This volume was brought together to celebrate the seventieth birthday (in November 2000) of the famous church historian, Heiko Oberman, who taught at Harvard, Tübingen and finally Tucson, Arizona. The broad title of the book is meant to take on the question of whether the medieval and early modern epochs may be best understood as clearly delineated from each other, or whether, guiding the change from one era to the next, the Reformation may be explained through an understanding of its medieval roots. The subtitle refers unmistakably to the research inspired by this man’s work and carried out internationally. More “bundles” in his honor may yet be expected, though now they must be prepared as commemorative collections, since the celebrated man died on 22 April 2001 in Tucson, Arizona. So this Festschrift is the last collection of its kind to be presented to the man it honors.

The first section comprises a number of studies on “Governance in Theory and Practice.” Cary Joseph Nederman (“Confronting Market Freedom: Economic Foundations of Liberty at the End of the Middle Ages,” pp. 3-19) uses the examples of Johannes Quidort of Paris (?1306) and the English clergyman William of Pagula (fl. 1331/32) to show that there was a basis in late medieval theories of ownership in the free market for an expansive conception of freedom. This conception was grounded in the free will of the owner and his inalienable right to consent, which provided the only legal circumstances in which the governmental power of the king might interfere in times of emergency. These medieval theories of how people ought to live together in societies thus precede the modern theory of the social contract. Clearly, the limited length allocated
to each of the contributors did not allow Nederman to take a comparative look at other medieval authors (such as Ockham or Marsilius of Padua) nor at early modern theoreticians. Thomas A. Brady ("The Holy Roman Empire’s Bishops on the Eve of the Reformation," pp. 20-47) gives a sharp-sighted overview of the imperial church (Reichskirche) and its bishops at the beginning of the sixteenth century—an overview that is also saturated with data, thanks to a recently published lexicon edited by Erwin Gatz, Die Bischöfe des Heiligen Römischen Reichs, 1448-1648 (Berlin, 1996). Brady’s essay uses the figure of the Prince-Bishop (Fürstbischof)—unique to the Holy Roman Empire—to explore the tension between spiritual and secular duties, and thus to illuminate relations between the church and the state. James Estes ("Luther’s First Appeal to Secular Authorities for Help with Church Reform," pp. 48-76) works on Luther’s well-known pamphlets of 1520, and their conception of the competence of secular authorities to intervene in ecclesiastical questions. J. Jeffrey Tyler ("Refugees and Reform: Banishment and Exile in Early Modern Augsburg," pp. 77-97) uses interesting statistical calculations to track expulsion from the imperial city—especially approximately 700 cases noted in the "Urgichten" (or catalogues of confessions (Geständnisse[n]), according to the Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob und Wilhelm Grimm, vol XI/3, ed. Karl Euling [Leipzig, 1936], p. 2426) of people mostly belonging to the lower stratum of society (beggars, whores, etc.) who were seized and thrown out of the city. The period covered in the essay, 1572-1623, was determined by the source. The task of confronting the observations made here with Oberman’s Reform of the Refugees in the first part of the century remains to be done, as is true also for Tyler’s comparison with policies for exiles and new burghers in south German imperial cities in the fifteenth century. Lastly, James Tracy ("Public Space and Restriction of Non-Calvinist Religious Behaviour in the Province of Holland, 1572-1591," pp. 98-110) investigates unofficial toleration, as he calls it, of non-Calvinist denominations (especially Mennonites and Lutherans, as well as Catholics—the most strictly limited) by the States of Holland in the age of Confessionalization and the war against Spain. The “religious use of public space” by the Calvinist public church (first formulation, 1572, according to note 1) is used as a conceptual bridge to clarify the development of later Dutch practices of tolerance in modern times. At the same time, the medieval roots of these ideas are convincingly sought in the medieval conceptions of “public honor/shame,” “public atrocity,” or “public heresy.” Once again, the need for a history of structures of publicity (Öffentlichkeitsstrukturen) that also takes