McGill University
Library

ARC SUPPLEMENTS

3001 137 189 Y

HULDRYCH ZWINGLI, 1484-1531: A LEGACY OF RADICAL REFORM

Papers from the
1984 International Zwingli Symposium
McGill University

E.J. Furcha, editor

ARC Supplement #2
Faculty of Religious Studies
McGill University, Montreal

FRC
ARC

1985

BR345
I55
1985

1423992

Rel St

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

International Zwingli Symposium (1984 : McGill University)
Huldrych Zwingli, 1484-1531 : a legacy of radical reform

(ARC supplement ; #2)
ISBN 0-7717-0124-1

1. Zwingli, Ulrich, 1484-1531 – Congresses.
2. Reformation – Switzerland – Congresses.
I. Furcha, E.J. (Edward J.) II. McGill University. Faculty of Religious Studies III. Title. IV. Series: ARC. Supplement ; #2.

BR345.I68 1984 270.6'092'4 C85-090077-8
ISBN 0-7717-0124-1
Dépôt Légal: IIième Trimestre 1985
© 1985 by E.J. Furcha. All rights reserved.

CONTENTS

Foreword J.C. McLelland.....1

Preface E.J. Furcha.....2

List of Contributors.....

Zwingli the Loser U. Gäbler.....

Luther and Zwingli: Reformation of Faith-Reformation of Society
G.W. Locher.....

Lutherdeutsch and Zwinglideutsch
J. Schmidt.....

Zwingli the Statesman
J. Rogge.....

Zwingli and Radical Early Zwinglianism
J. Stayer.....62

Between the Scylla of the Status-Quo and the Charybdis of Spiritual Radicalism
E.J. Furcha.....83

Resonating with Zwingli
H.W. Pipkin.....

The Religious Values of the Eucharistic Thinking of Zwingli
H.W. Pipkin.....107

Zwingli and the Old Testament
G. Hobbs.....p.144

Meta-Zwingli or Anti-Zwingli? Bullinger and Calvin in Eucharistic Concord
J.C. McLelland.....

FOREWORD

Joseph C. McLelland

Conferences in celebration of birthday anniversaries are revealing. Martin Luther was honoured far and wide in 1983, in all sorts of expected and unexpected quarters. Ulrich Zwingli in the following year posed a different question. Why is he still so overshadowed by Luther, why cast as Marburg antagonist or martyr with sword in hand? Even if it was a halberd, the point remains: Zwingli is the opposite of Cranmer, whose death was considered the better part of his life. If only Zwingli had lived longer, to develop his thought---especially on sacraments--and to correct the impression of militancy! Thus those who assign him any sort of priority in Reformation history and thought are put on the defensive, as if the obvious has escaped them and they strain at gnats. On this view, Zwingli is the neglected Reformer because he deserves to be.

Our Montreal conference on Zwingli corrected the caricature of this remarkable man by its very breadth of topic as well as depth of analysis. Published papers notoriously miss the dynamic of verbal exchange, of disagreement, of the colourful personalities who love Zwingli a little or a lot. But at the least they sketch the chief topics on the scholarly agenda today and how they contribute to preparing a more responsible curriculum vitae on Zwingli's behalf. Naturally the topic of sacramental teaching is here, and the church-state doctrine. Perhaps more to the point is his scriptural basis and exegetical method, his pastoral concern and considerable practical theology. Above all, his vision of community becomes clear: a unity of life and work in the Gospel, a unity which makes the formulation of its problematics according to church-state or secular-sacred terms inappropriate. The still figure on the battlefield at Kappel may have been heroic or foolhardy, unfortunate or ill advised; he is certainly not tragic.

These papers are commended to you, then, in behalf of a better image of a great theologian, pastor and churchman. May his memory be well and honestly served by our work!

PREFACE

E.J. Furcha

The Faculty of Religious Studies, McGill University, Montreal in conjunction with the Faculty of Graduate Studies and the Renaissance and Reformation Group hosted an International Zwingli Symposium, October 2-5, 1984. The Symposium was generously supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, Ottawa.

Scholars from Switzerland, The Netherlands, Scotland, the German Democratic Republic, Canada and the U.S.A. participated in the three-day event to celebrate the life and work of Huldrych Zwingli, 1484-1531, whose endeavours as reformer of the church in Zurich largely set in motion the so-called Reformed Tradition--a fact that is little appreciated in North America.

In the following pages the papers read during the Symposium are presented (largely unchanged) to a larger audience in the hope that others may share in the excitement of reading Zwingli in the context of the late twentieth century and may continue the debate wherever men and women are concerned with the nature and task of the church--its source of strength, its mission, the authority by which it speaks to human issues and the manner in which it may be renewed.

While we are aware that those who participated in the Symposium will not require a chart of main events in the life of Zwingli, we provide it here for those who come to Zwingli for the first time and who know him merely as a contemporary of Luther, Cranmer or Calvin, but lack a more intimate acquaintance with this remarkable parish priest whose genuine concern for change led him onto the path that made of him a major reformer of the church in the early sixteenth century and whom history--both social and religious--has elevated almost to the level of a national hero. Anyone who wishes to learn more may turn to Zwingli in translation, available in a two-volume edition published by Pickwick Publications, Allison Park, PA,[1] or in the three-volume edition initiated by S.M. Jackson and carried on after the first volume by his associates.[2]

For a readable bio-history of the Reformer we

suggest R. Potter, *Zwingli*, and for sound historical assessments of Zwingli, the works of G. Locher and U. Gäbler.[3]

Important Dates:

Jan. 1, 1484	Zwingli's birth in Wildhaus, Toggenburg.
1489-1498	Primary schooling in Weesen; further education in Basel and Berne.
1498-1506	University education in Vienna and Basel (*via antiqua*); M.A. degree obtained.
1506-1516	Priest in Glarus.
1516-1518	Priest in Einsiedeln. Study of classics, patristics, scholastics. Attraction to humanist thought of Erasmus of Rotterdam.
1519-1531	People's priest and later chief minister at the Grossmünster, Zurich.

During his Zurich years, Zwingli undertook reforms of the church by carefully responding to contemporary needs and measuring his "correctives" over against Scripture which he studied diligently. He encouraged fellow clergy and laypersons alike to study in Greek, Hebrew, Latin and in the vernacular translations that were being undertaken. Nothing was changed, however, until every responsible citizen had been appraised of the intended change, Scripture had been brought to bear on the significance or need for change and the Council--which assumed ever greater responsibility in determining all affairs of the City--had given approval. Several important disputations were held in the city from January 1523 onwards. These were under the auspices of the Council and included not only clergy and doctors of the church, but other invited participants. Among the issues debated and acted on were the nature and form of the eucharist, adequate

church organization, the use of surplus ecclesiastical property, the form and nature of baptism, Christian discipline and related matters.

Zwingli's premature death almost brought the reform work that had been carefully undertaken to naught. Fortunately, Heinrich Bullinger was chosen as his successor at the Grossmünster. In his long ministry he consolidated what Zwingli had begun and helped inaugurate what eventually came to be known as the Reformed Church of Zurich.

Zwingli has had a bad press outside Zurich and Switzerland. His contemporaries opposed him for what they knew second hand or understood poorly. Traditionalists saw in him a dangerous schismatic and other Reformers treated him as an enthusiast. Later developments in large segments of Protestantism gave greater attention to John Calvin, the Reformer of Geneva, or busied themselves with adaptations of Reformed teaching which soon obscured many of the directives and institutions of the great originator and consigned him to an undeserved oblivion.

Our Symposium last October is one small effort by scholars sympathetic to Zwingli and his work to redress the balance. We present this volume of our research and reflection in the hope that the clarity and certainty of the word that was heard by Zwingli and those who shared his vision of a renewed church may not be obscured by our efforts to understand Zwingli and introduce him to a larger audience.

A book of this sort cannot recreate, of course, the excitement of intense scholarly debate--either in its sharpness or in the warmth of longstanding friendly exchange. Those who were present in the Birks Building of McGill University will recall, however, the pain and the euphoria. Those who read what we wrote will be challenged, we trust, to turn to the writings of Zwingli himself, there to discover for themselves what it meant for him to respond creatively to the divine word, translate that response into a meaningful context and to live and work in discipleship.

The papers are arranged in the order in which they were presented. We hope to have thus preserved some of the "planned progression" and to recreate a sense of the ongoing debate which should keep Zwingli scholars reading and reflecting for generations to come.

Thanks to a grant from the Graduate Faculty, McGill University, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the Birks Fund of the Faculty of Religious Studies and an anonymous donation this second volume of ARC Supplements is made possible. We offer it to our readers in the hope that it may help advance the cause of "true religion".

NOTES

1. *Selected Writings of Huldrych Zwingli*, Vol.I *In Defense of the Reformed Faith*, E.J. Furcha, editor and translator, Vol.II *In Search of True Religion*, H. Wayne Pipkin, editor and translator. Allison Park: Pickwick Publications, 1984.
2. *Selected Works of Huldrych Zwingli*, edited by Samuel M. Jackson, Phildelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1901. *The Latin Works and the Correspondence of Huldreich Zwingli*, Vol.I. edited by S.M. Jackson (1912); Vol.II (1922); Vol.III (1929) New York, London, G.P. Putnam and Sons.
3. Ulrich Gäbler, *Huldrych Zwingli, Eine Einführung in sein Leben*, Munich, Beck, 1983. Gottfried W. Locher, *Zwingli's Thought. New Perspectives*, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1981.

ZWINGLI THE LOSER

Ulrich Gäbler

Huldrych Zwingli was killed in action on the 11th of October 1531. The religious war between Zurich and its Catholic opponents ended in disastrous defeat for the Protestants. The commentaries on Zwingli's death are paradigmatic for the way in which his life and work were assessed by various parties in his own times, as well as for the manner in which his significance is judged by different schools of thought in our own day. Generally, his history is viewed as that of a loser.

Four attitudes toward Zwingli's death can be distinguished. *First*, the Catholics regarded the finale of Zwingli's life as a fair sentence imposed on the life of a notorious heretic and rebel against the political institutions of the Swiss Confederacy. In an early stage of his career Zwingli had already opposed the Bishop of Constance by denying his authority over the church of Zurich. As time went on Zwingli succeeded in playing a prominent role in the political leadership in Zurich. One of Zwingli's earliest opponents, Hans Salat in Lucerne, referred to this political prominence in the following often repeated terms: "In Zurich Zwingli holds the office of Mayor, Councillor and Secretary to the Councils simultaneously." The First War of Kappel, 1529, demonstrates the political lengths to which Zwingli and his followers were prepared to go. They had no compunction whatever about seeking to extend their influence over the whole of the Swiss Confederacy. Failing in 1529, they began another war in 1531. But this time God pronounced a clear judgement on the rebel from Zurich: he preserved the Confederacy in its traditional form and in so doing plainly rebuffed Zurich and its leader Huldrych Zwingli.

Second, Luther and the Lutherans have also been very consistent in their appraisal of Zwingli. Their views on his death, too, were of a piece with their assessment of his life. They like the Catholics perceived Zwingli to be a political figure who received his just reward, according to Jesus' word: "All who put their trust in the sword shall die by the sword." But in addition to this element

of violence there is a second important aspect in the Lutheran appraisal of Zwingli. The image of Zwingli in the Lutheran mind is partly determined by the clash that occurred between Zwingli and Luther on the matter of the Lord's Supper. Even his death was interpreted from the point of view of this controversy. His eucharistic doctrine was held to be heretical. His denial of the bodily presence of Christ in the elements of the sacrament made him a heretic, who in being killed quite simply received the just due of a heretic. In and through the resolution of the Battle of Kappel God had, among other things, also pronounced judgement on Zwingli's views on the Lord's Supper. On October 11, 1531, the Lutherans triumphed along with the Catholics.

Third, Zwingli had better relations with Martin Bucer in Strasbourg than with almost any other theologian. This explains Bucer's deep shock at the news of Zwingli's death. But even Bucer registered a critical note in this connection. He, could not readily accept Zwingli's political involvement in Zurich and saw his death on the battlefield as a direct result of this involvement. It is not fitting for a minister and servant of God's Word to take up the sword in battle. The relationship between theologians and the church, on the one hand, and the civil authorities, on the other, was far too close in Zurich, and was harmful to the cause of the Gospel. The church should not become involved in political affairs, and the state was authority in the church only up to a certain point. After Bullinger had compared Zwingli to Luther in a letter to Bucer, Bucer characterized Zwingli's lifework in the following astute observation: "What Luther is in the world, Zwingli is in Switzerland."

Fourth, in Zurich itself the news of the defeat of Kappel and Zwingli's death came as a complete surprise. No one had expected anything like that to happen. This event caused a crisis in both ecclesiastical and political circles in Zurich. A growing fear that the Kappel fiasco represented the punishment of God himself upon Zurich paralysed many Reformed theologians.

Zwingli's successor, Heinrich Bullinger, however, stoutly defended Zwingli's person and work. He was convinced that Zwingli had brought about a renewal of Christian morality. In reply to Catholic and Lutheran reproaches Bullinger asserted that

Zwingli's death in no way proved the errancy of his positions and ways. Had not faithful Christians been robbed of their lives many times in the past? Did the Catholic Church not recognize martyrs and honour them? Why, then, could Zwingli too not have died as witness to the true faith? With respect to the violent way in which Zwingli met his death Bullinger observed, further, that in the Biblical narratives godly men lost their lives in this manner, Zechariah, for example, and Stephen and James.

Bullinger's defence of Zwingli along these lines resembled nothing quite so much as an exercise in treading on thin ice since Zwingli himself had stated nine years earlier that the defeat of the Swiss in the Battle of Bicocca had been a divine judgement. But Bucer caused Bullinger the most difficulty with his criticism of the Zwinglian commingling of ecclesiastical and civil authority. Bullinger pointed out that as chaplain Zwingli was duty bound to go into battle with his flock, and that in light of his views it was entirely fitting and necessary for him actively to support his people even in such worldly pursuits as military warfare.

Reviewing these four attitudes toward Zwingli one sees a striking parallel in them. All four of them share the perception that the most prominent feature of Zwingli's work was his political and social involvement, which was sealed by his death on the battlefield of Kappel. In each of them Zwingli is portrayed as a "political" reformer. The differences between them lie in the area of positive or negative judgement regarding Zwingli's involvements.

In his memorial address in honour of Zwingli in January 1532 Bullinger portrayed Zwingli as a prophet who succeeded in improving the ethical life of his city. This aspect of improvement of Christian morals plays no part whatever in any summing up of Luther's work. It is on the basis of such considerations that we are led to our first conclusion: Already at his death and probably as a result of the way he died, the *theologian* Zwingli disappeared from the scene. The emphasis on Zwingli the *activist* limited the impact of his theological work from the very beginning. One could perhaps put it this way: the *theologian* Zwingli was defeated by the *activist* Zwingli. On the other hand, one has to admit that neither the friends nor the opponents of

Zwingli were totally wrong in depicting him primarily as activist. For, indeed, Zwingli's teaching on social life, which was given concrete shape by the establishment of certain institutions in Zurich, is one of the essential features of his work.

The Reformer of Zurich developed his teachings with an eye to influencing the whole of the social reality in which he lived. It is the intention of the Word of God to take on concrete shape in human life and demonstrate its effective power through the improvement of moral behaviour. God's final judgement stands at the gate. There the pastor will be required to render an account as to whether he had exposed existing social abuses or had remained silent about them. It is the task of ecclesiastical office-bearers to work toward a moral renewal of the whole people. This is what reformation means. In no case may Christians shirk their responsibility for the whole and devote themselves to the establishment of a separate ecclesiastical organization.

It is convictions of this nature that led Zwingli to view the baptismal inauguration and ingathering of special, separate Christian congregations as divisive of human community and as a deadly threat to his work. It is for this reason that he assigned to the Council of Zurich, composed entirely of Christians, the responsibility of overseeing all matters of ecclesiastical doctrine and life. He did not do this with a view to subjecting the church to the state or because he wanted to make politicians of pastors, but rather out of a deep concern to avoid the situation that had obtained in pre-Reformation society, in which the clergy formed a state within the state. A situation such as that gives rise to nothing other than self-centredness and duplicity, to the great detriment of the church. For this reason Zwingli repudiated any attempt to exercise church discipline on the basis of doctrine. To his mind life was of greater moment than doctrine. If it is true that this is one of or even *the* main feature of Zwingli's work, we may proceed to the question as to whether this position was adopted after the reformer's death. In other words, I should like now to direct to our attention to the matter of the spread of Zwinglianism.

Here one notes with some astonishment that in the "race" to influence the minds and win the hearts

of people, Zwingli and Zwinglianism were soon overtaken and eclipsed by Calvinism. Allow me to detail in brief sketches the historical developments in various centres of Europe. In Zurich itself Bullinger throughout his life not only theoretically defended Zwingli's conception of the coordination of civil and ecclesiastical authority but also took practical steps to preserve, consolidate and enlarge upon the institutions initiated by Zwingli. Instrumentalities such as the Church Synod and the Zurich Marriage and Morality Tribunal are good examples of this. The structure of the Zurich church remained unchanged right up to and even during the French Revolution. In 1796, for example, the mayor of Zurich, David Wyss, came out strongly in favour of the traditional role of the church in Zurich society and this despite the fact that he had been influenced by the Enlightenment. To his mind the State of Zurich provided a perfect model of how a modern government should supervise religious life. To illustrate what he meant Wyss referred to established procedures for the appointment of pastors and to the clergy's required oath of loyalty to the magistracy.

Berne, like Zurich, maintained the Zwinglian type of church government for more than two hundred years. In Basel, however, Zwinglianism was supplanted very early. Already during Zwingli's lifetime the Zwinglian teaching on church discipline was being opposed there by John Oecolampadius. Later on, the Lutheran-minded Simon Sulzer distanced his cause from Zurich and Berne, highlighting this fact by his refusal to subscribe to either the Consensus Tigurinus or the Second Helvetic Confession. As far as the three territories of Zurich, Berne and Basel are concerned, one cannot really speak of a direct showdown between Zwinglianism and Calvinism. It was a different story, however, in the territory of the Vaud, where already during the lifetime of Bullinger and Calvin the relationship between Calvinism and "the other Reformed tradition" was one of downright competition (W. Baker). Both Bullinger and Calvin made efforts to channel the course of developments there into a direction of their own liking. I refer here to the region of the Vaud which the Bernese conquered in 1536 and thus secured for Protestantism. Ecclesiastically, however, this territory remained dependent on Geneva and came to be markedly

stamped by the influence of the Lausanne preacher Peter Viret. In opposition to the Bernese option, Viret championed the Calvinian ideal of an ecclesiastically administered church. In this way the territory of the Vaud became the field of battle over these two contradictory conceptions of church-state relations, and in the process ended up under the political control of Berne and the spiritual hegemony of Geneva. This went so far, in fact, that it was said: "Viret is the bishop of Lausanne and Calvin the archbishop" (*TLZ* vol. 104 [1979] 331, note 6).

The leading pastor in Berne at this time, Johannes Haller, whose father had fought and died for the Zwinglian cause in the Battle of Kappel, was deeply imbued with the ideas of Zwingli. Haller gave his unqualified support to the course of action the Berne magistracy was taking against his Reformed brothers in the faith in the Vaud region. The struggle ran so deep that the citizens of Geneva began to designate their city as "Jerusalem" and to contrast Berne as "Samaria."

In the end the Bernese state-church arrangement became the prevailing model in the Vaud region as well, but the price for this was high. Just as the military forces of Berne had once saved Geneva from Catholic envelopment, thereby securing the safety of the Reformation in that city, so also was this later intramural Reformation dispute resolved by the power of the state. Beyond the borders of the Confederacy a similar conflict between Calvinist and Zwinglian schools of thought on the matter of church discipline arose in the Palatinate during the 1560's. The most fervent Zwinglian outside of Switzerland was probably the Swiss-born physician Thomas Erastus, who lived and worked in Heidelberg. As we know, Erastus ultimately failed in his attempt to have his ideas adopted by the Palatinate authorities. The Church Order of 1570 represents a compromise between the Zwinglian and Calvinist approaches to church polity. In summary, then, Zwinglianism enjoyed no real success in the Palatinate, despite Thomas Erastus' efforts. Four other countries besides the Palatinate are said to have been heavily influenced by Zwingli's ideas. They are England, Hungary, the Netherlands and Scotland. Time does not allow us to consider all four; I shall therefore concentrate on the Netherlands for a sketch of the development

there.

First of all it ought to be stated that the influence of Zurich Reformation on the Netherlands has been vastly exaggerated in the Zwingli and Bullinger literature. Anything like a genuine adoption of the ideas of Zwingli or Bullinger is scarcely discernible in that country. Not a single one of Zwingli's works was ever reprinted there, and the first translation of one of them was not published until 1645. Nor were Bullinger's works ever reprinted in the Netherlands, although there are fifty-one known *Dutch* editions of various of his writings. But even this latter fact does not prove a great deal in connection with the question at issue, for in the works that appeared in Dutch Bullinger provides no clearly pointed articulation of the distinctive positions of the Zurich tradition respecting the eucharist, predestination and especially church polity. In his apparently most widely circulated work, *The Decades*, Bullinger takes a general Reformational approach; it is impossible to detect in this collection of sermons a conception of either church order or church discipline which deviates from that of Calvin. Nevertheless, Zwinglian voices were not altogether wanting in the Netherlands. Before going on to demonstrate this, however, I should like to make a couple of qualifying remarks. On no other country did Erasmus exert so strong and enduring and influence as on the Netherlands (*TRE* X 15, 11f.). To make a consistently sharp distinction between Zwinglian and Erasmian influences appears to be next to impossible at the moment. If this assessment is valid, it naturally implies significant problems of interpretation for anyone attempting to trace the history of Zwingli's impact on these countries. At the same time it underlines the great importance of gaining a firmer fix on the differences between Zwingli and Erasmus. Be that as it may, what *is* clear at this point is that the half dozen or so existing documents treating of the familiarity with Zwingli and his writings up to around 1570 prove only that he, too, had made his entry into the European trade fair of religious ideas.

In more than one respect the 1570's constituted a watershed in the Reformation history of the Netherlands. The steady gain of territory by William of Orange and his Reformed adherents

naturally gave rise to the question regarding the type of ecclesiastical organization that should be instituted in the areas newly liberated from Spanish occupation. On which model ought the emerging evangelical church to be patterned? It was not until 1574 that a synod could be convened in the Netherlands itself; this gathering took place in Dordt.

The twenty-six delegates to this synod drew up a church order along classical Calvinistic lines, whereby the organizational arrangement was that of presbytery, classis and provincial synod. In this system the consistory was granted the right to call a minister subsequent to his examination by the classis involved. There was no provision made for the participation of the civil authorities in the calling of pastors. Taken in its entirety this ecclesiastical constitution allowed for only very loose ties with the temporal authorities.

Neither William of Orange nor the Estates of Holland and Zeeland accepted this relative freedom of the church from the authority and control of the state. They refused to approbate the church order and in 1576 ordered the drafting of ecclesiastical constitutions more to their own liking. In them the whole Calvinistic idea of a distinct and separate church organization with its own governing bodies such as consistories and classes was rejected out of hand. On their construction of things it fell to the local magistrates to appoint ministers and to select church elders from their own ranks. These drafts make no mention whatever of a binding profession of faith or church discipline. They are wholly informed by a state church spirit along lines found earlier in Zurich.

Among the ministers, Casper Coolhaes of Leiden was the one single serious opponent of the Church Order of 1574. His case commanded a great deal of attention between 1578 and 1582. In 1578 a conflict broke out in Leiden over the question as to who was authorized to appoint the elders in the church. Coolhaes took the side of the civil authorities and argued in favour of their right to nominate not only the elders but also the pastor. When it became evident that the conflict was incapable of resolution at the local level, Coolhaes was summoned to the Synod of Middelburg in 1581. There his views were condemned, which led to his expulsion from the

church in 1582. This was the first excommunication to have taken place in the history of Dutch Calvinism and at its receiving end stood an ardent Zwinglian. An adherent of the Zurich Reformation was put out of the church by Calvinists!

During his defence Coolhaes not only cited the writings of Zwinglian theologians, such as Zwingli himself, Bullinger, Gwalther and Musculus, but also adduced the exemplary state of affairs in the towns of the Swiss confederacy in support of his convictions and contentions. Particularly Zurich with its liberal regulation of church discipline ought to be viewed, he argued, as the model *par excellence* of a Christian society. The Swiss congregations lived in a spirit of harmony, while the Dutch churches were dominated by an atmosphere of conflict and divisiveness due to the fanatical zeal of the Calvinists for uncompromising confessional commitment and narrowly interpreted church discipline.

Coolhaes was not able to alter the course of Dutch Protestantism. But what is most significant in this whole affair is that in condemning Coolhaes the church repudiated not only a person but an entire system, and this did not fail to produce the necessary effect on public opinion. Although the state church idea was not totally obliterated from the Dutch scene after 1583, from then on the Zurich Reformation no longer played the role of crown witness for this concept in the Netherlands. While it is true that the controversies between Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants at the beginning of the seventeenth century also involved the matter of church order and that the antithetical positions articulated in these controversies in fact boiled down to the opposing views of Calvinism and Zwinglianism, the contestants remembered Zwingli. The most accomplished member of the Remonstrant party, Hugo Grotius, was at any rate no Zwinglian, but rather had a disposition of mind akin to that of Erasmus; indeed, he was possibly "the most authentic Erasmian of the 17th century" (*TRE* X 15, 21).

This brief review of developments in the Netherlands must suffice. I shall now proceed to state four conclusions drawn from it which seem to me to be of particular significance for the debate on the history of Zwinglian impact.

First, one must seriously ask whether it is possible to identify legacies of Zwinglian thought

beyond all reasonable doubt. Differentiation between Zwinglian and Erasmian influences will, it seems to me, prove to be very difficult in individual cases.

Second, Zwingli's ideas have been perpetuated under other names. Here one thinks particularly of Erastianism.

Third, we must rid ourselves of the idea that the Zurich and Genevan Reformations are two harmoniously complementary parts of one entity called "Reformed Protestantism." In more than one instance they were in bitter conflict with each other.

Fourth, one should consider whether it is possible to identify developments and trends in other areas similar to those found in the Netherlands. After an initial period of indecisive confessional development, during which it underwent influences from various directions, Dutch Reformed Protestantism began, from the middle of the century, to take on ever more Calvinistic contours.

Why was this so? Do our fragmentary observations lead to an answer to the question why Zwingli failed to exert more influence than he did? Put another way, how did it transpire that Zwingli became the loser among the three great Reformers of the early sixteenth century? Five tentative responses suggest themselves. *First*, that Zwingli's thinking emanated no impulses whatever in the direction of Catholic Theology is explained by the fact that in Catholic circles he was viewed essentially as the agent of the splitting up of the Confederacy. His work was judged solely from a political point of view. It is only in recent times that this assessment has begun to undergo some alteration. One of the finest fruits of the Zwingli Jubilee Year is a book written by the Zurich Jesuit Albert Ziegler, *Zwingli katholisch gesehen, ökumenisch befragt*, in which he expresses his appreciation for the Reformer and pursues the question of what he has to say to Catholics. *Second*, for Lutherans the conflict over the Lord's Supper proved to be a barrier that blocked any and all access to Zwingli. Had not Martin Luther himself said, "Zwingli is possessed of the Devil"? And had not the Father of the Lutheran Church noticed that within the by no means small party of his opponents Zwingli formed a fundamental threat to his work? Confronted with a verdict such as this, Lutherans were well advised not to have

anything to do with Zwingli. *Third*, there is no gainsaying the fact that those within the circle of Zwingli's adherents, too, aided the emergence of a narrowly confined view of the Reformer by stressing his theological achievements less than his concrete ecclesiastical and social engagement. Bullinger's address in commemoration of Zwingli is a perfect example of this. Here Bullinger focuses attention on Zwingli as prophet and stresses the ethico-social components in his preaching (cf. L. v. Muralt [1970], 254).

Furthermore, in Zurich itself there existed a tradition of identifying Zwingli's work so closely with the history of this city that the Reformer took on the character of a local hero. As such Zwingli went unheeded outside the confines of Zurich: he belonged, after all, to Zurich and in keeping with his character as town hero bore little significance beyond its borders. Anyone who has ever spoken about Zwingli in Basel will understand what I mean. *Fourth*, it seems to me that Zwingli's literary corpus itself constitutes a decisive barrier blocking the way to any kind of effective Zwinglian impact. A comparison between his writings and those of Bullinger or Luther or Calvin immediately reveals the striking extent to which Zwingli's published works are time and area bound. In contrast to Calvin's *Institutes*, the time of the composition of Zwingli's *Commentarius* can be determined at first glance. This can be seen from the way in which Zwingli continuously assails the traditional church or from the place he gives to the topical themes of Holy Communion and governmental authority at the expense of a balanced treatment of the whole of his subject matter. A book such as this was simply no longer topical in the second half of the sixteenth century when the religious problems differed essentially from those in Zwingli's day. To take another example, just as happens today, ministers in the sixteenth century looked for books that were of immediate use to them in carrying out their daily pastoral duties, that is to say, they were looking first and foremost for commentaries and preaching aids. From this point of view Luther with his *Church Postils* and Bullinger with his *Decades* performed brilliantly. Zwingli never produced such a collection of sermons, and his commentaries are too fragmentary and technical to satisfy the practi-

cal requirements of the pastorate. To recapitulate this point: I am convinced that the nature of Zwingli's written works--which in comparison with those of other Reformers appear onesided--has impeded a wider diffusion of Zwinglianism. *Fifth*, it is possible that Zwingli became the loser among the Reformers by reason of the fact that his thinking is less than profound, not very existential, not openly gripping, not especially religious, not particularly evangelical. This question I cannot pursue, however, since it goes beyond my competence and exceeds that of the historian altogether. I shall therefore rest my case.

Note: The translation of the above from the original German was made by Dr. Gerald Gort, Free University, Amsterdam.

ZWINGLI BETWEEN LUTHER AND CALVIN: REFORMATION OF FAITH, COMMUNITY, AND CHURCH

G.W. Locher

My task in this paper is to relate Zwingli to Luther and Calvin without losing myself in historical detail, but by exposing "the problems that were matters of controversy and that may still be of importance today." Last year's Luther year was to be put into relation to the intentions and the work of Huldrych Zwingli.

I have taken this reminder to heart and propose to demonstrate how Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin after them, undertook reform of faith, community, and church. I shall begin with a brief preamble concerning the orientation of my paper.

The traditional German depiction of Luther and his work, well known to us from school, confirmation classes, and books, but from which church historians have distanced themselves during the past 30 years, is still alive and has been repeated undauntedly in books, pictures, and expositions on the occasion of the 500th anniversary of his birth. It presents Luther as the reformer of the Church, who as a result of his exemplary spiritual development confronted the papacy with certain criticisms and who was rejected by a) the Pope and b) the Emperor and the Empire. He, nevertheless, carried the Reformation and built up the Protestant Church thanks to the protection of the Saxon electors and with the help of his friend Melanchthon and others; this despite the disagreements with a) the peasants, b) the Anabaptists and enthusiasts, and c) the Swiss reformers. Zwinglians, Calvinists, Anabaptists, and, later, Baptists and Methodists all appear in this traditional interpretation as deviant disciples. To a large extent they agree with the original reformer, but their teachings differ on this and that point such as the sacraments.

According to this traditional understanding, Luther, whose own norm was Holy Scripture alone, is made a standard according to which all other reformers are to be measured. I doubt if we really do honour to him when we make of him a normative reformer.

The traditional interpretation of Luther and his work is particularly unfair to the other reformers whose influence in part extends further in the world and history. As a result they are measured throughout against Father Luther, instead of being understood in their context and on the basis of their own aims. In addition, this interpretation is, as we shall see, historically incorrect.

When we try in this paper to see Luther and his teaching and the events in Wittenberg "in their relation" to the other centres of the Reformation, the decisive methodological undertaking will be not to describe particular differences in particular points of doctrine, but to try to perceive him within the frame of a great movement which still continues today. Keeping this in mind we shall now consider the following points:

1. Common principles of the Reformation
2. Lutheranism
3. The origins of the Reformed Tradition
4. Calvinism
5. Five particular points of controversy and their roots
6. Weak points of Protestantism
7. Tasks and ecumenical perspectives.

1. Common Principles of the Reformation

Whoever wants to relate the Reformation to our time obviously ought to present the main features of Protestant faith within the context of today's vital issues: the search for the meaning of life, for example. However, it may be more useful for the mutual understanding among different denominations simply to reiterate the *sola gratia*, by grace alone; for this, the starting-point of the Reformation movement in the sixteenth century, has ineffaceably impressed itself on each new generation and has lost nothing of its importance. It declares every human being who accepts it the brother of sister of Jesus and, because of Jesus, the child of God directly, without any mediation of priest, and beloved and eternally accepted in the final judgement. He who accepts it is liberated in an unprecedented way, despite everything; he is freed from his own being, from all human judgement, from mundane reality, from

a guilty past, and from a deadly future. The reformed churches, always conscious of their responsibility and therefore unafraid of a certain intellectualism, have over the centuries unfolded this redeeming "only" in four steps: *sola gratia, sola fide, sola scriptura,* and *solus Christus*, i.e. by grace alone, by faith alone, by the Word alone, and by Christ alone. Actually, it is more precise and more sensible to begin with the Bible: "The Word, nothing but the Word, the whole Word!" "Grace, nothing but grace, the whole of grace!" "Faith, nothing but faith, the whole faith!" and, finally, the summary and apex of the whole revelation: "Christ, nothing but Christ, Christ in his fullness, as teacher, prophet, priest, and king." In contrast to former anniversaries, which loudly proclaimed Luther as the champion of a defiant German Protestant freedom of conscience, Lutherans and Roman Catholics today show how Luther's concern about the certainty of salvation caused the new understanding of the gospel to spring forth. Luther was the ingenious spokesman of a deeply disturbed generation. We must not forget that the frequently-cited ecclesiastical abuses were not the origin of the Reformation events, though in many places they gave rise to them; fundamental questions were at stake, not only abuses.

The reformation was a movement of repentance; it did not ignore the divine and human commandments, but took them seriously. The primary question to which Luther tried to find an answer was: how can we do the good works that the law demands of us? How do we attain the pure, unselfish love of God, from which alone they can rise? The answer which he had to acknowledge was that we are incapable of doing it. But are we then, notwithstanding all our endeavours, forever liable to the wrath of God? How can I find a merciful God? The answer of the Reformation is: "Your mercifulness bewails our sin and great sorrow ... To atone for sin you spent your precious blood!" (From one of Luther's most famous hymns *Nun freut euch, lieben christen gemein.*) In his sufferings, Christ has taken upon himself the responsibility for my sins and given me his righteousness. In the Cross we find both our condemnation and our pardon. Therefore, "by grace alone" means that if I had to gain salvation by my inner, spiritual growth or by my moral achievements, I

should never achieve it and should never be sure of it. Furthermore, "the Word alone" means the fundamental significance of the biblical message that comes to me by the preaching of the Word. I cannot grant the great pardon myself. The trust in the grace of God amidst the temptations of our life has only one guarantee: God's Word. Or to put it ecumenically, what the faithful Catholic receives in the sacrament at the culminating point of the Mass--the real presence of the Lord and the dispensation of grace--the believing Protestant experiences in the preaching of the Word: *God is present*. The negative implications which Catholic theology does not accept are as follows: the Word of God, in other words, not the Church; grace grasped by faith and therefore no (meritorious) works; Christ himself and therefore not the saints, nor his mother, nor a spiritual institution acting as intermediary to bring us salvation, nor any human, much less any policital or cultural organization. All these negations form and safeguard the one marvellous promise founded only upon the unfathomable mercy of God.

The most widely disseminated confession of faith of the Reformed churches is the Heidelberg Catechism of 1563; in Switzerland it is called simply *das Fragebüchli*. Its first question and answer, deliberately drawn up for the Lutherans and other Protestants, gives as the answer to the question of our salvation those words with which innumerable men and women have died in full confidence:

> What is your only comfort in life and in death? That I am not my own, but belong--body and soul, in life and in death--to my faithful saviour Jesus Christ. He has fully paid for all my sins with his precious blood, and has set me free from the tyranny of the devil. He also watches over me in such a way that not a hair can fall from my head without the will of my Father in heaven: in fact all things must work together for my salvation. Because I belong to him, Christ by his Holy Spirit assures me of eternal life and makes me whole-heartedly willing and ready from now on to live for him.

This belief unites all Protestants. Even now, four hundred and twenty years later, there is no truly Protestant Christian who does not feel challenged by the seriousness of this question and whose heart is not moved by the vigour of this answer.

2. Lutheranism

The concentration on the grace given to us in Christ and received by faith remains the inexhaustible source of the liturgical and spiritual life of the Lutheran churches. Through devotional manuals and music, particularly the German chorale, this abundance has flowed over to the Reformed churches and, of course, to the United churches, yes, to all of christendom. Concentration always means deepening and enrichment, but it can also bring limitation. Lutherans have been frequently reproached with one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness, although they rightly reject this criticism. Moreover, they see themselves as mediators between the Catholic-sacramentalist churches on the one hand and the pneumatological-preaching churches on the other as representatives of both word and sacrament. They are, thus, in the centre of the ecumenical community although this claim is, of course, contested by the Anglicans. We need not dwell on the long-established reproach that "by faith alone" will "make people indifferent and wicked" (Heidelberg Catechism, question 64) or that it even breeds moral cynics. Luther had already proclaimed that "faith is something alive and active." And the Heidelberg Catechism, in the exposition of the ten commandments, places the whole of Christian ethics under the heading, "Human Gratitude," i.e. gratitude for "the only comfort in life and death." The only thing of any avail, as St. Paul says, is "faith working through love" (Gal. 5:6.). It is out of a living faith that good works grow, and from faith decisions, endeavours and the realizations of Christian life result. But does this occur automatically, of itself, out of the inner attitude of faith? Martin Luther's answer is: "Yes, indeed." And insofar as convictions, one's private life, and individual ethics are concerned, he is certainly right.

The tension may be seen in a text that is highly valued by the Luthrans themselves. In the

Augsburg Confession of 1530, the most important document of Lutheran faith, we read in Article VII: "The Church is the assembly of all believers, among whom the gospel is genuinely taught and the holy Sacraments are administered according to the gospel." The sentence is directed in the first instance against the contention that only the presence of an ordained priest of the Church of Rome ensures the legitimacy of the divine service. Nevertheless, there is more in it than that. The following Article (VIII) expressly states that any possible individual unworthiness of the officiating priest in no way affects the validity of his acts. In short, not only our private life, but also our worship takes place through the "justification" of God. The preaching of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments are valid because of the grace of God. Thus, the Church is established by automatic action and autonomy of grace, as it were.

Anyone who recalls the epistles of St. Paul will be aware of the fact that there is something missing here. One may ask whether word and sacrament alone are essential in the Epistles to the Corinthians? Do not other things belong as well to the distinguishing marks of the Church: faith, hope, and love, mutual edification, and the responsible cooperation of the so-called laypersons. In Lutheranism, from the outset the congregation is relegated to the background by the quest for the certainty of personal salvation. Though the congregation is mentioned in the Augsburg Confession, it is neglected. Hence, a rather extreme concept of the ministry could arise early in the Lutheran churches in reference to the legitimate administration of word and sacrament. In connection with the idea that the reigning prince is supreme bishop of the established church (*summus episcopus*), this led to a religious conservatism which laid the ideological foundation for the corresponding political conservatism. We should not forget that this conservatism in both spiritual and temporal things is likewise a reflection of that concentration, which goes back to Luther himself, on the gracious revelation of God in the humanity of Jesus Christ. Lutheran piety is related to Christmas. It implies a living and rich inwardness, endurance--even indifference--in the face of worldly things. The hope of eternal life even in social misery, and loyalty to

sinful and anarchic authorities. It produces the hymns of Paul Gerhardt, which, in turn, made possible the whole of classical German poetry. And it inspires the music of Johann Sebastian Bach.

3. The Origin of the Reformed Churches (The Swiss and South German Branch)

We deliberately do not begin with the problems which have been a matter of controversy between the two Protestant Churches all along: the Lord's supper, election, the relationship between law and gospel, the ministry, etc. Instead, we shall concentrate on that which is at the bottom of these doctrinal differences. For the sake of clarity we shall first state our conclusion: reformation is understood by the Reformed churches as the reformation of the community or congregation. Devotion in the Refomed churches is not introverted, but extroverted; it does not proceed from Christmas, but from the resurrection and ascension of Christ. The goal of the grace of God is not only the certainty of my own salvation but the creation of a people that serves him here and now on earth.

How did this come about? Already in the late Middle Ages several movements of renewal had arisen which continued to produce a strong effect in the sixteenth century. We mention the official councils, then the so-called "devotio moderna," which was slightly mystical and decidely personal and which expressed itself in fraternal communities, the widely read *Imitatio Christi* of Thomas à Kempis, the "Everyman" plays, the "danse macabre" depictions, etc. A new interest in antiquity, whose most illustrious representative, Erasmus of Rotterdam, lived in Basel, spread among the educated classes. And there was something else, which only recently has been discovered by scholars: a revival of the ancient principle of cooperative societies, especially in the imperial cities in Switzerland, Alsatia, and Southern Germany, and this in a consciously Christian sense. It was caused by the change to a monetary economy and by political changes necessitating a new order in the general administration, still without an official, be it noted, except for the position of town clerk and therefore with the active participation of all. Finally, it resulted from the breakdown of the episcopal administrations,

which were atavistic in terms of organization and frequently corrupt. Bishops generally did not object when the city magistrate relieved them of their administrative duties when they were no longer able to fulfil them, although this meant diminished power. Magistrates ordered the affairs of monasteries and nunneries or parishes for the sake of public welfare. They justified their intervention by proclaiming that they were responsible to God for the common weal and, thus, for Church matters, public morality, and the spiritual welfare of the people.

When Luther proclaimed the gospel of God's grace and when Zwingli, Bucer, and Oecolampadius called people to heed Holy Scripture, they were readily heard. Their message was understood as helping the renewal of urban community life which needed "pax et concordia," which were expected as the fruits of the word of God. Evangelical faith became a part of the striving for the renewal of Christian life within the community. It is evident that because of their individualism neither mysticism nor humanism was sufficient. Even the Lutheran quest for individual salvation was relegated to the background by the comprehensive problem of rebuilding the life of the community. The real danger for the community was just this individualism, which manifests itself in economic egoism and in the desire to dominate. Where earthly things are placed first, life on earth is ruined. Only where the glory of God is esteemed by all, will both eternal salvation and earthly welfare be found. Therefore, for Zwingli--and in this he is a genuine spokesperson for the entire reformation in Upper Germany--the antithesis to "by faith alone" is not "justification by good works" but "idolatry" in genreal, be it in religion or be it in economics. To rely on our own merits is only part of that idolatry. Near the end of his life Zwingli wrote significantly in the preface to his exegesis of one of the prophets: "A Christian city is a Christian community, nothing else." What he meant is that the Christian city is a real form of Christian life, which comprises political life as well. For ecumenical discussion we should like to add that this is an alignment, which, though surely not Roman, is truly and profoundly catholic.

Zwingli goes even further: "God is spirit.

The spirit of God alone by leading us, saves us." In the name of the spirituality of God he opposes the crass materialism of the Swiss mercenaries as well as the religious sacramentalism of the Middle Ages, which he fears reappears in Luther's doctrine of the eucharist. In general, the Reformed churches saw themselves as being more fundamental and more radical in thought and practice. This is true, although the aims of these Upper German Protestants, as well as Luther's, were entangled in the web of medieval political concepts. They strove for an evangelical continuation of the homogeneous Christian civilization, later called the *Corpus christianum*, within small territories.

If we ask about the cultural effects of the religious reformation, we may briefly state: in urban republics like Strasbourg, Ulm, Augsburg and Constance, as well as Basel, Zurich, Schaffhausen, St. Gall, Geneva and Berne we find the beginning of a democratic and social order of the community, a thorough blending of faith, the sense of duty and industrious activity, which later was violently halted. We also observe that individual and communal sanctification have become the context for education, science and technological progress. In the Netherlands painters discover the secular world as the field where God's providence is at work. Politicians led by God's spirit move in progressive as well as conservative directions; the ideal of theocracy can take both forms. Some of these effects are still observable in our century. The same religious tradition produced such diverse spirits as Abraham Kuyper, the conservative Dutchman, Leonhard Ragaz, the Swiss religious socialist, and the liberal American Woodrow Wilson. All three of them claimed Calvin as their spiritual ancestor.

A key word for this whole branch of the Reformation might be found in the final sentence of Zwingli's *De vera et falsa religione commentarius (Commentary on the True and False Religion)* of 1525, which is the first detailed exposition of Reformed dogmatics. "All that I have said here has been said to the glory of God, for the well-being of the Christian community, and for the salvation of hearts." Note the sequence of the three points.

