

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](https://paypal.me/robbradshaw)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Baptist Quarterly* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bq_01.php

John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism

(Continued)

THE journey from Zürich to London took the Hoopers and their party seven weeks. Their way lay through Basle and then down the Rhine to the sea. The party was joined at Basle by Martin Micron,⁹² a Flemish physician, in exile on account of his Protestant beliefs and now bound for England. At Strasbourg Hooper found that Bucser was about to leave for an unknown destination—a refugee in the face of the Interim which the Emperor Charles V was forcing upon his empire. Although Hooper did not at that time know of Bucser's destination he soon discovered it, for Bucser⁹³ too was on his way to England. In Cologne the party came across Jan Utenhove who, like Micron, was an exile from Ghent on account of his faith. It was on this occasion that Hooper wrote to Bullinger commending Utenhove to him that he may "observe the mode of administering the Lord's Supper, which, as it is most simple among you, so is it most pure."⁹⁴ We shall meet Utenhove again in England.

As Hooper neared England the rumours of what was going on there reached him and the news did not please him. Peter Martyr⁹⁵ and Bernadino Ochino⁹⁶ were there, neither of whom it seemed were in line with the Zürich teaching to which Hooper hoped to convert England, although they were certainly not Lutherans as Hooper suggested.⁹⁷ Further news reached him that Bucser had now arrived in England but that John A'Lasco⁹⁸ was no longer there. This was a double blow, for Hooper had already been in conflict with Bucser about the doctrine of the Eucharist, whilst A'Lasco, who was at that time a Zwinglian, would have been a strong supporter. The prospect for Hooper in England was uncertain and as he neared his destination letters went to Bullinger and to Pellican⁹⁹ asking for copies of their writings and sermons. This request occurs in almost every letter that Hooper wrote to Zürich. He was concerned that if he was to fire the artillery in England the ammunition should be made in Zürich. It was a determined, if somewhat apprehensive, Hooper that landed in London on May 16th, 1549. The exile had come home and lost no time in setting about his mission.

V. HOOPER IN LONDON

His first experiences were scarcely encouraging. He carried a letter from Bullinger to Cranmer and delivered it to the Archbishop. The reception was cold. "He did not vouchsafe a single word either respecting yourself or your most godly church,"¹⁰⁰ wrote Hooper to Bullinger on May 31st. It was not to be wondered at, for Bucer had just arrived in England and was already at Cranmer's elbow. In addition Hooper had already become involved in a controversy over his claim that equal liberty of divorce should be allowed both to the man and woman on the occasion of adultery.¹⁰¹

The situation he found in English church practice did not help matters. Things were far indeed from Hooper's ideal. It is true that England under the leadership of the Duke of Somerset had moved a considerable way towards the institution of Protestant doctrine and practice in the years since the death of Henry VIII, but nothing like far enough for the Zürich sympathisers. On June 4th, 1549, Richard Hilles, the merchant, now in England wrote: "We have an uniform celebration of the Eucharist throughout the whole kingdom, but after the manner of the Nurenberg churches and some of those in Saxony, for they do not yet feel inclined to adopt your rites respecting the administration of the sacraments."¹⁰² The 1549 Prayer Book had recently been published in which the eucharistic service carried the title "The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass" and the instruction concerning the celebrating priest was "The priest that shall execute the Holy Ministry shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration; that is to say, a white alb plain with a vestment or cope . . ." In addition, the Prayer Book instructed the priest to stand "afore the midst of the altar." The retention of the word 'mass,' the vestments, and the assumption of the existence of an altar would not be pleasing to the Zürich supporters. Hooper discovered also that the liberty of preaching was limited by the bishops, of whom by no means all were favourable towards the idea of reform in doctrine and practice and very few, if any, were inclined towards the more radical reforms desired by Hooper. But Hooper was not daunted. Before long he had got himself attached as a chaplain to the household of no less a person than the Duke of Somerset and if he could not preach, why then he would lecture. This is what he did, probably at St. Paul's Cross, and he did it with enthusiasm and success. He told Bullinger: "I myself too, as my slender abilities will allow me, having compassion upon the ignorance of my brethren, read a public lecture twice in the day to so numerous an audience that the church cannot contain them."¹⁰³

It is clear that Hooper lectured on various books of the Bible and that his concern was that the people should hear the gospel—yet hear it "Zürich fashion." Martin Micron, who was of course a

strong supporter of Hooper, gives a picture of the English situation as seen from the point of view of the Zürich party.¹⁰⁴ The evangelical gospel is no more than an ember, the bishops are asleep, the nobility fight and the common people are corrupt. The Lord must send out faithful labourers into His vineyard. But John Hooper is there and seems to be fanning the ember of true doctrine into a blaze by his teaching. Writing to Pellican in Zürich, Micron said of Hooper's lectures: "But good God, what a concourse of people, how many lives have been changed . . ., many enemies of the gospel return to discretion: If the Lord God, in His great goodness, increases His Spirit in Hooper, I do not doubt but that he will be the future Zwingli of England." Hooper's mission had begun in earnest.

It is not surprising that he became involved in controversy. He was involved almost inevitably, in a clash with the Bishop of London, Edmund Bonner,¹⁰⁵ in whose diocese he was lecturing, and who viewed with horror the spread of reformed doctrine and practice in England. But the clash does not appear to have been instigated so much by Hooper's preaching as by Bonner's. The *Greyfriars' Chronicle* records that on Sept. 1st, 1549, Edmund Bonner preached at Paul's Cross and afterwards was accused before the Council by two people, a minister named William Latimer and John Hooper himself.¹⁰⁶ Martin Micron makes plain the basis of the accusation in a letter to Bullinger. "The Bishop of London preached on the 1st September at St. Paul's to a most numerous congregation, and maintained with all his might the corporal presence in the Lord's Supper, which Hooper had strenuously opposed in that day's lecture. The same bishop was ordered in his sermon to inform the people, that the king is no less to be obeyed as a boy, than if he were an old man, and that his decrees possessed the same authority. The bishop omitted to do this."¹⁰⁷ It appears that some of those in opposition to the Reformation during Edward VI's reign adopted the position that laws made during the minority of a king were invalid.¹⁰⁸ It is easy to imagine Hooper, knowing that Bonner was supposed to make this declaration, seizing the opportunity of its omission to gain influence with the authorities by calling attention to the fact. There can be little doubt that the majority of the Council welcomed the opportunity of silencing Bonner, and according to the *Greyfriars' Chronicle*, Cranmer was responsible for putting Hooper up to preach at St. Paul's Cross where "he spoke much against the Bishop of London."¹⁰⁹ By the end of September, 1549, Bonner was in prison and it is perhaps not surprising to find Micron recording that the Archbishop of Canterbury had become somewhat more favourably disposed towards Hooper.¹¹⁰ The latter might clearly be a useful instrument in certain circumstances.

Hooper did not clash only with the Romanist sympathisers.

He complained that his lectures were disturbed by the Anabaptists who attended in large numbers. It is clear that these Anabaptists had a defective Christology which became known as Hoffmannite.¹¹¹ Hooper indicated that they denied altogether that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary according to the flesh, and said also that they believed that a man who is reconciled to God is without sin. It is interesting to note that Hooper seems to have been very successful in dealing with these Anabaptists, for not only did he write a pamphlet against them but he also was sent down to Kent and Essex to deal with strong groups of Anabaptists there.¹¹² It is certain that Hooper's lectures were anything but orderly and quiet and it is recorded that one, Edward Underhill, became known as "Hooper's champion" on account of his defence of Hooper against "raylynge billis cast into the pulpitt."¹¹³

In the late autumn of 1549 Hooper's progress and safety became endangered by the fall from power of his patron the Duke of Somerset, who joined Bonner in prison. The man behind this change was the unscrupulous Earl of Warwick, later created Duke of Northumberland. For a brief period Hooper was uncertain which way this new Protector would jump. If it had been towards a reaction in favour of Romanist doctrine and men like Bonner were set free, then Hooper had no illusions as to what would happen. If Bonner is restored to his bishopric then, says Hooper, "I shall, I doubt not, be restored to my country and my father which is in heaven."¹¹⁴ But although all lecturing and preaching was stopped temporarily, permission to continue was soon restored, and it became plain that Warwick was going to look with favour on the Protestant party and notably on extreme Protestants like Hooper.

