

Introduction

Pre-Reformation Ecclesiology (What Is the Church?)

MOST REFORMERS WERE CERTAINLY not trying to split the church into competing sectarian factions; they all identified themselves as members of *the church*, that singular institution gifted to man by God. They had, however, come to differing understandings about what *the church* is and what it was meant to be. This is an important point to remember, but one that students, readers and those interested in the Reformation often have the greatest difficulty understanding. Convenient labeling (e.g., Lutheran, Zwinglian or Anglican) has muddied the waters, as has comparisons between the reformers' desired goals for the church and the results of attempted implementation. Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, and the scores of lesser well known reformers all naturally considered questions about the church following on from their considerations of such things as predestination, salvation and the sacraments, and their distinctive ecclesiology reflected these other doctrines (as will be touched upon later) and brought them into conflict with each other and with Rome. Yet, each and every one of them identified themselves, without qualification, as Christian, and they all absolutely refused to be labeled schismatic (as far worse than being called a heretic). They self-identified as members of the church and maintained that they were simply trying to reform it from within; to re-form it into its pure, early Christian form, but were obstructed by Rome and its human traditions. Partially this is where trouble began. What exactly was that pure form they wanted to instil? It became more than a matter of disagreement and debate after 1541, however, as the collapse of the colloquy of Regensberg (the final attempt to achieve compromise between Roman Catholics and Protestants in the sixteenth century) made it necessary for the Protestant leaders to follow through on their preliminary conclusions and local reform programs and actually build-up distinctive churches. These reflected all the questions that

the reformers had been striving to answer. Who actually belongs to the church? How does the church function? What is the role of the clergy?

WHICH CHURCH?

Looking back to the earliest records, historians of religion are confronted by at least four legitimate versions of the church to which the reformers could be referring. Initially, there was a small, radical sect of the Judaic religion (persecuted by the Jews but largely ignored by the Romans) which became a persecuted minority church within the Roman Empire divided from its Judaic origins. As we shall see, Anabaptists and more radical sectarians took from this the view that suffering persecution and isolation was part and parcel of the faith and a condition of the true church. Over time, Christians became an acknowledged, legitimate sect (still periodically abused) among others within the empire, but they were tolerated and even awarded legal standing from time to time. Again, during the reformation period some sectarians took this as indication that the church stood apart from the government. Finally, the Christian church became the state church of the Empire (even taking a hand in suppressing other religious groups) and later some Christians took this to mean that the church not only cooperated with the state but sometimes could take on a temporal leadership role itself. Each one of these stages in the church's early history had attractive elements and each had clear scriptural connotations, so is it any wonder that controversy, arguments and not a little bloodshed arose between the reformers centuries later. Moreover, this explains why ecclesiology exercised the leading theologians of the sixteenth-century as much as it did.

The prevailing view from those within the church, in the early stages of its development, was that it was "an assembly of saints joined together by correct faith and an excellent manner of living," and they took Jesus and the disciples as their inspiration. Out of such idealism and sacred history, Alistair McGrath extracted a simple, four-fold ecclesiology to help modern readers understand what it all meant. The church was viewed as (1) a spiritual society (the people of God) because the spiritual kingdom was not of the earth. Members of the church were (2) made one in Christ (those saved by Christ's redemptive work on the cross gathered together in communion). For their benefit (3) the church was a repository of true Christian teaching. To help them live correctly (4) the church projected outward to provide a known gathering point for, and teacher of, the faithful. The church identified, gathered and sponsored the growth in faith and holiness of its

members.¹ This was a simple and obvious mandate molded in the crucible of controversies long before the Reformation. One of the most thought-provoking of these formulating controversies was Donatism.

