulit. Idem ille in missa, quae est omnium sacrorum sanctissima actio et publicum in Ecclesia ministerium, totius ecclesiae nomine repraesentatio sacrificio eidem deo patri immolatur. Quod certe fit, cum Ecclesia illum eiusque verum corpus et sanguinem deo patri pro totius mundi peccatis pia prece sistit.”

<sup>44</sup> While this seems to imply Purgatory, it was open to other interpretations. See Thompson, *Eucharistic sacrifice*, 150—155, 214—221.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., 463, 7—13, “Secundo Ecclesiae in hoc missae sacrificio, quatenus christi mysticum corpus est, per Christum deo offerre non dubitat... fit ut vicissim se totam deo consecret et, quemadmodum Christus nos omnes in cruce portabat et totius Ecclesiae causam gerebat, eam in se ipso deo patri offerens, sic ecclesia tantam oblationem pia deuotione recolens se totam per Christum deo vicissim dedicat.” Cf. *Canon missae*, Memento domine, “...tibi que reddunt vota sua aeterno Deo, vivo et vero.”

BDS 9.1: 463, 17—24, “...recolit Christum ob id mortuum semel, ut et uiuorum et mortuorum dominetur, non se diuidit, sed veluti se totam colligens non solum praesentium, sed et sanctorum, quos iam certo apud deum viuere nouit et aliorum quoque fratrum et sororum, qui in domino, sed non defecati satis, obdormuerunt, meminit ac testatur se in hoc sacrificio unitatem corporis Christi intelligere...” Ibid., 25—27, “Quamobrem patres testantur ecclesiam in eodem sacrificio non solum martyrum cum ad excitandam imitationem, tum ut meritis eorum consocietur, religiose celebrare...”

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 465, 1—9, “Tertio in missa sacrificium laudis, quae huius quoque Institutionis finis est... gratiarum actionis communicatio et confessio doctrinae, obsecrationis, orationis, postulationis et preces pro omnibus hominibus et pia vota, sacrificia certe spiritualia et deo grata coniuncta sunt...”

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., 15—21.

relationship between the *offerimus* of the church and the unique *oblatio* of Christ are not really resolved.

Certainly, as we have already noted, the article's passage on the Canon warned against a faithless and superstitious trust in the work of the priest. This seems intended to answer Melanchthon's claim that the Mass was held to remit the guilt and punishment of *sin ex opere operato sine bono motu utentis* (i.e. by its mere performance even for a beneficiary utterly devoid of contrition/saving faith).<sup>48</sup> Against this, the article suggested that no one derived any benefit from the sacrifice where the *motus bonus* of saving faith was not present.

But the article warned only against trust in the work of the priest *alone*. This did not exclude the possibility that the priest's work had some role in mediating the benefits of Christ's sacrifice to the faithful present, as well as those absent. So what was this work? Firstly, the article made it clear that whatever the priest did was done as "a public ministry in the name of the whole church." Speaking on behalf of the church, the priest "set" the true body and blood of Christ before the Father for the sins of the whole world. Although Christ's offering on the cross had been made once and could not be repeated, its strength endured so that it was "no less effective today in the sight of the Father in those who *represented* it with religious faith."<sup>49</sup>

What did the article mean by this "representative" sacrifice? Was it the figurative "eucharistic" sacrifice of Melanchthon's *Apologia*: i.e. the church's thankful memorial and its confident approach to the Father through the unique and unrepeatable sacrifice of Christ – prayer associated with the sacrament, but not of its essence? Or was there some more integral relationship between the sacrament of Christ's body and blood and the church's sacrifice? The latter is suggested by the article's allusion to a claim, common in Catholic apology, that intercession was somehow more effective when offered in the presence of the sacrament of Christ's body and blood.<sup>50</sup> On the other hand, the article does not endorse this claim: such prayer is simply "reckoned" more effective. These ambiguities would only be fully clarified in the debate between the *Worms Book's* two principal authors following the Colloquy of Regensburg.

#### 4. The Clarification of the Worms-Regensburg Article

---

<sup>48</sup> BSELK, 352, para. 11.

<sup>49</sup> BDS 9.1:461, l. 10–13, "Nam etsi oblatio illa in cruce semel facta transijt non reiterabilis, victima tamen ipsa Immolata perpetua virtute consistit, vt non minus hodie in conspectu patris oblatio illa In ijs, qui eam deo religiosa fide repraesentant, sit efficax quam eo die, qua de suo latere sanguis et aqua exiuit." Cf Ps.-Cyprian [i.e. Ernardus Bonaevallis] *De cardinalibus operibus Christi* (PL 189:1631) "non minus efficax... quam ea die qua de saucio..." Allusion not noted in BDS 9.1.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 465, l. 9, "... quae [i.e. sacrificia spiritualia] etiam in praesentia tanti Sacramentj magis efficacia et plus Valere censentur."

The church order outlining the proposals for a reformation in the Electorate of Cologne appeared in autumn 1543. Bucer had worked on the order in collaboration with Melancthon and under the supervision of Hermann von Wied and his advisors. The short title of the order was *Einfältiges Bedenken*; that of its Latin translation was *Simplex ac pia deliberatio*.<sup>51</sup> In November 1543, the Cologne cathedral chapter responded with *Christliche und catholische Gegenberichtung* or, in Latin, *Antididagma*. This was primarily (and possibly solely) the work of Johannes Gropper, Bucer's primary collaborator on the *Worms Book*.<sup>52</sup>

The *Antididagma* reproached the *Deliberatio* for having replaced the Mass, including the Canon, with a new order for the celebration of the Lord's Supper.<sup>53</sup> The Canon's sequence structured Gropper's defence of the received understanding of Eucharistic sacrifice. Gropper's argument also used the "four offerings" structure of the *Worms Book* and this structure was mirrored, to a large extent, in both of Bucer's replies.

