

Consensus Tigurinus or Dissensus Tigurinus ?

International Ecclesiastical Politics
in Switzerland in the mid-16th Century

Hirofumi Horie

Zurich and Geneva, both belonging to the Reformed camp, were leading Reformation cities in Switzerland and exerted a considerable influence upon Reformation movements in other countries. But the two cities differed significantly when we look at their modes and methods of engagement in ecumenical diplomacy, especially when they were confronted with increasingly vibrant ecumenical activities of the Lutheran princes and theologians. An attempt will be made here to trace the history of the contacts between these two differing confessional camps and see how the two Swiss cities diverged in approach despite the recently agreed Consensus of Zurich (*Consensus Tigurinus*).

The year 1549 was the height of optimism at least among the Reformed churches in Switzerland.¹⁾ A detailed examination of the relationship between Zurich and Geneva in the mid-16th century, however, shows that the two cities were not in total agreement on policy issues in spite of their basic concurrence on doctrines.²⁾ Zurich's averseness toward ecumenical diplomacy could already be witnessed when Zurich failed to accept Philipp Melancthon's Wittenberg Concord of 1536, which was the result of the Strasbourgers' effort to unite the Reformed churches of Switzerland with the Lutherans. On the other hand, it was probably during the period of John Calvin's sojourn in Strasbourg that he became more ecumenically-minded, which may have been a result of his closer acquaintance with Martin Bucer, Melancthon, and then Peter Martyr. Calvin's *Petit traité sur la Cène* published in 1540, as well as his attendance at *Religionsgespräche* in Frankfurt (1539), Hagenau-Worms (1540) and Regensburg (1541), are a testimony to his ecumenicity. Calvin was also determined not to alienate Heinrich Bullinger of Zurich in his

¹⁾ It was the year when a mutual consent on the sacraments between the ministers of the Church of Zurich and John Calvin, minister of the Church of Geneva, was formulated. The consent was named Zurich Consensus (*Consensus Tigurinus*).

²⁾ The problem is briefly treated by Gottfried W. Locher in 'Bullinger und Calvin — Probleme des Vergleichs ihrer Theologien', *Heinrich Bullinger 1504-1575 Gesammelte Aufsätze zum 400. Todestag*, Ulrich Gäbler and Erland Herkenrath, eds., (2 vols., Zürich, 1975), II, 1-33. For a succinct description of the period, see John T. McNeill, *The History and Character of Calvinism* (New York, 1967), pp. 196-200.

attempt to unify the Protestants. Therefore in the next ten years we find Calvin defending Bucer against Zurich's mistrust of the Strasbourger while working on the actual terms of an agreement between Geneva and Zurich. Writing to Bullinger probably in 1539, Calvin states: 'For Bucer I will answer, that there is no cause why he ought in anything to be suspected by you.' About a year before the Consensus of Zurich, Calvin pleaded with Bullinger on Bucer's behalf: 'I beseech you, my Bullinger, to consider with what propriety we should alienate ourselves from Bucer, seeing he subscribes this very confession which I have laid down.'³⁾ It is difficult to judge whether Calvin's case for Bucer's sincerity persuaded Bullinger and worked as a counterbalance to the reports from Anglo-Zurichers who branded Bucer almost as a Lutheran agent.⁴⁾

In the mid-16th century, in spite of the damage done to the ecumenical cause, for instance, by the publication of Luther's *Short Confession of the Sacrament* (1544), there was a resurgence of interest in an ecumenical conference of learned men. Jan Łaski (Johannes à Lasco) of Poland in his letter to Zurich theologians, Bullinger and Conrad Pellican, in March 1546 expressed his desire to settle the sacramental controversy through this means, calling Zurich to join a conference with a group of Lutheran princes. Across the English Channel, Archbishop Thomas Cranmer had a similar idea in order to 'do away with all doctrinal controversies, and build up an entire system of true doctrine', inviting Łaski and Melanchthon to join him in England.⁵⁾ Bullinger's general mistrust of such a conference or synod seems to have been a reflection of his worried concern over the Council of Trent, in which Lutherans took part. Bullinger judged that the Lutherans were running the risk of compromising doctrinal fundamentals in a search for a superficial concord, which in the end would never work. This view was shared by Bullinger throughout his life, leaving him virtually on the fringe of international ecclesiastical politics, of which England shared a part. Cranmer, still hoping to host a conference, tried to ease Bullinger's anxiety that England might send delegates to the Council of Trent. Then he continued:

but I considered it better, forasmuch as our adversaries are now holding their councils at Trent to confirm their errors, to recommend his majesty to grant his assistance, that

³⁾ Jules Bonnet, ed., *Letters of John Calvin* (New York, 1972), I, 114, 171. (hereafter *Letters*)

⁴⁾ See, for example, Hastings Robinson, ed., *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation* (Cambridge, 1846-7), Parker Society edn., I, 61 (John Hooper to Bullinger), II, 651-2, 662 (John Burcher to Bullinger) (hereafter *O.L.*). Burcher went so far as to claim, 'The death of Bucer affords England the greatest possible opportunity of concord. The leading men of England are desirous of a successor not less learned than himself, to supply his place.' *Ibid.*, p. 678. One cannot avoid an impression that Burcher's 'biased' description of the English religious scene could have worked as a detriment to Bullinger's proper understanding of it. Bullinger, in this respect, was not properly informed of the nature of the Edwardian Reformation.

⁵⁾ George Cornelius Gorham, ed., *Gleanings of a Few Scattered Ears, during the Period of the Reformation in England and of the Times Immediately Succeeding AD 1533 to 1588* (Cambridge, 1857), p. 34 (hereafter *Gleanings*); *O.L.*, I, 17; John Edmund Cox, ed., *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer* (Cambridge, 1846), Parker Society edn., p. 420-2 (Cranmer to John a Lasco, 4 July 1548).

in England, or elsewhere, there might be convoked a synod of the most learned and excellent persons, in which provision might be made for the purity of ecclesiastical doctrine, and especially for an agreement upon the sacramentarian controversy.⁶⁾

If any agreements were to be reached on the Lord's Supper, the protestant divines had to overcome the Romanist-Zwinglian antithesis. In this regard *Consensus Tigurinus* should have presented a basis upon which all the Reformed parties including Bucerians could concur. As for England, the *Consensus* must have been a boost for the supporters of the Reformed cause. In his letter to Bucer, Calvin explains three principal matters he had obtained from the Zurichers:

(1) That Sacraments are not merely [signs] of external profession, but true testimonies and seals of the grace of God. (2) That grace is not si[mply] offered to us there, but that God efficaciously [works] through them. (3) That those who receive them by faith, find Christ there with all His [gifts].⁷⁾

These principles were not so much concessions on Bullinger's part since Zurich already a year before seems to have accepted Calvin's position in principle. Calvin's letter to Bullinger in June, 1548 is an indication of this:

What then is the sum of our doctrine? It is this, that when we discern here on earth the bread and wine, our minds must be raised to heaven in order to enjoy Christ, and that Christ is there present with us, while we seek him above the elements of this world.... And you also concede that the sign is by no means empty.⁸⁾

The key to the broader Reformed view of the Lord's Supper is the question how to eschew *manducatio indignorum* without adopting an empty memorialist view and thus to guarantee a true presence of Christ in the Supper and the efficacy of the Sacrament. The answer was provided by the idea of *sursum corda* with the Holy Spirit working as an agent in response to man's faith.⁹⁾

⁶⁾ *O.L.*, I, 23. For Calvin's concurrence with Cranmer on a general synod, see *Letters*, II, 345-6.

⁷⁾ *Gleanings*, p. 95.