This short survey of the ideas underlying the historic events in the cities makes clear what is

significant. In the Reformed branch of the Reformation, as in Lutheranism, life emanates from faith and good works from gratitude. But that is not all. Where customs or orders do not correspond to the Word of God, particularly in social ethics and in the establishment of the Church, there mutual consultation, discussion, even open dispute and controversy, and far-reaching radical decisions in practical matters are necessary. They are necessary on account of the clarity of the proclamation of grace which grants justice and liberty to the weak as well as to the strong. No doubt, the danger of a new, evangelical legalism is latent in this idea; more than once it became real.

4. Calvinism

Four years after Zwingli's death in Kappel, the French refugee John Calvin found shelter in Basel. There Thomas Platter, printer and headmaster of the secondary school near the cathedral, printed the first edition of the later world-famous *Institutio religionis christianae*. From Basel the greatest dogmatics of the Reformation, and possibly of all church history, began its triumphal progress, which still continues.

Calvin inherited the seriousness of ecclesiastical discipline from Oecolampadius in Basel and Bucer in Strasbourg. It later stood him in good stead during his activity in Geneva. There was more to it than the strained relations with the municipal magistrates and the princes. They simply intended to bring under their control that which had before been in the bishop's power. This occurred quite spontaneously and automatically, as we have seen in cities like Zurich, Berne, Basel, and Geneva; for who else should have carried out the Reformation? However, politically Calvin was no longer a man of the Middle Ages, but a modern man. He saw the approach of the secularization of public and private life as a consequence of the Renaissance and the humanists. He knew that the Church had to be independent. And in this, Calvin, a decidedly ecumenical thinker, fully agreed with his most bitter enemy: Rome.

Where lay the motivating force of the rapidly expanding and tightly organized Calvinist congregations in France, on the Lower Rhine, in the Low

Countries, in Scotland, and elsewhere? What made them capable of initiative and sacrifice? We might answer: it was the demanding, strict preaching of their pastors who shied no consequences, and who were esteemed on account of their office. But owing to persecutions pastors were often absent for long periods, sometimes even for decades. However, there were always presbyteries of reliable laymen who did their duty, openly or in hiding. They established contact with each other, and together set up across all of Western Europe the secret network of the "Church under the Cross." Their martyrs numbered hundreds of thousands, but this system was the rock on which the assault of the Counter-Reformation broke. What enabled Calvin to lay its foundation? What inspired this readiness in those congregations of laymen? It was the consistent application of the basic principle that there is one question even more important than any quest for God: God's quest for us. This is what Calvin meant with his famous *Soli Deo gloria*. Already in 1539 Calvin wrote in his friendly and clear open letter to Cardinal Sadolet, who himself was inclined toward reform: "It is bad theology to induce man to be exclusively interested in himself rather than to teach him and urge him that the beginning of a godly life is to set our mind on the glory of God. We are born first for God, not for ourselves."

Calvinism won through its piety the consciousness of being elected by God; through its individual ethics, the will to self-conquest and asceticism; through its social ethics, its interest in the secular world and its organization; and for the Church, the autonomy and independence of Christian life. Its energies have been effective right up to the present day, especially in the New and in the Third World.

Here again, we shall not ignore the dark side. Calvinists had spent many long years living in exile, which historically forced them into the practice of new professions. Their emphasis on serving God in everyday life in the condition of exile led to the connection of Calvinism with banking, industry and the accumulation of capital--a tendency which has effects to this day. It is, of course simplistic nonsense to say that Calvinists were just looking to material success as a confirmation of their being elected by God. But there is a

connection nevertheless. What God gives to me through my work is not mine because all work is performed in his service. If we admit the view of Lutherans as being somewhat servile towards the state, we must admit that Calvinists have sometimes yielded to economics and its built-in laws.

The influence of Calvinism upon other aspects of the history of our civilization is well known. It reaches from the establishment of modern democracies to the Declarations of Human Rights in the eighteenth and twentieth centuries. The freedoms of creed and conscience should be mentioned, too. In the beginning this freedom was completely supplanted by the sovereignty of God, just as it had been through-out the Middle Ages. The Servetus affair testifies to this. However, it was just this same sovereignty of God and of the Holy Spirit which later made Calvinists acknowledge the freedom of creed and conscience. This recognition found its way into public law for the first time in the Netherlands, which then became a model for the whole of Europe.

5. Five Controversies and Their Roots

With this general picture in mind, we return to Martin Luther and his influence. We shall emphasize those points in which the Reformed churches, as a result of the theological positions just described, had to contradict him.

i) The Authority of the Scriptures and the Problem of Justification

As we said at the beginning, the whole Reformation started with the slogans "by faith alone" and "by the Scriptures alone." Everybody understood these two principles to be interdependent and directly opposed to the Roman Catholic understanding of church and authority. Nevertheless, the primacy or precedence of either of the two principles posed problems. Luther's commentaries always proclaim that we find Christ in the Scriptures. In every text he discovers the tension between the law that makes us despair of ourselves and the gospel that promises us the grace of God by the cross of Christ. Our redemption from death and damnation is the one subject that is dealt with everywhere in the Scrip-

tures, for it is to this that they are witness and it is this which precedes everything else. Luther goes so far as to say: "God and the Scriptures are two different things." Zwingli and Bucer already, and even more Calvin, perceived in their own experience that they had discovered the Bible and that the Bible began to speak directly to their time, the beginning of the great renewal. In their understanding the Bible not only deals with me and my salvation and eternal bliss, but equally with God and the whole of his creation. It deals with the world and with the ways of God who reigns over the nations and rules history. All these were matters of little interest to Luther; they were irrelevant in view of the imminent end.

In the reformed churches the readers and commentators of the Bible--laypersons and preachers alike--appeared more open to surprises from the Bible. For them, the Bible was an instrument of the Holy Spirit, and the living spirit always has a new word, a word never said before, a particular word of warning and consolation and instruction for each situation. The Bible talks not only about my justification, but also about my sanctification and even of the sanctification of the world with the coming of the kingdom of Christ. Let me add that, strictly speaking, we should perhaps speak of the "authority of the Spirit" rather than the "authority of the Scriptures," since this is where the Reformed emphasis is found.

ii) Two Kingdoms or one "Kingdom of Christ"?

Here we enter the "maze of the doctrine of two kingdoms"--to quote the title of an important book by Heckel--the maze in which Protestant ethics has wandered about trying to find its way ever since theology lost its direction under the Hitler government. Let me state immediately that in this debate Luther and Lutherans were sometimes treated unjustly by Reformed, and particularly Swiss, theologians. It is not true that Luther taught the autonomy of politics and economics. It was the orthodox theology of the seventeenth century which began to teach in this way. It is an entirely different matter to state that such teaching may have been an inevitable result of Luther's. Luther begins by distinguishing the kingdom of God in the proper sense of the word

from the order of power and force. The former exists where Christians are ruled according to the gospel, while the latter refers to a necessity in a sinful world. "This worldly kingdom," said Luther, "may likewise be called the kingdom of God, for it is God's will that it remains and that we should submit ourselves to it. But it is only the kingdom 'on the left hand'. The kingdom 'on the right hand' where He does not establish father or mother, emperor and king, hangman and jailer, but where He is present himself, is the one where the good news is preached to the poor." Thus, Luther does not mean that the creator has left the world to itself or to the devil. It is precisely for this reason, however, that resistance is forbidden to the Christian. "We must not resist the [despotic] authority with misdeeds and revolt as Romans, Greeks, Swiss and Danes have done." It is obvious that the evolution tending towards a secular world found here its point of departure for the so-called emancipation from ideological and moral prejudices. The "forces of circumstance" were invented and pretended to be inescapable.

Zwingli countered this by writing a tract "On Divine and Human Righteousness" which emphasized the links between the two forms of justice rather than their division. Human righteousness, according to him is imperfect and, therefore, ever new; it must be adjusted in each new circumstance according to its divine counterpart. In a letter written to Ambrosius Blarer but clearly aimed at Luther he wrote: "The reign of Christ is also external" (*regnum Christi etiam externum*). Zwingli sees no problem in entrusting the political authorities with the care for the church and the preachers with the role of guardians watching over the state; for him, state and church are as inseparable as body and soul. To quote from one of his letters to Strasbourg: "A christian township is nothing else than a christian congregation." What he means to say is that a christian congregation searches for its form in the political community.

Calvin later described this community as constantly regenerated by the exchanges between high and humble, rich and poor, scholars and simple people, citizens and peasants, and so on. To quote him: "God has appointed the magistrates to be obedient to those whom they serve by ruling." As is

often the case, Calvin's expressions concerning "two regiments" resemble those of Lutherans. But upon closer view the totally opposing direction comes to light in statements such as that all government on earth must be "like an image of the lordship of Christ." I think things are plain in the Bible: neither the Old Testament nor the New knows of a distinction of two kingdoms. Luther charted a path of great consequence, but it was not the right path.

iii) The Lord's Supper

As everybody knows, Luther interpreted the words of Jesus, "this is my body," literally. Zwingli quoted in reply John 6:63, "The flesh is to no avail," and insisted that the sacramental word ought to be understood according to the "analogy of faith." Hence, "this SIGNIFIES my body." For him the Lord's supper is the last of the parables of Jesus. Likewise Calvin spoke about the "figures" and "symbols" in the sacrament by which God presents his gift to those who receive it. All this only deals with the interpretation of the sacramental words; far more was at stake than that. Luther stresses the revelation of God in the humanity of Christ to such an extent that the incarnation of the Lord is continued in the consubstantiation of bread and wine. At this point the Reformed churches had to shout, Stop! And they continue to do so today for good reason. Zwingli's principal argument is that we are *saved on the Cross*--and the sacrament must not compete with the Cross. At the Lord's Supper we remember the Cross, but it is the Cross that is the foundation of the forgiveness of sins.

In my view it is a blessing that in our churches neither the interpretation of Luther nor that of Zwingli has prevailed, nor that of Calvin, which is somewhat complicated, but rather that of the Heidelberg Catechism. Bread and wine in the Heidelberg Catechism are "holy signs" and "seals" of the grace of Christ. The "sign" goes back to Zwingli, the "seal" to Calvin.

The great mistake in the bitter controversy of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was the preoccupation with "the elements." The real presence of the Lord was sought in bread and wine. In fact, Christ's command, "Do this in memory of me," was a promise of his personal, spiritual, (all

the more real) invisible presence. His "personal presence" was "until he comes." The table is set for a world full of material and spiritual hunger. If we dare to re-introduce Zwingli's communal supper, if we sit with one another just as we are, and invite as many as would like to come, then we shall be astonished to see what the supper really is; we shall know that He is here.

iv) The Law of God

It is my impression that an almost suppressed difference in degree was more important in the long run in underscoring the differences between the confessions than the differences in their conceptions of the Lord's Supper. I am referring to the reformers' conceptions of the Law. For Luther the distinction between law and gospel was the most important element of good theology. He has Paul's saying in mind, "From the law comes knowledge of sin." This is onesided. Paul also writes, "The law is holy, just and good." Zwingli countered: "To him who honours God, the law is gospel." God's commandments are God's will; the good commandments of God are for our good and are there to protect us from inner decay and outer chaos. For this reason Calvin emphasized the importance of the Ten Commandments for the life of the believer.

There is thus a Lutheran joy of being freed from the law and a Reformed joy in the law comparable to that of the psalms. Both need each other; both must make their voices heard in the Protestant church.

This question is especially relevant with regard to the Sermon on the Mount. For Luther, the Sermon on the Mount is law. It is primarily a mirror of the kingdom of God which confronts us with the abyss of our sinfulness. When Chancellor Helmut Schmidt declared in Hamburg on occasion of the Kirchentag that one could not practise politics with the Sermon on the Mount he was speaking as a genuine Lutheran. Reformed churches have always maintained that the laws of the Sermon on the Mount must be followed. This may appear to be utopian, yet for the sake of our threatened world one might actually want to discard *Realpolitik* in favour of even weak and haltering efforts along the lines of the Sermon on the Mount.

v) Word and Spirit

A central insight common to all the reformers is that we receive faith from God himself. Human beings cannot grant it, not even the apostles. Zwingli concluded that the real word of God is the "inner word" spoken to us through the Spirit of God. Luther, on the other hand, felt that because of the temptations experienced by the conscience, the dispensation of grace could be no less external than the law. The outer word is the historical presence of the humanity of Christ. The being is weak and not to be depended upon. Certainty exists only in the objective promise *extra me*. Zwingli must argue differently, based on his experience of the dangers for man in the mundane shpere. He sees in the overemphasis on the "outer" sermon a threat to grace. For him, the outer word is dependent upon the Holy Spirit to open our hearts. Rome guarantees the presence of the Lord through the sacrament. Zwingli's dialectic admonishes us that the same thing cannot be guaranteed on the Protestant side by simply substituting sermon for sacrament; this "thing," the Lord's presence, wants to grant itself to us.

Luther recognizes in thankful astonishment that the Spirit has bound itself to the word. Zwingli anxiously holds watch to assure that, on the contrary, the word remains bound to the Spirit. The sermon attests to salvation; but the Spirit reserves itself the right to grant it. There must be different christologies underlying all this.

vi) The Christological Root

All the reformers are quite orthodox when teaching the old dogma that "Christ is truly man and truly God" (*Vere Deus vere homo*). Yet Zwingli emphasizes along with Augustine that although God assumes humanity he transcends it. For Luther humanity and divinity become almost totally identical. To accentuate the contrast even more, Luther emphasizes Christ's humanity, Zwingli his divinity. Luther emphasizes God's *Revelation*, Zwingli the revelation of *God*. This is, in my opinion, the most important difference; the Spirit emphasized in Zwingli's thought is the Spirit sent by the Exalted One, according to John's gospel. This is the source

of all other debates concerning election, word and sacrament, the Lord's Supper, baptism and penance, church, state and the right to resistance.

At this point, and keeping in mind the above list of topics, it should become clear to us why the Reformed churches' criticism of Lutheran formulations should, upon closer inspection, always reveal the same motif--the more intense faith in the reign of the Exalted One through the Holy Spirit present in his disciples. The critical element is the conviction that the Spirit can prove itself stronger than sin. This conviction also explains the hope for liberating changes in the realm of the "world." The Christian community is called to be a model of social life for the society here and now--much more than merely the persecuted yet protected small flock.

I have been asked to present these doctrinal differences with a certain degree of clarity and I hope to have done so. Let me add, however, that the Reformed have never thought these differences important enough for a schism within "their" church, in other words a schism between themselves and Lutherans. They took a much more radical stance against Rome while thinking of themselves and the Lutherans as two "schools of thought" within one "evangelical" church.

I have presented you with the Reformed churches' view of Martin Luther and their understanding of themselves. Luther rejected this view, especially where it pertained to the Lord's Supper and the right to political resistance. But the older Melanchthon was already willing to desert him in this regard, and the divisions were bridged on many occasions throughout the centuries. Thank God that there were church unions, that there were confederations during the Counter-Reformation as well as during the Thirty Years' War and in the Confessing Church. Thank God that there are alliances even with Roman Catholics working for the peoples and Christians of the Third World.

Our congregations have always felt that there was *one* Protestant church. It was the theologians and the princes who could not agree with one another.

6. Weaknesses--Problems of Protestant Piety

We have touched on certain inner problems of Protestantism. We can now give a summary and make a few additions in point form.

i) The principle of *sola scriptura*, which took the place of the Church's teaching, has not only maintained itself, it has also proved its strength. The Bible has been effective as a corrector, moderator, and provider of new insights for all spiritual developments--not always immediately, but always in the long run. Yet today the juxtaposing of Scripture and tradition is not always accurate. The witness of revelation in Holy Scripture, though not the revelation itself, is also part of tradition. It is more important to notice that the Bible has become foreign to our generation, not because of the Bible, but because of ourselves.

ii) The Lutheran doctrine of faith and the Reformed churches' doctrine of election have produced in Protestantism an individualism that was foreign to the Bible and to the Reformers themselves.

iii) It is here that the endangered unity of Protestantism lies, and not in the Reformation, which was of lasting importance for ecumenism.

iv) Individualism has been transformed into relativism and indifference. It weakened the foundations of morality and thus undermined not only faith but civilization as well. It is not conducive to ecumenism, as many think, but dangerous for it, for it prevents genuine encounters with other confessions and an understanding of them.

v) The prerequisite for and the context of the Protestant message of grace and the reign of Christ was the living community and congregation. It has almost disappeared in pseudo-Protestant individualism. We are confronted with a sickness which has also infected Catholicism; it is thus a genuine ecumenical problem.

7. Tasks Ahead and Ecumenical Percpectives

i) The witness of grace and redemption remains an irrevocable duty for the heirs of Protestantism, as well as for the heirs of the Catholic reform of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It is also a very modern task. It may be a prerequisite of a genuinely ethical and political conception of reality to accept that the world and humanity need more than just *solutions*, that indeed they need *redemption*.

ii) Given today's interdependence of all conditions and relations and given also the importance of international relations, the assertions of Christian ethics can only be elaborated on an international scale. Only ecumenical ethics is credible ethics.

iii) The political, economic and social responsibilities of Christians for the world hardly demand Christian parties, for parties exclude; but they surely demand the persistent cooperation of all of Jesus' disciples of all persuasions. That would be the "theocratic tendency" in the midst of pluralism.

iv) As in the sixteenth century, the Christian message, especially today, only has power if it is represented in communicable forms of Christian existence. All of us together--and that means ecumenically--must work for new forms of Christian community.

v) For this, the common, open and obedient devotion to Holy Scripture is a necessity. In this context we will have to admit that a reversal of sorts has happened. While we are celebrating anniversaries--Luther's last year, Zwingli's now and someone else's next--many Roman Catholics are busy reading the Bible.

vi) The next Reformation will be an ecumenical one. That is to say, it will equally comprise Lutherans, the Reformed churches, the United and the Catholic.

To conclude, then, we see tasks and more tasks. We

should be bad Protestants if we did not confess--together with our Catholic brothers and sisters and ignoring all differences--that we are not the ones who build the church. We are built into it, and let us be grateful for this. The church lives by Christ's promise, by the presence of the Living One. "The Lord protects his church," says Huldrych Zwingli.

Note: Translated from the German original by G.W. Locher, et. al.

ZWINGLIDEUTSCH AND LUTHERDEUTSCH

Josef H. Schmidt

Huldrych Zwingli was a reformer of unusual gifts and talents, and some of his modern critics have steadfastly maintained this flair for the unusual. When reading through Oskar Farner's four volumes on Zwingli, however, I was surprised by the almost marginal and perfunctory treatment of the reformer's part in the translation of the "Zurich Bible."[1]

This is all the more unexpected as Zwingli's radicalism in reform was, paradoxical as it may sound, far more a reform of the Word, of the Bible, than that of Luther. For, in the words of Steven Ozment,

> The test of Scripture became Zwingli's basic reform principle ... Zwingli's reform principle was to test the biblical foundation of traditional ceremonies, practices, and teachings and ask whether they promoted the central message of the New Testament, the redemption of the world in Jesus Christ.[2]

But before I present you with an examination of the discrepancies and the homologies between Zwinglideutsch and Lutherdeutsch--that is to say, not just between the language of the Zurich Bible and the Luther Bible--let me remind you of some salient points concerning the pragmatic context of these translations. Today there is consensus among such diverse voices in the critical spectrum as Marxists and Catholics that Zwingli's initial reform and his textual understanding were more visibly rooted in humanistic concepts, beliefs and the resulting self-understanding than were those of Luther.[3]

While Luther remained a primary force not just of "his" translation of the *Septembertestament* of 1522 but throughout the teamwork leading to the complete translation of both Testaments in 1534, Zwingli's role was different from the beginning. He was also the main impetus behind the undertaking that was to produce a New Testament in 1523 and,

also in Froschauer's officine, the complete translation in 1531. But whole parts were translated by other people--notably the Apocrypha and the Prophets by Leo Jud.[4]

The scriptorial set-up was also different: in public workshops at the Grossmünster, the work was done in a broad and didactic manner, making the undertaking truly an instructional institution for a multitude of people, not just the humanists and students of theology for whom a certain degree of participation was strongly recommended.

While Luther long before 1525 merely reacted to the political impact of his reformation with ever growing irritation, consternation and anguish, Zwingli developed a distinctive theoc- racy in his city republic and died as the political leader of the movement.[5]

But there is another side to the pragmatic context of the two "Bibles" which is less known and which has been recently analysed within the limited scope of historical linguistics in an exemplary fashion. Walter Schenker in his *The Language of Zwingli in Contrast to the Language of Luther* has pointed out several distinctive features of the two reformers' specific "languages."[6] They shared a profound distrust of Latin and regarded their German publications as an act of emancipation from Roman bondage. Through their successful preaching, their German language skill demonstrates a broad range of differentiated social codes in that they "spoke" in many genres to very different social groups.[7] The real difference between the two reformers, however, comes into play in what Schenker describes as vertical and horizontal language barriers. Luther decided very early on that he would use an elaborate horizontal or supraregional code, aspiring to be understood by all people of the German-speaking regions; Zwingli, on the other hand, operated in a parochial context and placed emphasis on a vertical language that was directed to a small but regionally and socially well defined audience, comprising farmers, burghers, lower class citizens and scholars alike. Schenker recalls a telling example of how wide the gap stretched between the two reformers' language concepts by narrating the anecdote of the "language problem" at the Marburg Disputation. Zwingli wanted the proceedings to be conducted in Latin. The reason behind this wish--which, by the

way, was not granted--was his recognition of Luther's emotionally charged aversion to what he regarded as coarse dialect not worthy to be used when discussing holy matters. He went so far as to call some of Zwingli's idiomatic renderings of biblical passages disrespectful and inappropriate when, in actual fact, even today we recognize that it was a clear case of cognitive dissonance. Zwingli the humanist was aware of the actual reason of Luther's irritation: that he was incapable of properly understanding a regional, dialect-oriented language. In short, we have a situation that communication terminology aptly describes as noise!

Schenker admirably presents the descriptive problem of "Zwinglideutsch" with regard to the New Testament. He points out the oral context--that is to say that Zwingli, when quoting the New Testament in sermons and other genres, translates directly from the (Greek) original and does not quote the Zurich Bible.[8]

As a linguist, Schenker wanted to establish a genuine "heuristic corpus" by collecting 625 passages, representing the total of quotations from the Gospel according to Matthew used by Zwingli in all kinds of texts; these are passages where the reformer frequently differs substantially from the Zurich Bible Text which, in turn, more often than not follows the Luther Testament of 1522. He chose the Gospel according to Matthew because Zwingli himself recommended this as a point of departure; Schenker, however, is not quite conscious of the fact that the reformer probably did this following good medieval tradition of choosing the testament.[9] The analysis compares all these passages with the September Testament of 1522 and the Greek Testament of 1516 by Erasmus. As a basis for the Zurich Bible version, Schenker uses a concordance of the 1524 edition and the version of the whole Testament which was published by Froschauer in 1531.[10] I have expanded this by adding four more versions: The whole Testament of Luther (L, 1546), the revised text of the Church Council of Zurich of 1907-1931 (Z, 1955); the Luther-edition of the German Evangelical Church Executive Committee of 1912 (1960 = L, 1960); and finally the 1981 version of the Catholic unity-translation published by the bishops' conferences of the German-speaking countries (=C, 1981).[11]

Allow me to use, as the first example, one which is appropriate to providing a firm grounding in the text, Matthew 16:18: "... and upon this rock I shall build my church." The Greek text, according to Schenker (p.159) and the German versions of the 16th century read as follows:

epi tauté té petra oikodométo mou tén ekklésian.
uff den felsen wird/will ich min kilchen buwen. ZB
Auff disen felss will ich bawen meyne gemeyne. L,1522
auff disen Felsen wil ich bawen meine Gemeine. L,1546
und auf diesen Fels will ich meine Kirche bauen. Z,1955
und auf diesen Felsen will ich bauen meine Gemeinde. L,1960
und auf diesen Felsen werde ich meine Kirche bauen. C,1981

I find it a most fortunate coincidence that a first glance reveals that the three modern versions reflect historicity to an astonishing degree: the Zwingli version parallels the Catholic rendering while the Lutheran text differs in both word order and semantics. These are the two features we shall focus on presently. But before we do, I would like to point out that the three sixteenth-century German versions also provide clear examples of the difference between early High German and Swiss in terms of the vowel system and the difference in morphology. You notice that the Luther version of 1546 capitalizes "the rock/den Felsen," and it provides it with a definite inflection: "Fels-en." But more important in our context are the vowel changes which the main language had undergone and which the Swiss dialects up to the present day have not absorbed: the possessive pronoun "min/meyne," and the verb "buwen/bawen." This difference of monophthongs as opposed to diphthongs sounds really different even to a modern native German speaker. The distinctive "Schweizerdeutsch" (which is a false synthetic label for several fairly distinctive and different subdialects) is only understandable if one gets passively used to the oral "translation" of the Swiss sound system! In our context, word order and semantics are of primary importance; for we see a remarkable difference in the key terms which can be

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

roughly translated as "church/kilchen" vis-à-vis "community/gemeine." The second major difference is, of course, the final position of the infinitive in Zwingli's version as contrasted to the Zurich and Luther Bibles where the verb precedes the key term. Walter Schenker uses a host of such examples to build his case for describing and characterizing Zwingli's biblical language as the language of the preacher, the rhetorician, who addresses himself to a specific context. Luther, on the other hand, builds his sentences towards the categories prescribed by the new medium of literacy, the medium of print. In linguistic terminology, when we go back to the position of the verb, Zwingli uses postdetermination, while Luther prefers predetermination (no pun intended). However, the verb is also instrumental in signalling the importance of the key terms--church: community. Schenker argues that Zwingli, engaged in a reconstruction of a city republic, does not just speak as a rhetorically skilled humanist, but he consciously uses the rhetorical figure of emphasis to interpret the biblical text while translating it for an oral audience he wants to persuade.

The main objections one can possibly raise at this point are twofold. Not only are we on treacherous ground in that we are dealing not with just any text but a translation of the Holy Scriptures during the Reformation where linguistic predetermination plays a fairly important and restrictive role, we are also at an historical crossroads in the development of the German language where one can argue that the linguistic code actually allowed for such differentiation--or that we ourselves are not interpreting the two translators' interpretative translations! A point in question in our text sample is the modal verb. Did Luther and Zwingli really see much difference between "werden" and "wollen"? A glance at the modern Catholic rendering, however, will show you that the bishops most definitely do see a difference in the Lutheran/Protestant modern translation of "will." The *periti theologiae* among you no doubt also realize where this future tense led to according to Catholic doctrine and dogma.

It should be stressed again that Schenker does not operate, as I do, simply with selected passages; he always lists an impressive number of passages

from his heuristic corpus (Gospel according to Matthew as quoted by Zwingli in his "writings"). Another category of Schenker's, on where there is firm and concise evidence for deviation, is Zwingli's frequent use of doubling up a specific or obscure expression by means of rhetorical amplification.[12] Schenker (pp. 59 ff.) states definite functions (clarification, literal and spiritual translation, actualization for specific secular applications) of Zwingli's characteristic use of the dual expression; Luther seems to refrain almost totally from this practice. This is indeed suprising; for his programmatic manifesto *Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen*, admittedly written *post festum*, was probably most revolutionary in his claim that the intrinsic structure of the vernacular would not only allow, but really force him to translate properly by adding colloquialisms. When precision and intelligibility were at issue, situational context allowed for what modern trivialism has as "poetic licence" --classical rhetoric, more precisely, would place the problem into the categories of the *proprium, aptum,* in short, the "status" of the text.[13] Let me briefly present two examples, Matthew 17:24 and 26:52:[14]

(they that received) tribute money (King James)
ta didrakhma
den diadrachmun/ist ein pfennig gewesen, den der keyser
zuo einem schatz hatt uffgelegt; ZB
den tzins groschen; L, 1522/46/1960

(for all they that) take the sword (King James)
hoi labontes makhairan
das schwert zuckt und damit ficht; ZB
das schwerdt nympt; L, 1522
das Schwert nimmt; L, 1955
zum Schwert greift; Z, 1955
zum Schwert greifen; C, 1981

I think the thrust of these two expressions in the context of the reformer in the city republic is fairly obvious: while in the first example one expression is given a circumscription amounting to an explanation of the municipal bond subscription system, the second example shows the former chaplain of Swiss mercenaries who lost no time in making the

McGill University Library

prohibition of this practice one of the first issues of his reform. Clarification is undoubtedly given in the context of civil behaviour. Schenker's argument is convincing--especially if one adds Birgit Stolt's earlier findings that Luther, in his treatises, uses the double or triple amplification as a favourite means of argumentation.[15]

The conclusion of Schenker's argument that Zwingli translates the Bible into the oral context while Luther moves toward a "literate" translation is developed within the framework of syntactical rhetoric (p. 31 ff.).[16] I do not intend to narrate the details of Schenker's argumentation, for this requires a firm knowledge of early High German. Let me summarize his deductions briefly. Unlike Luther, Zwingli prefers a syntactical structure that is linear--important parts of a sentence precede the less important ones, the dominating comes before the dominated segment (p. 144). In actual fact, Zwingli's simplicity even shows in such basic categories as use of prepositions, tenses, and cases, (p. 147); Schenker ends his analysis with a rhetorical question (p. 155):

> Zwingli's syntax presents itself as simple and plain. Luther's, however, emerges as dramatic and complex ... Did Zwingli persuade his audience from the pulpit so thoroughly because his rhetoric was based on a plain and simple dialectic?

A tentative answer can be given with a quotation from the reformer's *Commentary on True and False Religion* where the section on the Gospel is introduced as follows:[17]

> The name of the Gospel, as everybody knows, means nothing else but "the good message." What constitutes its substance, however, has to be learned from words of the one who is revealed through it. He sent out his disciples with the command: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." (Mark, 16.15) We thus hear first that the Gospel is something which brings redemption to the faithful. And so we know the

effect of the Gospel, but not yet its substance.

We, the modern audience, have the benefit of hindsight; and we are tempted to understand Zwingli's last phrase literally: even within the limited pragmatic context of the German-speaking countries, it was not "every creature" that Zwingli addressed himself to but rather a restricted-extended city republic. His language literally attained its force from a parochial environment for a parochial environment! A history of language and of Swiss Protestantism demonstrates unmistakably that the dialectics of the context did indeed limit the influence of Zwinglideutsch--be it biblical or not. But, at the same time, it was entrenched in a tradition which, up to the present day, has remained alive. Useful as Schenker's study is for the philologist, a strong dosis of semiotic analysis would surely show that it was not so much the popular syntactic code which ensured Zwingli's position in the development of the Reformation, but rather the social code of pegging reform to very specific social issues on the basis of the Gospel.[18] This is not to belittle Zwingli's German nor the achievement of the Zurich Bible-translation; rather, it is to come to grips with the irony that the humanist reformer in Zurich while professing the ultimate authority of the Word, really had his effect through his deeds.

NOTES

1. Oskar Farner, *Huldrych Zwingli*, 4 vols. (Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1943-1960) particularly vol. 3.
2. Steven Ozment, *The Age of Reform: An Intellectual and Religious History of Late Medieval and Reformation Europe* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1980), pp. 323-24.
3. Cf. Robert Weimann, "Renaissanceliteratur und frühbürgerliche Revolution" in *Renaissance und frühbürgerliche Revolution* ...,ed. R. Weimann et al. (Berlin/Weimar: Aufbau, 1976) p. 23, and J.V. Pollet, O.P. *Huldrych Zwingli et la Reforme Suisse* (Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1963), pp. 24 ff. A more recent survey of this assumption is given in

McGill University Library

Peter J. Klassen, *Europe in the Reformation* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall 1979), pp. 110 ff. It cannot be the purpose and scope of this paper critically to describe the circumstances leading to Erasmus' Greek New Testament and the impact it had on the next generation of humanists with regard to Bible translation; cf. Jerry H. Bentley, *Humanists and the Holy Writ: New Testament Scholarship in the Renaissance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983).

4. For a concise description of the situation, cf. Hans Rupprich, *Vom späten Mittelalter bis zum Barock: Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, ed. H. de Boor and R. Newald, Bd. IV/2 (München: Beck, 1973), pp. 130 f.
5. Cf. Robert C. Walton, *Zwingli's Theocracy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967), p. 116 et passim.
6. *Die Sprache Huldrych Zwinglis im Kontrast zur Sprache Luthers* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1977).
7. The charge that Schenker uses a naive social model when discussing the social code of the "common man" as stated by Erwin Arndt and Gisela Brandt in their *Luther und die deutsche Sprache* (Leipzig: VEB Bibliographisches Institut, 1983), pp. 45 ff., is quite unfounded in my opinion. For an in-depth survey of the literature on Luther and language, cf. the excellent book by Herbert Wolf, *Martin Luther: Eine Einführung in germanistische Lutherstudien* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1980).
8. P. 22. Cf. also my note on the problem in *Wirkendes Wort*, 18.6 (1968), pp. 389-395, "Die Drucksprache als Massenmedium und die deutsche Literatur des 16. Jahrhunderts." For a modern rhetorical analysis of the transition from oral to literal tradition, see Helmut Schanze, "Vom Manuskript zum Buch: Zur Problematik der 'Neuen Rhetorik' in Deutschland" in *Rhetorica* I, 2 (1983), pp. 61-73.
9. Cf. Schenker, p. 23.
10. Cf. Schenker, pp. 26-27.
11. For the Luther version of 1546 I use the Weimar Edition (Deutsche Bibel, Bd. 6). The Zurich Bible (Z, 1955) was published by the Zwingli-Bibel Verlag, Zurich 1955; L, 1960 is the Stuttgart *Perlbibel*-edition; and the *Einheitsü-*

bersetzung der Heiligen Schrift, NT, is the 4th edition published by the Katholische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart (1979; 1981).

12. Understood here in the classical rhetorical function as increasing and intensifying the *utilitas causae*; cf. Heinrich Lausbert, *Elemente der literarischen Rhetorik* (München, 1963), pp. 63 ff.
13. Cf. James M. Lauer, "Issues in Rhetorical Invention" in *Essays on Classical Rhetoric and Modern Discourse*, ed. Robert J. Connors et al. (Carbondale and Edwardville: Southern Illinois Press, 1984), pp. 127-139.
14. Schenker, pp. 59 ff. The actual number of significant passages he uses for demonstrating this circumstantial kind of evidence is 550. In only 3 cases does Luther use double-expressions where Zwingli remains unequivocal; Zwingli, however, amplifies in 80 cases very "significantly" where Luther does not.
15. Birgit Stolt. *Studien zu Luthers Freiheitstraktat* ... (Stockholm: Alquist & Wiksell, 1969), Acta Universitatis Stockholmensis, Germanistische Forschungen, p. 35 et passim.
16. He does not, in any way, delve into stylistic problems of Renaissance rhetoric; see *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*, ed. James J. Murphy (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), particularly the essays by Paul Oskar Kristeller, Helmut Schanze, Charles Trinkaus, and Heinrich F. Plett. They all touch upon the problem of humanistic rhetoric and its translation into the literature in the vernacular.
17. I translate from the German translation in *Zwinglis Hauptschriften*, I, *Der Theologe*, bearbeitet von Fritz Blanke et al. (Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag 1941), p. 102.
18. Cf. Umberto Eco., *A Theory of Semiotics* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1979), p. 36 et passim.

McGill University Library

ZWINGLI THE STATESMAN

Joachim Rogge

I. Problems and scope: a general assessment

Zwingli's thought and action are effective medicine against any form of resignation. His life's work not only produced a theoretical framework and foundation for the future, it was also a guide for immediate action--source and stream interacting organically. Even today his peculiarly integral view of life remains impressive. It is not surprising, therefore, that theologians have criticized him for trespassing into politics and politicians, as well as political ideologues, have criticized him for going beyond his competency as a theologian.

Zwingli teaches us to see areas of human endeavour as a space entrusted to us by God in which the word of God is unconditionally valid, without the possibility of withdrawing from the claim, appeal, and exhortation of God the creator and reconciler autonomous entities, be they of a political or economic nature. The great *How* of obedience over against God's word in state and church, in individual or personal and social ethics, in reformatory and revolutionary movements, has been the spacious playground of Zwingli research and shall remain so. Gottfried W. Locher has thematically defined the key when he states "Zwingli's significance for church and society" in the following succinct motto: "Obedient to the Word of God."[1] In a different context he has stated further that obedience to the "word of God" is "the *only* means by which a nation may be saved from external danger and internal corruption."[2] Application of this self manifestation of God takes place through the sermon, so that preaching must be undertaken with care and intensity.[3] Wherever as a result of preaching, God is not in the human heart, we find nothing but the human person itself.[4] Thus in the strictest sense of the word, theology is intimately bound up with Zwingli's understanding of anthropology.

Accusations by Catholic theologians that such concentric thinking is heretical or more specifically Lutheran, the Zurich reformer rejects with the

specific rejoinder that he is not making exclusive statements about ecclesiology. The honour of God, salvation of souls, liberating of the conscience and concern for the homeland all belong in the same context. Zwingli challenges his confederates, "...look to what is done with God's word: does one seek *solely* the honour of God and the salvation of souls, or does one insist on the established power and pomp of the priesthood! If you find that it is solely to the honour of God and the salvation of souls, support it with God's help, whatever any one might say. For such behooves you righteous, God-fearing people. [Zwingli does not intend this in any way to be directed to the inner-ecclesiastical circle but speaks with a view to the socially open awareness of the citizen.] Thus, you will preserve your homeland even though it may displease the devil. For wherever the fear of God is, there God's aid is present. Where it is lacking there is hell and every misery and injustice."[5]

Precisely into the context I have delineated, which comprises all areas of human existence, Zwingli places the concluding sentence of his tract: "therefore obey the word of God, for it *alone* will set you straight once again."[6] Noteworthy is the frequently used "*alone*" (my emphasis). Among other things, it indicates the exclusiveness of the authority of the preached word of God.

If one evaluates the above text as the core of Zwingli's view of life, it may appear as simple, transparent, and initially easily acceptable to evangelical thinking, as well as proving to be defensive and interest bound. Many ballots have been cast in favour of the life-encompassing work of Zwingli on its theologically reflective and practical levels. This is so from the first contemporary assessments right down to the current re-assessment of the reformer's thought by the Deputy of the State-Council of the German Democratic Republic, Gerald Götting, in 1983 on the eve of the Jubilee Year.

As is well known, the near contemporary Roman Catholic Chronicler Hans Salat accused Zwingli, in connection with the first Zurich dispuation, January 1523, of behaving "in this matter as if he were the general factotum of Zurich--its mayor, clerk and council of two hundred."[7] Between the widely divergent concepts of hierarchy and theocracy, every

McGill University Library

evaluative nuance of interpretation is possible in the mind of Zwingli's opponent, Salat. Considerably more friendly is Gerald Götting's assessment of Zwingli's life achievement as significant for our contemporary situation. According to him, Zwingli began "with premises that were directly opposed to the ecclesiastical and socially conservative segments of society. ... for the relationship of church and state Zwingli proclaimed that any authority which is unfaithful and outside the precepts of Christ, i.e. which did not intend to take the commandments of Scripture as its guideline, might be deposed with God's help. This meant that the people could depose rulers should they not live and act according to the gospel. Tyrannical forms of government were, according to Zwingli, opposed not only to the will of the people, but also to the will of God."[8] Thus, Zwingli's questions concerning regress and progress, concerning criteria of government and the right to resist have remained thematically relevant to this day.

II. The range of perspectives

Two masters of Zwingli research, Leonhard von Muralt and Arthur Rich, demonstrated in the 450th anniversary year of the Zurich reformation, 1969, the entire range of problems by their differently determined framing of the issues--even in terms of terminology.

Having presented "Zwingli's reformation in the confederacy" up to the first territorial peace of June 26, 1529, and after citing the challenge of the reformer to the magistrate of Zurich, to "do something brave for God's sake" in war and peace,[9] von Muralt sums up as follows, "these events allow us to see that Zwingli was not regent in Zurich. We cannot speak of Zwingli the statesman or of Zwingli the politician; he was and remained reformer."[10] In the next sentences the writer considers the term "theocracy" as unsuitable also. In contrast, Locher picked up this term from a lecture given in 1957, and published in the volume *Zur Theologie der Zürcher Reformation* (1969), interpreting it once again positively as part of Zwingli's goals.[11]

Rich, who wrote about "Zwingli as socio-political thinker," begins his exposition (which incidentally, appeared later in a journal for evangelical

ethics),[12] in order to clarify the initial question with the lapidary sentence, "Huldrych Zwingli was undoubtedly a political brain by nature."[13] The author considers it beyond doubt, "that the reformer played a politically fully engaged role throughout his short life ... No one of the reformers--not to speak of Luther, of course--so directly involved himself in the great political events as did Huldrych Zwingli." Very conscious of the problem, however, Rich seems to limit or at least to differentiate; for he continues immediately, "this must be said, without thereby passing an all too hasty value judgement. Nonetheless, the question arises here, *how* [emphasis mine] the *political role* harmonizes with that of the *religious reformer*. *Politics and Faith* are generally considered to be two totally different worlds. This, however, does not seem to be the case for Zwingli. He united what is generally separated without allowing politics to dissolve into faith or faith to dissolve into politics."[14] Apparently, the results of work done on the question of "church and world" during decades of new insights in Zwingli research up to the current period have not yet been fully presented, so that Ulrich Gäbler may be right when he sharpens the matter into a highly relevant theme by saying, "in any case a precise delineation of differences and parallels between Luther's two kingdom theory and Zwingli's manner of speaking of dual righteousness is yet to be achieved."[15]

III. Zwingli's biography as key to his theory of state

We require a hermeneutic to understand the reformer's life work. How are we to achieve it? Anyone who prematurely systematizes and brings to a common denominator the many expressions of Zwingli during different phases of his life on the question of the magistrate in order to attain a useful distillation will undoubtedly arrive at false conclusions or false generalizations. In Zwingli's case, just as in that of Luther, the opponents change, and in each case one would have to know against whom or for whom a statement is made. Though one must not confuse a change in the reformer's emphasis, which depends on the addressee, with a constant shifting of his basic position, one should, nonetheless, be

Bethel University Library

cautioned in one's analysis of systematic-theological questions against making too simplistic a statement, such as "Zwingli is more reformer than politician" or vice versa that he was more politician than reformer.

The clearly "reformed turning point" in Zwingli, which one may place around 1520-21 in line with Wilhelm Neuser[16] or which may be focused differently in keeping with Ulrich Gäbler's differently motivated view,[17] is, as we know, not at all the date at which one posits Zwingli's politically conscious activity. With reference to a date for the "reformed breakthrough" around the middle of 1520 Gäbler raises the question of criteria, to determine what one ought to understand by "reformed" or "not reformed." Depending on the answer one could then respond to the differences in dating which, even in Locher's work, range between 1516 and 1522, "by which a picture is projected of a development that extends over several years."[18] Depending on whether one takes the new scripture principle (1516) or the development of the insight into the new "teaching of grace and freedom" (1522) or still something else as a criterion, one will be able to speak of a reformed beginning or of the final development of this beginning.

What is acceptable in the ever-continuing debate on the reformed beginning ought to be equally acceptable in the discussion on where one is to put the emphasis with Zwingli the politician. Data and dates do not help greatly in this regard. Yet, then as now, attention must be given to the horizonally relevant framework from the poetic fable *The Ox* (Fall 1510),[19] through the reworking of the sermon preached on St. John's day, *On divine and human righteousness* (July 1523),[20] down to the "last great political statement of the reformer," *What is essential for Zurich and Berne to keep in mind in the matter of the five cantons* (Z VI/III, No. 182) (1531).[21]

All of the above-named tracts allow one to see--practically even in the titles--that they are occasional writings through which Zwingli addressed a particular situation. The turning point in his work is indicated by Zwingli's wanting to intervene in situations which are delineated by church and society in an ever more concentrated fashion and then exclusively on the basis of the gospel. Thus

he became reformer of a reality in which people found themselves and which was united by the will of God, so that he might develop equally their social consciousness and their Christian consciousness without distinguishing the two or developing them differently.

