When Johannes de Turrecremata wrote his masterpiece, the *Summa de ecclesia* (1449-53), he was confronted with two challenges: refuting the Hussites and overthrowing conciliarism.

The followers of Hus Turrecremata had first confronted directly when he intervened in John of Ragusa's debate with John Rockycana and later indirectly when he censured the opinions of Agostino Favaroni. Against the conciliarists Turrecremata had vented increasingly bitter criticism as he despaired of convincing the Council of Basel that reform could be combined with obedience to the pope. This twofold attack upon current errors was no simple task, for conciliarism emphasized the corporate nature of the Church in direct contradiction to the Hussite emphasis on the invisible community of saints. Turrecremata had therefore to defend the visible Church—while at the same time denying that the ecclesiastical institution, via a general council, should be allowed to judge the pope and limit the use of his governmental powers. Furthermore, Turrecremata had to steal orthodox thunder from the conciliarists, who included the anti-Lollard apologist Thomas Netter, and anti-Hussites, like his coreligionist John of Ragusa. Turrecremata did all this so effectively that his *Summa* superseded completely Ragusa's tract on the Church.¹

A preliminary look is needed at the historico-doctrinal
context in which Turrecremata operated. The ferocious controversy between heretic and orthodox—whether conciliarist or papalist—over the nature of the Church stemmed partly from the fact that they drew different conclusions from the same Christians tradition. Indeed, in the Scriptures themselves one can find an unresolved ambiguity between the idea that the Church had room in its ranks for sinners and the belief that it was an elite or community of saints. The broader concept of the Church had its strongest base in gospel parables of the kingdom of heaven, where sinner and saint would remain intermixed till the Last Judgment. The elite concept of the Church rested on Pauline texts that described the Church as free of stain and wrinkle (Eph. 5:27); this inner elite of saints or elect made up the Mystical Body of Christ.2

The early Fathers never fully clarified the ambiguous status of sinners in the Church. Their ecclesiological doctrines were concerned with the inner elite united to Christ by charity as well as faith, rather than with the visible institution that numbered sinners among partakers in the sacraments. However, when confronted with rigorists like the Donatists, who wanted to purge the present Church of sinful members, Augustine and the other Fathers argued consistently that, at the final winnowing of souls, only God could separate the wheat from the chaff. Yet despite his response to the Donatists, Augustine thought the true "congregation of the faithful" (congregatio fidelium) was identical with the Mystical Body of Christ.3

This patristic emphasis on the Church's spiritual elite remained the primary doctrine down to scholastic times, when greater emphasis was placed on the membership of all baptized Christians (whatever their state of soul) in the congregation of the faithful. Confronted by Waldensian heretics who denied the visible institution any connection with the true invisible Church, scholastics began instead to emphasize that institution and equate it with the Mystical Body of Christ and the congregatio fidelium. Several currents of thought reinforced this institutional bent. A belief that the Church and its sinful members had fallen away from the primitive purity of apostolic times had always characterized reform movements. The Waldensians, who had begun as reformers within the ranks of the Church, now
argued that the institution had abandoned its apostolic model for more temporal pursuits. Other dissidents, including the more radical Franciscans, took up similar ideas. Defenders of Roman orthodoxy responded by arguing that the primitive Church had actually embodied (in embryonic state) the present form of ecclesiastical institution.\footnote{More-}

Moreover, canonists built upon the medieval concept of the \textit{congregatio fidei} Hum an entire body of doctrine on the Church's hierarchical structure and corporate nature. These juridical ideas about the Church coincided with arguments on ecclesiastical power by whole generations of publicists, who ascribed to the pope and the Church Militant perfections best ascribed to God and the Church Triumphant. Small wonder that reformers, whether orthodox or heterodox, viewed the law as the source of the Church's woes.\footnote{These woes took a singularly painful form in the Schism, which, in creating two rival ecclesiastical governments, sndered the much prized unity of the visible Church. No one pope guarded both the faith and the union thought to be a mark of the true Church. Under these circumstances some theologians naturally began to question whether the true Church was not located elsewhere than in the visible institution. Both the Lollard and Hussite movements, though maintaining medieval emphasis on the sacraments, tell into heresy. Other churchmen, theologians and jurists, turned to the corporate doctrine of the Church for a solution to the Schism. They argued that the whole Church, via a general council, had power from Christ to end the Schism and begin a much-needed process of reform. Indeed, after the failure of the Council of Pisa, the Council of Constance did reunite the Church and enact some reform decrees. But the Council of Basel produced a new schism that cast doubt on the credibility of conciliarism. Into this breach stepped Turrecremata, who, having grown up during the Schism, promised to defend orthodoxy against Lollard and Hussite assaults while he guaranteed that the papacy would once more safeguard the unity of the Church.\footnote{In his \textit{Summa de ecclesia}, Turrecremata began by carefully reiterating the definition of the Church as the "congregation of the faithful." Initially he listed sixteen meanings of the term \textit{eclesia}, all of which could be found in theology}
or law. *Ecclesia* could signify things as diverse as the hierarchy, the elect, the totality of the blessed, or a gathering for prayers; each of these definitions had been employed by Aquinas or some other orthodox writer. Intent on refuting Hussite heresy, however, Turrecremata affirmed the primacy of the term *congregatio fidelium*, the definition for the concept of the visible Church that had been used most often by late medieval apologists, because of its antiquity and juridical potential:

