The Myth of the Swiss Lutherans: Martin Bucer and the Eucharistic Controversy in Bern

by Amy Nelson Burnett

In 1842, Carl Hundeshagen published *Die Conflicte des Zwinglianismus, Luthertums und Calvinismus in der Bernischen Landeskirche von 1532–1558.*[1] The book describes the doctrinal strife within Bern and the effects of that strife on the relationship of the Bernese church with those of Geneva and Zurich. The conflicts centered on two issues: the Lord's Supper, and the independence of the church from state control. As the title implies, Hundeshagen identified the three positions in the controversy as Zwinglian (as represented by Zurich and one of the factions in Bern), Calvinist (Geneva and Vaud), and Lutheran (the dominant faction in Bern during the later 1530s and 1540s).

It is difficult to overestimate the impact of Hundeshagen's book. His analysis of the controversies in Bern has shaped the standard account of the confessional history of western Switzerland. It was followed by both Richard Feller, in the second volume of his authoritative *Geschichte Berns,* as well as by Kurt Guggisberg in his more specialized *Bernische Kirchengeschichte.*[2] Hundeshagen's account also had repercussions on the historiography of other areas of Switzerland as well, for Simon Sulzer, the leader of the party Hundeshagen identified as Lutheran, became head of Basel's church in 1553. Sulzer, in turn, has generally been blamed for leading Basel's church in a Lutheran direction and away from the Zwinglian heritage fostered by Johann Oecolampadius and Oswald Myconius.[3] Hundeshagen's account found its way into the *Handbuch der Schweizer Geschichte* published in 1972 and continues to influence current historiography, as can be seen in two recent English-language works, Bruce Gordon's *The Swiss Reformation*

1 Carl Bernhard *Hundeshagen*, Die Conflicte des Zwinglianismus, Luthertums und Calvinismus in der Bernischen Landeskirche von 1532–1558, Bern 1842.

2 Richard *Feller*, Geschichte Berns. Vol. 2: Von der Reformation bis zum Bauernkrieg, 1516–1563, Bern 1953, 265–267; Kurt *Guggisberg*, Bernische Kirchengeschichte, Bern 1958, 204–212.

3 Representative for Basel's historiography is Hans R. *Guggisberg*, Das lutheranisierende Basel. Ein Diskussionsbeitrag, in: Die Lutherische Konfessionalisierung in Deutschland, ed. Hans-Christoph *Rublack,* Gütersloh 1992 (SVRG 197), 199–201, and the works cited therein. In fact, with Basel's adoption of Bucer's concord policies in 1536, the city had moved away from a strictly Zwinglian position a decade before Sulzer's arrival; Amy Nelson *Burnett,* Basel and the Wittenberg Concord, in: ARG, forthcoming.

and Philip Benedict's history of the Reformed tradition, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*.[4]

Even after 150 years, Hundeshagen's description of events in Bern is still valuable, because it was based on archival material that remains unpublished. Nevertheless his analysis of the events he describes is fundamentally flawed, for there were no Lutherans in Bern. What Hundeshagen depicted as a struggle between two rival confessions, Lutherans and Zwinglians, with the Calvinists stuck in the middle, can in fact be better understood as the final phase of Bucer's efforts to heal the divisions within the Protestant church and as the beginning of Reformed confessional formation. The leaders of Bern's church in the 1540s were disciples not of Martin Luther, but of Martin Bucer, and Bern was the battleground where Bucer and Bullinger each sought to promote their own interpretations of the Lord's Supper and their contrasting positions on the relative importance of church unity and doctrinal precision.

Hundeshagen's mis-identification of the rival factions in Bern is understandable. He did not have the benefit that modern scholars have in the careful studies of the eucharistic controversy by Walther Köhler and Ernst Bizer, and he was unaware of the evolution and elaboration of sacramental theology under the pressure of Bucer's concord efforts during the 1530s.[5] The difficulties Hundeshagen faced in presenting an accurate assessment of the theological positions advocated by the rival parties in Bern were compounded by the inaccessibility of many of the various confessions and eucharistic explanations written not only by Bucer himself, but by other individuals and groups of pastors during that decade.

More specialized works have not ignored Bucer's influence on the developments in Bern. Historians of French-speaking Switzerland in particular have been readier to identify the faction in Bern as Buceran rather than Lutheran, perhaps because of their sensitivity to Bucer's influence on Calvin's theology. Other recent studies have drawn on both our deeper understanding of the eucharistic controversy and on the critical editions of Bucer's German works and Bullinger's correspondence to discuss Bucer's role in the controversy in Bern. The myth of the Swiss Lutherans is so strong, however, that despite this sensitivity to Bucer's influence on the Bern church and to the theological debates that divided the city's pastors, many of these authors

[4] Peter *Stadler,* Das Zeitalter der Gegenreformation, in: Handbuch der Schweizer Geschichte, vol. 1, Zurich 1972, 589; Bruce *Gordon*, The Swiss Reformation, Manchester 2002, 155–159; Philip *Benedict,* Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism, New Haven 2002, 55–56. Rudolf *Pfister* does not discuss the situation in Bern during the 1530s and 1540s, Kirchengeschichte der Schweiz, Vol. 2, Zürich 1974.

[5] Walther *Köhler*, Zwingli und Luther: Ihr Streit über das Abendmahl nach seinen politischen und religiösen Beziehungen, Gütersloh 1924–1953 (QFRG 6–7); Ernst *Bizer,* Studien zur Geschichte des Abendmahlsstreits im 16. Jahrhundert, Darmstadt 1962.

continue to use the term «Lutheran» to describe the faction allied with Bucer.[6]

The time is long overdue for a complete re-evaluation of the conflicts that wracked Bern during the 1530s and 1540s. This article will lay the groundwork for such a re-evaluation by putting to rest the myth of the Swiss Lutherans. It will first demonstrate that the circumstantial evidence on which Hundeshagen based his identification of Bern's Lutheran party points more clearly to Bucer than to Luther. It will then examine the positions on the sacrament advocated by those so-called Lutherans, relying on their own writings, rather than on the descriptions of others, to demonstrate their dependence on Bucer's concord theology as reflected in both the First Helvetic Confession and the Wittenberg Concord as Bucer interpreted it for the Swiss churches. Finally, it will discuss the implications of the conflict in Bern for our understanding of the early stages of confessional formation in the Reformed church.

Before considering the developments in Bern, it is helpful to review Bucer's concord efforts leading up to the Wittenberg Concord and his own understanding of that Concord. In comparison to the precise formulations of the second half of the sixteenth century, the confessional boundaries of the 1530s and 1540s were still poorly defined. During the latter 1520s there was a clear distinction between Luther's insistence on the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the elements of bread and wine and the early Zwingli's view of the elements as representing or symbolizing Christ's body and blood. The differences between the two sides became blurred, however, due to Bucer's efforts to find a formulation describing the sacrament that was acceptable to each side. Embracing Luther's concept of «sacramental union», Bucer argued through the early 1530s that both parties agreed on Christ's presence in the sacrament, although they disagreed on the terms used to de-

[6] Like Hundeshagen's book, Otto E. *Strasser,* Capitos Beziehungen zu Bern, Leipzig 1928, 122–155, is particularly valuable for its use of the Bern Ratsmanual and unpublished correspondence, but the account is distorted by the identification of Megander's and Ritter's opponents as Lutherans. More theologically nuanced are Henri *Vuilleumier,* Histoire de l'Eglise réformée du Pays de Vaud sous le régime bernois, Vol. 1, Lausanne 1927, 627–653; L. *Aubert,* Activité de Farel de 1545 à 1550 dans le pays de Neuchâtel et au dehors, sa participation au Consensus Tigurinus, in: Guillaume Farel, 1489–1565, biographie nouvelle, Geneva 1978, 578–591; and J.-V. *Pollet,* O. P., Martin Bucer. Études sur la correspondance, Vol. 2, Paris 1962, 401–427. The most recent studies have concentrated on the beginning of the conflict, Cornelis *Augustijn,* Bern and France. The background to Calvin's letter to Bucer dated January 12 1538, in: Ordenlich und fruchtbar, Festschrift für Willem van 't Spijker, ed. Wilhelm H. *Neuser,* Leiden 1997, 155–170; and Rainer *Henrich,* Ein Berner ‹Kunzechismus› von 1541. Bucers verloren geglaubte Bearbeitung des Meganderschen Katechismus, in: Zwa 24, 1997, 81–94. Henrich quite rightly points to the need for a new presentation of both the theological issues and the political background to the controversy.

scribe that presence. Bucer saw his role as formulating new terms or concepts that could be used by both Lutherans and Zwinglians, even if they might be understood in different ways by each side.[7]

The eventual result was a sacramental theology that lay between the two poles of Luther and the early Zwingli. Bucer had fully developed his concord theology by 1534, but it was first given official endorsement in 1536 in two different forms, the «Swiss» version contained in the First Helvetic Confession, drafted in February, 1536, and adopted by the Swiss cities a month later, and the «South German» version contained in the Wittenberg Concord, signed in May of that same year and elaborated by Bucer in various documents intended for the Swiss churches.