DONATISM

Without going into excessive detail, the early understanding of the church and its role in society was seriously challenged almost before it became firmly established in the early fourth century. Indeed, many of the elements of the challenge—localism *v.* universalism, obedience, resistance, relations with the magistrate—would replay again and again over the centuries. As the Roman Empire expanded out from its mid-Mediterranean position so too did Christianity and, like the Romans, the church sometimes found within the new regions useful local customs, incorporating these to strengthen ties with the local populace (provided they did not detract from its universal beliefs). As, yet, a persecuted minority church, Christians were often subjected to great violence. Patiently suffering persecution for the faith became itself a mark of membership and, just as Jesus acknowledged the power of the state and submitted to punishment rather than challenge its authority so too did Christians at large try to live peacefully within the temporal sphere. And this was the case even at the height of the last great period of general persecution of the Christians under Emperor Diocletian. The governor of the North African region, however, remained tolerant of the large Christian minority under his authority and he decided that it would be good enough if Christians simply handed in their holy books; they need not actively sacrifice to the ancient Roman gods as the emperor wanted, and in so doing their churches would be spared destruction. While much of the rank-and-file stood firm and accepted persecution rather than actively resist the imperial authorities, some of the wealthy and powerful among the Christian minority, including some clergy, agreed to the governor's request. Their action raised questions, however, which had not been considered before. Could those who had abandoned their principles, holy books, fellowship and faith be readmitted and forgiven afterwards? What of the lapse clergy? Could their posts and authorities be restored after the persecution passed simply on the strength of repentance? Another question arose over whether the sacraments were themselves tainted by those clergymen's ill-faith and weakness? These questions made it imperative that a doctrine determining specifying what the church actually was beyond a theoretical mandate be settled. As one might expect, there were no entirely satisfactory answers.

1. McGrath, *Christian Theology*, 405.

Hans J Hillerbrand pointed out that, with regard to the laity it was decided that if a genuine sorrow was in evidence, after a proper penance, weak Christians could of course be forgiven their weaknesses and brought back into the fellowship. But more had been expected of the clergy, so this forgiveness and re-admittance did not apply to them, at least in the eyes of hard-line rigorists. These were the Donatists, named after the bishop of Carthage, generally members drawn from the local North African populations. Colonist Romans took a more positive, lenient line and welcomed the “*traditores*” (traitors) back into the fold with full membership and authorities restored. This secondary dispute between particular (local) and universal interests would also play out over the centuries to come. The Donatists thereafter formed a break away and persecuted minority faction (reminiscent of the earlier church, a condition which did not escape their notice). In this way other theologic points became exposed: each side claimed the others were *schismatics* (“they” had broken the unity of the church, completely unjustifiably and, therefore, “they” forfeited any possibility of salvation which could only be gained within the church); the Donatists claimed that lapsed (i.e., “apostate”) clergy cannot administer the sacraments nor minister to believers; only those clergy who had held firm under persecution could do so legitimately. The Donatists saw themselves as a true church because they had stood firm in their faith and endured persecution (as had the earliest Christians), but they were charged as *schismatics* because they denied the universal church’s interpretive authority over the sacraments. Their opponents in this controversy, now called “Catholic” (meaning universal), took the position that lapsed clergy who repented could be restored to full authority.² One of the greatest of the church fathers, Augustine, bishop of Hippo, was subsequently drawn into the controversy at the urging of Emperor Constantine. His conclusion was that the church was, by necessity, a mixture of saints and sinners (after Matt 13:24–31) and he noted how utterly dangerous, counter-productive and potentially devastating it would be to try to separate the sinners from the saints in this life. Man could not recognize his own righteousness and, the bishop’s advice (to use a modern expression) was to *let God sort it out* because no mere mortal could. In his view the church’s ministry, preaching and sanctity did not rely on the holiness of its ministers but only on the person of Christ (in whose name ministerial work was done). Indeed, schism was viewed by far a worse sin than handing over some books, or lapsing from the church under persecution. Looking at the Donatist controversy and its aftermath, McGrath wrote that four “marks” of the true church had as a result been determined by the end

2. Hillerbrand, *A New History of Christianity*, 76–78.

of the fourth century. The marks, as found in the ecumenical creeds, are best summed up by the phrase “one holy catholic and apostolic.” He went on to develop these themes into a useful discussion.³