> It is the collectivity of all catholics or of the faithful ... Or the Church is the totality of the faithful who assemble for the worship of the one true God through the profession of one faith. ... The Church is the convocation of many for the worship of one God.

Further, Turrecremata denied that there was any salvation outside this *congregatio fidelium*, the body of true believers worshiping the true God. Without faith, one could not receive the grace necessary to please God; without grace, not even the best works could save an infidel from damnation. This was a doctrine inherited from Augustine and other doctors, who had developed it as a counterweight to heresies like Pelagianism. (Boniface VIII had made a more political use of the doctrine, identifying the Roman obedience with the Church outside which there is no salvation.) So Turrecremata considered salvation neither a private matter nor separable from the work of the visible Church. Since there was only one deposit of faith accepted and taught by the one Church, the believer must enter its ranks through baptism as the sign of adherence to the truth. The Christian became a member of the congregation of the faithful for his own good, communing with his brothers while worshiping the true God. Baptism itself was a formal act, with a freight of grace and a load of institutional obligations, that made the Christian subject to the authority of the clergy: ministers of the sacraments, teachers of the truth, correctors of wrongful behaviour. Turrecremata accepted the reasoning of Aquinas and other Inquisition apologists that baptism legally bound the believer to remain orthodox. If he fell into heresy, the clergy could compel him, for his good and that of the community, to return to the true faith. So much for faith, but what about works?
Turrecremata's "congregation of the faithful" was all-embracing, with room for sinners beside the saints. Wycliff and Hus, and orthodox reformers as well, had always pointed to discrepancies between the faith professed by members of the Church and their often sinful behavior. Of course, Turrecremata knew that these criticisms were founded on fact; like John of Ragusa, he had to prove that the sinner was still a member of the holy Catholic Church. Thomas Aquinas had distinguished between "unformed faith," mere adherence to correct doctrine, and faith "formed" by charity, which is faith brought to its proper perfection. On this basis, Turrecremata argued that the baptized believer who did not pursue perfection was only nominally a member of the Church, a member "dry and dead." The living member displayed his health of soul by entering into a communion of true charity with his fellows, a union sealed by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Here Turrecremata followed Augustine in seeing charity as the inmost bond of the Church. The sacraments existed within the Church to promote this spirit or bond of charity. Like Aquinas, Turrecremata thought such union was most perfectly expressed in the sacrifice of the mass, where the faithful fed on the body and blood of Christ. Baptism was the gateway to this eucharistic feast; the other sacraments, particularly penance, promoted the sanctification of souls through absolution of sinners and special infusions of grace. So the truly penitent sinner could advance, with the aid of sacramental grace, to the communion of the saints, his faith, like theirs, being formed by true charity.

Turrecremata's definition thus stressed the visible Church, to which all believers belonged whatever their state of grace, and in which all might receive the sacraments. An inner elite of souls transformed by charity was simply part of this "congregation of the faithful," not its totality or an opposing body. This doctrine contrasted sharply with Hussite doctrines of a true Church that was purely spiritual. And Turrecremata drove home the point by assimilating into his ecclesiological synthesis all the notae ecclesiae and the traditional biblical metaphors for the Church, including the Mystical Body of Christ—giving each a distinct institutional emphasis. (In further contradistinction to heretical groups, Turrecremata assigned to the ecclesiastical insti-
tion itself some characteristics of the true Church noted by the Fathers in their polemics against these heretics.) Parallel to his discussion of the notae ecclesiae Turrecremata placed an Aristotelean discussion of the Church with exactly the same implications, upholding the ecclesiastical institution and assigning sinners a real place in its membership.