IV. The priest as patriot and humanist

In Glarus, where he worked for a decade from 1506, and in Einsiedeln where he worked for two years more, Zwingli began to realize gradually that the church of his day not only participated in a leading fashion in the formation of the political climate, but also sought to enforce its political position through military means. Zwingli's politically engaged, but Roman Catholicly integrated conformity, consisted for quite some time in permitting the people-destroying and only apparently profitable mercenary service in the affairs of the Pope, even when he denied the privilege to his confederates in favour of the French King, the German Emperor or Italian potentates. In the allegory *The Ox*, the patriot is a priest who is totally faithful to the church though very much concerned with the well-being of the people as he fights corruption; he places in the mouth of the ox, who symbolizes the confederacy, the words, "leave me in peace, I eat the green clover and despise the gifts. Take the gifts--you will soon discover that life disintegrates (*malunt qui vivere inique*)." [22] Oskar Farner is fully in the right when he arrives at the conclusion, "there is no trace of a light from Scripture and much less one of a reformed attitude."[23]

"Only with the maieutic help of Erasmus does Zwingli realize that the Pope engages in diplomacy and wages his battles with the same means as those used by the temporal powers."[24] From 1515-16 onwards the humanistic-pedagogical element is added to the patriotic one. Influenced by Erasmus--hence seeking his moral support in the classics--Zwingli asks for "instruction in the right rules of conduct in the world."[25] Christ now becomes the great ethical teacher, the culminating point of classical education and learning ideals. In face of brutality and killings in the world, the writer of the educational poem *The Labyrinth* asks in the year 1516 "Did

McGill University Library

Christ teach us that?"[26]

To obey Christ is the decisive element now for the reformed Catholic and Erasmian. Otherwise we could not understand the question, "Say what do we Christians have other than the name?"[27] The context clearly indicates--among others, the question is directed to the princes who act in folly--that the arena of testing must be the world. All those who wish to work effectively in God's world must "take it upon themselves to adopt other ways of behaving."[28] The civilizing of the world, the effect on the public welfare of the teaching of salvation of God, who allows the aura of peace to shine over us, a peaceful and obedient acting in keeping with all this, which is demanded of everyone, these are the increasingly Bible-oriented goals (for a *corpus christianum* which he cannot imagine as being divided) envisaged by Zwingli at this time. One could come to the conclusion,therefore, that the picture-puzzle "reformer or politician" attributed to him from our modern vantage point more likely contributes to the difficulty of understanding him than it helps. Not only must we consider diffuse borderline situations between state and church, but also the more radical questions of viewpoint which do not as yet concern themselves with the boundaries of modernity with its classical-juridical principles of division of power. Not only Luther but Zwingli too looks backwards in many respects. The new element which begins to show itself from the moment of Zwingli's call to Zurich lies in a revolutionary theologically new perspective of the whole.

V. Being Christian from obedience in responsibility to the world: General considerations

Every one of the concepts in our section heading appears to be loaded in a contemporary fashion (responsibility to the world) or horizonally relational and thus not generally useful here, since they are conditional upon relations (being Christian, obedience). Once again we must fuse the boundaries of each concept in order to understand Zwingli. "World" is not to be understood as opposite to "church" and political community is not to be seen as an opposite of Christian community. Personal ethics is not distinct from social ethics. In a christologically concentrated prolepsis, as it

were, the Zurich reformer presents us with the categorical imperative of Immanuel Kant. Both were moralists, differing only in degree of relation. Existence in presence of the God who makes himself known in Holy Scripture, the obedient relation in his sight, in view of God's promise and commandment is common to both Luther and Zwingli as determinative of everything else.[29]

Zwingli teaches us to see God's creation inclusive of his church as a totality within which there cannot be different kinds of right and righteousness. Indeed, the specific distinction of "divine and human righteousness" precludes them from being separated, since God or Christ (Zwingli is something of a modalist and does not always formulate the inner trinitarian problem concisely) is Lord over both understandings of righteousness. If Bernd Möller is right in stating that the first Zurich Disputation of January 29, 1523, is one of the first evangelical councils, "in a certain sense the founding assembly of the Evangelical Church of Zurich,"[30] then the comment made in a letter of April 1523 serves as a hermeneutical passport to it, far beyond the responsibility for founding a church: he, Zwingli, does truly see "that God did not create human beings to live unto themselves, but rather that they be consumed in service to God and the neighbour."[31] The creator makes of the person a "steward"[32] for the total reality of life, of that which is not his own but which has been entrusted to him and which belongs to the sole universal owner of all the earth, namely God. For everything there is a true "Christian understanding," in other words, a "Christian use."[33]

In one case this basic insight refers also to the demand of church renewal and in one instance to the notion of property, as Gottfried W. Locher has shown impressively in one of his studies.[34] Questions of property are certainly not peripheral for the reformer of the church, but rather a paradigm of the right understanding of being and relationship *coram deo*. As a consequence this then affects the treatment ofthe hitherto "ungodly manner in which profit making was handled."[35] Temporal goods or the temporal as such can be used in a godly or ungodly manner. The basic guilt of humankind in its complex sense is that a person thinks he owes to himself and may appropriate to himself "that which

McGill University Library

is God's."[36] We remain indebted to him, according to the programmatic tract *On divine and human righteousness*, and we are permanently indebted to "use the temporal in accordance with his word and his bidding alone."[36] With this we not only have the radical principle of the Reformation, the "alone," but also a concretizing of the notion of sin. Righteousness and unrighteousness *coram deo* are decided here, "therefore everyone who does not use the temporal according to God's will is unrighteous in God's sight, though he may not use it contrary to human righteousness. Therefore, Christ rightly calls riches unjust, partly because we appropriate to ourselves [make our private property] that which is God's...."[38] Should the remark of the editor of Z, Georg Finsler, be correct that *eigen machend* is to be modernized by "private property," then discussion is urgent on how the *coram deo* relation of the Christian is to be understood within the purview of a Marxist society-oriented theory of property (*Eigentumsethik*).

VI. State and society as testing ground: Specific considerations

For Zwingli everything temporal had derived value and derived authority. This is very instructive for our own time since at its depth it is most comforting. We must understand Bernd Möller in this context when he uses a statement found in Hundeshagen. It is possible to speak of an "immediate reference of Zwingli's religious reforms to the state, of a moral rebirth of communality."[39] It is interesting in this connection to pursue Möller's subsequent remark, "the most significant socio-ethical writings of Zwingli which contain this particular emphasis come from the year 1523. The sermon *On divine and human righteousness* appeared on the 24th of June and the commentary on the 35th to the 43rd Articles in his *Exposition of the 67 Articles* appeared in July."[40]

Everything else (*The Shepherd*, 1524, *A Faithful and Serious Admonition of the Confederates*, 1524, *One Who Causes Rebellion*, 1524, *Preface to the Commentary*, 1525, *Plan for a Military Excursion*, 1526, *Advice in Anticipation of Citizen's Day*, 1530, *What Zurich and Berne must consider in the matter of the five Cantons*, 1531, and the confessional

writings, 1530-31, addressed to Charles V and Francis I) expresses a basic reformed insight which repeatedly has to be concretized and approved.

VI.1 Magistracy

The First Zurich Disputation was intended by the initiator, the Council of Zurich, to deal with gospel-based preaching and with ecclesiastical matters in the city state of Zurich. It can be seen as a test case that Zwingli devotes articles 34-43 of his preparatory set of Articles to the "magistracy," but characteristically relates only the 34th article to "spiritual authority," commenting that "it has no basis in the teaching of Christ for its pomp."[41]

All the following articles on authority with their somewhat extensive commentaries in the *67 Conclusions* useful for a "founding assembly of the evangelical church of Zurich" served to authorize temporal authority on the basis of the teaching and work of Christ,(35) on the basis of God's will (38 & 39). From this, the people's priest who had been in the city for only four and a half years at this point derives his responsibility for the common good regardless of person or party to call for "peace and Christian life."[42] "Should I be accused of belonging to one or another of the parties, I am able to defend myself against everyone by pointing to the fact that I preached peace seriously in this righteous Christian city of Zurich. I confess before God and everyone that I have done so for no other reason except that I knew this to be my office. Ever since I became a priest I have carried this out with great zeal and in fear that I might not fulfil my obligation sufficiently. Indeed, as young as I may have been, I have always felt in my conscience fear rather than joy considering the office of minister [Z and H: "Waechterampt"]. For since I know that the blood of the little sheep who should be destroyed because of my neglect will be demanded of me, I have, in keeping with the obligation of my office, always preached peace. And when I saw subsequently that God worked through his word and inclined human hearts to peace, I would have been a great murderer of righteous people indeed, had I not again and again led to peace and Christian life and seriously admonished people when I saw so clearly

McGill University Library

the increase of that which was good."[43]

Zwingli accordingly not only develops a theory of state but evolves in keeping with it an obligation to carry out the office of preaching over against the magistrate, just as he calls all Christians to obey temporal authority as citizens, in expositing Romans 13:1f. (article 37). The above quote concerning the *engagement* of the preaching office for peace is found characteristically as commentary on the 37th Article.

This obligation, however, is not a one-way instance by demanding obedience; it is a mutual undertaking. Beginning with Article 38, Zwingli already prepares the possibility, indeed the necessity for the right to resistance. Acts 5:29: "One must obey God rather than human beings" is self evident, precisely when an authority commands what is against God. The hearing, reading and preaching of the teaching of Christ are not to be forbidden. Zwingli of course does not develop a theory of revolution on the basis of a possible attitude to such prohibitions; rather, he demands the willingness to suffer. The "unafraid soldiers of Christ"[44] are to expose their bodies to evil and beatings which an authority that has departed from the guidelines of Christ (article 42) may administer to the obedient-disobedient Christian citizens. "Do something bravely for God's sake." This sentence, used in a different context, is fully borne out here. For even at the time of Nero, Domitian and Maximinian persecution of Christians could not exterminate the teaching of Christ.

By the same token, the authorities ought to legislate "in conformity with divine will" to protect those who are burdened.[45] This sentence, whose problem term "in conformity" haunts the entire history of the Reformation, has left us a great many puzzles, not only in relation to Thomas Müntzer. In any case, Zwingli points the authority to the God-given law which is to serve as guideline. The authority is not to "create or establish the guidelines but is merely to act according to the guideline."[46] Is this Zwingli's version of a theocracy which by disregarding the differentiation between law and gospel not only overcomes problems but creates them?

When the magistracy serves those who have been entrusted to it (Article 41) through counsel and

aid, carrying out its office according to law and in righteousness, it naturally is not only entitled to obedience but even to appropriate support. Zwingli who more or less supports a social order ruled by aristocracy does not as yet distinguish between different forms of government, but simply turns to God in prayer for princes who are entrusted to protect the divine word.

Article 42 permits the right to resistance because it is in accordance with God's will to depose authorities which act "unfaithfully and outside the guidelines of Christ."[47] Zwingli does not shy away from the concretizing of this right: not through killings, war and rebellion is an authority to be replaced but "by many other ways."[48] The reason given: God has called us unto peace according to 1 Corinthians 7:15. A king who has been installed by common consent is to be deposed through common consent. The form of deposition depends for Zwingli on the constitution of government and election. Above it all God's hand is stretched out and warns.

Zwingli does not approve tyrannicide, for it would lead to rebellion. In a vision which sees the Kingdoms related to one another, he draws on Romans 14:17 for support: "The Kingdom of God is righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." However, when in order to avoid dangers the entire people or a greater part of the people unanimously depose the tyrant whom no one has chosen in the first place, "it is with God."[49] Not the manner of getting rid of the tyrant is at issue but rather that "there is lack of common righteousness."[50] The gospel will bring forth righteous people, which undoubtedly means within the context that applied righteousness will bring the tyrants to an end.

This appeal to righteousness culminates in the summa of the theses on authority in Article 43. The reformed "*alone*" refers here to the sole and sure foundation of any state. "The kingdom of one who rules with God alone is best and strongest. And the rule of him who governs on the basis of his own inclination (libido, driven by his own desires) is the most evil and weakest."[51]

VI.2 The relation of divine and human righteousness[52]

The St. John's sermon of 1523 is the next great test case. Its preparation is once again an occasional tract, this time with the intention of expositing that evangelical teaching does not lead to unrest and radical expressions but to the true and right foundation and stabilizing of authority. The entire tract represents a project for an evangelical social ethics which Arthur Rich in his paper presented in 1969 on the occasion of the centennial celebrations has pointed out with many quotations.

Zwingli here establishes relationships. Divine righteousness alone ought to be called righteousness.[53] In ten sentences the reformer argues in this fashion. Thoughts borrowed from the Sermon on the Mount play a very significant role here. The grace of God applied to the sinner alone forgives all our guilt without any of our merit. Since this is so, Zwingli may assume that the Christian can accept the demands of the Sermon on the Mount, i.e. attention to the neighbour, as a frequently repeated demand from God. God wills that we love the neighbour as ourselves, for he himself followed this rule by giving himself for us and receiving us as his friends, brothers and heirs.[54]

However, there are two forms of righteousness: a divine and a human one. One part of the law applies to the inner being only and extends to relationships of the love of God and the love of neighbour. No one can fulfil these except the one who "through grace, whose guarantor Christ is, has been made righteous through faith."[55] Human righteousness comprises the other part of the law, which applies to the external being. External piety and righteousness do not in every case correspond to the inner being. One who by the measure of human righteousness is often declared upright is and remains "an unrighteous person in God's sight (*coram deo autem iniustus est et furti reus*); for he has the desire and temptation after other goods perhaps greater than one who has stolen these."[56] Thus, Zwingli draws the *coram deo* relationship--as the Latin version has it--into the horizon of his statements about divine and human righteousness.

Only the knave who is apparent to human eyes

will be handed over to the authorities for judgement, but human righteousness is a poor weak righteousness since anyone may be found righteous who in God's sight is not righteous at all. Nonetheless, human righteousness is essential for every human society since otherwise the law of the wolf would take over. Even in knowing that according to divine righteousness we are all knaves, i.e. unrighteous persons, and knowing that this unrighteousness is known to God alone, knowing also that human righteousness is not worthy to be called righteousness, nonetheless, human righteousness and with it authority must be acknowledged as a righteousness and authority commanded by and derived from God. Thus judges and superiors are servants of God as schoolmasters to whom obedience must be rendered, except when they wilfully act against God.[57]

An authority can neither properly adjudge nor forbid absolute[58] divine righteousness. The proclaimers of the word of God have nothing directly to do with the power of an authority of a magistrate.[59] They have the office of presenting the gospel,[60] as Zwingli thinks he has amply demonstrated in the *Exposition of the Articles*. When all this is clear, the reformer is able to authorize human righteousness or authority within the framework of a binding Christ obedience; for according to Matthew 22:21, one must render to Caesar what belongs to Caesar and to God what belongs to God.[61]

Zwingli of course has his criteria by which a confusion of divine and human righteousness is excluded. In a clear summary statement he points out that God's word is to govern all people but that without our Lord Jesus Christ we in our guilt and impotence cannot comply. The more we are aware of our guilt and impotence, the more we discover also the beauty and omnipotence of God. In view of the fact that God's word cannot be followed because of godlessness and unbelief, God has given us the least commandment so that human society (*humanae societatis securitas, pax et studium*) may be preserved and protected, and he has set up guardians who must seriously look to it that even the last remnant of poor human righteousness is not totally removed."[62]

In the manner which we indicated, the gospel does not simply become human law in the sense of law and order. There are distinctions between believers

McGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

and unbelievers, there is a derived human righteousness which must serve the security of human society without either theocratic[63] or hierarchical practices of government becoming dominant.

This uncompromising relationship to God's word in Zwingli, his *coram deo* relation which teaches us to distinguish the absolute from the relative, remains intact in subsequent phases of the reformer's life and work. In the compromises and in the openness to misinterpretation of his theological and socio-political decisions right up to the battle at Kappel, Zwingli shows himself to be "a man who had committed himself to the progressive forces in church and world with the aggressive word of God at his back. To open oneself to Zwingli's spirit means therefore today, as it did for him in his own day, to stand up for a true reordering of church and world out of the radicalism of faith, despite all opposition."[64]

Note: Translated from the German by E.J. Furcha and R. Cooper

Notes

1. Lecture given in the Münster at Berne, March 26, 1984.
2. G.W. Locher, "Huldrych Zwingli" in M. Greschat, ed., *Gestalten der Kirchengeschichte*, Vol. 5, *Die Reformationszeit I* (Stuttgart, Berlin, Köln, Mainz, 1981), 208.
3. Z III 112, 21f., *Eine treue und ernstliche Vermahnung an die Eidgenossen* (1524).
4. Ibid. 22f.
5. Ibid. 113, 7-17.
6. Ibid.
7. Cited by F. Büsser, *Das katholische Zwingli-Bild. Von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart* (Zurich, Stuttgart, 1968), p.62.
8. G. Götting, *Huldrych Zwingli. Zum 500. Geburtstag des Schweizer Reformators*, Hefte aus Burgscheidungen, 217 (Berlin 1983). The Zwingli citation in Z I, 463, 8f., Article 42 in Zwingli's 67 articles of January 1523. W. Hollenweger, *Huldreich Zwingli zwischen Krieg und Frieden* (Munich, 1983) picks up the juxta-

posing of problems in Zwingli for decisions which are relevant today. See also S. Widmer, *1484 Zwingli 1984* (Kirchenrat der evangelisch-reformierten Landeskirche des Kantons Zürich, 1983), especially the chapter "A New State Emerges," pp.39-45.

9. Z X 165, 4f (June 1529).
10. Zwa XIII, (No. 1, 1969) 27. 25. "Zum Problem der Theokratie bei Zwingli" is dealt with by L. von Muralt a year earlier in *Discordia Concors. Festschrift für E. Bonjour* (Basel, 1968), pp. 369-390.
11. G.W. Locher, *Huldrych Zwingli in neuer Sicht* (Zurich, Stuttgart, 1969), 14.198.
12. *Zeitschrift für evangelisch Ethik*, 1969, Vol. 5, pp. 257-273.
13. Zwa, XIII, Vol. 1, (1969), p. 67.
14. Ibid., p. 67f.
15. U. Gäbler, *Huldrych Zwingli: Eine Einführung in sein Leben und sein Werk* (Munich, 1983), p. 72.
16. W.H. Neuser, *Die reformatorische Wende bei Zwingli* (Neukirchen, Vluyn, 1977), 143, 153 and elsewhere.
17. U. Gäbler, "Huldrych Zwingli's Reformatorische Wende", *ZKG*, vol. 89 (1978), p. 134.
18. Ibid., p. 121. See also, G.W. Locher, *Huldrych Zwingli in neuer Sicht*, p. 185.
19. Z I II, 1-22, 184. Generally on this question cf. J. Rogge, "Zwingli und Luther in ihren sozialen Handlungsfeldern", Zwa XIII, 10 (1973), pp. 625-644.
20. Z II 471, 1-525, 20.
21. The relationships are found in Z VI/II 669. G.W. Locher, *Die Zwinglische Reformation im Rahmen der europäischen Kirchengeschichte* (Göttingen and Zurich, 1979), p. 167, note 345, lists the most important writings of Zwingli on the matter of religion and politics.
22. Z I 20, 97-99. For a consecutive analysis cf. J. Rogge, *Zwingli und Erasmus. Die Friedensgedanken des jungen Zwingli* (Berlin 1962), 17f., and O. Farner, *Huldrych Zwingli*, Vol. II (Zurich 1946), pp. 85-88.
23. Ibid., p. 88.
24. J. Rogge, *op. cit.* p. 18.
25. J. Rogge, *Anfänge der Reformation. Der junge Luther 1483-1521. Der junge Zwingli 1484-1523*

MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

(Berlin, 1983), p. 259.

26. Z. I 60, 213.
27. Ibid., 223f.
28. Ibid., 242.
29. For Luther see J. Rogge, *Anfänge der Reformation*, pp. 126, 137 and passim.
30. B. Möller, *Zwinglis Disputationen. Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, Vol. 87, Kanonistische Abteilung LVI (Weimar, 1970), pp. 317, 319.
31. Z VIII, 71, 9f (April 22, 1523). See also B. Möller, *op.cit.* 295.
32. Z II, 451, p. 10.
33. Ibid., 8f. p. 17.
34. G.W. Locher, *Der Eigentumsbegriff als Problem evangelischer Theologie* (Zurich, Stuttgart, 1962), pp. 35, 53, note 83.
35. Z II, 515, 26-516, p.4.
36. Ibid., 515, p. 23.
37. Ibid., p. 25.
38. Ibid., 515, 26-516, 2. Expositions on the problem of property in Zwingli and in the social context are rendered in increasingly more profiled fashion by Marxist theorists. Cf. G. Rudolph, *Huldrych Zwingli (Zwinglis Eigentumslehre, Zwinglis Auffassung vom Staat)* in *Staat und Recht*. Published by Akademie für Staats-und Rechtswissenschaft of the GDR, 1/1984, pp. 64-66, 66-70.
39. B. Möller, *op. cit.*, p. 295.
40. Ibid., cf. Z II, 471-525 and 298-347.
41. *Huldrych Zwingli: Auswahl seiner Schriften*, E. Künzli, ed. (Stuttgart, 1962), 128. Z II 298, 18f; Z I, 462, 15f.
42. Z II, 313, p. 26.
43. Huldrych Zwingli, *Auswahl seiner Schriften*, E. Künzli, ed., 130f., cf. Text and exposition of terms in Z II, 313, 13-314, 1, and *Zwingli Hauptschriften*, edited F. Blanke, O. Farner, et. al., Vol. 4 (Zurich, 1952), 100f. (Referred to as H.)
44. Z II, 321, p. 19.
45. Z I, 463, 1f.
46. Huldrych Zwingli, *Auswahl seiner Schriften*, E. Künzli, ed., p. 133.
47. Z I, 463, 8f.
48. Z II, 344, 17f.
49. Ibid., 345, 22.

50. Ibid., 346, 10.
51. Z I. 463, 10f; Z, II, 346, 15-17; H, Vol. 4, p. 141.
52. See A. Rich, "Zwingli als sozialpolitischer Denker" in Zwa XIII-1 (1969), pp. 67-89. Note especially p. 81. F. Büsser, *Huldrych Zwingli. Reformation als prophetischer Auftrag* (Göttingen, Zurich, Frankfurt, 1973), pp. 73-80. Ch. Gestrich, *Zwingli als Theologe* (Zurich, Stuttgart, 1967), 176-180. (Note particularly the examinations on the dependence on Luther's pamphlet on Authority of the same year.) H. Schmid, *Zwinglis Lehre von der göttlichen und menschlichen Gerechtigkeit* (Zurich, 1959).
53. Z II, 479, 16f.
54. Article 10, Z II, 481, p. 9-13.
55. Ibid., 484, 20f.
56. Ibid., 31f.
57. Ibid., 488, pp. 4-6.
58. A. Rich, *op. cit.*, p. 81.
59. The people's priest who had been entrusted with numerous edicts simply worked on behalf of the Council. Cf. W. Jacob, *Politische Führungsschicht und Reformation* (Zurich, 1970), pp. 91-100.
60. Z II, 498, 5.
61. Ibid., 6-9. "...volonté divine" and "droit humain" J. Pollet, too, sees as relating to one another: "Zwingli ancrait dans la volonté divine l'existence de la société civile, et il assignait au droit humain lui-même un fondement et une origine divines." J.V. Pollet, *Huldrych Zwingli et la Réforme en Suisse* (Paris, 1963), p. 51.
62. Z II, 521, 22-522, 2. See also the text and commentary in, *Huldrych Zwingli. Auswahl seiner Schriften*, E. Künzli, ed., p. 163 and H, volume 7: *Zwingli der Staatsmann*, p. 97f.
63. R.C. Walton devoted an entire volume to the much debated issue. Cf. R.C. Walton, *Zwingli's Theocracy* (Toronto, 1967), p. VII and passim. With some scepticism on the matter, cf. G.R. Potter, *Zwingli* (Cambridge, 1976), p. 88, n.2, and 377.
64. A. Rich, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

RADICAL EARLY ZWINGLIANISM: BALTHASAR HUBMAIER, FABER'S *URSACH* AND THE PEASANT PROGRAMMES

James Stayer

"Radical Early Zwinglianism" has had almost opposite meanings for historians of Anabaptism and for historians of the Peasants' War of 1525. For traditional Anabaptist historians "radical early Zwinglianism" was a welcome religious predigree for Anabaptism and was repeatedly used to destroy the credibility of anyone, from the sixteenth century to the twentieth, who said the Anabaptists "went back" to the Peasants' War and/or Thomas Müntzer.[1] Peasants' War historians have universally regarded Zwinglianism itself, particularly in its "radical, early" form, as a part of the Revolution of 1525. Günther Franz wrote in 1939 that "in Switzerland under Zwingli's influence the connection of Reformation and Revolution was closer than in Lutheran territories."[2] Max Steinmetz' presentation of "the Early Bourgeois Revolution in Germany" describes Zwingli as the leader of a "bourgeois-radical camp" which, like Müntzer's truly revolutionary movement, played its part in the history of the Peasants' War.[3] Most recently and most emphatically, Peter Blickle declared in his *Revolution of 1525* (1977) that Zwingli's career and influence demonstrated "that the Revolution of 1525 was an unfolding of the Reformation itself."[4]

There is probably no better place to contrast these two conceptions of "radical early Zwinglianism" than in the interpretation of Balthasar Hubmaier, considered by both Anabaptist historians and Peasants' War historians to have been a "radical early Zwinglian." This paper will examine "radical early Zwinglianism" through the prism of one source concerning Hubmaier, Johannes Faber's *Ursach warumb der Widertauffer Patron unnd erster Anfenger Doctor Balthasar Huebmayer zu Wien auff den zehenten Martij Anno 1528 verbrennet sey.*[5] The *Ursach* has been a source of scholarly controversy for more than one hundred years, since Alfred Stern's book on the Twelve Articles of the peasants, published in 1868.[6] In 1939 Günther Franz noted that it would require a book just to describe one specific part of that controversy.[7] It would be

surprising if I were today to offer a convincing solution to matters that have puzzled Central European scholars for a century. In fact this paper makes no such claim. It aims rather to explain why the *Ursach* seems a more credible source now than it did when Torsten Bergsten wrote the most recent comprehensive study of Hubmaier in 1961,[8] and to explore the very indirect illumination provided by this scholarly conundrum for the topic: "radical early Zwinglianism."

Johannes Heierlein Faber had been an Erasmian Biblical humanist working together with Zwingli for reform of the church in the Swiss Confederation and the southwestern corner of the Empire. As late as autumn 1520 he had made a friendly visit to Zwingli in Zurich.[9] Forced to choose between Rome and the Reformers, he chose Rome. In 1522 he had probably authored the Bishop of Constance's admonition against the Zurich Reformation, and in January 1523 he was Zwingli's chief opponent in the disputation that launched Zurich on its anti-papal course.[10] As vicar general of the Bishop of Constance and later as Bishop of Vienna Faber had a close acquaintance with Zwingli and radical Zwinglians like Hubmaier.

The *Ursach* was written, as its title says, to justify Hubmaier's execution:

> I have related these things, not because I take any pleasure in his death...but in the recognition that there are many obstinate perverse self-proclaimed 'Christians' who have said in many places that he was treated unjustly, that he was a martyr in the sight of God, burned at the stake despite his innocence like John Hus...[11]

The chief accusations against Hubmaier are Anabaptist heresy and rebellion during the Peasants' War. In a short nine-folio presentation[12] the *Ursach* describes Hubmaier's career on the basis of contemporary reports and written sources, one of which, Hubmaier's confession in his final trial at Vienna, is reproduced verbatim.[13]

The consensus of Hubmaier's biographers has been to accept the authenticity of the Vienna confession and the reported data about Hubmaier's life, since here the *Ursach* confirms and complements

McGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

our other historical sources, except for some instances of imprecise chronology.[14] Faber's really controversial allegations concern Hubmaier's supposed authorship of peasant programmes, leading to the extravagant conclusion that "therefore [Hubmaier] takes second place only to Luther in being responsible for the sad slaughter of a hundred thousand peasants and the making of many hundred thousand widows and orphans."[15] Since few of us are inclined to agree with Faber either on the power he attributes to subversive ideas or about Luther's guilt for the violence that accompanied the unfolding of the Reformation, his conclusion about Hubmaier and the Peasants' War appears at best exaggerated, at worst incredible. What about the data upon which he bases such a charge?

We will begin by trying to clarify the substance of Faber's accusations against Hubmaier before examining the question of their credibility. First, Faber describes how Hubmaier encouraged Waldshut's military resistance against the Habsburgs and the Swabian League, as well as the town's eventual alliance with the peasants of neighbouring regions on the Upper Rhine. Hubmaier called Ferdinand of Austria a "childish" ruler, told the common citizenry that they had the right to install and depose rulers, carried weapons himself and encouraged the fortification of Waldshut. He was also supposed to have opposed tithes and "zins" contracts, saying that anyone who had paid upon a "zins" contract to the amount of the original loan capital had no obligation to pay further. He preached to the armed peasants when they were in Waldshut "that game, fish, fowls, wine, meadows, woods, etc., were free" and encouraged military cooperation between the Waldshuters and the Klettgau peasants.[16] These allegations, both descriptions of Hubmaier's actions and paraphrases of his words, probably came from Faber's discussions with Waldshuters when he visited the town in December 1525, immediately after its fall to Austrian troops.[17]

At that time, Faber continued, he discovered documentary evidence of Hubmaier's involvement in the authorship of peasant programmes. When he fled, Hubmaier left behind a manuscript booklet containing eight folios written in his own hand and other pages "written by others, but improved upon by him."[18] In

another writing Faber supplied additional data about this booklet, saying it contained thirty folios,[19] i.e. eight in Hubmaier's writing and twenty-two edited by way of insertions in his hand. Faber summarized two documents, one that we know of from elsewhere and one that we have access to only in the summary contained in the *Ursach*. The Letter of Articles, used by the armed peasants of the Black Forest in May 1525, was the document written by Hubmaier in eight folios. Faber reduced it to one-fifth of its original size.[20] The other document, to which scholars have referred as "the Draft of a Constitution,"[21] though often complaining about the inadequacies of that label,[22] would have covered the remaining twenty-two pages of Hubmaier's folio booklet and have been edited, rather than written, by him. Carl Sachsse, in attacking the credibility of Hubmaier's authorship of these documents, suggested that what Faber may have been describing was a booklet in which Hubmaier made marginal notations on "the Draft of a Constitution" and then made a personal copy of the Letter of Articles.[23] Faber's description of what Hubmaier did to "the Draft of a Constitution" was that he "improved" ("gebessert") it.[24] Certainly the point was that he was taking editorial responsibility for the document, not annotating it in the sense of jotting down his possibly dissenting responses to its contents. Whether or not the notion that Hubmaier was the author of the Letter of Articles and the editor of "the Draft of a Constitution" is credible, that was the substance of Faber's accusation.

Then, leading up to his passionate charge that Hubmaier, after Luther, carried upon his head the bloodshed of the entire Peasants' War, Faber reverted from documentary analysis to hearsay:

> He produced particular peasant articles, circulated in print, which had the consequence that the peasants in Stühlingen and the Klettgau were the first to rise up against their rulers, which was the cause of the pitiable, terrible rebellion and slaughter ...[25]

The most common contemporary label for the Twelve Articles was the peasant articles "which circulated in print."[26] With the exception of the League

McGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Ordinance (Bundesordnung) worked out in Memmingen on 7 March 1525,[27] the Twelve Articles were the only peasant programme to appear in print, and they were by far the most widely circulated. Among the scholars who have expressed an opinion on the subject there is a consensus that, rightly or wrongly, Faber was accusing Hubmaier of the authorship of the Twelve Articles.

Toward the end of the *Ursach* comes the admission from Hubmaier's confession that "he elaborated and interpreted the peasant articles that they brought to him from the armed assembly, and led them to imagine that they could be accepted as Christian and just."[28] Such a statement is broad enough to apply to any or all of the peasant programmes Hubmaier is supposed to have "made" or "improved."

From the work of Alfred Stern in 1868 to that of Wilhelm Mau in 1912 a tradition of scholarship took Faber's proposal that Hubmaier authored the Twelve Articles very seriously and tried to prove it. They were opposed by other scholars who argued that the Twelve Articles came from Upper Swabia, not from the Black Forest, and were authored by Sebastian Lotzer, the secretary of the Baltringen peasant band, perhaps assisted by the Memmingen pastor, Christoph Schappeler. The Upper Swabian case seemed to have won out when Günther Franz, the leading Peasants' War scholar of his generation, lent it his authority in an article in the *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* in 1939.[29]

Peasants' War historians continued, however, to give weight to Faber's suggestions about Hubmaier's authorship of the other documents. Franz thought him the probable author of both the Letter of Articles and "the Draft of a Constitution."[30] The post-World War II study of the Soviet historian, M.M. Smirin, tried to draw distinctions between the merely political aims of "the Draft of a Constitution" and what he considered the more advanced economic programme of the Letter of Articles. Hubmaier, as a Zwinglian bourgeois radical, was an appropriate author for "the Draft of a Constitution," but the Letter of Articles must go back to Thomas Müntzer's visit to the Upper Rhine in the fall of 1524.[31] This distinction carried over into the categories applied by historians of the German Democratic Republic to their theory of an

"Early Bourgeois Revolution in Germany."

The scholars who approached Hubmaier primarily as a theologian who radicalized Zwinglian religious ideas in the direction of Anabaptism were inclined to attach little weight to the assertions in Faber's *Ursach*. We have already mentioned Carl Sachsse as a case in point. Torsten Bergsten's major study of Hubmaier in 1961 presented a sober, fair-minded analysis of Faber's data, based both on the current state of Peasants' War research and on the "free church" historians' understanding of Anabaptism. Bergsten was Swedish Baptist, but his treatment of Hubmaier was not burdened by apologetic intent. He accepted Faber's account of Hubmaier's part in Waldshut's resistance against the Austrians and in her alliance of convenience with the peasant bands. Nevertheless, it seemed incredible to him that Hubmaier should have been the author either of the Twelve Articles, the Letter of Articles or the Draft of a Constitution.

Bergsten's assumption was that there could be no "inner" connection between the religious objectives of the Anabaptists and the social goals of the peasants of 1525: "Here we are looking at two occurrences, parallel in time and place, but with different content."[32] Bergsten acknowledged that Hubmaier probably did approve of the moderate economic and social objectives of the Twelve Articles, but held that, since they originated in Upper Swabia rather than on the Upper Rhine, he could not have had a hand in writing them.[33] As to the Letter of Articles and "the Draft of a Constitution," a comparison of their content with Hubmaier's authentic, published, religious writings makes it "very improbable" that he was their author.[34] Bergsten concludes that Faber's *Ursach* has misled previous scholarship about Hubmaier's importance for the Peasants' War. "Waldshut's Reformer did not have the farreaching significance for the so-called German Peasants' War that scholars have often attributed to him."[35]

But Faber's *Ursach* was not, in fact, to be so easily dismissed. A new generation both of Anabaptist and Peasants' War historians have upset those assumptions of their elders which seemed to make its allegations incredible. To begin with the Twelve Articles, Peter Blickle, who is at least in contention for Franz's former position as doyen of

MENNONITE LIBRARY & ARCHIVES

Peasants' War historians, is not in agreement with his predecessor on their exclusively Upper Swabian origin. Blickle has proved, at least to my satisfaction, on the basis of fresh archival research that the Memmingen League Ordinance of 7 March 1525, the other published peasant programme besides the Twelve Articles, was substantially borrowed from an earlier, Upper Rhine League Ordinance that circulated in manuscript.[36] In other words, the renowned union of the Baltringen, Allgau and Lake Constance peasant assemblies of Upper Swabia was borrowing the instrument of a similar, earlier union of armed peasant bands in the Upper Rhine area, possibly bands from the Breisgau and Sundgau.[37] Moreover, this earlier document that Blickle refers to as "the Upper Rhine League Ordinance" contained an extraordinary article that disappeared when it underwent further editing in the Upper Rhine area and was not present in the printed Memmingen Ordinance.[38] Blickle describes it as an "embryonic form of the Twleve Articles":

> In a very tight, abbreviated form that calls for much interpretation, [it] demands the abolition of serfdom (Art. 3 of the Twleve Articles), of death taxes (Art. 11), of the small tithe (contained in Art. 2) and freedom of hunting and fishing (Art. 4). More decisive and weightier seems to me the fact that the justification of these demands is strikingly similar to that of the Twelve Articles. The Twelve Articles want to drop all demands that are not in harmony with the Scriptures, but reserve the right to make further demands if they can be derived from the Bible. [This article] likewise dispenses ... with the demands explicitly put forward, in case they can be proven by Scripture to be unjust; it also reserves the right to make further demands if they can be established from the Holy Scriptures.[39]

Blickle interpreted the influence of the "Upper Rhine League Ordinance" in a way maximally compatible with the earlier research of Günther Franz. He suggested that, besides its obvious

influence on the Memmingen League Ordinance, it was used by Lotzer (and Schappeler) as a basis for editing and summarizing the grievances of the Baltringen peasants so as to produce the Twelve Articles. "In this way the accomplishments of previous research are not devalued, for the responsible editorial activity of Lotzer (and Schappeler) remains untouched by the arguments advanced here."[40] As for Hubmaier, could not his confession that "he elaborated and interpreted peasant articles" brought to him from the camp refer to the authorship of "the Upper Rhine League Ordinance"?[41] In his concern to keep his revision conservative, it seems to me that Blickle is close to self-contradiction. He describes the oldest version of "the Upper Rhine League Ordinance," which he was interpreting, as "hardly meeting the requirements of a systematic treatment of its individual contents; grievances against the lords and organizational measures for securing the League are placed beside each other abruptly."[42] Obviously an editorial distinction between the articles of grievance and the league ordinance was called for. But respect for Günther Franz (in whose Festschrift Blickle's article was published) seems to have closed Blickle's eyes to the greater plausibility of Hubmaier having made this editorial division rather than Lotzer. Aside from the fact that Hubmaier and not the furrier Lotzer was the scholastically trained intellectual, the grievance article was already separated out of the League Ordinance in later manuscript versions used on the Upper Rhine, as Blickle shows.[43]

It had been clear even before the research of Günther Franz that the Twelve Articles were indeed first printed in Upper Swabia.[44] They were in circulation in Augsburg and Ulm, certainly by the period 19-22 March. In their printed form there is much philological evidence that they came from the same hand as the grievance articles of the Memmingen villages, which adds up to an overwhelming case that Sebastian Lotzer prepared them for the press.[45] So much was already conceded by Wilhelm Mau in 1912, who nevertheless argued that Hubmaier wrote the essential prototype of the Twelve Articles.[46] Franz had the argumentative advantage of the simpler construction when he pointed out that, in the absence of source evidence, it should be assumed that the

MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

local Baltringen grievances, not a document from the Upper Rhine, provided the material edited by Lotzer.[47] Blickle, however, seems now to have provided the hitherto missing source evidence that peasant documents authored on the Upper Rhine *were* published in a lightly altered form in Upper Swabia. Accordingly it is called for to reexamine the scholarly arguments advanced just prior to World War I on behalf of Hubmaier's authorship of the Twelve Articles.

Some of these arguments, pointing to Hubmaier's theological dependence on the Zurich Reformation, stressed the "radical early Zwinglian" origin of specific demands like the local election of pastors or the distinction between a great tithe, regarded as Biblical and justifiable, and a small tithe, denounced as an unscriptural innovation. Supposedly, the Upper Rhine region, containing the Black Forest and Hubmaier's Waldshut, adjacent to Switzerland as it was, had absorbed these demands, while they were unknown in Upper Swabia at the time of the appearance of the Twelve Articles. While not denying their Zwinglian content, Franz was easily able to situate such grievances in Upper Swabia among the demands of the Baltringen peasantry, which antedated the Twelve Articles.[48] More difficult to account for are the numerous contemporary references to the Twelve Articles as "Black Forest Articles," balanced of course by other sources that call them "Swabian Articles."[49] But the most striking arguments for Hubmaier having a hand in the Twelve Articles are textual comparisons with his authentic writings, the kind of evidence Bergsten valued most but did not have to consider after Günther Franz had supposedly closed the subject.

I would suggest that historians of the Reformation and Peasants' War reexamine the textual case that Wilhelm Mau makes for Hubmaier's authorship of the Twelve Articles.[50] It is based on the same kind of evidence that scholars use currently in presenting their opinions about the authorship of the Letter of Articles and "the Draft of a Constitution." I will mention only three instances in which Mau seems to have a particularly strong case. One comes from the Introduction to the Twelve Articles: "the words and life [of Christ] teach nothing but love, peace, patience, and unity. And

all who believe in this Christ become loving, peaceful, patient and one in spirit." Compare Hubmaier's *Rechenschaft* (1528): "the word of God teaches love, peace, unity and not rebellion."[51] Mau also points to the way Hubmaier's *A Form of the Lord's Supper* (1527) elucidates the sentence in Article 3: "we should love God, recognize him as our Lord in our neighbour, and willingly do all things God commanded us at his Last Supper."[52] The marginal note "A Christian offer" ("Ain christliche Erbietung"), repeated seven times in the Twelve Articles, recurs in two of Hubmaier's published writings.[53] These examples merely skim a bit of the cream from Mau's argumentation. In my estimation they are not sufficient to prove that Hubmaier played a role in the composition of the Twelve Articles. On the other hand, the allegations of the *Ursach* on this point no longer seem incredible, as they did until recently.

To turn to the Letter of Articles, the *Ursach* says that Hubmaier composed it, indicated that it was written in Waldshut, dated it and sent it to "Hall and other places."[54] The Letter of Articles sought to win the membership of rural assemblies and towns for a "Christian Union" which would remove financial and other burdens that clerical and lay lords had imposed upon "the poor common man in the towns and countryside."[55] It wanted to achieve this objective "without any fighting or bloodshed."[56] Its primary device was a sort of general boycott, referred to as "the worldly ban." Holders of castles and monasteries, who had been the main cause of the peasants' misery, were to be placed under this boycott immediately, and to be released from it only if they would withdraw from these strongholds of past oppression.[57] Presumably the castles and monasteries were to be torn down. The secular and clerical lords, as well as anyone who assisted them or refused to join the "Christian Union," were to be totally shunned.

> Absolutely no intercourse should be maintained or carried on with those who refuse and decline to enter the brotherly Union and to promote the general Christian welfare -- neither by way of eating, drinking, bathing, grinding meal, baking, tilling the soil, mowing hay.[58]

MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

When Hubmaier later wrote of the ban in the Christian congregation, in the Nikolsburg period, he used strikingly similar terms:

> The Christians should have no intercourse with such a person -- neither in conversation, eating, drinking, grinding meal, baking or in any other way.[59]

Applying a comparison between the Letter of Articles and Hubmaier's "authentic writings," Bergsten concluded that the hypothesis of Hubmaier's authorship was an unlikely one.[60] Not surprisingly, he shows that in his published religious writings Hubmaier never made the step from Christian excommunication to a secular boycott nor demonstrated the antagonism to lay aristocrats that comes to the fore in the Letter of Articles.[61] Recent Peasants' War literature in the wake of the 1975 anniversary has differed with Bergsten. Tom Scott and Justus Maurer regard the part of the Letter of Articles on the "worldly ban" as a natural secular application of Hubmaier's views on the ban in the church.[62] Siegfried Hoyer's comment on Hubmaier's Nikolsburg writings, which form the basis of Bergsten's argument, seems to underline the obvious: "The failure of the revolutionary situation caused many of the participants in the Peasant War to reverse their former revolutionary convictions."[63] In Nikolsburg Hubmaier, after all, was able temporarily to carry through an Anabaptist Reformation with the patronage of local aristocrats.

"The Draft of a Constitution" does not lend itself to textual comparisons like the Twelve Articles or the Letter of Articles because we know it only in Faber's terse summary. It received its name because it proposes a process of removing and replacing rulers. The people of each territorial assembly ("Landschaft") were to constitute a covenant, brotherhood or union (the terms were used interchangeably) and summon their ruler to join. If he did not comply, the power of government could be taken from him and given to someone else. The ordinary peasantry should then nominate twelve candidates for the position of new ruler, without giving any special preference to the aristocracy. This new ruler, too, was removable. In case a ruler should resist deposition by his people he should be

subjected to the general boycott or secular excommunication (presumably as described in the Letter of Articles). If that did not suffice, the new ruler might summon his people to arms or even hire mercenaries to expel the deposed "tyrant."

The idea of getting rid of a tyrannical, "childish" or otherwise unsuitable ("ungeschickt") ruler because, if his subjects failed to do so, "they are becoming accomplices in the ruler's vices,"[64] seems to echo Hubmaier's later statement "On the Sword" (1527), which was in turn borrowed verbally from Zwingli's commentary on Article 42 of the Zurich Reformation disputation of January 1523. Both "On the Sword" and Zwingli's "Commentary" caution that a tyrant should be endured if he cannot be deposed "without great damage and rebellion."[65] Bergsten stresses this difference between "the Draft of a Constitution" and the related statements of Hubmaier and Zwingli on what to do about a tyrannical ruler.[66] However, 1523 and 1527 were times of peace when bloodshed could be avoided, while 1525 was already a time of the massacre of innocents or so the author of "the Draft of a Constitution" described the princes' "war against the peasants":

> The time has come that God will no longer tolerate the skinning, scraping, forcing, fleecing, gouging, squeezing and other tyranny of the temporal rulers. They treat the poor people like Herod treated the innocent children. The murderous Duke of Lorraine gave a first sample of this at Zabern in Alsace, as His Princely Highness [Ferdinand of Austria] did elsewhere.

Interpreters of the most varying standpoints, Bergsten, Scott, Maurer and the Müntzer biographer Walter Elliger have established it as a virtual consensus of current scholarship that "the Draft of a Constitution" contains the ideas and, in the passage quoted from Faber's *Ursach*, echoes of the phraseology of Thomas Müntzer.[68] The three last publications of Müntzer, the ones Carl Hinrichs styled his "political writings," seemed to be the major source of "the Draft of a Constitution."[69] Of course, it could not have been written by Müntzer in the form Faber summarized it. Müntzer left

MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Mühlhausen for Southwest Germany and Switzerland on 27 September 1524 and returned there by February 1525. The battle of Zabern occurred on 17 May 1525, two days after Müntzer's own defeat and capture at Frankenhausen.[70] Elliger's solution was that "the Draft of a Constitution" was based on a document Müntzer left behind him on the Upper Rhine, and that the reference to the battle of Zabern would have been an addition by Hubmaier.[71] This would correspond to the statement from Müntzer's confession that "in the Klettgau and Hegau near Basel he presented some articles from the gospel on the right manner of government, and from these other, further articles were made ..." He characterized his preaching in the rebellious regions of the Upper Rhine as saying "that where there were unbelieving rulers there would also be an unbelieving people, so that a proper reordering must occur there."[72] The idea that subjects would be punished for tolerating unbelieving rulers appears, then, to have united Müntzer, Hubmaier, Zwingli and "the Draft of a Constitution."