The term or mark “one” refers to the unbroken unity of the church which denied the validity of *schismatics* and outside of which salvation was impossible. We might now think it rather self-serving, but both interpretation of theology and the customs of pastoral care taught that Christ was to be found only in the Catholic institution which was the only true mediator and guarantor of God’s will and promise to redeem sinners. Redemption was partially achieved through the sacrament of penance augmented by as many Masses, good works and bought indulgences as could be had. Spiritualism aside, the institutional church and its sacramental system was considered the only route to heaven.⁴ The term or mark “holy” means that the true church depends on the “righteousness” of its members, the clear yardstick of the Donatists, although the word itself had different definitions attached to it and became of supreme importance during the Reformation. The Old Testament, for example, defines holy as “someone or something which God has set apart” whereas the New Testament restricted the meaning to people “dedicated to God” (or *called out* by God) and who set themselves apart. The term or mark “catholic” means universal or general. For example, the English Bible translators often made a distinction between the epistles of James and John (addressed to all Christians and therefore called the “catholic epistles”) and those of Paul (which addressed the situation and needs of local bodies, what we might label “particular epistles”). The early church thus recognized the existence of distinctive local chapters which, yet, shared in the “catholic” totality. It was under Constantine that the term “catholic” took on imperial and legislative meanings, and congregations outside of the established church were declared illegal. By the time of the Reformation, Protestants argued that “doctrinal fidelity” (a close dependence on Scripture) was more important than “institutional continuity” (a Roman Catholic staple) and many did argue that “they” were the ones clearly consistent with the early, dynamic-but-persecuted Christian church. The term or mark “apostolic” indicated the direct link to the apostles. The nature and identity of the Christian church would exercise many of the major reformers of the sixteenth century due to these questions and controversies.

3. McGrath, *Christian Theology*, 419–24.

4. Wriedt, “Founding a New Church,” 51–52.

THE LATE MEDIEVAL VIEW

Considering all these early issues—the church as guarantor of institutional, historical and theologic continuity for the people of God—it becomes clear enough why church leaders took on responsibilities far beyond the original mandate of finding and binding the faithful. Education, culture, society, charity, economics, administration, legalities, bureaucracy, diplomacy, political rule, etc. all became church concerns for legitimate reasons. From safeguarding the souls of its members the church seems to have also taken on control of their minds and bodies as well. To paraphrase a current critic of religion, the church and its officers really were doing the best they could but they had to contend with limited information, ever-present fears of death and divine judgment, low life expectancy, brutal living conditions, and the widespread illiteracy of their followers. All this and with no sure resources either.⁵ If it was genuinely a choice between a temporary, local and self-regarding human institution (i.e., a lay authority subject to all the foibles of man) and the eternal, outward looking, universal, spiritual institution (i.e., the body of Christ founded by God), which was the better institution to look after all these temporal matters and safeguard, nurture and protect the people of God even, if necessary, from themselves?

On account of these additional duties, however, the church and its clergy developed beyond its spiritual mandate. It had a necessary stake in the political realm, and over the centuries it came more clearly to reflect the society it protected and out of which it had grown. By the late medieval period the church regulated Christian society much as royal governments regulated kingdoms. The church's king (or pope) ruled over an aristocracy (princes of the church) who had local rule over a vast proletariat (the rank and file clergy and the laity). Clerical educators taught replacement clerics in universities; clerical diplomats discussed peace between the states among themselves on behalf of lay political authorities; clerical lawyers regulated society (in theory dealing with only spiritual issues but often they were learned in civil law too); clerical administrators and bureaucrats kept royal governments ticking over. Eventually, in some places, clerics simply took over temporal rule outright, making war and negotiating peace between themselves without secular interference. Indeed, three of the seven electors of the Holy Roman Empire were prince-archbishops! Of course people wondered how this had become the case. Erasmus harshly criticized Julius II (the so-called warrior pope) in *Julius Excluded from Heaven* because of his military adventurism. At one point the situation was so bad that, in an