Turrecremata chose the classic list of notae ecclesiae ("marks of the Church") formulated by the First Council of Constantinople (381) and describing the Church as one, holy, catholic, and apostolic. Although other versions existed, he selected this list and gave it a specifically institutional point of reference—without ignoring its other, more spiritual implications.15

Both in tradition and in Turrecremata's discussion of them, foremost among these marks of the Church was that of unity. Cyprian had emphasized unity in order to combat schismatic tendencies in the churches of Roman Africa. Turrecremata saw the similar threat that the Church would be fragmented by the errors of Hussites and Lollards and the disobedience of conciliarists. Accordingly his discussion of ecclesiastical unity is no dry theological argument, but a passionate (if erudite) defense of a beloved institution by a witness to the Schism and the Conciliar Crisis.16 Turrecremata listed eight bonds of union among members of the congregation of the faithful, each intertwining to create the design of an institution divinely established as a means of salvation for its members. Foremost of these bonds was the role of Christ as head of all the Church. The Church expressed one faith in its divine head, a faith expressed in the sacrament of baptism through which the believer came to the other sacraments. All believers shared one hope of salvation and were unified toward that end by a single, vivifying bond of love or charity. The loving unity of this body, called (from its true head) the Mystical Body of Christ, was sealed by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. So it arrived at its one goal: eternal beatitude.

In this unified system, a major part—often threatened by Hussites and conciliarists—was assigned to the papacy. Under the pope's visible presidency and unified government, the Church Militant operated on earth to achieve its one saving goal.17 Jesus himself had made Peter the Prince of Apostles, arbiter of all divisive disputes among the faith-
ful, in order to safeguard the Church's unity. Without Peter's authority, handed down to his successors, the popes, the ecclesiastical institution would be wracked with schisms. Turrecremata went so far as to accuse the Greeks of an error of faith in rejecting the unifying supremacy of the bishop of Rome. He also criticized others for this fault, denouncing Marsilius of Padua for describing the papacy as a superfluous human institution exalted by Constantine. Turrecremata even thought, as we shall see, that there was a dangerous Marsilian element in conciliarism. Against these critics of the papacy, Turrecremata reaffirmed the papalist doctrine defined in Boniface VIII's Unam Sanctam that submission to Rome is necessary for salvation; "Whoever is outside the Church of Peter, which is the Church of Christ, is not in the Church."

Turrecremata's discussion of each of the other notae cc-

desiae similarly emphasized the ecclesiastical institution and its saving work. The visible Church, with its sacraments and possession of the theological virtues, offered the means of sanctification; even the laws of this institution had a place in its saving labor, laws helping to conform the Church Militant to the image of the Church Triumphant. Wycliff and Hus—envisioning a true Church of only the elect, living virtuous lives in grace—had objected to inclusion of any sinful believers in this holy body free of stain and wrinkle. Like the fathers at Constance, Turrecremata thought such ideas were a denial of the sanctity of the congregatio fidelium and a threat to the Church's saving work. So he elaborated the old patristic argument, oft repeated by Catholic apologists, that the Church in its present state included sinners as well as saints. Indeed, the Church's main work in this world was to lead sinful believers to the perfection of charity, for sinners would be purged from the Church only at the Last Judgment—removing all stains and wrinkles and finally conforming the Church Militant to the image of the Church Triumphant. For, as opposed to heretics and infidels, the Church had the universal (or catholic) truth, the universal remedy for human sinfulness. All men were called to the catholic community of believers and worshippers of God, cause and end of all things; the sacraments, with their ministers, were valuable everywhere for
the good of souls; therefore, the Church was the universal or catholic means of salvation and sanctification. The faith, doctrine, and worship of this Christian community were all of apostolic origin, founded, in particular, upon Peter and his successors. Peter's see was "the mother of sacerdotal dignity and the teacher of right understanding," the visible director of the Church's labors in this world. Turrecremata's insistence on the apostolicity of the institution answered charges that the present state of the Church reflected a debasing pursuit of power and wealth. Where Lollards and Hussites saw discontinuity between the primitive Church and the visible institution, Turrecremata saw continuity in the work of salvation from the days of Abel, the first man to live by faith, through Christ's saving mission and perfection of the Church, to his own day. Offices and dignities potentially present in the primitive Church had been fully developed for the work of saving souls—a labor not impeded by the continued presence of sinners in the congregation of the faithful.

Turrecremata reached similar conclusions in his Aristotelian analysis of the Church, first presented in a censure of Agostino Favaroni's works and then amplified in the first book of his Summa. Once again, he focused on the congregation of the faithful with its saving work and its sacraments. In this analysis, however, he placed less emphasis on the ministry of the clergy and more on the nature of the Church's mission in this world, underlining its role as a vehicle of salvation rather than as an end in itself. Thus, analyzing the Church in terms of Aristotle's four causes, Turrecremata described Christ as the efficient cause. The sacraments were secondary (or instrumental) efficient causes, enabled by virtue of Christ's Passion to promote the welfare of souls. The material cause on which Christ and the sacraments worked was the body of the faithful, open to grace through belief. The formal cause of the Church was the union of the faithful with their divine head, a relationship often described as the unity of the Mystical Body of Christ. The Church did not exist as an end per se, having been founded for the perfection of all believers in this life that they might have eternal beatitude in the next. The clergy, led by the pope, served this end. They were not a cause in themselves, only servants of the
final cause, acting in the best manner possible and without regard to the personal wishes of the faithful. This was particularly true of the chief servant, the Roman pontiff, who was not ordinarily responsible to the Church for his conduct of office. Nonetheless, the Church's mission was the touchstone against which the pope's conduct of office could be measured objectively. Here, in the spiritual mission of the clergy, Turrecremata endeavored to establish bounds beyond which even the chief of the clergy, the pope, might not stray.\textsuperscript{31}