Although he was impressed with the near consensus that associated Müntzer with "the Draft of a Constitution" and did not reject its conclusions outright,[73] Peter Blickle pointed to some serious difficulties in viewing "the Draft of a Constitution" as a work of Müntzer. The "Landschaft," territorial assembly, a very basic part of the framework of "the Draft of a Constitution," was a South German institution not discussed in Müntzer's known writings. The concept of a covenant, "Bund," is of course frequently used by Müntzer, but, then, it was not unknown in Southwest Germany, where the chief instrument of Habsburg policy had long been the Swabian Bund. The Upper Rhine peasants as well as Thomas Müntzer used the expressions "skinning, scraping," "forcing, squeezing" in their descriptions of the oppression of the overlords.[74] Since we did not even have the original document, only a summary, before us, it was necessary to be very cautious about textual comparisons. (On the other hand, Faber's method in the *Ursach* was to insert what were, in effect, direct citations in his descriptions of speeches and writings. The problem was that he never clearly indicated where he was citing.)

In reference to "the Draft of a Constitution"

and the Letter of Articles Blickle suggested that it was important, above all, to situate them in the fast moving narrative of the Peasants' War on the Upper Rhine in the spring of 1525. I would like to underscore that point even more than Blickle himself has done. These documents, like the Twelve Articles and the radical pamphlet "To the Assembly of Common Peasantry" (1525),[75] are anonymous. Their significance centres on the texts themselves and their appropriation by the peasants' movement rather than on the possible authors. Although an attribution of probable authorship would have historical value, if it were possible, it is a secondary matter.

If that were my only point, the investigation presented here would have the distinct but limited value of a "levelling operation," an exercise in cautioning scholars against producing an appearance of clarity about issues that are unclear. We can no longer be sure that we know that Lotzer (much less Lotzer *and* Schappeler) wrote the Twelve Articles, although Lotzer surely edited them. We ought not to say with assurance that Hubmaier composed the Letter of Articles, although there is a presentable case that he did. We cannot be certain that Thomas Müntzer had anything to do with "the Draft of a Constitution," and be assured that, if he did, the document Faber summarized underwent major revisions from the one Müntzer left behind when he departed from the Upper Rhine late in 1524.

But there is another, subtler point. We cannot be certain that the *Ursach* is wrong when it associates Hubmaier with the authorship or editing of the three anonymous documents. In each instance the suggestions of the *Ursach* have a definite plausibility. The arguments of Bergsten that we can accept the *Ursach's* statements about Hubmaier's actions during the Peasants' War but must reject his authorship or editing of the documents are unconvincing. Suspension of judgement may not be transmuted into denial. The *Ursach* has not been rendered incredible.

In further investigation of "radical, early Zwinglianism" and its involvement with Anabaptism and the Peasants' War we must be on guard, above all, against historical stereotypes. In 1524 and 1525 Zwinglianism was not yet a Reformed church with established governmental support. In 1524 and early

MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

1525 Thomas Müntzer's reputation was not yet so blackened by Wittenberg polemics that the Zwinglians wanted to stay clear of him, nor had he become so desperate that he rejected all temporal authority.[76] In 1524 and early 1525 many evangelical peasants in Southwest Germany preferred nonviolent resistance to military action against their clerical and lay overlords.[77] In early 1525 not only Hubmaier but other Anabaptist leaders like Wilhelm Reublin and Hans Krüsi encouraged armed peasants to protect their proclamation of the gospel.[78] In 1524 and early 1525 Zwingli, Müntzer, Hubmaier, the Swiss Anabaptists and the peasant resisters of Upper Swabia and the Upper Rhine were closer to each other than the stylized categories of Protestant historical theology or the Marxist-Leninist Early Bourgeois Revolution in Germany would allow us to imagine.

NOTES

1. Cf. the argument of Harold S. Bender, "The Zwickau, Prophets, Thomas Müntzer, and the Anabaptists," *MQR* XXVII (1953), 4, 16, that Anabaptism began "in Zurich (1525) in the bosom of the Zwinglian Reformation" and "belongs even though as a 'left wing,' to the great mainline Protestant movement and to no other"; John H. Yoder, *Täufertum und Reformation im Gespräch* (Zurich, 1968): IV, "Die Weiterführung der zwinglischen Grundeinstellung durch die Täufer," 155-205. I used the category "radikaler Frühzwinglianismus" in a different but related sense in "Die Anfänge des schweizerischen Täufertums im reformierten Kongregationalismus," in Hans-Jürgen Goertz, ed., *Umstrittenes Täufertum-Neue Forschungen* (Göttingen, 1975), 25-27.
2. Günther Franz, "Die Entstehung der 'Zwölf Artikel' der deutschen Bauernschaft," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, XXXVI (1939), 212.
3. Max Steinmetz, "Theses on the Early Bourgeois Revolution in Germany, 1476-1535," in Robert W. Scribner and Gerhard Benecke, eds., *The German Peasant War of 1525: New Viewpoints* (London, 1979), 16-17.
4. Peter Blickle, *The Revolution of 1525: The German Peasants' War from a New Perspective*, trans. Thomas A. Brady, Jr., and H.C. Erik

Midelfort (Baltimore, 1981), 155-161, esp. 161.

5. Vienna, 1528, reprinted in Johann Loserth, *Doctor Balthasar Hubmaier und die Anfänge der Wiedertaufe in Mähren* (Brünn, 1893), 210-216.
6. Alfred Stern, *Ueber die zwölf Artikel der Bauern* (Leipzig, 1868)
7. Franz, "Entstehung," 194.
8. Torsten Bergsten, *Balthasar Hubmaier: Seine Stellung zu Reformation und Täufertum, 1521-1528* (Kassel, 1961), 281-301.
9. Z VII, 354.
10. Z I, 251, 444-448; Leo Helbing, *Dr. Johann Fabri* (Münster, 1941).
11. *Ursach*, 216.
12. Ibid., 210, n.1.
13. Ibid., 215-216.
14. Cf. Wilhelm Mau, *Balthasar Hubmaier* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1912), 56-59. For an attack on Faber's reliability, cf. Carl Sachsse, *D. Balthasar Hubmaier als Theologe* (Berlin, 1914), 106-109.
15. *Ursach*, 213.
16. Ibid., 211-212.
17. Ibid., 213-214.
18. Ibid., 212: "befindet sich, das hinder doctor *Balthasarn*, als die stat Waltzhut erobret, in libellweiss gefunden seind die anschleg vnd fürnemen der paurn, derselbigen artickel acht bletter hand, so doctor *Balthasar* mit aigner hand geschriben, die vbrigen sind durch andere geschriben, doch durch in gebessert."
19. Johannes Faber, *Doctoris Joannis Fabri adversus Doctorem Balthasarum Pacimontanum ... orthodoxae Fidei Catholica Defensio* (Leipzig, 1528), f. G4 vo.: "triginta folijs, tua manu exaratis."
20. Günther Franz, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Bauernkrieges* (Munich, 1963): cf. 233, ll. 1-12 and 235, l.9-236, l.25.
21. *Ursach*, 212-213.
22. E.g. Mau, *Hubmaier*, 76-77: "Umfassende und tiefgehende Bestrebungen nach einer politischen und sozialen Neuordnung der Dinge liegen in den Sätzen des 'Verfassungsentwurfes' wohl kaum ..."
23. Sachsse, *Hubmaier*, 108-109.
24. N. 18.
25. *Ursach*, 213: "Er hat auch ... sondere pawern artigkl, die jn dem truckh aussgangen, gemacht,

MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

darauss eruolget, das die Stülinger pawern vnd in dem Kleckow die ersten gewesen seynd, die sich wieder die Obrigkayt erhöbt, daraus die jämerlich vnd erschrocken auffrur vnd plutuergiessen entstanden ist...."

26. Stern, *Zwölf Artikel*, 89-90; Peter Blickle, "Nochmals zur Entstehung der Zwölf Artikel im Bauernkrieg," in Peter Blickle, ed., *Bauer, Reich und Reformation. Festschrift für Günther Franz* (Stuttgart, 1982), 306, n. 101.
27. Stern, *Zwölf Artikel*, 90; Blickle, "Zwölf Artikel," 288.
28. *Ursach*, 215: "Item, mer hat er bekhennt, wie er der pawrn artigkel, so jm von jnen aus dem heer zukhummen sein, dyselbigen jnen erweytert vnd aussgelegt, vnd denselbigen solches eingebildt, die antzunemen als christlich vnnd pillich."
29. Franz, "Zwölf Artikel," 193-213.
30. Günther Franz, *Der deutsche Bauernkrieg* (Munich and Berlin, 1933), 136-137.
31. M.M. Smirin, *Die Volksreformation des Thomas Münzer und der grosse Bauernkrieg*, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1956), 392-399.
32. Bergsten, *Hubmaier*, 292. Also, 301: "...das Täufertum und die soziale Opposition der Bauern geistesgeschichtlich gesehen völlig getrennten Ursprungs waren."
33. Ibid., 282-285.
34. Ibid., 285-301.
35. Ibid., 301.
36. Blickle, "Zwölf Artikel," 288-308. For the documents cf. Franz, *Quellen*, 193-197; A. Bernoulli, *Basler Chroniken*, ed. by Antiquarischen Gesellschaft in Basel, VI (Basel, 1902), 490f.
37. Blickle, "Zwölf Artikel," 288-308. For the documents cf. Franz, *Quellen*, 193-197; A. Bernoulli, *Basler Chroniken*, ed. by Antiquarischen Gesellschaft in Basel, VI (Basel, 1902), 490f.
38. Ibid., 297: "Item es sollenn ouch hinfur ein yeder fry sin Inn der Ee Im todttfal Im abziehenn vnnd der eigennschafft. Dessglichenn zoll vmbgellt vnnd anndere der glichenn gefell an gemeynenn nutz steg vnnd weg etc. bewennt werden damit wir vnns hiemit vorbehalten haben wollenn alles das so wir vnnder anndernn

vnnsern beschwerden finden, das zum lands frydenn vnnd ruow der armenn dienen vnd mit der geschrifft besteen mag. Als der geistlichen gutter wo hin die hinfuor bewennt werden sollenn, derglichen das wir denn kleynenn Zehennden gar nit gebenn wöllen ouch frontauwen vischen voglen vnnd jagens halber daby erbotten habenn, Das wir Inn vnnserm furnemen alles des so vnns mit der geschrifft vnformlich oder gar zu nichten erkennt werden mag gütlich abston vnnd daruon wyssen lassen wollenn."

39. Ibid.
40. Ibid., 301-306, esp. 306.
41. Ibid., 307, n. 104.
42. Ibid., 299.
43. Ibid., 297; cf. Franz, *Quellen*, 193-195.
44. Heinrich Böhmer, "Die Entstehung der 12 Artikel der Bauern von 1525," *Blätter für württembergische Kirchengeschichte* N.F. XIV (1910), 1-14, 97-118.
45. Franz, "Zwölf Artikel," 195-209.
46. Mau, *Hubmaier*, 49-72.
47. Franz, "Zwölf Artikel," 211: "Hubmayer soll also die Artikel verfasst haben, unabhängig von ihm hätten die Baltringer die gleichen Forderungen aufgestellt. Und Lotzer hätte im März die Hubmayerschen Artikel, die ihm auf unbekannte Weise zugänglich geworden wären, für den Druck umgearbeitet.... Eine so umständliche und schwer erklärliche Konstruction lässt sich nur halten, wenn sie von eindeutigen Quellenstellen gestützt wird." Franz exaggerates somewhat. The Baltringen grievances did not contain the most characteristic note of the Twelve Articles, the promise to withdraw any demands proved contrary to Scripture, and the notion that new demands based on Scripture could always be advanced.
48. Franz, "Zwölf Artikel," 194, n.3, 199-200, vs. Mau, *Hubmaier*, 54-55.
49. Franz, "Zwölf Artikel," 196-197; Blickle, "Zwölf Artikel," 306-307.
50. Mau, *Hubmaier*, 62-68.
51. Franz, *Quellen*, 175: "...welchs Wort und Leben nichts dann Liebe, Fride, Geduld und Ainigkaiten lernet, also das alle, die in disen Christum glauben, lieplich fridlich, gedultig und ainig werden....," trans. Blickle,

MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Revolution of 1525, 195; Gunnar Westin and Torsten Bergsten, eds., *Balthasar Hubmaier Schriften* (Gütersloh, 1962), 488: "Das wort gottes leert liebe, friden, Ainigkait vnnd nit aufrueren...."

52. Franz, *Quellen*, 176: "Wir sollen...Got lieben, in als unsern Herren in unsern Nechsten erkennen und alles das ton, so wir auch gern hetten, das uns Got am Nachtmal gepotten hat zuo ainer letz.", trans., Blickle, *Revolution of 1525*, 197; *Hubmaier Schriften*, 361-362.
53. Franz, *Quellen*, 174-179, trans., Blickle, *Revolution of 1525*, 195-201; *Hubmaier Schriften*, 168, 349.
54. *Ursach*, 213.
55. Franz, *Quellen*, 235, l.11: "dem armen gemeinen Man in Stetten und uf dem Land."
56. Ibid., ll. 18-19: "on alle Schwertschlag und Blutvergiessung."
57. Ibid., 236, ll. 11-20.
58. Ibid., 235, ll. 38-41: "... mit denen, so sich sperren und widern, brüderliche Verainigung inzugon und germainen cristenlichen Nutz zu fürdern, ganz und gar kain Gemainschaft halten noch bruchen söllen, und das weder essen, trinken, baden, malen, bachen, agkern, mäyen."
59. *Hubmaier Schriften*, 316: "...die Christen kain gemainschafft mit einem solhen menschen, weder in worten, essen, trincken, malen, bachenn oder annderlay gestalt haben sollen."
60. Bergsten *Hubmaier*, 294: "Die Hypothese, dass Hubmaier den Artikelbrief verfasst habe, muss als sehr unwahrscheinlich zurückgewiesen werden."
61. Ibid., 285-295.
62. Tom Scott, "Reformation and Peasants' War in Waldshut and Environs: A Structural Analysis," Part II, *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* LXX (1979), 147: "...the invocation of the secular ban as the penalty for refusal to join the Black Foresters' Christian Union so strongly resembles Hubmaier's doctrine of the spiritual ban that *Bergsten's* description of them as no more than simultaneous phenomena deriving from a common New Testament source looks like special pleading. Who else was supposed to have instructed the peasants in the meaning and

application of such passages from the Scriptures?" Justus Maurer, *Prediger im Bauernkrieg* (Stuttgart, 1979), 335 "...ist die nächstliegende, allerdings nicht voll beweisbare Schlussfolgerung, dass Hubmaier entweder den Artikelbrief oder eine Vorlage dazu zugeschickt bekam und dieselbe um die drei Bann-Artikel erweitert hat. Der 'weltliche Bann' im Artikelbrief ist ja eine wörtliche Übertragung des dirchlichen Banns Hubmaiers."

63. Siegfried Hoyer, "The Rights and Duties of Resistance in the Pamphlet *To the Assembly of Common Peasantry* (1525)," in Scribner and Benecke, *Peasant War*, 130: "By the year 1527, the socio-political situation had changed fundamentally in favour of the ruling circles."
64. *Ursach*, 213: "so verwilige sy in den obern laster."
65. *Hubmaier Schriften*, 455; Z II, 343-346.
66. Bergsten, *Hubmaier*, 299-300.
67. *Ursach*, 212: "Es sey auch die zeit schon khomen, das Got der welltlichen heren schinden, schaben, stöcken, blöcken, zwingen, tringen vnd andere Tyraney, nit mer leiden wöl, sy thuend mit den armen leüten, wie Herodes mit den vnschuldigen kinder, also habe der mörderisch, lotheringisch hertzog zu Ellsass, Zabern, vnd anderstwo seiner fürstlichen durchleüchtigkait erste prob gethon."
68. Bergsten, *Hubmaier*, 296-298; Maurer, *Prediger*, 337-339, 560-562; Walter Elliger, *Thomas Müntzer: Leben und Werk* (Göttingen, 1975), 651-672; Scott, "Reformation and Peasants' War," 147-148, a position he has more recently repeated; Tom Scott, "The 'Volksreformation' of Thomas Müntzer in Allstedt and Mühlhausen," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, XXXIV (1983), 205: "Despite certain reservations, the provisions of the draft clearly reflect Müntzer's thinking...."
69. "Auslegung des anderen Unterschieds Danielis (Sermon to the Princes)," "Ausgedrückte Entblössung," "Hochverursachte Schutzrede (against Luther)," in Günther Franz, ed., *Thomas Müntzer, Schriften und Briefe, Krit. Gesamtausgabe* (Gütersloh, 1968), 241-343.
70. For a convincing reconstruction of the narrative of the last two years of Müntzer's

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

career, cf. Scott, "Volksreformation," 194-213.

71. Elliger, *Müntzer*, 659-660, 667.

72. *Müntzer Schriften*, 544: "Im Clegkaw und Hegaw bey Basell habe er etliche artigkel, wye man herschen soll aus dem ewangelio angeben, daraus furder andere artigkel gemacht ... Dye entporunge hab er des orts nit gemacht, sondern seyn bereit uffgestanden gewest. Ecolampadius und Hugowaldus haben in des orts geweyset zum volk zu predigen, do er dan geprediget, das doselbest unglaubige regenten, were auch unglaubigk volk, das doselbest eyn rechtfertigunge gescheen musst."

73. Blickle, *Revolution of 1525*, 148: "the Draft of a Constitution ... borrowed heavily from Thomas Müntzer."

74. Peter Blickle, "Thomas Müntzer und der Bauernkrieg in Südwestdeutschland," *Zeitschrift für Agrargeschichte und Agrarsoziologie* XXIV (1976), 79-80.

75. Siegfried Hoyer and Bernd Rüdiger, eds., *An die Versammlung Gemeiner Bauernschaft: Eine revolutionäre Flugschrift aud dem Deutschen Bauernkrieg (1525)* (Leipzig, 1975), 87-160.

76. James M. Stayer, *Anabaptists and the Sword* (Lawrence, 1972), 76: "About the Sword and about tyrants, Müntzer had a teaching, but about rulers and government, only an attitude."

77. Heiko A. Oberman, "The Gospel of Social Unrest," in Scriber and Benecke, *Peasant War*, 40: "... during the time of the so-called Peasant War, peasant leaders repeatedly and explicitly distanced themselves from any use of violence...."

78. Stayer, "Anfänge," 39-46.

ZWINGLI'S EARLY REFORMS: BETWEEN THE SCYLLA OF THE STATUS QUO AND THE CHARYBDIS OF SPIRITUAL RADICALISM

E.J. Furcha

Abstracts of papers written long before one has done the necessary research or formulated a single sentence as a result of such investigation are potentially misleading. They tend to create certain expectations which may be far removed from that which is finally delivered. The best I hope to achieve in this hazardous venture is to stay clear of the rock or rocks on the one side and the dangerous currents on the other (leaving it to you to decide which is which).

As for Huldrych Zwingli and his course in the years 1519 to 1524, I trust that my paper will demonstrate how this gifted prophet and pastor manages to become a protester without selling out to excessive demands by those reform-minded contemporaries who were more radical than he, or bowing too willingly to those others who would preserve at all costs what they had received in the *traditio* as being the fullest manifestation of the church in their own generation.

You may conclude, of course, that the Zwingli I see active in those crucial years of his ministry in Zurich is one of my own making -- coloured by the context of church, world and academic environment in which I live and work -- just as some other Zwinglis we have been introduced to were shaped by the context of their creators. While my peculiar Canadian perspective cannot be denied, I trust, nonetheless, that its distortions are not undue and its interpretations not so far-fetched as to tear Zwingli totally out of his context. I should state at the outset that I generally agree with those interpreters of Zwingli (Gottfried Locher, I believe, is one) who do not detect fundamental changes in Zwingli's thought, but would tend to ascribe the changing emphases in his reform work to his sensitivity to social and political realities of his own day and context.

My interest in Zwingli, not only as reformer of the church in Zurich, but indeed as a major socio-political force, goes back several years now. When

MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

examining his major writings in a seminar on socio-political factors in sixteenth century reform activities we were struck by the rather complex nature of his involvement with magistrate, bishop, papacy and the citizenry of Zurich. The picture that emerged was never unambiguous, though Zwingli's intense commitment to the cause of reforming the church in head and members was never in question.

The very theologian who asserts in one place that God's word must never be controlled by temporal interests and power [Z III.482; Eidgenössische Abschiede (EA), pp. 562 - 569] fully co-operates with the magistrate of the city of Zurich at a different time in its bid to wrest from episcopal control the supervision of churches and chapels within its jurisdiction and the assessment and collection of *ordinary* and *extraordinary* contributions by which citizens were heavily taxed.[1]

Zwingli does not deserve full blame, of course, for the perceived ambivalence in his position, even though the numerous opponents of his cause -- both among the traditionalists and the Radicals of the day -- did not treat him too kindly and branded him either a heretic and sectarian whose enthusiasm had run wild or one who had abandoned his own cause. On the contrary, the more one studies his writings and involvements, the more one learns to appreciate and respect his theology and his astute sense of socio-political affairs. Even when one disagrees, one must concede that here was a genuine Christian involved in "an act of historical transformation" (to quote Karl F. Morrison, *The Mimetic Tradition of Reform in the West* [Princeton: Princeton U.P.,1982]), attempting to be obedient to the divine word as he heard it within valid expressions of the church.

Not surprisingly Zwingli comes across as being genuinely "catholic," then again, as radically "protestant," i.e. as one who challenges existing structures without destroying the essentials, submitting his work and that of others to the demand of being *ecclesia semper reformanda* with a thoroughness hardly found in any other reformer of his day in quite that measure of intensity.

Allow me then a few observations at this point which, I trust, will become concrete in the course of this brief assessment of Zwingli's reform activities.

1. We should note, above all else, that Zwingli refused to be "sectarian," which in the early years of his work in Zurich meant not to be identified too closely with Luther. Whether the distancing was strategy, stemmed from perceived theological differences or reflected the reluctance of a "patriotic confederate" to be identified with a "German" cannot concern us here.

2. A second observation is to register surprise at the relatively large number of opponents to Zwingli, especially among the canons and chaplains of the Grossmünster -- who, after all, were his colleagues -- but also among the religious in Zurich (Salat has been mentioned repeatedly; Edlibach and others could readily be added). We might note in passing that the Zurich territory was comprised of one hundred and fifteen communities. The entire area came under the episcopal jurisdiction of Constance within the archdiocese of Mainz. There were one hundred and forty church buildings, fifty-four chapels, nineteen brother and sister houses and twelve cloisters and homes for spiritual knights.[2]

3. We note, thirdly, the reformer's success in crystallizing his position over against "etliche doctores und magister" (as his contemporary Edlibach, put it), on the one hand, and against the radicalizing of his own views by "unauthorized" exponents of change, on the other. Zwingli's sense of when to compromise and when to stand firm is fully apparent.

4. The fourth observation I should like to register here is the support Zwingli's spiritual and ecclesiastical reforms were given by the magistrate -- a fact which, as you well know, has led some scholars to argue that Zwingli belonged to a "Geheimer Rat" (a sort of privy council), the alleged seat of real power in Zurich.[3] One is tempted to ask whether such strong support by the Council made ecclesiastical reforms possible without significantly dividing the community. The price dissidents paid was rather high, of course. Indeed, Peter Huber ascribes the success of reforms in Zurich to the innumerable "warnings, mandates and penalties" with which citizens of Zurich were controlled and which helped to master even the most critical phase of the peasant rebellions of 1525 "by diplomatic means."[4]

Others have been more grudging in their praise

of Zwingli's success. The most damning of the detractors was the reformer's erstwhile admirer and fellow humanist Conrad Grebel who in a letter to Vadian of 1523 is quoted to have written that, "Whoever thinks, believes and says that Zwingli acts as a true shepherd, thinks, believes and speaks wickedly."[5] Grebel was at the receiving end of the reformer's measures to keep under the guardian's eye -- not to say, control -- any activity in the city that might have an adverse effect on the well-being of the *corpus Christianum* there. Though the Zurich clergy of the early 1520s was not under the kind of control exercised in Geneva almost a generation later, Zwingli's influence was apparent enough to allow some to conclude that the city functioned as a "theocracy."[6]

More to the point, in my estimation, are those who see the reformer's work in close proximity to the Council whose power in all matters social, political and ecclesiastical had gradually been growing since the days of Waldmann.[7] Numerous articles, theses and histories have traced and documented Zwingli's work in relation to the political situation in Zurich, among the confederate *Orte* and beyond. Why this paper then?

My aim here is not so much to break new ground or even to challenge existing assessments as it is to verbalize for a largely North American audience what seems to have been at the core of reforms in Zurich. Permit me to repeat the obvious: at the heart of the reformation in Zurich was Zwingli -- the prophet and pastor -- calling his parishioners to an obedient, contextual response to God's word. He believed that such a response could best be realized when a Christian community preserved what was essential in the tradition while, at the same time, allowing for change through the prompting of the spirit of God. This meant, of course, that every Christian as a living member of the body of Christ -- and naturally belonging to a Kilchor -- had specific tasks and functions, with the total community through its representatives determining which of these were to be carried out and when, as visible expressions of human righteousness.

Huldrych Zwingli was in his mid-thirties when he accepted the position of people's priest at the Grossmünster. Was he aware of the complex situation in Zurich and of the tensions between the various

power blocks over -- among other things -- the question of mercenary service? The issue had been a live option for several years. Elsa Beurle points to an order regarding mercenaries as far back as 7 April 1500, accepted in 1503 by all but two of the cantons (Zug and Solothurn), though she concedes that pressure groups and frequent disregard of the order reduced it to virtual ineffectiveness.[8] Zurich issued "Reislaufverbote" in March 1517 and at regular intervals from 1521 onwards,[9] but continued to support the pope with soldiers despite Zwingli's strong objections. Bullinger puts rather strong words on the matter in Zwingli's mouth,

> Wegen eines tierfrässigen Wolfes würde man stürmen und dem Wolf, der die Leute verderbt, will niemand wehren. Sie tragen billig rote Hüte und Mäntel: schüttelt man sie, so fallen Dukaten und Kronen heraus, windet man sie, rinnt deines Sohnes, Bruders, Vaters und guten Freundes Blut heraus.[10]

Zwingli was given little time to orient himself to Zurich politics. He was elected late in 1518 and assumed his duties on the first day of the new year. It must have been clear from the very first sermon on the Gospel of Matthew, rather than on the prescribed Lectionary, that the new people's priest was setting out on a new course. His parishioners were to be exposed to the hearing of the Gospel -- a drastic departure from the customary that could not have gone unnoticed nor avoid alienating some from the very start.

One of the first and most systematic opponents to this type of change was one of the senior canons, K. Hofmann.[11] So persistent was he in proving Zwingli wrong and harmful to the church that he kept track for some three years of what the reformer preached (since he was hard of hearing he must have used able-bodied informers to accumulate the theological "wrongs" uttered by Zwingli). Hofmann's complaint, finally submitted in 1522, extended to twenty-six folio pages. Zwingli was accused of being a self-seeker who advocated change for its own sake. Other canons working independently of Hofmann, perhaps, expressed their dissatisfaction and anger in a set of *Articuli* which they made

public some time in 1523.[12]

Zwingli endeavoured not to alienate the weak while at the same time retaining the confidence of the social and political hierarchy of Zurich. At the outset he was in the minority, of course, but he spoke with the authority and in the name of the word of God. He soon learned also -- if he did not know it from his Glarus and Einsiedeln days -- that ecclesiastical reform had to bring with it changes in the socio-political affairs of a community. How then would he fare on the journey between the Scylla of maintaining tradition in Zurich and the Charybdis of radical change? Mere survival even in the effort to stay clear of the Scyllas and Charybdises of religious and political *engagement* is a major achievement and sufficient grounds for celebrating -- several centuries later -- the life and work of a great navigator.

It is not my intention in this context to review in detail the numerous events on that journey. Others have done it with skill and authority.[13] I simply wish to trace the path he charted between obstacles and objections, for it illustrates that he and those who followed his vision were wise mates of the ship *ecclesia Tigurina* whose examples should be upheld -- if not emulated.

As we note some of the difficult choices Zwingli had to make we might be able to see, in passing, that he was often not motivated by strictly theological or ecclesiastical considerations. Rather, he sought to avoid the stultifying effect of merely maintaining a fixed tradition while he advocated the unity of the body of Christ as a territorial unity of the Christian people in Zurich and, whenever possible, of likeminded confederates. On the other hand, he had to curb the enthusiasm of those whose desire for change outweighed prudence and pastoral concern for the weaker members.

Zwingli showed himself sensitive to the needs of the *corpus Christianum* in Zurich. He was fortunate in gaining eventually the necessary backing from a majority of the Council when he had to oppose the ecclesiastical hierarchy, residing in Constance, whose influence on the religious life in Zurich was on the wane for some time. Thus, both he and the Council were able to honour some theological and social traditions and disregard some others without creating a traumatic effect on the majority of the

citizens. They were free, at the same time, to be guided by Scripture in its evangelical and life-renewing force.

One need not wonder then that Zwingli strikes one as the most "modern" of the major reformers in his effort to be contextual as he responds to burning social issues. Among these -- as we noted earlier -- were 1. the matter of mercenary service by Zurich men, 2. the question of what constitutes membership in the body of Christ (the testimony of god-fearing parents and sponsors at an infant's baptism or the public testimony of an adult believer, the latter of which Zwingli feared might lead to self- or work righteousness), and 3. the most suitable estate to be in when rendering priestly service. From 1522 on, led perhaps by his own experience through his "secret" betrothal to Anna Reinhart, Zwingli defends the right of priests to marry -- supporting his argument from Scripture and the practice of the early church.

It would be wrong, nonetheless, to attribute Zwingli's defence of the principle of a married clergy solely to his own problems with celibacy -- widely attested in the literature of his "catholic" opponents.[14] Rather, the reformer responds on this issue, as on others before and after 1522, to widespread dissatisfaction with clerical celibacy among at least some of the priests and laity. He calls for a halt to the practice by some of the bishops of collecting "fines" for tolerating "live-in arrangements" that had all the marks of a marriage. He addresses the hardships inflicted on clerics who were torn between the need for expressing their sexuality and the desire to comply with vows of celibacy which had become an obstacle rather than an aid to their effective ministry. Zwingli fights for the right of clergy to be not only fathers in God, but fathers of their children and faithful husbands to their respective wives. Unwittingly he thus relocated the primary centre of the *corpus Christianum* in the family. Consequently, it is easy for him to support a vision of the enlarged family in which the guardian of the word and the guardian of human rights and responsibilities (in the case of Zurich, the mayor and the City Council) play important "paternal" roles. Matters of civil status were to be the concern of the Council and not of an external agency -- episcopal or otherwise. Clergy

MARVIN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

and laity alike were to relate to the Council in all matters that affected the total community. A duly instituted council in return would regulate all aspects of life through mandates without undue coercion. The general public seems to have accepted this new and simplified ordering principle. An instrument for effecting change had been found; it proved to be vital to the harmonious and largely nonviolent process of reforming church and society in Zurich. Zwingli called for freedom from episcopal oversight and control by arguing that such hierarchical ordering interferes with the activity of God's spirit through the local pastors and "bishops." In 1522 he had developed this line of thought in the *Archeteles* -- the last word, as it were, to Hugo, Bishop of Constance, on the matter of fasting. The work is also the first major "system" of Reformed theology.[15]

Allow me now to turn to a brief sketch of some of the issues we have been referring to (without undue apology for not going beyond 1524). We know Zwingli's views on mercenary service from Bullinger's Reformation history and through an undated report on Zwingli's preaching on the matter. The recorder adds the laconic comment, "The papists and he were not on such terms as to engage in too many intimate exchanges on the matter" (Z. 1.73.25 ff). The most detailed indication of Zurich's willingness to be serious in stopping mercenary service rendered by its men comes from a "representation" by the Council to the guilds and country places, dated 16-22 May 1521.[16] The document makes clear that Zurich is anxious to maintain unity among its confederate partners. At the same time, however, the Council is not prepared to concede more power to the king of France than the confederate partners would have in determining the extent of any contract and commitment. Nor do they consider six thousand men to be an acceptable number of persons to be hired out. They urge their addressees to make an honourable response, appropriate to the advancement of peace and tranquillity.

The *Göttliche Vermahnung* (May 1522), contains Zwingli's personal views directed to the confederates at Schwyz. Though this appeal was written in haste (as were most of Zwingli's works), he makes important ethical and theological points to show the futility of serving foreign masters. He held that

such service would incur the wrath of God, suppress common righteousness, expose honourable men to bad habits, stir up envy and hatred in their own community because of the gifts mercenaries receive from foreign masters, and subject free men to the domination of strangers. The author pleads with his free Christian friends and compatriots not to be enticed by "soft gold" when "strong iron" could never have overcome them.

If the enemy outside Zurich was seen to be powerful and destructive, the enemies within appeared to be equally formidable. Zwingli faced them with the same blend of gospel of liberation, commonality of purpose and patriotic identity and sense of commitment that befitted a covenanted community of evangelical Christians.

To the opposition from the right, singled out earlier in the person of Canon K. Hofmann, many others were joined in 1522 and in subsequent months. Foremost among them was the Bishop of Constance, a native of Zurich who initially seems to have been favourably disposed toward Zwingli, but who obviously changed his mind.[17] In the *Supplicatio* of 2 July 1522 Zwingli states his unwavering position. He rejects the charge of erroneous teaching.[18] In asking for greater freedom and flexibility concerning celibacy he was not alone. He hoped therefore that the Bishop might personally waver since he suspected bad advice behind his public stance on the matter. In mid-July *Eine freundliche Bitte und Ermahnung* (Z 1.214 ff) appeared, testimony to Zwingli's belief that a group of likeminded people, acting within acceptable bounds, could ask for and initiate change.

The sausage incident meanwhile was having an unprecedented ripple effect. What may well have begun rather harmlessly in Froschower's printing shop was now turning into a *cause célèbre* of the Zurich reformation. Zwingli contributes a sermon on the subject. It appeared in print on 16 April 1522 under the title *Von Erkiesen und Freiheit der Speisen*. The bishop responded in an *Ermahnung* addressed to the chapter of the Grossmünster (May 1522). Toward the end of May, the *Tagsatzung* of Lucerne dealt with Zurich's refusal to tow the line. Confederate delegates no longer met in Zurich.(March 13 had been the last such meeting in Zurich. After that date to the end of May 1524 Lucerne hosted the

Tagsatzungen twenty-two times.) Opposition to Zwingli's cause had become strong in and outside of Zurich; there especially from the monastic orders and, in the course of 1523, also from those who were later to be identified as the Baptists.

By 1523 events were beginning to turn in Zwingli's favour. On 5 January, the Zurich magistrate informed the other confederate *Orte* that it was planning to convene a disputation on 29 January, with representatives of the Bishop of Constance invited to be present. The break with tradition had become all too apparent. Not surprisingly, Zurich received no reply. None of the invited *Orte* sent delegates; in fact, they forbade attendance by their representatives.[20]

Zwingli's *Sixty-Seven Articles* are introduced to help focus debate on important matters in the reform of the church. They are amplified later that year by the *Auslegen* (Exposition) which has the distinction of being the first major systematics in German within the Reformed tradition. Here, as in *Von Klarheit* earlier, the Reformer's operative principle seems to be his claim that Scripture is its own interpreter, that it must inform Christian action and activity rather than being controlled by human agencies, and that all conflicting interest groups must ultimately come under the authority of Scripture, if unity is to be maintained. [21]

As Zwingli had done in the *Archeteles*, so here too he puts all ecclesiastical hierarchies in their proper place. All individuals and groups must come under the rightful oversight of the magistrate. A blueprint for a well-structured and organic community that would know itself to be body of Christ and address all matters of ethical, political and ecclesiastical concern had been found. Responsibility would be delegated on the basis of training, skill or ability in rightly ordered relationships.

Underlying all, is the assertion that Scripture when given its place and duly heard breathes the spirit of God. Any political activism that may be present in Zwingli's work, then, is simply an expression of the conviction that Christians in community must respond to God's word concretely through human relationships and structures which reflect God's will for his people in their own time and in their specific place.

Zwingli's fight is a battle against misplaced

power and falsely elevated structures. On this basis he opposed Rome and all who supported its hegemony. On the same grounds he objected to manifestations of falsely assumed power within the Zurich community. It is here, I submit, that we should look for reasons for his harsh opposition to the Baptists in Zurich who -- he believed -- assumed for themselves more than was justified in the word of God as he, its authorized exponent, understood it (theological differences would appear to have played a subordinate role, though they are often the ones cited).[22]

Rightly or wrongly, Zwingli located the core of misplaced power in self-authenticated individuals and groups. Since he accepted rightfully appointed temporal authority as the place from which a Christian community was to be ordered, he placed his own ministry of prophet, pastor and guardian (legitimized by his training rather than by a call) in the service of the magistrate. He accepted as the duty of clerics the tasks of teaching, inspiring and prodding those who had been appointed to govern in temporal affairs. How he executed that task may be seen in all major events in Zurich between the years 1519 and 1523-24 (and beyond, had we chosen to look at them).

Though the back of opposition was not altogether broken, its force was markedly curtailed and with the aid of a determined Council, effectively channelled. Pestalozzi (*Gegner*, p.16) is undoubtedly right when he considers it a victory for the magistrate to have removed spiritual power from the place from which it might have exercised a negative influence on events in Zurich. At the same time, the catholic cult was replaced by rites that were pruned to bare essentials, almost austere in their simplicity. The successful erosion of clerical rights and privileges won the support of the citizenry and contributed positively to the breaking-down of longstanding barriers between clergy and laity. In its new manifestation the church was to be a community in which clergy and laity alike were subject to the same laws and mandates, taxed by the City and scrutinized in their moral conduct. Zwingli's vigorous application of the gospel to all aspects of life was showing some results.

Whether in the process he had become vulnerable

to being used as a pawn by those who sought power may be debated. His intentions were honourable enough. He did not seek power for himself or any other cleric, but safeguarded the influence of pastors, provided they rightly carried and guarded the word of God. The Council supported such "wise" churchmanship.

On 7 March 1523 it withdrew from the Dominicans the privilege of continuing to preach and have pastoral oversight at the Oetenbach cloister. Henceforth it was one of the duties of Leo Jud (an approved evangelical preacher) to bring the gospel to the worthy sisters.[23]

Yet another factor is added to the potentially volatile mix of Zurich politics by the Second Zurich Disputation which must have seriously threatened the notion Zwingli had so painstakingly nurtured of a unified church in Zurich in coexistence with like-minded confederates.

Letters of concern over what seemed to be an isolationist policy by Zurich were sent to the magistrate and were circulating among the other cantons. Zurich responded as best it could. Among the documents in defence of Zurich's cause to which Schaffhausen had now joined itself was the *Treue Vermahnung an die Eidgenossen* (Z 111.97-113). Zwingli tried to disguise his authorship; the blend of religious reform and political implication could hardly be denied. Barely two months later on 25 June 1524, *Wie man sich vor Lügen hüten soll* attempts to stop false rumours about Zurich.

Zwingli's publication of *Der Hirt*, reminiscent of the *Shepherd of Hermas*, early in 1524 (Z 111.1 - 68) clearly distinguishes between true and false pastors in an attempt (as the lengthy preface to the "Bishop of Teufen," Appenzell, would indicate) to justify his position and what he had undertaken against the "murderers of souls." He sees the task of the true pastor to be twofold, namely to make known to the flock its "infirmities" (*praesten* or *bresten*) and to draw its attention to the grace of God in whose protection alone it is able to walk.

One more document deserves our attention, if ever so briefly. It dates from December 1524. We include it here since it complements in some ways the emphasis of *Divine and Human Righteousness*. *Wer Ursache gebe zu Aufruhr* (Z 111.355 - 469) distinguishes two groups in Zurich. (Are they the Scylla and

Charybdis Zwingli had to negotiate in his reform work?) The first group are those who hear the gospel from hate of the papacy. They are rebels pretending to be good Christians. Several manifestations of this group of people are named: those who abuse Christian liberty, those who hope for material advantage from reform and seek exemption from necessary financial obligations and, finally, those who are puffed up with the artfulness of the gospel, but lack love.

The second, also distinguishable in sub-groups, are the true troublemakers. These include high church officials, all unreformed priests and the princes and powerbrokers of the world. Zwingli's cure has several important ingredients -- eight in all, which he gives in some detail. I shall list them briefly:

1. God must be the author of all true reform (Z III.445).

2. The papacy must be removed -- if not, it will lie low until, at an opportune moment,it will suppress the gospel once again (Z III.448.17ff.), though a well-informed Christian community should be able to shed such a yoke freely.

3. Evangelical preachers must be adequately provided for out of unused ecclesiastical properties.

4. There must be reliable, god-fearing preachers.

5. Ex-nuns must be given sustenance until their death or else given work.

6. Monasteries ought to be discontinued -- their property is to be used for poor relief.

7. Certain taxation should be abolished, though Zwingli feels that the Council is on the right track in its current taxation reforms.

8. No future contributions are to be made to Rome.

While the tract bears some resemblance to Luther's address *To the Christian Nobility* it is clearly placed within the Zurich context, with some reference perhaps to the Toggenburg. The author is confident that the labours of all who work for reform are bearing fruit and appear not to have been in vain. Zwingli speaks as chief pastor, identifies with the reforms that have gone out through the Council, yet senses the potential for reversal or failure.

We have limited our review of Zwingli's reform work to some six years of intense activity which saw him pitted against formidable opposition from the right and from the left. Throughout he advised the Council to assert its power and authority over against the Bishop of Constance in matters ecclesiastical and against the other *Orte* of the confederacy in matters social and political.

Later years of Zwingli's ministry saw other constellations at work. The reformer seemed less and less in control, his influence was waning to the point at which -- immediately after his death on the battlefield at Kappel am Albis -- his name was almost an embarrassment. Instead of being an agent of change, as he had been during those creative years from 1519 on, Zwingli had become one of a number of participants in activities that led to an established Reformed tradition with the prophetic and pastoral elements receding somewhat and protest and politics moving to centre stage. Elsa Beurle noted this change and explains it by declaring that Zwingli had become Realpolitiker. I agree with her analysis of the change, but would wonder whether the reformer's compromises are a defence mechanism of one who senses defeat of his cause, but cannot accept that God's cause can thus be lost in the course of reform. As he steers the middle course between extreme demands on either side of the political fence, he links the interests of *polis* and *ecclesia*, but loses some of his erstwhile supporters and many whose favour he had curried. In the end, the new confederacy would not be held together by "Christian" tenets alone, but by political and juridical means.

While the Scylla of status quo and the Charybdis of spiritual radicalism had not swallowed up Zwingli or destroyed his work, the peace-loving "bishop" of the city of Zurich paid the heavy price of many a navigator and spiritual guardian: one was death at the hands of his religious opponents, the other relative oblivion outside Switzerland and a small circle of Zwingli scholars. The first is a fact of history, the second may be ours to correct.

END NOTES

1. H. Bullinger, *Reformationsgeschichte*, 1.4 lists the numerous contributions to which the populace was subjected. Among ordinary contributions were the quart, bannalia, cathedraticum, primi fructus, consolationes. Included among extraordinary contributions was the subsidia caritativa.
2. Karl Daendliker, *Geschichte der Stadt und des Kantons Zürich*, 11, p.289 f.
3. Cf. Ekkehart Fabian, "Zwingli und der Geheime Rat, 1523-1531" in *Gottesreich und Menschenreich*. Festschrift für Ernst Staehelin, 1969. For a different assessment cf. Walter Jacob, "Zwingli und der Geheime Rat", *Zwa* X111/4, 1970, p. 234 ff. Von Muralt categorically stated, "Den geheimen Rat gab es nicht!"
4. Peter H. Huber, *Annahme und Durchführung der Reformation auf der Zürcher Landschaft*, Zurich, DPhil, 1972
5. Muralt/Schmid, *Quellen*, 1.8
6. The most detailed case is made by Robert Walton, *Zwingli's Theocracy*. See also L. von Muralt, "Zum Problem der Theokratie bei Zwingli" in *Discordia Concors*. Festschrift für Edgar Bonjour, Basel, 1968 and Gottfried Locher, "Theokratie" in *Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon*, 111, Goettingen, 1959.
7. E. Egli, *Die zuerchersche Kirchenpolitik von Waldmann bis Zwingli*, Zurich, 1896.
8. Elsa Beurle, *Der politische Kampf um die religiöse Einheit der Eidgenossenschaft, 1520-27*, Zurich, DPhil, 1920
9. E. Egli, *Aktensammlung*, nos. 170, 191, 195, et.al.
10. H. Bullinger, 1.51. On account of a wolf who devours animals one would sound the alarm, but the wolf who devours people, no one fends off. All of them readily wear red hats and cloaks. Shake them and ducats and crowns come tumbling out, but if one wrings them out, the blood of your son, brother, father and good friend flows forth.