#### a. The Origin of the Canon

Gropper attempted to identify the Canon's first author – apparently on analogy with the attribution of the Greek Liturgies to Ss. John Chrysostom and Basil. He quoted from Gregory the Great's letter to John of Syracuse describing the Canon as "a prayer over the offering which a scholar had composed."<sup>54</sup> Gropper argued that Gregory's use of *scholasticus* indicated his esteem for the composer. In *Constans defensio*, Bucer dismissed this suggestion. There was nothing, he wrote, to suggest that *scholasticus* was a mark of esteem. It might equally have been someone's name (here he alluded to St. Benedict's sister Scholastica). Even if the prayer to which Gregory referred was in fact the Canon, the most that this allusion showed was that the Canon had been composed by a scholar (or a man named Scholasticus) at some time prior to, or during the pontificate of Gregory.<sup>55</sup> Elsewhere in *Constans defensio* Bucer also refused to accept Ambrose's *De sacramentis* 4.5–6 as evidence that a prayer like the Canon had existed in the late 4<sup>th</sup> century. "Who is there," he asked, "among the truly learned who believes that these

---

<sup>51</sup> Stupperich, 74, 74a–c. German text in BDS 11.163–429. For the publication history see Köhn, 60–63.

<sup>52</sup> References below to the Latin translation by Eberhard Billick O.Carm., *Antididagma seu Christianae et Catholicae religionis... propugnatio aduersus librum quendam* (Louvain: Servatius Zassenus, 1544). Regarding the composition of the *Gegenberichtung* see Gropper, *An die Roemische Keyserliche Maiestat... Warhafftige Antwort* (Cologne: Jaspar Gennepaeus, 1545), 67a-68a; *Johannes Gropper: Briefwechsel*, ed. R. Braunisch (CCath 32) (Münster, 1977) 1:332, n.2.

<sup>53</sup> *Antididagma*, 112a.

<sup>54</sup> Gropper assumes that the *oratio dominica* is the Lord's prayer and that Gregory (PL 77:956–958) is arguing that it should be included at the end of the Canon. On the identity of the *oratio* see G.G. Willis, "Saint Gregory the Great and the Lord's Prayer in the Roman Mass," *Further Essays in the Early Roman Liturgy* (Alcuin Club Collections, 50) (London, 1968): 177–188.

<sup>55</sup> *Constans defensio*, 328.

books are Ambrose's?"<sup>56</sup> As we shall see, however, he was prepared to make use of *De sacramentis* when it suited his argument.

Bucer thought it likely that the Roman Canon, like the Greek liturgies, was the product of accretion and admixture. In *Constans defensio*, he urged his readers to compare the Liturgies of Ss. John Chrysostom and Basil with what the two fathers in question had written about the Lord's Supper. The discrepancies they found, he argued, would demonstrate that neither the Roman Canon nor its Greek counterparts had remained unchanged since the time of these fathers, let alone the time of the Apostles.<sup>57</sup>

On the other hand, Bucer did not regard the modification of earlier Eucharistic prayers as illegitimate *per se*. He argued that the third and seventh Councils of Carthage had sanctioned a variety of Eucharistic prayers, provided that they had been composed by "more prudent bishops" and contained nothing contrary to the faith.<sup>58</sup> This, he claimed, was no more than the *Deliberatio* had done in introducing a new liturgical order.

Bucer's allusions to the Greek liturgies in *Constans defensio* were largely dismissive. However, as the appendix to Fraenkel's edition of Bucer's *Florilegium patristicum* suggests, Bucer had been reading a number of editions of these liturgies (both in Latin translation and in Greek) and had paid close attention to their use of sacrificial vocabulary.<sup>59</sup> In *De vera et falsa* they were quoted as a key to the authentic sense of the Roman Liturgy, and it seems to have been his study of the "Greek Canon" which encouraged Bucer to attempt a complete appropriation of the Roman one.

Although Gropper recognised that the Roman Canon was not an artefact of the apostolic church, he argued for the apostolic character of its content. Here, as we shall see, two of Gropper's most important sources were Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses* 4.17—18 and the Ps.-Dionysian *De hierarchia ecclesiastica* 3. In the first case, Bucer acknowledged *Adversus haereses* as the earliest "more certain" witness (i.e. more certain than Ps.-Dionysius) to the early celebration of the Lord's Supper.<sup>60</sup> The work would feature prominently in his interpretation of the post-consecratory prayers of the Canon. In *Constans defensio* Bucer expressed agnosticism about the provenance of *De hierarchia ecclesiastica*. However, he continued to use it, for the sake of argument, as evidence of the true shape of the primitive liturgy.<sup>61</sup> Like Lefèvre, Eck and Clichthove (though unlike

---

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., 335, "Vnde nos memores & supplices te rogamus, inueniri apud D. Ambrosius lib. 4. de Sacramentis, cap. 5 [i.e. cap. 6]. Verum quidem est, quod in eo loco talia verba reperiuntur. At quis est inter vere doctos, qui hos libros Ambrosij esse agnoscat?" Cf. PL 16:464. Bucer believed (incorrectly) that Erasmus doubted the authenticity of *De sacramentis*. See his remarks recorded in the Codex Musculus in P. Fraenkel, "Les protestants et le problème de la transsubstantiation au Colloque de Ratisbonne: documents et arguments, du 5 au 10 mai 1541," *Oecumenica* 3 (1968): 103, n.22.

<sup>57</sup> *Constans defensio*, 328—329.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., 327. Carthage 3, c. 23 (J. Mansi, ed., *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, 53 v. (Florence; Paris, 1759—1866) (hereafter Mansi) 3:884) is repeated at Carthage 7 (Mansi 4:435).

<sup>59</sup> See BOL 3:197—207.

<sup>60</sup> *Constans defensio*, 270.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 289.

Gropper) Bucer presented his readers with a tabular summary of the Ps.-Dionysian rite. Here, however, he did so to prove that it was reflected in the shape and content of the new Cologne Order. He also compared the Order with a précis of John Chrysostom's description of the Eucharistic liturgy in *Homiliae in 2 Corinthos* 18.<sup>62</sup> Bucer admitted that both sources referred to ceremonies not preserved in the Cologne Order: eg. the use of incense, the sign of peace and the recitation of the names of the saints in the Eucharistic prayer.<sup>63</sup> Here, as elsewhere, he protested that if Cologne reforms did not conform to the letter of the patristic liturgical texts, they nevertheless conformed to their spirit. This distinction was fundamental in determining Bucer's attitude toward the Canon. It enabled him to distinguish between what he believed had been the Canon's original sense and its debased sense in the contemporary church. He also attempted to demonstrate that in several respects, the liturgical practice of the adversaries had departed not just from the spirit but also from the letter of patristic liturgical practice.