5. Hitchens, *God Is not Great*, 68.

attempt to resolve a schism at the highest levels the church actually ended up torn apart by three rival popes! By the time that issue was resolved too much had been written critical of papal supremacy, conciliar power, the extent of the church's authority and the role of lay rulers to simply go back to a simpler time, and universities were emerging as alternative theologic authorities (giving kingdoms an alternative opinion to Rome if one was required). The religious, social, political and economic ideas of the church, however, were still by and large the ideas practised by and/or enforced upon the masses, and they were satisfied with the structures and practises, rituals and ceremonies of the church. Higher up the social scale one goes, however, the less contentment one seems to find. The clergy were often in contest with lay political powers, but they faced none of the barriers (like taxation, civil regulations or military or familial expectations). It was an impotent discontent on the part of the lay authorities, however; as yet, there were no widely known legitimate alternatives. Yes, some turned to so-called heresy movements (which seemed only to satisfy practical short-term needs) or to more individually satisfying practises like mysticism, but none of this detracted from the power of the church as an institution.

By the late medieval period it was next to impossible, therefore, for the church any longer to live up to its simple, preliminary, spiritual mandate, because less than a fifth of the clergy were exclusively devoted to it (and most of these few were at the lowest pay grade, the so-called "work for hirelings" generally drawn out of the least educated). The original mission of the church, pastoral care (the ministering to, preaching to and teaching of the laity in the ways of Christianity) sometimes known as "cure of souls," was by the late medieval period in the hands of vicars and chaplains who had no real incentive to strive for self-improvement. It was futile; the real work of the high fliers in the church, those who made their way to the senior positions (bishops, archbishops and cardinals), and who made the real decisions about everything were largely dedicated to finding the necessary resources to maintain control over all the church's responsibilities, whether by shifting around existing incomes to temporarily more important pet projects (like building new cathedrals) or by finding new sources of income (e.g., new license fees). Money was the common denominator and sometimes economics held sway even over theologic developments. At a time when, on account of humanism, lay piety was searching for greater spiritual succor the church seemed to be entirely material orientated (worldly rather than spiritual), and forever shifting resources away from the servicing of that lay spiritual need and its original simple mandate. In this light, Luther's anti-indulgence rants of the late 1510s may be seen as the famous final straw. He certainly was not the first person to make the connection, however.

It has been noted that the clergy with responsibilities closest to the illiterate masses, those priests, chaplains, vicars, and rectors, had no real incentive to strive for improvement or to offer more than a minimal shepherding of the flock. This is not to say they did not do their jobs efficiently, just that they often did so mechanically. The dynamic, gifted and enthusiastic few were rapidly moved on to the more necessary work of keeping the entire enterprise financially afloat. Those on the scene were the unspectacular, and they probably knew it. If some short term injection of spiritual excitement was needed (and this generally to raise money) there was always a pool of guest preachers available in the form of itinerate friars. These were men who belonged to no particular endowed order, who studiously avoided wealth (seeing it as a distraction from the teaching mission), and who relied instead on gifts from the laity and on charity. They were more often renowned for their missionary zeal as much as for their austere spirituality, but they could offer a real alternative to the local priest in other ways besides exciting preaching and fund-raising. They could, for instance, hear confessions (allowing parishioners an alternative to the man they must be in contact with day after day) and they offered educational opportunities to those who might not otherwise have been noticed. Indeed, over time the friars became real competition for those priests who did not seek out self-improvement. By the late medieval period, however, friars were beginning to accuse and ridicule priests for the apparent idleness in their preaching and teaching work, and for their ignorance of the Scriptures while priests were counter-charging friars as mere entertainers, good for a brief engagement, a bit of short-term excitement, but not sturdy enough for the long term nor conscientious enough to have a care for the local situation in their preaching. Both priests and friars rounded on monks (and nuns) as mere consumers of landed wealth—spiritual parasites—only mechanically performing what limited duties they seemed to have (e.g., praying for the souls of benefactors in purgatory). All three groups simply forgot, over time, where their focus was supposed to have been; that is, they forgot the poor parishioners, the true believers, and the message.