The First Helvetic Confession was the first common confession of the Swiss churches, and it contained some essential features of Bucer's concord theology in embryonic form. It stated that the sacraments were not empty signs but joined two things, the sign and the thing signified. Accordingly, the Lord's Supper was comprised not only of the signs of bread and wine, but also that which was «essential and spiritual.» In the Supper, «the Lord truly offers his body and blood, that is, himself, to his own.» The confession rejected any local inclusion or carnal presence of the Lord's body and blood. Rather, «through the institution of the Lord, bread and wine are symbols through which the true communion of his body and blood are exhibited by the Lord himself through the ministry of the church.» The key term was the verb *exhibere* and its variants *exhibitiva* and *exhibentes*. These were translated into German as *darreichen* and *anbieten* (to offer or present), but the Latin term goes beyond its English cognate, «to exhibit (or present),» to include the sense of «to deliver or procure.»[8]

The First Helvetic Confession was an important statement for the Swiss who accepted Bucer's concord efforts, because although Luther disliked

[7] For a careful discussion and analysis of Bucer's early concord efforts, see Wilhelm H. *Neuser*, Martin Bucer als Mittler im Abendmahlsstreit (1530/31), in: Kaum zu glauben. Von der Häresie und dem Umgang mit ihr, ed. Athina *Lexutt* and Vicco *von Bülow,* Rheinbach 1998, 140–161.

[8] Latin and German versions of the First Helvetic Confession in Philip *Schaff,* ed., The Creeds of Christendom, with a History and Critical Notes, Vol. 3: The Evangelical Protestant Creeds, with Translations, New York 1905, 211–231; article 21 on the power and efficacy of the sacraments and article 23 on the Eucharist, 223–227. Cf. Charlton T. *Lewis* and Charles *Short,* A Latin Dictionary, Oxford 1879, 685. See also David *Wright's* comment on Bucer's use of *exhibere,* Infant Baptism and the Christian Community in Bucer, in: Martin Bucer: Reforming Church and Community, ed. David F. *Wright,* Cambridge 1994, 95–106. On the background to the First Helvetic Confession (Confessio Helvetica Prior, sometimes known as the Second Basel Confession), Bizer, Studien, 91–92, and Köhler, Zwingli und Luther, 412–416. Köhler describes the article on the Lord's Supper as falling into two parts, the first inserted by the Strasbourgers to give a Lutheran «tone» to the more clearly Zwinglian position of the second half, 415.

some of the wording, he gave it his grudging approval when it was presented to him in May. Despite reservations on both sides, it was thus the closest that the two parties came to a mutually acceptable statement on the Lord's Supper. Nevertheless, it was eclipsed in importance by the Wittenberg Concord, which was the ultimate achievement of the meeting between representatives of the south German churches and Luther. The Wittenberg Concord made further concessions to Luther, but Bucer's various explanations written for the Swiss churches reveal how he understood the wording of the Concord as compatible with the First Helvetic Confession.[9]

The contents of the Concord, as interpreted by Bucer for the Swiss, can be summarized under four points. First, in the Lord's Supper things both spiritual and material, or heavenly and earthly, are joined together in sacramental union. This distinction between «things heavenly and earthly» in the sacrament paralleled the more traditional terminology of the First Helvetic Confession, which spoke of the sign and the thing signified. As a corollary of this point, the Wittenberg Concord explicitly rejected transubstantiation and the local inclusion of Christ's body and blood in the bread and wine. In his explanation of the Concord, Bucer also rejected the other extreme, the belief that the sacrament contained only the symbols of bread and wine.[10]

Second, Christ's body and blood are truly and substantially present, offered (*dargereicht/exhiberi*), and received with the bread and wine. In his explanation of this article written specifically for Basel's pastors, Bucer identified this position with the statement of the First Helvetic Confession that Christ's body and blood are truly offered to his own in the Supper. The wording of the Wittenberg Concord clearly went beyond that of the First Helvetic Confession, and Bullinger, for one, never accepted either the terms «substantially» or «exhibited.» For Bucer and his Swiss supporters, however, the wording of both the First Helvetic Confession and the Wittenberg Concord taught the same underlying truth: that Christ was truly present and received in the sacrament by the faithful. As he explained in the wake of the Concord, one need not worry about terms such as «essential,» «bodily,» and

[9] On the Wittenberg Concord, Bizer, Studien, 96–117; Köhler, Zwingli und Luther, 432–455. Luther's reluctant endorsement of the First Helvetic Confession came after the Concord had been signed by both sides, Martin Bucers Deutsche Schriften, Gütersloh 1960 ff. [hereafter BDS], 6/1: 170–171; in a letter to Bucer, Luther was much less positive, stating that the First Helvetic Confession pleased him less than the Tetrapolitan Confession, especially with regard to the article on the Lord's Supper, WA Br 8: 157–8, no. 3193; cf. Hans *Grass,* Die Abendmahlslehre bei Luther und Calvin. Eine kritische Untersuchung, Gütersloh 1954, 166–167.

[10] BDS 6/1: 209–210; 220; 232–234; 249–250.

the like, as long as one held to the truth that the bread and the wine were the true communion of Christ's body and blood, and not empty signs.[11]

Third, the Wittenberg Confession stated that Christ's body and blood are received by the worthy and the unworthy alike. Bucer discussed this point at some length in his explanation of the Concord, pointing out that the unworthy (*indigni*) were not the same as the impious (*impii*), or those with no faith. The unworthy ate judgment upon themselves along with Christ's body and blood. The impious, however, received only bread and wine. In this way Bucer preserved the Swiss insistence that faith was necessary for reception of the benefits of the sacrament.[12]

Lastly, the Wittenberg Concord studiously avoided the issue of Christology, and specifically the question of how Christ's truly human body could be truly present in the sacrament if it was at the right hand of the Father in heaven. This fundamental objection of Zwingli to the Lutheran understanding of the sacrament could not so easily be swept under the carpet, and so Bucer was forced to address it in his further exchanges with the Swiss. His response on this issue was a rejection of human speculation. The union of Christ's body and blood with the elements could not be understood by human reason but could only be acknowledged by the believing mind. Ultimately, however, Bucer answered the Christological question by arguing that «heaven» should be understood not as a place but as a condition, and therefore the argument that Christ's human body was limited to one place in heaven was in fact invalid.[13]

When interpreted according to Bucer's explanation, the Wittenberg Concord allowed for significant deviation from Luther's own understanding of the Lord's Supper. Its silence or vagueness regarding the three points that would separate Lutheran from Reformed over the third quarter of the century – *manducatio oralis, manducatio impiorum,* and the doctrine of ubiquity – made it acceptable to many whose views lay between the two poles of Luther's real presence and Zwingli's symbolic view of the Lord's Supper. Luther's acceptance of the Concord, even with Bucer's explanation, marked the greatest degree of openness that the Wittenberg reformer would ever show towards an understanding of the sacrament that differed from his own. Within seven years, Luther had backed away from this openness, claiming

[11] BDS 6/1: 210; 219–221; 249; 285–286.

[12] BDS 6/1: 213–214; 223; 254–256.

[13] Neither the Concord itself nor any of Bucer's defenses of the Concord contain any discussion of the location of Christ's truly human body. Bucer did cite Zwingli's rejection of the ubiquity of Christ's body as evidence that the Zurich reformer rejected the oral manducation of Christ's body, which Bucer also rejected, BDS 6/1: 243–244. On the limits of human reason, see the confession of Bucer and Capito at the Bern synod of Sept. 1537, BDS 6/1: 297, and most clearly in Bucer's letter to Johannes Comander of Oct., 1539, BDS 8: 349–400.

(wrongly) that he had forced the south Germans to accept both oral manducation and reception by those without faith.[14]

Luther's rejection of Bucer's position lay in the future, however, and in 1536 the great question facing the Swiss theologians was whether they could accept Bucer's concord theology. Thanks to Zurich's opposition, Bucer's efforts ultimately failed in Switzerland, but Zurich's final victory was not a foregone conclusion. In the later 1530s and through the 1540s Bucer's concord theology was supported actively by Basel and passively by Vadian and the St. Gallen church, and it was vigorously promoted in Bern by the party misleadingly labeled «Lutheran.»[15]

The eucharistic conflict in Bern began in the spring of 1537, when the theology professor Kaspar Megander and the pastor Erasmus Ritter attacked their colleague Sebastian Meyer for preaching that «the body of Christ was present in the Supper in some ineffable way, and that his true body was eaten and his blood drunk, but he did not teach who ate [them] and in what way.»[16] Another of Bern's five pastors, Peter Kunz, defended Meyer, and the battle lines were drawn that would last for over a decade. A synod held in May resulted in Meyer's censure, but the conflict continued, and in September a second synod was held for all of the urban and rural clergy. This time Martin Bucer and Wolfgang Capito came to the city to settle the quarrel, accompanied by Oswald Myconius and Simon Grynaeus from Basel.

Despite an initially unpromising situation, the Strasbourg theologians succeeded in persuading Bern's clergy to unite behind a confession on the Lord's Supper. The Strasbourgers' confession taught that «all of those who are in the congregation, approach the table, and receive the holy sacrament and do not pervert the Lord's word, but who believe it and celebrate it according to the Lord's institution, truly receive and eat the true body and the true blood of Christ together with the visible signs … not as a perishable

[14] If Luther had been unaware of Bucer's understanding of the Wittenberg Concord, he was certainly informed about it when he received a copy of Bucer's explanation that was sent along with a statement of the Swiss churches in Jan., 1537; Bizer, Studien, 164–166. For a discussion of Luther's interpretation of the Concord and the differences between Luther and Bucer, see Grass, Abendmahlslehre, 139–165.

[15] On Basel, Burnett, Basel and the Wittenberg Concord; on Vadian's support for Bucer's concord efforts in 1536, Ernst Gerhard *Rüsch*, Im Ringen um die Glaubenseinigkeit. Vadians Brief an Bullinger vom 2. November 1536, in: Zwa 16, 1983, 19–34.