⁸⁾ *Letters*, II, 170; *Gleanings*, p. 50. Also in Wilhelm Baum, Eduard Cunitz and Eduard Reuss, eds, *Ioannis Calvini Opera quae supersunt Omnia* (Brunswick, 1863-97; Berlin, 1900), XII, 726-31 (hereafter *C.O.*). 'Quae igitur sententiae nostrae summa est? Quum hic in terra panem et vinum cernamus, erigendas esse in coelum mentes ut Christo fruuntur. Ac tum praesentem nobis esse Christum, dum supra huius mundi elementa ipsum quaerimus.... Et vos etiam conceditis signum nequaquam esse inane.' In fact, already as early as 1532, Bullinger in his *Uff Johannsen Wyenischen Bischoffs Trostbüchlein trostliche Verantwortung* seems to have abandoned a 'sacramentarian' view in favour of sacramentalism in which sacramental presence of Christ is acknowledged. See B.J. Kidd, ed., *Documents Illustrative of the Continental Reformation* (Oxford, 1911), p. 651.

⁹⁾ Łaski also expressed the same view in his letter to Bullinger and Conrad Pellican in 1546: 'Here I

As Joseph C. McLelland has successfully demonstrated, there was a degree of unity existing among the Reformers far beyond what their successors allow or Reformation historians have so far recognised.¹⁰⁾ However, the basic unity on doctrines does not necessarily mean they agreed on every detail in the actual ecclesiastical diplomacy, and even on doctrinal matters each Reformer placed a varied emphasis on certain aspects of doctrines.¹¹⁾ On the Supper, William P. Haugaard is correct when he says that the chain of mediating theologians, standing between Luther and Zwingli, runs from Melancthon, whose views touched those of Luther, through Bucer, Calvin, and Peter Martyr to Bullinger, whose views touched those of Zwingli.¹²⁾ Thus there existed an amazing underlying agreement on the doctrinal fundamentals among these men. But in the nitty-gritty of actual negotiations, Bullinger could go as far as Calvin, but found it difficult to accept Bucerians, not to mention Melancthon's celebrated *Confessio Augustana variata*, which was presented to the Regensburg Colloquy of 1541 and was subsequently disavowed by the Lutherans.

Bucer, on the other hand, despite his general acceptance of the *Consensus Tigurinus*,¹³⁾ still did not fail to throw three rather negative comments on the *Consensus* in his letter to Calvin. First, more stress should be placed upon the true communion with Christ than the formula allows. Secondly, Bucer wanted to avoid a specific phraseology in the form of a new article as to the whereabouts of the body of Christ. Thirdly, defending his Lutheran friends, Bucer wrote that he had discussed and rediscussed the whole of this controversy with many, and even with the most rigid Lutherans, yet he never could discover that they entertained any other opinion than that Christ was truly given or received in the Supper. Then he, after condemning the notion of Ubiquity cherished by some Lutherans, blamed John Hooper, future bishop of Gloucester in England, who grossly misrepresented Bucer by publicly

assent, and I confess that, our minds being drawn up into heaven by faith through the Holy Spirit, we there receive a true communion of the Body and Blood of Christ,...' *Gleanings*, p. 32. Peter Martyr's concurring view is expressed, for example, in the preface to *Disputatio de Eucharistia Sacramento Habita in Celeberr. Vniuersitate Oxonien. In Anglia...* (Tiguri, 1552), in which Martyr in effect said that those who criticized him for not accepting Transubstantiation and thus leaning toward Anabaptists did not understand the role of the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament: 'efficaciã spiritus Sancti nihil morantur, quam nos in hoc sacramento statuimus.' pp. 8-9. See also his confession on the Supper exhibited to the Senate of Strasbourg in 1556 when he was called to Zurich and his opinion touching the presence of the body of Christ in the Eucharist introduced at the colloquy at Poissy. Peter Martyr Vermigli, *Loci Communes* (London, 1583), pp. 1068-70, 1070-1 (hereafter *L.C.*). Also see his 'Confessio sev sententia D. Petri Martyris Vermilii de coena Domini, exhibitã amplissimo Senatui Argentinensi, cum vocaretur Tigurum, Anno M.D. LXI.' *L.C.*, p. 1069. I have used Martin's English translation of 1583, but unless otherwise stated, I follow the page numbers of the 1583 Latin edition.

¹⁰⁾ Joseph C. McLelland, *The Visible Words of God* (Edinburgh, 1957), p. 278.

¹¹⁾ For instance, in spite of Bucer's essential agreement with Martyr's theology, Bucer did not share Martyr's emphasis on a 'local' presence of Christ's body and the *sursum corda* as the movement of faith in the Supper. *Ibid.*, p. 275.

¹²⁾ W. P. Haugaard, *Elizabeth and the English Reformation* (Cambridge, 1968), p. 266.

¹³⁾ 'I heartily thank the Lord, that you have obtained those pious [confessions] on the primary use of the Sacraments, efficacy, and the feeding on Christ through faith:...' *Gleanings*, p. 99. See also *C.O.*, XIII, 350-8. Gorham transcribed the letter from a copy in Parker manuscripts kept in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. CCC MS. 102, p. 289.

spreading that he shared this notion. He also blamed Bullinger who had almost believed Hooper's report from England.¹⁴⁾

This letter points to some important aspects of later ecumenical developments. First, the fact that Bullinger was not adequately informed by such English correspondents as Hooper on the English situation especially in relation to Bucer's role seems to have been costly, leading him to the failure to draw his own ecumenical pictures, and could have triggered his aversion to ecumenical politics. Secondly, Calvin was probably not yet aware that in ten years time he himself would stand much closer to Bucer with his irenic motives. In 1549, Calvin was hoping that *Consensus Tigurinus* could provide a base for all the reformed parties to be united, including Bucer and if possible Melanchthon. As the content of the *Consensus* and the process of negotiations between Geneva and Zurich would show,¹⁵⁾ however, it was Bullinger rather than Calvin who conducted a tougher bargain, and from the outset the *Consensus* as a basis for further ecumenical talks was destined to fail.¹⁶⁾ Bucer's somewhat cool reception of the *Consensus* was accompanied by Melanchthon's failure to endorse it, with the only consolatory result being that all the Swiss Reformed Churches became its signatories. Therefore to include Melanchthon at the table of negotiations, Calvin himself had to move toward Bucer's ecumenicity without sacrificing his theological tenets. This is the backdrop against which ecumenical talks between the Reformed and the Lutherans in the late 1550s should be interpreted, and *Confessio Augustana variata* was to provide Calvin with a basis from which to start the negotiations with the Lutherans, though this time not just with 'Crypto-Calvinists' like Melanchthon but principally with 'official' Lutheran representatives. It is no surprise Bullinger was not happy about a possible union with Lutherans on the basis of the Augsburg Confession, even the one based on the mitigated form of the *Variata*. Bullinger did not believe that confessional unity could be affirmed on the basis of a Lutheran confession rather than the *Consensus Tigurinus*, 1551 versions of which were published in Zurich by Rodolph Vuissenbach and in Geneva by Jean Crispin respectively and looked almost identical. But already in the early 1550s a theological hiatus began to open up between Calvin and Bullinger in spite of the recent agreement in Zurich.

It is not right to interpret the shift of Calvin's ecumenical policy from the Zurich

¹⁴⁾ *Gleanings*, pp. 100-6 (Bucer to Calvin, August 1549). These were not so much a criticism of the *Consensus Tigurinus*, as McLelland seems to maintain, but rather Bucer's indirect message to Zurichers. Bucer basically was endorsing the *Consensus*. 'D. quidem Bucerus, cuius nos indicio tribuimus quantum par est, libenter amplectitur.' C.O., XIII, 457 (Calvin to Myconius, December 1549).

¹⁵⁾ For the description of the discussion which Calvin gave Oswald Myconius see C.O., XIII, 456-7.