By the end of the year 1549, seven months after his arrival from Zürich, Hooper's influence in high places had increased greatly. He can claim that Cranmer "is now very friendly towards myself" and that there are now "more favourers of God's word in his majesty's Council who with activity and courage defend the cause of Christ."¹¹⁵ It is interesting to discover Hooper reporting that Cranmer now had some articles of religion to which he required all preachers and lecturers in divinity to subscribe. Whether these articles were a first draft of the 42 articles which were to appear three years later is a matter of conjecture. They may well have been, especially as we shall see, when Hooper produced some articles for his diocese in Gloucester in 1550 he anticipated several of the 42. The article which dealt with the Lord's Supper was reckoned by Hooper to be satisfactory. As far as Cranmer's personal opinion is concerned Hooper can go so far as to say that "now as I hope, Master Bullinger and Canterbury entertain the same opinions."¹¹⁶ Whether Hooper was right or not is very difficult to say, for even today, four hundred years later, the

question as to Cranmer's doctrine of the Eucharist is still being actively argued. In addition to Cranmer, Hooper has by personal contacts discovered that there are six or seven other bishops who "comprehend the doctrine of Christ as far as it relates to the Lord's Supper, with as much clearness and piety as one could desire."¹¹⁷ So far so good. But Hooper has his eyes on no less a figure than the young king, Edward VI. The time was ripe for influence to be brought to bear directly on the king and how better than by the dedication of a book to him by Bullinger. This suggestion Hooper passed on to his Zürich friend.¹¹⁸

THE SERMONS ON JONAH

On the afternoon of February 5th, 1550, as Hooper was writing a letter to Bullinger, a summons came for him from the Archbishop of Canterbury. When Hooper returned after the interview and took up his pen to continue his letter it was with great excitement that he told his friend that he had been ordered by Cranmer, in the name of the king and Council, to preach before the king once a week during Lent.¹¹⁹ It was the practice to have a sermon preached at court each Wednesday and Friday during Lent. Hooper had been chosen to preach on Wednesdays and Ponet on Fridays. Here was the opportunity for which Hooper must have been waiting, and it was one which he seized with both hands to further his mission. He took for his subject the book of Jonah because, he told Bullinger, "it will enable me freely to touch upon the duties of individuals."¹²⁰ These sermons on *Jonah*,¹²¹ although trying the patience of the reader with their numerous digressions, deserve to be studied. They contain in summary form Hooper's manifesto for the reformation of England according to the Zürich practices. As Latimer had done before him, so Hooper attacked the social and economic evils of his age, but his chief concern was to present to his influential congregation his ideal of the reformed church in England. There can be little doubt but that the seven sermons preached before the king contain the heart of Hooper's beliefs and that what he preached to the king and his court was the same message that he had preached to the crowds of London citizens at Paul's Cross. It is not possible here to quote extensively from his sermons, but it is worth recalling and illustrating once again how faithfully Hooper had learnt the theological lessons of Zürich.

The authority for doctrine and practice is the Bible.

"And this note, Christian reader, that the prophet calleth false and vain religion vanity. So judge thou of every religion that is not contained within the Word of God, to be nothing else than vanity, from whencesoever it cometh."

"For Christ was and is wisdom of the father, and the apostles had received the Holy Ghost that brought them into all truth: therefore it must needs follow, their doings and ministration to be most perfect, holy and religious."¹²²

The task of the Christian man is to keep his side of the covenant.

"But what thing, after the right judgment of the Scripture, chiefly pleaseth God? Obedience: that is to say, when every man in his state and his vocation doth the thing he is commanded to do; as it is written 1 Samuel 13 'I desire obedience, and not sacrifice'."¹²³

As for the comments of the sermons on the Lord's Supper—they are legion. Hooper must have strained the patience of his hearers by his interminable discussions on the phrase "this is my body." It was in these sermons that Hooper made his demand for a simple form of administration of the Lord's Supper with the congregation sitting around the simple table.

These points we have noted in detail earlier, but certainly the pronouncement in these sermons which caused most stir and had the most immediate and far-reaching consequences was his attack on an oath and on vestments. These had been prescribed in the Ordinal published in 1549 by the authority of the bishops. Hooper said:

"I happened to see of late a certain book for the making of deacons, priests and bishops, wherein is required an oath by saints; whereat I did not a little wonder. . . . I am led to think it to be the fault of the corrector in the printing, for two causes: one is, because in the oath for the bishop is no mention made of any saints; the other cause is, that in the same book the minister must confess, at the receiving of his vocation, that the book of God, the Holy Scripture, to be perfect and sufficient for the salvation of man, yet do I much marvel that in the same book it is appointed, that he that will be admitted to the ministry of God's word or his sacraments, must come in white vestments; which seemeth to repugn plainly with the former doctrine that confessed the only Word of God to be sufficient. And sure I am, they have not in the Word of God, that thus a minister should be apparelled, nor yet in the primitive and best church."¹²⁴

The immediate result of this sermon was a summons to Hooper to appear before the Council. Cranmer reprimanded him severely for his censure of the oath. It was not in fact a printer's error, but may quite possibly have been an oversight on the part of the compilers. Nevertheless the Ordinal was issued with the authority of the bishops and any challenge to any part of the book constituted a challenge to their authority. There was a long argument between Hooper and the bishops. This was but a prelude of things to come. It was an indication of the different points of view taken by Hooper and by the bishops. Hooper's idea of reformation was uncompromising and absolute—only the doctrine and practice recorded in the Word of God were permissible.

OTHER INFLUENCES SUPPORTING HOOPER

(a) *Henry Bullinger*. Although Bullinger never visited England—indeed it seems he scarcely left Zürich during his whole lifetime—he carried on a considerable correspondence with Englishmen and with foreigners in England from the early 1540s until his death in 1575. During the reign of Edward VI Bullinger was in close touch with Peter Martyr, the Regius Professor at Oxford and with a group of Swiss students studying in that university and acting as his “personal representatives” in England. He also corresponded with Richard Cox, tutor to the king and Chancellor of Oxford University. Bullinger’s contact with the ill-fated Lady Jane Grey is well known and her letters to him, written in perfect handwriting, may still be seen in the Zürich Library. He also knew her father, the Marquis of Dorset, later Duke of Suffolk, and dedicated his fifth Decade of sermons to him.

We have already noted Hooper’s request that Bullinger should dedicate a book to Edward VI. Bullinger obeyed with a dedication of his third and fourth Decades of sermons to the king. When the young king came to read the dedication at the beginning of the third series of Decades he would find that the theme of the dedication was familiar and was one which he had certainly heard many times before from Hooper and others.

“I dare boldly avow, that those kings shall flourish and be in happy case which wholly give and submit themselves and their kingdom to Jesus Christ . . . acknowledging him to be the mightiest prince and monarch of all, and themselves his vassals, subjects and servants; which, finally, do not follow in all their affairs their own mind and judgment, the laws of men that are contrary to God’s commandments . . . but do both themselves follow the very laws of the mightiest king and eternal monarch, and also cause them to be followed throughout all their kingdom reforming both themselves and all theirs by the rule of God’s holy word.”¹²⁵

The king received this book favourably and another of Bullinger’s correspondents, Bartholomew Traheron, informed him that the king “both loves you and acknowledges the religion of Christ to be exceedingly well established among you.”¹²⁶ Before the year 1550 was out these sermons had been translated into English.¹²⁷

Encouraged by this favourable reception, Bullinger followed up with a still more explicit statement in the dedication of the fourth Decade of his sermons to Edward. He wrote :

“neither are they worthy to be heard, who think that the canonical scriptures are not plain enough, full enough, or sufficient enough, to minister a perfect platform of reformation. . . . Proceed, therefore, proceed, most holy king to imitate the most godly princes and the infallible rule of the holy scripture. Proceed, I say, without staying for man’s authority, by the most true and absolute instrument of truth, the book of God’s most holy word, to reform the Church of Christ in England.”¹²⁸

Thus was the weight of Bullinger's personal influence thrown into the scale in the support of Hooper and his mission.