[16] The conflict and its immediate repercussions are described in a letter of the Bern ministers to the Dean and Chapter of Thunstetten, 14 May 1537, Zürich Zentralbibliothek [hereafter ZZB] (Simlersche Sammlung), Ms S 43: 23: «Etenim cum pro concione sacra dixisset, corpus Christi ineffabili quodam modo in coena esse, veramque ejus carnem in illa edi, et sanguinem ejus bibi, non tamen interea docens, quis et quo pacto ederet …» Megander and Ritter wanted Meyer to be more clear that only the faithful could receive the body and blood of Christ in the Supper.

food for the stomach, but as food for the soul to eternal life.» It should be noted that while this confession clearly went beyond Zwingli's symbolic and representational view of the sacrament, it was by no means a full endorsement either of Luther's own eucharistic theology or of the Lutheran position contained in the Augsburg Confession. It could be called Lutheran only in the sense that it accorded with the Wittenberg Concord, which Luther had accepted.[17]

During the synod Bucer had criticized the Zwinglian statements contained in the catechism Megander had written for Bern. Before the outside theologians left the city, they modified the catechism's text to bring it into accord with the documents now recognized as authoritative for the Bern church: not only the ten theses of the 1528 disputation, but also the summary of doctrine written by Capito and adopted at the Bern synod of 1532, the First Helvetic Confession, and the joint letter of the Swiss churches sent to Luther in early 1537 in response to the Wittenberg Concord. The numerous small changes made to the catechism emphasized more clearly that the sacrament was not merely a sign but actually conveyed what it represented, the communion of Christ's body and blood.[18]

Although Megander participated in the revision process, he objected loudly to the publication of the revised text. As a consequence, the Bern Senate relieved him of his post, and he returned to Zurich in the spring of 1538. A few months later he was followed by the professor Johannes Rhellikan, another of the staunch Zwinglians in the city. Ritter remained as the sole defender of Zwinglian theology in Bern through the mid-1540s, when he was joined by deacon Johannes Wäber, a fervent Zwinglian who had been a pastor in Aarau. When Ritter died in 1546, he was succeeded by Jodocus Kirchmeyer, another outspoken Zwinglian who had served the church of Küsnacht. Meanwhile, the so-called Lutheran party was strengthened by the addition of Simon Sulzer, who succeeded Megander as theology professor in the early summer of 1538. From his arrival, Sulzer helped the city's pastors with their preaching duties, and by 1541 he had been promoted to a pastoral post. Two deacons who served the church during the later 1530s and into the 1540s, Paul Strasser and Conrad Schmidt, also allied themselves with Meyer,

[17] Both the Latin and German versions of the Strasbourgers' confession in BDS 6/1: 294–299; citation from the German text, 295–297. Hundeshagen gives a detailed description of the two synods of May and September, Conflicte, 74–89. Brian *Gerrish* has called Zwingli's eucharistic teaching «symbolic memorialism»; Sign and Reality: The Lord's Supper in the Reformed Confessions, in: The Old Protestantism and the New: Essays on the Reformation Heritage, Chicago 1982, 118–130.

[18] Henrich describes both the conflict over the catechism and discusses the changes made to its text; see also BDS 6/3: 266–269. The letter of the Swiss cities to Luther was dated 12 Jan. 1537; WA Br 12: 241–275, no. 4268, with accompanying documentation.

Kunz, and Sulzer. When Meyer left Bern in 1541, Sulzer assumed leadership of this faction, and Beat Gerung, the pastor sent from Strasbourg to replace Meyer, became his most outspoken supporter.[19]

There is no question about the commitment of Megander, Rhellikan, Ritter, and Kirchmeyer to the Zwinglian interpretation of the Lord's Supper. If anything, they were even more faithful to Zwingli's original symbolic and representational view of the Lord's Supper than were the Zurich theologians led by Heinrich Bullinger. The theological convictions of their opponents are more difficult to determine, because they are buried in unpublished letters and confessions scattered between Bern, Zurich and Basel. Hundeshagen identified them as Lutherans primarily on the basis of circumstantial evidence. That evidence can be summarized under three points. First and most obviously, they were called Lutherans by their Zwinglian opponents in the city, and they clearly opposed the radical Zwinglianism upheld by Ritter after the departure of Megander and Rhellikan. Second, they defended practices that were retained by the Lutherans but had been rejected by Zwingli. Third, Hundeshagen pointed to their personal contacts with Luther himself.[20] Hundeshagen's characterization of these men as Lutherans can be challenged on each of these points, and in each case the evidence points more strongly to Bucer than to Luther as their chief theological influence.

Hundeshagen could certainly justify his use of the term «Lutheran» on the basis of his sources, for contemporary accounts of the eucharistic strife in Bern used the term as well. Both Rhellikan and Eberhard von Rümlang, a staunch Zwinglian who was Bern's *Seckelschreiber,* referred to their opponents as «Lutheranizers» or «Lutherans.» However, Hundeshagen overlooked the fact that Bern's Zwinglian party used «Lutheran» more as a polemical term to discredit those who disagreed with them than as a precise characterization of their opponents' eucharistic theology. In fact, both Rhellikan and von Rümlang clearly recognized the dependence of their «Lutheran» opponents on Bucer's theology, and the correspondence between Bern and Zurich referred much more often to the «Bucerans» than it did to the «Lutherans.» Significantly, at the point when Bern's Zwinglians appealed to Zurich for support against their opponents in the fall of 1537, they said

[19] Hundeshagen mentions Strasser and Schmidt as deacons in the spring of 1540, Conflicte, 107. Strasser was transferred to Burgdorf in early 1542; cf. Bern Staatsarchiv [heareafter BeStA] DQ 11 (Michael Stettler's Berner Chronik), Bd. D: 1541–50, fo. 25r-v. He matriculated in Basel in 1546/47 and became a pastor in Basel's rural church in 1548; Die Matrikel der Universität Basel, vol. 2., ed. Hans Georg *Wackernagel,* Basel 1956, 48, which does not mention his tenure as deacon in the city of Bern. Even less is known about Schmidt. He was removed from office in 1548, along with Sulzer and Gerung.

[20] Hundeshagen, Conflicte, 70, 105–107.

nothing about Luther but described in vivid terms the epidemic of «Buceranism» that was infecting the Bern church.[21]

Hundeshagen's statement that the Bernese «Lutherans» advocated those practices that distinguished Lutherans from Zwinglians is also problematic.[22] While the Lutheran and Zwinglian Reformations were certainly distinguished by their differing attitudes towards the retention of traditional practices, one cannot assume that those who differed from the Zwinglian position were necessarily Lutheran. Certainly, no one could question Bern's adherence to Zwinglian doctrine when it adopted the Reformation in 1528. Nevertheless, the city was more conservative than was Zurich with regard to the retention of many traditional practices. For instance, it retained the use of oblates rather than leavened bread in communion into the seventeenth century, long after the «fractio panis» had become a point of controversy between Lutherans and Reformed in the Empire.[23] Hundeshagen, however, attributed the complete breakdown in relations at the end of 1537 between Kunz on one side and Calvin and Farel on the other to Kunz's awareness that the rigorism of Geneva's church «opposed the practices of the Saxon churches.»[24] It is much more plausible to regard Kunz as a defender of Bern's own traditions than as an advocate of what was done in far distant Saxony. Moreover, the conflict between Kunz and the Genevan reformers can be explained just as easily by personal animosity as by deeper theological differences. Presenting his side of the conflict, Calvin highlighted Kunz' personality and his conduct, not his theology, and even Kunz' defenders described him as having «peasant manners.»[25]

Hundeshagen's original mistake in attributing Kunz' hostility to Calvin

21 «Lutheranizers» in Rhellikan to Bullinger, 26 March, 1538, HBBW 8: 112, no. 1116; cf. Rhellikan's reference to the «Bucerans,» in a letter to Bullinger of 21 Aug., 1537, HBBW 7: 220–222, no. 1032. Eberhard von Rümlang wrote of the «Lutherans» to Bullinger, 20 Oct., 1539, A.-L. *Herminjard,* Correspondance des Réformateurs dans les pays de langue Française, Geneva 1866–1897, 6: 79–81, no. 829 and used the terms «Lutheran» and «Buceran» synonymously, to Bullinger, 7 Dec. 1545, Zürich Staatsarchiv [hereafter ZStA] E II 345, 306; on the epidemic of «Buceranism,» see the letter of Bern's pastors and teachers to Zurich, 28 Nov. 1537, HBBW 7: 317–23, no. 1074.

22 Hundeshagen accused Sulzer in particular of placing himself on the side of Luther «in almost everything on which the Lutheran Reformation deviated from the Zwinglian», Conflicte, 106–7.

23 Although there were attempts to eliminate the oblates in the 1580s, Bern retained them until 1605; Guggisberg, Bernische Kirchengeschichte, 276–277, 334–335; cf. Bodo *Nischan,* The «Fractio Panis»: A Reformed Communion Practice in Late Reformed Germany, in: Church History 53, 1984, 17–29.

24 Hundeshagen, Conflicte, 130.

25 «Mores rusticos», Simon Grynaeus to Calvin and Farel, 4 Mar. 1538, CO 10: 158–61, no. 97; cf. Calvin to Bucer, 12 Jan. 1538, CO 10: 137–44, no. 87; Calvin and Farel to Bullinger, CO 10: 203–9, no. 121.

to his supposedly Lutheran convictions led him into the second error of seeing the later alliance between the French-speaking Reformers and Bern's «Lutherans» as a tactical move, rather than one that grew out of similar theological concerns.[26] Through the 1540s, Sulzer consistently supported the efforts of Pierre Viret and the Lausanne church to defend the independence of the ministry and the exercise of church discipline. It was due to this support, rather than to their understanding of the Lord's Supper, that the so-called Lutherans were removed from office in 1548. In fact, Sulzer's defense of the Lausanne church indicates that on the issue of church governance he, like Calvin, had been influenced by Bucer.