In his tract against Favaroni, as in his \textit{Summa} and other works, Turrecremata showed a medieval taste for symbolic language, elaborating on the meaning of each scriptural metaphor applicable to the Church. Like John of Ragusa, he interpreted each to portray a Church that granted membership to sinners as well as to saints. In the parable of the fishnet (Matt. 3:47-50), for example, where just and unjust in the Kingdom of Heaven would not be separated until the last day, Turrecremata saw the "kingdom" as the visible Church with its sinful and saintly members.\textsuperscript{32}

Most noteworthy was Turrecremata's reinterpretation of the Mystical Body, a concept with a long potential history. Traditionally the major metaphor for the Church was Paul's description of the true believer as a member of Christ's body (e.g., Eph. 4:1-16). Early Fathers, including Augustine and Gregory the Great, had used the description as a metaphor for the spiritual Church rather than the institution; the same spiritual meaning was employed by medieval theologians, who did not clearly distinguish between the terms "mystical body" and "real body" (or eucharist) until the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{33} In that century, however. Scholastic writers—Aquinas and other Dominican doctors—began to connect the term "mystical body" with the visible Church. This more institutional idea of the Mystical Body influenced Boniface VIII's bull \textit{Unam Sanctam}; however, the Thomist John of Paris used it to chide Boniface for forgetting that Christ (not the pope) was the true head of the Mystical Body. Then, during the Schism, this interpretation became a favorite weapon of conciliarists, like Dietrich of Niem and Pierre d'Ailly, who argued that the pope was subject to a council representing the whole Church, or Mystical Body of Christ.\textsuperscript{34} Naturally, the insti-
tutional concept was repulsive to Wycliff and Hus, for whom the "mystical body" metaphor was one of the best Scriptural proofs of their spiritual concept of a true Church composed only of the elect, with sinners excluded. The fathers at Constance found this argument subversive, for it endangered their own claim to represent the Mystical Body and thus be able to judge the several contenders for the papal throne. Inevitably, the heresy trials held at Constance condemned both Wycliff and Hus.

Turrecremata first discussed the controversial doctrine of the Mystical body in his criticism of Agostino Favaroni's works, which he felt used the term too literally. In fact, Favaroni had described the true Mystical Body as composed solely of the elect (a Hussite error that Turrecremata had already set out to refute). The Augustinian did ascribe to Christ some members only potentially saved, men without faith, hope, or charity in their present state but concluded, with extreme literalism, that Christ sinned in the misdeeds of such members. In reply to Favaroni, and thus indirectly to Wycliff and Hus, Turrecremata for the first time expounded his own interpretation of the Mystical Body. He reminded his readers that the Mystical Body was a body only metaphorically. Like a human body, it had members united to one head, but in a material organism there was an identity of natures between head and members that was not present in the spiritual organism. Members of Christ's body were only similar, not identical, to their divine head, because they lived good Christian lives. Thus, sins were acts contrary to the union of the Mystical Body, separating the sinner from it; and no misdeed of a Christian could be attributed to the sinless Christ but, rather, only to the author of the deed. But answering Favaroni was only a starting point.

Turrecremata wanted a definition of the Mystical Body that would include all the visible Church, so he stressed conformity rather than differences between head and members. Christ, the Incarnate Word, was head of the whole body, giving it identity and direction by virtue of his Passion and Resurrection. There were several modes of conformity with Christ, in an ascending scale of perfection. First and broadest was the human nature that the god-man shared with all human beings, sinners as well as saints. Second was conformity through faith, without which the
soul could not receive the grace necessary for more perfect union with Christ. The third mode of conformity was charity, the bond of love uniting Christ and all true believers. The final mode, crown of all, was the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. According to Aquinas this outpouring sealed the union of head and members in the Mystical Body of Christ.  