(b) *The Strangers' Church.* The second influence was a group of foreign exiles in London. The leader, and the most influential of this group, was John A'Lasco who returned to England in the summer of 1550 and who is known to have had "a high regard" for Zürich.¹²⁹ With A'Lasco were Martin Micron, Jan Utenhove and Richard Vauville. The members of this group were all strong and consistent supporters of Hooper and in return sought his help. A'Lasco's desire was to be able to establish a foreigner's church in London. A letter is preserved from A'Lasco to Utenhove asking him to arrange for a meeting with Hooper, seemingly to discuss matters connected with the founding of such a church.¹³⁰ There is a postscript from Hooper added to the original letter accepting the invitation to this meeting. That Hooper would help them if he could was to be expected. His connections with the would-be leaders of the Strangers' Church were closer than is sometimes realised. Martin Micron was very friendly with the Hoopers and lived with them in London from the time of their arrival together in May, 1549 until the autumn of 1550. Jan Utenhove had also lived for a time with the Hooper family and Richard Vauville had married Anne Hooper's maid Joanna. Hooper was of course known to John A'Lasco and although there is no evidence of close personal friendship before this meeting in London, it is clear that they found each other kindred spirits. Then again, apart from his personal connections with these leaders who desired to gain a charter for the Strangers' Church, Hooper would, of course, also find a theological kinship. These men all were sympathetic towards the teaching and the practice of Hooper's beloved Zürich church, and no doubt Hooper saw that if a church could be set up in London which showed in practice the ideas which he had been preaching so vigorously for the last year, then the authorities could scarcely fail to be impressed. Hooper saw in the Strangers' Church and its ministers a very real ally in his mission.

When this application for a charter came to the Council in July, 1550, Hooper's influence on the Council was fairly strong and, as Cranmer also seems to have favoured the project, the charter for the church was issued on July 24th.¹³¹ This charter gave permission to them to institute a pure ministry of the Word and sacraments according to the apostolic form—and more remarkable still, this Strangers' Church was to be exempt from all jurisdiction of the bishops. It is not surprising that some of the bishops, notably Ridley, Bishop of London, in whose diocese the church lay, objected to the plan. Ridley himself tended towards extremes in reform. When he had been Bishop of Rochester he had made a name for himself as one who replaced altars by tables. On his translation

to London in April, 1550, to replace the imprisoned Bonner he continued this work. Hooper had welcomed him as an ally although claiming that the replacement of altars in London had begun before Ridley's arrival.¹³² But now this same Ridley was objecting to two challenges to his episcopal authority. Both these challenges were connected with Hooper. One was this charter for the Strangers' Church with Hooper in the background. The other was the vestment controversy in which Hooper played the leading rôle. It was not until Ridley could see success in his resistance to the challenge of the latter that the difficulties in the way of A'Lasco's Strangers' Church were finally removed.

THE VESTMENT CONTROVERSY

No essay on Hooper can be complete without some treatment of the Vestment Controversy. It was in this controversy that the ultimate logic of Hooper's principles was first clearly seen, and we, looking back, can discern that it was clearly a portent of things to come in English church history.

It is not our purpose to write a full history of the controversy, which dragged on for nearly a year. We are concerned simply to give an outline of the events and to indicate Hooper's principles in acting as he did. The first move which led to this controversy came as a direct result of the sermons preached by Hooper before the king in Lent. At the end of these sermons, at Easter, the Council, acting on behalf of the king, offered the bishopric of Gloucester to Hooper. Hooper refused this office "on many accounts" but chiefly on account of the "impious oath" which the bishop was compelled to take at his installation, and of the "Aaronic vestments" which the bishops had to wear not only when administering the sacraments, but also at public worship.¹³³

The oath to which Hooper objected was that of the king's supremacy—not that he objected to the oath of supremacy as such—but his objection was that the oath ended "so help me God, all saints and the holy evangelist."¹³⁴ This oath, prescribed by the Ordinal of 1549, which was issued by the episcopal authority, had already involved Hooper in a clash with Cranmer as we have seen. Hooper now flatly refused to swear by saints.

Hooper, in addition, objected to wearing all forms of clerical vestment. The vestments to which he objected were those then in use in England.¹³⁵ These were, for the priest or deacon officiating at services other than mass, a loose white gown or surplice. When officiating at mass, however, they replaced the surplice by a tighter fitting alb and over this they put a gown with a cross embroidered on the back. For wear outside the church the priest or deacon usually wore a black gown and a four-cornered hat. Bishops wore a scarlet overgown called a Chimere with white linen sleeves and

underneath it, instead of the surplice, a white garment called a rochet.

These two objections of Hooper's reached the ears of the king and on May 15th, 1550, Hooper was called before the Council to state why he should refuse this call to a bishopric. The ensuing discussion in the Council centred on vestments. There was a long and stormy debate on the matter in which Hooper was strongly supported by the Duke of Somerset, lately released from custody. Eventually it was agreed that the matter of vestments was one of indifference and the inference seems to have been that it was up to each individual to decide whether they should be worn or not.¹³⁶ This point of view was carried in the Council chiefly, it seems, by the Duke of Somerset's influence and against the wishes of almost all the bishops.¹³⁷ Nevertheless, it was carried, Hooper's point was made and he was to be "freed from all defilement of superstition,"¹³⁸ as he himself puts it, in his acceptance of the bishopric. The Council book records simply "at Grenewiche the XVth Maye 1550. Mr. Hoper was constituted busshop of Gloucester."¹³⁹ Thus Hooper was now a bishop, at least on paper. There was natural rejoicing among his supporters and the news was passed to Bullinger in Zürich, who noted the fact of Hooper's appointment in his diary¹⁴⁰ and passed on the good news to his friends. On July 11th, for example, Bullinger wrote to his friend Matthew Erbius that Hooper had been made Bishop of Gloucester and that "great things are expected from him."¹⁴¹

On July 3rd the patent for the bishopric was issued recording "grant to John Hoper, professor of theology, of the bishopric of Gloucester."¹⁴² Hooper appeared before the king and Council on July 20th for confirmation of the grant, and the question of the oath of supremacy rose again. It is reported that the king seeing that the oath required the recipient to swear by saints, "became much excited" and said, "what wickedness is here, Hooper?" Hooper re-emphasised his arguments that a man should swear by God alone and convinced the king, who struck out the offending clause with his own pen.¹⁴³ King Edward's own personal journal records for July 20th "Houper was made bishop of Gloucestre."¹⁴⁴ Once again it seemed that Hooper's problems were settled, but he was still a bishop on paper only. The secular authorities had allowed his objections, but the bishops had by no means accepted the matter as settled.