¹⁶⁾ As Otto Erich Strasser observed, the *Consensus Tigurinus* by nature could not become a solid basis upon which to build the unity of Protestant churches. 'Der Consensus Tigurinus steht wohl am Anfang der Bugründung einer eigentlichen reformierten Kirche, aber dieses Bündnis, vor allem durch Bullinger und Calvin bewerkstelligt, ist eine entschlossene Absage nicht nur gegenüber dem Katholizismus, sondern auch an das Luthertum. Damit ist aber dieser reformierte Consens... kein Beitrag zur Einigung der christlichen kirche,... Er muss vielmehr als Ausprägung und Stärkung einer besonderen Konfession und so als Konfessionalismus angesehen und gewertet werden.' 'Der Consensus Tigurinus', *Zwingliana*, IX (1949), 1-2.

alliance to his pursuit of relationships with the Lutherans solely on doctrinal grounds. There was one major political justification for this shift. In 1549, the Genevans were concerned about the intensified persecution of Huguenots in France and sought the Zurichers' approval of the renewal of the Swiss alliance with Henry II of France in order to bail out these Huguenots.¹⁷⁾ This mission to Zurich was entrusted to Calvin by the Genevan council. He failed to accomplish this task while reaching an agreement with Bullinger on doctrines with the resultant *Consensus Tigurinus*. Negotiations with Lutherans in 1557 also started with similar political motives: a concern for persecuted Protestants in France and Piedmont and the desire to solicit Lutheran support. Admitting this political necessity for a renewed approach to the Lutheran princes, the shift of Calvin's ecumenical policy could partly be attributed to his growing uneasiness toward Bullinger.

Although his exclusion of predestination from the doctrine of God in the 1559 *Institutes of the Christian Religion* might indicate a move away from speculative determinism and a retreat from a certain type of doctrine of predestination, Calvin in the early 1550s was adamantly trying to win the battle against Jerome Bolsec, who, holding on to many tenets of semi-Pelagianism, attacked the notion that God's will was equally well expressed in election as in reprobation and that both were based on a purely arbitrary act of God, without consideration for future faith and unbelief. The magistrates of Geneva then asked for the advice of the leading Swiss churches. The answers unanimously endorsed Calvin's position recognizing the doctrine of election but solicited indulgence for Bolsec.¹⁸⁾ However, the answer given by Zurich did not satisfy Calvin, nor did Bullinger's private letter. Writing to William Farel in December 1551, Calvin expressed his discontent:

I can hardly express to you, my dear Farel, how much I am annoyed by their rudeness. There is less humanity among us than among wild beasts.... Should you be displeased with the general letter of the men of Zurich, let me tell you, that Bullinger's private letter to me was not a whit better,... It is not fair that I should be troubled with his trifles, while he is, at the same time, looking down on our wants with supreme contempt.¹⁹⁾

Then he wrote to Bullinger in January 1552 directly to show his dissatisfaction:

Inasmuch as we experienced — not without severe pain — considerably less support from you than we had anticipated, I prefer bringing my complaint candidly before you, rather than nourish my displeasure by keeping it to myself.... Your charging us with the want of moderation and humanity was caused, we think, by your placing less

¹⁷⁾ Strasser, 'Der Consensus Tigurinus', pp. 8-9.

¹⁸⁾ *Letters*, II, 331-2 notes.

¹⁹⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 329.

confidence in our letter than you ought to have done.... Although you disappointed my expectations, I nevertheless gladly offer you our friendship.²⁰⁾

Zurich's counsel of moderation troubled Calvin and here existed a sign of disagreement, though not fundamental, between the two great reformers on one of the key theological issues of the time.

The reflection of the disagreement between the two could also be witnessed in England. In his controversy with Hooper, Bartholomew Traheron, following the Genevan interpretation, criticized Hooper whose view mirrored that of Bullinger.²¹⁾ Two years later Traheron tried to clarify Bullinger's notion on predestination and the providence of God as he was informed that Bullinger leaned too much to Melancthon's views. Traheron revealed that he and the greater number among them embraced the opinion of Calvin as being perspicuous and most agreeable to the Scripture. Bullinger replied in March and made clear the points of differences with Calvin.²²⁾ Traheron's reply shows that he disagreed with Bullinger since the Zurich divine seemed to take away both the providence and the wisdom of God altogether by not endorsing Calvin's views. Traheron's worry proved to be well-founded. Bullinger seems to have avoided mentioning reprobation and negated double-predestinarian views, even though by the early 1560s he might have changed his position in favour of Calvin under the influence of Peter Martyr.

The most celebrated episode on the question of Bullinger's doctrine of predestination during this period was his attitude toward the theological dispute between Girolamo Zanchi and Johannes Marbach which broke out in Strasbourg in 1561. Bullinger supported here the extreme view of Zanchian predestination. But as Peter Walser leads us to believe, this act of Bullinger's could have been more an official endorsement of the general Reformed position than a personal doctrinal commitment. Or the episode signifies at most a reluctant move on the part of Bullinger to Calvin's position.²³⁾ We can safely conclude that on the issue of predestination Bullinger did not want to probe too deeply into the hidden mysteries of God but that this fact does not ultimately dilute his firm commitment to the sovereignty of God's grace and his absolute understanding of the nature of predestination.

²⁰⁾ *Ibid.*, pp. 332-3. Bullinger's private letter to Calvin dated 27 November 1551 is printed in *C.O.*, XIV, 207-9. See also Peter Walser, *Die Prädestination bei Heinrich Bullinger im Zusammenhang mit seiner Gotteslehre* (Zürich, 1957), pp. 168-81.

²¹⁾ On Traheron see S.T. Bindoff, *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1509-1558* (London, 1982), III, 473-4.

²²⁾ Edward Cardwell, *Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England* (2 vols., Oxford, 1839), II, 30 note.

²³⁾ P. Walser, *Die Prädestination*, pp. 182-3. The difficulty of interpreting Bullinger's position in the 1560s is partly caused by the lack of conclusive evidence. For the radical nature of Martyr's view, see, for example, 'Of Providence and Predestination', *L.C.*, pp. 992-4. On reprobation he wrote: 'Reprobation is the most wise purpose of God, whereby God constantlie decreed before all worlds, without anie iniustice, not to take mercie on them whome he loued not:...' On the Zurich predestinarian dispute of 1560 that brought the dismissal of Theodor Bibliander, see Joachim Staedtke, 'Der Züricher Prädestinationsstreit von 1560', *Zwingliana*, IX, 9 (1953), 536-46.

The issue of discipline did not bring the two reformers closer, either. Facing the challenge of the Libertines,²⁴ Calvin wrote to Bullinger that Bude was to be sent to solicit the Zurichers' opinions. The point of this mission was to get an official Zurich acceptance of the Genevan position.²⁵ Here again, despite their basic agreement on the issue, Bullinger exhorted Calvin to use moderation. His balanced position is most evident in his letter to Calvin on 12 December 1553, in which Bullinger, while concurring in principle with what Genevans taught, advised Calvin to use moderation lest he lose those whose salvation is desired by the Lord (*modum adhibeatis rebus omnibus, ne rigore nimio perdati quos servatos cupit Dominus*). This is a clear indication that Bullinger was worried about the possibility of Calvin probing too deeply into the hidden mysteries of God. A mitigated form of Bullinger's teaching can also be seen in the earlier section of the same letter. Accepting the Genevan ecclesiastical laws, Bullinger stated:

Dudum audivisse nos de legibus istius ecclesiae consistorialibus, et agnoscere illas pias esse et accedere ad verbi Dei praescriptum: ideoque non videri admittendum ut per innovationem mutantur. Satius esse ut integrae conserventur, hoc praesertim saeculo, in quo subinde homines fiunt deteriores.²⁶

