and the evangelical Anabaptists had in common was the outward form of baptism" (p. 103).

In its haste to make a dubious peace between Luther and the "Evangelical Anabaptists" Professor Loewen's book betrays inadequate historical empathy for and historical research on Müntzer and the revolutionary Anabaptists.

JAMES M. STAYER, Zurich, Switzerland


It is of enormous benefit to the scholarly world to have available a volume enumerating and describing briefly the printed works of Heinrich Bullinger. A second volume, published a year after the first, includes Bullinger's most important correspondence between the years 1524-1531. The original theological and his historiographical works are to comprise parts three and four of this gigantic enterprise.

The importance of Bullinger's influence on the Reformation, both on a theoretical and practical level, is reasonably well-known to a limited scholarly audience, particularly in Switzerland. But outside Switzerland his role in the Reformation has been unheralded—largely, I suppose, because of the sheer religious power of Luther, Melanchthon, Calvin and Zwingli. Bullinger was Zwingli's successor in Zürich at the Grossmünster. A less political man than Zwingli, he nonetheless was responsible for the consolidation and spread of the Evangelical reform. He took part in the Bern disputation with Zwingli in 1528—a disputation that formally introduced Reformation principles in Bern. He was responsible for the understanding with Calvin that produced the Zürich consensus. And he was instrumental in forming in 1566 the Second Helvetic Confession which ultimately became the most widely held Reformed confession of faith.

Bullinger's correspondence (including answers) is more extensive than that of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin combined. The 12,000 or more total indicates, of course, that letter writing was a large-scale activity as well as an art. Therefore the letter was the vehicle not only of random sentiments or haphazard information but of theoretical and historical issues that in a later day would, I suppose, be expressed in monographs, journals and texts. Thus the correspondence not only discusses the meaning of faith, justification, baptism, patristic and biblical terms, eucharist, preaching, free-will, images, and vows and provides some exegesis, etc. (which might be described as theology in fieri), but also concerns the actual practice of religion, the experience at the source of religion. In the letters one can perceive the development of reform theology, particularly in its emphasis on sola Scriptura. The reader will note an amunct present not only because of personal convictions of the writers but also because the historical-critical method was still several hundred years away.

It is very helpful for the reader to have extensive footnotes describing the recipients and writers of the correspondence. These figures are pastors, theologians, learned people as well as rather ordinary types. Thus one comes to an intimate knowledge of the culture of sixteenth-century Switzerland. It is not without significance that among Bullinger's longest and most serious letters are those written to Anna Adlischwiler. One even wonders if these letters do not deserve separate treatment at some later date. It is in these letters that Bullinger's persua-
sive powers, buttressed by scriptural and theological arguments, appear at their best. This is particularly true of the 26th letter, in which Bullinger attempts to overcome the opposition of Anna’s mother to their marriage.

More than anything else, one acquires from these Swiss dialect, German and Latin letters a sense and taste for the reform movement and an acquaintance with its principal figures. The first two volumes are excellently done in every respect. Hopefully, a much more accurate portrait of Bullinger will result. The editor and his assistants deserve congratulations for putting their work before the scholarly world. This is wissenschaftliche Forschung at its very best.

P. JOSEPH CAHILL, University of Alberta


This book is already one of the standard works on Anabaptism. While it deals with one subject, it is the most comprehensive book on Anabaptism with the exception of George Williams’ Radical Reformation.

Stayer sets out to portray the view of the sword and its functions as held by the various Anabaptist groups, the Swiss, the Upper German sects, and the Melchiorites. The work is introduced by a chapter on the early Protestant context of the teaching on the sword. He gives special attention to Luther, Zwingli, and Müntzer.

Stayer has deliberately left behind some main assumptions of traditional Mennonite and non-Mennonite scholarship. He takes a new look at the old sources and clearly shows that Swiss Anabaptism before Schleitheim was not consistently nonresistant. Although some of his evidence, like Blaurock’s usurpation of the pulpit at Zollikon and Hinwil, comes close to nit-picking, his case can be regarded as established. Similar conclusions are reached regarding South German and Dutch Anabaptism. His findings parallel the reviewer’s own discovery that Anabaptism in Tyrol in 1526-27 was also ambivalent on the issue.

Stayer comes down hard on much Mennonite scholarship as being determined by the arbitrary category of “evangelical Anabaptism” and his censure is justified. However, he is then himself an example of special pleading when in the case of the Swiss Brethren he asserts without firm evidence that ambivalence on the question of the sword was the majority position. Similarly, evidence he himself adduces should have made him more cautious in asserting that violence was adopted by the “clear majority” of the Melchiorites. He is determined to prove Mennonite historiography wrong—hardly an unbiased position.

However, the author also demonstrates that among the Swiss, as among the majority of the South German Anabaptists, the nonresistant position ultimately became normative. Similarly, although over a longer period of time, the Melchiorites, turned Mennonite, for the most part adopted the Schleitheim position.

The main harvest of this book is its demonstration that Anabaptism was much more acquainted with violence than had been thought, especially by Mennonites. Still, Stayer asserts that it was not, as G. R. Elton said, “a violent phenomenon.” “The balance in early Anabaptism is on the side of the peaceful,” writes Stayer, “not the revolutionary.” Never-