11. Edlibach reports that Hofmann was a native of Bremgarten, born in 1454. His vote for Zwingli in 1518 was because of the latter's reputation

as opponent of mercenary service. He had grave reservations concerning Zwingli's moral reputation. His *Klageschrift*, published anonymously, is dated by Egli 1522, thus correcting Staehelin who had placed it between the summer of 1521 and the beginning of 1522 and Wirz (1519). Pestalozzi agrees with Egli. Cf. Pestalozzi, *Die Gegner Zwinglis am Grossmünsterstift in Zurich*, Zurich, 1918, pp. 86-87.

12. Pestalozzi, *op. cit.*
13. G.W. Locher, *Die Zwinglische Reformation*, Goettingen, Vandenhoeck, 1979. See also U. Gaebler, *H. Zwingli. Leben und Werk*, C.H. Beck, 1983
14. F. Buesser, *Das katholische Zwinglibild. Von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart*, Zurich, Zwingliverlag, 1968.
15. The importance of this "apologia" cannot be stressed enough. Bullinger recognized it (1.78 f.); it was noted subsequently by Moerikofer, O. Horowitz, Baur (1.119), Staehelin (1.232f) and a host of others right down to our own day. According to Bullinger the specific targets of Zwingli's pen were suffragan bishop Fattli and the episcopal vicar, John Faber.
16. Egli, *Aktensammlung*,169.
17. So Egli in Z 1,189.
18. Cf. Egli, *Aktensammlung*, 246 and Z 1.197ff.
19. Egli, *Aktensammlung*, 233, 234 and Z 1.88ff.
20. Cf. Bullinger, 1.97, and *Eidgenössische Abschiede*, 1V.1a, 263.
21. Cf. E. J. Furcha, "In Defense of the Spirit" in Furcha/Pipkin, eds., *Prophet, Pastor, Protestant*, Pickwick Publications, 1984.
22. Cf. *Von dem Predigtamt*, Z IV.382ff., where the argument is most fully made. Their offence is said to be two-fold: 1. political and 2. spiritual; and manifests itself in their divisiveness and falsification of the truth. Zwingli proposed to ban lay preaching. Cf. also, Egli, *Aktensammlung*, 933, 937, 1080 and Z 1X. no. 6.
23. Egli, *Aktensammlung*, 346, 348, 366.

RESONATING WITH ZWINGLI

H. Wayne Pipkin

Chapel Sermon
McGill University
Faculty of Religious Studies
October 2, 1984

Brothers and sisters, I greet you in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and express my appreciation for the opportunity to speak to you on this occasion. I also bring greetings from Kirchenratspräsident Pastor Ernst Meili of Zurich. I mentioned to Pastor Meili that I would be coming to the Zwingli Symposium and he wanted me to express to you his appreciation for your taking the time to remember in "far off Montreal" the life and work of the Zurich reformer.

Huldrych Zwingli was born January 1, 1484, 500 years ago this year. It is appropriate, then, that we come together this week in a place that has kept alive many reformed traditions to celebrate one of the founders of the reformed churches.

I was first introduced to Zwingli some twenty years ago this autumn when I took my first reformation church history course. In the midst of that course, my professor decided that it was time for us to re-enact the Marburg Colloquy. I was chosen to play the role of Zwingli. I still remember that occasion clearly and how my colleague who was to be Luther was careful to come to class with his piece of chalk in hand with which to write the words "hoc est corpus meum" on his desk in the midst of that debate. It was the beginning for me of a long relationship with the Zurich reformer. I have learned much from Zwingli over the years and I find it appropriate on this occasion to ask ourselves what it is that he might be saying to us who are gathered in worship here today some 500 years after his birth.

My Doctor Father, Professor F.L. Battles, was fond of speaking of church history as the "third testament" of the church. Of course, we who are church historians do not presume to ascribe the same authority to that third testament as we do to the Old and New Testaments. Nonetheless, we do

recognize and affirm that God did not stop speaking to and through the church when the canon of the New Testament was closed. If church history then is a theological discipline, let us look to one life story within the history of the Christian Church to see what appropriate reflections might emerge which will be meaningful for us gathered here today in worship.

We began the worship today with an organ prelude based upon a song that Zwingli himself wrote ("Hilt Gott, das Wasser gaht") and we have just sung a hymn that comes from his hand ("Herr, nun selbst den Wagen halt"). Given what we know about his role in the bringing to an end of congregational singing in Zurich and our awareness of the fact that the organs were shut down, it is perhaps surprising to us to recognize that it may be that he was not entirely opposed to music as such. In fact, some have suggested that he was less opposed to good church music than we have generally thought. It is from the recognition of this musical element in Zwingli that I want to take our theme for today. I have discovered that there are many elements in Zwingli's work and life with which I resonate. What I would like to do is to suggest that there are several themes running through the life story of Zwingli with which I resonate and which have a message for us today. Let us listen for those motifs.

The first theme is that of *Zwingli the Pastor*. He was a man concerned with ministering to his people. He was an intensely religious person, one preoccupied with the spirituality of the minister.

If you go to Zurich, you will discover a Zwingli statue located behind the Wasserkirche that was commissioned to be built around the time of the 400th anniversary of Zwingli's birth. The statue itself is somewhat misleading, I think. It has a very erect and powerful person leaning on a two-handed sword, holding a book in his arm. It is the view of that sword that impresses us. We think of Zwingli dying on the battle field and we know that Zwingli had something to do with the political life of the city. So we think of Zwingli the statesman. And yet, that is not all there was to the story. Presumably the book in his arm is a Bible. Walter Köhler once remarked that he imagined that it was the Greek New Testament interleaved with pages from

Plato's dialogues. That probably tells us more about Köhler's view of Zwingli than it does about Zwingli himself.

The Zurich reformer was in fact a biblically oriented, spiritually concerned pastor. There were some surprisingly modern elements in his reflections as well. In his writings, he often observed that a person's God was that in which one put faith and from which one sought consolation. At breakfast this morning I heard a number of students commenting on a paper on Tillich that was due today. I was reminded of the similarities of Tillich's notion of faith as "ultimate concern" and Zwingli's understanding as well. He was greatly concerned about the object of one's faith. For Zwingli, to take refuge in anything less than the one God was to be guilty of idolatry. This was a major religious concern of his and it leads me to a second note with which I resonate.

The difference between false and true ministers, between false and true Christians occupied much of Zwingli's time and thinking. Primarily, it was a question of the *direction of one's faith.* It is not a question as to whether or not one has faith. Everyone does, in fact. It is the goal of one's faith that determines the authenticity of one's being.

"False Religion" suffers from misdirected aim. It is faith directed towards creation, towards the creature rather than towards the Creator. It is faith invested in the means rather than directed toward the end. It is the tendency to rely on one's own capacity rather than on the divine.

A few years ago Bel Kaufman wrote a novel entitled *Up the Down Staircase.* It was the story about a new teacher in a large metropolitan high school. In this high school, since there were so many students, there were staircases devoted to one-way traffic up and down. This new teacher constantly found herself going "up the down staircase." Perhaps you can identify with her mis-direction. That is a parable for False Religion. To go up the down staircase is exactly what is not needed, for God has already come to us. Therefore it is no longer necessary for us to earn our way back to God or to seek to attain the divine heights on our own strength.

True Religion is religion whose faith is

directed towards Christ. It is looking to God the Creator, depending on the enlivening Spirit rather than on one's own capacity. Zwingli's understanding of the *sola gratia* theme is cast in these terms. God the Creator in his providence has already come to us and already redeemed us. Whatever is lacking in us, God has already supplied--in Christ. We do not need then to earn our way to the Divine. Zwingli also speaks in terms of the imitation of Christ. Anything less than following Christ is idolatry. Zwingli wrote, "Since Christ is a perfect model, the shepherd must see that he relies only on his example."

A third motif in the life and work of Zwingli with which I resonate is that *spirituality is concerned with the ways in which faith is acted out, that is, lived out in society.* Zwingli judges not only in terms of whether one says one has faith but in terms of the fruits of faith as well. For him faith in God is always followed closely by love of God and love of neighbour. He rediscovers, as do many of his generation, the early church motif that it is the way in which Christians live that distinguishes them from the pagan or non-Christian environment. In his treatise on the *Shepherd* Zwingli wrote, "We see that it is not enough only to take possession of salvation, it is also necessary to take care that one does not lose it or despise it. Most helpful towards that end is the shepherd's doing in practice what he teaches in words." It is not a self-righteousness that Zwingli is content with, but a qualitative expression of Christian living that reflects the difference in being Christian.

A fourth thematic undercurrent in Zwingli's thinking with which I resonate is one that I have only recently discovered: it is his *concern for the poor.* This theme occurs quite often in Zwingli's writings. In the Zwingli film produced by the church council in Zurich there is a scene in which Zwingli walks outside amidst a group of poor folk. He turns to his companion and says that it would perhaps be a better idea if they were to empty the monasteries of the monks and fill them with God's poor. That is an artistic impression of a very real Zwingli.

In his 1522 writing on the "Clarity and Certainty of the Word of God" he lists several rules

of scriptural interpretation. Two of his rules indicate that Zwingli believed that scriptural interpretation should favour the poor. He wrote, "It is the nature and property of the Word to humble the high and mighty and to exalt the lowly," and again, "the word of God always attracts and helps the poor, comforting the comfortless and despairing."

On another occasion Zwingli wrote that we should be less concerned with clothing the images that are in the churches and more concerned with clothing the true images of God, that is, the poor. Zwingli's concern for society was thus not only for the right ordering of the society, but also a concern for the less fortunate, for the poor in the society. He felt a special responsibility for them and he felt that God did as well. It is a theme with which I resonate.

Finally, there's the entirely characteristic reformed and Zwinglian *concern for the whole community*, a genuine concern for his people, the Swiss. He said, "I am Swiss and I proclaim Christ to the Swiss." If it could be said that Luther was seeking an answer to the question, "How can I be saved?", then Zwingli was seeking additionally an answer to the question, "How can my people be saved?" His concern for his people played an important role in his becoming a reformer and it played itself out in his reforming work in a profound sense of responsibility, with pain and suffering and with total commitment. His concern for his people is a theme with which I resonate.

Let me now pause for an entr'acte. As it happens, there are non-resonating elements in Zwingli as well. This, of course, will not surprise you. As you are aware, I teach in a Baptist faculty. In fact my colleagues have often been puzzled about that. It seems that I am the only one on my faculty that has to justify his area of scholarly expertise. They wonder why a Baptist would want to be a Zwingli scholar, not realizing that the real question is, why would a Zwingli scholar want to be a Baptist?

There are, however serious questions that I find myself raising about the reforming activity of Zwingli. Not all of the elements are positive, you see.

In 1525 Zwingli found himself encountering a

challenge to his vision of the reformation in the persons of the Täufer. Unfortunately, he was not willing to extend to them the freedom he himself expected. A year earlier he had written, "Christ does not want anyone to be forced to believe." In 1525 one can understand the necessity of preserving the reformation with which Zwingli was confronted, yet does the end justify the means?

It is also true that towards the end of his life Zwingli became too deeply involved in the political dimension on the one hand and in the international dimension of creating, maintaining and advancing alliances on the other. It seems to me that he became more interested in seeing what he himself could do, that is, he trusted less in the divine initiative than in his own devices. It would have been better, I think, if he had been content to do fewer things and to do them well. Eventually, his reformation was saved by Bullinger and the spirituality of that reformation, which was then transmitted elsewhere, to Geneva, to Holland, to England, and eventually to North America was preserved.

Zwingli was then, after all, only human. That is part of the glory of it, it seems to me. He was merely a human being through whom God *could* and *did* work and act, a human being with faults and limitations, even as we ourselves are. I must not be too harsh with Zwingli and his mistakes. I must learn to forgive him and to forgive *his* past even as I must learn to forgive *my own* past. I am therefore able to accept the fact that through this mere mortal, God was able to effect a great deed.

Zwingli's reformation was a reformation that turned to the centrality of the Scripture and the role of the Spirit in understanding it. He spent his whole life in trying to learn how to apply the text to the context. His reliance on the *lectio continua* method of reading straight through the Scripture and preaching from the Scripture in order made all the difference in his reformation as he applied to the everyday scene in Zurich what he was learning from the Bible. His was a spirit-filled biblicism. He understood the biblical sense of God's involvement in the whole of human history. He understood that one should work for the kingdom as part of one's Christian commitment. The remarkable sense of responsibility of public life and public

affairs that grew out of his reformation was every bit as significant and important as was the notion of vocation for Luther. This understanding exercised a significant influence on both Anglican and puritan England and spread from there to North America. In addition, although it is only one, it is indeed *one* of the streams that have flowed into the liberation theologies of today.

So this was the reformation effected from Zurich. It was a commitment to understanding the ways in which God was related to the whole life of humankind. For those of us who are ministering in today's diaspora of the churches, we encounter in Zwingli a challenge to look to the end and not to the means, to the divine and not merely to our own initiative. We hear a word that says to us that the spirituality of who we are as ministers is essential, that if we follow Christ we will be assured of being formed like Christ. We are assured of his Presence. Indeed, it seems to me that one might characterize Zwingli's pastoral theology as a "theology of presence."

Zwingli said, "The Lord protects his Church. Let us see if God is stronger than the court dancers."

Let us conclude our worship this morning with the prayer of Zwingli that was used at the beginning of biblical studies each day as the Zurich ministers came together in the *Prophezei* to study God's word. Let us pray:

> Almighty, eternal and merciful God, Whose Word is a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path, open and illuminate our minds, that we may purely and perfectly understand Thy Word, and that our lives may be conformed to what we have rightfully understood, that in nothing we may be displeasing to Thy Majesty through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Note: A sermon is not a research paper, but a reference to a few sources is in order. The quotations of Zwingli are for the most part my own translation which appear in the Furcha/Pipkin edition. The quotation from the "Clarity and Certainty of the Word of God" is that of Geoffrey Bromiley, *Zwingli and Bullinger*. The two concluding quotations are taken from the English translation of Gottfried Locher, *Zwingli's Thought*.

ROYAL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

THE POSITIVE RELIGIOUS VALUES OF ZWINGLI'S EUCHARISTIC WRITINGS

H. Wayne Pipkin

In the English-speaking world, Huldrych Zwingli may well be the forgotten reformer. If there is anything known about him, it is that he was involved in some significant way in the eucharistic controversies of the sixteenth century. That this is the fact best known about this otherwise unknown person suggests something about how important this topic was to Zwingli, how much he must have written on the subject, and thereby the pitfalls open to anyone who presumes to address the one Zwingli topic about which theologians and historians claim to have some knowledge.

The Literature

The literature on the general topic "Zwingli and the Eucharist" is vast, especially in the German language, and this is not the place to give a lengthy overview of what is available. Fortunately, it is relatively easy to discover in recent publications citations of the most important writings. Especially noteworthy in this regard are the efforts of Professor Gottfried W. Locher.[1] One should note also the work of Ulrich Gäbler.[2] In the Anglo-Saxon world one may consult the bibliography of Pipkin.[3] The forthcoming volume by Peter Stephens on the theology of Zwingli will contain helpful bibliographical comments.[4] Among the many researchers who have worked on the subject of the eucharistic thinking of Zwingli, there are two persons whose work has been so substantial that any of us who come after must necessarily stand on their shoulders. Especially significant is the work of a Zurich church historian of an earlier generation, Walther Köhler. In many areas Köhler's work is still a point of departure for Zwingli scholars, but nowhere is this more true than in the area of the eucharistic thinking of Zwingli. His two volume work, *Zwingli und Luther: Ihr Streit über das Abendmahl nach seinen politischen und religiösen Beziehungen*, though necessarily dated by the passage of time and its attendant maturing reflections on the eucharist,

remains until today the standard work on the development of Zwingli's eucharistic conceptions.[5]

Of more recent vintage has been the work of Gottfried Locher. One discovers very soon that there are no topics of Zwingli research through which one will tread without discovering first the prior footsteps of Professor Locher. In numerous analyses of Zwingli's theology and reforming work one encounters insightful sections and passages on the Lord's Supper in Zwingli. One should note especially the small monograph, now available in an English language collection of Locher's writings, "Discord among Guests.--Lessons to be learned from the Reformers' debate about the Lord's Supper for a contemporary understanding and celebration."[6] Also of value is his larger recent work, *Die Zwinglische Reformation im Rahmen der europäischen Kirchengeschichte*, in which he concisely analyses the course of the development of Zwingli's thinking. One should note especially in that work the careful chronological listing of the complex variety of writings by Zwingli, Luther and their contemporaries that contributed to the eucharistic debates.[7] It may well be that the most important contribution that Locher has consistently made in this area is to the understanding of the nature of Zwingli's eucharistic thinking. He has made important suggestions concerning the religious values of Zwingli's thought that help correct some of the all too common misinterpretations.

In addition to these two researchers, one must take note of the work of a trio of scholars who have made important contributions in the area of Zwingli's liturgical work, namely Fritz Schmidt-Clausing, J. Schweizer and Markus Jenny.[8] A recent work by a Roman Catholic scholar is also worth noting: Stefan Niklaus Bosshard, *Zwingli-Erasmus-Cajetan: Die Eucharistie als Zeichen der Einheit*.[9] Bosshard presents an insightful analysis of the major eucharistic writings of Zwingli in comparison to the two sixteenth century Catholic Reformers, Erasmus and Cajetan, with a liturgical and theological sensitivity that probably only a Roman Catholic scholar could muster. Finally, a comparative study of Luther and Zwingli by Grötzinger on the issue of the sacrifice in the Mass is of some value.[10]

There has been remarkably little of value

written in English on the matter of the Eucharist in Zwingli. The older work by Scott, "Zwingli's doctrine of the Lord's Supper,"[11] and the fruitful study by Cyril Richardson, *Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist*[12] are not without merit.

Misinterpretations of Zwingli

These several works, however, could not save Zwingli from the misinterpretations that have fallen to his lot. The Zwinglian emphasis on the Lord's Supper as memorial, for example, often led commentators to describe his eucharistic doctrine as "mere memorialism."

Examples of this kind of interpretation are too numerous to list--one or two must suffice. The influential Anglican interpreter, Gregory Dix, to cite one, describes Zwingli thus:

> His doctrine of the sacraments, like that of his colleague of Basle, leaves them no force or efficacy of their own whatsoever. They are bare signs or ceremonies by which a man assures *other people* rather than himself of his saving faith in Christ's redemption. ... In the eucharist there is but plain bread and wine, a *reminder* of the salvation achieved long ago on Calvary. ... In other words, the eucharistic action consists in a vivid mental remembering of the passion as the achievement of 'my' redemption in the past.[13]

The elements of the critique are familiar: Zwingli is guilty of emptying the sacraments of any real religious content. He is a rationalist and a subjectivist. The view of the Catholic historian of Christian spirituality, Louis Bouyer, though a bit extreme, is also typical of the modern assessment of Zwingli. He writes that in Zwingli,

> The sacraments enshrine no mystery; Christ is not present in the Eucharist in any way that we would understand. They are no more than vivid images that speak to the simple and remind us of what we know already by means of the word: the

love that God has shown us in Jesus Christ.[14]

All this may be admirable, but it certainly leaves the sacraments as less than religiously significant. Thus C.W. Dugmore characterizes Zwingli's sacramental views not as real presence, but as real absence.[15]

If this were true, then there would be no great need to look into the eucharistic views of Zwingli within the context of this international symposium. The fact is, however, that it is not a fair representation of the views of Zwingli. Apparently much that is shallow or empty in eucharistic theology is paraded under the name of Zwingli. The reasons for this misleading portrayal are not difficult to find. One need look no further than Martin Luther and Johann Eck and their respective spiritual descendants to find sufficient examples of such interpretation.[16] The point is, if such a "bare memorialism" and what it implies are "Zwinglian," then we must affirm here that Zwingli was not a Zwinglian.

The Background of Zwingli's Eucharistic Thinking

The eucharistic thinking and practice of Zwingli did not appear suddenly on the horizon without considerable prior development. In order to approach this important aspect of the reformer it is worthwhile to sketch something of the background of the eucharistic reformer. The necessary brevity of this overview runs the risk of superficiality; yet, with this caveat in mind, we will gain an important introduction into the question at hand. We shall consider Zwingli under three rubrics.

First, *Zwingli the Swiss*. Zwingli was born in Wildhaus in the Toggenburg region of Switzerland and, although it is a bit anachronistic to call him "Swiss," his outlook was decidedly more Swiss than, say, German or Austrian or French. He recognized this himself. He described his preaching in such terms when, in 1523, he replied in his *Archeteles* to the Bishop of Constance: "I have not, I say, used any false nostrums or tricks or exhaortations, but in simple words and terms native to the Swiss I have brought them to the recognition of their trouble, having learned this from Christ himself...."[18]

Young Huldrych's father was the chief public official in the village of Wildhaus. As the political world was alien to Martin Luther, so the public world, the world of politics in the broadest sense, was familiar and natural for Zwingli. George Potter describes succinctly what that means for our study here:

> For Zwingli, it was the tightly-knit community of a Swiss valley where every man knew his neighbour, where cooperation was essential for survival and where the leadership of the more prosperous element was taken for granted, that formed the basis of society. Such was the *Gemeinde*, in ecclesiastical terms the parish, with priest, church and common worship; and this, too, was to be the basic unit of the Zwinglian religious organization much later.[19]

Such an understanding of community was to figure prominently in Zwingli's eucharistic practice.

Secondly, *Zwingli the humanist*. Zwingli's training as a humanist is no doubt the best known fact about his development. It is so familiar that the meaning of it has been lost. Rather than cover again what is familiar territory, let us mention here certain implications of Zwingli's humanistic training for the development of his eucharistic thinking and practice.[20] Whatever else humanism was, it was fundamentally an educational programme and, therefore, to say that Zwingli was a humanist is to say that he was educated in some of the leading centres of education in Europe. He gained thereby a profound appreciation for the process of education itself and whereas it is true that the Renaissance humanist might typically be an elitist, in the case of Zwingli this was not so. His commitment to the community combined with the belief in education strongly coloured his reforming work. This was important for the development of his eucharistic practice as well. In addition, a fundamental approach of humanism was that of returning to the sources. As a result, the Zurich reformer's efforts to reform the worship in Zurich are characterized by the return *ad fontes*, that is, to the early fathers of the church and especially to the

Scriptures. Finally, mention of the several mentors of Zwingli must be made, especially Thomas Wyttenbach, who figures prominently in one eucharistic writing in 1523, and Erasmus, the great scholar and teacher of a whole generation of early Protestant reformers.

The influence of Erasmus is indeed great and complex--too much so to dwell in great detail on it here. One aspect of that influence, however, is important to mention, one that is often overlooked. In this regard, it is not the educational or methodological impact of Erasmus that is of primary importance for our study. Rather, it is the religious impact. Zwingli obtained from Erasmus a religious vision that was to inform his reforming work in general and his eucharistic theology in particular.[21] Zwingli was motivated by a search for True Religion, a term that figures prominently in his writing and which he may well have taken over from Erasmus.[22] The content of that term, True Religion, is of even greater significance, especially for his eucharistic thinking. There is no doubt that Zwingli developed significantly beyond Erasmus in his work as reformer, but Zwingli's search for a mode of religious expression that went beyond the mere ceremonial in true worship of the Creator was one that was clearly impregnated by an Erasmian perspective. There is more, but the search for True Religion was an essential and determinative part of that synthesis that Zwingli eventually worked out. This essentially religious element must be kept in mind as we turn to our final observation.

Thirdly, *Zwingli the Pastor*. The social, political, educational and religious background of Zwingli came to full fruition within the context of ministry. As we will see, Zwingli's life was characterized by a long and consistent development, one worked out not in the isolated confines of the study, or even the monk's cell, but one that had daily to face the rigours of pastoral obligations. His search for True Religion was not merely an individualistic one. Rather, it was the necessity of applying the inner religious vision to a corporate entity, the Zurich church, that shaped his reform. Thus, his pastoral concerns and the impact which these made on his developing theology and action are significant for understanding Zwingli overall, but especially for grasping the meaning of

his eucharistic thinking.

To conclude: Zwingli's eucharistic theology did not emerge in a vacuum, either socially, theologically or personally. If we will take note of this simple truth, we will be able more readily to grasp the meaning of the Lord's Supper as it emerged within Zurich. It is against the personal and corporate backdrop of the maturing reformer and reformation that the Eucharist developed.

An Overview of the Periods of Zwingli's Eucharistic Writing

If we but limit ourselves to those writings wherein Zwingli made a significant statement on the Eucharist, we will still have before us no less than a dozen treatises of varying length and complexity spread out over a period of some nine years. In order both to highlight and to simplify that developmental process, we will set before us four periods of eucharistic writing in Zwingli.

First, the period of the establishing of the reformation, 1523. During this crucial period in which the major issue is the establishment and victory of the reformed church in Zurich, the Eucharist is not a central issue as such. The eucharistic issues are part of a larger mosaic in which the foundational doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church are being called into question.

Secondly, the institutionalization of the church, 1524-25. During this period the theological and ecclesiological basis of True Religion is defined by Zwingli. During this period Zwingli's thought itself becomes an issue and he finds it necessary to defend his theology even as it is developing further. As he finds himself standing between the Täufer and the Roman Catholics, he reforms decisively the practice of the Lord's Supper and undertakes a maturing defence of his eucharistic doctrines.

Thirdly, the controversy with Luther, 1526-29. One of the most unfortunate periods in the Reformation epoch, this time produced the controversial writings of Luther and Zwingli on the Eucharist which culminated in the Marburg Colloquy. It is the writings from this period that have left the greatest impressions and which have consequently

distorted the positive nature of Zwingli's understanding of the Lord's Supper.

Fourthly, the post-Marburg, mature Zwingli, 1530-31. During this period Zwingli emerges in his eucharistic spirituality as a mature reformed catholic theologian. The most positive religious understandings emerge during these last two years of Zwingli's ministry.

The Early Eucharistic Writings of 1523

Stefan Bosshard calls the early period of Zwingli's eucharistic reflection the "pre-symbolic" period.[23] It is the period in which the eucharistic concerns must necessarily have been subordinated to the larger questions of the establishment of an independent Zurich church. It is pre-symbolic because it is the time before Zwingli has fully developed his later understanding and it is likely true that he did not as yet have the tools for letting himself fully interpret the words of institution in a symbolic way.[24]

There are four significant writings from 1523 which deal in whole or in part with the Eucharist. *The Exposition of the Conclusions*,[25] published in July, is Zwingli's lengthiest theological statement. It is an exposition of the sixty-seven articles which Zwingli had prepared for the First Disputation in January. Its very length and apparent lack of organization make it difficult to utilize. Nonetheless, it is worth the effort, for it represents the most complete theological statement of the Zurich reformation in its early stages. The eucharistic reflections occur in the well-known "Exposition of the Eighteenth Article." A second writing on the Eucharist is the unique *Attack on the Canon of the Mass*,[26] which contains a lengthy analysis of the great prayer of the Mass along with suggestions from Zwingli for a new canon. It is therefore more liturgical in nature and is highly valued by scholars.[27] It is in many ways the liturgical counterpart of the *Exposition of the Conclusions*.[28] A third writing by Zwingli, his *Short Christian Instruction*, published in November after the Second Disputation under the mandate of the City Council, served as an early confessional statement of the Zurich reform. It was to educate the reformed clergy in Zurich and to inform both the

confederates and the Catholic authorities and clergy concerning the bases of the reform. The section on the Mass is short and contains as such nothing new, but it is placed within the setting of one of the best apologies for the Zurich reformation and tells us much about the early eucharistic spirituality of Zwingli.[29] The fourth writing is a letter to his erstwhile teacher, Thomas Wyttenbach. An important point of departure for the eucharistic concern in the letter is the question of the reservation of the host, but along with this question other fundamental questions are raised by Zwingli which reveal an intensely religious side of Zwingli's concern for eucharistic reform.[30]

The material, as always, is complex. Nonetheless, let us isolate several themes that reflect the religious concerns of Zwingli at this early stage.

There is first of all a reformation concern as such. The year 1523 was the decisive year for the official establishment of the Reformed Church in Zurich. The very life of the Zurich reform was at stake. It was a concern that went far beyond the matter of the Eucharist, and yet eucharistic issues were very much at the centre of the developing reform. Understandably, a focal point of Zwingli's thinking and action in these early years of the reform was the correction of the abuses as he encountered them in the church of his day. The church in need of reform was one that had focused its energies on the material and the phenomenal rather than on the spiritual. To Zwingli this was the essence of idolatry and was contrary to True Religion, in search of which he had been engaged for the better part of a decade--an evangelical search now tempered by the emerging commitment of the reformer.

In 1523 for Zwingli the essence of False Religion as manifested in the Catholic eucharistic practice was the understanding of the Mass as sacrifice. The problem with the sacrifice of the Mass is that it is an approach which suffers from misdirected aim. It turns to the work of the creature rather than to the work of God in Christ. The true believer knows that it is the unique sacrifice of Christ that brings forgiveness. "He will not tolerate that such a deed be credited to a creature, since it is God's deed alone."[31] For, writes Zwingli, "whatever we attribute to the

creature, we take away from Christ."[32] As Zwingli understands it, "if he were to be offered up again and again, he would be made like the sacrifices in the Old Testament which had to be offered up repeatedly because of their imperfection."[33] Such is the essence of impiety and "what can be viler than impiety?"[34] It is a theme that will remain consistent throughout Zwingli's eucharistic writings.

On the other hand, a more desirable and positive view of sacrifice is guaranteed if the essence of the Supper as memorial and remembrance is restored. For the participants it is not a sacrifice, " ... but a memorial of the sacrifice--a warranty of salvation through Christ as long as they believe with understanding that Christ has paid for their sin on the cross, and that they eat and drink his flesh and blood in this faith, knowing that it has been given them as a seal of the fact that their sins are forgiven, *as if Christ had only now died on the cross.*"[35] It is to remembrance that Christ calls, not to sacrifice.[36] In addition to the biblical witness, Zwingli cites the fathers, especially Chrysostom and Augustine, as ancient support for this view.[37]

Note especially that the remembrance is not a mere intellectual exercise. For Zwingli faith is absolutely essential and when it is present, it is "as if Christ had only now died on the cross," an idea that will linger in his thinking and come to full fruition in the late period. It is especially the *Letter to Thomas Wyttenbach*, that stresses this importance of faith. He writes, "I believe the Eucharist is eaten where there is faith."[38] Without faith the sacrament is useless. Just as you can wash the unbeliever a thousand times in water to no avail without faith, so is faith necessary for the Eucharist.[39] Indeed, it is faith which frees, not the sacrament itself.[40] One of the many striking images that Zwingli uses about the Supper is cited in support of the role of faith: "Fire, I say, is in the flint only insofar as it really emerges fully when the flint is struck; in the same way Christ is eaten in the form of bread only when there is both faith and a desire to possess him in the recipient, and this happens in a wonderful way which the believer does not examine particularly and in detail."[41] Thus it is faith that gives validity to

the Supper. Likewise, it also is clear that in the early period Zwingli has not in any sense denied a doctrine of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist.[42]

Finally, it is striking to note that in this early period there is a consistent recognition of the effects of the Eucharist. Far from being empty of any religious benefit, Zwingli maintains that "... this food is given among other things to strengthen weak faith."[43] This theme will fall into the background in the middle periods but will re-emerge decisively in the mature Zwingli.

The Institutionalization of the Eucharist, 1524-25

The years 1524-25 saw the full development of a symbolic understanding of the Eucharist by Zwingli and the institutionalization of eucharistic theory and practice at Zurich. Four particular writings reveal the growing understanding of the Eucharist. They also reflect the interaction between thought and practice on the one hand and the historical context on the other.

In the *Letter to Matthew Alber*,[44] Zwingli has clearly entered into a new phase of his eucharistic endeavours and gives first clear evidence of a solid symbolic understanding. In *The Commentary on True and False Religion*,[45] Zwingli's best known systematic theology, he sets forth a mature symbolic view within the context of his overall theology. It is an important contribution to the institutionalization of the Eucharist. In *The Subsidiary Essay on the Eucharist*,[46] he provides not only further reflections on the Eucharist, but reveals particularly important insights on the historical and personal setting. Finally, it is during this period that the eucharistic liturgy was finally instituted at Zurich. In April 1525, Zwingli published his *Action or Use of the Lord's Supper*,[47] which was to form the basis of the celebration at Zurich for years to come.

A striking feature of this period is seen in the role external events played in shaping eucharistic developments. For example, it is difficult to measure the importance of the mission of Saganus and Rode who brought the letter of Cornelisz Hoen to Zwingli and thereby opened up the symbolic interpretation of the words of institution. Whether it was

"providential" or a "happy accident," it certainly came at the right time for Zwingli. He had clearly worked through to a view of the Supper as memorial and the additional tools for interpreting the words of Jesus symbolically were of inestimable value to him. In addition, although the reformation had been officially established, the course of the institutionalization was still under way and, as Furcha points out, Zwingli had to steer a course between Scylla and Charybdis.[48] This fact is obvious during this period and is clearly manifested in eucharistic developments. Let us examine them briefly.

Forces on both the left and the right were confronting Zwingli. By late 1524 radical forces in Zurich, in part under the influence of Hubmaier, were pressing for changes in the Lord's Supper along the lines of the efforts of Karlstadt.[49] Then in January 1525 there began the series of public confrontations and private meetings that were to multiply into the widespread Täufer movement. While the basic issues were ecclesiological and the speed of the reformation, the questions very soon developed into sacramental issues as well. Baptism became one of the points of contention. What is not generally recognized is the likely role of the Lord's Supper in the developing controversies. In the printed collection of Anabaptist testimony and related documents we encounter several references to the Lord's Supper from January to March 1525 which make significant linkages of baptism and the Supper, one reference to the writings of Karlstadt, one reference noting the presence of forty persons at a celebration of an evangelical Lord's Supper, a letter from Felix Manz and, finally, testimony by Georg Blaurock is particularly interesting, for on February 18 he testified that he was the first to baptize and to celebrate the Lord's table as Jesus had with his disciples, thereby accusing Zwingli of doing violence to Scripture.[51] Not only must this have been a particularly bitter pill for Zwingli to swallow, it illustrates clearly that Zwingli was in danger of losing the initiative in his reformation of the Eucharist.

Soon thereafter there took place a series of intense meetings within the City Council on the matter of the Eucharist. Zwingli's intention finally to revise the Lord's Supper met with catholic opposition in the City Council, particularly on this

occasion in the person of the Deputy Town Clerk, Joachim am Grüt. In his *Subsidiary Essay*, Zwingli reveals just how tense the meetings were.[52] Out of the tension produced by the radical threat on the one hand and the conservative opposition on the other, was to come one of the genuinely creative responses of Zwingli.

The debates took place before the Council on April 11-12, with the decision of the Council definitively abrogating the old practice and commanding the Zurich church to " ... celebrate the Eucharist hereafter ... according to the institution of Christ and the apostles."[53] The victory was clear and apparent, but Zwingli was not satisfied. He had been challenged in the course of the debates to establish the symbolic bases of eucharistic interpretation from Scripture itself and, indeed, on some basis other than by arguing from parables. No matter how hard he tried, all the arguments he could think of were either ones he had used in his *Commentary* or were like those. Finally, in the early morning hours of April 13, Zwingli reports that the answer came to him in a dream:

> ... when, I say, the thirteenth day of April was at hand, I had a dream that I was again, to my great annoyance, contending with the hostile clerk, and that I had been struck so dumb that my tongue refused to fulfill its function and I could not speak what I knew to be true. This distress seemed to oppress me terribly, as dreams do sometimes mock us in the treacherous night. ... Thereupon, as by supernatural power, an adviser seemed to stand beside me ... who said, "Why do you not answer him, sluggard, what is written in Exodus 12: 11, 'It is the passover, that is, the passing over of the Lord'?" As soon as I had had this vision I awakened and leaped out of bed. I examined the passage in the Septuagint, first from every point of view, and spoke upon it to the best of my ability before the whole people. When this sermon was heard, it scattered all the mist from the eyes of all the candidates in theology. ...

Thus, from out of the depths of his own subconscious, a discovery forced itself into consciousness by the stress of the challenges from both left and right. Zwingli had found the scriptural image that was to provide ever thereafter a key element in his description of the Eucharist, i.e., the Passover.[54]

The significance of the Passover lay in its essentially religious value. This scriptural image preserved both the christological dimension of the Eucharist as well as the symbolic approach to interpreting it. As Zwingli recognized, "... among all the shadows and the things perfected in Christ none more plainly corresponds to each other than the passover of the ancestors and the offering of Christ upon the cross. ..."[55] Furthermore, both are a commemoration. "In the one it is of deliverance in the flesh, in the other of reconciliation unto the Most High God."[56] The image is a fruitful one, one that will be utilized often by Zwingli. The discovery is a striking illustration of the way in which the events of the day, balanced over against the intellectual and spiritual struggles of Zwingli, produced a meaningful response.

Other themes, consistent with this paschal discovery, emerged as well during this time and can be summarized briefly. First, the hermeneutical dimension is apparent. Zwingli developed a fully symbolic view of the Eucharist that was maintained by a commitment to the authority and clarity of Scripture. This means, of course, that he had to interpret Scripture and he did so with certain consistent emphases. Above all, he sought to interpret Scripture by Scripture. A particularly characteristic approach for him at this point was to utilize John 6; although he denied that the discourses in John 6 are about the Eucharist, he clearly asserted often during this period that he learned from this chapter that "the flesh profits nothing." Therefore, the words of institution can be safely interpreted symbolically, for the flesh of Christ would profit nothing in the Eucharist. Also, Zwingli's typical use of metaphor and his dependence on tropes and figures of speech to explain Scripture, especially the words of institution, is characteristic from this time. In addition, faith itself, which is to say Zwingli's understanding of faith, is introduced as a principle of

interpretation.[57]

Secondly, there is the christological dimension. Whereas earlier Zwingli was concerned about the abuse of the sacrifice of the Mass, in this period he is more concerned about the abuse of the assertion of the bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist. It is only the divinity of Christ that saves, not the humanity; it is therefore only the divinity that is to be worshipped.[58] He does not want to separate the natures, certainly, but it is the Christ who is slain that redeems, not the Christ who is eaten.[59] To maintain otherwise is false religion.[60]

Thirdly, the personal, soteriological dimension is prominent. The eating of which Christ spoke in John 6 is the eating of faith.[61] Faith is contrasted with physical eating, for believing and perceiving by the senses are entirely different activities. If something is done by the senses, that is of the body, it requires no faith.[62] Faith, however, is of the Spirit and is the result of the working of the Spirit. "It is therefore spiritual food of which I am speaking, for only the Spirit gives it, since the Spirit alone draws the heart to itself and refreshes it."[63] The spiritual eating is not unrelated to the Eucharist, but it is not the eating of the Supper itself that is described as such, rather the eating is faith.[64] This pronounced dimension in Zwingli is often erroneously taken to be subjective. In fact the emphasis is not on human action but on the divine activity and consequently on the objective basis of salvation. What *is* clearly missing from this period is any emphasis on the strengthening of faith from participation in the Eucharist.[65]

Finally, there is consistent with this time of institutionalization an ecclesiological dimension. Eating the Eucharist is a sign of the unity of Christians and confession that we are Christ's body. "For whosoever eats of this symbol shows himself to be a member of the Church of Christ."[66] There is the ethical dimension as well, for the Eucharist "... binds you to the Christian life, so that if by chance you live shamelessly and do not repent, you may be shut out from the other members. ..."[67] Central to this church concern during this time are Zwingli's liturgical efforts. Contained within the liturgical creation is a significant social and

religious message that bears examining.

Peter Blickle suggests that Zwingli's reformation was of interest to the "common man" precisely because his reform was shaped less by expectation of the end times than by a commitment to make concrete, practical changes of the world in accordance with evangelical doctrine.[68] There is a striking sense in which Zwingli's liturgical innovations do reflect a reformation of the common person. One should keep in mind the fact that it was precisely at this point in time, i.e. 1525, that there was considerable unrest among the peasants and the commoners throughout German-speaking Europe. The *Twelve Articles* were in fact published and distributed widely in 1525, as were many variants of this manifesto.[69] As has been suggested, Zwingli was in danger of losing the initiative of the reform to the radicals. In light of this historical context the liturgical innovation itself is particularly meaningful. When the Zurich constituency came to the celebration of the Lord's table on Maundy Thursday, 13 April 1525, they encountered a revolutionary change in worship. Perhaps most striking immediately was the fact that no longer was the altar in the chancel, separated from the people, and no longer were they to go forward to stand in line to be handed the elements by the priest. Instead, the altar had been moved down as a table to the level of the congregation and the elements were passed among the community. Worshippers were no longer mere spectators; now they were participants in the truest sense of the term. It was an act of the worshipping community, "...come together for this practice or festival, to commemorate, that is, to proclaim the Lord's death, [and] to bear witness by this very fact that they are members of one body, [that they] are one bread. ..."[70] Zwingli had significantly regained the initiative and had instituted a eucharistic reformation for the common person.

The Polemical Period, 1526-29

The time of Zwingli's polemics with Luther is the best-known period of his eucharistic activity and also the most unfortunate. The period has been much studied, though to the present researcher it is of less interest for its positive religious values. One should also be aware of the fact that the

Zwingli-Luther controversy was only one part of a much larger mosaic of eucharistic controversy.[71]

For the purposes of analysis here the beginning of the period is conveniently seen in the transitional writing of February 1526, *On the Lord's Supper.*[72] Writing in German in order to appeal to a broader public, Zwingli summarized his views over against the Lutheran and current Catholic positions.[73] In this writing Zwingli developed a lengthy christological basis for his eucharistic views.

Among the several other writings of this period, the most significant is the pointed analysis of Luther represented in the *Friendly Exegesis of the Matter of the Eucharist* of February 1527. Although to modern ears the tone of bitter irony is less than "friendly," there is evidence in this lengthy Latin treatise of a gradual movement toward concord.[74] In this treatise Zwingli combines his humanistic training with that of the biblical exegete in service of the reformed church.

The period culminates in the Marburg Colloquy and the Marburg Articles which appear to be, as Locher suggests, "... a Lutheran text with Zwinglian elements."[75] Although less of a harmonious statement than wished for by the planners of the colloquy, the event and the few publications following thereafter basically brought the polemical period to an end and provided something of the impetus to a final significant and religious development on the part of Zwingli. In terms of the positive religious values, this period is more transitional than determinative and will be treated here more cursorily.

The major concern of Zwingli during this third eucharistic period is the perspective of Luther. Zwingli was afraid that Luther was opening the door to the return of papalism and voiced critique of this kind several times.[76] In the reconstructed text of the Marburg Colloquy, Zwingli is reported at one time to have cautioned Luther: "At this point I ask you, Herr Doctor, to take care that you do not thereby revive the papacy."[77] It should be recognized that Zwingli is motivated here by religious concerns. Such views as those of Luther and his followers opened the door to the return of false religion. How else could one understand the ceremonial piety which so characterized the Lutheran posi-

tion? "For such doctrines are impious as that sins are remitted through eating, faith strengthened, that made materially present which is only taught by the word, and your other doctrines of the kind."[78]

It is during this period that Zwingli's christology plays such a distinctive role in his eucharistic thinking. Accepting the traditional two natures of Christ in one person he falls back heavily on the Augustinian assertion that "The body which has risen must be in one place."[79] It is the property of the humanity to be circumscribed "... just as angels and people are circumscribed."[80] Each nature preserves its own character. "His humanity can no more reign than his divinity die--even though he who reigns is human, and he who dies is God."[81]

The christological arguments are developed at length by Zwingli in order to argue against the bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The body of Christ as it was slain is profitable, not as it is eaten.[82] It is not the physical body as eaten, then, that brings comfort.[83] How could it? For, after all, "... the body of Christ is a created thing."[84] Zwingli's arguments are a logical consequence of his understanding of true and false religion. Bodily presence is impious and a manifestation of false religion.

Zwingli is not excluding the presence of Christ as such and does refer to the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the mind of the believer.[85] He does not elaborate at great length, however, concerning this presence and prefers to speak of the presence of God, whose nature it is to be everywhere.[86]

Consequently, there is a continuing emphasis on the role of the Spirit and of a spiritual presence. It is the Spirit, not the body that comforts. Were it not so, what need would there have been for the sending of the Spirit?[87] We must be careful not to ascribe to the body what rightfully belongs to the Spirit:

> Now whoever has sure faith in God, cannot be strengthened by anything save that from which faith is born. That is the Spirit of God, who is goodness and the light and strength of the conscience, and is alone this thing we are talking

of. The pious heart cannot be fed or strengthened by a body.[88]

Finally, one notes a continuing ecclesiological and liturgical emphasis in this period. The two are closely linked. It is in the action of thanksgiving, that is, in the celebration of the Eucharist that the church of Christ shows its unity and that it is the communion or the congregation of the body of Christ.[89] It is the liturgical moment that gives the name itself and the meaning to the Eucharist, for "... it is only an action, the action, namely, of giving thanks...."[90]

The Reformed Catholic Period, 1530-31

After Marburg Zwingli's eucharistic writings underwent a decisive transformation, one that issued in a highly developed eucharistic spirituality. Under the influence of Martin Bucer and reacting against Luther and Eck, Zwingli produced the clearest statements yet which reveal the positive religious values in his eucharistic thinking. Two treatises are well-known, the third less so.