## **b. The Relationship between the Four Sacrifices of the Mass**

### **(i) The "Significative Sacrifice" of the Offertory**

Gropper argued that the offertory prayers of the Minor Canon constituted a "significative" or "mystical" sacrifice of bread and wine: i.e. the fourth sacrifice of the *Worms Book*. Along with a number of Protestant commentators, he recognised that the ritual of the Minor Canon had its origin in a collection of bread, wine and material goods taken up from the congregation. Part of this was distributed to the poor and part was used in the celebration of the Eucharist.<sup>64</sup> By giving thanks with gifts of bread and wine, the church expressed its gratitude to God for creating all things, for sustaining them, and for having sent his beloved Son to redeem them. Here Gropper appealed to the account of the Eucharist in Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses* 4.18.4:

for we must make our offering to God, and in all things be found grateful to God our Creator, pure in thought, without hypocrisy in our faith, firm in hope, in love, offering him the first-fruits of his creation; and the church alone makes this pure oblation to the Creator, offering to him from his creation with thanksgiving.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> Ibid. 338–339. Cf. PG 61:527.

<sup>63</sup> *Constans defensio*, 340.

<sup>64</sup> *Antididagma* 90a—b cites the *Canones Apostolorum* (Mansi 1:30B, 50–51) *Decreta Fabiani* (Mansi 1:786D) and the Collect for the Seventh Sunday after Pentecost. Cf. Luther, *Sermon von dem neuen Testament* (WA 6:366, 14—19); Melancthon, *Apologia* (BSELK 372, para. 86); Oecolampadius, *De genuina verborum hoc est corpus meum... expositione* (Strasbourg: Knobloch, 1525) d5b. Mediaeval commentaries recognised the offertory as a "sign" of the "spiritual sacrifices" of the faithful (see e.g. Biel, *Expositio* 16C (Oberman & Courtenay); Durandus, *Rationale* 30.4.15) but apologists such as Eck were keen to make a sharp distinction between these "lay" offerings and the Eucharistic sacrifice offered by the priest. See his remarks on the *Worms-Regensburg Book* in *Apologia aduersus mucros & calumnias Buceri* (Cologne: Melchior Novesianus, 1542) N3b, "...sed quid hae oblationes laicae, ad diuinissimam oblationem sacerdotalem in missa?"

<sup>65</sup> *Antididagma*, 90a Cf. PG 7:1026–1027.

Bucer did not contest this gloss. Here, as elsewhere, his objection was that it bore no relation to the liturgical *status quo* among the Catholics. The people's offertory, he wrote, had become a rite performed by priests or deacons with a "morsel of bread" and a "few drops of wine."<sup>66</sup> The Roman *Collect for the fifth Sunday after Pentecost* suggested to Bucer the original meaning of the Offertory:

O God, you have ratified the various sacrifices of the Law through a single perfect sacrifice. Receive the sacrifice of your devoted servants with equal blessing and sanctify it with the same blessing which you gave to Abel's gifts, so that what they have offered individually may advance their salvation to the honour of your majesty.<sup>67</sup>

The *Collect* was right, he argued, to speak of the sacrifices of the people "advancing their salvation," because this offering was not only "mystical;" it was also an offering of alms for the poor.<sup>68</sup> If "to offer bread and wine" meant

to celebrate God on account of his many gifts, to tell of his kindnesses and to show them forth, to call on him for further blessing and grace, then it is certain that the *Book of the Reformation* [i.e. the *Deliberatio*] does not overlook offering of this kind, but orders it to be observed and exercised.<sup>69</sup>

The order for the celebration of the Lord's Supper in the *Deliberatio* had replaced the Offertory of the Roman Rite with a collection. The collection's significance was explained in terms reminiscent of *Adversus haereses* 4.17.4—5:

each person who hears the Gospel with true faith, and through it recognises that God has given us his only Son and everything with him out of his unfathomable love, will give himself completely to God and Christ... Because of this, the faithful shall bring their free-will offerings while the Creed is being sung, each as a token of what has been bestowed on him by the bounteous hand of God.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> See eg. *Constans defensio* 282, "verum oblationem istam panis & vini veteribus mysterium fuisse, cui congruat id quod nostro tempore diaconi siue sacerdotes paucillum panis & pauculas guttas vini in calice conficiunt, id longe aliter se habet."

<sup>67</sup> *Constans defensio*, 282, "Deus, qui legalium differentiam hostiarum unius sacrificij perfectione sanxisti: accipe sacrificium a deuotis tibi famulis et pari benedictione, sicut munera Abel, sanctifica; ut quod singuli obtulerunt ad maiestatis tuae honorem, cunctis proficiat ad salutem." Here he also refers to and quotes the Collects for the fifth and sixth Sundays of Pentecost. See also *De vera*, 156. The Collects for the fifth, sixth, seventh, and ninth Sundays "after Trinity" (in fact Pentecost) are cited in *Florilegium patristicum* (BOL 3:30—31). Bucer may have these *via Antididagma* 90b (fifth and seventh Sunday) or Aquinas, *ST* 3a q.83 a.1 (ninth Sunday).

<sup>68</sup> *Constans defensio*, 282.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, 283, "Si igitur offerre panem & vinum est & significat Deo pro talibus donis celebrare, ac beneficia eius enumerare & predicare, eum pro vltiori benedictione & gratia inuocare, certe Liber Reformationis huiusmodi oblationem non praetermisit, sed obseruandam & exercendam ordinauit."

<sup>70</sup> BDS 11.1:348. See also *ibid.*, 285—289 on "Christian offering" both at the Supper and in other contexts. Cf. PG 7:1023, "... ut ispi nec infructuosi nec ingrati simus, eique seruire discamus."