In this schema Turrecremata left no place for predestination as a mode of conformity. He never denied that God knew in advance who would be saved and who would be damned, since this aspect of Paul’s doctrine had been expounded by Augustine, Boethius, Aquinas, and Ockham, as well as by Wycliff and Hus. But Turrecremata did hope to render the doctrine of predestination innocuous for ecclesiology. Election (known or assumed), as a criterion for measuring the present state of believers, especially that of priests, would threaten the Church with chaos. Like other anti-Hussite apologists, Turrecremata drew a picture of laymen trying to guess whether their ministers were among the elect, a vain quest for knowledge possessed only by God. He saw such guesswork as conducive to turmoil and schism rather than to the salvation of souls, and in his tract against Favaroni’s errors he cited the quarrels among Hussites to show the pernicious effects of such speculation.

With typical insistence, Turrecremata brought his discussion of predestination back to the question of sinful members of the Church. Men unconverted, yet predestined to salvation, had only potential membership in the Church, for Christ—he was refuting Favaroni—could not have dead members.” But this did not excuse the sins of believers, who put themselves in danger of damnation. A present remedy was, however, at hand: a Christian’s state of belief and state of grace were in the care of the visible Church. The eventual inclusion of the elect in the Church Triumphant was God’s business and not man’s. The ecclesiastical institution could not be thrown into chaos by heretics like Wycliff and Hus, men who asked questions answerable only by God.

Structure: Congregation or Corporation?

Turrecremata’s masterly defense of the institutional Church had a second major thrust: it was aimed not against
heretics but against conciliarists. A fresh analysis and synthesis of the conciliar position must be intruded here, in order for us to understand how Turrecremata demolished this more amorphous yet equally formidable challenge.

In the conciliar epoch, Catholic theologians like Turrecremata and John of Ragusa shared a common defense of the visible Church against assaults by heretical Lollards and Hussites. Initially the issue among the orthodox at the Council of Basel was the scope of permissible reforms, not the very nature of Church government. Even the papal apologists present, Turrecremata included, accepted the Constance decree Haec sancta as a valid statement of ecclesiological principles, although they did not believe its reference to reform included interference with the prerogatives of the pope. Gradually, though, the growing extremism of the Basel assembly alienated more and more conservative ecclesiastics. And the council undermined its reformist image by trying to replace the Roman curia with a similar body of its own to judge causes, distribute benefices, and collect taxes. The council's internal rupture over the location for its meeting with the Greeks, and the attempt of a majority faction to depose Eugenius IV, pushed revolt towards apparent revolution. In the ensuing schism between council and pope, basic questions of ecclesiology came to the fore, since embassies from both sides had to debate (before meetings of princes and magnates) their conflicting claims to rule the visible Church. Disputants drew on a common fund of authoritative texts and ecclesiological ideas to prove rival doctrines were true expressions of Christian tradition—until Turrecremata emerged from the conflict, determined to tear conciliarism out of the Church by its roots.

The Dominican cardinal claimed that these roots were planted in the soil of false doctrine, in the errors of the condemned heretics Marsilius of Padua and William of Ockham; his accusation became a commonplace of ecclesiastical historians challenged only by John Neville Figgis, who thought that the great general councils of the fifteenth century were modelled on secular representative assemblies like the English Parliament. Modern research, particularly by Brian Tierney, has undermined both of these previous explanations of conciliarism. Turrecremata's thesis
failed to appreciate that conciliarists borrowed only the orthodox doctrines employed by Marsilius and Ockham. Thus, Ockham, in order to censure John XXII for tampering with the Franciscan doctrine of Christ's absolute poverty, had employed canonistic doctrines (especially from Huguccio of Pisa) that allowed removal of a heretic pope. And to prevent even a council from condemning this Franciscan ideal, Ockham had proclaimed the self-sustaining authority of truth as discerned by the remaining faithful few—a truly subversive doctrine, one that was later employed by Protestants of the Reformation. But those conciliarists who made use of Ockham's works, Henry of Langenstein, Conrad of Gelnhausen, and Jean Gerson, accepted only the more orthodox ideas of the Venerabilis acceptor; they rejected Ockham's novelties, since they wanted to exalt a general council that could judge claims to the papacy and prevent ecclesiastical anarchy. Again, Marsilius had claimed that papal power was a human creation and that real power in the Church rested with the faithful, whose agent, the general council, could judge an erring pope. This portion of Marsilius's theory of communal sovereignty was founded on orthodox ideas, but few conciliarists cared to identify themselves with the doctrines of a condemned heretic. Even Dietrich of Niem and Nicholas of Cusa, who used arguments derived from Marsilius's Defensor pacis, carefully refrained from identifying the source of those arguments.