The *Account of the Faith*, sent to the emperor on the occasion of the Diet of Augsburg in the summer of 1530, is a systematic profession of faith by Zwingli.[91] The section on the sacrament "... takes on a highly 'spiritual' tone."[92]

In response, John Eck produced a formal *Refutation of the Articles of Zwingli*, which appeared in July, though it was less a systematic refutation of the treatise than a broadside against Zwingli's reforming work and theology.[93] In terms of the Eucharist, his critique is not without its impact. He accuses Zwingli of not recognizing the "...genuine and special way of eating the Eucharist, which is sacramental and mystical,"[94] and of failing to understand what sort of a memorial the Eucharist is. "What sort of memorial, however, the Eucharist is in the Church Zwingli no longer knows,--renegade from the faith as he is."[95] Although primarily polemical in nature, the treatise is not without its sophistication in theological insight, especially in its eucharistic analysis, containing views not so far from that which Zwingli himself will proceed hereafter to espouse.[96] Zwingli's response, *Concerning the Insults of Eck*, published in August, con-

tained one of the most highly developed statements of eucharistic spirituality to come from the pen of Zwingli.[97]

In 1531 Zwingli penned his last systematic theology, the *Exposition of the Faith*, which was to be published only in 1536. It contained an important section on the Eucharist and an appendix of considerable significance that provided further affirmations on the Eucharist and described the liturgy as it was practiced at Zurich.[98]

Let us now take these three treatises together and discover the positive affirmations that Zwingli makes concerning the Eucharist.

There is first of all a concentrated emphasis on the positive significance of the symbols themselves. Though he continues to distinguish between the sign and that which is signified,[99] he affirms that "... the sacraments should be reverenced as holy things because they signify most holy things. ..."[100] It is clear that the Spirit is not tied to the external means in any fashion.[101] Still the Spirit is free also to act not only without, but sometimes also with the external instrument.

The symbols themselves still remain mere bread and wine, and yet Zwingli is ready now to affirm a clear change not in substance, but in significance. Zwingli had long before departed from transubstantiation. He is now prepared to maintain a form of transsignification.[103] To do so he uses the metaphor of the ring:

> The master of the house on the point of starting upon a long journey and handing to his wife a splendid ring with his image cut upon it, and saying, "Here am I, your husband, for you to keep and delight in in my absence," typifies our Lord Jesus Christ. For He, when going away left to His spouse, the Church, His own image in the sacrament of the Supper. As He is the strong foundation of our hope, so does the bread strengthen humankind, and as wine refreshes the heart of a person, so does He raise up the despairing soul. He gave us His image with the words, "This is my body," sacramentally and symbolically, like the

ring of the master of the house.[104]

Clearly the elements have been transformed in meaning and significance by Christ's gift.[104]

With this new appreciation of the value of the symbols, Zwingli's understanding of the Eucharist as commemoration is clearly more than a mere remembrance or looking back. He writes,

> By this commemoration all the benefits which God has displayed in his Son are called to mind. And by the signs themselves, the bread and wine, Christ himself is as it were set before our eyes, so that not merely with the ear, but with eye and palate we see and taste that Christ whom the soul bears within itself and in whom it rejoices.[105]

Surprisingly, Zwingli affirms "...that in the holy Eucharist, i.e. the supper of thanksgiving, the true body of Christ is present by the contemplation of faith."[106] In fact, not only is the body of Christ present in the Supper, "... I do not believe it is the Supper unless Christ is there."[107] It is not the physical body, which is in heaven at the right handd of God; rather it is the sacramental body,[108] made present by faith.[109]

Zwingli then makes a distinction between spiritual and sacramental eating. Spiritual eating is trusting God. "... To eat the body of Christ sacramentally is to eat the body of Christ with the heart and mind in conjunction with the sacrament."[110] When the believer comes to the sacrament, thanks God for his favour, and joins with the brothers and sisters in partaking of the tokens of the body of Christ, then in the truest sense of the word is Christ eaten sacramentally.[111]

The ecclesiological dimension of the sacrament is still maintained in that the sacraments act as an oath of allegiance.[112] They also serve as proclamation, for "... the sacraments are given as a public testimony of that grace which is previously present to every individual."[113] The sacraments then testify to the historical facts and proclaim the reality of redemption. Finally, at the personal level, "... the sacraments augment faith and are an aid to it. This is particularly true of the

Supper."[114]

Thus, in conclusion, we see that in this later period the attention to the Eucharist on the part of Zwingli has issued in a highly spiritual sacramental understanding.

Conclusion: The Religious Values of Zwingli's Eucharistic Thinking

In the course of this survey of the eucharistic writings of Zwingli several essentially positive religious aspects of his thinking and practice have emerged. It is now the task to summarize them, recognizing that many of these topics obviously overlap.

1. First, there is a *contextual and heuristic dimension* to Zwingli's eucharistic thinking and practice. The examination of his eucharistic writings over a nine-year period reveals a process of development in his thinking. Many factors are involved which force the consistent re-evaluation of his position, most of them religious, but some social and not a few frankly political. Zwingli spent his whole reforming career searching for appropriate ways to apply the text to the context and if, in the four periods we have investigated, we see a willingness to change, let us recognize that the acceptance of the necessity of change is not unrelated to the religious perspective of Zwingli. According to the principles of True Religion, it is only the Creator in whom one puts one's trust, not in idols, whether they be paintings and statues or our own created formulations of truth as we understand it. It is the Scripture that has divine authority, not our theological statements, except insofar as they conform to Scripture. The willingness to change and the openness to correction is one of the more engaging aspects of Zwingli's religious perspective. Is it not also another dimension of *ecclesia semper reformanda*?

2. There is consistently in Zwingli's eucharistic thinking an insistence on the *priority of the divine activity*. Scripture is the basis of interpretation, not our formulations. The Eucharist points to the redeeming work of Christ, not to the human ability to recreate that sacrifice. Faith, which is a divine gift, is absolutely necessary and prior to any meaningful participation in the Eucha-

rist. Indeed, without faith, which is to say, without the divine gift, it is not the Eucharist. The "subjectivity" of which Zwingli is frequently accused is in fact controlled by the divine activity. The role of the Spirit is far more impor-tant than human activity in Zwingli's Eucharist, for it is "the Spirit which enlivens, the flesh profits nothing." Indeed, the Spirit plays an important role throughout the whole of Zwingli's theology.[115] The prominent place of the Spirit in the Eucharist in Zwingli is in some ways tantamount to the rediscovery of the Spirit in western eucharistic thinking. The perspective will be more apparently and perhaps more successfully developed by Calvin.

3. The *ecclesiological and social dimensions* are prominent. In Zurich the Eucharist is a drama in which the congregation participates. It is not a mere spectator function performed when the congregation gathers; rather, the congregation finds itself on the stage.[116] In fact, the room itself is transformed from being a holy place off to the side in which the laity stand in awe of the priestly caste into a room of the congregation.[117] The celebration has profound implications as well, for the congregation shares together in a common meal. As Staedtke and Locher suggest, in an important way the congregation becomes the subject of the celebration.[118] It does not come up out of its seats and stand in line like going to the post office, to be handled by officials who alone are qualified to dispense the eucharistic goods, to take an image from Locher.[119]

Also, the church comes together to confess and pledge its loyalty to Christ. It is an act that forms the community as body of Christ in a significantly public way.[120] The understanding of the sacrament as oath of loyalty is not unlike the citizen's oath that was often made to the city in late medieval and early modern times.[121] This has profound ethical implications, as well, for those who come together in celebration of the Eucharist and also carries within it a significant social impact.

4. The *priority of worship over theology* is apparent. Time and time again one encounters in Zwingli's thinking the priority of the eucharistic *action*. Certainly, Zwingli was a critical and systematic theologian, but especially in terms of

his eucharistic concerns the theological concerns are clearly in service of his practice. From the earliest eucharistic writings, notably the *Letter to Thomas Wyttenbach* to the "Appendix" to the *Exposition of Faith*, Zwingli reveals his concern for the liturgical. The very words which he uses to describe the meaning and significance of the Lord's Supper, namely, "Eucharist" or "thanksgiving," "panegyric" or "festival," as well as "contemplation of faith," and "sacramental eating," suggest the priority of the religious action of worship. Indeed, one of the decisions for which Zwingli has been criticized, i.e. the "limitation" of the celebration of the Eucharist to four times a year, may well have been the result of the desire to ensure more frequent communication rather than less.[122]

5. Finally, the *nature of the Lord's Supper* as symbol and commemoration suggests an event of religious significance rather than an empty "mere memorial." As we have seen the Eucharist as "commemoration" means for Zwingli not a "looking back" so much as an encounter in the present with Christ. An observation of Locher at this point is pertinent: "*Memoria*, as understood by Augustine ... describes the soul's power of realisation and of consciousness in general. ... According to this tradition, remembrance does not denote our ability to set ourselves back into the immediate or the remote past, but the way in which the past is brought into our present time, becoming contemporary with us and effective in us."[123] At this point, not only is Zwingli returning to the Augustinian notion of "memoria," he is adopting unawares the Hebrew notion of "zikkaron," the cultic call to remembrance. Such remembrance is not a mere looking back, but by utilizing a "sign that evokes remembrance"[124] the cultic action allows the faithful community, whether Israel or, in this case, the church in Zurich, to participate in the present in the sacred order.[125] His personal re-discovery of the significance of the Paschal meal for the celebration of the Supper is an appropriate underpinning of the Eucharist as memorial. By virtue of transsignification, that is, by the change in significance and meaning of the symbols of bread and wine, the faithful believer is able to come into an encounter with Christ who is present in the Eucharist.

Thus the emphasis is not on the substantialistic and essentialistic aspects of the Eucharist, but upon the relational dimension of the faithful believer in the present to Christ and to other believers. Thereby it is not possible to affirm that participation in the Eucharist does in fact strengthen and augment faith.

To conclude: Huldrych Zwingli was not primarily a theologian whose eucharistic thinking and practice was either that of a rationalist or a mere subjective memorialist. When the religious dimensions of his thought are overlooked the true significance of his eucharistic thinking is lost. Rather, the investigation of Zwingli's writings leads to the conclusion that if one considers the significant action and thematic content of his eucharistic assertions, one must conclude that he was primarily a religious and pastoral reformer whose eucharistic spirituality was of a highly developed nature.

Notes

1. See especially Locher 1979: 221-224, 283-343.
2. See Gäbler 1975.
3. Pipkin 1974.
4. I am grateful to Professor Peter Stephens for sharing a copy of his chapter on the eucharist from his *The Theology of Huldrych Zwingli*, to be published by Oxford University Press.
5. Köhler 1924, 1953.
6. Locher 1981.
7. Locher 1979: 307-318.
8. Schmidt-Clausing 1952, 1969, 1970; Schweizer 1954; Jenny 1968.
9. Bosshard 1978.
10. Grötzinger 1980.
11. Scott 1901.
12. Richardson 1949.
13. Dix 1945: 632.
14. Bouyer 1969: 81.
15. Dugmore 1958: 160.
16. For analyses of the image of Zwingli as held by both Protestants and Catholics, see Guggisbert 1934 and Büsser 1968.
17. For more lengthly assessments of the motivating presuppositions in the theology and eucharistic thinking of Zwingli, see Bosshard 1978: 22-24,

Locher 1979: 197ff., Staedtke 1978: 51-64.

18. Z I: 285: 29-286: 1; English translation (hereafter: ET): Potter 1977: 19.
19. Potter 1976: 10.
20. There have been numerous efforts to assess the impact of humanism on Zwingli. One of the more influential biographies of Zwingli which addressed the issue positively is Köhler 1943. See also: Büsser 1973: 16ff. and Potter 1976: 12ff.
21. This point is made at greater length in Pipkin 1984: 57-60.
22. Pipkin 1984: 59-60.
23. Bosshard 1978: 8.
24. In his *Friendly Exegesis*, Zwingli credited Cornelius Hoen with having provided the tools for understanding "is" in the words of institution as "signifies." Z V: 738: 4-739: 5. Various dates are offered for the discovery. Potter 1976: 293 says early 1524, Köhler 1924: 62, more or less the end of May 1524. The arguments of Locher 1979: 293 for autumn 1524 are not without merit. Since the argument by Zwingli first appeared in the *Letter to Matthew Alber*, Z III: 344: 9ff., it is clear that Zwingli had read the work of Hoen at least by November 1524. An English translation of the letter of Hoen is found in Oberman 1966: 268-278.
25. Z II: 14-457, ET: E.J. Furcha, *Huldrych Zwingli Writings*, Vol.I. Allison Park, Pickwich Publications, 1984.
26. Z II: 556-608.
27. Schmidt-Clausing 1952: 49 points to this treatise as indicative of Zwingli as an experienced liturgist. In Schmidt-Clausing 1969: 3, it is valued among the best writings of Zwingli and is described as the "first liturgy" of the reformation. Schmidt-Clausing 1970: 22 suggests that this writing is evidence for the priority of the liturgical in Zwingli.
28. Hence: Schmidt-Clausing 1969: 6.
29. Z II: 658-663, ET: H.W. Pipkin, *Huldrych Zwingli Writings*, Vol. II, Allison Park, Pickwick Publications, 1984.
30. The location of the letter is Z VIII: 84-89, ET: Potter 1977: 94-98. For an analysis of

the letter with a decided Lutheran bias, see Neuser 1976. Also see: Köhler 1924: 21ff. and Bosshard 1978: 15-19.

31. Z II: 148: 23-24.
32. Z II 581: 38-582: 1.
33. Z II: 114: 17-19.
34. Z II: 558: 19-20.
35. Z II: 127: 20-27--emphasis added; also: Z II: 137-138, 592: 8-16, 605: 10-16.
36. Z II: 136: 15-26.
37. Z II: 586: 33-37.
38. Z VIII: 85: 10.
39. Z VIII: 85: 34-37.
40. Z VIII: 86: 28-29.
41. Z VIII: 88: 7-10, ET: Potter 1977: 97.
42. The well-known citation from Zwingli in the "Expostion of the 18th Article" has been much debated, but it is apparent that Zwingli does not yet deny the real presence of Christ: "Simple folk should learn at this point not to quarrel about whether or not the body and blood of Christ is to be eaten or drunk (no Christian doubts this), but whether it is a sacrifice or only a memorial." Z II: 128: 8-11.
43. Z VIII: 85: 15-16, ET: Potter 1977: 94.
44. Z III: 335-354, ET: Pipkin 1984.
45. Z III: 628-911, ET: Heller 1929: 44-343.
46. Z IV: 458-504, ET: Pipkin 1984.
47. Z IV: 13-24, ET: Thompson 1961: 149-156.
48. See the article by Furcha in this volume. For a treatment of the matter of the "official institutionalization" of the reformation in Zurich, see Walton 1972.
49. Potter 1976: 156.
50. The several references are found in von Muralt 1952, documents 31, 36, 37, 42a, 42b, 42c, 50, 55, and 56.
51. von Muralt 1952: document 42b.
52. The issues as they arose and the concern of Zwingli and his colleagues for the pastoral well-being of the city are strikingly revealed in Z IV: 476ff.
53. Z IV: 482: 23-24.
54. Z IV: 483: 2-484: 4.
55. Z IV: 484: 19-23.
56. Z IV: 486: 18-20.
57. "Faith is from the beginning a fundamental element in Zwingli's eucharistic theology, al-

though its role varies. Now it becomes an important principle of interpretation, ruling out views which deny faith in Christ, as well as the way of understanding terms like food and eating John 6." Stephens: forthcoming.

58. "For since God alone is to be worshipped, and absolutely no creature, so that even the theologians declare that Christ's pure humanity cannot be worshipped without risk of idolatry, is it not the height of impiety to worship the bread? And what does it amount to when they say they worship not the bread, but the body of Christ? Do they not worship the creature?" Z III: 817: 20-25, ET: Heller 1929: 249-250.
59. "The flesh of Christ profiteth very greatly, aye immeasurably, in every way, but as I have said, by being slain, not eaten." Z III: 782: 30-31, ET: Heller 1929: 209.
60. Z III: 803: 28-29, ET: Heller 1929: 233.
61. Z III: 781: 3, ET: Heller 1929: 206.
62. "... for it is perceived by sense and things perceived by sense have no need of faith, for by sense they are perceived to be absolutely sure." Z III: 786: 37-38, ET: Heller 1929: 213-214.
63. Z III: 782: 16-17, ET: Heller 1929: 208.
64. "Do we not eat Christ's body spiritually when we believe that He was slain for us and trust in Him? ... We eat spiritually when through the grace of God we come to Christ. To eat the body of Christ spiritually, then, what is it but to trust in Christ?" Z III: 818: 2-8, ET: Heller 1929: 250.
65. "For if your faith is not so perfect as not to need a ceremonial sign to confirm it, it is not faith." Z III: 761: 25-27, ET: Heller 1929: 184.
66. Z III: 802: 26, ET: Heller 1929: 232. See also Z III: 349: 3-15.
67. Z III: 348-349.
68. Blickle 1981: 243.
69. For a study of the *Twelve Articles* within the context of the broader socio-economic crises of the day, see Blickle 1981: 23-104.
70. Z III: 807: 15-18, ET: Heller 1929: 238.
71. The standard work on the controversy is still Köhler 1924 and Köhler 1953. One should supplement Köhler with Seebert 1929, Locher

1972, Locher 1979: 283-434 and Groetzinger 1980. Further bibliographical citations will be found in these works. Locher has done us a recent service by setting in a concise fashion the relevant writings into a chronological framework. See "Die grossen Streitschriften und der Brief an Luther 1525-1528," Locher 1979: 307-318. A useful concise description of the historical side of the controversy is Potter 1976: 287-342. Stephens: forthcoming, will contain a brief insightful overview of the theological perspectives of Zwingli in the controversy.

72. Z IV: 773-862, ET: Bromiley 1953: 185-238.
73. See Köhler 1924: 301-310.
74. See Locher 1979: 312 for a brief summary of the important insights in this treatise. See also Potter 1976: 302-305 and Köhler 1924: 462-486. ET: Pipkin: forthcoming.
75. Locher 1979: 333.
76. See Z V: 580: 23-25; 614: 2-7; 655: 2-6.
77. Ziegler 1969 (=Köhler 1929): 87.
78. Z V: 637: 9-11.
79. Z V: 655: 10-12. Zwingli is citing Augustine's "Tractate 30 on the Gospel of John," Migne PL 35: 1632.
80. Z V: 697: 17-18.
81. Z V: 687: 14-16.
82. Z V: 661: 1-2.
83. Z V: 574: 32-575: 4.
84. Z V: 582: 26-27.
85. In Z V: 588: 24-589: 5, Zwingli refers to a "mental or spiritual presence" and to having the body and blood of Christ present in the minds of the faithful, which he claims also to assert.
86. Z 654: 25-28.
87. Z V: 689: 12-14.
88. Z V: 625: 4-8.
89. Z V: 643: 10-28.
90. Z V: 711: 8. Also: "Baptism is not the water but the act; so the Eucharist is not the bread or the body of Christ but the act of thanksgiving." Z V: 711: 18-19.
91. Z VI/2: 790-817. For assessments of the content and value of the treatise, see Blanke 1966. For treatment of the sacramental issue in the *Account*, see Bosshard 1978: 65-76. ET:

Hinke 1922: 33-61.

92. Potter 1976: 337.

93. ET: Hinke 1922: 63-104.

94: Hinke 1922: 88.

95. Hinke 1922: 90.

96. For example, compare the assertion of Eck: "For the flesh of Christ is not eaten physically, so as to pass into the stomach, be changed by the natural heat, assimilated by the liver and sent out to nourish the members. What ugly and ill-omened notion is this, to have any such idea about the glorious body of Christ that can experience no sensation? The body of Christ is taken in mystically in its real and true essence veiled under the sacramental forms. ... "(Hinke 1922: 88) with that of Augustine: "Understand spiritually what I have said; ye are not to eat this body which ye see; not to drink that blood which they who will crucify me shall pour forth. I have commended unto you a certain mystery, spiritually understood it will quicken. Although it is needful that this be visibly celebrated, yet it must be spiritually understood." Augustine, "On the Psalms," *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Philip Schaff, ed. (Grand Rapids: Erdmann's, 1956), VIII: 485-86. In his reply Zwingli wrote, "The strife about the Eucharist Eck himself would have brought to an end, if one could trust what he said when he spoke of the body of Christ being eaten in the Supper mysteriously. For I say the same thing. And then he said that the body is eaten indeed in the Supper but not physically. I again say the same thing." Z VI/3: 273: 4-9, ET: Hinke 1922: 118.

97. Z VI/3: 249-291, ET: HInke 1922: 105-127.

98. Contained in S IV: 44-78, ET: Hinke 1922: 235-293 and Bromiley 1953: 245-279, the latter without the appendix. The appendix was taken to be an addition by Bullinger until recent times. See Locher 1968: 695.

99. S IV: 46: 7-8, ET: Bromiley 1953: 247.

100. S IV: 46: 39-41, ET: Bromiley 1953: 248.

101. Z VI/2: 803: 10-11, ET: Hinke 1922: 46. Also: Z VI/3: 266: 15ff., ET: Hinke 1922: 114ff.

102. "Are the sacraments, then, in vain? By no

means, as has been said. For they proclaim salvation from God, turn the senses to it and thus exercise the faith which they also promise to the neighbor, drawing us to brotherly love. And one and the same spirit worketh all these things, sometimes without, sometimes with, the external instrument, inspiring whom it will and drawing him whither and as it will." Z VI/3: 271: 7-12, ET: Hinke 1922: 112.

103. Attempts have been made by Roman Catholic theologians in recent eucharistic theology to reinterpret transbustantiation in terms of transfinalization or transsignification which posits not a change in the concrete reality as such but a change in the meaning or purpose thereof. See Leenhardt 1958. A similar image to that of the ring as put forth by Zwingli is that advanced by B. Welte: "Ein Tuch von bestimmter Farbe kann lange ein blosser Dekorationsstoff sein. Bestimmt aber eines Tages die das öffentliche Recht in Händen tragende Autorität, dass Tücher dieser Farbe von nun ab als Fahnen, also als Hoheitszeichen anzusehen seien, dann wird das Tuch auf Grund solcher seinsbestimmender Stiftung etwas anderes als es war. Es ist nun wirklich--oder objektiv--, was es vorher nicht war, nämlich eine Fahne, und wer es nunmehr nur noch als neutralen Stoff verwendete, verletzte dadurch die Seinsordnung. Das Sein dieses Seienden hat sich verändert, nicht weil physikalisch etwas geändert wurde, sondern weil dies Seiende durch massgebliche Stiftung auf neue Weise in einen verbindlichen Bezugszusammenhang übergeführt wurde." Welte 1960: 193-194.

104. Z VI/3: 278:19-280: 3, ET: Hinke 1922: 122.

105. S IV: 46: 16-21, ET: Bromiley 1953: 248.

106. Z VI/2: 806: 6-7, ET: Hinke 1922: 49.

107. S IV: 73: 36-37, ET: Hinke 1922: 285.

108. "Therefore whether we like it or not, we are forced to concede that the words: 'This is my body' cannot be taken naturally or literally, but have to be constructed symbolically, sacramentally, metaphorically or as a metonymy, thus: 'This is my body,' that is, 'This is the sacrament of my body,' or, 'This is my sacramental or mystical body,' that is, the sacramental and representative symbol of the

body which I really assumed and yielded over to death." S IV: 58: 16-22, ET: Bromiley 1953: 265. "Grant that daily bread is blessed by the word and by prayer, then much more is that bread which before was common bread but now is changed so as to be the sacramental body of Christ, made divine and sacred by blessing and consecration, exactly as the ancients said it was changed and blessed, not so that the substance of bread passed over into the substance of Christ's body, but so that the bread became Christ's sacramental body." Z VI/3: 271: 15-272: 3, ET: Hinke 1922: 117-118.

109. "Since, therefore, this presence amounts to nothing without the contemplation of faith, it belongs to faith that the things are or become present, and not to the sacraments." Z VI/3: 265: 5-6, ET: Hinke 1922: 113.
110. S IV: 53: 39-40, ET: Bromiley 1953: 258.
111. S IV: 54: 27-33, ET: Bromiley 1953: 259.
112. S IV: 58: 6-15, ET: Bromiley 1953: 264-5.
113. Z VI/2: 804: 16-18, ET: Hinke 1922: 47.
114. S IV: 57: 12-13, ET: Bromiley 1953: 263.
115. On the role of the Spirit in Zwingli's theology, see Gestrich 1967 and Locher 1981: 178-80. The term "pneumatology" has been widely, though not universally, adopted to describe the element of the Spirit in Zwingli's theology, this largely due to Schmidt-Clausing 1965 and the acceptance of that rubric by Locher.
116. Schweizer 1954: 22-23.
117. Schmidt-Clausing 1952: 73-74.
118. "Die wesentliche Funktion des Glaubens macht für Zwingli das Abendmahl vor allem zu einem *Gemeinschaftsmahl*. Es gehört zur sichtbaren Wirklichkeit, der Kirche, weil sich in ihm die Präsenz Christi manifestiert. Damit wird für Zwingli die Gemeinde zum Subjekt des Abendmahlsgeschehens." Staedtke 1977: 114. See also Locher 1981: 222.
119. "In the age of religious individualism, however, the onesided construction of the Lord's Supper concentrating on reception would be dangerous. In many churches, the moving about at communion is like being served at the post office: according to rows, one after the

other; no togetherness. Should the fellowship-building power of the celebration develop again, then the congregation must proceed from the assumption that it exists in essence according to its calling and rediscovers, recognises, and represents itself in the Lord's Supper. The more representation, the more benefaction." Locher 1981: 335.

120. Schweizer 1954: 84f. and 103ff. offers a creative suggestion that has been widely accepted, namely, that precisely at the place in the Eucharist where formerly the Catholic practice addressed the transubstantiation of the elements into the body of Christ Zwingli's "Action" maintains the transubstantiation not of the elements but of the congregation into the body of Christ. See also Locher 1979: 337 and Jenny 1968: 62. Bosshard 1978: 52 n. 100 notes on the other hand that such a view must necessitate a radically different understanding of the meaning of "transubstantiation." Stephens: forthcoming, argues as well that such an understanding is unwarranted. One should examine not only the liturgy itself in this regard, but the various other places where Zwingli addresses the matter of the church as the body of Christ. Within that context it becomes more difficult to speak of such a transubstantiation of the church. A more tenable conclusion is that at this point in the service of worship Zwingli is changing the emphasis from the bodily presence of Christ, and the following notion of sacrifice, to the confession and manifestation of the church as the body of Christ.

121. For example, the description of the loyalty oath as noted in Brunner 1939: 405 is apropos: "Der Bürger schwört seiner Stadt einen Treueid, in dem er sich verpflichtet, 'der Stadt getreu, hold und gehorsam zu sein, das gemeine beste zu suchen und allen schaden helffen abwenden'." I am indebted to Prof. Robert Walton for the suggestion to consult Brunner on the matter of the oath.

122. Schweizer 1954: 39f.

123. Locher 1981: 222-223.

124. Botterweck 1980: 77.

125. "Ex. 12.14 declares the passover festival a

zikkaron. The particular concern of the P writer is not the reliving of a past historical event so much as the maintaining of a reality which indeed entered history, but is now an eternal ordinance (v. 14). The *zikkaron* stimulates God's memory and his acts of memory are synonymous with his acts of intervention. The *zikkaron* also stimulates Israel's memory, which produces participation in the sacred order." Childs 1962: 67-68.

List of Works Cited

Blanke, Fritz. 1931. "Zum Verständnis der Abendmahlslehre Zwinglis." *Monatsschrift für Pastoraltheologie*. 27: 314-320.

_____. 1966. "Zwinglis Fidei Ratio, 1530: Entstehung und Bedeutung." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*. 57: 96-102.

Blickle, Peter. 1983. *Die Revolution von 1525*. 2nd Edition. Vienna: R. Oldenbourg Verlag.

Bosshard, Stefan Niklaus. 1978. *Zwingli-Erasmus-Cajetan. Die Eucharistie als Zeichen der Einheit*. Wiesbaden: Franz Seiner Verlag GMBH.

Botterweck, G.J. and Helmer Ringgren. 1980. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. IV: 77-79.

Bouyer, Louis. 1969. *Orthodox Spirituality and Protestant and Anglican Spirituality*. New York: The Seabury Press.

Bromiley, G.W. 1953. *Zwingli and Bullinger*. Vol. 24, The Library of Christian Classics. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Brunner, Otto. 1939. *Land und Herrschaft*. Baden bei Wien: Rudolf M. Rohrer.

Büsser, Fritz. 1968. *Das Katholische Zwinglibild*. Zurich: Zwingli Verlag.

_____. 1973. *Huldrych Zwingli. Reformation als prophetischer Auftrag*. Göttingen: Musterschmidt.

Childs, Brevard S. 1962. *Memory and Tradition in Israel*. London: SCM Press.

Dix, Gregory. 1945. *The Shape of the Liturgy*. Westminster: Dacre Press.

Dugmore, C.W. 1958. *The Mass and the English Reformers*. London: Macmillan.

Furcha, Edward J. 1984. *In Defense of the Reformed*

Faith. Vol. I of Huldrych Zwingli: Selected Writings. Pittsburgh: Pickwick Publications.
Gäbler, Ulrich. 1975. *Huldrych Zwingli im 20. Jahrhundert.* Zurich: Theologischer Verlag.
_____. 1983. *Huldrych Zwingli. Eine Einführung in sein Leben und sein Werk.* Munich: C.H. Beck.
Grötzinger, E. 1980. *Luther und Zwingli.* Zurich-Cologne: Benziger Verlag.
Guggisberg, Kurt. 1934. *Das Zwinglibild des Protestantismus im Wandel der Zeiten.* Leipzig: M. Heinsius Nachfolger.
Heller, Clarence Nevin. 1929. *The Latin Works of Huldreich Zwingli.* Vol. III. Philadelphia: The Heidelberg Press.
Hinke, William John. 1922. *The Latin Works of Huldreich Zwingli.* Vol. II. Philadelphia: The Heidelberg Press.
Jenny, Markus. 1968. *Die Einheit des Abendmahlsgottesdienstes bei den elsässischen und schweizerishcen Reformatoren.* Zurich: Zwingli Verlag.
Köhler, Walter. 1924. *Zwingli und Luther: Ihr Streit über das Abendmahl nach seinen politischen und religiösen Beziehungen.* Vol. I. Leipzig: M. Hensius Nachfolger.
_____. 1929. *Das Religionsgespräch 1529. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion.* Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte. XLVIII: 7-38.
_____. 1943. *Huldrych Zwingli.* Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang, 1954.
_____. 1953. *Zwingli und Luther.* Vol. II. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag.
Leenhardt, F.J. 1958. "This is My Body." In *Essays on the Lord's Supper.* London: Lutterworth Press.
Locher, Gottfried W. 1968. "Zu Zwinglis 'Professio fidei'. Beobachtungen und Erwägungen zur Pariser Reinschrift der sogenannten Fidei Expositio." *Zwingliana.* 12: 689-700.
_____. 1972. *Streit unter Gästen.* Zurich: Theologischer Verlag. ET: Locher 1981: 303-339.
_____. 1979. *Die Zwinglische Reformation im Rahmen der europäischen Kirchengeschichte.* Göttingen-Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
_____. 1981. *Zwingli's Thought: New Perspectives.* Leiden: E.J. Brill.

_____. 1982. *Zwingli und die schweizerische Reformation.* Vol. 3/J.1. of Die Kirche in Ihrer Geschichte. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Neuser, Wilhelm H. 1976. "Zwinglis Abendmahlsbrief an Thomas Wyttenbach." In *Wegen en gestalten in het gereformeerd protestantisme.* Amsterdam: Bolland.

Oberman, Heiko A. 1966. *Forerunners of the Reformation.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Pipkin, H. Wayne. 1974. *A Zwingli Bibliography.* Pittsburgh: Clifford E. Barbour Library.

_____. 1984. "The Making of a Pastor: Huldrych Zwingli's Path from Humanism to Reformation." *Reformed Review.* 37/2: 54-67.

_____. 1984. *In Search of True Religion.* Vol. II of Huldrych Zwingli: Selected Writings. Pittsburgh: Pickwick Publications.

Potter, George R. 1976. *Zwingli.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. 1977. *Huldrych Zwingli.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Powers, Joseph M., S.J. 1967. *Eucharistic Theology.* New York: Herder and Herder.

Richardson, Cyril C. 1949. *Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist.* Evanston, Ill.: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary.

Schmidt-Clausing, Fritz. 1952. *Zwingli als Liturgiker.* Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsantalt.

_____. 1969. *Zwinglis Kanonversuch.* Frankfurt am Main: Otto Lembeck.

_____. 1970. *Zwinglis liturgische Formulare.* Frankfurt am Main: Otto Lembeck.

Schweizer, Julius. 1954. *Reformierte Abendmahlsgestaltung in der Schau Zwinglis.* Basel: Friederick Reinhardt.

Scott, C. Anderson. 1901. "Zwingli's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper." *The Expositor.* III: 161-171.

Seeberg, Erich. 1929. "Der Gegensatz zwischen Zwingli, Schwenckfeld und Luther." *Reinhold Seeberg Festschrift.* Vol. I. Leipzig: Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 43-80.

Staedtke, Joachim. 1960. "Voraussetzungen der Schweizer Abendmahlslehre." *Theologische*

_____. 1977. *Zeitschrift.* XVI: 19-32. *Abendmahl.*

Zwingli. In *Theologische Realenzyklopädie.* I: 113-114. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Stephens, W. Peter. Forthcoming. *The Theology of Huldrych Zwingli.* Oxford University Press.

Thompson, Bard. 1961. *Liturgies of the Western Church.* New York: World Publishing Co.

von Muralt, Leonard and Walter Schmid. 1952. *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer in der Schweiz.* Zurich: S. Hirzel Verlag.

Wainwright, Geoffrey and Max Thurian. 1983. *Baptism and Eucharist.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Walton, Robert C. 1967. *Zwingli's Theocracy.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

_____. 1972. "The Institutionalization of the Reformation at Zurich." *Zwingliana.* XIII/8: 497-514.

Welte, Bernhard. 1960. "Zum Referat von L. Scheffczyk." In Michael Schmaus. *Aktuelle Fragen zur Eucharistie.* Munich: Max Hueber Verlag: 190-195.

Ziegler, Donald J. 1969. *Great Debates of the Reformation.* New York: Random House.

Standard Abbreviations as used for Zwingli editions:

S = *Huldreich Zwinglis Werke.* Edited by M. Schuler and J. Schulthess. 8 volumes. Zurich, 1828-42.

Z = *Huldreich Zwinglis Sämtliche Werke.* Edited by E. Egli *et al.* Zurich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 1984--(in process: reprint of edition begun in 1905.)

ZWINGLI AND THE STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

R. Gerald Hobbs

Amongst the several facets of the reforming activity of Zwingli, his work as exegete of the Hebrew Scriptures has not drawn the same attention of scholars that has been given to his role, for example, in the restructuring of the Zurich church or in the eucharistic controversy. If there are good reasons why his exegetical work has been overshadowed by other dimensions of his career, to overlook the significance of biblical studies for Zwingli the reformer and theologian would be to misapprehend the man's own self-understanding as well as ignore a major part of his daily life and literary activity.

In fact, Zwingli's work on the Old Testament has received some study by Edwin Künzli, who bore major responsibility for the editing of the published texts in volumes thirteen and fourteen of the Corpus Reformatorum edition.[1] At the beginning of this century, Emil Egli pointed to some of the significant questions in his paper on Zwingli the Hebraist.[2] From another quarter, Louis Israel Newman gave a lengthy chapter in his study *Jewish Influence on Christian Reform Movements* to this dimension of Zwingli's life and thought.[3] Nonetheless, it remains true that there is much to be done. In particular, we have seen the rise, since the work of Künzli in the 1950's, of considerable interest and publication in the field of the history of biblical interpretation. While the work of Künzli has not been called into question--far from it, it is clear that he anticipates much of the present discussion--there is a work of completion, of supplementing, in particular of relating Zwingli in his conceptions, style and results, to the vigorous discipline of which he was a part.

A thorough study of this nature far exceeds, of course, the scope of this presentation. It will be my much more modest goal to indicate some of the connections that must be made, to note some of the salient questions, and to point in the directions of areas of further research. To these ends, I shall employ the lens of Zwingli's only significant state-

ment of his preconceptions and goals, the preface to his exegetical notes on Isaiah.[4] A few illustrations drawn from his commentary on Isaiah and translation of the Psalms will serve to make concrete the issues under discussion. I hasten to add that these do not have the character of a scientific sampling; they will illuminate, but certainly not replace the detailed analysis of the exegesis that is yet to be done.[5]

While still with methodological observations, it is important to remind you of a particular feature of Zwingli's exegetical production. All of his work took place within the context of the *Prophezei*, that unusual institution of the Reformed churches which originated in Zurich one June morning in 1525, when Zwingli and a number of Zurich clergy, students and curious laypersons gathered in the chancel of the Grossmünster to begin a systematic and regular group study of Scripture. According to several reports that have come down to us from participants,[6] a pattern was quickly set which varied thereafter only slightly. After an opening prayer, the Scripture passage for the day was read in Latin; that June 19th began appropriately enough with Genesis 1. The same text was then read in Hebrew with some explanatory comments by the resident Hebraist; after 1526 this would be Conrad Pellican, [6a] an ex-Francisan from Rouffach in upper Alsace, and until he accepted Zwingli's call, an associate of Erasmus within the Basel university community. Zwingli himself then undertook the overview of the Greek, or Septuagint, version of the passage, to which he added an interpretation developed from the three versions of the text and their discussion.[7] The final step, often the responsibility of Zwingli's lieutenant, another Alsatian, Leo Jud,[8] was the distillation of the results of this study into a German exposition for the assembled public. One suspects that in fact those laypersons who attended the *Prophezei* with any assiduity formed the habit of gathering when the pastors were drawing to the close of the more technical deliberations. The five-times weekly session then closed with prayer.

Clearly the biblical interpretation that resulted from these gatherings was a team-effort, however much the group may have been dominated by the forceful personality and the strategic role of

Zwingli himself. Such was of course the intention; these studies were to fuel directly Scriptural preaching in the Zurich pulpits. Oscar Farner has shown[9] how intimately in fact Zwingli's own preaching was linked to the *Prophezei*. The study of Genesis and at least the first half of Exodus continued until late spring 1526; Zwingli then began to preach his way through these same texts in July of that year, continuing until March 1527. That same month, Froschauer issued a volume, curiously titled *Hotchpotch of Notes on Genesis*,[10] whose title page bore the further notice, "excerpted from H. Zwingli's remarks by Leo Jud and Caspar Megander". A prefatory letter by Zwingli[11] confirmed for the reader the character of the volume, viz. notes gathered during and after the *Prophezei* sessions were the result of the collaboration of the several participants. That Zwingi bore major responsibility is not in doubt, but it would be misleading to consider the work as his alone. However valuable for the study of the origins of early Reformed biblical exegesis, the *Genesis* and subsequent partial *Notes on Exodus*[12] cannot be used as primary data for the study of Zwingli's own approach to the Old Testament.

With the three publications of 1529-32--the translations and commentaries on Isaiah (1529)[13] and Jeremiah (1531),[14] and the *Handbook of Psalms* (1532)[15]--we have to do, on the other hand, essentially with Zwingli's own labours. The *Psalms* of course appeared posthumously, thanks once again to the labours of the faithful Jud. But it had been in preparation since 1529, when Zwingli signalled his intention to issue both it and the *Jeremiah* in the closing lines of the *Isaiah* preface. That is does lack the exegetical notes that accompany both the major prophets is probably the consequence of the interruption of Zwingli's labours by Zurich's war with the Confederates and his consequent death.

The editors of the *Sämtliche Schriften* have published a series of notes on Ezekiel, Daniel and the minor prophets, as well as a translation of Job.[16] These manuscript materials are not from Zwingli's own hand, and fall doubtless into the same category as the *Genesis* and *Exodus*. The same is true for the two great Bible projects, the German of 1531[17] and the Latin of 1543.[18] The influence of Zwingli upon the former in particular was certainly

paramount, but can only be studied once the contours of Zwingli's exegetical style have been established on the basis of the works that are incontestably his alone.[19]

II

To speak of the context of Zwingli's approach to the Old Testament is to name first of all the renaissance of Hebrew and Greeks letters which within his lifetime spread from the Italian cities to become a major cultural force in northern Europe. Of the two languages it was Greek that most attracted Zwingli, as it had the Italian humanists whom he admired. His studies of classical literature were matched by an enthusiasm for biblical and patristic texts that marks his Erasmian orientation.[20] By the mid-1520's several editions of the Greek Old Testament were available, including that in the Complutensian Polyglot;[21] his preferred text was the Aldine of his so-called "Hausbibel."[22]

If some Christian interest in Hebrew was maintained throughout the Middle Ages[23] and the study of the sacred tongue formally ordained by the Council of Vienne (1311) at five European centres, it is only in the last quarter of the fifteenth century that one can speak of a significant awakening of Hebrew letters amongst European Christians.[24] During a stay in Italy the Swabian nobleman Johannes Reuchlin began his studies, and it was he who furnished the basis for the first serious studies by Christians north of the Alps with his 1506 *De Rudimentis Hebraicis*, a combined grammar and dictionary. This volume, acquired during his Glarus years, was Zwingli's introduction to Hebrew.[25] Hebrew printing first flourished in Italy, primarily to meet the needs of Jewish communities there, but with a steadily-increasing Christian clientele as well. Daniel Bomberg of Venice issued two successive Rabbinic Bibles (1517, 1524-5) as well as the Hebrew concordances that would render accessible the mediaeval Jewish commentators to Christian readers.[26] Meanwhile, cost and relative difficulty of access to these supplies encouraged northern printers; in Basel, a steady stream of Semitica followed Froben's publication in 1516 of a trilingual Psalter.[27]

Secondly, naming evangelical Reformation as

context is a reminder of the central place of the Scripture of both Testaments within this movement. The preaching of the word was the prime activity of the Reformer. If the citizen Christians were not only required to have faith for themselves but also to govern the Church within the borders of their commune, the clergy had a fundamental educational task to fulfil. Further, the necessity of enabling and stimulating biblical preaching that was faithful to evangelical norms by a clergy that had not necessarily been trained to that task meant, in centres like Zurich and Strasbourg, the creation of some form of advanced Bible classes. These would rapidly be adapted to the training of youth particularly but not exclusively for the ministry. Meanwhile, the urgent demand for a format more accessible to those at distance from the urban centres prompted printers like Froschauer of Zurich to propose editions of these lectures. Faced with the choice of writing for the press or of seeing their names attached in any event to pirated versions of student notes--as was already happening to the principal Lutheran interpreters--the evangelical preachers and teachers became authors. Through the medium of the book fairs, above all that of Frankfurt, they attained a European readership whose significance for evangelical propaganda was not lost on them. Martin Bucer of Strasbourg, for example, even before undertaking any biblical commentary of his own, published several volumes of his Latin translations of Luther's sermons for the French and Italian market.[28]

The mention of Bucer evokes the third of these contexts, namely the community of biblical scholarship that thrived in the upper Rhine cities of Strasbourg, Basel and Zurich. The principal leaders of the evangelical Reformation in these cities were bound to one another by a series of common characteristics and objectives. All had come to their evangelical convictions through Erasmian humanism. Several, like Wolfgang Capito of Strasbourg[29] and Conrad Pellican, had worked as associates of Erasmus in Basel. They possessed in varying degrees skill in both Greek and Hebrew. If Basel alone was the seat of a university, the other cities found nonetheless a forum for biblical lectures; and in all three cities, the experience of the unfolding Reformation was similar to the pattern

McGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

just described--from biblical preaching to systematic lecture series to the printed page. Further, each of the cities served a hinterland and had significant cultural and commercial contacts with the wider world. And finally, the unfolding eucharistic controversy with the Saxons after 1525 on the one hand and the rise of indigenous radical dissent on the other stimulated the growth of a common theological stance that would not be seriously menaced until after the disappearance of both Zwingli and Johannes Oecolampadius[30] of Basel in 1531.

It should not surprise us, then, to find amidst their voluminous correspondence, frequent references to matters of biblical interpretation, to projects underway or intended, requests for the opinion of colleagues on a piece of work[31] or on a thorny *crux interpretum*,[32] even debates over unresolved issues.[33] It is clear from these letters, as indeed from a reading of their books, that there were significant differences with respect to a number of issues amongst them; but also a commonalty of such proportions as to justify our speaking of an upper Rhine evangelical school of biblical exegesis.[34] The precise definition of this school is not our task here; suffice it to observe that Zwingli the exegete was subject to the influence of colleagues in Basel and Strasbourg as well as to that of his associates of the Zurich *Prophezei*.