Hundeshagen was well aware of the theological similarities between Calvin and Sulzer, but he was so convinced of the Lutheran convictions of the latter that he downplayed those similarities and distorted their differences. On the one hand, he admitted that Calvin, like Sulzer, could accept «Lutheran» practices such as the pre-communion examination and administration of the Lord's Supper to the sick that were rejected by other Swiss churches. He did not, however, accuse Calvin of being a Lutheran for endorsing these practices, although this was part of his justification for calling Sulzer a Lutheran. On the other hand, Hundeshagen emphasized the disagreement between Sulzer and Calvin on the issue of midwives' baptism, turning what Viret described as Sulzer's «suspension of judgment» on the issue into «a rather strong inclination towards the Lutheran side.» It is entirely possible that Sulzer's reservations did not concern the question of baptism *per se,* but rather Calvin's conviction that the pastors of Montbéliard should resist this practice to the point of martyrdom. Moreover, on this point Bucer also apparently disagreed with Calvin.[27] Whatever the reasons for Sulzer's reservations, this particular issue should not be allowed to obscure the many points on which he and Calvin agreed.

Finally, the personal ties which Hundeshagen saw between the so-called Bernese Lutherans and Luther himself are greatly exaggerated. A brief biography of each of the leading «Lutherans» shows that in almost every case, Bucer was the far greater influence. Only Peter Kunz did not have close links

[26] Hundeshagen, Conflicte, 160.

[27] Hundeshagen, Conflicte, 161–2; 180. These issues arose in the context of efforts to impose the Lutheran ceremonies of Württemberg on the county of Montbéliard and concerned how far Montbéliard's pastors could accept these «innovations.» There was no attempt to introduce these practices in Bern; cf. Calvin's letter to the Montbéliard pastors, 7 Oct. 1543, CO 11: 623–6, no. 506; Viret's account of his discussion with Sulzer, Nov. 1543, CO 11: 638–641, no. 512, and Calvin's response, CO 11: 6501, no. 520. On Bucer's disagreement with Calvin on baptism by midwives, see Viret to Calvin, 16 Feb. 1544, Herminjard 9: 160, no. 1329. Unfortunately, if Sulzer and his colleagues wrote to the pastors of Montbéliard on these questions, their letter has not survived.

with the Strasbourg church, but there is no corresponding evidence to show a direct influence of Luther on his sacramental theology. In fact, his case demonstrates the persistence of the «Lutheran» myth in the face of evidence to the contrary.

Although it is a staple of any discussion of Kunz that he studied at Wittenberg, his most recent biographer could find no proof that he had ever been there. He concluded that if Kunz had spent time at Wittenberg, it could only have been before 1517 – in other words, before the outbreak of the Reformation, let alone the development of the eucharistic controversy. It is therefore hard to attribute Kunz' eucharistic theology to Luther's personal influence, particularly since Kunz became an ardent partisan of Zwingli after meeting the Zurich reformer in 1526.[28] Hundeshagen also reprinted Kunz' correspondence with Jodocus Neobolus, Bucer and Capito's intermediary in Wittenberg, as evidence of the Bern pastor's eagerness to curry favor with Luther. But Kunz's letters to Bullinger, written at the same time, show that he was just as eager to cultivate good relations with Zurich as he was with Wittenberg.[29]

Unlike Kunz, Simon Sulzer's ties with Wittenberg can be substantiated, for he visited the city in the spring of 1538. There he met with both Luther and Melanchthon, and he returned home greatly impressed with the Wittenbergers' desire for concord.[30] Sulzer's brief encounter with the Wittenbergers

[28] Ernst von *Känel,* Peter Kunz, Kilchherr von Erlenbach, ein bernischer Reformator, in: 450 Jahre Berner Reformation, ed. Historischer Verein des Kantons Bern, Bern 1980, 156–193. Curiously, despite his lack of evidence, von Känel concludes that Kunz must have studied at Wittenberg, because «during his Bern years 1535–1544 he represented a theology that followed Luther, especially in his doctrine of the Lord's Supper;» 164. He bases this statement solely on Hundeshagen.

[29] Von Känel also cites Kunz' correspondence with Neobolus, not weighing the two surviving letters to Wittenberg against the five extant letters to Bullinger or Kunz' correspondence with the Strasbourgers Bucer, Capito and Jacob Bedrot (three letters) and with Oswald Myconius and his colleagues in Basel (six letters); see von Känel's list of correspondence, Peter Kunz, 190–191. Kunz's two letters from 1538 to Neobolus describing the eucharistic strife in Bern are reprinted in Hundeshagen, Conflicte, 367–373 and 374–375, along with his letter to Bucer, 373–374; cf. Kunz' letters to Bullinger, 26 May 1538, HBBW 8: 139–141, no. 1132, and 8 July, 1538, HBBW 8: 157–159, no. 1143. Those writing about Kunz routinely cite his description of Ritter as «Zwingli's ape» in his letter to Neobolus as evidence of his extreme partisanship. While striking, the expression was not unique to Kunz, but was used by other individuals as a slighting reference to the disciples of an opponent; cf. Johannes Oporinus to Heinrich Bullinger, 24 Aug. 1542, who included among those opposed to the printing of the Koran pastor Jakob Truckenbrot, «hoc est [Bonifacii] Amerbachii simia,» ZZB F 46, 694; Johannes Haller to Bullinger, 20 Nov. 1545, describing his colleague in Augsburg, Wolfgang Musculus, as «ipsissimus Bucerus et quasi simia Buceri», ZStA E II 346, 151; and Jean Calvin to Bullinger, 11 May, 1560, referring to «Lutheri simiis», CO 18: 83–5, no. 3197.

[30] Sulzer left Bern in late March and was in Wittenberg for Easter; he also visited Augsburg, Ulm, and other churches in Hesse, Thuringia and Saxony on his trip; Martin Frecht to Am-

must, however, be balanced by his years of contact with Bucer. Sulzer studied in Strasbourg as a stipendiate of Bern's government in 1530–31, then continued his education at Basel during the 1530s, at a time when that city's church was won completely to Bucer's concord theology.[31] After the death of Berchtold Haller in 1536, the Bern Senate sent Sulzer to Strasbourg to request Bucer and Capito's help in finding a successor, and he was in the city when the two Strasbourgers returned home to report on the successful negotiations that resulted in the Wittenberg Concord. Sulzer's background and training inclined him to accept the Strasbourgers' concord theology, but that did not make him a Lutheran.

Sebastian Meyer was the Strasbourg pastor whom Sulzer helped recruit to head the Bernese church after Haller's death. The *Lesemeister* of Bern's Franciscan convent in the early 1520s, Meyer was one of the earliest supporters of evangelical teachings in that city. He was expelled in 1524, and after a brief period in Schaffhausen became a pastor in Strasbourg from 1525–1531. He was then sent to Augsburg where, along with three other pastors from Strasbourg, he sided with the Zwinglians against the Lutheran party in the city.[32] Won to Bucer's concord theology by the end of 1534, Meyer retired to Strasbourg the following year and was loaned to Bern in 1536. Meyer was already in his sixties, and his appointment in Bern was regarded by everyone as pro-

brosius Blarer, 14 May, 1538; Traugott *Schiess,* Briefwechsel der Brüder Ambrosius und Thomas Blaurer 1509–1548, Freiburg i. Br. 1908–1912, 1: 876–877, no. 810. In his own correspondence, Sulzer emphasized the support Luther showed for concord, and not Luther's eucharistic theology; see his letter to Johann Buchser, dean of the Aarau chapter of Bern's church, 7 Aug., 1538, Staatsarchiv des Kantons Aargau, AA 2233, no. 20, fol. 84v: «Nam ego ipse, qui paulo ante Lutherum vidi, qui mensae colloquioque adhibitus sum non semel nec familiariter solum, sed etiam libere cum ipso et Melanchtone de rebus omnibus contuli, animadverti, si vel tertia parte nos ei propensioni, qua erga nos nostrasque Ecclesias feruntur viri isti, respondeamus, in manibus nos habere profecto concordiam. Testis est mihi Dominus Christus, sic universum negocium ex nostris ducibus me accepisse, ut animis et studijs magis quam re et causa dissensum esse et pugnatum affirmem … Vidi revera, nullam hic presentiam Christi urgeri nisi quae est salutaris, nec unionem aliam quam sacramentalem, hoc est, qua fateamur rebus sumptis adesse aliud minus a formulis scripturae et patrum abhorreamus.» Cf. Sulzer to Vadian, 31 Jan. 1540, Emil *Arbenz* and Hermann *Wartmann,* eds., Vadianische Briefsammlung, 1508–1540, St. Gallen 1884–1913 [hereafter Vad BS] 5: 606–608, no. 1098. Hundeshagen was only the first historian to blow Sulzer's brief visit with Luther entirely out of proportion. In his biography of Sulzer, Gottlieb Linder attributed even more importance to Sulzer's Wittenberg visit, and his narrative has shaped all subsequent accounts of Sulzer's life; Gottlieb *Linder,* Simon Sulzer und sein Antheil an der Reformation im Land Baden, sowie an den Unionsbestrebungen, Heidelberg 1890, 14–17. Linder cites Sulzer's letter to Vadian but mistranslates Sulzer's «sesquiannium» as «vor sechs Jahren.»