The Earl of Warwick wrote to Cranmer on July 23rd on behalf of the king and Council. In this letter Warwick indicated that Hooper should be consecrated without the use of the oath.¹⁴⁵ Hooper himself took this letter to Cranmer. Cranmer presumably accepted the matter of the oath but on the question of vestments he referred Hooper to Ridley who would be responsible for the

actual consecration. Ridley refused to use any other form of consecration than that which had been prescribed by Parliament, i.e. that in the Ordinal of 1549, which stated that the elected bishop should wear a surplice and cope. In other words he refused to allow the authority of a ceremony put out by the bishops to be overruled by the objections of one man. Hooper therefore returned to the Council with this news and on July 30th obtained definite permission from them to be consecrated "without any superstition."¹⁴⁶ A letter was therefore sent on August 5th to Cranmer and the bishops giving them permission to omit certain of the ceremonies of the consecration which were against Hooper's conscience.¹⁴⁷ Once again Ridley refused. He did more than refuse, he went himself to the Council and said that it was true that vestments were matters indifferent, but added therefore they could be retained and demanded by the Church without any harm to anybody. This was a different interpretation of the conception of "things indifferent" than had earlier been agreed upon by the Council. It would appear that they decided on May 15th that if a thing was "indifferent" it could be left to each individual's conscience to decide whether to use it or not. Ridley's arguments turned the Council against Hooper who, when he came to the Council shortly afterwards, found that they would not listen to his arguments. He therefore requested to be allowed to put his arguments in writing. This request was granted.

During the month of September the point of view of the bishops became clear. They refused to depart in the slightest from the form of consecration prescribed. They were in an awkward position, for as Peter Martyr pointed out when he wrote to Bullinger later, it was very difficult for the bishops to have the prescribed use of vestments, put forward by their authority and by that of Parliament and which had been used for more than a year, now described as ungodly.¹⁴⁸ The bishops reiterated that vestments were things indifferent and that therefore it rests with the authorities to decide whether such things should be used in the church or not.

The bishops were trying to force Hooper to submit to their ceremonies and such an attitude brought out Hooper's opposition. He referred everything to apostolic ceremonies. He denied that vestments were matters of indifference, for they obscured the dignity of Christ's priesthood and nurtured superstition.¹⁴⁹ Hooper wrote during September to Warwick to this effect but Warwick by now had gone over to the bishops' side and replied that the king must be obeyed in matters of indifference. Warwick added that one must avoid placing a stumbling block in the way of the weak, just as Paul did when he made a vow and was shorn, and when he circumcised Timothy.¹⁵⁰

The issue was thus clear. The bishops said that vestments were

things indifferent and on such matters the authorities must decide. Nominally these were the king and magistrates, but actually they merely enforced the decisions of the ecclesiastical, i.e. episcopal authority. Hooper now denied that vestments were things indifferent and took his stand firmly on the principle that only the practices of the primitive church as reflected in the Bible should be followed.

In this fixed frame of mind, and at the height of the controversy, Hooper submitted to the Council a statement on October 3rd. This statement has recently come to light.¹⁵¹ The manuscript which has been found is not complete but there is enough to show Hooper's main emphases. It must, however, be said immediately that from the point of view of logic the document is very poor. Ridley, who was told to answer it, had no difficulty at all in pointing out the errors of logic and even contradictions, which appear. Undoubtedly Hooper wrote in the heat of the controversy and when tempers are aroused logic tends to get lost.

The manuscript bears the heading "from the book of Hooper to the king's counsellors, produced by him, 3rd October, 1550, against the use of vestments which the Anglican church uses in the sacred ministry."¹⁵² Then comes Hooper's main thesis which is as follows :

"There is nothing to be had in use in the church which has not either its authority from the expressed Word of God, or else is of itself, a thing indifferent, which thing when used, profits nothing and when omitted does no harm.

"The particular vestments in the ministry do not have the Word of God unless they are ordained, nor are they, of themselves, things indifferent. Therefore they ought not to be in use."¹⁵³

This absolute appeal to Scripture is what we should expect of Hooper. From the point of view of a strict appeal to Scripture he is quite right, that vestments are not ordained in the Word of God. Hooper's difficulties, however, began when he tried to define what he meant by "things indifferent." He continues his argument :

"The first part of the argument is so clearly true that it needs no proof. Concerning the second part, I would point out that by nature . . . all things indifferent ought, of necessity, to have these four conditions and properties, otherwise they are not indifferent."¹⁵⁴

In laying down the four conditions for "things indifferent," Hooper clearly had in mind that he was going on to show that vestments could not comply with these conditions. What Hooper however succeeded in doing was to produce four conditions which were not consistent with each other and which made it just about impossible for any practice to fall into the category of a "thing indifferent." Nevertheless, in spite of the fact that his four conditions, taken together are valueless as a definition of a "thing indifferent," when

taken separately they provide further interesting and clear evidence of the direction in which Hooper's teaching was leading him. After he had stated his four conditions, Hooper then added further expansion to each point, relating these points to the question of vestments in particular. For the sake of clarity, however, as the original document is confused in the extreme, we will mention each point in turn together with Hooper's expanded explanation of it. The contradictory nature of the conditions, both among themselves and also for the main thesis given above, will be self-evident and need not again be remarked upon.

(a) *The First Condition.*

" Things indifferent ought to have their origins and foundation in the Word of God for what cannot be proved from the Word of God is not from faith, for faith is from the hearing of the Word of God (Romans 10). Indeed what is not from faith cannot be something indifferent, but, as the Scripture says, truly is sin (Romans 14)."¹⁵⁵

In this condition Hooper strikes once again at the roots of any idea of practices being allowed in the church which are not vouched for in the Word. Traditional usage which has grown up in the church through the years cannot be allowed of itself to sanction any practice in the church. There must be a complete break with all tradition which had grown up in medieval times, even in things indifferent, and an unconditional return to the apostolic practice.

In his application of this condition to vestments Hooper suggests that the only mention of vestments in the Word is confined to the Aaronic priesthood, the ceremonies and practices of which are shown in the apostolic writings to be only types and shadowy figures. Hooper returns to this point in his second condition.¹⁵⁶

Hooper further tells the Council that people who claim vestments as " things indifferent "

" ought to show us from these books (i.e. the apostolic writings) why and when some . . . particular vestments ought to be employed in the ministry, for the adornment of the minister himself or the preservation of dignity or for some distinction whereby the minister should be separated from the people, just as formerly it was ordered by the Lord in the ministry of the Aaronic priests. But the statutes, books, and decrees of the apostles and evangelists make no mention of this fact."¹⁵⁷

This application provides evidence, which may be confirmed from the rest of Hooper's writings,¹⁵⁸ of Hooper's view of the ministry. The minister does not belong to a " priestly caste " and therefore he should not wear vestments as if he were a priest. Further, the task of the minister is to serve the people in the preaching of the Word and administration of the Sacraments, thus it is not right that the minister should dress himself up in special vestments in an attempt to make his office one of superiority. The Aaronic

priesthood was separated from the people by its priestly office, and thus priests wore special clothes to indicate this separation. A Christian minister, however, Hooper implies, should not be thus separated from the people, he is one of them, his task is a functional one. When a man becomes a minister there is no question of his being transferred to a different class in the church, he is simply a believer who is performing the function of a minister.

Therefore, Hooper concludes, as the writings of the apostles and evangelists make no mention of the use of vestments in the apostolic church, vestments lack the first condition of a "thing indifferent" and cannot be reckoned as such.

At the end of his statement on this first condition Hooper supports his case with quotations from church history.¹⁵⁹ Two quotations are taken from Polydore Vergil's *De Inventoribus Librum*. Speaking concerning vestments Polydore says, "From whence soever these things may have originated they altogether refer to Hebrew rather than apostolic institutions."¹⁶⁰ Hooper returns to this quotation later. The second quotation is: "At the beginning of the rising church the priests, when about to conduct divine worship, were not accustomed to put on any additional garment."¹⁶¹ Concerning this appeal to the practice of the early church, Ridley, in his reply to Hooper, denied the validity of the principle that "it is not lawful, because they (the early church) did it not."¹⁶² Ridley suggested that this doctrine was "the very mother and wellspring of many both old and new schisms,"¹⁶³ because the result of such teaching was a failure to consider "the diversity of times concerning the external ecclesiastical polity, or the true liberty of the Christian religion in external rites and ceremonies."¹⁶⁴ Ridley saw the situation clearly. It was exactly this difference of principle which separated him from Hooper, and which, in the reign of Elizabeth I caused some of the Puritans to refuse to conform to the English church. Ridley and the other bishops could not possibly come to agreement with Hooper for the two parties started from different pre-suppositions. Hooper's pre-supposition was the authority of the Bible only, Ridley's was the authority of the Bible together with the freedom of the Church to institute external rites and ceremonies as the "diversity of the times" demanded.