III

Zwingli's Isaiah commentary belongs indisputably within these settings. Indeed few of the score of biblical commentaries produced by these evangelicals have so prominent a place in the correspondence of Zwingli with his colleagues. A good year before its appearance in time for the autumn bookfair of 1529, rumours of its impending appearance were circulating. If these caused Zwingli some embarrassment, their source is probably located in Zwingli's own announcement of his decision to proceed towards a commentary, a decision in all likelihood taken within a few months of the completion of Isaiah in the *Prophezei* on February 27, 1528, to judge from allusions to it in correspondence of the following spring and summer.[35] By early March 1528, Zwingli launched his Isaiah

series from the pulpit of the Grossmünster, completing the prophetic warnings and promises only at the end of the year. By late winter 1529, some portions of the volume were in print and circulating amongst Strasbourg colleagues. Capito and Bucer each responded on a characteristic note. Capito's urging that the rabbinic traditions not be undervalued by Zwingli probably fell upon stony ground, to judge both from his subsequent qualifications and the expression of Zwingli in the *Isaiah* preface. On the other hand Bucer, himself busy with a project of comparable scope, preferred to express his satisfaction on points of agreement; and to dispatch some of his own text for Zwingli's perusal.[36]

The title and format of Zwingli's commentary gave striking prominence to the new translation of the prophet. The *First hatching* (or new growth, Latin *foetura*) *of the planing smooth of Isaiah the Prophet, with justification for why and how it has been translated thus*, as the title may be rendered,[37] consisted of two distinct sections. After a letter of dedication to the cities of the Christian Civic League (*Christliche Burgrecht*)[38] came the complete translation, the "planing smooth" (*complanatio*), accompanied in parallel columns by St. Jerome's translation, the received text of the Latin church. That this was a gesture of prudence and pastoral concern urged by Pellican is signalled in a brief notice from Zwingli to the reader which seems to have escaped the attention of the editors of the *Sämtliche Schriften*.[39] At the conclusion of the translation, the second, larger half of the volume was given over to the *apologia complanationis*, the exegetical justification of the radically new rendering. Separating the two parts of the book is the preface, to which we now turn.

> We have for some years now experienced the difficulty of publishing anything in this tumultuous age--a time in which so many of the stellar spirits who seemed destined to bring forth and defend the truth as comrades-in-arms are rather, as a general rule, in contradiction to us ... so that you will sooner reconcile fire with water than succeed with these persons.[40]

On this plaintive note of personal apology the preface opens; and something of this tone remains throughout. Some of the defence is probably no more than the conventional disclaimers of the neophyte author, with more than a touch of humanist artifice. He professes a profound consciousness of his own limitations, and a corresponding concern for the criticism he will evoke for having published his humble efforts. In a display of charitableness he praises his notable predecessors in the field of Isaiah studies and translation; he has benefitted from all that noble "fellowship of the learned and godly of every place and age."[41] His own contribution is in no way intended to replace, but rather to complement the work of the Septuagint, Jerome and Oecolampadius in particular.[42]

> Thanks be to God who has given us these teachers by whose labour we have been both stimulated and helped, so that the things that in their scruples and reticence they were unwilling to say quite openly, we have interpreted more familiarly and popularly for the good of all. Not that we disagree with them, but we speak more the language of the people. Indeed, there really are few things brought out by us that they did not see or dissimulate.[43]

Zwingli's generosity towards his predecessors is not extended, however, to another recent venture into translation of the prophet, the work of his erstwhile colleague Ludwig Haetzer.[44] Neither here nor in the preface to the 1531 Bible does the German rendering of *All the Prophets* by Haetzer and Hans Denck[45] receive any credit. Zwingli insists that he has welcomed truth from whatever quarter. Critics claim that despite the profession of the Zurichers to have translated the prophets for themselves in 1531, the debt to Haetzer and Denck is apparent[46] in their Bible. Did Zwingli consult them as he prepared the Isaiah commentary? Given that the Worms *Prophets* appeared in April 1527 and was immediately and widely reprinted, and that the *Prophezei* study of Isaiah commenced the following September, it seems probable that the two radicals should be numbered among Zwingli's sources. Confir-

mation of this hypothesis must, however, await a detailed comparison of the two translations, a task outside the purview of this study.

Are Denck and Haetzer among th unnamed adversaries whose reproaches or scorn Zwingli anticipates, the know-it-alls, those who should be learning for themselves rather than trying to teach others?[47] They would certainly be numbered, together with the Strasbourg colleagues, among those who allow too much to rabbinic exegesis--of which we shall say more in the next section. In any event, amongst his foes whose attacks proceed from ignorance and envy rather than from knowledge Zwingli does number his papalist adversaries at the Baden disputation. The so-called puerile errors for which he was reproached on that occasion were in fact the consequence of an approach to textual criticism whose sophistication was beyond the critics. Their slander merely reveals how little they themselves knew of the sacred tongue![48]

One other adversary, or group of adversaries of mark, is certainly intended, though their identity is never made explicit. Zwingli argues at some length for the necessity of an understanding of the nature of figures and tropes in the sacred tongue, in order rightly to comprehend and so to translate with sense. With an appropriate attention "to the mind and custom of the period in which they wrote,"

> ...we should have ventured boldly into the knowledge of the ways of thinking and figures of speech, into the richness of tropes and expressions out of which the divine oracles so consist that there is obviously no sentence in the whole Bible which you can open with other than these keys.[49]

Those who refuse recognition of the metaphorical nature of the biblical language, on the grounds that this opens the door to justifying error through invocation of figurative language, show that they simply do not understand that all language is figurative. They are unwilling moreover to trust either the Holy Spirit or common sense to enable the discovery of the proper sense of a text.

Here there can be little doubt that Zwingli intends Luther and those who follow him in refusing

Zwingli's arguments for the figurative nature of the language in some of the key eucharistic texts.[50] Set within the framework of this preface, Zwingli's argument transcends the eucharistic quarrel of the moment, however, to plead for an approach to all biblical translation and exegesis that will enable the exegete to penetrate to the proper meaning of Scripture, rather than to remain with frivolous human comments or ambiguities that can only result in uncertainty and hence "the more harmful evils, disagreement, rash definitions in obscure matters and the impudent insulting of one's opponents."[51]

If there is clearly value in reading this preface within the broader development of Zwingli's life and thought as these are manifest in the spring of 1529, it is also instructive to read comparatively a similar text composed by Martin Bucer at about the same time for his Psalms commentary.[52] Like Zwingli, Bucer endeavours to stake out the middle position between Catholics, Lutherans and Anabaptists. Several similar notes are sounded in matters exegetical and on the nature of biblical translation, although, as we shall note later in this paper, there are some areas of disagreement with Zwingli as well. In the matter of eucharistic doctrine, too, Bucer has a different agenda. While he does make veiled allusions to a Lutheran penchant for disputatiousness, he also lays the foundations of his career as reconciler with a strikingly irenic stance--"it is not given to everyone to see the same things at the same time."[53]

One other text deserves mention at this juncture--the "Short Exhortation and Introduction" that prefaces the Zurich German Bible of 1531.[54] If the text is unsigned, the themes and style recall vividly our *Isaiah* preface, and suggest the influence of Zwingli's thought, if not his actual expression. I shall note some parallels in what follows.

Amongst the several issues raised by Zwingli, there are two that shed a particularly interesting light upon his approach to Old Testament exegesis and to which we shall now give particular attention. The first is the relationship of the Greek and Hebrew text traditions of the Old Testament to one another. The other concerns the nature of biblical translation.

IV

The Septuagint or Greek Old Testament text enters into consideration almost with the opening lines of the preface as the most ancient interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures, one to which Zwingli freely confesses his indebtedness. A major section of the preface is consecrated to a critical discussion of its authority and value.[55]

The chief literary source for the origins of the Septuagint is a document of second century B.C.E., the so-called "Letter of Aristeas."[56] According to the legend, the royal librarian of Alexandria, at the request of Ptolemy II Philadelphos, arranged with Jerusalem authorities to have a team of seventy-two Jewish elders sent to Egypt, where they completed a translation of the Torah within seventy-two days. This text, acclaimed for its splendid perfection, became enshrined as the official Greek version of the Hebrew.

Subsequent Jewish and Christian authors elaborated the legend, giving ever greater sanctity to what was the most widely used Greek Bible of the Jewish Diaspora until at least the second century of our era, by which time it had become the Christian Scriptures of the Old Testament. Josephus entered a paraphrase of Aristeas into his *Antiquities*.[57] Philo of Alexandria embroidered details into the fabric, in particular making the claim that the translators were gifted with divine inspiration.[58] In this form the story circulated amongst Christian apologists, and made its way into Augustine's *City of God*. Each of the seventy-two translators had worked in isolation and on the entire Scriptures, not just the Pentateuch, yet when their versions were compared, they were found to be identical.[59] Jerome, on the other hand, at work on new translations of the Hebrew into Latin, criticized sharply the current version of the legend with its authentication of the inspiration of the Church's Greek Bible. The original text of Aristeas knows nothing of these "lies" concerning separate cells and identical translations. The gifts of prophecy and of translation ought not to be confused, the former clearly far outranking the latter according to the teaching of St. Paul.[60]

Against this background, Zwingli raises the issue of the inspiration of the Septuagint. He

HOWARD UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

indicates at one point that he is reading Josephus' *Antiquities*,[61] and this does seem in the main to be his source. The "Letter of Aristeas," although not printed in Greek before 1561, was available in Latin translation. Details of the account in that text, however, are not in Zwingli; and I judge he did not know it at first hand. On the other hand, he is also familiar with the legend of the inspiration in splendid isolation, in a form which may indicate that he has it from Augustine.[62] The story does not impress him. First of all, he rejects the miraculous element: "If whatever we venture to create we then assert to have taken place miraculously, there will be no end of lying!"[63] Next, he refuses to believe that each translator produced a version of the whole. Such is an offence to common sense; for if one could do the whole Bible, there was certainly no need of the other seventy-one. Thirdly, the seventy-two day period of completion of the project is laughed out of court. Here Zwingli draws upon his experience of committee work for the Zurich council. Whenever a committee debates a difficult question, merely producing an agreed-upon version of the committee minutes requires lengthy discussion and revision. "From which you can easily guess how much time the whole Bible would require if all of them together were giving their opinions."[64]

Zwingli is apparently not the beneficiary of any critical studies of the tradition;[65] but his combination of historical criticism and Swiss common sense brings him to the conclusion that the Septuagint is the product of a group of translators--he is willing to give credence to the oldest tradition of the seventy--who divided up the task either by lot or by choice and each produced some part. Corroboration of his conclusions he finds in the unevenness of the translation often within the same book, and the variety of ways in which the same figures and expressions are translated in different locations. The Septuagint is also not without errors and places where the translators were simply unable to manage the sense of the original. Finally, the text tradition has suffered severely in its transmission: from so-called shcolars who presumed in the days when Origen's *Hexapla* was on display in Caesarea to import into the LXX readings from one of the other columns, from copyists who brought marginal glosses

into the text as genuine readings. The alerted student must work in awareness of the deficiencies of the Septuagint, discovering that Jerome's Latin version is a helpful corrective. Yet, for all this, it is quite wrong to scorn the LXX, for its knowledge is essential for working with the Hebrew text.[66]

With this statement Zwingli turns to the tradition that he has identified as superior to all others, including the Greek, namely the original Hebrew. Already, in the face of those--one suspects perhaps some humanist lovers of the classical tradition as well as scholastic theologians--who look down upon Hebrew because of its limited vocabulary, he had been lavish in his praise of its economy of words which coupled with its rich imagery means an expressiveness equalled in no other tongue.[67] Thus far the praise is conventional, and could have been written by any of a hundred Christian Hebraists of the epoch.

But the tone changes abruptly. The Hebrew we possess today is unfortunately a pale shadow of the wondrous *lingua sacra* of pre-exilic Israel. The numerous vicissitudes that befell the Jews from the time of the Babylonian captivity onwards meant that knowledge of the language in its pristine purity virtually vanished amongst the Jews. Consequently there was invented and introduced "pretentiously" into the text a system of vowel points unknown in Jerome's day, traces of whose imposition on the text can be found in the most ancient manuscripts. Zwingli is of course referring to the work of the Massoretes late in the first millennium of our era. Further, "in place of the ancient knowledge of the language which I fear was never restored after the Babylonian captivity to its earlier brilliance," rabbis with little or no knowledge of the primitive structures of the language imposed a grammar on the texts they had inherited.[68] This process he dates about 1000 years after the translation of the LXX, a fairly accurate reckoning, in fact, of the beginnings of the science of Hebrew grammar.[69] Finally, those who no longer had any sense of how the divine oracles were once pronounced developed a system of pronunciation that frightens away all but the most determined students: "... extremely barbarous vocalizations with which they have only been prevented from polluting the divine oracles by

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

the fact that Truth cannot be contaminated."[70] The ignorance that lay behind such corruption of the original purity is surely demonic![71]

What then is to be said for Hebrew studies? They are, unfortunately, indispensable. "Since without the rabbinic pointing, Hebrew letters are quite unintelligible to us, we are now willy-nilly obliged to accept it."[72] Zwingli does allow some merit to rabbinic grammar, namely the use of masculine and feminine grammatical gender, and their system of pronominal suffixes wherein gender is determined by the subject, not by the object. But the reader-student is warned not to give too many years to the study of Hebrew grammar, nor place too much faith in its canons.[73] Rather, having read the Hebrew in its Massoretic pointing, look then to what lay behind the LXX and which the Jews failed to see.[74] The LXX, to be sure, is an imperfect instrument, but the alert student will discover how to compensate for its unevenness and gaps by recalling how similar passages have been handled elsewhere.

Zwingli anticipates some incredulous reaction to his proposals.

> "First, you declare that one must break through to a stage of the language uncorrupted by the rabbinic vowel points and punctuation. Next, this has to be done with tools in which you have less than perfect confidence in many passages; yet tools which will so illuminate my judgement that I discern both where the rabbis have corrupted the text, and the things which the translators of the LXX themselves did not see!"[75]

His reply is the invocation of the gifts of God to those who seek an increase of faith and love.

> *Ask therefore in faith, nothing doubting.* If you have faith, you will then say to Olympus: Depart hence into the Euxine, and it will depart [Mt.21:21!]; that is, nothing will be so dense and impenetrable that you may not enter by faith. Faith always understands the Spirit speaking.

Earlier Zwingli had spoken of the application of "the analogy of faith and of the circumstances" for those passages where no parallels could be found elsewhere in Scripture to bring light from the more evident to the more obscure.[77] It would seem that he understands here not only the historic faith of the Church, but also the unlettered faith of the simple Christian.

> If you cannot disentangle the letter, I want you to remember that there are more persons in the Church who are unlearned in letters than who are learned. It is required that all burn with charity, but only of a few that they excel in learning ... Pray therefore that your faith increase, that your love be inflamed and then you will nowhere fall.[78]

In sum, his recipe reads as follows: a smattering of Hebrew, a large dose of Greek and a spirit illumined by faith.

Several comments are in order. In the first place, these value judgements are startling when viewed in the context of the attitudes of his fellow-exegetes of Basel and Strasbourg. I have referred above to the preface of Bucer's *Psalms* composed that same summer of 1529. In it one sees almost a mirror reversal of the position of Zwingli on this question of the relative merits of Hebrew and Greek. The LXX tradition is of limited value for the sixteenth-century exegete due to its errors as well as to the bad state of text transmission. Indeed, a simple comparison of the Aldine text with that of the 1516 Basel *Psalter* and with citations found in the various Fathers shows that it is scarcely possible even to speak of a Septuagint tradition in its present state.[79] On the other hand, Christians must thank the graciousness of God for the wondrous preservation of the Hebrew text, through the work of those very Massoretic scribes whom Zwingli denounces for their corruption of the text! Although all Jewish commentators are limited by their failure to see the end of Scripture in Jesus Christ, there are nonetheless commentators, especially from the golden age of Hispano-Provençal Jewry, who are invaluable for piercing to the historic sense of Scripture.[80]

McGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Bucer's value judgements are faithfully reflected in his own exegetical practice in his *Psalms*, which are replete with explicit rabbinic citations. Conversely, his infrequent quotations of the LXX come clearly as an afterthought (often added in the second edition), and not infrequently elicit a comment on how they have missed the sense of the original altogether.[81] They also signal a fundamental disagreement between Zurich on the one hand and Basel and Strasbourg on the other over the merits of the two text traditions and the corresponding weight to be given to rabbinic as opposed to patristic sources.[82] One must add, however, that Zwingli's position is extreme even by Zurich standards. He must regularly have found himself on the opposite side of the argument from Jud and Pellican "and their protesting rabbis";[83] and the influence of these last increases noticeably from the Zurich German to Latin Bibles,[84] i.e. in the decade after the death of Zwingli. Moreover, if Pellican concurred in the view that rabbinic Hebrew was not up to the classical standard, he dated the decline, in company with most Christian Hebraists, to the period after the destruction of the second Temple in 70 C.E.[85]

This distinction even from Zurich colleagues reinforces my second observation, that we have certainly to do with a highly personal element. Zwingli would doubtless have concurred with Dr. Johnson's observation that "Greek is like lace; a man gets as much of it as he can."[86] Put positively, he shared the Erasmian admiration for the whole classical tradition; a Greek lens for the study of Scripture was congenial in one who found it natural to refer to Jeremiah's dying city as Troy.[87] Künzli has claimed that Zwingli's views on the relation of the LXX to the Hebrew anticipate modern Septuagint studies.[88] This is perhaps to credit him with more originality than is his due, though I have not yet found a source from which Zwingli could have drawn his position.

There may also be a negative personal factor at work. Erasmus' failure to master Hebrew is well known, and may not be unrelated to his intense personal dislike of Jews.[89] How well did Zwingli in fact know Hebrew? If Johannes Eck is to be believed, he had a rudimentary knowledge at best. Eck was hardly a neutral observer; and one can find

Zwingli making similar accusations concerning Eck.[90] Newman and Egli both credit Zwingli with a certain competence.[91] But it is hard to escape the impression that the relative merits of Greek and Hebrew in Zwingli's mind are a fairly accurate reflection of his linguistic competences and preferences.

Zwingli himself cited the elder Pico della Mirandola as authority for at least some of his views. A perusal of Pico's writings has led to the identification of several elements that may have served to shape the direction of Zwingli's stance. Pico believed that the Babylonian captivity was a turning point for the knowledge of the ancient tongue in its purity and of the oral traditions that dated from Moses.[93] Amongst his *900 Theses* is one that claims by reading Hebrew without the vowel points, one gains access to the mysteries, which elsewhere he identifies with the secret truth given to Moses together with the Law at Sinai.[94] In a letter written from a Florentine monastery near the end of his life, Pico tells a friend that at the request of Lorenzo de Medici he is turning his Hebrew knowledge to the defence of the Septuagint against Jewish slanders.[95] Unfortunately, this text with its arguments does not seem to have survived.

A detailed analysis of the consequences of these views for Zwingli's O.T. exegesis belongs in another study. Here we shall content ourselves with a few illustrative examples. In the first place, Zwingli retains the LXX system of numbering the Psalms that was used also in the Church's Latin Bible; and the Zurich German Bible of 1531 in following Zwingli's preference is the only Bible of Reformed origins to do so.[96] Similarly he retains the Graeco-Latin forms of biblical names like *Esaias*, rather than introduce new forms based on a transliteration of the Massoretic Hebrew such as *Jeschaiahu*.[97] A third illustration comes from Psalm 19:5. The Massoretic Hebrew *qawwam* was rendered by most sixteenth-century Hebraists as "their line" in the sense of plumbline or cord. Zwingli is one of a minority that preferred to follow the LXX *ho phthoggos* by rendering *oratio eorum*, although he had translated in his 1525 German Psalter according to the former sense (*ir mess*). The LXX version is of course that used by St. Paul who cites this verse in Romans 10:18. We are handicapped here by the

MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

absence of annotation in the Zwingli *Psalms*. Some sixteenth-century exegetes, including Olivetan in the 1535 French Bible,[98] proposed that the LXX had read the consonants *qlm* in place of *qwm*, which would account for the disparity. It is just not possible to know if this solution occurred to Zwingli. On the other hand, a random sampling furnished instances, too, where Zwingli preferred *not* to follow the textual tradition of the LXX. To cite only two, at Psalms 24:6, Zwingli's LXX would have translated: "This is the generation of those seeking the Lord, of those seeking the face of the God Jacob (or, of Jacob)." He prefers to go with the Massoretic Hebrew, however, which translates: "This is the generation of those seeking him, who are searching out thy face, Jacob." Further, at Psalms 14:1, to the Hebrew "there is none doing good," one LXX tradition and the Gallican Psalter of Jerome added "up till the one," a reading with obvious christological application. Despite this, Zwingli translated with the Massoretic Hebrew.

Before leaving this question of the relative merits of the Greek and Hebrew traditions, it is appropriate to append a few comments on Zwingli's attitude towards the Jews.[99] One might have hoped for a significant turning-point in the Christian relationship with the Jews of Europe as a consequence of the emergence in the early sixteenth century, for the first time in the history of Christendom, of a considerable number of Christians who through their Hebrew skills could read Jewish texts for themselves, and make not only literary but personal scholarly contacts within the Jewish community.[100]

What light does our text bring to this question? Early in the document, Zwingli claims to have had many teachers--Latin, Greek and Hebrew--and to have learned from each.[101] The discussion of the Septuagint and of Jerome which follows suggests that his reference is to literary sources rather than teachers. But his pejorative comments on contemporary Jewish pronumciation of Hebrew seem to indicate first-hand acquaintance: "the harshness and heavy breathing ... the rustic pronunciation and the croaking ... that makes it not just barbarous but virtually unpronounceable for persons of other languages."[102] Curious criticism on the lips of a speaker of schwytzer-tütsch! And in fact Zwingli

admitted to having had discussions with one Moses of Winterthur, perhaps on occasion within the *Prophezei* itself, though he vigorously denied ever having been his pupil.[103]

There is no evidence here that Zwingli went in any way beyond the traditional stereotypes. His interesting admonition to the reader on distinguishing three types of prophecy[104] proceeds from a polemical stance typical since the early Fathers, one which there is good reason to believe is defined not so much by missionary zeal as by the concern to present an exegesis of Hebrew Scriptures that does not draw the deserved mockery of the Jewish interlocutor.[105] We have Zwingli's word that he discussed Messianic texts with the same Moses of Winterthur. Yet his language here is replete with the classical epithets of opprobrium. Jews are ignorant of general culture; they are blinded by their perfidy, and are not completely trustworthy even in matters grammatical.[106] Zwingli apparently believes the Jews will ultimately be converted to Christ.[107] But for the present, he would seem to share the attitude of his Strasbourg colleague:

> So long as they lack a mind gifted with the Spirit of God, they have a veil before their eyes, and it is futile to press your textual arguments, however much these seem to make the truth of our case crystal clear ... Let them go, then, until the spirit of Christ touches them.[108]

V

The character of biblical translation was a matter of real pertinence in 1529, given the number of projects already underway or contemplated. These included of course the Zurich German Bible. As pressing as the production of new vernacular texts appeared, it did not displace another concern of the evangelical exegetes, the provision of new Latin translations for a learned public, in particular for those who would be charged with occupying the newly reformed pulpits. For both Zwingli and Bucer this task had something of an interim character, in that these new Latin texts were to be tools to help move the student into a profound familiarity with the

MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

originals. Bucer could express in his *Psalms* the dream that one day, in accord with the prophecy of Isaiah (19:18), *all* Christians, not merely certain parts of Egypt, would speak the Hebrew tongue.[109] Zwingli does not interpret the prophet in this sense, perhaps a reflection of his own ambivalence toward Hebrew; but in the closing lines of his *Isaiah* preface, the reader is reminded of the goal of Zwingli's work:

> by constant reading and comparing the sacred texts, above all in Hebrew and Greek, you at last reach the point where you swim without cork.[110]

In the interim, however, aids were necessary if the fledgling student of Scripture was not to sink in the swirling, muddy currents of confused commentary and ambiguous translation. Zwingli held distinctive views on Bible translation, views shared with Bucer of Strasbourg but running counter to tradition and much contemporary practice. These have been discussed elsewhere in the context of the correspondence of the two reformers;[111] it will suffice here to summarize the context of the argument which Zwingli makes in his *Isaiah*.

Since the age of Jerome, all consideration of biblical translation was dominated by the Latin Father's views as expressed in his letter "On the Best Method of Translating."[112] Jerome defended vigorously his practice of translating according to sense rather than the letter of the original; but he qualified this liberty in the case of Scripture, "whose very word order contains a mystery." If his personal practice showed a mitigation of this literalism, mediaevals preferred, perhaps because of their much more limited linguistic skills, to be ruled by Jerome's dictum. Faithful translation was literal translation.[113]

Early translations by Christian Hebraists were no exception. Thus Johannes Oecolampadius of Basel wrote in the preface to his *Isaiah* of 1525 that he could not be convicted of being an unfaithful translator, having "retained the idioms of the Hebrew people though these sound rather harsh in Latin" out of respect for the needs of students.[114] Zwingli and Bucer were convinced, however, that their Basel colleague was in error. The first concern of the

Christian translator is not to provide an interlinear guide for students of Hebrew, but to render the Scriptures in their native clarity for those who lacking access to the originals are nonetheless called upon to read and judge for themselves. When phrases and expressions make no sense in the host language, "when words, not even sentences, are understood in the fashion of school children," ignorance, uncertainty, theological speculations and debates without foundation in the original are the inevitable consequence.[115] The truly faithful translator will rather express the sense of the original in the idiom of the host language. Both reformers were aware that this style presumed the ability of the translator to penetrate to the sense of the biblical text, and that here there was clearly possibility of erroneous understanding affecting the new translation. But each argued that this was preferable to having every reader invent a meaning where none was evident, and that the Spirit would come to the aid of the devout and learned translator. Zwingli is gracious in his references to Oecolampadius, but he makes it clear that "smoothing out" (*complanandum*) the prophet is an essential addition to the work of the Basler.[116]

This embrace of paraphrastic translation is without reserve on the part of both Zwingli and Bucer.[117] One is probably justified in seeing the influence of Erasmus' use of *paraphrasis* here, though it ought to be noted, too, that Erasmus' paraphrases were complements to his more careful and exact translation.[118] It is perhaps this reminder that enabled Pellican to prevail upon Zwingli and Froschauer to print Jerome's Latin in parallel columns with Zwingli's.[119] For his part, Bucer was forced to bow to criticism and furnish a second, literal rendering to accompany his free one in the second edition of the *Psalms* (1532).[120]

Two examples will illustrate Zwingli's application of his principles. In Isaiah 40:1-2, Oecolampadius had translated the Hebrew,

> Comfort, comfort my people, you God will say.
> Speak to the heart of Jerusalem ...[121]

Under the influence of Jerome, Zwingli takes the "people" of verse 1 as a vocative, and the

HOUGHTON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

imperative as reflexive; then from the LXX he borrows a reference to priests that is without justification in the Hebrew (as he admits), so that his translation reads,

> Be of good cheer, I say, be of good cheer, my people, says your God.
> O ye priests, comfort Jerusalem...[122]

For a second illustration, I refer again to the text of Psalm 24:6. Here, as we earlier saw, Zwingli follows the text tradition of the Massoretic Hebrew, but displays his freedom and willingness to bring considerable interpretation into the text. In his 1525 German he translated

> This is the generation that asks after him;
> They are Jacob, who are seeking his face.[123]

The 1532 Latin retains the interpretation of "Jacob" as parallel to "generation"; but the verb of the second half of the verse is rendered in a fashion that attests his willingness to depart from both Hebrew and Greek when the Spirit leads.

> This is the generation of those inquiring of him,
> It is Jacob, who has *found* his face.[124]

What to say by way of some concluding observations? First, I would underline the crucial significance of Zwingli's understanding of the Pauline term "prophecy," in particular as this is expressed in I Corinthians 14:29-32. The role this plays in Zwingli's thinking is already manifest at the First Zurich Disputation (1523) when he identifies the assembly of magistrates as proper spiritual judges in the Pauline sense, and draws attention of the opponents to the gift of tongues as well in the ability of several persons in the room to read Greek and Hebrew.[125] In my studies I have been able to trace this particular interpretation of prophecy and judging to the *Ratio seu Methodus* (1518) of Erasmus[126] but no further, whence it is picked up and developed by Luther[127] to become a

commonplace of evangelicals in the 1520's. Certainly allusions to it run throughout the *Isaiah* preface, as is also true of Bucer's *Psalms* preface. To this theological undergirding we must add the supreme instance of the institutionalizing of the concept, the genius of the Zurich *Prophezei* with its numerous imitators.[128] In our text Zwingli remains faithful both to the concept and to the model, a model as we have seen that he explicitly cites as evidence of the value of his method. It is interesting to observe that in the 1529 *Psalms* Bucer is already showing more awareness than Zwingli manifests here of the limitations of a concept that predicates that whatever interpretation emerges as the consensus of the group is to be understood as the work of the Holy Spirit. All interpretation is to be judged by the analogy of faith, which Bucer increasingly associates with the consensus of orthodox tradition.[129] Zwingli, as we have seen,[130] likewise invokes the *analogia fidei*, but not without ambiguity, and certainly with no reference to tradition.

What of the long-term influence of Zwingli's exegesis, something that is central to our preoccupations in this 500th anniversary colloquium? As one would expect, Zwingli's hand is evident in the 1531 German Bible, though this does not always agree with the choices he had made in his Latin texts. As Künzli observed,[131] his influence is greatly diminished in the 1543 Latin Bible--in favour ironically of that of Bucer, as my studies have shown--though Jud and company did remain faithful to the principle of seeking elegant and clear Latin expression rather than reflecting literally the Hebrew original.

Other colleagues of the upper Rhine evangelical *sodalitas* were not great admirers of his exegesis. Calvin wrote of him in 1540: "though not lacking in skill, he used too much freedom and often wandered from the mind of the prophet."[132] This critique, written from Strasbourg, reflects the evidence of a document from the Strasbourg Synod of 1534, wherein were listed the exegetical texts that should form the core of every pastoral library. Oecolampadius is there in his numerous publications, as are naturally Capito and Bucer; but of Zwingli's several commentaries not a word is said![133] This was certainly a measure of ingratitude, considering that

MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

the *Jeremiah* was explicitly dedicated to the city and its magistrates.[134] But given that this commentary appeared the year of Zwingli's death on the battlefield of Kappel, it may have been an association the Strasbourg authorities preferred not to underline.

Zwingli did find, on the other hand, some striking allies, if we number as such those who found his exegesis congenial. His three major Old Testament translations were put into English in the early 1530's by George Joye, thereby making Zwingli a significant contributor to the first generation of the English Bible.[135] A stormy figure, Joye was himself a firm believer in paraphrase and his renderings do not always reflect well the Zwinglian original. Castellio, working alone in Basel in the 1540's and 1550's, would seem to have felt Zwingli's influence at least in a liberty of translation that did not hesitate to replace Hebraisms with classical imagery.[136] The most striking instance of his afterlife comes from the anonymous employment of the Psalms translation in parallel columns alongside the extremely paraphrastic rendering of Jan van Campen in a dozen editions printed in Paris, Antwerp and Lyons in the 1530's and 1540's.[137] From this position Zwingli was able to attract the favourable notice of the conservative Catholic exegete Richard of Le Mans, who used him regularly and on occasion praises his preferences for the LXX tradition.[138]

What finally can be said of Zwingli's place within the circle of upper Rhine evangelical exegetes? We have seen that in his attitude towards the LXX in comparison with the Massoretic text and the corresponding place to be accorded to rabbinic commentary, Zwingli stands over against Basel and Strasbourg and much closer to the attitude of his colleague Pellican, though the latter gave more nuance to his position. On the other hand, he stands with Bucer against Oecolampadius and Pellican in his strong argument for liberty in translation. In a number of respects he seems to have had important links to Bucer, despite their disagreement over the relative merits of LXX and Massoretic texts. If Zwingli's position was counter to the current of sixteenth-century evangelical biblical studies in this respect, there is some consolation for those who would refurbish his image in the recognition that his arguments for the worth of the

LXX as witness to a Hebrew text tradition older than and not always identical with that of the Massoretes are widely accepted today. And the principles of translation espoused and practiced by Zwingli and by Bucer are those now generally recognized.

Zwingli and the study of the Old Testament. In this he was strikingly his own man, if not always a loser certainly consistently an individual and sometimes a maverick. Let me conclude with the hope that this study based essentially on one document has pointed out the potential for further work on Zwingli's exegesis of the Old Testament for our understanding of the origins of Reformation thought and institutions as well as of modern biblical studies.

NOTES

1. E. Egli, G. Finsler et al., *Huldreich Zwinglis Sämtliche Werke*, in 14 vols. (Corpus Reformatorum, vols. 88-101 (Berlin, Leipzig, Zurich, 1905-)), vols. 100-101. Studies by Künzli include "Nachwort zu den Uebersetzungen und Erläuterungen der Psalmen," CR 100, 829-836; "Zwingli als Ausleger des Alten Testamentes" in CR 101, 869-899; "Quellenproblem und mystischer Schriftsinn in Zwinglis Genesis und Exoduskommentar," in *Zwingliana* 9/4 (1950), 185-206; 9/5 (1951), 253-307; *Zwingli als Ausleger von Genesis und Exodus*, typescript diss., Zurich, 1951; "Zwinglis Jesaja-Erklärungen," in *Zwingliana* 10/8 (1957), 488-491.
2. E. Egli, "Zwingli als Hebräer," in *Zwingliana* 1/2 (1900), 153-158.
3. Columbia University Oriental Studies 23 (New York, 1925), pp. 454-510.
4. The *Complanationis Isaiae Prophetae Foetura Prima, cum apologia qur quidque sic versum sit* (Zurich, 1529), printed in CR 101, 1-412. The preface is given at Sign.* - *iii; CR 101, 85-103. On the structure of the commentary, see below at notes 37-39. The text of the CR, which is regularly used here, is not without faults of punctuation and errata.
5. This paper does not explore another area where detailed study will yield further insights into Zwingli's Old Testament scholarship, viz. the

MOORE THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

marginal glosses in his "Hausbibel," a copy of the 1518 Greek Bible of Aldo Manutius of Venice. Walter Koehler has published a complete repertory of these for the Pentateuch, "Aus Zwinglis Bibliothek. Randglossen Zwinglis zu seinen Büchern," in *ZKG* 45 (1927) 243-276; cf. the samplings for other biblical books in CR 99/1, 104-109.

6. Cf. in particular Heinrich Bullinger, *Reformationsgeschichte*, ed. J.J. Hottinger and H. Vögeli (Frauenfeld, 1838-40), I, 281-291. Most recently G.R. Potter, *Zwingli* (Cambridge, 1976), 221-224. The order of the "prophecy" as set forth in 1535: CR 91, 701-702.

6a. Cf. Christoph Zürcher, *Konrad Pellikans Wirken in Zürich 1526-1556*, Zürcher Beiträge zur Reformationsgeschichte 4 (Zurich, 1975). Pellican comments upon his own participation in the *Prophezei* in his *Chronikon*, ed. B. Riggenbach (Basel, 1877), pp. 110, 115-118.

7. Zwingli alludes in the *Isaiah* preface to these discussions, and the modification of opinions under the impact of friendly opposing viewpoints: CR 101, 93, 22-26.

8. Cf. Karl-Heinz Wyss, *Leo Jud: seine Entwicklung zum Reformator 1519-1523* (Berne, Frankfurt, 1976), for a recent study of Jud's formative years as colleague of Zwingli. The standard biography is C. Pestalozzi, *Leo Judä* (Elberfeld, 1860).

9. Cf. the chart prepared by E. Künzli (CR 101, 872), on the strength of the data gathered by Farner, *Huldrych Zwingli: seine Verkündigung und ihre Ersten Früchte* (Zurich, 1954), pp. 36-45, 558-559.

10. *Farrago Annotationum in Genesim ex ore Huldrychi Zuinglii per Leonem Judae et Casparem Megandrum exceptarum*, reprinted in CR 100, 1-290.

11. Ibid., pp.5-6.

12. *In Exodum alia farraginis annotationum particula* (Zurich, 1527), in CR 100, 291-427.

13. See above, n.4.

14. *Complanationis Ieremiae Prophetae foetura prima, cum apologia quur quidque sic versum sit* (Zurich, 1531), printed in CR 101, 413-681.

15. *Enchiridion Psalmorum, quos sanctae memoriae clarissimus vir Hulderichus Zuinglius ex*

Ebraica veritate latinitati donavit, et mira claritate illustravit (Zurich, 1532), in CR 100, 467-836.

16. In CR 101, 683-867; and 100, 429-466.
17. *Die gantze Bibel der ursprünglichen Ebraischen und Griechischen waarheyt nach, auffs aller treüwlichest verteütschet* (Zurich, 1531), reissued in photo reprint Zurich, 1983.
18. *Biblia Sacrosancta Testamenti Veteris et Novi, e sacra Hebraeorum lingua Graecorumque fontibus* ... (Zurich, 1543).
19. Outside the purview of this study, but matter that will repay careful examination, is the German Psalter printed in parallel columns to the Latin in CR 100. It is drawn from a translation apparently made by Zwingli about 1525 and preserved in at least two MSS. Study of this text in comparison with the 1532 Latin and the 1531 Bible should furnish interesting insight into exegetical development in Zwingli.
20. For two discussions of the relationship between Zwingli and Erasmus, cf. Gottfried Locher, "Zwingli und Erasmus," in *Zwingliana* 13/1 (1969), 37-61, reprinted in English translation in Locher, *Zwingli's Thought: New Perspectives*, (SHCT 25, Leiden, 1981), 233-255; and J.F. Gerhard Goeters, "Zwinglis Werdegang als Erasmianer," in Martin Greschat and J.F. Gerhard Goeters, eds., *Reformation und Humanismus. Robert Stupperich zum 65. Geburtstag* (Witten, 1969), 255-271.
21. Cf. Basil Hall, "The Trilingual College of San Ildefonso and the making of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible," in G.J. Cuming, ed., *Studies in Church History* (Leiden, 1969), 114-146, although as recently noted, this article is not without factual errors: Jerry H. Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ: New Testament Scholarship in the Renaissance* (Princeton, 1983), p. 71, n.2. Bentley has a good chapter on the Alcalà project, but confines his study to the N.T. volume.
22. The first complete published edition of the Greek Bible by Aldo Manutius, Venice, 1518. Zwingli's heavily annotated copy of this edition, into which he also entered the birthdates of his children, is in the Zwingli Museum in Zurich. See above, n.5.

HOUSE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

23. Cf. Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1983).
24. Cf. Jerome Friedman, *The Most Ancient Testimony: Sixteenth-Century Christian Hebraica in the Age of Renaissance Nostalgia* (Athens, Ohio, 1983), esp. chaps.1-2.
25. *De Rudimentis Hegraicis* (Pforzheim, 1506; rpt. Olms, Hildesheim/New York, 1974). On Reuchlin, see most recently Friedman, *op.cit.*, chap.4; on Zwingli's use of Reuchlin, esp. after 1520, cf. Egli, *op.cit.*, 153-154. Zwingli also possessed a copy of a Sebastian M}nster publication, Froben's 1525 edition of Elias Levita's Hebrew grammar: CR 99/1, 391-392. Zwingli may be alluding to Reuchlin's work in the *Isaiah* preface: CR 101, 101,23-25.
26. On Bomberg, cf. most recently *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 2, vol.4, 1195-1196. The concordances, entitled *Me'ir Nativ* and attributed to Isaac Nathan, were published in 1523.
27. Conrad Pellican was the principal scholar responsible for the *Sefer Tehillim. Appendici huic inest quadruplex Psalterium* ..., which appeared, as the title intimates, as an appendix to the Froben/Erasmus edition of Jerome; it was also sold independently.
28. The Luther *Kirchenpostillen*, issued in Bucer's Latin translation by Herwagen of Strasbourg, 1525-1527: cf. R. Stupperich, *Bibliographia Bucerana*, nos. 10,11, (SVRG 169, G}tersloh, 1952).
29. Cf. James Kittelson, *Wolfgang Capito: From Humanist to Reformer* (SMRT 17, Leiden, 1975). I find Kittelson's thesis of radical disjuncture between Capito's humanism and his Reformation career too sharply drawn.
30. Ernst Staehelin, *Das theologische Lebenswerk Oekolampads* (QFRG 31, Leipzig, 1939); E.G. Rupp, *Patterns of Reformation* (London, 1969), pp.1-46.
31. Cf. Hobbs, "Exegetical Projects and Problems: a new look at an undated letter from Bucer to Zwingli," in *Prophet, Pastor, Protestant: the Work of Huldrych Zwingli after Five Hundred Years*, eds. E.J. Furcha and H. Wayne Pipkin, (Allison Park, Penn., 1984), p.89-107.
32. Oecolampadius writes to Zwingli fruitlessly for help with Daniel, chapter 9: CR 96, nos. 774,

786.

33. Cf. Hobbs, "*Monitio amica:* Pellican à Capiton sur le danger des lectures rabbiniques," in *Horizons Européens de la Réforme en Alsace*, eds. M. de Kroon and M. Leinhard (Strasbourg, 1980), pp.81-93.
34. Relatively little attention has been paid hitherto to the exegetical work of the upper Rhine Reformers. For an overview in the case of Bucer, cf. Bernard Roussel, "Martin Bucer exégète," in *Strasbourg au coeur religieux du XVIe Siecle* (Strasbourg, 1977), pp. 153-166.
35. Cf. CR 96, nos. 735, 743, 746, 762.
36. This correspondence, including an English translation of Bucer's letter is discussed in Hobbs, "Exegetical Projects."
37. Above, n.4. On *foetura*, Zwingli writes: "we are pushing out an immature foetus ... so that the learned may judge concerning this method, and if they approve, follow it": *Preface*, CR 101, 93, 3-7.
38. A defensive alliance of Swiss evangelical cities: cf. Rene Hauswirth, *Landgraf Philipp von Hessen und Zwingli*, Schriften zur Kirchen- und Rechts-geschichte 35 (Tübingen-Basel, 1968), 86-95.
39. The text of Zwingli's remarks is reproduced in Hobbs, ibid. p.103, n.23.
40. CR 101, 85, lines 4-8.
41. CR 101, 86, 15-18.
42. Jerome, *Commentarii in Isaiam*, printed in the 1516 Basel edition by Erasmus, MPL 24, 17-706; Oecolampadius, *In Iesaiam Prophetam Hypomnematon ... libri VI* (Basel, 1525).
43. CR 101, 88, 27-32.
44. Haetzer (c. 1500-1529), a priest and early ally in the evangelical cause in Zurich, is the author of the account of the Second Zurich Disputation printed in M.Schuler and J.Schulthess, *Huldreich Zwingli's Werke* (Zurich, 1828-1842), vol.1, 461-540. Breaking with Zwingli over infant baptism, he was active in a number of Rhineland centres before meeting death for adultery in Constance in 1529. The basic study is J.F.Gerhard Goeters, *Ludwig Hätzer (ca.1500 bis 1529) Spiritualist und Antitrinitarier* (QFRG 25, Gütersloh, 1957); an English article in *Mennonite Encyclopedia* 2, 621-626.

MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

45. *Alle Propheten nach Hebräischer sprach verteutscht* (Worms, 1527); cf. Goeters, *op.cit.*, pp.88, 99-104; G.Baring, "Die *Wormser Propheten*, eine vorlutherische evangelische Prophetenübersetzung aus dem Jahre 1527," *ARG* 31 (1934), 23-41. Credit to the Wittenbergers in the 1531 Zurich preface: sign.3^{v}.
46. Cf. *Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol.3 (Cambridge, 1963), pp.105-106; Goeters, *op.cit.*, p.104. The latter notes that the 1529 preface to the Zurich *Prophets* translation makes explicit and disparaging reference to Haetzer and Denck, while recognizing the merit of their work. I have not had access to this text.
47. CR 101, 93, 7-12; 90, 21-26.
48. CR 101, 101, 36-103, 1.
49. CR 101, 89, 5-92, 21; quoting here 90, 11-15.
50. Cf. e.g. Zwingli, *Subsidium sive Coronis de eucharistia* (1525), CR 91, 467, 37-476, 3.
51. CR 101, 89, 34-90, 1.
52. *Sacrorum Psalmorum libri quinque* (Strasbourg, 1529), published under the pseudonym Aretius Felinus of Lyon: cf. Hobbs, "Exegetical Projects," 92, 96-98.
53. Bucer, *S. Psalmorum*, "Quomodo de rebus sacris disserendum et iudicandum," f.10^{v}-11^{r}. The words "at the same time" are added in the 1532 edition, which accentuates the irenical tone of the whole commentary.
54. See above, n.17.
55. CR 101, 95, 24-98, 13.
56. Cf. John W. Weavers, "Septuagint," in *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (New York, Nashville 1962), vol.4, 273-278.
57. Josephus, *The Jewish Antiquities* XII, ii, Loeb, vol. 7, pp.8-59.
58. Philo, *Life of Moses*, II, v-vii, Loeb, vol.6, pp. 460-471.
59. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, XVIII, xlii, CCSL 48, p. 638.
60. Jerome, *Apologia contra Rufinum*, II, 24-25, CCSL 79, pp. 60-63.
61. CR 101, 95, 32-33.
62. On the 72 elders, Zwingli: "Legem et Graecam linguam doctos"; Augustine: "linguae utriusque doctissimi Hebraeae scilicet atque Graecae."
63. CR 101, 96, 7-8. Cf. Jerome: "mendacio suo,"

op.cit., p. 62, line 43.