The *Deliberatio's* collection did not, however, include bread and wine for the Eucharist. Bucer argued that the essence of the Offertory lay not in any particular act, but in the confession, thanksgiving, and prayer that accompanied it. However, in *Constans defensio* he conceded that – all other things being equal – a collection of bread and drink, together with the consecration of a certain portion, would be “proper and in accordance with the custom of the Christian and primitive churches.”<sup>71</sup>

## (ii) The Offering of Christ

Bucer had been reluctant to include an offering of bread and wine in the new Cologne Order because of the possibility that it would be open to misinterpretation. As we have already noted, the Strasbourg preachers interpreted the *Suscipe sancte Pater* of the Minor Canon as an attempt to win the remission of sins with bread and wine. Hence *Constans defensio* declared that “considered in themselves” the bread and wine of the Offertory were “an offering different and separate from the thanksgiving, prayer and memorial of Christ and his passion which follow [i.e. in the Major Canon.]”<sup>72</sup>

Bucer recognised, however, that considered as part of the whole liturgical movement, the “offerings” of the Minor and Major Canons were connected. In *De vera et falsa* he argued that the Major Canon's references to *dona*, *munera* and *sancta sacrificia* referred chiefly to the praise, thanksgiving, intercession and self-dedication offered by the church in grateful recollection of Christ's death. However, even in the Major Canon, these prayers continued to be symbolised in a portion of the bread and wine “offered” by the people, (i.e. the Canon's *circumstantes*, *famuli et famulae*, *familia* and the *plebs sancta*). This portion was set aside for the administration of sacrament.<sup>73</sup>

Following the recitation of the institution narrative (i.e. the Canon's consecratory formula) this portion “represented” (*exhibere*) the body and blood of Christ.<sup>74</sup> For this reason the prayer *Unde et Memores* referred to the offering (i.e. *de tuis*

<sup>71</sup> *Constans defensio*, 281.

<sup>72</sup> *Constans defensio*, 284, “Haec sane realis oblatio erat per se: non quidem sine Christo, fide propria, & traditione in voluntatem & obedientiam Christi: adhuc considerata in se ipsa alia erat oblatio & diuersa a sequenti gratiarum actione, oratione, ac memoria Christi & passionis eius.”

<sup>73</sup> *De vera*, 156ff. Cf. *Canon missae*, “Memento, Domine, famulorum famularumque tuarum...et omnium circumstantium... pro quibus tibi offerimus: vel qui tibi offerunt hoc sacrificium laudis, pro se, suisque omnibus: pro redemptione animarum suarum, pro spe salutis...” Cf. also the *sententiae* collected under “Oblationes ad missam” in the *Florilegium patristicum* (BOL 3:31). In *De vera*, 157 he notes that the words *pro quibus tibi offerimus* did not occur in the earliest versions of the Missal which he had seen. The Mass, he argued, now excluded the corporate dimension suggested by *qui tibi offerunt* and had become the preserve of the celebrant.

<sup>74</sup> In Bucer's Eucharistic theology *exhibere* and *repraesentare* are synonyms. This is the case in the 1520s (see e.g. BOL 2:269) as well as the 1530s when both words acquire a “strong” sense: i.e. both come to mean the objective conjunction of the outward word/sign and the inward grace offered when the sacrament is celebrated according to Christ's command (see e.g. BOL 5:120). See also Bucer to Peter Martyr, 20.6.1549 (J.V. Pollet, *Martin Bucer: études sur la correspondance avec de nombreux textes inédits* (Paris, 1962), 1: 268, l. 10–15); Bornert, 315ff; Hazlett, *Development*, 345. I have translated *exhibere* “represent” to make clear its connection with Bucer's understanding of “representative” sacrifice here.

*donis ac datis*) as “the bread of everlasting life and the cup of eternal salvation.”<sup>75</sup> Luther and Zwingli had found this prayer particularly offensive since it seemed to suggest that the church was “offering” Christ’s body and blood, objectively present on the altar, to God the Father and thereby attempting to repeat or supplement his sacrifice.<sup>76</sup> Bucer resolved this difficulty by reading *panis vitae eternae* and *calix salutis perpetuae* as anticipatory formulae: i.e. this was what the church’s thanksgiving-offering of bread and wine *would be* to those who communed. Thus, in *De vera et falsa* Bucer clarified the four-sacrifice structure of the *Worms-Regensburg Book* by adding a fifth sacrifice: the “offering” of bread and wine, consecrated for the use of the sacrament, through which the body and blood of Christ are “represented to us.”<sup>77</sup>

Here he appealed (as Gropper had done) to Irenaeus’ *Adversus haereses* 4.18 and its allusion to the first fruits offering of Deuteronomy 26:1—11.<sup>78</sup> According to Bucer, this offering had manifested the people’s liberation from Pharaoh, superstition and impiety, it had celebrated the giving of the Law, and it had looked to the coming of the promised Messiah. Priests and people thanked God for his kindnesses, resolved to use his gifts in a wholesome manner, and then consumed them in his presence. They also set aside some of the offering for the use of the widows, the Levites and the poor.<sup>79</sup> Likewise in the New Testament God’s holy people presented their offerings, acknowledged them as gifts of God and gave thanks for them through Christ. They set a portion of these offerings aside for holy purposes, prayed that these would be sanctified to them, then consumed them and offered themselves and their lives to God.<sup>80</sup> In this sense the sacrifices of the Old and New Testaments possessed the same internal or spiritual character. The *species* had changed, but not the *res*.<sup>81</sup>

Here Bucer appropriated those patristic texts that referred to the Last Supper as a fulfilment of the priesthood and sacrifices of the Old Testament. Cyprian’s *Epistola* 63, for example, described the Last Supper as a fulfilment of the priesthood of Melchizedek

---

<sup>75</sup> *Canon Missae*, “Unde et memores... offerimus praeclarae maiestati tuae de donis tuis ac datis, hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam, panem sanctum vitae eternae et calicem salutis perpetuae...”