Conciliarism, it is now possible to show, had a far more orthodox origin, drawing as it did upon traditional theories of ecclesiological authority and reinterpreting them to suit the needs of the time. Perhaps chief of these sources was the canonistic concept of the Church as a corporation. From Gratian's time to the outbreak of the Schism, canonists generally sought to advance papal power, since centralization at the expense of local interests seemed advisable for the welfare of the Church. But the Decretum included patristic texts, particularly by Augustine, that emphasized the authority given by Christ to the Church; other citations suggested that the pope could be deposed for heresy and that a general council was the best judge of matters of faith. All of these texts could be used to create a theory that exalted council over pope, and the Decretalists contributed the
unifying thread to such a development: a juridical concept of the Church more potent than the passive notion of all believers gathered in one fold. When canonists applied to the whole Church the corporate theories (of Hostiensis and Innocent IV) derived from studying local ecclesiastical bodies, it was but a short step to holding that the corporate Church could judge its rector, the pope, through a general council if he endangered the welfare of the whole corporation. Critics of the papacy, from Frederick II onward, often appealed to councils against adverse judgments by reigning popes. John of Paris and the younger Guilelmus Durantis, more orthodox than Marsilius or Ockham, also looked to a council to correct abuses of papal power. Finally an overwhelming scandal in the Roman Church provided the impetus that joined demands for a reforming council with the nascent conciliarism of the canonists.  

That catalyst was, of course, the Schism. Responsible ecclesiastics came to see a general council, representing the whole Church, as the only agency able to resolve or set aside conflicting claims to the papacy and effect much needed reforms. Various nonlegal sources—theology, philosophy, polemic (even the condemned ideas of Marsilius)—were used to justify these claims, and theologians like Henry of Langenstein, Pierre d'Ailly, and Jean Gerson employed juridical notions as well. They held that the Mystical Body, via a council representing the whole, could judge an erring pope in the name of Christ, its true head. Circumventing the legal maxim that only the pope could call a council, they appealed to equity (epikeia), superior to the letter of the law, and asserted that any responsible dignitary, prince or prelate, could convocate a council when necessary. None of these arguments really came to dominate a coherent conciliar ecclesiology, however, and the conciliarists tended instead to gravitate toward a wholist view of the Church.

Their corporate idea of the Church gained preeminence, in Turrecremata's mind at least, as the most dangerously coherent statement of conciliarist principles. The potential synthesis of corporate theory and demands for a council was actually achieved by the noted canonist Franciscus de Zabarella, a leading figure at the Council of Constance. Zabarella developed his conciliar theory shortly before the
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Council of Pisa, for the success of which he also worked. The pope, according to Zabarella, was rector of the ecclesiastical corporation, governing the faithful in the ordinary course of events. But if the Roman pontiff fell into heresy or some other fault harmful to the welfare of the Church, he could be called to account by a general council representing the whole corporation. Ordinarily the right to call a council belonged to the pope; however, in an emergency it devolved onto the cardinals, then the emperor, and then other lay and ecclesiastical magnates.

Still, at the time of the Council of Basel, there was no single conciliar ideology, only a common desire for ecclesiastical reform. The ideas of d’Ailly and Gerson were championed by John of Ragusa and a nonparticipant in the council, Alfonso Tostado. Zabarella’s corporate theory was advocated by the formidable Nicholas de Tudeschis, “Panormitanus,” the author of widely read canonical commentaries that taught conciliarist doctrines. His polemical tracts and speeches were among the most persuasive defenses of Basel’s deposition of Eugenius IV. (Yet the influence of Panormitanus was diluted, for, as ambassador of the House of Aragon, he often gave the council advice that was in conflict with his own writings.) Perhaps the most original thinker of the age was Nicholas of Cusa—lawyer, philosopher, and mystical theologian—whose De concordantia Catholica, composed in his early years at Basel, presented a scheme of reforms applicable to Church and State in order to bring both into harmony with the divine order of the universe. Although he held that the invisible Church was composed of angels and men (an Aquinan idea familiar to Turrecremata), Cusa, too, concentrated his greatest attention on the Church Militant, the visible institution. The pope should promote unity and concord among all believers, he wrote, bringing them into harmony with God’s scheme of universal order; if he failed in this task, and especially if he fell into heresy, the pope undermined his own authority and that of the Church, and in that case he could be judged by a general council, the Church’s representative. Into this scheme of government Cusa integrated an elaborate hierarchy of ecclesiastical authorities—including pope, cardinals, and local and general councils—each deriving, from Christ through the
Church, its power to promote harmony. Later, disillusioned with the Council of Basel, Cusa served Eugenius IV as a prominent member of the curia and an internal worker for ecclesiastical reform, and his ecclesiology underwent a noticeable transformation. Gone were parallels to the reform of the Holy Roman Empire, but the system continued to rest on an order of hierarchies related to the order of the universe. Now the pope was paramount as head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, as font of jurisdiction and personification of the Church, though room was left for the powers of cardinals and of a general council.