But then Bullinger qualified his statement:

Et quanquam nostra disciplina vestrae per omnia non respondeat, illam tamen pro ratione temporum, locorum et personarum esse temperatam, nec ideo vestram velle subversam.²⁷

The most important question pertinent to the disciplinarian debate is the issue of excommunication; whether excommunication should be used in the process of applying programs of discipline and, if used, to whom the right of excommunication belongs. This question exerted significant influence on Puritan proponents of the churches in England who blamed the English Episcopal administration for its abuse of the right to

²⁴ The immediate problem facing Calvin concerned disciplining Philibert Berthelier whose excommunication was revoked by the Council in Geneva. See 'Annales Calviniani', *C.O.* XXI, 551. 'Septembre. (1553) Samedi 2. Sus ce que hier par resolution de Conseilz Messieurs arrestarent que attendu les raisons et excuses de Philibert Bertellier le quel auroit prier de luy donner liberte de recepvoir la sancte cene: ce que fust fait et arreste non obstant les choses et remonstrances faites par le S^r Calvin: le quel non obstant le commandement a luy fait ne veult consentir a cela alleguant plusieurs raisons: veu que ledit Bertellier na point obayr au Consistoyre ny a point obtenu reconciliation et liberation deux ce que doit estre fait iouxte les ordonnances et esdict sur ce passez, et fait auxquelz il ne veult contrevenir:...'.

²⁵ *C.O.*, XIV, 673-4.

²⁶ *C.O.*, XIV, 696-8 (Bullinger to Calvin, 12 December 1553)

²⁷ *Ibid.* For the mature form of the Genevan ecclesiastical ordinance, see 'Les Ordonnances ecclésiastiques de l'Eglise de Genève', *C.O.*, X, 91-124. Calvin's view on excommunication is found in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (Philadelphia, 1960), IV, 12, 8.

excommunicate.

John Whitgift, stepped up an archiepiscopal surveillance over the clergy through the court of high commission upon being confirmed as archbishop of Canterbury in 1583.²⁸⁾ Archbishop did not deny ecclesiastical discipline to the civil authorities. But he believed that the ordinaries should use their right to excommunicate recusants in case the civil justice did not function properly. What the Puritans and continental divines like Beza deplored was that the line between civil justice and the ordinaries in the matter of excommunication was not strictly drawn in England, and as a result, excommunications and absolutions had quite often been pronounced on the authority of some lawyers and even sometimes on that of one person, in mere pecuniary and civil actions.²⁹⁾ Zurich's position on the issue was that authority to punish offences resided only with the Christian civil magistrate and not with the ordinaries. Thus the meaning of excommunication was quite different in this sort of community, and as a divine ordinance it simply ceased to exist. When historians say Zurich was opposed to excommunication by the clergy altogether, it should not be taken to mean that the power to excommunicate the offender was given to the civil authority. The idea such as dichotomy between civil and ecclesiastical authorities or lay encroachment on things ecclesiastical were no longer applicable in an urban Christian community like Zurich where state and church belonged to each other and both were responsible for the entire Christian *Gemeinde*. What could have offended Zurich was not that the civil authority in England was involved in the punitive actions against

²⁸⁾ Whitgift's eagerness to quell the Puritan upsurge can be seen in his 'Articles touchinge prechers and other orders for the church', which he issued in the same month that he was confirmed as archbishop. Lambeth Palace Library, Whitgift Register I, fo. 97. The articles are printed in John Strype, *The Life and Acts of John Whitgift, D.D.* (3 vols. Oxford, 1832), I, 229-33. Also in Edward Cardwell, ed., *Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England* (2 vols. Oxford, 1839), I, 411-16 and David Wilkins, ed., *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae* (4 vols. London, 1737), IV, 299. According to Strype, these articles were based upon yet another set of articles agreed upon in the synod of 1575, which were reduced to a shorter set of more necessary articles in 1581. They were intended to be confirmed by an act of parliament. These articles could roughly be divided into two sections. The first part simply consisted of means to enforce uniformity, including the usual three-fold subscription to the supremacy, the Prayer Book and the Articles of Religion. The second part appears to be an adoption of articles which were delivered to the bishops from the Lower House of convocation in February 1581. However, on the issue of excommunication, Whitgift did not follow the line of argument propounded in the convocation. The articles of the 1581 convocation, while admitting that the alteration of the conventional use of excommunication was difficult and might interrupt all ecclesiastical jurisdiction, expressed a desire that the problem be examined by 'two or three honest persons well skilled in the ecclesiastical laws'. Edward Cardwell, *Synodalia: A Collection of Articles of Religion, Canons, and Proceedings of Convocations in the Province of Canterbury, from the Year 1547 to the Year 1717* (2 vols. Oxford, 1842), II, 548-9. An attached document, 'an argument propounded in the convocation, concerning reforming the ordinary use of excommunication', argued that excommunication might not be taken away entirely from the ecclesiastical judges, but proposed that instead of the writ 'de excommunicato capiendo et relaxando', a somewhat softened version 'de contemptore jurisdictionis ecclesiasticae capiendo vel relaxando' should be issued to contumacious persons if they remained so for forty days. *Ibid.*, pp. 549-52. However, Whitgift failed to follow the proposal made by the Lower House of convocation on excommunication.

²⁹⁾ Joannes Henricus Hessels, ed., *Epistulae et Tractatus cum Reformationis tum Ecclesiae Londino-Batavae* (Cambridge, 1897), p. 281 (The ministers of the Genevan church on ecclesiastical polity, 24 October 1567) (hereafter *Epistulae et Tractatus*).

recusants but that excommunication was abused.³⁰⁾ But here it is suffice to say that Calvin regarded the consistory as being responsible for implementing moral discipline, using excommunication as its ultimate punishment. Calvin was not ignorant that there were pious and learned men, including Zurich divines, who did not consider excommunication to be necessary under Christian princes. Nevertheless, he was convinced that the employment of that right by the consistory was evidently in accordance with Christian doctrine.³¹⁾

It was over their policies towards the Lutherans that we find Calvin and Bullinger the furthest apart. While Bullinger, *der Stadtpfarrer*, was principally engaged in the ecclesiastical politics of a city whose magistrates supported the course of the Reformation, Calvin, a French refugee, had to be concerned with French and Piedmontese protestants in a hostile environment. The difference of their working environments seems to have contributed to the distinct approach each reformer maintained when faced with ecumenical talks with the Lutherans. A hope of conciliation with the Lutherans already arose among some Reformed theologians like Francis Hotman who in early 1557 saw Melanchthon as an ally in an attempt to form a united Protestant front in their struggle against the Gallican persecution of the French protestants. As for Melanchthon, he seems to have believed that the Augsburg Confession (*variata*) could include Calvinists as well as Lutherans by avoiding disputes over *adiaphora*.³²⁾

Calvin's gradual and cautious change of policy had already manifested itself in the previous year. In a letter to Łaski, Calvin expressed his uneasiness over Łaski's private contacts with Württembergers, i.e. Pietro Vergerio and Johann Brenz. Brenz, one of the principal architects of the Lutheran territorial state church and a chief theological adviser to Duke Christoph of Württemberg, had written the *Confessio Virtembergica* in 1551 for presentation at the Council of Trent.³³⁾ Vergerio, who was translating Brenz's *Confession of Württemberg* and *Katechismus* into Italian in 1553, became a leading figure for the advancement of 'international Lutheranism', and thus was met with grave mistrust by the Reformed theologians.³⁴⁾ What upset Calvin and Martyr, who reported the incident, was

³⁰⁾ The abuses of excommunication together with the same in the commutation of penance were also a concern of the privy council, thus it drew up inquiries in November. Strype, *The Life and Acts of John Whitgift*, I, 237-8.