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Luther, *Vom Gneuel der Stillmesse* (WA 18:29); Zwingli, *De Canone* (CR 89:584; 592); *Auslegen und Gründe der Schlußreden* 18 (CR 89:112ff).

<sup>77</sup> *De vera*, 147, “...panis & uini, in usum sacramenti, quo nobis corpus & sanguis Domini exhibentur, sanctificati.”

<sup>78</sup> *Antididagma* 85a—b.

<sup>79</sup> *De vera*, 168.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 167, “Verum cum offerent sancti suas oblationes, iam eas esse dona Dei, & esse quoque in manu & in conspectu Dei, religiosius considerabant, de eis gratias Deo per Christum Dominum agebant religiosius, eaque iam uelut e manu Dei suscipiebant, & sua quoque professione gloriae Dei, diuinisque usibus... decernebant, denique in hunc usum sanctificari ea sibi precabantur, ac etiam usurpabant, seseque iuxta Deo in omne obsequium sistebant & consecrabant.”

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 151. See also *Constans defensio*, 267, “...iuxta Scripturam veteris Testamenti sacrificia nihil aliud sint quam symbola & sacramenta imprimis Domini nostri Iesu Christi, & redemptionis factae & acquisitae nobis pretioso sanguine eius vna cum beata communionem diuinam ac sanctae vitae...”

and as the institution of the offering that was Christ's passion.<sup>82</sup> In *De vera et falsa*, Bucer glossed this passage as follows:

when [Christ] made an offering as High Priest of God the Father, he gave thanks with the bread and wine, the gifts of God, which he had taken in his hands and held out as if in the sight of God and his church then gathered around him. And, together with teaching, prayers and hymns, he blessed and distributed them in order that the sacrament might be profitably enjoyed: that is, in order that he might represent to his disciples a life-giving communion with himself and his merit, and establish and encourage a blessed memorial of himself.<sup>83</sup>

In so far as the *sacerdotes* of the church “assimilated” themselves to Christ in this, Bucer was prepared say that they acted *ex persona Christi*.<sup>84</sup> When Christ's institution was observed, the *opus operatum* of the Mass was rightly called *opus bonum et salutare* even if the church's minister was entirely faithless. Through this work the minister could rightly be said to mediate or “apply” redemption and communion with Christ to the faithful. However, it was necessary that the *opus operatum* (i.e. Christ's objective offer of grace through the administration of Word and sacrament) meet with the faith of the *opus sumens* (i.e. the faithful communicant) in order for it to be effective.

As this suggests, Bucer regarded the “application” of Christ's sacrifice as something activated through the faithful reception of *communion*. There is no suggestion of an objective sacramental presence independent of this. Although Bucer had expressed scepticism about the Ambrosian authorship of *De sacramentis*, he was able to put its Eucharistic prayer to use in this respect. He noted that the Ambrosian *Quam oblationem* asked God to accept the Church's offering, “in order that it may become for us *a figure of* the body and blood of Christ.”<sup>85</sup> Bucer treated this pre-consecratory prayer of the Ambrosian and Roman Canons as a kind of Western *epiclesis* – but one that he believed was directed at the congregation rather than at the elements. Like Gropper, Bucer did not entertain the possibility that the *epiclesis* to which the Greek Fathers referred could itself have a consecratory function.<sup>86</sup> *Epiclesis*, he argued should not be translated as

---

<sup>82</sup> PL 4:387.

<sup>83</sup> *De vera*, 172—173, “cum ipse summus sacerdos Dei patris obtulit, Pane & uino, donis Dei [cf. Gen 14:18] in manibus sumptis, ac ita ceu in conspectum Dei, & eius suae Ecclesiae, quam tum collectam apud se habet, prolatis, egit gratias patri. Et in salutarem usum sacramenti ea, quo uiuificam sui & meriti sui communicationem discipulis exhiberet, & beatam sui commemorationem excitaret, & sanciret, sanctificauit, & distribuit adiuncta doctrina, precibus, & hymnis.” See also *Constans defensio*, 91.

<sup>84</sup> *Constans defensio*, 100. Here Bucer invokes Ps.-Dionysius, *De hierarchia ecclesiastica* 3.12 (PG 3:442CD) which refers to the priest's *hierourgia theomimētos* and his *aphomoiōsis* to Christ.

<sup>85</sup> *Constans defensio*, “342” [i.e. 332]. Cf. PL 16:464. Cf., however, *Canon missae*, “Quam oblationem tu, Deus, in omnibus quaesumus, benedictam... facere digneris: ut nobis Corpus et Sanguis fiat dilectissimi Filii tui...”

<sup>86</sup> Though there is no reason he should have been unaware of the differences between the Eastern and Western churches in this respect. The question was discussed in Cardinal Bessarion's *Oratio de sacramento eucharistiae et quibus verbis Christi corpus perficiatur* (1465). A 1513 Strasbourg edition was included in the list of books in Bucer's possession at Heidelberg in 1518 (BCor 1:48, 55, n. 56).

*invocatio* but as *vocatio* or *cognominatio*: i.e. calling the bread and wine what they “represented” through Christ’s word.<sup>87</sup>

Yet, although this *exhibitio* of the body and blood of Christ depended entirely on Christ’s words in the consecratory formula:

the faithful mind must nevertheless pray constantly, not only after the recitation of the consecratory words, but also after the bodily consumption of the sacramental elements has been completed. The meaning here is not that the bread and wine, or their “accidents” hold Christ, the true bread of heaven and food of eternal life, but that we disciples of Christ – we for whom the food was ordained by Christ the Lord – should receive its benefits. So whatever prayers are poured out over the bread and cup are poured out for us, and with this purpose – that through these elements we may receive Christ to our salvation.<sup>88</sup>

This, Bucer believed, was the authentic sense of the prayers that followed the consecration in the Greek and Roman Canons. They functioned as a kind of *praedicatio* to stir up faith in the congregation about to commune.<sup>89</sup>