(b) *The Second Condition.* The second condition that Hooper demands of a "thing indifferent" is that it should not be compulsory but "that it may be left free for us to use or not to use according as it will seem expedient or inexpedient to the conscience of the user."¹⁶⁵ Having said this, Hooper returns to his favourite theme and defines what is compulsory saying, "those things which are commanded by God are of a necessity always to be obeyed and those things which are prohibited must always of necessity be avoided and shunned."¹⁶⁶ He then adds a note concerning exegesis :

"But not only what is ordered or prohibited by the spoken Word of God, but even all knowledge of the divine will which can necessarily be deduced and assembled from the collation and comparison of the scriptures amongst themselves, has power and nature of the divine will, whether as a command or as a prohibition, provided it agrees with the nature and symmetry of the faith and Scripture."¹⁶⁷

It is of interest to note that as an example of this Hooper cites infant baptism which is commanded "not indeed by spoken words but by the collation of the Scriptures among themselves."¹⁶⁸ Obviously this condition and the first, which stated that "things indifferent" must have their origin in Scripture, can scarcely stand together. If all in the Scripture is bound to be followed as God's will, there can be no room at all for the category of a "thing indifferent."

In the application of the second condition to vestments Hooper says "vestments lack the second mark and condition of 'things indifferent.' What is prohibited by God can in no way be indifferent as we pointed out above."¹⁶⁹ He refers to *Galatians* ii. 18, "For if I build up again those things which I destroyed, I proved myself a transgressor." On the basis of this text Hooper suggests that whoever tries to reinstitute things fulfilled in Christ transgresses the will of the Lord. He goes on to say that the priesthood of Aaron is clearly abolished in the priesthood of Christ (*Hebrews* vii.-10). The rites, vestments, etc. of the Aaronic priesthood were abrogated. This priesthood pointed to Christ yet to come. Now Christ had come and "those shadows of the Aaronic priesthood cannot consist together with the priesthood of Christ."¹⁷⁰ Hence the quotation from Polydore, to which Hooper refers back, that vestments refer to Hebrew rather than apostolic institution. If the Aaronic priesthood cannot consist with the priesthood of Christ "much less (can) that Popish priesthood which even by the testimony of their own books has been derived either from Aaron or from the Gentiles."¹⁷¹

(c) *The Third Condition.* The third requirement for "things indifferent" is that they "ought to have a manifest and open utility known in the church, lest they seem to be received in vain or thrust in by fraud and craft into the church."¹⁷² Hooper takes the opportunity to warn civil magistrates and ministers of the church against bringing into the church anything which will not contribute to the building up of that church. Unfortunately, Hooper's expansion of this third condition is missing in the manuscript, but it is possible from Ridley's reply to gather something of what Hooper wrote.

Hooper apparently suggested that vestments were not "things indifferent" as they had no definite use in the church. He then reiterated the suggestion that anyway each person should be allowed to judge on the matter. Ridley's reply says "the church hath received these vestments by lawful authority, and with an agreeable consent, for causes to them seem to be godly. . . . If every

subject shall be a judge, what profiteth or not profiteth, what order then shall follow?"¹⁷³ Hooper next seems to have gone on and objected again to ministers wearing vestments on the grounds that it separated him from the people. A minister should not be known by his outer garments and Hooper apparently went so far as to protest against the distinction implied in the words "clergy" and "laity." In support of this Hooper probably quoted 1 *Peter* ii. 9, "But ye are . . . a royal priesthood," and explicitly stated his belief in the literal priesthood of all believers. Ridley's reply is as follows :

"I do . . . count it no more an inconvenience that some be called, men of the clergy, and some, men of the laity, than in the university, that some be called 'scholars' and some 'men of the town' although indeed they both dwell within one town. But St. Peter calleth all men priests. What then, I pray you, will you thereof gather, that all men must have priests apparel, or one kind of apparel?"¹⁷⁴

This reply of Ridley's at this point evaded the issue. Hooper had claimed that all believers were priests and that therefore those believers who were called to exercise the function of the ministry should not be distinguished from their fellow believers by outward vestments. Hooper's point was that the practice should be that ministers should wear their normal clothing in their ministry. To suggest, as Ridley does, that the implication of Hooper's argument was that all men should wear the same clothes was to miss the point. The remainder of Hooper's expansion is too obscure to be reconstructed with any certainty from Ridley's reply.

(d) *The Fourth Condition.* The fourth and last condition which Hooper stated for a "thing indifferent" is that it "ought to be instituted in the church with a kind of apostolic and evangelical lenity and freedom, not by a kind of violent tyranny."¹⁷⁵ Anything that has been tyrannically enforced and abused ceases to be a "thing indifferent." Once again the expansion of this condition in which Hooper applies it to vestments in particular is still missing, but Ridley's reply can give some idea of what Hooper said. The logical application of this condition obviously is that the appointed vestments in use in the English church were not instituted by apostolic lenity but by tyranny; therefore they were not "things indifferent." This would have been a frontal attack upon the whole system of ecclesiastical and civil authority in the English church. Apparently Hooper did not, in fact, draw this logical conclusion from his fourth condition. But if he did not explicitly draw this conclusion, Ridley rightly felt that this attack was implicit in Hooper's fourth condition. Ridley replied :

"I pray you, who hath appointed now and instituted our vestments in the church of England; and who have established them? Hath not the Archbishop with his company of learned men thereunto appointed by the king, his highness, and his majesty's Council appointed them? Hath not the king, his majesty, and whole Parliament

established them? If then this fourth note had been followed as it was proposed, what would have followed after, the wise may perceive. And though it follow not in words, yet it is evident what followeth in meaning."¹⁷⁶

It was clear to Ridley that in Hooper's challenge to the authority of the church on the question of vestments there lay the seeds of a far greater challenge. Ridley and the English bishops fiercely and successfully resisted Hooper's challenge but it inevitably came again in Elizabeth I's reign with greater force, and then it could not be beaten off.

The expansion of the fourth condition which Hooper, in fact, made, as Ridley said, little agreed with the fourth condition. To his statement concerning the tyrannical imposition of "things indifferent" Hooper merely added: "I dare as well defend the altar stones, holy bread and holy water, yea and images too, with as good authority as they defend vestments."¹⁷⁷ To this statement Ridley simply replied "This man putteth no difference between 'adiaphora vera' and 'pseudo diaphora' as all other men do that write upon the matter."¹⁷⁸

In addition to the four conditions and their expansions Hooper added three further dangerous points addressed chiefly to the magistrates. The first point was probably the most dangerous. Hooper said,

"that (authority) which pertains to the civil state our controversy does not touch. And so I would not willingly wish the state of this our controversy to be turned from the ecclesiastical state to the civil by anyone, which our opponents for the most part do; every one of them does not willingly suffer the cause to be examined and decided in their own ecclesiastical council, but power and aid are begged from the civil authority and from magistrates."¹⁷⁹

Hooper was daring to infer in a statement to the King's Council that the jurisdiction of the civil magistrate did not extend to authority in the church. This must have savoured very much of Anabaptism and no doubt helped to strengthen opposition against him.¹⁸⁰ It was dangerous talk indeed in the England of 1550.