³¹⁾ *Letters*, II, 443-4 (Calvin to the pastors and doctors of the church of Zurich, 26 November 1553). See also my 'Zürcher Ehegericht und Genfer Konsistorium' ('Zurich Marriage Court and Geneva Consistory Court') *Senshu University Institute of Social Science Monthly Bulletin*, 443, 1-41 (written in Japanese).

³²⁾ Donald R. Kelley, *François Hotman: a Revolutionary's Ordeal* (Princeton, 1973), p. 94. On Melanchthon's doctrine, Hotman succinctly reported to Calvin on 17 February 1557: 'Adiecit in sacramento nostrum esse, in praedestinatione aperte ac nominatim tibi repugnare, et librum iam in minibus habere.' *C.O.*, XIV, 414.

³³⁾ James M. Estes, 'Johannes Brenz and the Institutionalization of the Reformation in Württemberg', *Central European History*, VI, 1 (1973), 48. Also see his 'Church Order and the Christian Magistrate According to Johannes Brenz', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 59 (1968), 5-24.

³⁴⁾ For a brief account of Vergerio's life, see the introduction in T. Schiess, ed., *Bullingers*

not so much the fact of Łaski's contacts with these Lutherans as the procedure in which the dispute on the Lord's Supper between Brenz and Łaski was conducted, namely without competent witnesses and judges (*sine idoneis testibus vel arbitris*). While complaining to Łaski in April for entangling himself with Vergerio,³⁵⁾ Calvin seems to have been inclined to show the Lutherans that he was interested in a measure of moderation.³⁶⁾ At the same time he explained to Łaski some difficulties in bringing the Zurichers to a similar conciliatory position, since Bullinger feared that more problems would arise from whatever little concessions they might make to the Lutherans. Underlying the difficulties was Zurich's aversion to the colloquy, which Calvin attempted unsuccessfully to overcome.³⁷⁾ Calvin sought Bullinger's approval, carefully choosing the words in his letter of 1 July:

Respecting the colloquy, you will pardon me if I differ a little from you; for though it does not seem to offer so much advantage as I could wish, yet because it would be far more disgraceful to refuse, than to incur the reproach of obstinacy in asserting with firmness and good faith the true doctrine, I am of opinion that we should commit the issue to God, provided we do not avoid the light.³⁸⁾

It is rather difficult to interpret the motives behind Łaski's approach to the Lutherans. For Calvin, the involvement with the Lutherans was a necessary step for the advancement of the Protestant cause in France (and Piedmont), which was to become more evident in the following year. But for Łaski it was also his concern for his native Poland that might have brought him to the table. Łaski was reminded by his nephew that the king of Poland would be gratified if before Łaski returned to Poland he would write an apology demonstrating that his doctrine corresponded with the Confession of Augsburg.³⁹⁾ The colloquy however, simply clarified a difference between Łaski and the Lutherans on the Supper. Łaski's

Korrespondenz mit den Graubündnern (Basel, 1904-6), I, LXXI-LXXXIII. For Brenz's description of the colloquy, see Viktor Ernst, ed., *Briefwechsel des Herzogs Christoph von Württemberg* (4 vols., Stuttgart, 1899-1907), IV, 73-6 (Brenz to Christoph, 21 May 1556) (hereafter *Briefwechsel*). On three points Łaski and Brenz concurred: 'Einig sind beide 1. in Verwerfung der päpstlichen Transsubstantiation; 2. veram praesenciam Christi in coena affirmant utrique; 3. veram praesenciam corporis et sanguinis Christi in coena concedunt utrique.' But they differed quite naturally on the mode of the presence. *Ibid.*, pp. 74-5.

³⁵⁾ 'Nihil tamen mihi magis displicuit quam te consilia cum Vergerio miscere, cuius hominis vanitatem tibi non citius cognitam fuisse miror....' *C.O.*, XVI, 170.

³⁶⁾ 'Ego vero, ut libenter concedo obscura et ambigua vel flexiloqua conciliatione nihil esse deterius, ita non despero sinceram et ingenuam moderationem posse inveniri,....' *Ibid.*, col. 171.

³⁷⁾ *Ibid.* For Bullinger's abhorrence of this meeting, see also *Ibid.*, col. 239 (Bullinger to Calvin, 26 July 1556) and cols. 269-70 (Bullinger to Calvin, 28 August 1556). 'Optimus et sanctissimus vir Ioannes a Lasco contulit cum Brentio, sed ad finem colloqui audio Principem hortatum ut recipiat vel agnoscat confessionem Augustanam et suam peregrinam ecclesiam coniungat cum Germaniae ecclesiis etc. Annon hoc futurum praedixeram? Si mille instituantur colloquia, frustra agemus cum istis.' col.239.

³⁸⁾ *Letters*, III, 285-6. Also see *C.O.*, XVI, 219.

³⁹⁾ *Letters*, III, 285.

position, however, was drawn nearer to Melanchthon's by this time.⁴⁰⁾ The Lutheran intent was more obvious. In the same year, at the Imperial Diet of Regensburg, the decision was made to convene a colloquy of theologians both Protestant and Catholic which was to take place in Worms in the autumn of 1557. However, before the colloquy, the Lutherans were aware of the need to sort out their differences with the Reformed, hopefully using the Augsburg Confession (*Invariata*) as a norm. If Lutheran princes and their divines, evidently except the Gnesio-Lutherans, conceded acceptance of the *Variata* form of the Confession, with which many Reformed theologians could concur, doctrinal unity could have been accomplished. In contrast to the Lutheran search for a form of doctrinal unity including on the Lord's Supper, the Reformed party seems to have been looking for a sort of political alliance in the face of the ever-increasing menace from the Catholics and did not intend to bend before the Lutherans even an inch beyond what is implied in the *Variata* on the Sacrament.⁴¹⁾ Calvin seems to have been confident that he could avoid being pressed to accept the unacceptable and still come up with some agreements. However, he may have overestimated the influence of Melanchthon's group among the Lutherans in the late 1550s and Melanchthon's eagerness for reform.⁴²⁾ Judging from the single but crucial difference on the mode of Christ's presence in the Supper, what even successful negotiations could bring about was at most a peaceful coexistence, accepting each other's shortcomings on this issue, partly for the sake of political expediency, and it was to this end that Calvinists and Lutherans started meeting in 1557. It should be remembered that in confronting the Catholics neither the Reformed nor the Lutherans had to prove that they agreed on every point of the doctrines. All they had to do was to make Catholic opponents realise in the colloquy that they agreed more than they disagreed with each other.

⁴⁰⁾ At the Synod of Pinczow, interim motion was made by Łaski to introduce a variation of Melanchthon's Augsburg Confession. Norman Davies, *God's Playground: A History of Poland* (2 vols., Oxford, 1981), I, 183-4. Vergerio was also active in Poland in 1556-7, trying to influence the course of the Reformation there. See Theodor Wotschke, *Geschichte der Reformation in Polen* (Leipzig, 1911), pp. 153-65. Bullinger expressed his concern probably over Vergerio's activities: 'The Lord be praised that John a Lasco has found so much favour with (Sigismund) the king (of Poland)... We wish that the king would effect the reforms through a Lasco alone, as there is danger in engaging men of different opinions for the task.' Hessels, ed., *Epistulae et Tractatus*, p. 73 (Bullinger to Utenhove, 6 November 1557).