Such internecine criticism was often taken to heart, however, and provoked reactions throughout the medieval period. Monks, so much the focus of humanist banter, started breaking ranks within their own orders to separate themselves from the focus of the criticisms. The Benedictine, Franciscan, Dominican and Augustinian houses each saw breakaway “observant” factions established in the late fourteenth century. These observant orders claimed to forego the collective worldliness of the parent houses (which sometimes controlled landed estates rivaling the holdings of bishops and aristocratic magnates) and membership in order the better to observe

the regulations (the rules of their orders). These factions in turn fed the fires of priestly and humanist criticism. Hillerbrand found that among the more pious laity, criticism produced a kind of spiritual alienation from the church altogether. The pious laity increasingly turned their attention to the cult of saints (superior, but still human, intermediaries with God) or to veneration of the Virgin Mary or into activities with spiritual overtones (e.g., the adoration of relics or the performance of pilgrimages to sacred sites).⁶ The most striking example of this criticism, however, more so even than Erasmus' *Praise of Folly* and the cult of Mary is that we begin to see by the late medieval period ordinary laymen and rich noblemen putting aside their social differences and forming their own religious groups, known as confraternities, lay-fraternities, lay-sororities and oratorios (like the Brethren of the Common Life). In such societies they could perform acts of charity, or live spiritual lives through servicing the needs of the true believers in the wider community (in historically agreed ways), without having to take apparently nonsensical religious vows or any notice whatsoever of politics, economics, culture, etc. Nobles concerned for the state of their souls could avoid association altogether with the wider, materialistic church by establishing personal chapels with priests dedicated solely to them and their households. Another problem within the church was the question of control. All levels, from pope to humblest curate, knew the extent of their power, were jealous of their own authorities and jurisdictions and knew just how to bypass higher authorities without too much trouble, which made a mockery of both ecclesiastical discipline and local Episcopal controls, exacerbating many of the other problems faced by the church.

Whether Lutheran, Zwinglian, Anglican or some ever more esoteric grouping, they were all sure that the Roman model of their daily experience (and the models of some of their evangelical rivals) did not live up to the distinctive ideal before their own eyes while looking back to the church's earliest days. Part of the problem for modern readers has been in identifying exactly what was the basis for these ideals? Which early Christian church did the reformers, of whatever particular grouping, identify as the true, pure one? Another part of the problem is that society as a whole and the many previous generations of Christians were largely unconcerned with the issue. For all intents and purposes, in the popular mind the church had always been the way it was, that is, a constant fact of life along with death, pain and taxation. It had a function, of course, and it seemed to be fulfilling it so was change necessary.

6. Hillerbrand, *The Division of Christendom*, 15–20.

For those who considered such matters, the church was a gathering of true believers united by common beliefs and differentiated from falsehoods by such hallmarks as institutional, theologic or historic continuity (as discussed). So, despite the obvious discrepancies (the insight of hindsight could only make plain that the Christian church of 1500 was not the same as that of 400), this was still a useful observation as was some fairly common familial imagery. God the Father, creator of man in His own image, was sometimes set alongside the church as a mother figure, raising and nurturing man so that he would be worthy to be considered one body with Christ, the Son. To McGrath's observations we may add another, that the church was a dynamic, rather than a static, institution. Yes, it was not the same as it had been in the fourth century but the changes had not been haphazard or ill-considered (they evolved naturally). The church had in-built mechanisms for development (e.g., councils, synods, universities, conclaves) which strengthened the claims of institutional, historic and theologic continuities. And yet, as all reformation scholars know, by the late medieval period it was generally recognized (for those who had time to think about it) that there was something wrong with the church. Euan Cameron summed this up in this way: over the centuries the church as an institution had spread itself too thin and had taken on far too many responsibilities not in its original mandate of gathering true believers together, united in common beliefs, differentiated from falsehoods through established continuities.⁷ We noted where all these other responsibilities had come from so we need not read anything sinister into it (as the reformers often did); the simple truth is that the early church just took its responsibilities far too seriously and was far too successful. We will consider these issues in due course. In many ways, it must be said, that the medieval church worked as efficiently as it did for as long as it had and that it still inspired so much unity in the sixteenth century defies logic.