### (iii, iv) The Church’s Self-Offering and Its Thanksgiving and Praise

The *Worms Book* had described the Mass as a, “representative sacrifice,” and it is clear from the discussion above that Bucer understood this to mean principally that the true body and blood of Christ, the sacrificial victim on the cross, were *re*-presented (i.e. presented again) to the faithful for their spiritual consumption at communion. However, Catholic apologists such as Eck and Gropper used *repraesentare* in another sense; one that seems to be suggested in the *Worms Book*. This is the church’s representation of Christ *to* God the Father.<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> *Constans defensio*, 323. Cf. *ibid.*, 198 re. Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 4.18.5, “*Quemadmodum panis terrenus, accepta vocatione a verbo Dei... notandum est quod dicit vocationem non invocationem.*” A. Rousseau in *Irenée de Lyons, Contre les hérésies*, (Sources chrétiennes, 100) (Paris, 1965) 4.2:610 notes that in some Latin versions the translation is *invocatio* and suggests that this is reflected in variations between *epiklêsis* and *ekklêsis* in versions of John Damascene’s *Sacra parallela* (not traced in PG95—96). *Constans defensio*, 198 carries the marginal note “Sic Damascenus l.4, c.14.” This may be Bucer’s or Hardenberg’s (see above n. 15)

<sup>88</sup> See *Constans defensio*, 324, “Et si igitur exhibitio corporis & sanguinis Christi verbis eius penitus nititur, nihilominus tamen fidelis mens eam perpetuo orare debet non tantum post recitationem verborum Consecrationis, sed etiam post corporalem sacramentorum sumptionem peractam. Non enim hic sensus est, quod panis & vinum, vel accidentia panis & vini Christum, verum panem coelestem, ac cibum vitae aeternae habeant, sed quod nos discipuli Christi, quibus hic cibus a Christo Domino destinatus est, eo frui debeamus. Quaecunque igitur preces super panem & calicem funduntur propter nos funduntur, nempe vt per hae sacramenta Christum ad salutem nostram percipiamus.”

<sup>89</sup> *Constans defensio*, 328; quoting Augustine *Epistola* 149.2.16 (PL 33:637) “... quo Sacramento praedicatur nostrum illud votum maximum, quo nos vovimus in Christo esse mansuros, utique in compage corporis Christi.”

<sup>90</sup> See e.g. Eck, *De sacrificio missae* 1.10 (CCath 36:64); Gropper, *Canones concilii prouincialis Coloniensis... quibus adiectum est Encheridion [sic] christianae institutionis* (Cologne: Nicolas Wolrab, 1538), 107a, “...ecclesia per sacerdotem, vt publicum ministerium Christi corpus in missa offerens, non tantum hoc agit

In *Constans defensio* and *De vera et falsa*, Bucer allowed that there was a figurative “representation” by which Christ was “set before the Father” in common prayer of priest and people. To “offer Christ” in this sense meant to thank God the Father for the gift of his Son, for the forgiveness of sins and for the promise of his mercy on Christ’s account.<sup>91</sup>

In the *Antididagma*, however, Gropper argued that after the consecration, the self-offering of the church entered into a new relationship with the self-offering of Christ. The sacramental elements symbolising the church’s sacrifice of thanksgiving, intercession etc. were transformed into Christ’s sacrifice: i.e. his body and blood offered once and for all on the cross. For Gropper, the substantial conversion of the elements was an objective pledge that the church’s imperfect *obsequium servitutis* was acceptable to God through the perfect sacrifice of Christ. Hence

the consecrated host is not only substantially the true body and true blood of Christ our head, but also signifies and represents the mystical body of Christ, i.e. the church, just as it is joined together both in head and members... As the blessed Augustine teaches on the sacraments: “the mystery of yourselves lies on the altar; you receive the mystery of yourselves; you respond ‘Amen’ to what you are yourselves. Be a member of the body of Christ so that your ‘Amen’ may be true.”<sup>92</sup>

The transubstantiation of the elements was, as Gropper noted elsewhere, a “pledge of future glory,” in which the church caught a glimpse of what it was to become: i.e. the perfection of the body of Christ.<sup>93</sup> The prayers following the consecration expressed the church’s faith in this mystery and a desire for its fullness. For example, the *Supplices te rogamus* asked God the Father to

bid these offerings be carried by the hands of your holy angel to your altar on high, in the sight of your divine majesty, that as many of us as

vt corpus Christi verum, illiusque passionem quae praeterijt, deo repraesentat, sed & seipsam (quae Christi capitis mysticum corpus est) per Christum offerat...”

<sup>91</sup> *Constans defensio*, 273, 309, “In hac oblatione Christi nulla est propositio vel repraesentatio Domini nostri Iesu Christi, per quam Deo Patri proponatur, & repraesentetur, praeter id quod ibi summas illi gratias agere debemus, quod tantum erga nos amorem declaravit, vt vnigenitum Filium suum in mortem, cumque eo nobis omnia donarit: deinde etiam deuota mente ipsum orare, vt fidem in dilectum Filium suum nobis augere, & propter eum omnia peccata remittere, ac in perpetuum misericors esse velit. At haec non est propositio vel repraesentatio Filij Dei qua ipsum Patri sistamus vel repraesentemus: sed multo magis receptio ipsius Domini nostri, qui nobis inibi a Patre ministerio.”

<sup>92</sup> *Antididagma*, 95b—96a, “... hostia consecrata, non tantum est uerum corpus & uerus sanguis capitis nostri Christi substantialiter, uerumetiam corpus Christi mysticum, hoc est Ecclesiam, sicut ex capite & membris simul connexa est, significat & repraesentat... sicut beatus Augustinus tradit de Sacramentis: *Mysterium* (inquit) *uestrum iacet in altari, mysterium uestrum sumitis, ad quod ipsi estis, Amen respondetis. Esto membrum corporis Christi, ut Amen tuum sit uerum.*” Cf. Augustine, *Sermo* 272 “Ad infantes de sacramentis” (PL 38:1248). Cf. also Bucer, *Bericht* (BDS 5:245) in which he uses this passage to defend the patristic use of a language of “corporeal” and “natural” presence.