31 Burnett, Basel and the Wittenberg Concord.

32 The other three Strasbourg pastors were Theobald Nigri, who returned to Strasbourg after a matter of months, the later Bern pastor Wolfgang Musculus, and Bonifacius Lycosthenes (Wolfhart); Friedrich *Roth,* Augsburger Reformationsgeschichte, vol. 2: 1531–1537 bzw. 1540, Munich 1904, 46–50.

visional until Sulzer had the training and experience to assume leadership of the city's church.[33]

The fourth major player on the «Lutheran» side, Beat Gerung (or Gering), had no contact with Luther whatsoever. Gerung had served as schoolmaster and then pastor in a variety of parishes in Switzerland before becoming a pastor in Zurich. In 1538 he was deposed from his position for adultery, and he moved first to Basel, and then to Strasbourg. There, on the recommendation of the city's pastors, he was given the right to marry the mother of his adulterous child. In 1541 he was sent to Bern as Meyer's replacement, and his sermons provoked some of the most bitter conflicts in that city over the next several years. Gerung's checkered past would come back to haunt him. Although Zurich's pastors were quite sympathetic to Gerung's plight after his deposition, they turned against him after he was sent to Bern and used the adultery as evidence of his unsuitability for pastoral office.[34]

Of these four pastors, three had spent several years either in Strasbourg or in Basel, whose church had strong ties with Strasbourg. If one were to draw any conclusions about their theological leanings on the basis of their personal ties, it seems obvious that the most important influences were the Strasbourg theologians Bucer and Capito, not Luther. Neither Meyer nor Gerung ever met Luther in person, and Sulzer's brief encounter with the Wittenberger was hardly enough to cause the theological conversion that has been attributed to it. While all of them could have had direct access to Luther's theology through his published works, it seems most likely that their knowledge of Luther's theology was passed through a Buceran filter. This hypothesis is confirmed by a survey of the eucharistic teachings of the Bern «Lutherans.» The letters, sermons and confessions of Kunz, Meyer and Sulzer all reveal the commitment of these three pastors to Bucer's concord theology.

The earliest account of Kunz' understanding of the Eucharist comes not from Kunz himself but from Eberhard von Rümlang, who described a con-

[33] Bern Senate to Bucer and Capito, 26 Feb., 1536, BeStA A III 24 (T Missiven W), 208; Bucer and Capito to Bern Senate, 6 July 1536, BeStA A V 1421 (U. P. 56), 21. On Meyer's support for Bucer's concord efforts, Roth, Augsburger Reformationsgeschichte, 184–86; Köhler, Zwingli und Luther, 372–375.

[34] After being dismissed from his Bern post in 1548, Gerung returned to Strasbourg. Despite Bucer's warnings, he was named pastor of St. Thomas (Bucer's former parish) in 1550. He soon became involved in various conflicts with his fellow pastors and was finally removed from office in 1556; HBBW 3: 122, n. 15; BDS 10: 477–485 (which does not mention either Gerung's past or his future positions as pastor); Werner *Bellardi*, Die Geschichte der «Christlichen Gemeinschaft» in Strassburg (1546/1550), Leipzig 1934 (QFRG 18), 100. Theodor Bibliander commended Gerung to Myconius, 6 Mar. 1538, ZZB Ms S 44: 56: «Beatus enim Geringus Lucernas, amicus meus intimus, jam est afflictus et indigus opis amicorum. Eum si juves rem feceris rectissimam mihique gratissimam;» cf. Bullinger's judgment of Gerung to Vadian, 5 Oct. 1541, Vad BS 6: 74–75, no. 1200.

versation with Kunz in a letter to Heinrich Bullinger written in early 1540. Although in general the second-hand descriptions of the teachings of Bern's «Lutherans» are colored by polemic and must be used with caution, in this case von Rümlang sought Bullinger's judgment and seems to have portrayed Kunz' position as accurately as possible.

Rümlang began his letter by informing Bullinger that the preachers, and especially Kunz, were now teaching about the sacrament in an acceptable way and had retreated from «the crudeness and acerbity» with which they had advocated «the substantial eating (which they called the eating of the true body of Christ).» He then summarized the position Kunz had explained to him in an attempt to persuade von Rümlang that the two men agreed on the sacrament. According to von Rümlang, Kunz's understanding of the words of institution reflected his Christology: Christ's body was locally contained in heaven, but it was joined with his divinity in such a way that one could rightly say that the virgin bore God and, conversely, that the son of man came down from heaven. The same conjunction of divine and human was seen in the Lord's Supper, illustrated by the words of institution: «the body ought to be said to be under the bread because the joining and bond of Christ's body and of the splendor of his divinity are inseparable, and so for this reason God and man, the whole Christ, is perceived and exhibited under this bread.» But the wording merely signified the personal union of Christ's two natures and was to be understood as a trope.[35] Despite his obvious suspicion of Kunz, von Rümlang could not point to any specifically Lutheran teaching, but rather presented a position that mixed terminology drawn from both sides of the eucharistic debate.

Kunz himself described his understanding of the sacrament at length in a letter to Bullinger written in October 1542, a few months after a dispute among Bern's pastors on the Lord's Supper had been settled through the Senate's intervention. He began by reminding Bullinger that the Zurich reformer had found no fault with Kunz's teaching on the sacrament which the latter had presented at a meeting of Swiss theologians in Zurich in the spring of 1538. Moreover, Kunz continued, he had read what Bullinger had written on the sacrament in the commentary given him by the Zurich reformer and could find nothing on which the two disagreed.[36] Kunz stated that he held to the confession of the Swiss churches adopted at Basel – the First Helvetic Confession – as well as the axioms of the Bern disputation, and then sum-

[35] Von Rümlang to Bullinger, 15 Jan. 1540, HBBW 10: 37–39, no. 1351. Von Rümling was both puzzled by and suspicious of Kunz' explanation and asked for Bullinger's opinion; Bullinger's response has not survived.

[36] The commentary was Bullinger's *In sacrosanctum Iesu Christi Domini nostri Evangelium secundum Matthaeum, Commentarium libri XII,* Zurich 1542, HBBibl 144.

marized his beliefs: the spiritual gifts given in the sacrament were united sacramentally with the symbols; there was no local inclusion of Christ's body, but the spiritual gifts were received by the faithful through faith. Christ was corporally present in heaven, at God's right hand, because of the true nature of his human body. Nonetheless, Christ was also present spiritually and celestially in the Supper, offering and presenting (*exhibet*) himself to us, who are fed to eternal life. As the mouth received bread and wine, so the mind and spirit ate Christ's body and drank his blood.[37]

Although Hundeshagen described Kunz as «dependent upon Luther,» Kunz' own position as illustrated by these two confessions cannot be called Lutheran.[38] In fact, with his insistence that Christ was received by the faithful through faith and that his body was located in one place in heaven, Kunz was much closer to Bullinger than he was to Luther. If anything, von Rümlang's presentation of Kunz' Christology suggests that Kunz was eclectic in his theology and not concerned with conforming strictly to the positions of either side. This stance would have made him more open to a mediating theology such as that proposed by Bucer. That influence is revealed by Kunz' references to sacramental union and the exhibition of Christ's body and blood, terms that Bullinger both recognized and criticized in his response to Kunz's confession.[39]

While Kunz may have leaned towards Bullinger in his interpretation of Bucer's concord theology, his colleague Sebastian Meyer was closer to Luther. But Meyer too stayed within the parameters set out by the First Helvetic Confession and the Wittenberg Concord. In a letter to Konrad Pellikan written at the end of 1537, Meyer described both his general strategy for preaching on the Lord's Supper and the most important theological prin-

[37] Kunz to Bullinger, 20 Oct. 1542, ZStA E II 358, 136 ff.: «Confiteor item tecum Christum corporaliter in coelis esse ad dexteram patris adeoque in uno aliquo coeli loco propter veri corporis modum iterumque Christum hunc eundem verum deum et hominem nihilominus ecclesiae suae praesentem esse, pascere, satiare et vivificare fideles suos coenam sacram in terris celebrantes, non praesentia corporali, sed spirituali et plane coelesti, qua sola se suis fruendum praebet spiritualiter, efficaciter plene et eo prorsus modo, quo fidelibus suis salutaris et ad vitam satis efficax esse potest, vivatque ipse in suis et sui in ipso, nihil horum mysteriorum intelligente caeca carnis ratione. Offert ergo se nobis exhibetque cum omnibus bonis suis, quandoquidem non sola fides, sed ipsemet Christus sit vitalis refectio nostra ad vitam aeternam.»

[38] Hundeshagen, Conflicte, 70. Hundeshagen did not know of Kunz' letter to Bullinger, but he had read Bullinger's response to Kunz (see following note) and was aware that in his confession Kunz had rejected the ubiquity of Christ's body and emphasized the spiritual eating of Christ's flesh and blood. Although he described it as «a repetition of the Calvinistic confession of 1537», (i. e. Calvin's confession of faith presented at the Bern synod in Sept. 1537), he persisted in labeling Kunz a Lutheran and accused him of duplicity, 165–168.