Finally, the conciliarist ecclesiology of Turrecremata’s chief opponent, John of Segovia, has received close attention in recent years. Chief historian of the Council of Basel, theologian of great stature, and advocate of substituting dialogue for crusades against Islam, Segovia insisted that the whole Church had received from Christ a power superior to the pope’s—a power exercised by a council. In his exposition of this common conciliarist belief, Segovia used analogies to the constitutions of Italian city-states (an argument little used since the condemnation of its chief advocate, Marsilius of Padua). Segovia also saw a spiritual dimension in the struggle between the Council of Basel and Pope Eugenius IV: quoting the old idea of a Church that included angels and men, he compared the struggle between council and pope, in which all believers must choose sides, to the choice made by the angels between Cod and Lucifer. In the present crisis the Council of Basel, as representative of the Mystical Body, suffered pains like those of Christ’s Passion.

By contrast with the arguments of the conciliarists, a far greater unity marked those of the papalists. Their unity of purpose, strengthening as the conciliar movement failed, was reinforced by a common emphasis on the pope’s juridical supremacy over the entire congregation of the faithful. Christ, they argued, had given Peter and his successors power superior to that of any believer or all of them together. This was the unanimous opinion of Turrecremata, Anotinus of Florence, Petrus de Monte, and Rodrigo Sánchez de Arévalo. These papal apologists also emphasized the troubles that would plague the Church if supreme power rested with an assembly rather than with one person.
A monarchic papacy, they argued, could more easily prevent schisms and combat heresy.62

But Turrecremata's assault on conciliarism was more focused and more broadly based than that of his fellow papalists. The Dominican cardinal went out of his way to read conciliarist tracts, in order to understand the enemy he was attacking.63 During his research Turrecremata came to realize the importance in the conciliar polemic of key texts from Gratian's *Decretum*. Particularly significant, he felt, was the Augustinian idea that Peter had received the power of the keys as the Church's representative—a text that lent itself to conflicting interpretations. The decretist understanding of this text was propapal, arguing that Peter and his successors, the popes, most perfectly embodied the power bestowed by Christ on the Church. Augustine's authority was also cited, however, to support a contrary thesis. Zabarella, Panormitanus, and John of Segovia argued that the Church itself had received supreme power to govern the faithful; the pope was but the Church's minister, the rector of the ecclesiastical corporation, and as such accountable to this corporation (which was represented by a general council) for his conduct of office.64 Turrecremata early decided that this Augustine-based interpretation of the Petrine role in the establishment of the Church tended to subvert the good order of the ecclesiastical institution. So in the tract he wrote at Nuremberg the cardinal warned against heeding those who described Peter as the rector of a corporation; that would make the Church Peter's ruler, instead of vice versa.65 In his *Decretum* commentary, Turrecremata further developed the same theme thereby underlining his view that the corporate theory of the Church was the greatest rival to the papalist doctrine he was presenting:

*The Church excommunicates.* This is, the authority of the Church excommunicates. Therefore, if he [Peter] signified Holy Church, it was not, as some wrongly teach, that he is under the sign and name of the Church as its representative or procurator. This exposition is quite false, since many errors would follow in the name of the Church. The first is that Peter acquired no dignity or authority of his own from the grant [Matt. 16:18], but only that of the Church, whose procurator he was in receiving anything in its name. But this is quite false, since Christ said to Peter "Blessed are you etc. I
will give to you etc." Second, it would follow that the term \textit{princeps} would properly he applied to the Church. He would have received the keys of the \textit{principate} in its name. He would have received possession of the kingdom and the episcopate in its name. Not he, but that in whose name he received them, would be king and bishop. Third, it would follow that the power of the keys was given to the community, which we hold to be impossible of those keys properly called those of the kingdom of heaven.\textsuperscript{66}

Here we have the fundamental contention of Turrecremata's polemic against the conciliar movement. He found that he had to ascribe to the papacy all key titles and powers of ecclesiastical government and deny them to the Church as a corporate whole. At the deepest level, he had to cut \textit{Haec Sancta}'s linking of Christ with a council representing the Church, by denying that the Church could have received power to govern the faithful. If he could sever this link, then conciliar pretensions would be left with no pretense to validity.\textsuperscript{67} Turrecremata's effort to break the link came in his discussion of plenitude of power, the supreme juridical authority in the Church. He argued, especially in \textit{Summa de ecclesia}, book 2, chapter 71, that there were two possible definitions of "plenitude of power": one included both sacramental and governmental powers of the clergy, orders and jurisdiction; the other was limited to jurisdiction alone. In his exposition, as we shall see presently, Turrecremata found both of these concepts incompatible with conciliarism.\textsuperscript{68}