The second point Hooper made was to warn the magistrates against those who were venturing to persuade them of the value of vestments. As Ridley said in his reply, this was an attack on all those ministers "that do allow and approve the order of the Book of Common Prayer."¹⁸¹ Hooper did not mince his words but called them dreamers who wished to retain "the shows of vestments in the church . . . for the purpose of preserving utility, decorum and rank in the ministry."¹⁸² He warns the magistrates that the result will be "an ensuing scorn of the magistrates and the greatest lessening of their authority in civil administration and government."¹⁸³ Hooper continues the attack on the support of the vestments,

"O children of this world wiser in your generations than the children of light (St. Luke 16: 8), you who can persuade the magistrates so easily that adversaries are friends, and friends adversaries, and (persuade them) . . . to protect, to sustain, to embellish and defend your superstitious and blind church . . . more than the perfect and enlightened church of the apostles."¹⁸⁴

Such an attack can hardly have helped Hooper's cause, but it represents an impassioned plea to the Council for a more thorough reformation and a return to the simplicity and perfection of the apostolic church.

Hooper's third point is that he will maintain his position unto death. He challenges his opponents to take up their cause and to uphold it in the sacred volume of the Bible, because, he says, "the book is both yours and mine, your judge and mine."¹⁸⁵ He goes on to say that he will be willing to be punished by death,

"if I do not prove my cause to be good and your cause to be bad, either according to the example of the church of the apostles, or the church of anyone else which, in this our age, is administered according to the Word of God."

Hooper no doubt had in mind to point to the Zürich church as an example of the latter.¹⁸⁶

These then are the main points of the document which Hooper submitted to the Council on October 3rd, 1550. That it is confused, illogical, repetitive and contradictory when considered as a whole is undeniable. Nevertheless, in its individual clauses which argue for the absolute authority of the Bible in all matters, a return to the simplicity of the apostolic church, the freedom of judgment for the individual, the literal interpretation of the priesthood of all believers, and even for the freedom of the church from magisterial control, added evidence is provided that in the Vestment Controversy between Hooper and the English episcopal bench there can be seen many of the seeds of English Puritanism.

As a result of Hooper's document to the Council, Ridley was sent for by the Council on October 6th, and sharply told this controversy had gone far enough and should cease. Ridley asked permission to put in writing his point of view in answer to Hooper's document. This permission was granted¹⁸⁷ and Ridley went away to reply to Hooper.

In the meantime Hooper was attempting to rally support to his cause. A'Lasco and the Strangers' Church were on his side. That he knew. In fact A'Lasco wrote a letter, probably about this time, to Cranmer mentioning two points.¹⁸⁸ The first point contained an argument for the abolition of kneeling at the Lord's Supper, the second point argued for the abolition of vestments. Hooper sought also the support of Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer. On October 17th he wrote to both these men and sent the letter by

a messenger first to Martyr in Oxford and then to Bucer in Cambridge. In his letter to Bucer Hooper said: "You will understand from this dispatch the cause which has involved me in strife. I entreat you to be good enough to give it a single perusal and if you find anything amiss, I pray you to point it out to me by letter"¹⁸⁹ Hooper waited anxiously in London for their replies.

On October 19th Ridley came to the Council with his reply to Hooper's submission of October 3rd. Hooper was also present and there was a violent scene between the two men. Hooper was refused a copy of Ridley's reply. But he remained steadfast in his opposition to "all relics of popery."¹⁹⁰

About a month later Hooper received the replies from Martyr and Bucer.¹⁹¹ Neither of these two would take his side. Both agreed that it would be a good thing if the church was restored to the apostolic simplicity but they also both agreed that vestments were not a matter worth disputing about, for as Martyr wrote: "If we would first suffer the gospel to be spread abroad and to take deep root, perhaps men would better and more easily be persuaded to take away these outward garments."¹⁹² From these replies it is clear that Hooper had used very much the same basic arguments in his dispatch to Martyr and Bucer as he had in his submission to the Council of October 3rd. So by the end of November Hooper found himself opposed by everyone of note except A'Lasco. But he remained firm.

Soon Hooper's troubles increased, for the Council, by now no doubt thoroughly convinced by Ridley that Hooper was in the wrong, commanded him "to keep his house, unless it were to go to the bishop of Canterbury, Ely, London or Lincoln, for counsel or satisfaction of his conscience . . . and neither to preach nor read (i.e. expound the scripture) till he had further licence from the Council."¹⁹³ The date of this command is not known but it was probably about the beginning of December. Soon after this Hooper wrote a brief and pathetic letter to Bullinger indicating the danger he was in and remarking that only A'Lasco stood by him.¹⁹⁴ Hooper further increased the danger of the situation by writing and publishing *A Godly Confession and Protestacion of the Christian Faith made and set furth by Jhon Hooper*.¹⁹⁵ In this confession there is a lengthy statement of his views on magistrates and repudiation of the views of the Anabaptists. This was no doubt a result of accusations made against him on account of the extreme views he gave in his submission of October 3rd. The dedication of the confession was to the king and is dated December 20th. It is perhaps some indication of the interest which the controversy had aroused that two editions of his confession were published in the last ten days of 1550.

Hooper had asked for trouble by this act of publication, and

he got it. The entry for January 13th, 1551, in the Acts of the Privy Council records,¹⁹⁶ "This day Mr. Hooper, bishop-elect of Gloucester, appeared before the Council touching his old matter of denial to wear such apparel as other bishops." As Hooper had failed to keep his house as ordered, and as he had published his *Godly Confession* and as he was steadfast in the matter of not wearing the bishop's vestments "he was now committed to the bishop of Canterbury's custody, either there to be reformed or further to be punished as the obstinacy of his case requireth."

In spite of attempts by Peter Martyr to dissuade him Hooper remained firm in his stand. The Council were thus faced with the question what to do next. Cranmer reported to them that Hooper was immovable. They therefore decided upon drastic action. The entry for January 27th, 1551 records,¹⁹⁷ "Upon a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury, that Mr. Hooper cannot be brought to any conformity and coveteth to prescribe orders and necessary laws of his head, it was agreed he should be committed to the Fleet." On the same day a letter was sent from the Council to the warden of the Fleet Prison to receive the said Mr. Hooper and to keep him from conference of any person saving the ministers of that house."¹⁹⁸

So at the end of January, 1551 Hooper found himself in prison. His imprisonment only lasted just over a fortnight. On February 15th he wrote a letter of surrender to Cranmer. It was a complete and sudden capitulation. The possibility of the arrival of letters from Switzerland influencing this decision suddenly to abandon his position cannot be ruled out.¹⁹⁹ To this must be added another influence, and one which has been almost entirely ignored by writers on the Vestment Controversy. This influence lies in the fact that the next step the authorities probably intended to take was to put Hooper to death. Evidence for this is found in John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*. It is, however, only to be found in the Latin edition of his work published in Basle in 1559 and did not come through into the more accessible English translation of Foxe's book. In the 1559 edition Foxe wrote of Hooper's capitulation,

"Thus ended this theological quarrel in the victory of the bishops, Hooper being forced to recant; or, to say the least, being constrained to appear once in public attired after the manner of the other bishops; which, unless he had done, there are those who think the bishops would have endeavoured to take away his life; for his servant told me the Duke of Suffolk sent word to Hooper, who was not ignorant of what they were doing."²⁰⁰

This was written only some eight years after the events, and, as the context indicates, Foxe's informant was Hooper's own servant. There seems thus no reason to doubt the authenticity of the report.

In his letter to Cranmer Hooper wrote,

"I now acknowledge the liberty of the sons of God in all external things: which I affirm and believe, neither that they are impious in

themselves, nor that any use of them is impious in itself, only the abuse, which can be pernicious to all of those who use them superstitiously or otherwise evilly . . . together with Dr. Bucer, Dr. Martyr and all godly and learned men."²⁰¹

Hooper adds that his motive for this surrender is not "dissimulation, or fear, or any other motive, than for the church."²⁰² This was indeed a change of heart. Hooper now agreed that vestments were not in themselves impious and that therefore they could be used in the church. Only when they were used in connection with false and superstitious doctrines were vestments evil.