[39] He also complained about the distribution among Bucer's supporters of the latter's letter to Comander; Bullinger to Kunz, 30 Oct. 1542, ZStA E II 342, 108 ff.

ciples that underlay his sermons. He was committed to the phrasing of the First Helvetic Confession and the letter of the Swiss churches to Luther, which stated that Christ's body and blood were truly consumed, but in a spiritual and mysterious way by the believing mind. This wording corresponded to Scripture and the Fathers, and it refuted both the crude and crass teachings of the papists and the empty signs asserted by the Anabaptists. There was no need to discuss anything more detailed than Christ's simple presence in the sacrament before a simple and uneducated audience. Moreover, with such an audience it was always best to stick to the words of Christ himself, even if they were obscure, than to go off on lengthy explanations and arguments about the meaning of those words.[40]

Meyer did not openly criticize the Zurich church in his letter to Pellikan, but over the next few years he expressed his frustration with the hostility the Zurichers harbored towards Luther, Bucer and the latter's efforts for concord. His most explicit criticism of the Zurich position came in a letter to Vadian from early 1540. With their continual harping on terms such as «signify, represent, place before our eyes, remind, testify,» the purpose of the Zwinglians seemed to be to persuade everyone that Christ was absent from his church and from the sacrament, which was reduced to a ceremony of commemoration and thanksgiving. But no one ever read in their writings the most important point of the sacrament, that «together with the symbols provided and received rightly according to Christ's institution, the true body and blood of Christ are offered, delivered and procured, received and eaten (*porrigi, tradi et exhiberi, percipi et manducari*) according to the most certain promise of the Lord himself, and, in sum, Christ is very nearly as present as can be and entirely within his own.»[41]

The sermon Meyer preached on Palm Sunday of 1540 illustrates how he presented his understanding of the sacrament to his congregation. He told

[40] Meyer to Pellikan, 27 Dec. 1537, ZZB Ms S 43: 189: «Hoc autem in praesenti dico, mihi summopere placere, si modis loquendi utamur, quibus in Confessione Basiliensi, et in literis ad Lutherum, nam hi consonant modis loquendi scripturae et Patrum, cavent errores Papistarum, et ipsam S. Coenam contra Anabaptistas ecclesiae fideli reddunt augustiorem, ubi plenis verbis fatemur, corpus Domini vere edi, sanguinemque ipsius vere bibi, sed spirituali modo in mysterio et a fideli menti, quo aeternum inde vivat. Mihi enim magis videtur, dandam esse operam, ut simpliciter praesentiam Domini in Coena, coram simplici et rudi plebecula constanter more Scripturae et Patrum asseveremus, quam ut scrupulosius et curiosius de modo eius praesentiae argutemur, modo caveamus, ne Ecclesia crudam illam et crassam, quam Papistae docent, corporis Christi intelligat praesentiam, id quod satis caveri videtur, per dictos in Confessione modos, ac paullo supra positos … Quod si quis dixerit mihi: At obscura sunt quae mystice proferuntur? Respondeo: Hoc probe novit Christus, probe noverunt Apostoli, probe noverunt Patres, apud quos tamen nullas huiusmodi leges argutas ac frigidas expositiones, quibus res magis extenuetur.»

[41] Meyer to Vadian, 29 Jan. 1540, Vad BS 5: 594–604, no. 1095; for Meyer's earlier criticism of Zurich, see his letter to Vadian, 27 Jan. 1539, Vad BS 5: 527–529, no. 1036.

his hearers that it was necessary to believe that «we received not only bread and wine but with them also the true body and blood of Christ as food for eternal life.»[42] This gift of Christ's body and blood was not received in any natural or rational manner, but rather through faith. After a brief paraphrase of John 6, Meyer asserted that the manner and form of Christ's presence was a mystery, though he specifically rejected the local enclosure of Christ's body in the bread. Nevertheless, the Lord truly gave his body and blood to his disciples to be eaten, and thus those receiving the sacrament could know without any doubt that they received Christ's true body and blood as food for their souls. More provocatively, he asserted that those who believed they received mere signs did not believe Christ was truly present and thus sinned against Christ's body and blood, no less than the Corinthians had.[43]

Meyer's incendiary statement helps explain why the conflict in Bern over the Lord's Supper was so bitter. Moreover, his attacks on the Zwinglian interpretation of the sacrament were bound to link him with Luther in the mind of his opponents. Nevertheless, Meyer's more positive statements about the sacrament remain faithful to Bucer's concord theology. Like Bucer, he taught that the true body and blood of Christ were offered *with* the symbols according to Christ's institution, he freely used the terms «offered, de-

[42] Sermon preserved in Basel Universitätsbibliothek [hereafter BUB], MsKiAr 22a, fol. 276r-279r, no. 38a. Citation at fol. 277r: «Eben selliche gstalt hat es auch mit dem H. Sacramenten des H. Nachtmols, in wellichem so mir zvor wol wyn vnd brot die sychbarlichen element griffen vnd gsächen, vnd empfinden, So glauben mir doch hiemit vestiglich, dz wyr nit allein brot vnd wyn, sunder auch mit dänen, den woren Lib und dz wor blut Christi Jesu empfahendt, zu einer spyß des ewigen läbens, diwil dan Christus ustruckenlich die verheyß, vnd die H. geschrifft dz bezygt.»

[43] BUB MsKiAr 22a, fol. 278r-279r: «Die wys und form oder Maß, wie dise gschächt in dr gheymnuß, eroffnet der Herr synen lieben Jüngeren in sym H. abendtmol, dz namlich in der gheymnuß syn lib worhaftig geeßen, vnd syn blut getruncken, vnd dz uß der wirckung göttlicher krafft, wen dz mit dancksagung gnoßen wyrt … | Man soll auch hie kein rümbliche gegenwirtikeit des Herren libs inbilden, diewil und er nit nathürlich und liblicher wyß (wiewol doch worlich) empfangen wyrt. Und so das fleysch Christi, also empfangen wyrt, so gibt es ein nüwigs läben, dan es ist ein fleisch des wortzs, vnnd ein fleisch des läbens, welliches so mir eßen wärden, so werden mir in im auch zu lust verwandelet vnd ein fleisch mit synem fleysch, welliches auch inwonet syn H. geyst, wölliches unser tödlichen cörper erwöcken wyrt … Und domit wirß enden, so hat die sach sych in einer Sum allso, dz, wöllicher glaubt, dz er mit dem zeychen brot vnd wyns den woren Lib vnd dz wor blut Christi Jesu empfahe, zu einer spyß der seelen, domit er die fröliche vfferstendtnuß vnd dz eüwig läben empfache, der empfache dz auch on allen zweiffel, Wellicher aber glaubt er empfache do nüt dan ein zeychen dären dingen, der halltet Christum den herren nit fyr recht, vnd worlich worhafft, vnd versyndiget sych an dem lib vnd blut des Herren, nitt minder dan die Corinther mit yrer fülerey vnd verachtung der armen, in dem abendtmol, als die den lib des herren | nit vnderscheyden, Von wägen dz dy weder mit glauben noch mit geyst eßendt.» *Hundeshagen* briefly describes the conflict in Bern that was caused by this sermon, but he did not know the contents of the sermon, Conflicte, 107–108.

livered and procured,» and he specified that one received Christ's body and blood through faith.

Sick and tired of the perpetual conflict over the Lord's Supper – for which he was in part responsible – Meyer retired to Strasbourg in 1541.[44] The pastor elected to succeed him, Simon Sulzer, would achieve notoriety first as the head of Bern's «Lutheran» faction until his expulsion from that city in 1548, and then as the man who led Basel's church in a «Lutheran» direction until his death in 1585. As the theology professor at Bern's academy, Sulzer presented his confession concerning the Lord's Supper to a colloquy of pastors in January of 1540.

In clear reliance on Bucer and the First Helvetic Confession, he defined the sacrament as «a holy action, instituted by Christ himself, in which the Lord Jesus, through the ministry of the church, with the visible and perceptible signs, bread and wine, gives and presents the true communion of his body and blood to his own.»[45] The remainder of the confession, an explanation of this definition, contains every element of Bucer's concord theology, using language already familiar from Meyer's descriptions of the Lord's Supper. To compensate for human weakness, God works through his ministers who administer the visible signs of the sacraments. These visible signs not only represent God's invisible gifts but also transmit them. The sign and thing signified are joined in sacramental union so that the eyes see and mouth eats the physical and external sign, while the eyes of faith and the mouth of the soul receive the heavenly gifts.[46] Sulzer rejected transubstantiation and

[44] Peter Kunz to Joachim Vadian, Vad BS 6: 88–90, no. 1211. By the end of 1537, even the supporters of Bucer's concord efforts in Basel recognized that Meyer was contributing to the turmoil in Bern. Basel's Bürgermeister Jakob Meyer referred to him as «alt und kybig.» In letters to Bullinger from 26 Nov. 1537 both Jacob Meyer and Simon Grynaeus suggested that Meyer be removed from Bern; HBBW 7: 304–306, no. 1070, and 309–310, no. 1072.

[45] BUB MsKiAr 22a, no. 38b, fol. 280r: «Das Nachtmol des herren ist ein heylige handtlung, von dem herren Christo selbs vffgesetzt, in dären der herr Jesus durch den dienst der kilchen, mit sychtbarlichen vnd empfindtlichen zeychen, brots vnd wyns, die wore gmeinschafft synes libs vnd blutzs, das ist sych selbst dargibt vnd schenckt den synen, mit allen himelschlichen schätzen, zu der hoffnung der fröhlichen vfferstandtnuß, vnd des eüwigen läbens.»