<sup>93</sup> Gropper, *Enchiridion*, 91ab. Quoting the hymn (attrib. to Thomas Aquinas) “O Sacrum convivium, in quo Christus sumitur, recolitur memoria passionis eius, mens impletur gratia, et futurae gloriae nobis pignus datur.” See *A Dictionary of Hymnology*, ed J. Julian, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed (London, 1907), 847.

consume the most holy body and blood of your Son by a sharing in this altar, may be filled with every heavenly grace and blessing.<sup>94</sup>

Here, Gropper explained, the “altar” was Christ’s humanity in the heavenly sanctuary.<sup>95</sup> The prayer was not asking the Father to accept the sacrifice of Christ *again*, but seeking an ever-fuller participation in it for all people, for the church militant and for the faithful departed.<sup>96</sup>

To a large extent, Bucer could accept this gloss. Again, Bucer granted that “priestly” intercession had its foundation in the Last Supper (e.g. Jesus’ intercession for the elect in John 17) and warrant in 1 Tim 2:1—2 which commanded prayer for “all men, for kings and all who are in high positions, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in every way.”<sup>97</sup> Both before and after the consecration, the Canon offered thanksgiving and intercession through Christ for all kinds of human beings. Here, he argued, the Canon appealed to the heavenly priesthood through which Christ continually sets the prayers and petitions of the church before the Father. Hence, “in the offering which she [i.e. the church] makes, she herself is offered.”<sup>98</sup> He noted that in the Liturgy of John Chrysostom the priest prayed, “for you, O Christ our God are the offerer and the one who is offered, the one who takes up and the one who is distributed.”<sup>99</sup> He compared the *Supplices* with the Greek deacon’s exhortation:

For the precious gifts which have been offered and sanctified let us pray... that our most clement Lord who accepts them in his holy, high-heavenly and intellectual altar as a sweet-smelling spiritual sacrifice, may return to you divine grace and the gift of the Holy Spirit.<sup>100</sup>

With Gropper, Bucer also acknowledged that the church’s transformation into the mystery of Christ’s body was mirrored and effected by the transformation of the sacramental gifts into the body and blood of Christ. In *Constans defensio*, he quoted the

---

<sup>94</sup> *Canon missae*, *Supplices Te Rogamus*, “... iube haec perferri per manus sancti Angeli tui in sublime altare tuum, in conspectu divinae maiestatis tuae: ut quotquot, ex hac altaris participatione sacrosanctam Filii Corpus et Sanguinem sumpserimus, omni benedictione caelesti et gratia repleamur...”

<sup>95</sup> *Antididagma*, 101a—b. He argues that the Angel is also Christ, the *angelos megalēs boules* of Isaiah 9:6 (LXX).

<sup>96</sup> *Antididagma*, 100a—b, “...sacrificia illa patrum propter Christum utique designabant, denique & propter mandatum Dei... non poterant ipsa non placere... Itaque panis sanctus & calix salutaris, non ratione capitis superbenedicti illic se exhibentis (in quo Patri semper bene complacuit) sed ratione nostri, qui illic quoque unus cum Christo panis esse, mystice significamur, & quatenus nos ea offerimus, accepta haberi petuntur.”

<sup>97</sup> *Constans defensio*, 313, 315; *De vera et falsa* 172—173.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, 159—166. Cf. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 10.6 (PL 41:284).

<sup>99</sup> *De vera et falsa*, 166. Cf. *Prayer of the Cherubic Hymn* (F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western* (Oxford, 1896) (hereafter Brightman) 378); and annotations in BOL 3:202.

<sup>100</sup> *De vera et falsa*, 166, “Pro oblati & sanctificati praeciosis donis deprecemur Dominum... Vt clementissimus Dominus noster, qui accipit ipsa in sanctum & supercoeleste, ac intellectuale suum altare, in odorem suavitatis spiritualis, remittat uicissim uobis diuinam gratiam, & donum sanctissimi spiritus...” Cf. *Liturgy of John Chrysostom, Lord’s Prayer* (Brightman, 390); BOL 3:202.

*sententia* of “Eusebius Emisenus” (i.e. Faustus of Riez) which referred to Christ as invisible priest “converting” the visible creatures of bread and wine into his body and blood by his word.<sup>101</sup> There was, Bucer wrote, a “change” or “conversion” by which the elements were transferred from ordinary to sacramental use. This, he claimed, was the original meaning of “transubstantiation” as taught by Innocent III and Lateran IV.<sup>102</sup> However, to suggest that substantial conversion left only the “accidents” of bread and wine pointed to a Monophysite Christology. Here he quoted from Pope Gelasius I, *De duabus in Christo naturis*:

the sacraments of the body and blood of Christ, which we consume, are a divine thing, and on this account of this, and through them we are made partakers in the divine things [2 Peter 1:4] and yet the substance or nature of the bread and wine does not cease to exist... Just as they change into this, the divine substance, through the operation of the Holy Spirit while the property of their nature remains, so, by remaining in the proper sense those things which they are, they demonstrate that the chief mystery, whose efficacy and power they truly represent, remains the one Christ entire and true.<sup>103</sup>

When the fathers spoke of our own bodies taking on the flesh and blood of Christ, they did not mean that our own nature and substance was thereby evacuated. The same was true of the sacramental elements.<sup>104</sup>

Thus Gropper and Bucer agreed on original meaning of the Canon except in one respect. For both, Christ was present to his body as sacrificial victim and high priest of its offerings in order that the mystery of the body might be brought to its completion. For both, this mystery was “represented” through the effective words of Christ and faithful reception of the sacrament. For both it was also “represented” in the church’s prayer through, with and in Christ. For Bucer, this second representation referred only to Christ’s spiritual presence amid the invisible church. For Gropper, however, the perfect unity of Offerer and offered, *pignus futurae gloriae*, was present in a manner which was

---

<sup>101</sup> *Constans defensio.*, 201, 323; See *Decretum Gratiani* 3 de consecr. dist.2 c.35 (Friedberg 1:1325).