Hooper was faced with the choice of spending his life in prison—perhaps even of being put to death—or of capitulating and being allowed to continue his work for the kingdom of God. As Foxe says, "What was Hooper to do? The matter itself was not really worthy of death."²⁰³ Hooper gave in, and was received back into the friendship of the bishops and authorities. He was consecrated Bishop of Gloucester on March 8th. It was, however, conceded to him that he should wear the prescribed vestments only at his consecration, or when preaching before the king, or in his cathedral, or in any other public place. On all other occasions he should dress as he wished.²⁰⁴

Hooper's protest against vestments was not just the whim of a stubborn man; it was far more than that. It called for a more thorough reformation according to the Word of God, a clearer break with the medieval Roman traditions and a practical recognition of the theory of the priesthood of all believers. It was a conscious effort on Hooper's part to fulfil his mission and bring the English church into line with the Swiss church he had come to love. In this connection it should not be forgotten that this same Swiss church was, as Knappen says, "The one continental protestant group which gave signs of rising above national limitations to something of the power . . . of its medieval predecessor." Hooper's challenge "was an appeal from the narrowing Erastianism of England to something better."²⁰⁵ Hooper did not succeed and that was the end of the Vestment Controversy—for the moment. The bishops and their authority had apparently won a resounding victory. But this same challenge, first presented to the English episcopal authority by Hooper, was taken up by others in the reign of Elizabeth I, and then it had far reaching and lasting results in English Puritanism.

(To be concluded)

NOTES.

- ⁹² For Micron (1523-59) see J. H. Gerretsen, *Micronius*, Nijmegen, 1895.
- ⁹³ For Bucer's influence in England see C. H. Smyth, *Cranmer and the Reformation in England*, Cambridge, 1926, C. Hopf, *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation*, Blackwells, 1946, and A. E. Harvey, *Bucer in England*, Marburg dissertation, 1906.
- ⁹⁴ Z.S.A. E. II 343: 42; E.T. p. 36; O.L. 1 p. 56. For Utenhove see F. Pijper, *Jan Utenhove Zijn Leven en Zijne Werken*, 1883.
- ⁹⁵ Pietro Martyr Vermigli (1500-63) accepted the invitation to become Regius Professor of Theology at Oxford in 1547. He remained in England until 1553 and then returned to Strasbourg until 1556 when he moved to Zürich.
- ⁹⁶ Bernardino Ochino (1487-1565) was an ex Franciscan who came to England in 1548 remaining until 1553 when he returned to Zürich.
- ⁹⁷ Z.S.A. E. II 369: 6/7; E.T. p. 36; O.L. 1, p. 57.
- ⁹⁸ For A'Lasco see H. Dalton, *John A'Lasco*, 1881; A. Kuyper, *Joannis A'Lasco Opera* (2 Vol.), 1886; K. Hein, *Die Sakraments Lehre des J. A'Lasco* 1904.
- ⁹⁹ S.C. S. 70: 5; E.T. p. 39; O.L. 2, p. 622, and S.C. S. 70: 1.
- ¹⁰⁰ Z.S.A. E. II 343: 422; E.T. p. 41; O.L. 1, p. 64.
- ¹⁰¹ Hooper's teaching on divorce may be found in E. Wr. p. 380 fol.
- ¹⁰² Z.S.A. E. II 343: 418; E.T. p. 175; O.L. 1, p. 266.
- ¹⁰³ Z.S.A. E. II 343: 458; E.T. p. 42; O.L. 1, p. 65.
- ¹⁰⁴ S.C. S. 70: 136.
- ¹⁰⁵ See Strype *Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer*, Vol. I (Oxford, 1840), p. 269 fol.
- ¹⁰⁶ *Chronicle of the Greyfriars of London*, ed. J. G. Nichols, London, 1852, published Camden Society, p. 63.
- ¹⁰⁷ S.C. 71: 98; E.T. p. 363; O.L. 2, p. 557.
- ¹⁰⁸ See *Latimer's Sermons*, Parker Society Edition, p. 118.
- ¹⁰⁹ *Chronicle of Greyfriars*, *op. cit.*, p. 63.
- ¹¹⁰ S.C. 71: 98; E.T. p. 363; O.L. 2, p. 557.
- ¹¹¹ For a summary of the views of Melchior Hoffmann see Hans Joachim Schoeps, *Von Himmlischen Fleisch Christi*, Tübingen, 1951.
- ¹¹² Pamphlet entitled *A Lesson of the Incarnation of Christ that he took his humanity in and of the Blessed Virgin*, is in L. Wr., pp. 1-18. Also Z.S.A. E. II 369: 14/15; E.T. p. 56; O.L. 1, p. 88.
- ¹¹³ *Narratives of the Days of the Reformation*, ed. J. G. Nichols, London, 1859, Camden Society. Strype records a verdict concerning Hooper's preaching as recorded by a contemporary: "After Hooper began to preach in London . . . he was so admired by the people, that they held him for a prophet, nay they looked upon him as some deity." *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, Vol. II, 1, p. 66. Oxford, 1822.
- ¹¹⁴ Z.S.A. E. II 343: 420; E.T. p. 44; O.L. 1, p. 70.
- ¹¹⁵ Z.S.A. E. II 343: 457; E.T. p. 46; O.L. 1, p. 71.
- ¹¹⁶ Z.S.A. E. II 369: 12/13; E.T. p. 48; O.L. 1, p. 77.
- ¹¹⁷ Z.S.A. E. II 343: 457; E.T. p. 46; O.L. 1, p. 72.
- ¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹⁹ Z.S.A. E. II 369: 12/13; E.T. p. 48; O.L. 1, p. 75.
- ¹²⁰ *Ibid.*
- ¹²¹ E. Wr. pp. 431-560.
- ¹²² *Ibid.*, pp. 500 and 534.
- ¹²³ *Ibid.*, p. 503.
- ¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 479.
- ¹²⁵ The Decades of Sermons were first translated into English in their entirety in 1577 with two further editions in 1584 and 1587. They were

again published by the Parker Society in four volumes in the years 1849-1852, a volume each year. This is the translation to which reference is given in these notes. The present reference is Dec., Vol. II, p. 5.

¹²⁶ Z.S.A. E. II 369: 19; E.T. p. 214; O.L. 1, p. 324.

¹²⁷ Z.S.A. E. II 369: 205; E.T. p. 274; O.L. 2, p. 415.

¹²⁸ Dec., Vol. III, p. 122.

¹²⁹ Z.S.A. E. II 338: 1486/87.

¹³⁰ Letter in *Ecclesiae Londino Batavae Archivum*, Vol. II, p. 29.

¹³¹ For a full history of this church see J. Lindeboom, *Austin Friars. History of the Dutch Reformed Church in London, 1550-1950*. The Hague, 1950.

¹³² Z.S.A. E. II 369: 92; E.T. p. 50; O.L. 2, p. 79.

¹³³ Z.S.A. E. II 369: 14/15; E.T. p. 55; O.L. 1, p. 87.

¹³⁴ *The Two Liturgies with other Documents set forth by authority in the reign of King Edward the Sixth*, ed. Kettley. Parker Society, Cambridge, 1844, p. 169.

¹³⁵ For further details of the English Vestments see T. A. Lacey, *The Ecclesiastical Habit in England*, Transactions of the St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society, IV (1896-1900), pp. 126-134. N. F. Robinson, *The Black Chimere of Anglican Prelates*, pp. 180-220 in the same volume.

¹³⁶ See letters of J. R. Stumph in Z.S.A. E. II 335/2149; E.T. p. 308; O.L. 2, p. 466; and S.C. S. 72: 217.

¹³⁷ Z.S.A. E. II 369: 94; E.T. p. 270; O.L. 2, p. 410.

¹³⁸ Z.S.A. E. II 369: 14/15; E.T. p. 56; O.L. 1, p. 87.

¹³⁹ Acts of the Privy Council of England, Vol. III (ed. J. R. Dasent), p. 31.

¹⁴⁰ Bullinger's *Diarium*, *op. cit.*, p. 38, line 10.

¹⁴¹ S.C. S. 73: 4.

¹⁴² Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Vol. III, p. 174.