⁴¹⁾ *Confessio Augustana Invariata* reads: 'De Coena Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint, et distribuuntur vescentibus in Coena Domini; et improbant secus docentes.' In the *Variata*, the word 'distribuuntur', which was offensive to the Reformed theologians, was altered to the more acceptable 'exhibeantur', so that the final form reads: 'De Coena Domini docent quod cum pane et vino vere exhibeantur corpus et sanguis Christi vescentibus in Coena Domini.' Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (3 vols., New York, 1919), I, 241 and III, 13. Also in Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider and H.E. Bindseil, eds., *Corpus Reformatorum* (1834-), XXVI, 278 and 357. In the *Variata* form of Augsburg Confession, the problem of *manducatio indignorum* was avoided, at least according to the Reformed interpretation, by the formula which simply asserts that Christ is truly 'exhibited' in the bread and wine. Lutherans could interpret the formula otherwise since it did not deny explicitly the reception of Christ's body by the wicked. Bullinger's insistence that superficial agreement would do more harm than good is quite understandable. On the other hand, we should not underestimate the fact that, other than on the Sacrament, the two parties agreed with each other on other major doctrines.

⁴²⁾ *Letters*, III, 351 (Calvin to Bullinger, 31 August 1557).

Calvin's confidence is revealed in his letter to Bullinger dated 30 May 1557. It was the period of ascendancy for the Calvinists. Pushing aside Bullinger's doubt that little could be hoped for from a conference with such a figure as Brenz, Calvin thought it necessary to emphasise what they could agree on with the Lutherans.

... nothing will more further our cause than to assume, in our confession, that the doctrine of our party is substantially the same as that of our adversaries, and that with the exception of one article, there is a fortunate agreement between us. Thus a confession respecting a clear and undoubted matter would remove all grounds of controversy.⁴³⁾

This positive attitude was reflected in his sending Theodore Beza and Farel on a mission to bring the persecuted Protestants in France or in Piedmont under the protection of the German princes. Bullinger obviously endorsed this mission. But in Strasbourg Beza and Farel engaged themselves in a theological discussion which according to the Zurichers went beyond the stated purpose of the mission. There they were asked to draw up a statement to which both Lutherans and Zwinglians might agree in an attempt to bring German and Swiss churches together, and as a result there came in May two versions of the confession, the first prepared for Michael Diller at Frankfurt and the second a revision given to Jacob Andreae at Göppingen.⁴⁴⁾ Beza, reporting his 'successful' trip, told Bullinger that the Reformed side should send someone to Frankfurt to determine the common doctrinal position of the Protestants before the colloquy with Catholics at Worms.⁴⁵⁾ But Bullinger was very displeased when he heard the news that Beza and Farel extended the aim of their mission to discuss doctrine and actually produced a confession of faith which according to the Zurichers was ambiguous, and he demanded from Beza an explanation.⁴⁶⁾ It was not just Bullinger but also Martyr who could not believe the development in Germany and disapproved of Beza's action.⁴⁷⁾

⁴³⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 333.

⁴⁴⁾ Jill Raitt, *The Eucharistic Theology of Theodore Beza* (Pennsylvania, 1972), pp. 3-4. For the text of the Confession, see 'Confession de Foi Concernant la Sainte Cène Remise par Bèze et Farel' in *Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze*, eds. Henri Meylan, Alain Dufour and Arnaud Tripet (Geneva, 1960-), II, 243-8 (hereafter *Correspondance*).

⁴⁵⁾ *Correspondance*, II, 68 (Beza to Bullinger, 5 June 1557). Soon later Beza, writing to Calvin, expressed his concern that they might miss the chance of reconciliation as Zurichers remained silent. So he asked Calvin to write to the duke of Württemberg as well as to Brenz and Andreae, 'ut saltem intelligant te huic pacificationi non defuturum.' *Ibid.*, p. 70 (Beza to Calvin, 13 June 1557).

⁴⁶⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 75 (Bullinger to Beza, 16 July 1557). What upset Bullinger further was the fact that Beza had not communicated the matter of the Confession to him, when Beza insisted on the need for the Reformed theologians to participate in the Colloquy of Frankfurt. *Ibid.*, p. 76 (Beza to Calvin, 17 July 1557).

⁴⁷⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 79 (Martyr to Beza, 20 July 1557). and p. 82 (Beza to Farel, 2 August 1557). The expressed desire for Martyr's attendance at the coming Colloquy of Frankfurt can be found in Valerand Poullain's letter to Martyr, in which was enclosed a copy of the confession handed down to Diller. *Ibid.*, p. 251. For Bullinger's disapproval see also his letter to Calvin on 13 August. *C.O.*, XVI, 567.

In spite of the protestation from Zurich, Calvin did not lose any time to support the action taken by Beza and Farel. In his letter to Bullinger, Calvin tried to justify Beza's attempt for rapprochement:

As there is no lurking danger in Beza's confession, I readily excuse him, because, in consideration of the brethren, with studied moderation he has endeavoured to conciliate fierce men, especially as he previously distinctly explained all his different meanings. If on his return he did not communicate it to you, be perfectly assured that that happened from mere inadvertency.⁴⁸⁾

At the end of August, Calvin again wrote to Bullinger, expressing his endorsement of the confession:

I do not perceive that Beza's confession contains what is not quite in harmony with our doctrine, for what you adduce respecting the word 'substance' may be reconciled with it without any difficulty. And he himself, doubt not, will extricate himself adroitly from all the objections of which you are afraid. He has not explained, I admit, with sufficient clearness, the whole controversy, but the time did not allow of it, nor was it expedient, since it was a brief excuse and not a confession which he had to present.⁴⁹⁾

The use of the word 'substantia', which Bullinger abhorred, appeared twice in the confession presented to Diller, and a few more times in the Göppingen Confession. The one which could have offended Bullinger is in article two of the former confession, which reads:

Credimus ac profiteamur in Coena Domini non omnia modo Christi beneficia, sed etiam ipsam Christi substantiam, ipsam, inquam, veram carnem Filii hominis,...., et verum illum sanguinem quem fudit pro nobis, non significari tantum aut symbolice, typice vel figurate duntaxat tanquam absentis memoriam proponi, sed vere et certo exhiberi et applicanda offerri,...⁵⁰⁾

There is no question that for Bullinger the whole expression savoured of the 'Lutheran' rather than 'Reformed'. But for Calvin and Beza it was still within the bounds which their interpretation of *Confessio Augustana Variata* allowed. Bullinger would claim that the

⁴⁸⁾ *Letters*, III, 345.

⁴⁹⁾ *Ibid.*, pp. 351-2.

⁵⁰⁾ *Correspondance*, II, 244. The Confession Bullinger first knew the existence of seems to have been the one presented to Diller. See *Ibid.*, pp. 75, 79, 251. Bullinger soon wrote the marginalia to the Confession of Göppingen. The marginalia as well as the Confession is printed in J.W. Baum, *Theodor Beza nach handschriftlichen Quellen* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1843), I, 406-9. Bullinger wrote: 'Haec quae conspiciuntur manu mea scripta, descripsi ex epistola Bezae, missa ad D. Calvinum, manu illius propria conscripta, quam mense Junio accepi 1558.' *Ibid.*, p. 406.

manducatio indignorum was not clearly denied, while the Genevans could retort that an expressed affirmation of it was avoided.⁵¹⁾ However, concerning the conjunction *rei*, i.e. the conjunction of Christ's true body and true blood with us, though the fact of the unity was affirmed, the mode of the conjunction is stated 'non facimus physicum aut localem aut per diffusionem humanae Christi naturae, quae etiamsi divinae naturae unita est, tamen humana ac proinde finita esse non desinit.' Thus the 'ubiquity' was negated.⁵²⁾ Again the unity is 'non per crassam illam commixtionem Christi substantiae cum nostra,' nor by transubstantiation, but is spiritual.⁵³⁾ Therefore, the confession was, though in a sense ambiguous, acceptable to the Genevan minds.