<sup>102</sup> *Constans defensio*, 204, “... sine dubio verus istorum [i.e. Innocentis III et Concilii Lateranensis] verborum intellectus hic erat, quod sub pane & vino, quae species sunt ac figurae corporis & sanguinis Christi, verum corpus verusque sanguis Christi sit & praebatur, quodque ibi panis & vinum transsubstantientur, transelemententur, & essentialiter convertantur in substantiam corporis & sanguinis Christi, nempe sacramentaliter.” This interpretation was perhaps suggested to him by the canon *Cum Marthae* in the *Decretales Gregorii IX* 3, tit.41 c.6 (Friedberg 2:637—640).

<sup>103</sup> *Constans defensio*, 199, “Sacramenta quae sumimus corporis & sanguinis Christi, diuina res est, propterea quod & per eadem diuinae efficiuntur consortes naturae, & tamen esse non desinit substantia vel creatura panis & vini... vt sicut in hanc scilicet in diuinam transeant sancto spiritu perficiente substantiam, permanente tamen sua proprietate naturae: sic illud ipsum mysterium principale cuius nobis efficientiam uirtutemque ueraciter repraesentant: ex quibus constat proprie permanentibus, vnum Christum, quia integrum uerumque permanere demonstrant.” Not in PL. Probably quoted *via* Johannes Sichard, *Antidotum contra diversas omnium fere seculorum haereses...* (Basel: Henricus Petrus, 1528), 233b. Eucharistic portion of treatise quoted in Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West: History and Theology* (Collegeville, 1998), 41—42.

<sup>104</sup> *Constans defensio*, 200. Cf. Sichard, *Antidotum*, 233a.

ultimately independent of the worthiness *or the faith* of the church or its minister (i.e. *ex opere operato*). While the sacrifices of the Old Testament had merely signified the coming Christ, that of the New contained his saving presence.

## 5. Conclusion

At a cursory glance, it might appear that, after Regensburg, Bucer had returned to his earlier excoriation of the Canon. Introducing his discussion of the Canon in *Constans defensio* he remarked:

If we wished to go through it part by part, we would find horrible perversions in abundance, contempt and dishonour for the majesty of God, as well as the baneful seduction of the ordinary people.<sup>105</sup>

However, it is clear from the subsequent discussion, as well as from *De vera et falsa*, that Bucer no longer believed that this “baneful seduction” lay in the Canon itself. Rather, the source of the “horrible perversions” was the shortfall between the intentions of the Canon’s composers and contemporary Catholic belief and practice. Considering the explanation of the Canon offered in the *Antididagma*, Bucer commented:

Such glosses are elegant indeed, as long as they are also understood and set before the people in this way, but what is the number of priests and Mass-peddlers that understands these words in such a sense, let alone explaining them to the church of Christ?<sup>106</sup>

The present performance of the Canon with its gesturing, its whispered recitation, its use of a foreign language, and its sacramental minimalism, was calculated to lead the people and the vast majority of priests into godless superstition. The times were thus “poorly suited to a true understanding of the sacrificial vocabulary.”<sup>107</sup> Instead of parroting the fathers or trying to hide the mysteries of Christ with “prolix commentaries and glosses,” the adversaries should imitate the fathers by *doing* as they did: i.e. by speaking openly, intelligibly and simply, and observing the teaching of Christ and the apostles.<sup>108</sup>

---

<sup>105</sup> *Constans defensio*, 330, “Iam si per singulas eius partes transire voluerimus, rursus horrendas peruersiones, contemptum & ignominiam diuinae Maiestatis, perniciosam item simplicium seductionem abunde reperimus.”

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, 334, “Tales glossae elegantes quidem sunt, si modo etiam intelligentur, & ita populo proponentur. Quantus vero sacerdotum & missatorum numerus est, qui ipsi haec verba tali sensu intelligent, taceo Ecclesiae Christi & exponant.”

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, 269, “... tutissimum est, & ad aedificationem vtilissimum, eisdem nominibus S. Coenam appellare, quae S. Scriptura illi imposuit, his praesertim temporibus, quibus de nominibus sacrificiorum ad verum intellectum non modo male conuenit, sed etiam plerique ad horrendam offensionem iis abutuntur.”

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*, 335, 337, “Quid opus est fidelibus Christi tam obscuris & non intellectis verbis abscondere, sepelire, ac deinde prolixis commentariis ac glossis rursus eruere & in lucem proferre?... Annon debemus totum Euangelium, omnia mysteria Christi & salutis nostrae fidelibus eius quam apertissime & simplicissime proponere?”

It appears, however, that at the time of the first Colloquy of Regensburg, Bucer had been prepared to contemplate continued use of the Roman Canon – at least in the Catholic territories of Germany – provided that this was accompanied by suitable preaching and catechesis. This would be at least a step toward the destruction of Antichrist and the establishment of Christ's kingdom in the whole of Germany. It was also to be accompanied by what appeared important Catholic concessions on justification and transubstantiation, *inter alia*.<sup>109</sup> However when Hermann von Wied invited Bucer and Melancthon to assist him at Cologne, the opportunity for a more radical reformation of the liturgy was opened up, and gradualism was no longer desirable or necessary. Even here, however, Bucer claimed that the new church order was consistent with the spirit in which the patristic liturgies had originally been compiled.

---

<sup>109</sup> For justification see R. Braunisch, *Die Theologie der Rechtfertigung im Enchiridion (1536) des Johannes Groppens* (Münster, 1974); H. Mackensen, "Contarini's Theological Role at Ratisbon," *ARG* 51 (1960):36—57; Lippens, 80ff. For transubstantiation see Fraenkel, 70—116; G. Kretschmar, "Realpräsenz und Transubstantiation: der Reichstag von Regensburg 1541 und ökumenische Konsensdokumente der Gegenwart," in *Praesentia Christi: Festschrift Johannes Betz zum 70. Geburtstag dargebracht...* ed. L. Lies (Düsseldorf, 1984), 208—239; J. Mehlhausen, "Die Abendmahlsformel des Regensburger Buches," in *Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie der Reformation: Festschrift für Ernst Bizer*, ed. L. Abramowski & G. Gerhard Goeters (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1969), 189—211.