¹⁴³ See letters Z.S.A. E. II 369: 205; E.T. p. 274; O.L. 2, 416; and Z.S.A. E. II 369: 93; E.T. p. 368, O.L. 2, p. 566, from John Ab Ulmis and Micron to Bullinger.

¹⁴⁴ *Literary Remains of King Edward VI.* (ed. J. G. Nichols), Camden Society, p. 414.

¹⁴⁵ Letter in Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, *op. cit.*, Vol. VI, p. 641.

¹⁴⁶ Z.S.A. E. II 369: 93; E.T. p. 368; O.L. 2, p. 567.

¹⁴⁷ Letter in Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, *op. cit.*, Vol. VI, p. 640.

¹⁴⁸ Z.S.A. E. II 369: 98; E.T. p. 321; O.L. 2, p. 487.

¹⁴⁹ Z.S.A. E. II 369: 87; E.T. p. 371; O.L. 2, p. 571.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁵¹ The manuscript is in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, reference (New College 343, folios 16-17 verso). The Latin was published by Dr. Hopf in *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. XLIV, July-October, 1943, pp. 194-99. We shall give the reference to the J.T.S. with page and line number, the title reference is J.T.S., p. 196, lines 15-18.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, lines 19-25.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, lines 26-29.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, lines 31-35.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 198, line 24.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, lines 26-32.

¹⁵⁸ See original Thesis, p. 139 fol.

¹⁵⁹ J.T.S., p. 198, line 35. The manuscript gives only two citations but from Ridley's reply to Hooper (published in *Writings of Bradford*, Vol. II, Parker Society, Cambridge, 1853, pp. 373-385, hereafter *Bradford*, Vol. II) it appears that Hooper gave four citations. See *Bradford*, Vol. II, p. 383.

¹⁶⁰ Polyd. Vergil, *de inventoribus rerum Lib.* IV, cap. vii, Basileae 1570, p. 325 fol.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, Lib. VI, cap. xii, p. 534.

¹⁶² Bradford, Vol. II, p. 381.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 382. Ridley suggests that this savours of Anabaptist teaching.

¹⁶⁵ J.T.S., p. 197, lines 1-2.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, lines 4-6.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, lines 7-12.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, lines 13-14.

¹⁶⁹ J.T.S., p. 198, lines 37-38.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, line 43.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, line 44, and p. 199, lines 1-2.

¹⁷² J.T.S., p. 197, lines 19-21.

¹⁷³ Bradford, Vol. II, p. 386.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁵ J.T.S., p. 197, lines 28-30.

¹⁷⁶ Bradford, Vol. II, pp. 387-8. It is interesting to note the seventeenth century historian Fuller on the Vestment Controversy. He writes: "In a word all those arguments, which later ages have more amply enlarged, more clearly explained, more cunningly improved, more violently enforced, were then and there first solidly propounded, and solemnly set down on both sides: posterity in this matter having discovered no new mine, but only refined what formerly was found out in this controversy." Fuller, T., *The Church History of England*, ed. J. Nichols, 1868, Vol. II, p. 377.

¹⁷⁷ Bradford, Vol. II, p. 388.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁹ J.T.S., p. 197, lines 39-43.

¹⁸⁰ It is not surprising that Hooper was called an Anabaptist by some of his opponents. Evidence of this may be found in the *Calender of letters between England and Spain*, Vol. 10, pp. 261, 254, 591, and 593.

¹⁸¹ Bradford, Vol. II, p. 379.

¹⁸² J.T.S., p. 197, lines 46-47 and p. 198, line 1.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 198, lines 1-3.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, lines 3-9.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, lines 12-13.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, lines 13-16. This appeal to the "best Reformed Churches" of the sixteenth century as an example to be followed became typical of Puritanism. See M. N. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, Chicago, 1939, p. 363.

¹⁸⁷ *Acts of the Privy Council*, Vol. III, ed. J. R. Dasent, p. 136.

¹⁸⁸ Kuyper, A., *A'Lasco Opera*, Vol. II, letter 79, p. 655 fol. The letter is undated but internal evidence points to a date when the Vestment Controversy was at its height.

¹⁸⁹ Gorham, G. C., *Gleanings of a few scattered ears during the period of the Reformation in England*, London, 1857, p. 185. Latin in L.Wr., p. XIV.

¹⁹⁰ Z.S.A. E. II 369: 87; E.T. p. 373; O.L. 2, p. 573.

¹⁹¹ Letters in Gorham, *op cit*, Martyr's, p. 187 fol. Bucer's, p. 200 fol. A Latin copy of the former is in the Zürich archives, Z.S.A. E. II 359: 3021/3 and the Latin of the latter is in *Scripta Anglicana fere omnia a. Conr. Huberto collecta*, Basle, 1577, p. 705 fol.

¹⁹² Strype, J., *Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer*, Vol. I, Oxford, 1840, p. 304, where quotations from Martyr's reply are given. It is also clear that there was correspondence between Bucer, Martyr and A'Lasco about Hooper's situation. This correspondence is gradually coming to light. See Hopf, C., *Martin Bucer*, Oxford, 1946, p. 147 fol.

¹⁹³ *Acts of the Privy Council*, Vol. III, ed. Dasent, p. 191.

¹⁹⁴ A mystery surrounds this letter; for a discussion and solution of it see the original Thesis, p. 70 and note 276. The letter may be found embedded in the postscript in E.T. p. 60 and O.L. 1, p. 95 of another letter. Original is Z.S.A. E. II 369: 28.

¹⁹⁵ In L.Wr., pp. 64-92.

¹⁹⁶ *Acts of the Privy Council, op cit*, p. 191.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid*, p. 199.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid*.

¹⁹⁹ Calvin had certainly written to Hooper suggesting that he should not go to such lengths in his opposition. Unfortunately we do not know the date of this letter. It is only mentioned in a letter from Calvin to Bullinger dated March 4th, 1551. We cannot be certain that this letter which Calvin tells Bullinger he has written "recently" to Hooper reached England before February 15th. See *Corpus Reformatorum*, Vol. XIV, p. 74, and G. C. Gorham, *op cit*, p. 241. It is definite that Bullinger wrote to Hooper in the middle of January, 1551. This letter passed through Strasbourg on January 19th (see letter of Burcher to Bullinger dated January 21st, S.C. S. 74: 40; E.T. p. 438; O.L. 2, p. 676) and thus might be expected to arrive in London about the middle of February. The letter is not extant but may well have contained advice to capitulate and to get on with the work of a bishopric.

²⁰⁰ Foxe, J., *Rerum in ecclesia gestarum . . . commentarii*, Basle, 1559, p. 280.

²⁰¹ Gorham, *op cit*, p. 233 fol. Latin in L.Wr., p. XV.

²⁰² *Ibid*.

²⁰³ Foxe, J., *Rerum in ecclesia gestarum . . . commentarii, op cit*, p. 280.

²⁰⁴ Reported in Burnet, G., *History of the Reformation*, ed. Pocock, 7 Vols., Oxford, 1865. Vol. II, p. 286.

²⁰⁵ Knappen, *op cit*, p. 84.

W. MORRIS S. WEST.

Sing With The Understanding, by G. R. Balleine. (Independent Press, 10s. 6d.)

To the stream of books on hymns now flowing from the presses this publication adds one which may warmly be commended to members of congregations and those who conduct worship. The author takes forty-one well-known hymns, tells their stories and expounds their meaning. One of the tasks he has set himself is to unravel obscurities—such as "Each sweet Ebenezer," the "sons" which are borne away by time's "everlasting stream," the "anointing Spirit," the "sevenfold gifts"—which must puzzle the majority of worshippers. In this, Mr. Balleine has rendered a valuable service. Indeed the whole book, which is based on thorough knowledge and most interesting to read, successfully fulfils the author's purpose and, if used rightly and widely, will contribute to more intelligent and worshipful congregational singing.

GRAHAM W. HUGHES.