[46] BUB MsKiAr 22a, fol. 281v: «Semlicher hoher schatz wyrt durch sychtbarliche ding vnd zeychen brot vnd wyn allso dargreycht, dz ein anders den liblichen augen zeygt wyrt, vnd von dem mundt des libs empfangen wyrt, Ein anders aber durch dz wort gegäben vnd gschenckt wyrt, ein sömlichs namlich das wie es den liblichen augen vnsychtbarlich ist: Allso ist es den augen des glaubens bekant, vnd dz mit dem mundt der seelen empfangen wyrt. Dan wie Augustinus spricht, als der lib, allso hat auch die seel yre augen vnd yr mundt, die mit dem, dz der lib vom vßerlichen diener empfocht libliche vnd vßerliche ding, allso auch die seel mit yrem mundt von dem ynnerlichen diener dem herren Christo namlich selber, vff den schauwen syn lib vnd blut, beide recht vnd worlich. Dan sy weyst die gotts verstendig seel, das die ding dargreicht vnd übergäben syndt, erstlich ein empfindtlichs vnd übergroß zeychen dem mundt des libs, Ein anders aber yren der seelen, namlich ein vnempfindtlichs vnd himlisch,

the local inclusion of Christ's body in the bread. Without directly rejecting Bullinger's Christology, he also argued that the sacramental union and Christ's true presence in the Lord's Supper did not contradict his true human nature. One must simply accept that the paradox of Christ's presence in heaven and his true presence in the sacrament was beyond human understanding and reason.[47]

This brief presentation of the eucharistic theology taught at Bern by the so-called Lutherans should be enough to demonstrate their theological dependence on Bucer. Their mis-labeling as Lutherans raises larger questions about the terminology used to describe the participants in the eucharistic controversy. Like Bern's Zwinglians, Carl Hundeshagen recognized the influence of Bucer and Capito on Bern's church, but he equated the eucharistic theology of the Strasbourgers with that of Luther. According to this view, there were only two positions on the Lord's Supper: that of Zwingli, and that of Luther. Any movement away from Zwingli's eucharistic teaching was therefore Lutheranizing, and those who advocated that movement were Lutherans. The fact that Luther accepted the positions set forth in the Wittenberg Concord only confirmed this equation in the mind of Bern's Zwinglians, and because the churches of south Germany who endorsed the Concord eventually did become Lutheran, later historians have been tempted to accept this equation as well.

Such an equation is misleading and anachronistic, however. The problems inherent in it are made plain merely by pointing out that Jean Calvin accepted the Wittenberg Concord while he was a pastor in Strasbourg.[48] To call Calvin a Lutheran makes that term so broad that it becomes virtually meaningless. Moreover, the Buceran concord theology taught in Bern differed sig-

sampt der sacramentlichen niessung, mit dem mundt des glaubens zuempfachen vnd zunießen.»

47 BUB MsKiAr 22a, fol. 282r-v: «Und durch solliche Sacramentliche vereynigung hallte ich den herren rächt vnd worlich gegenwertig im abendtmol, nit dz er von der selbigen wägen einige creathurliche eigenschafft an sych nemme, der hoch vnd herliche ist, vnd sytz zu der grächten synes vatters, vndt so vil man die nathürliche art betracht eines libs, ist er allein im himel, vnd ist doch semlichs nit abbrüchlich syner woren gegenwertikeit, | die vns widerfar on allen zwifel, vß krafft synes h. worts, in dem er vns versprochen, Er spricht, ich worer gott vnd mensch, wölle by vns bliben byß zum endt der wellt, Mathej. 28 [20]. Einer semlichen wys aber kein synn noch menschlich gmüet vnd verstandt faßen mag, namlich wie er wol kan, wol weyß, vnd vermag.»

48 Brian A. *Gerrish,* Strasbourg Revisited: Reformed Perspectives on the Augsburg Confession, in: The Old Protestantism, 248–263; Bizer, Studien, 244–246. Grass emphasizes Calvin's criticism of the Wittenberg Concord, expressed in his letter to Bucer written in early 1538, and questions whether Calvin actually signed the Concord in Strasbourg, Abendmahlslehre, 198–204; but Calvin's letter to Bucer must be understood in the context of the Bern synod of Sept. 1537, as Augustijn has demonstrated, «Bern and France.» Calvin's attitude towards Bucer, and to Bucer's concord efforts, changed significantly after his move to Strasbourg.

nificantly both from Luther's own eucharistic theology and from the way the term «Lutheran» was gradually defined through the bitter confessional struggles of the second half of the century. Bucer's concord theology rejected oral manducation, teaching instead a distinction between the elements of bread and wine received by mouth, and Christ's body and blood received by the soul. It also rejected the *manducatio impiorum,* holding to the principle that some amount of faith, however weak and defective, must exist for one to receive Christ's body and blood. Finally, Bucer and his followers differed from both the Reformed and from later Lutherans in their Christology. Although they criticized the Reformed insistence on the local presence of Christ's body in heaven, they also refused to speculate about how Christ's body could be present both in heaven and in the sacrament. Instead they remained reticent in their Christology, emphasizing the priority of Scripture over Aristotle and the limits of human understanding.[49]

It might be more accurate to describe Bucer's concord theology as Lutheranizing, if this were taken to mean moving away from the Zurich position and towards that of Wittenberg. The hard-core Zwinglians who opposed the Buceran party in Bern certainly understood any deviation from Zwingli as selling out to Luther. But there are significant problems with this term as well. The more theologically sensitive accounts of the eucharistic controversy in Bern based on primary sources do indeed use the term «Lutheranizing,» but even in these accounts the careful distinction too often disappears, and «Lutheranizing» becomes simply «Lutheran.» And most of the secondary accounts overlook this distinction entirely and speak simply of the Lutherans in Bern. The term thus presents too many possibilities for misunderstanding to be useful.

There is also a more serious objection to the term, for to call the Bernese faction Lutheranizing ignores Bucer's key role in developing that theology and distorts both the purpose and the accomplishments of Bucer's concord efforts. The Strasbourg reformer was not trying to introduce Lutheranism, but was rather trying to formulate a concord theology acceptable to both Lutherans and the Swiss, a middle ground between the two sides. Oswald Myconius, perhaps Bucer's staunchest supporter in Switzerland, put this clearly in a letter to Theodor Bibliander written in the fall of 1538. There he repeated Bucer's argument that Zwingli and Oecolampadius had misunderstood Luther as speaking too crassly about the presence of Christ's body and blood

[49] Capito stated this position clearly in a letter to Vadian, 26 Aug. 1538, Vad BS 5: 504–507, no. 1021: «Neque sane ego velim onerare meam conscientiam cum stulta illa philosophia de absentia Christi in uno loco circumscriptivo, qui scio, hominem exaltatum a resurrectione propter coniunctionem verbi in unam individuam personam, servato etiam corporis malo, alium habere statum, quam vel Aristotelis ingenium assequatur.»

in the sacrament, while Luther had never understood that the Swiss reformers did not teach that the sacrament consisted only of empty signs. «Nor can it be said,» Myconius continued, «that I have departed from the one in order to approach the other, but rather that I have departed from both that I may draw closer to both, and this in the way that you should be able to understand from what I have said. Doing this, I am acting in a way that above all is fitting for members of the body of Christ, with whom we should in truth agree, not disagree.» [50] Sulzer is reported to have made much the same argument during one of the many occasions when Bern's pastors were summoned before the Senate to settle their quarrels. When one of the city's Zwinglian pastors, Johannes Wäber, «asked if the foreign churches had approached us, or if we had approached them, he answered that both parties should [move away] from themselves and approach God, for there are faults on both sides.» [51]

For Myconius, as for Bucer's supporters in Bern, the concord theology endorsed in the First Helvetic Confession and the Wittenberg Concord avoided the mistakes and misunderstandings of each side. Any ambiguity in their own position was in fact a strength, for it enabled concord. To call those who endorsed this position Lutheranizers overlooks their sincere commitment to a middle ground between Luther and Zwingli.

Last but certainly not least, to categorize the eucharistic conflict in Bern as a struggle between Lutherans and Zwinglians obscures the real issue that underlay the debate: where to draw the boundaries around a theology that up to that point had been called Zwinglian and would in future be called Reformed. This question became even more urgent over the 1540s, as Calvin grew in influence not only inside Switzerland, but outside it as well.

On the central issue addressed by the Wittenberg Concord, Christ's real presence in the sacrament, Calvin's theology was closer to Luther than it was

[50] 7 Sept. 1538, ZZB Ms S 45: 70: «Video Zwinglium et Oecolampadium (quos aliquamdiu secutus sum tamen) ab initio non intellexisse, quod Lutherus crassum, et qui fit ratione seculi huius, esum carnis Christi noluerit, imo quod oderit talem, ut veritati Domini haud consentaneum. Video item Lutherum nunquam intellexisse, dum contentione etiamnum saeviit, duos illos non nuda signa voluisse habere in Coena, sed Christum praesentem, et cibum animae carnem eius, et sanguinem potum … Neque ideo discessisse ab altero vere dicor, ad alterum accessisse, sed potius discessisse ab utroque et accessisse ad utrumque, ratione, quam tu ex dictis facile potes intelligere. Ita faciens enim ago quod in primis decet membra corporis Christi, quorum est in veritate concordare, non discordare …» Bucer frequently repeated this view that Luther and the Swiss had simply misunderstood each other because of their different priorities; there is a particularly lengthy statement of this position in his *Defensio adversus Axioma Catholicum*, BOL 5: 89–102.

[51] Stettler's Berner Chronik, describing an appearance before the Senate on 5 Dec. 1544; BeStA, DQ 11, vol. D (1541–50), 92v-93r: «Allß ouch bemellter Wäber, Inne gefragt ob die vßlenndischen Kilchen zue vnnß, oder wir zue innen tretten, geantwortet, daß beide Partheyen, vonn Innen selb zue Godt tretten söllennt, dann ouch vff beiden syten etwaß mangels.»

to Zwingli.[52] But in arguing that Christ's presence is spiritual and that the benefits of the sacrament are received only by the faithful, Calvin was closer to Bucer than he was to Luther. Calvin's use of the terms *exhibere* and *substantia,* his frequent reference to the communion of Christ's body and blood, and his insistence that the elements were instruments of divine grace demonstrated the similarities of his eucharistic theology to that of Bucer.[53] To be sure, Calvin shared with the Zurich theologians an understanding of the nature of Christ's truly human body that required it to be locally circumscribed in heaven, and this distinguished his doctrine of the sacrament from Bucer's, but this difference was not directly relevant to the Wittenberg Concord. It was inevitable, then, that Calvin would fall under the same suspicion of Lutheranism – or more precisely, of Buceranism – as Kunz, Meyer and Sulzer.