Thus, in treating the idea of plenitude of power as involving as orders and jurisdiction, Turrecremata concentrated on the inability of the Church as a whole to receive sacerdotal ordination. Only individuals could receive holy orders, since a human soul must receive the indelible mark of grace to allow effective performance of the sacraments.\textsuperscript{69} The Church, whether described as a corporation or as the Mystical Body, did not have a soul; hence, it could not receive sacerdotal ordination. Since the Church could not be ordained, it could not have the plenitude of power defined as both orders and jurisdiction. For, being incapable of receiving one aspect of this plenitude of power, it was consequently incapable of receiving the other.\textsuperscript{70} Turrecremata noted further that neither Scripture nor the liturgy suggested that individual priests acted in the Church's
name. Commands given to priests in the Church’s name were given only figuratively, just as a bishop-elect could give commands to priests he had not ordained. Nor could the whole Church be said to possess powers—particularly priestly powers—that it could not exercise. It was the duty of individual priests, not the faithful, to celebrate mass and absolve penitents. Therefore, the entire Church did not have the plenitude of power described as orders and jurisdiction. Nor did the group of all priests. They could not gather together from the ends of the earth to exercise the plenitude of power, for God would not have made such a clumsy disposition of authority. Thus, neither the whole Church nor all of its clergy could hold supreme authority over the faithful. So, Turrecremata was left free to ascribe that power to the pope.

In treating the idea of plenitude of power as limited to jurisdiction alone, Turrecremata was on more difficult ground. In many ecclesiastical corporations, including monasteries and cathedral chapters, the more distinguished members shared in the decision-making process. The very idea of the Church as a corporation had grown from the efforts of canonists to determine the legal status of such bodies. Turrecremata had to prove, accordingly, that the Church was a different sort of entity, not governed by the corporate regulations of the canonists. His argument here turned on the fact that the Church was composed of laymen as well as clerics. The laity, the larger part of the faithful, was by definition unable to hold and exercise the power of jurisdiction. (Women in particular were unworthy to share in the plenitude of power.) Since the largest part of the membership could not exercise jurisdiction, the whole corporation was incapable of exercising it. Turrecremata further argued that the Church could not possess the plenitude of power because the transaction of crucial business would require a mass meeting of the faithful, which was clearly an impossibility. Then, since the whole Church could not hold or exercise the plenitude of power, it was no rival of the pope. Indeed, any effort to make an ecclesiastical corporation the pope’s rival would threaten the unity that was one of the marks of the true Church.

Another favorite conciliarist argument, derived from a text of Cyprian, described the pope as a member of the
ecclesiastical body, a part of the whole. He was superior to any other part but inferior to the Church, which was represented by a council. Turrecremata replied that the papacy was head of the Church and the human agent responsible for ecclesiastical unity; without the papacy, the whole congregation of the faithful would disperse. Thus, the Church could not be superior to the papacy, its head and principle of union.

Finally, as an apologist for the papacy and opponent of the corporate theory of the Church, Turrecremata had to create an alternative interpretation of the key Augustinian text that said that Peter received the keys as the Church's representative. Turrecremata argued that this text proved the pope superior to the Church. Since Peter represented the Church in receiving the power of the keys for himself and his successors, the popes, in turn, established all ecclesiastical governments. To Turrecremata's mind, the only true ecclesiastical corporation (universitas) was the succession of popes and of bishops, who received powers of ecclesiastical government from them. The congregation of the faithful was dependent on the Roman see, whose supremacy was beyond question. Turrecremata dismissed all other patristic metaphors for the powers of the Church. Thus, the union of charity in the Mystical Body permitted ascribing to the Church some attributes of both Christ himself and the pope, his earthly representative. But these metaphors lacked any real significance for a proper papalist doctrine on the nature and government of the Church.

His doctrine was essentially monarchical, reflecting the times. Turrecremata composed his ecclesiastical treatises during a period of profound political change. After serious reversals in the fourteenth century, European monarochies were recovering and consolidating their power, while local and external interests—including the local clergy and the pope—were under increasing assault. A whole polemical literature grew up around the extent of a monarch's powers and the rights of the community to resist arbitrary commands, a literature parallel and related to the polemics between conciliarists and papalists. In the sixteenth century, Huguenots would cite conciliarist doctrines, kept alive by the Gallican party at the University of Paris, to justify
resistance to the Catholic regime in France. And Turrecremata himself, during his career as diplomat, made common cause with the monarchist movement in France. Yet it would be a mistake to view him as a mere apologist for absolute monarchy.

For Turrecremata's chief interest was the visible Church, the sacramental and juridical body dedicated to the salvation of souls. This Church had to be defended from its heretical detractors; its internal foes, the conciliarists, had to be prevented from causing disorder and dissension. Only thus could human beings confidently become members of the congregation of the faithful, receiving the sacraments from clerics themselves subject to the just rule of the pope. Ever mindful of good order in the Church he expected the believer to join, Turrecremata succinctly and categorically proclaimed, "[It] is the flock, [and] not the shepherd."