64. CR 101, 96, 35-37.

65. Unless Zwingli had consulted the edition of Augustine's *De Civ. Dei* by Louis de Vives (Basel, 1522), where questions concerning the authenticity of the legend are raised; cf. H.B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 1902), p. 15. I have not been able to consult the De Vives edition.

66. CR 101, 96, 37-98, 11. CF *Die Gantze Bible*, Vorred, Sign. 4^{r}: "Der sibentzig tolmaetschen translation (die lang vor Christo gemachet ist) verachtend wir gar nit/ sonder haltend sy grosz/ dann sy an vilen orten die ding gar eigentlich besaehen habend. Doch giltet bey uns allwaeg mer das Hebreisch/ als der ursprung und grund...."

67. CR 101, 89, 5-17.

68. Zwingli's contempt for post-exilic Hebrew reveals a pre-critical understanding of the origin of Old Testament texts. Contrast the views of Martin Bucer, who posited datings as late as the Maccabean era for certain psalms (*op.cit.* 1532 ed., Sign. [a 7]^{r}). Zwingli's reverence for the primitive partakes of that humanist "nostalgia" that is Friedman's leitmotif in *The Most Ancient Testimony* (Athens, Ohio, 1983).

69. Whose origins are customarily identified with the work of Saadiah ben Joseph Gaon (10th c. C.E.). For Conrad Pellican's survey of the history of Jewish scholarship, which differs somewhat from that of Zwingli, see the preface of his *Commentaria Bibliorum*, vol.1 (Zurich, 1532), Sign A 4^{r-v}.

70. As examples of barbarous, obviously erroneous vocalizations he cites several proper names; thus Hebrew *kwrš*, which only *magistri indocti* would have pointed as *koraesch*, when it clearly demands to be pronounced *kurios*! (CR 101, 99, 4-11.)

71. CR 101, 98, 28-99, 14. Cf. also the comments in the Vorred, *Die gantze Bibel*, Sign. $3^{v}-4^{r}$.

72. CR 101, 100, 2-4.

73. CR 101, 100, 12-15; 101, 32-35.

74. CR 101, 103, 1-7.

75. CR 101, 100, 35-101, 2.

76. CR 101, 101, 8-11.

MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

77. CR 101, 100, 31-35.
78. CR 101, 101, 13-20. One is forcibly struck by the reminiscences of both Augustine and Erasmus.
79. *Op.cit.*, 1529 ed., Sign. 7^{r}. Bucer cites Josephus, moreover, to the effect that the Aristeas tradition refers only to the Pentateuch, something Zwingli apparently overlooks. Note that neither Zwingli nor Bucer seems to have used the Complutensian text.
80. Bucer, *op.cit.*, Sign. 7^{v}.
81. Cf. discussion of Bucer's exegetical practice in Hobbs, *An Introduction to the Psalms Commentary of Martin Bucer*, Diss. Strasbourg 1971, vol.1, p. 307 and n.121.
82. Cf. Hobbs, "*Monitio amica*," 82-87. The typology presented by Friedman, *op.cit.*, p.134, which sets all Basel, Zurich and Strasbourg exegetes in the same camp, is too simplistic: his assessment of Zwingli's abilities in Hebrew is inaccurate, p. 257.
83. CR 101, 93, 22-26.
84. *Biblia Sacrosancta Testamenti Veteris et Novi* ... (Zurich, 1543).
85. *Commentaria*, vol. 1, Sign. A 4^{r}.
86. James Boswell, *The Life of Samuel Johnson*, 1780 (London, 1925), vol.3, p.100.
87. CR 101, 423, 22.
88. CR 101, 97, n.33.
89. Cf. G. Kisch, *Erasmus Stellung zu Juden und Judentum* (Tübingen, 1969); for an attempt to portray Erasmus' attitudes more sympathetically, S. Markis, *Erasme et les Juifs* (Lausanne [?], 1979).
90. Eck: "Man sicht, das Zwingli nit kann die puerilia, der kinder ding in Hebreischen," quoted by Newman, *op.cit.*, p.472, n.46, apparently from the *Verlegung der disputation zu Bern* (1528); Zwingli, letter to P. Gynoraeus (31 August 1526), CR 95, no.524, pp. 702-703.
91. Cf. above, notes 2-3.
92. Italian humanist philosopher and theologian (1463-1494). Cf. Hermann Greive, "La kabbale *chrétienne* de Jean Pic de la Mirandole," in *Kabbalistes chrétiens*, Cahiers de l'Hermétisme (Paris, 1979) 159-179, orig. in German in *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 57 (1975).
93. *Apologia* "De Magia naturali et Cabala disputa-

tio," in *Opera Omnia* (Basel, 1572: rpt. Torino, 1971), vol.1, 177.

94. Ibid., p.113, no. 70.
95. Ibid., p.383.
96. The 1543 Zurich Latin Bible adopts the Hebrew system. Note that Pico used the Greek numbering: *Opera*, 1, 339.
97. CR 101, 100, 4-11. Basel and Strasbourg exegetes used new transliterations.
98. *La Bible, Qui est toute la Saincte Escripture* (Neuchâtel, 1535).
99. Here again the primary work has been done by E. Künzli, "Zwinglis Stellung zu den Juden," in *Festgabe Leonhard von Muralt* (Zurich, 1970), 309-318.
100. Cf. on the Reformers in general most recently, H.A. Oberman, *The Roots of Antisemitism* (Philadelphia, 1984); and Friedman, *op.cit.*, esp. chaps. 10-14.
101. CR 101, 87, 8-14.
102. CR 101, 89, 7-11.
103. Künzli, "Zwingli als Ausleger," p. 878, n.39.
104. CR 101, 94, 16-95, 18.
105. Cf. Bucer, *op.cit.*, Sign. 6^{v}, discussed in Hobbs, "How Firm a Foundation: Martin Bucer's historical exegesis of the Psalms," in *Church History* 53 (1984), pp. 480-481. Public Disputations were not unknown; and witnessing the discomfiture of the Christian in such a debate left an enduring mark on Pellican: *Das Chronikon*, ed. B. Riggenbach (Basel, 1877), pp. 14-15.
106. One wonders how this ignorance of classical culture could have been otherwise given the exclusion of the Jews from most urban centres and from the Church-dominated educational system! CR 101, 100, 15-18; cf. Pellican, *op.cit.*, Sign. $A4^{v}$; and a letter of 6 August 1529 to Bucer: "a scopo errant [Judaei] iamdudum et externarum linguarum dialectos ignorant et suam ... [eruditionem?] postliminio didicisse videntur ..." orig. Zurich Staatsarchiv E I, 1, 1, no. 216; Zurich 1531 *Bibel*, Vorred, Sign. 4^{r}: "...allerguten Künsten unwüssend unnd gar unverstendig."
107. Künzli, "Zwinglis Stellung," p. 316.
108. Bucer, *op.cit.*, f. 225^{r-v}.
109. Preface to the 3rd book of the Psalter, f.269^{v}.

MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

110. CR 101, 103, 10-12.
111. Hobbs, "Exegetical projects and problems," pp. 94-96.
112. *Epistulae* 57, 5; CSEL 54, 508; MPL 22, 571.
113. Cf. W. Schwarz, "The meaning of *Fidus Interpres* in medieval translation," *JTS* 45(1944), 73-78.
114. Oecolampadius, *op.cit.*, Sign. a 3^{v}-4^{r}.
115. CR 101, 89-91. CF. Bucer, *op.cit.*, Sign. 5^{r}-6^{v}; the letter printed in Hobbs, *op.cit.*, pp.90-92; and *Bibel*, Vorred, Sign. 4^{r}: "...wir nit so vil auff buchstaben/als auff den sinn unnd meynung achtend ... Die torechte supersticion etlicher/ die für ein grosse sünd habend vonn den silben unnd worten zeweychen/ bedunckt unns mer ein eigenrichtiger kyb/ weder ein vernünfftig ermässen unnd urteyl."
116. CR 101, 88, 4-8; cf. 103, 14-16.
117. Cf. Luther's claim to the necessary freedom of biblical translation, written in 1530-1531: WA 30/2, 632-646; 38/1, 8-69, English translation in *Luther's Works* (St. Louis, Philadelphia, 1955-) 35, 181-202, 203-232. The similar comments by Etienne Dolet, *La Maniere de Bien Traduire d'Une Langue en Aultre* (Lyon, 1540; rpt. Geneva, 1972) refer to translation in general, while, as we have seen, Bible translation was a special case.
118. Cf. Erasmus' prefatory texts to the 1522 Paraphrases, LB 7.
119. See above n.39.
120. The new translation (*versio paulo liberior*) was printed at the head of each Psalm; the *ad verbum* of 1532 is set at the head of each unit of verses within the Psalm. Bucer also withdrew reluctantly the new form (*Autophyes--"the self-existent one"*) which he had introduced for the tetragrammaton *yhwh*, subsituting instead the form *Jehovah*. To my knowledge he is the first biblical translator to make extensive use of this form. Cf. Bucer, *op.cit.*, 1532, Sign.Äa8^{r}Ü.
121. Consolemini, consolemini populum meum, dicet deus vester. Loquamini ad cor Ierusalem ...
122. Bono animo, bono, inquam, animo sis, popule mi, dicit deus vester. Consolemini *hiereis* Jerusalem ...
123. Das ist das gschlecht, das imm nachfragt; Jacob sind, die dyn angsicht suchend.

124. Haec est generatio adquirentium eum; Jaacob est, qui invenit vultum tuum.
125. CR 88, 497-499.
126. Ed. G. Winkler, in *Ausgewählte Schriften* (Darmstadt, 1967-75), 3, 124.
127. WA 6, 411-412; *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation*, in *Luther's Works*, 44, 134-136.
128. Cf. G. Locher, "Im Geist und in der Wahrheit," Eng. tr. "In Spirit and in Truth," in *Zwingli's Thought*, 27-30.
129. Cf. *op.cit.*, Sign.a4^{r}; f.10^{v}-11^{r}.
130. Cf. above, n.77.
131. "Nachwort," CR 100, 835.
132. To Pierre Viret, 19 May 1540, CR 39, 36, quoted by Künzli, "Zwingli als Ausleger," p. 881.
133. Cf. T.W. Röhrich, *Mittheilungen aus der Geschichte der Evangelischen Kirche des Elsasses* (Paris, Strasbourg, 1855) 2, 27.
134. CR 101, 417-425.
135. Cf. Charles C. Butterworth and Allan G. Chester, *George Joye* (Philadelphia, 1962), chapters 4 and 7; the three works: *The Prophete Isaye* (Strasbourg [! = Antwerp], 1531; STC 2777), *Ieremy the Prophete* (Antwerp, 1534; STC 2778), *Davids Psalter* (Antwerp, 1534; STC 2372).
136. Cf. above nn. 76, 87.
137. Joannis Campensis, *Psalmorum omnium iuxta hebraicam veritatem paraphrastica interpretatio* (Nurnberg, 1532; and numerous editions thereafter). Various editions carried Zwingli's translation, identified only, as in this edition of Lyon, 1533, as "Psalmorum ad Hebraicam veritatem versio Latina." Cf. W. Köhler, "Ein Plagiat an Zwingli," *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, 13 November 1936, no. 1954.
138. Richard Cenomanus, *Collationes ad Psalmos* (Paris 1541; rpt. with the *Commentarium in Psalmos* of Peter Lombard, MPL 191).

MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

META-ZWINGLI OR ANTI-ZWINGLI?
BULLINGER AND CALVIN IN EUCHARISTIC CONCORD

J.C. McLelland

The eucharistic agreement between Zurich and Geneva--the Consensus Tigurinus of 1549--is much more than a tale of two cities of modest size and significance in sixteenth century Helvetia or a minor engagement in a twenty years war from 1529 (Marburg) to 1549. For one thing, England was well aware of the Swiss in that fateful year of Cranmer's Prayer Book revision. Peter Martyr Vermigli, the Italian exile now Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, found himself drawn into a major Disputation on the eucharist in May, to the applause of the Swiss Party in London and Oxford. Meanwhile, Martin Bucer at Cambridge was fretting over the language of his friends in their vairous debates and documents, as well as over the damp climate. Bullinger heard regularly from his disciples in England--was ever a correspondence so earnest and diligent as the Zurich Letters?

Martyr and Bucer are part of our story, the latter as friendly critic who was shrewd evough to see the possibilities in the language of positive and negative theology whereby consensus might be gained without achieving a doctrinaire statement of doctrine. Peter Martyr is a different case. He had met Bullinger only briefly, on first fleeing Italy in 1542; he would end his life as a Zurich Reformer and Bullinger would serve his dying needs. But in 1549 he was caught in the net of transition, his ousted predecessor in the Chair still around to heckle, although Richard Smith departed hastily before the Disputation. Such were the lives and times of this period of religious ferment and theological controversy.

The cluster of questions attending the Zurich Consensus suggests its usefulness in our exploration of Zwingli and "Zwinglianism." The subsequent perspective allows the original stance of the Zurich antistes to reveal itself through developments by his colleagues and successors, particularly Bullinger. In order to organize the complicated data informing our topic, I will frame the chief problems and my supposed solutions in the form of

theses. These either underline my essai in interpretation or constitute part of my argument below.

Six Theses

1. The Reformation was essentially a dispute about christology--the Person who is present in church and world, the peculiar work which is effective and authoritative in redemption.
2. The modalities of divine presence focus on the presence of Christ in the Mass/Eucharist. This functions in debate as the test case for divine-human relationship and mediation: eucharistic theology combines the logic of both christology and pneumatology.
3. The language of the Institution of the Lord's Supper becomes the model of biblical language and so of hermeneutics. The authoritative sentence of the Mass (*Hoc est corpus meum*) determines the terms of the Marburg debate. Luther seems unaware of what Zwingli considers the key to interpretation what today is called "the rule of metaphor."
4. Zwingli was by circumstance destined to leave an incomplete legacy. Bullinger's strength lay in clarity of thought and purpose in the new polemics and the need for solidarity. Calvin is late but original, recognizing in Bullinger the mediating theology to which he himself aspired.
5. The agreement on the Supper between Geneva and Zurich signified a common theology of word and sacraments, the basis of the Reformed family of churches, particularly in subsequent development. Its conceptual framework recalls us to a neglected but essential theme, the mystical union which supplied the dynamic of "sacramental" forms and intention. The *unio hypostatica* of Christ leads to the *unio mystica* of Spirit.
6. The Zurich Consensus is a landmark in the Supper-Strife, but not a primary confessional document. It interprets Calvin and Bullinger well but not necessarily Zwingli. Whether they honoured Zwingli's true intention depends on whether their interpretation can be shown to be at least consistent with his. But together they have assigned him the role of founder of Reformed church and theology--an ambiguous heritage indeed.

MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Interpreting Zwingli

Zwingli represents the original Reformation of German Switzerland, largely independent of Luther and the Northern Reformers. He would emphasize this independence, a good polemical tactic and true in essence. His early debt to humanism, and to Erasmus and his New Testament edition, was sufficient to effect reaction to mercenary military and--as he saw it--ecclesiastical service. The courage and carnage of the battlefield demanded better ways of citizenship, much as the homage to the Black Madonna at Einsiedeln called for alternatives for soldiers of Christ. His practical experience, personal faith and biblical scholarship directed him into theological agenda similar to those of Luther, Bucer and other early Reformers. His respect for the Old Testament is one reason for his likeness to Calvin. Another is no doubt the similarity of view toward the state, more properly the *politeia*--a kind of conciliar local government with properly episcopal role. For Zwingli, moreover, the vulnerability of the cantons of Zurich and the Helvetic Confederation proved as decisive as the errors of the Mass in determining his programme of reform. How could the true church be revived if either church or state were threatened by corruption from within or enemies without?

We might say of Zwingli that he was a dialectical theologian, one who recognized the polarities of life: church and state, war and peace, religion and culture, Christ in the world and in the Supper. But the logic of his dialectic was unitive--he saw distinction without separation, unlike Luther's theory of the two kingdoms. Moreover, he shared with other Reformers the insight that the two enemies on right and left--Romans and Anabaptists chiefly--in fact shared a common error. Both believed in works righteousness. The Roman Mass and the Radical Baptism, on this view, are forms of human pride, attempting to storm the Kingdom of God by violent means. Such context for this man of many talents warns against reductionism in approaching his theology. For instance, was he soft on original sin and final judgement for unbelievers? Was he guilty of his own reduction in holding the Lord's Supper to be a memorial only? To both we might reply that at Marburg all points of doctrine were agreed by both

Luther and Zwingli, except one.

Zwingli's sacramental doctrine is complex because of the highly polemical context of his writings and the vexed problem of the direction of his thought up to his death. The Berne Theses of 1528 for instance are quite negative about the mode of presence: "It cannot be shown from holy scripture that the body and blood of Christ are received [*percipiatur*] essentially and corporally in the bread of the Eucharist."[1] But in the *Fidei Ratio*, 1530, while explicitly rejecting a presence "*per essentiam et realiter*" he can state, in now famous words, that the body of Christ is present for the contemplation of faith (*verum Christi corpus adsit, fidei contemplatione*). A sentence that provides doctrinal context, however, is often neglected: "assumed into heaven, he is therefore departed and is not here" (*adsumptus in coelum, abiit ergo et non est hic*). Here is the distinctive doctrine of Reformed faith, the Ascension which dictates indirect modalities of presence, later developed into the notorious "extra Calvinisticum."

But behind the christological debate lies Zwingli's concept of faith which is so easily misunderstood by us moderns. Cyril Richardson has pointed to "the apparent confusion of the Renaissance with the Enlightenment" in this regard. That is, when Zwingli identifies faith as "spiritual eating," so that *credere est sumere*, he does not intend a subjectivism, whether or not he anticipates the Cartesian dualism in certain respects (e.g. eschatology). Rather he reflects a different anthropology according to which "lively faith" is an act of God, indeed "a fact of being, not a piece of knowledge or an opinion or a flight of fancy."[2] Richardson, by the way, is criticizing Dom Gregory Dix for mistaking Zwingli's--and therefore in proportion Cranmer's--doctrine for subjectivism. The problem posed by "*Cranmer dixit et contradixit*" takes us too far afield, into the question of Continental influences on the English Reformation. But it reminds us that whereas the significance of Bullinger seems clear, through the Parker Society collection for instance, Zwingli's for Cranmer and colleagues still requires clarification. What does seem clear is that later views of Zwingli as mere subjectivist in his concepts of faith, of spirit and of sacramental pledge (*Pflichtzeichen*) remain

MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

uncertain guides to his actual grammar of assent.

Zwingli's "two plain scriptures"--John 6 and 1 Corinthians 10--seemed to him quite clear: "to feed on Christ is simply to believe on the one who offered up his body and blood for our sakes."[3] But in the final work *Fidei Christianae Expositio*, 1531, he provides some categories which anticipate Bullinger and Calvin. Here is the christology which distinguishes the two natures dangerously close to their separation--so the Reformed played Nestorius to the Lutheran Eutyches. Here also is the Aristotelian-Augustinian dogma of "no body without place" (*topos*). Ubiquity thus applies to divine but not human nature. Again comes the stress on "spiritual" eating, whenever faith is engaged, as distinct from "sacramental" eating, referring to the external signs or elements. So completely does faith depend on the Holy Spirit that outward participation gives only *fides historica*, memory of past events, like "the remission of debts at Athens." Therefore Zwingli can say, "The greater and holier faith is, the more it is content to feed spiritually." But he does conclude the chapters on the Supper by treating "the virtue of the sacraments." There is power or virtue even in exchange of names--a note heard later in Reformed exposition, according to which figurative language, in this case metonymy or synecdoche, helps explain the prestige and power of sacraments, as well as the general accommodation (*katabasis*) of God's revelation. So Zwingli proceeds to analogy, both to Christ who feeds and gladdens us, and to ourselves, many members in one body. His conclusion of the matter is that the words of institution "cannot be taken naturally or literally, but have to be construed symbolically, sacramentally, metaphorically, or as a metonymy."

Marburg

Martin Luther seems always to have taken Zwingli for a "Sacramentarian" (meeting Schwenkfeld at Wittenberg as early as 1525 he replied to him with "Yes, Zwingli"). We should keep in mind that Luther was well aware of the Radical use of John 6 to push the (Gnostic and Monophysite) concept of Christ's "celestial flesh." Thus he approached Marburg as if ancient heresy were stalking him and

all the Fathers were watching. Luther's nominalism attributed authority to scripture in a manner repugnant to Zwingli who in this regard was closer to the medieval "moderate realism." Thus Seeberg characterized the two protagonists, followed by Köhler's exhaustive work: "Hier stehen sich in Zwingli und Luther Humanismus und massiver Biblizismus, Thomas von Aquino und Wilhelm von Occam, die beiderseitigen Lehrer in der Studienzeit, auch Plato und Aristoteles der Kunst gegenüber."[4]

Zwingli's concept of place, including the heavenly locale for Christ's glorified body, struck Luther as involving a real absence from the Supper (like "a stork in a nest in the treetop," he would say). The dispute on christology meant that Luther took Zwingli's figurative speech to separate the natures in heretical mode. *Alloeosis* is for him *Gegenwechsel*, a "devil's mask." Zwingli's fondness for the tropes familiar in the rhetorical tradition was not shared by Luther. The vocabulary of Quintilian and his successors--and Renaissance admirers--was rich in tropical distinctions, including metonymy or *transmutatio*.[5] In christology, while Zwingli's approach was a creative attempt allowing for distince properties, Luther's took the communicatio idiomatum to mean that both natures share equally in humility as in glory. Even the distinctions among kinds of presence inherited from the scholastics (*localiter/circumscriptive, diffinitive, repletive*) take us only a little way in this Mystery, which is sui generis and thus reverts to scriptural authority. Zwingli, on the other hand, is one of the best examples of Renaissance-Reformation concern with language. Like Calvin, he seeks for the least "improper" language (by definition therefore the most appropriate, *theoprepes*). But Luther misses the point: "Let Zwingli regard the words in the Supper as he will, be they command-words or permission-words; it doesn't matter to me. But I ask this one question: Are these same action-words of Christ false or true words?"[6]

Thus did Zwingli's attempt at linguistic analysis, quite in the dialectico-rhetorical tradition to which Calvin and Martyr would also belong, appear to Luther as threatening biblical authority and even identifying him with the Sacramentarians with their virtual avowal of Christ's "real absence" from the Supper. Now it is

MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

true that Zwingli chose terms which convey an ambiguous message. He is, according to D.G. Schrenk, afraid of gnostic and mystic ideas of divine presence, and therefore anxious to emphasize the historical dimension as well as the human-responsive.[7] Thus he characterizes the Supper as both *Gemeindemahl* and *Gedächtnismahl*. But if he says "only a Memorial," adds Schrenk, this "ist nicht nur ein 'Nur'." That is, we should accord him the benefit of doubt. In the debate between G.W. Locher and Paul Wernle, for instance, whereas the latter considers Zwingli's philosophic dualism responsible for the spirit/flesh dichotomy, Locher considers the Reformer's christological doctrine decisive and the tensions of his thought sufficiently explained in these terms.[8]

A good example of such archetypal function of the *unio hypostatica* is the concept of the power or *virtus* of the glorified humanity. This will prove most significant for Calvin and company in subsequent years, serving to identify Reformed theology. The insistence that the body of Christ cannot be *ubique* has positive as well as negative implications. It does indeed mean corporeal absence, even measured by the distance between heaven and earth. So Beza contended, occasioning an uproar at the Colloquy of Poissy: "his body is as far removed from the bread and wine as the highest point of heaven is removed from the earth." Peter Martyr was present, but he was alarmed by such extreme manner of speech. He had accused Brenz of thinking in "dimensions of geometry" on this very topic: "if you define such a [heavenly] place with reference to the daily revolution of the earth, then your absurdity needs no answer." [9] Thus a different corollary developed on the positive side. That which gives life, saves, has power is not simply spirit but Christ's new humanity in conjunction with Holy Spirit. Thus the suspicion of dualism is overcome by Zwingli's own emphasis: *secundum divinitatem, virtutem et bonitatem.*[10] Not that he is as clear or explicit as his successors will be on the function of the glorified humanity interpreted in personal and dynamic terms. Rather, here is one more point of contact between Zwingli and the subsequent Reformed church and its doctrine. When Bullinger expounds the *charismata* and *dona* which the Christ who fills all things bestows through the Holy

Spirit, he is surely exhibiting that "development of doctrine" which honours the interior logic of his predecessor.

Karl Barth provides helpful commentary on the difference between Luther and Zwingli. Luther was saying Yes and Zwingli But. Because he tried to do without (Luther's) Yes, Zwingli seemed to be saying No. Meanwhile, Luther tried to do without the But. Barth concludes, "The name of Calvin, the man who later knew and spoke both Yes and But, points the tragedy of this historical cul-de-sac--perhaps also the way out and hope."[11] Barth notes that "Criticism and negation are the same only for theological dilettanti." Ironically, Luther's own sharp critique of the Corpus Christi festival--expressed in a 1522 sermon on John 6!--was one of Zwingli's favourite texts against him, with its insistence on eating by faith, "in the heart and not with the mouth." Dr. Locher's comparison of the three Reformers is worthy of note here: Luther seeks a bodily contact with Body, Zwingli a meeting of soul with Divinity, and Calvin of soul with Body.[12] Such are the categories which require appreciation if we are to penetrate the thicket of controversy. For one thing, between Zwingli and Luther stood the medieval debate about universals. Was Zwingli acting as a nominalist in refusing sensible vehicles of grace and--much more serious--avoiding the doctrine of participation, operating with a christology which removed the Humanity from human experience so that soul communes with Divinity? To interpret John 6 (Zwingli used the pericope as Gospel reading in his Eucharistic liturgy) as teaching a contradiction between flesh and spirit, and then to put the weight of communion on spirit as related (ontologically?) with godhood, is to ask for trouble. On this same point, the ambiguity in the Anglican debt to Zwingli through Cranmer was only partly clarified by Bullinger's subsequent influence, while it remained for Calvin to persuade the latter to develop the doctrine of participation in the Humanity which stands as a signal advance on the original stalemate--even though subsequent Calvinism has neglected the very doctrine which provided its original identity. (All this illus-trates the severe limitations of the Two Natures christology, unless one goes beyond Chalcedon to later conciliar teaching, as at

MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Constantinople II where the relationship is asymmetrical in the *anhypostasia/enhypostasia*.)

Bullinger and Calvin

At Zwingli's death in 1531 John Calvin was only twenty-two, still regarding himself as a humanist scholar and working on his commentary on Seneca. Henry Bullinger, the new antistes of Zurich, became a figure of considerable influence without moving much from his city--England and Poland took him more seriously than Calvin for instance. Yet despite the incredible correspondence, the sermons and treatises, Joachim Staedtke is probably correct in observing that his theology remains an unfinished problem for the Reformation and the Reformed Church.[13] Despite his erudition in classical, humanistic and scholastic literature, in Staedtke's judgement he lacked Zwingli's mastery of theology which allowed for a nuanced articulation. Still, his affinity with Zwingli is remarkable, an essential agreement on the central issue of the Supper qualified by a different focus which threw him more squarely in the path being taken by the massive theology of John Calvin. In his *Short Treatise on the Supper*, 1540, the latter wrote of Zwingli and Oecolampadius that "while engrossed with this point [carnal presence] they forgot to show what presence of Jesus Christ ought to be believed in the Supper, and what communion of his body and blood is there received."

Bullinger begins from the unity of Old and New Testaments, in turn providing the central idea of covenant: *Schriftprinzip, Bundestheologie*. A typological exegesis follows, the whole development moving away somewhat from Zwingli and Oecolampadius in the direction of exegetes such as Martyr and Calvin. The impressive patristic knowledge now well recovered by the Reformers was nevertheless handled differently according to the hermeneutical decision as to the role of typology for Old Testament authority. I think this is of great significance for our topic, since the weight assigned to Old Testament precedents for signs and sacraments tended to serve polemical needs for the older theologians, whereas the younger mined with a positive and constructive aim. Personality also plays a considerable part, as Pestalozzi's comparison suggests:

"Zwingli et Bullinger, quel contraste! Le temperament rapide et fougueux de l'un, le calme et la ponderation de l'autre. L'humour mordant de Zwingli, la conscience studieuse de Bullinger."

On the Supper, Bullinger achieves an advance beyond Zwingli chiefly by accenting latent themes such as the *scopus* or fruit of the Meal. His covenant theology allowed entrance into the tradition of mystical theology: the *Gemeinde* derives from union with Christ, and the origin and growth involved signify more than Bund or human gathering; the Body of Christ is on view.[15] When we speak of Calvin's influence on him before the Consensus, therefore, we must acknowledge both the complexity of Zwingli's thought and the depth of Bullinger's. As we approach the fateful year of 1549 it is well to reckon with the state of the question by that date, the polarization of the Supper-Strife by which the sacrament of unity had become the instrument of *Kontroverstheologie*. Bullinger was more than Zwingli's successor and senior statesman of the Swiss churches. He was an international figure, with links to Germany, Poland and especially England. The "Swiss Party" applauded Cranmer's attempt to attract Reformed scholars to England to form a "godly synod," as outlined in his letter to Bullinger of 20 March 1552. Peter Martyr was already at Oxford, as mentioned above, to be followed from Strasbourg by Martin Bucer to Cambridge, while Laski went to London. The correspondence preserved by the Parker Society in the Original Letters and Zurich Letters shows Bullinger as chief author or recipient. It also shows the centrality of the doctrine of sacrament. For instance, John Hooper writes from Zurich to Bucer, 19 June 1548, replying to Bucer's previous letter in which he wrote that he "cannot believe the sacraments to be bare signs." Hooper, who might well be considered soft on this point, insists at length on his right doctrine. My point is that with such ferment of correspondence, debate and conference on the issue, it was high time that Calvin and Bullinger expressed their position.

The two Swiss leaders had been in active discussion of the matter, exchanging texts and commentaries. Bullinger sent Calvin his 1546 *Absoluta de Christi ... sacramentis tractatio*, which Calvin reviewed in a long letter, 25 February 1547.[16] His

MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

critique includes points to be developed between them as written agreement drew closer. Calvin does not like the Zurich penchant for casting sacraments in military mode and so neglecting their continuation of the ancient notion of mystery. He also thinks that the significance of memory in the eucharistic action is being missed. Memory (the logic of *disparata* is at work here), according to Calvin, acknowledges the absence of the bodily Christ, but is linked with the power of faith to make distant things present. Moreover, and here is the concept which will move into a definitive role for Reformed theology, what matters is "our spiritual union with Christ." Many good men abhor the teaching of Zwingli; they include Melanchthon. But his metonymy must be stated clearly to allow the place of the Spirit, *anima sacramentorum*. Calvin insists on terms such as effective and exhibiting to reinforce the goal of union with Christ. And since faith is *ex verbo et sacramentis*, the latter are to be included in the work of faith. "For if Christ dwells in our hearts through faith, his communication also grows because of the increase of faith. Sacraments are ladders (*scalae*) by which faith advances."

The next step was for Bullinger to reply. His letter of November 1548 took the form of *Propositiones De Sacramentis*. Twenty-four sections show him on the attack, accusing Calvin of teaching a sacramental grace not much different "from the doctrine of the papists." On union with Christ he agrees, but insists that the Spirit is the *vitalis succus*, the stuff of life, needing no other agency for its work of growth. A key article is No. 13, where Bullinger repeats the favourite Zwinglian argument: the faithful always (*semper et ubique*) eat and drink Christ, as the saying (of Augustine) has it: *crede et manducasti*. For union with Christ is spiritual, as numerous scriptures say (No. 16). Hence also a trope must be admitted in the words of institution. Finally, Bullinger is far from averse to Calvin's insistence on the mystery by which we are joined to Christ and grow in faith. Both sign and mystical action accomplish this end (*simul sigillis et actione mystica fidelis mysteria Christi peragit*).

Calvin replied to these *Annotationes* in January 1549, a *Responsio* which followed its sections and

advanced their agreement considerably. The themes are now settling. Bullinger's rejection of all instrumental role for sacraments is countered by Calvin: even if God alone is actor, means or instruments are not at all dispensed with (No.7). The argument is that we should beware of disjuctive logic, as if divine action abrogates symbols: *SIMUL* be our watchword (No. 9). The other sections are growing together now, the nuances are carefully introduced--the indwelling, the inevitability of tropes, the distance of place combined with nearness of person. The controversy between us, concludes Calvin, has to do with change of terms.

Bullinger responded 15 March 1549. He agrees essentially with Calvin, but maintains a more cautious attitude towards terms which may occasion error in allowing too much weight to sacramental action. He has no doubt about this insofar as signifying, representing and attesting are concerned. He agrees that signs used by God can never be empty (*inania*) but his emphasis on the work of Holy Spirit leaves him still suspicious of Calvin's bolder language. The conclusion is obvious, however, that the two theologians are now close enough even in terminology to proceed with a formal and public document. To this end Farel and Calvin visited Zurich, Calvin drafted the heads of agreement of that conference and sent them on 1 August to "The Pastors and Doctors of the Church of Zurich." They replied on 30 August, stating that those with whom they consulted have "recognized that we agree even in those articles in which it was hitherto supposed by many that we differed." The *Mutual Consent* was an established fact, the document being printed in 1551, and again in 1554 along with Calvin's *Exposition*.

The Consensus Tigurinus

Philip Schaff called the document produced in 1549 not so much a confession of faith as an "elaborate theological and polemical" essay "for the purpose of harmonizing and defending the teaching of the Swiss Churches."[17] This is certainly true, and entirely to be expected in view of the embattled position of those churches. What is surprising is the positive tone, the careful speech in which their position is advanced. Since our purpose is not to

MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

exegete but to ask whether the *Agreement* sits well or ill with Zwingli, a brief summary of salient points must suffice.[18]

The basis of sacraments in the person and work of Christ provides introduction to the chief issue, the fact that God is author of faith and that faith consists in being "ingrafted into his body" (Articles 1-6). The ends of the sacraments (Art. 7) are significant: marks and badges (*notae sint ac tesserae*) of Christian profession and society or fraternity. Thus both emphases, Zurich and Geneva, find place together. Signs and things signified are to be distinguished but not separated (Art. 9: *distinguimus ... tamen non disiungimus*). The promise and not the signs is to be considered, so that "those who stand gazing on the elements" are in error (Art. 11). Sacraments effect nothing by themselves, but are instruments for God's efficacious activity (12-14). Lest "creatures or elements" be considered salvific, we hear that "the sacraments are sometimes called seals (*sigilla*), and are said to nourish, confirm and advance faith, and yet the Spirit alone is properly the seal, and also the beginner and finisher of faith" (Art. 15). The *manducatio impiorum* is ruled out in Art. 16-18, while Art. 19 is explicit on the Zwinglian point that believers themselves "receive the reality which is there figured" even "without their use." The old tension remains in this document, whereby the eating of faith never quite seems to need sacramental action.

Local presence is denied (Art. 21). The words are to be taken not literally, which were a "preposterous interpretation," but "figuratively--the bread and wine receiving the name of that which they signify," an instance of that metonymy familiar in Scripture (Art. 22). Transubstantiation, together with all "gross figments and futile quibbles" is denied, because such errors derogate from Christ's celestial glory and human nature (Art. 24). Article 25 is important for its place in the Ubiquitarian controversy. It states:

> And that no ambiguity may remain when we say that Christ is to be sought in heaven, the expression implies and is understood by us to intimate distance of place. For though philosophically speak-

> ing there is no place above the skies, yet as the body of Christ, bearing the nature and mode of a human body, is finite and is contained in heaven as its place, it is necessarily as distant from us in point of space as heaven is from earth.

Here is the crux of the Reformed position, in all its splendid ambiguity. It turns on the doctrine of Ascension, but has not thought through the dynamics of the Easter-Pentecost revelation. That is, it is not enough to claim that philosophy has something to say about space or locale (Aristotle is speaking here; Plato might have been a better choice). For surely ambiguity does remain if we insist that "heaven" and "earth" are spatially distant as if that explains the bodily absence and the spiritual presence. The Reformers were in deep waters here--as are we all. They wished to avoid the twin errors of too much and too little being ascribed to sacraments. And surely they were on the right track in recognizing a spiritual power emanating from the glorified humanity of Christ. Calvin later would develop this in his teaching on the sacraments. He can even say that "the flesh of Christ is like a rich and inexhaustible fountain, which receives the life flowing from the Divinity, and conveys it to us" (*Inst.* 4.17.9). He will concentrate on the dynamic relationship between the glorified Man and Holy Spirit. He will follow Augustine's lead in developing the notion of union as the key to God, Christ and Church. He will bring the doctrine of sanctification to its proper place, as Luther had done with justification.

Our final question is whether this agreement between Bullinger and Calvin was a logical development of Zwingli's teaching on the sacrament. It should be obvious that at certain points it would not have been acceptable to him. Whether he would have moved in this direction if he had survived to work with Bullinger is difficult to estimate. At least we can say that he would have cautioned against language which could be misinterpreted by the right, since the left seemed less threatening. Thus while the Consensus is a good document in clarifying the agreed doctrine in a very complex and polemical situation, it represents, in my opinion, a

MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

victory for Calvin rather than Bullinger--if the language of warfare is even appropriate here.

It is interesting to note the reactions of Martyr and Bucer. Peter Martyr was fresh from his Disputation at Oxford in May and commended the document. In his *Treatise*, which accompanied the transcript of the Disputation, he mentions the opinions of Luther and Zwingli at the end, observing that "Luther regards this matter not so crassly, while Zwingli thought not so lightly of the sacraments."[19] Meanwhile, poor Bucer was having a bad year. He did not like Martyr's language in the debate, which he thought gave too much away to the adversaries, leaving Martyr with a doctrine of bare signs or merely "spiritual" presence. Nor did he think much differently about the Consensus, writing a lengthy letter to Calvin 14 August 1549.[20] He laments the tendency to avoid the consolation of Christ's presence, to labour what the minister can-not do rather than the positive. "Let them not make a new article of faith concerning the certain place of heaven in which the body of Christ is contained."

Thus the document itself did not prove acceptable even to the irenical Bucer, whose final years witnessed the hardening of lines between Lutheran and Reformed. Yet it stands for that series of efforts on behalf of the unity of reforming leaders which shows the stature of both Calvin and Bullinger in a most difficult situation. If we can see faults on both sides today, if it is a case of "Marburg Revisited" and renegotiated, their foundation remains a work of theological insight and good intention. Moreover, one would have to do justice to Bullinger by following through with his developed teaching in the fifth Decade of sermons and the *Helvetica Posterior*.[21]

As for Zwingli himself--let us rescue him from the Supper-Strife and allow him to speak his primary word about the social nature of reality, and about human accountability on its behalf. Let us go back behind Bullinger and colleagues, behind the giant Calvin also, to recover the real behind the phantom Zwingli. In that case, I suspect that he would suggest a deeper question, the properly radical or root problem we face. It is being hinted at these days by Reformed scholars such ar Markus Barth and Arthur Cochrane: is the very idea of "sacrament" biblical? There is a Mystery to be named Jesus

Christ, but are there "lesser mysteries" which somehow interpose impersonal or even personal "elements" between him and ourselves? He is Mediator--are we then set a task of developing further mediating words, acts or things or even a "doctrine of mediation"? I think that is a little like what Zwingli was after, deep and unsettling as it may be. The grace of God is a matter of accommodation, mediation; but he remains in control of both ends and means. All the Reformers (and Counter-Reformers more than is at times admitted) were intent on saying something like that. But they tended to accept the terms of debate inherited from the tradition; Zwingli perhaps thought that the matter of sacraments demanded a song in a higher key.

Notes

1. B.J. Kidd, *Documents Illustrative of the Continental Reformation* (Oxford, 1911), 460, No. 4 for Berne; SW VI.2, (Corp. Ref. 93.2) 806 for *Fid. Ratio.*
2. C.C. Richardson, *Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist* (Evanston: Seabury-Western, 1949), 6.
3. Library of Christian Classics 24, 211 ("On the Lord's Supper," 1526, trans. G.W. Bromiley).
4. W. Köhler, *Zwingli und Luther* II (Leipzig 1953), 137; cf. "Aristoteles" in CR 99 (Z vol. 12), 111-135.
5. See Z 13 837ff., *Register der grammatisch-rhetorischen Ausdrücke* (alloeosis 837, metonymia 846: Transfertur enim signati nomen ad signum); cf. alloeosis Z5, 679ff; metonymia Z 6.2, 813; cf. L.A. Sonnino, *A Handbook of Sixteenth Century Rhetoric* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968), 184ff.; J.C. McLelland, *The Visible Words of God* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957), 224ff., "Tropes True and False."
6. *Confession Concerning Christ's Supper*, 1528.
7. D.G. Schrenk, "Zwinglis Hauptmotive in der Abendmahlslehre und das Neue Testament," *Zwingliana* V.4 (1930, Nr.2), 176-185; cf. the fine study by G.W. Locher of "Grundzüge der Theologie Huldrych Zwinglis im Vergleich mit derjenigen Martin Luthers und Johannes Calvin," *Zwingliana* 12.7, 470-509, and 12.8, 545-595 (1967).
8. See J. Courvoisier, *Zwingli, A Reformed Theo-*

McGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

logian (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1963), 47 and Ch.4 "The Sacraments," 63ff.

9. Peter Martyr Vermigli, *Dialogus de Utraque in Christo Natura*, 1561. This was written the year before Poissy, with Brenz in mind, but may be applied to Beza with irony. Cf. McLelland, *op.cit.*, "The Eucharist and Ubiquity," 203ff.
10. *Fid.Ratio*, CR 93.2 (Z 6.2), 809; 805 for *mysterium*.
11. "Luther's Doctrine of the Eucharist: its basis and purpose" (1923) in *Theology and Church* (London: SCM, 1962), 93.
12. G.W. Locher, *Streit unter Gästen*, 12 (Theologische Studien 110-1952).
13. J. Staedtke, *Die Theologie des jungen Bullinger* (Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1962), 9.
14. Quoted in A. Bouvier, *Henri Bullinger, le successeur de Zwingli* (Paris: Librairie E. Droz, 1940), 15.
15. Cf. Staedtke, *op.cit.*, 234ff.
16. CR 40 (Calvini Opera 12) 480-9; the 1548-9 correspondence is in CR 35 (Cal. Op. 7) 693-716.
17. P. Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, Vol.3 (1877), 232.
18. The Consensus is printed in CR 35 (Cal. Op. 7) 733ff.; Kidd, *op.cit.* 652ff.; E.T. in *Calvin's Tracts and Treatises* (Beveridge Ed.), Vol. 2; cf. O.E. Strasser, "Der Consensus Tigurinus," *Zwingliana* IX.1 (1949), 1-16.
19. My translation of Vermigli's *Tractatio de Sacramento Eucharistiae* (Oxford 1549) will appear in the Courtenay Library of Reformation Classics, with shorter texts and Simler's *Oratio*.
20. CR 41 (Cal. Op. 13) 350ff.
21. Cf. J.C. McLelland, "Die Sakramentslehre der Confessio Helvetica Posterior" in J. Staedtke, ed., *Glauben und Bekennen* (Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1966), 368-391; "Bullinger's Testament: The Sacraments According to Helvetic II," *Renaissance and Reformation* (Toronto) 8.2 (1971).

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Ulrich Gäbler, an Austrian by birth is currently Professor at the Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam.

Gottfried W. Locher, Bern, Switzerland, the author of numerous books and articles on Zwingli is professor emeritus of the University of Bern.

Josef Schmidt is Associate Professor in the Department of German, McGill University, Montreal.

Dr. Joachim Rogge, Berlin, German Democratic Republic. He is President der Kirchenkanzlei, Evangelical Church of the Union.

James Stayer is Professor of History at Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario.

E.J. Furcha is Associate Professor of Church History in the Faculty of Religious Studies, McGill University, Montreal.

H. Wayne Pipkin, a native of Texas is Professor of Church History at the Baptist Theological Seminary, Rüschlikon, Switzerland.

Gerald Hobbs is Professor of Church History at the Vancouver School of Theology, Vancouver, B.C.

Joseph C. McLelland is Dean of the Faculty of Religious Studies and McConnell Professor of Philosophy of Religion, McGill University, Montreal.

Due to unforeseen circumstances the paper by Dr. Duncan Shaw, Edinburgh, Scotland could not be included in this volume.

McGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

FF

MCGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

McGILL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

McGill University Library
3 102 655 948 9