The similarities between Calvin's and Bucer's eucharistic theology had serious ramifications, for they distanced the churches of western Switzerland theologically from that of Zurich. If Bucer's theology triumphed in Bern, the way would conceivably be open for both that church and the church of Geneva to endorse a eucharistic concord with the German churches that included all who taught Christ's presence in the sacrament and excluded only those who still clung to Zwingli's representational view.[54] The eucharistic controversy in Bern thus became a struggle for the fate of Zwingli's theology.

In the end, Bern remained loyal to its own Zwinglian tradition. After a decade marked by disputes among the clergy, the leaders of the Buceran party were dismissed from their posts and expelled from the city in April of 1548. Their expulsion led to a backlash against anyone associated with Bucer, including not only Calvin but Bern's new theology professor Wolfgang Musculus as well.[55] It is no coincidence that only a few weeks after the expulsion

[52] Calvin did not use «real» with regard to Christ's body, but he granted its use as an equivalent to «true» when discussing Christ's presence, Joseph *Tylenda*, Calvin and Christ's Presence in the Supper – True or Real, in: Scottish Journal of Theology 27, 1974, 65–75. On the similarities between Calvin and Luther, Brian A. *Gerrish,* Gospel and Eucharist: John Calvin on the Lord's Supper, in: The Old Protestantism, 108–117; on the differences between Calvin and Zwingli, see Gerrish, The Lord's Supper.

[53] See for example the confession Calvin submitted to the Bern synod of Sept. 1537 and which was signed by Bucer and Capito, CO 5: 711–712: «Ergo spiritum eius vinculum esse nostrae cum ipso participationis agnoscimus, sed ita ut nos ille carnis et sanguinis Domini substantia vere ad immortalitatem pascat, et eorum participatione vivificet. Hanc autem carnis et sanguinis sui communionem Christus sub panis et vini symbolis in sacrosancta sua coena offert, et exhibet omnibus qui eam rite celebrant iuxta legitimum eius institutum.»

[54] The broad range of views included in such a consensus would have made it inherently unstable, but that is not the issue. More significant is the fact that it would have changed the later inter-confessional debates on the Eucharist into inner-confessional ones.

[55] Cf. Johannes Haller to Calvin, CO 13: 14–15, no. 1052; Haller to Bullinger, 26 July 1548, CO 13: 19–20, no. 1055; and again on 30 Aug. 1548, ZStA E II 370, 79, referring to finding positions for refugee pastors from Germany: «De illis autem, qui vel semel Lutheranismi aut

of Bern's Bucerans, Calvin traveled to Zurich and opened the discussions with Bullinger that would eventually lead to the Consensus Tigurinus. Threatened by Savoy, faced with the hostility of the now dominant Zwinglians in Bern, and separated geographically from Basel and the cities of south Germany that endorsed Bucer's concord theology, Calvin had little choice but to try and improve his relations with Zurich.[56]

It took another year of negotiation for the two parties to reach a point where they could agree on a common statement concerning the Lord's Supper. Scholars have long recognized that both Calvin and Bullinger made concessions to the other in order to reach their agreement. It is less often noticed that the Consensus Tigurinus carefully excluded those features most characteristic of Bucer's concord theology. The concessions that Calvin made to Bullinger in the Consensus concerned precisely those points which Bullinger found most objectionable in Bucer's theology, such as the terms *exhibere* and *substantia,* and the instrumental nature of the signs (or even the term *instrumentum*). The Consensus also contained an explicit endorsement of the local circumscription of Christ's body in heaven, a point on which Calvin had always agreed with Zurich against Bucer.[57] In return for this agreement with Calvin, Bullinger finally abandoned Zwingli's symbolic and representational view of the Lord's Supper.[58] If the Consensus was a victory

Buceranismi (nam cogimur, proh dolor, tam seditiosis uti vocabulis) nota commaculati fuerunt, nihil promittere possum omnino; ita in illos omnium tam symmistarum, quam principum animi incanduerunt, ut etiam suspectus facile fiere possit, quisquis pro ipsorum commendatione vel verbum dixerit.» Musculus had been a pastor in Strasbourg with Bucer and was one of the original signatories of the Wittenberg Concord. On Haller's impression of Musculus when he first met him in Augsburg, see n. 29 above.

56 The Bucerans in Bern were closely connected with the reasons for Calvin's trip. The official reason for their deposition was their defense of Pierre Viret's theses on the power of the keys and the authority of the ministry. Calvin made his trip to Zurich in order to win Zurich's support for Viret. An earlier round of negotiations on the sacrament, which Calvin initiated in Feb., 1547, had reached a stalemate. On the background and contents of the Consensus Tigurinus, W. *Kolfhaus,* Der Verkehr Calvins mit Bullinger, in: Calvinstudien, ed. A. Bohatec, Leipzig 1909, 27–125, esp. pp. 44–74; Bizer, Studien, 248–263; Otto Erich *Strasser,* Der Consensus Tigurinus, in: Zwa 9, 1949, 1–16; Ulrich *Gäbler,* Das Zustandekommen des Consensus Tigurinus vom Jahre 1549, in: Theologische Literaturzeitung 104, 1979, 321–332; Paul *Rorem,* Calvin and Bullinger on the Lord's Supper, Nottingham 1989, 20–58.

57 Rorem notices the anti-Buceran thrust of the Consensus, but he does not connect it explicitly with events in Bern, Calvin and Bullinger, 41–45; Gäbler also points out that one result of the Consensus was to clear Calvin of suspicions that he was a Buceran, Zustandekommen. So deep was the hostility to Bucer in Bern that the Consensus was suspect to some, despite its studious avoidance of positions identified with Bucer; Haller to Bullinger, 27 June 1549, CO 13: 315–316, no. 1215.

58 Kolfhaus, Verkehr, 69–70. It has been argued that the Swiss moved away from the purely symbolic view of the sacrament already in the First Helvetic Confession; Strasser, Consensus; more generally on Bullinger's earlier willingness to make concessions for the sake of concord, Martin *Friedrich,* Heinrich Bullinger und die Wittenberger Konkordie. Ein Ökumeniker im

for Calvin in winning the support of the Zurich church, it was also a victory for Bullinger in excluding key features of Bucer's eucharistic theology from what would become a foundational document for the Reformed church.

For in this respect, the Consensus Tigurinus cannot be overestimated. The Consensus did not end all differences between the Calvinist and the Zwinglian branches of the Reformed faith, nor did it improve relations between the churches of Geneva and Bern as Calvin had hoped. But it did lay out a common position on the Lord's Supper that would be cited in the future as normative by both sides.[59] It also placed Calvin clearly on the side of Zwingli's heirs in Zurich and changed the terms of the eucharistic debate. No longer did Lutherans and Zwinglians argue about the presence of Christ in the sacrament. During the eucharistic controversies of the later sixteenth century, Christ's presence was accepted by both sides, and the disagreement now hinged on whether that presence was corporal or only spiritual. And the Consensus Tigurinus played a key role, for its publication in 1551 sparked the polemical exchanges between Joachim Westphal and Calvin that initiated this second phase of the eucharistic controversy. In an ironic twist of fate, the Consensus Tigurinus was therefore both the final outcome of Bucer's concord efforts in Bern and the starting point of the renewed polemical battles that firmly fixed the confessional boundaries between Lutheran and Reformed in the later sixteenth century.

Abstract:

Most accounts of the eucharistic controversy assume that after the Swiss cities rejected the Wittenberg Concord, Martin Bucer had no more influence in Switzerland. In Bern, however, a party supporting Bucer's concord theol-

Streit um das Abendmahl, in: Zwa 24, 1997, 59–79. This argument holds true for the Swiss who later followed Bucer, but the Zurich church did not genuinely embrace the First Helvetic Confession. By the 1540s Bucer was complaining that Zurich had receded from the first Helvetic Confession, and the *Wahrhaffte Bekenntnis* of 1545, written in response to Luther's *Kurtze Bekenntnis* of the preceding year, certainly did not go as far as the earlier confession; Bucer to Vadian, 21 Feb. 1545, Vad BS 6: 396–397, no. 1384; Bucer to Blarer, 25 Feb. 1545, Schiess 2: 348–349, no. 1168.

59 This was particularly the case in the wake of Beza's and Farel's confession on the Lord's Supper submitted to the Duke of Württemberg in 1557; Salvatore *Corda*, Bullinger e la confessione eucaristica di Göppingen (1557), in: Heinrich Bullinger 1504–1575. Gesammelte Aufsätze zum 400. Todestag, ed. Ulrich *Gäbler* and Erland *Herkenrath,* Zürich 1975, 1: 109–122. Bullinger also followed the formulations of the Consensus Tigurinus in his Decades, Paul *Sanders,* Heinrich Bullinger et le «zwinglianisme tardif» aux lendemains du «Consensus Tigurinus», in: Reformiertes Erbe. Festschrift für Gottfried W. Locher zu seinem 80. Geburtstag, ed. Heiko A. *Oberman,* Ernst *Saxer,* Alfred *Schindler* and Heinzpeter *Stucki,* Zurich 1992 (Zwa 19), 1: 307–323.

ogy dominated the church from the later 1530s through the 1540s. Although traditionally identified as Lutherans, the theological statements of this group demonstrate their loyalty to Bucer's «middle way» between Luther and Zwingli. The expulsion of this party from Bern in 1548 meant the end of Bucer's influence in western Switzerland, finalized by the Consensus Tigurinus, which carefully avoided any Buceran terminology.

Prof. Dr. Amy Nelson Burnett, Lincoln NE