Ecclesiology as a doctrinal focus drew out significant theoretical conflicts in the Reformation period and these are mapped out and examined in the following five chapters of this book. Many historians follow A G Dickens and look to abuses in the institutional church and related anti-clericalism and anti-papalism as the basic cause behind the Reformation. No one doubted that the church needed reform from top to bottom; the practical implementation of this realization by reformers and traditionalists alike, however, is my key theme. I choose, therefore, to dedicate chapter one to a discussion of the problems in the church (its obsession with finances, its material orientation, and its questionable ceremonial minutiae)

7. Cameron, *The European Reformation*, 20.

as a reflection of problems within Christendom itself, using the lens of the influential writings of Erasmus (e.g., *Handbook of the Christian Soldier* and *Praise of Folly*). Erasmus (and the *ad fontes* rule of the humanists in general) inspired the reformers in their own quests to replace the centuries' worth of appended human tradition with a more spiritually and ceremonially pure church, one more particularly suited (in time and place) rather than (like Erasmus) continue to support a church falsely centered at Rome and under the power of one human being. I will draw out and examine similarities in their various approaches to the *Augustinian* or *Pauline mandates* and what the *ad fontes* rule revealed to them. Humanism, philosophy, the rejections of scholasticism and their own experiences and doctrines of predestination and salvation suggested to the reformers a variety of elements that a *genuine* church must embody and, once I have established what these fundamentals are (e.g., pure gospel, genuine sacramental theology, appropriate administration, clear leadership of professed believers), I will go on to examine how each reformer accommodation their ecclesiology to the vision of a pure church. Without putting too fine a point on it, I found many similarities and many differing interpretations of ceremony, doctrine and office, and I will present those findings in the following chapters.

I will start with Luther as the subject of chapter two (as he was chronologically just ahead of Zwingli). At least from the *Ninety-five theses* onward (and largely in conflict with Roman authorities and radicals like Karlstadt) Luther developed an ecclesiological position highlighting an external and visible church of all professed believers containing within itself, and protecting, an internally understood invisible gathering of genuine believers. That is, the church *visible* and the church *invisible*. Luther placed greater emphasis on the latter, however, leaving the former very much to the desires of the locality, and he placed limitations on his own *priesthood of all believers* doctrine, restrictions which some of his colleagues and disciples subsequently rejected. Karlstadt, for instance, found Luther's definitions ultimately unsatisfying, theorizing that the church must also direct pure Christian living through scriptural purity and the immediate removal of non-scriptural materials. I will show Karlstadt taking Luther's *priesthood* doctrine to its radical, democratic limit, thus setting himself at odds with the master. In chapter three, I will do something similar with Zwingli's reform of the Zürich church and the subsequent distancing of his doctrine from a radical version based on perceived scriptural purity.

Here I will examine Zwingli's *Abrahamic-covenantal* understanding of the church. At the heart of Zwinglian ecclesiology was a Holy Spirit inspired moral, Christ-centric, code of behavior. As did Luther (at about the same time) Zwingli too faced a radicalized version of his doctrine which

threatened the church settlement in Zürich (as Wittenberg's settlement had been threatened by Karlstadt's own more militant scriptural interpretation). Building up to that I will examine many of Zwingli's dedicated treatises, focusing on the disciplinary, office-holding and ceremonial aspects of his ecclesiology, some of which developed in opposition to traditional Catholic interpretation and some of which developed, subsequently, in opposition to the radicalism of such men as Conrad Grebel, Balthazar Hubmaier and Thomas Sattler. I will focus some attention as well on their developments of isolated, disciplined, true believers-only sects and what this meant in terms of ecclesiology and the prime mandates of Augustine and Paul.