So Calvin tried to mitigate Bullinger's anger by claiming that what Beza produced was not really a confession but a brief excuse. He probably regarded it to be a sort of working paper before actually engaging in a serious talk with the Lutherans to which Zurichers should be invited. On the other hand, in Bullinger's marginalia for article two of the Göppingen Confession, which basically followed the wording of the one submitted to Diller, Bullinger qualified some of the phrases in an attempt to make the confession less offensive to the Zurich theological position. For example, immediately after the word 'exhiberi' was added 'nobis per fidem'.⁵⁴⁾

Yet Calvin had not given up his hope of Bullinger. Writing to Farel on 24 September, he said, while complaining how averse Bullinger was to a conference, that the Zurichers might be appeased little by little.⁵⁵⁾ However, this did not take place. Bullinger stubbornly remained averse to international ecumenical politics. Calvin was already determined to proceed and sent Beza and others to Worms to plead the case for French protestants and at the same time to confer with Melanchthon.⁵⁶⁾ Beza, Farel, and Budé left for Worms and there talked with Melanchthon and other Lutheran theologians. On 8 October, Beza and others submitted to German theologians in Worms a confession of faith for the French church in which they declared that the *Confessio Augustana (Invariata)* was utterly congruous with their church's views except one article, namely the one on the Lord's Supper.⁵⁷⁾ About the same time, they also presented a supplication to German princes in the cause of the persecuted French protestants.⁵⁸⁾ Thus in the late 1550s German princes

⁵¹⁾ *Correspondance*, II, 244.

⁵²⁾ In the Göppingen Confession, the phrase 'quae etiamsi ... desinit' was omitted. Jill Raitt concludes that the passage which touched upon the 'ubiquity' problem was left out. Raitt, *The Eucharistic Theology*, p. 5. It seems, however, that the passage still conveys the denial of the ubiquity, albeit in a less offensive form.

⁵³⁾ *Correspondance*, II, 245.

⁵⁴⁾ Baum, *Theodor Beza*, I, 407.

⁵⁵⁾ *Letters*, III, 368. See also *C.O.*, XVI, 616-17 (Bullinger to Calvin, 10 September 1557).

⁵⁶⁾ *Correspondance*, II, 106 (Calvin to Beza, 13 September 1557).

⁵⁷⁾ *Ibid.*, pp. 115-16 (Farel, Budé, Carmel et Bèze aux Théologiens Allemands, 8 October 1557). 'Et quum legerimus vestram confessionem quae Augustae exhibita est anno 1530, prorsus eam in omnibus articulis congruere cum nostris Ecclesiis iudicamus, et eam amplectimur, excepto tamen uno articulo, videlicet de Coena Domini,....' p. 115.

⁵⁸⁾ *Ibid.*, pp. 118-20. Genevans requested 'abermaln ein fürscreiben Intercession unnd Botschafft an

played significant roles in the international ecclesiastical politics which in the event involved Elizabethan England.⁵⁹⁾

This confession of faith was later approved by Calvin, and Beza then set out to write to pastors in Zurich on 24 November cautiously explaining the details of their achievements.⁶⁰⁾ Beza's argument is that the confession distinguished itself from the *Confessio Augustana* on the question of the Lord's Supper by rejecting three significant aspects of its teaching,⁶¹⁾ namely, 1) the corporeal presence, *in pane sive sub pane*, while affirming the true communication to the faithful by faith (*vereque a fidelibus per fidem*), 2) the *communicatio infidelium*, 3) the Ubiquity.⁶²⁾ Therefore, on major theological issues, this confession did not differ significantly from the previous confessions presented to Diller and Andreae. From the Genevan point of view, the mission to Worms was an overall success. They could agree with Lutheran theologians without being forced to concede more than they were willing, and still they were allowed to officially present their case for the persecuted French brethren before the German princes. Zurich's answer to Beza's letter, dated 15 December, disapproved of the confession Beza and others presented in Worms on 8 October. Tracing the unfruitful results of such ecumenical talks from the efforts by Bucer and Wolfgang Capito in 1536 down to the Łaski-Brenz colloquy of 1556, the Zurichers claimed that the recent efforts by Beza fell in the same category.⁶³⁾ They reminded the Genevans that they had previously expressed their concern by exhorting Genevans not to present this sort of confession to German princes. Therefore Zurichers felt that a deaf ear had been turned to their request.⁶⁴⁾ Zurich's objection was not just to the article on the Eucharist but extended to some other parts of the *Confessio Augustana* which could be alien to Swiss ecclesiastical practices.⁶⁵⁾ In the wake of a series of ecclesiastical talks, the circumstances surrounding Geneva seem to have changed. No matter what Genevans thought of their stance with regard to the *Consensus Tigurinus*, from the viewpoint not only of Zurich but also of neutral bystanders, Genevan divines no longer seemed to view the

die Kön. Majestat zu Franckreych senden.' p. 119.

⁵⁹⁾ As to the English involvement in these politics, see my 'The Lutheran Influence on the Elizabethan Settlement, 1558-1563', *Historical Journal*, 34, 3 (1991), pp. 519-37.

⁶⁰⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 124 (Beza to Farel, 19 November 1557), and pp. 131-5 (Beza to pastors of Zurich).

⁶¹⁾ Beza states 'Comperimus autem tria omnino esse in quibus non omnes quidem, sed tamen aliqui a nobis dissentiant, sed placide tamen ac moderate.' *Ibid.*, p. 133.

⁶²⁾ *Ibid.*

⁶³⁾ *Ibid.*, pp. 145-51.

⁶⁴⁾ '... hortati sumus ut ab hujusmodi confessionibus scribendis et offerendis principibus abstineas. Nihilominus nunc quoque dum iterum ad principum illustrissimorum concionatores venisti Vuormaciam in colloquium, aliud interim agens, causam nempe victorum Jesu Christi in Gallia, et novam rursus Confessionem conscripsisti et colloquium postulasti.' *Ibid.*, p. 149.

⁶⁵⁾ 'Interea nos non arbitramur Ecclesias Galliae puriores ea omnia, tametsi tu excipias Eucharistiae articulum, agnaturas, quae isti in sua illa Confessione Augustana profitentur. Cujus quidem generis inter alia esse putamus, Baptismi aquae necessitatem in infantibus ad salutem, Confessionem item quae fit sacerdoti, et Absolutionem privatam, ut nunc alia non commemoremus. Nos certe in his, nedum in articulo Eucharistiae, Augustanam Confessionem non sequimur, neque illam unquam simpliciter recipere voluerunt Ecclesiae Helvetiorum...' *Ibid.*, pp. 149-50.

Consensus as binding the course of their ecumenical activities, even though they were extremely careful not to isolate Zurich.

The year 1559 saw one of the turning points of the conciliar development. It was a year of expectation and concern, which was a result of the accessions of new rulers in two crucial states in European politics: France and the Palatinate. The death of Henry II on 10 July did not give the Genevans relief, but deepened their anxiety over the French protestant community. The rule of Francis II meant the worsening of the situation for the persecuted protestants since the Guise now obtained the upper hand.⁶⁶⁾ On the other hand, the accession of Frederick III in the Palatinate on the death of Ottheinrich on 12 February was a positive indicator of advancement for the Reformed party,⁶⁷⁾ which in effect contributed to the deteriorating relationship between the Reformed and the Lutherans. The Conference of Naumburg held in January 1561, with its effect of dividing Lutherans from Calvinists and thus spoiling all the ecumenical efforts made by both parties in previous years, was the natural consequence.⁶⁸⁾ The next major scene for ecumenical talks was in France, where lay one of the Genevans' predominant concerns. Although it was an occasion for a French national council where the Catholics and the Reformed searched for a possible coexistence, the campaign of Lutheran internationalism spearheaded by the duke of Württemberg was again evident. The shadow of the *Confessio Augustana* again loomed throughout the colloquy. Therefore, the colloquy which was intended to settle the domestic religious discord contained from the outset an international significance. And to no one's surprise, Zurich was left out of these conciliar developments. The only significant contribution on the part of Zurich was their reluctant release of Peter Martyr to attend the colloquy. While the Zurich reformers seemed disenchanted with ecumenical talks with the Lutherans, and at the same time the idea of inviting the Swiss Reformed theologians to the synod intended to unite all the evangelical princes and theologians was frustrated by the opposition of Württemberg, a

⁶⁶⁾ Genevan anxiety is expressed in Beza's letter to Bullinger dated 12 September. *Correspondance*, III, 20.

⁶⁷⁾ Already during the reign of Ottheinrich, the Palatinate was noted for its moderate Lutheranism of Melanchthonian scent. However, the declining influence of Melanchthon and his subsequent death in 1560 brought this moderate policy to a halt. Frederick favoured Calvinism, though not a rigorous Genevan kind but rather with a Melanchthonian bent. For the detailed description of the period, see Volker Press, *Calvinismus und Territorialstaat, Regierung und Zentralbehörden der Kurpfalz 1559-1619* (Stuttgart, 1970), pp. 204-66. On 12 August 1559, Frederick III along with Dukes Christoph and Wolfgang wrote to Francis II and Catherine de Médicis for the sake of persecuted French protestants. The French responded without any positive notes. A. Kluckhohn, ed., *Briefe Friedrich des Frommen* (2 vols., Braunschweig, 1868), I, 90-1 and 96.

⁶⁸⁾ On the Colloquy of Poissy and the Conference of Naumburg, see my 'Sixteenth Century European Diplomacy and Naumburg *Fürstentag*', *Senshu University Institute of Humanities Monthly Bulletin*, vol. 179, pp. 1-18 (written in Japanese). The centre of the Lutheran attempts to exert their influence at the Colloquy of Poissy was the duke of Württemberg. Already on the accession of Francis II, Württemberg and other German princes were writing to the French King exhorting him to profess the true Christian religion which was expressed in the Augsburg Confession. This is the same letter which Württemberg, Frederick III, and Wolfgang sent to Francis II on 12 August 1559. See footnote 64. The letter is also in *Briefwechsel*, IV, 688.

direct influence of Brenz's opinion,⁶⁹⁾ it is now more obvious that princes even more replaced theologians in the German theological scene, as we could witness at the Naumburg *Fürstentag* in 1561.

The decade of the 1550s is remembered as the era of international ecclesiastical diplomacy, with the Peace of Augsburg in 1555 standing as its centre. The subsequent interconfessional discussions involving both Reformed cities and England were the offshoot of this agreement as well as the response to the proposed general council. Bullinger's general mistrust of interconfessional conferences outside the Reformed camp prevented him from becoming a *reformateur oecumenique*. The impression of the *Consensus Tigurinus* also did not last long, as Bullinger's role in interconfessional politics faded away. Instead the *Confessio Augustana variata* of Melanchthon provided a basis for the dialogue between the Lutherans and the Reformed in the late 1550s until German princes led by the duke of Württemberg finally put an end to these ecumenical endeavours.

⁶⁹⁾ Heinrich Heppe, *Geschichte des Deutschen Protestantismus in den Jahren 1555-1581* (4 vols., Marburg, 1852-9), I. 334. Brenz declared in his 'Gutachten' of 18 May: 'So lange man unter den Fürsten keinen Constantin und unter den Theologen keinen Luther habe, würden derartige Zusammenkünfte nur dazu dienen, die geheimen Häresien der Theologen und die Blösse der evangelischen Stände vor den Papisten immer mehr aufzudecken, denn Jeder werde auf der Synode Richter sein, und Keiner sich der Entscheidung der Uebrigen unterwerfen wollen.' *Ibid.*

社会科学研究所 定例研究会 報告要旨

2007年9月22日(金) 定例研究会報告

テーマ: 「ケインズ『一般理論』と不況動学-

『不況のメカニズム』(中公新書)をめぐって」

報告者: 小野善康(大阪大学社会経済研究所教授)

コメンテーター: 平井俊顕(上智大学教授)

野口 旭(本学経済学部教授)

時間: 15:00~18:00

場所: 専修大学神田校舎7号館(大学院棟)6階764教室

出席人数: 29名

報告内容概略:

報告者の近著『不況のメカニズム-ケインズ「一般理論」から新たな「不況動学」へ』(中公新書)をめぐって、活発な討論が行われた。まず、報告者の小野氏より、同書執筆の動機と、小野氏によるケインズ『一般理論』の評価、さらに小野氏による不況理論、いわゆる「小野理論」の基本的特質が報告された。次にコメンターの一人である野口より、同書におけるマクロ経済学の現状把握の問題点と、小野理論における「流動性の罍」の性質を中心に、コメントがなされた。さらに、もう一人のコメンターである平井氏により、同書におけるケインズ解釈の特質を中心に、いくつかのコメントがなされた。その後、両コメントに対する小野氏によるリジョインダーと、出席者全体での討論が行われた。全体討論においては、とりわけ、小野氏による乗数理論批判と、小野理論における流動性の罍と物価上昇率の位置付けをめぐって、活発な議論が行われた。

日本を代表するケインジアンであり、小野理論とも呼ばれる独自の不況理論の提唱者である小野氏の報告研究会だけに、学内はもとより多数の学外研究者の参加を得ることができた。小野氏の主張をめぐって、今後も多方面にわたる論争が期待される。

記: 専修大学経済学部・野口旭

2007年10月16日(火) 定例研究会報告

テーマ： 中国の「新階層(テクノクラート、富裕層)」について

報告者： 柴田弘捷

時間： 16:30~18:30

場所： 社会科学研究所会議室

参加者数： 26名

報告内容概略：

1 中国の社会階層と格差

1990年以降の「高度経済成長」の過程で、産業構成では第3次産業の比率が、職業構成では専門技術者の比率が上昇している。所得格差が拡大している。

改革開放前には、階級・階層構成は「二つの階級(労働者階級、農民階級)・一つの階層(知識人階層)」にとらえられてきたが、改革開放以降、職業を基礎とする階層分化が生じている。中国社会科学院は2000年に「十大階層・五大階級」の区分に基づく社会階層調査研究を実施したが、この区分が官許階層構成になっている。

2 「新しい階層」・テクノクラートの出現と主張

民間企業の創業者と技術者、外資企業の管理的技術者、個人経営者、私営企業家、専門職がテクノクラート、社会的・政治的一勢力・集団として出現している。

3 「富裕層」その出現

改革開放、「先豊論」市場経済の中で「富裕層」が出現しているが、その明確な基準はない。テクノクラートと「富裕層」の職業的地位は共通している。

記：専修大学経済学部・町田俊彦

〈編集後記〉

本稿は、堀江所員による16世紀半ばにおける、トリエント公会議に対抗する形で議論に上ったプロテスタンティズム同盟に向けての動きを、ドイツ諸侯、ドイツ・ルター派協会、スイス改革派協会（チューリッヒ、ジュネーヴ）に焦点を当てたもので、その交渉過程を検証したものである。特に、ドイツ・ルター派との同盟に積極的なジュネーヴと、交渉そのものに消極的なチューリッヒを取り上げて、同じスイス改革派内での足並みの乱れを指摘している。いつもながら堀江所員の許容範囲の広さには驚かされるが、今回はどのあたりを取り上げるのか、楽しみにしています。

(K/M)

神奈川県川崎市多摩区東三田2丁目1番1号 電話 (044)911-1089

専修大学社会科学研究所

(発行者) 内田 弘

製作 佐藤印刷株式会社

東京都渋谷区神宮前2-10-2 電話 (03)3404-2561