Erasmus, Luther, Zwingli (with Karlstadt and Hubmaier *et al*) give us the basis of three rival evangelical traditions by the mid-1530s, the height of what J V Fesko called the dynamic period of the Reformation⁸: a "Lutheran" view of a divided membership and irrelevant externals, a "Zwinglian" view of covenantal importance, and radical isolationist doctrines based on extreme interpretations of the masters' doctrines, Scripture, and the influence of mysticism. These three options were subsequently, I will show in chapter four, taken up and modified (or opposed) by a "second generation" of Reformation thinkers including Oecolampadius, Bucer, Bullinger, Calvin and Beza. I have not taken "second generation" to mean second best, nor do I think these men any less significant than Luther or Zwingli. They were often contemporaries, or nearly so, and often close friends with the chief reformers of Wittenberg and Zürich. I use the term merely because of the fact that they took on and adapted the doctrine of the two masters, or of the original dissidents, and emphasized particular aspects much more than did the first generation (and much more suited to their own locations). Indeed, more so than Luther or Zwingli, such men as Bucer and Calvin almost normalized the doctrine of the dynamic period of the Reformation, leading Europe into the confessional period. In this chapter, as well as considering the true marks of the fundamental mandates I will present Oecolampadius' concentration on organization and opposition to radical Anabaptism, presenting him largely as a disciple of Zwingli's covenantal-communal view which he thought the sectarians disrupted. Bucer took up the fellowship view as well, but as Strasbourg was a center of toleration which neither Zürich nor Basle was, he found it advantageous (in the short to mid-term) to emphasize a moral and social imperative to see to the welfare of others. Melancthon, still in Wittenberg, moved away from the fundamental Lutheran position of two orders within the church toward Bucer's position, hoping to find common cause between all evangelical groups. This placed him in conflict with a

8. Fesko, *Beyond Calvin*.

radical Lutheran named Philip Rothmann, who formulated a doctrine seeking to recapture the purity of the primitive church. Rothmann went so far as to argue that the changes made by the reformers were, not to put too fine a point on it, less than half-baked. Bullinger (Zwingli's successor at Zürich) redeveloped Zwinglian covenant theology to meet a raising demand from outside the city-state, becoming a leading diplomat (via correspondence) as well as a leading reformer in his own right. I shall show how he laid emphasis on the work of the preaching office (taking up Bucer's theory of preachers as *cooperarii* or God's agents), incorporating this into Zwinglian covenant theology as a means of spreading Swiss doctrine to other important centers of reform, like Heidelberg, Hess and England. Finally, in this chapter I will present an examination of Calvin's attempted reformulation of the Geneva church as a guardian and enforcer of public morality (which he may have adopted from Bucer) with Beza subsequently taking up the theme for export (mainly into France).

Chapter five is dedicated to the unique ecclesiology developed in England, a doctrine which incorporated some continental influences while giving them a distinctive Englishness (based on constituted religious positions imposed from above or taken from John Wycliffe and Lollard sources). I have selected instances and theorists which I think best highlight that singular English situation. It is a dense chapter certainly, featuring the influence on royal policy of the Tyndale/More dispute over basic ecclesiological issues, the thinking of John Hooper and Nicholas Ridley on externals, and Robert Barnes' introduction into England of the basic Lutheran doctrine. Subsequently I will examine how that gave way to a more spiritual, Swiss covenantal view, as sponsored by Bucer, Peter Martyr Vermigli and John à Lasco under Edward VI. I will then present an examination of the evangelical position in exile under Mary, and the subsequent schisms which built up as a result between competing doctrinal positions in the Elizabeth era, namely conformity, non-conformity and separatist Puritanism. The conclusion I have dedicated to a review of Catholic ecclesiology of the so-called Catholic and Counter-Reformation, starting with the Lateran V council, moving through the doctrine of Gasparo Contarini on episcopal office, the reforms recommended by the *Consilium de emendanda ecclesia* (1537), ending with the impact of Trent on the office and work of bishops and priests. Here, I will use the work of Archbishop Borromeo of Milan as a case study.

Like any intellectual commodity (e.g., a song, a poem, a philosophy) reformation ecclesiology grew out of certain common ideas, was modified and was expressed in ways better suited to the particular locations, and what I want to show here is that despite the disputes and debates (and even the

bloodshed), reformation theologians were in fact all trying to do the same thing, that is, rediscover and reformulate a pure, Christian, church.

SAMPLE