Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism

(*Concluded*)

VI. HOOPER IN GLOUCESTER

A BRIEF SURVEY OF BISHOP HOOPER'S VISITATION BOOK[206]

HOOPER went down to his bishopric about the beginning of April, 1551. He now had a real opportunity to put his precepts into practice. He felt himself responsible for the salvation of the people in his diocese and so the first thing he did was to carry out a visitation and examination of the clergy who would be his "brethren and fellow preachers"[207] in this work. The result of that visitation cannot have been very encouraging and the results show the situation among the clergy in England at that time.[208]

The examination consisted of questions concerning the Commandments, the Apostles Creed and the Lord's Prayer. The clergy were asked the number of the Commandments, where they were to be found in Scripture, and whether they could repeat them. They were asked to repeat the Creed and prove it from Scripture and, concerning the Lord's Prayer, they were asked to repeat it, to say who its author was, and where it could be found in Scripture. The results were as follows: 311 clergy were examined, and 79 were reckoned as satisfactory. Of the unsatisfactory clergy, 9 did not know how many Commandments there were, 33 did not know where they could be found in the Bible, and 168 could not repeat them. In the case of the Creed, 10 could not repeat it and 216 were unable to prove it. Concerning the Lord's Prayer, 39 did not know where it appeared in the Bible, 34 were ignorant as to who its author was and 10 could not repeat it. To take two examples:

> "Parish Church of Wydforde . . . John Nutle rector, not examined because decrepit, Charles Gawden, minister, Commandments, says ten, Exodus 20 but cannot repeat. Creed and Lord's Prayer, can say nothing to these nor repeat them from memory. Parish Church of Camme-cum-Stinchecombe . . . Nicholas Compton, Vicar, Commandments, knows their number, but says that they are written in Matthew 16, or in some of the Evangelists, and cannot repeat them. Creed, repeated the Articles, but did not prove one of them from Scripture. Lord's Prayer, can scarcely reply."[209]

Perhaps the most remarkable statement came from Philip Hawlinge (or Huling), minister of Awre, who suggested that the Creed might be proved from the Royal Injunctions and the first chapter of *Genesis!*

In connection with the results of this visitation it must, however, be remembered that at that time the Ten Commandments were not greatly used in public worship and also of course that the English version of the Bible had not long been in use. Nevertheless, the position was clearly bad, and Hooper set to work to improve the situation. To this end he produced a series of articles, injunctions and interrogatories for his diocese.

One of his chief tasks obviously was to improve his clergy. Therefore in an injunction which begins: " That whereas the people of God cannot be instructed in the truth of his word, except the parsons and curates, that have oversight over them be learned and exercised in the testaments of God, the new and the old . . ."[210] he ordered the clergy to study one book a quarter and stated that they should be examined each quarter on the contents of the book. For the first year the books to be studied were *Romans, Deuter-onomy, Matthew* and *Genesis.*[211]

For our purpose, however, what is more interesting is the injunction ordering assemblies of clergy once a quarter. Every clergyman in the diocese was ordered to appear four times a year before Hooper or his deputies in assemblies in the deanery of the area of the diocese in which he worked. The purpose of their assembling together was " for the determination of such questions and doubtful matters in religion as may happen to stand and be in controversy between men learned and them; and there to speak modestly, soberly and learnedly what they will."[212]   In other words, problems concerning religion were to be brought by these ministers to the assembly and there debated among themselves in the presence of the bishop or his deputy.

The practice was uncommon in an English bishopric at that time and the question may be asked as to where Hooper got the idea. The answer may well be—from Zürich. These assemblies of ministers up and down the diocese for the discussion of religious matters may have been suggested to Hooper either by the Zürich practice of Synods or more probably, by the first half of the " Prophesyings," i.e. the ministerial discussion, which we noted Hooper attended in Zürich. It is obvious that the state of the clergy did not permit of the presence of the laity at these assemblies. Hooper's desire was that the problems should be discussed by the ministers privately so that when they were settled the ministers could carry the answers back to the people. This was of course basically the same idea as the " Prophesyings " in Zürich. An interesting point which arises is that, from this Gloucester diocese, a link can perhaps be traced with the well known Elizabethan " Prophesyings " which began some thirteen years later. This link is John Parkhurst.

Parkhurst was the rector of the parish of Bishop's Cleeve in

Hooper's diocese, and in the visitation examination of 1551 was one of the few who were found "insigniter doctus."[213] It is clear that such a man would be used by Hooper in these assemblies and in other ways, and it is known that the two men became very friendly. When Queen Mary's injunctions were issued early in March, 1554, the fourth injunction urging all bishops to be vigilant "that no person be admitted or received to any ecclesiastical function, benefice, or office, being a sacramentary, infected or defamed with any notable heresy"[214] would make quite certain that Parkhurst would lose his charge at Bishop's Cleeve. He was faced with the prospect of exile and no doubt his contact with Hooper led him to choose Zürich. Parkhurst left England in the early summer of 1554 and arrived in Zürich about the middle of July.[215] He remained in exile until the death of Mary in 1558. Whilst in Zürich Parkhurst and his fellow exiles would see the "school" of which Hooper had no doubt often spoken.

It is clear that the Elizabethan "Prophesyings" as they are reflected in the records left of their practice in Northampton and Lincoln[216] were not exactly the same as those of Zürich. In these English "Prophesyings" the public preaching, in which three ministers usually took part, preceded the private ministerial discussion instead of vice-versa, and the attendance on the part of the ministers seems to have been voluntary. Nevertheless, the fact of these exercises bearing the same name as the Zürich practice and having the same basic idea, i.e. the education of the laity through the ministers working together on Bible exegesis, would seem to suggest some contact between the Zürich and English practice.[217]

The likelihood of such a contact is increased when we consider where these "Prophesyings" first appeared in Elizabethan England. It is true that the fullest records we have are of the exercises in Northampton in 1571, and in Lincoln in 1574, but the first recorded appearance of them is in Norwich in 1564. In this year it is recorded that the preachers of the city began "both for their better exercise and also for the education of the people, prophesying; which is done once in three weeks ..."[218] The Norwich "Prophesyings" were instituted with the exegesis of *Romans*. The point of interest is that the Bishop of Norwich since 1560 had been John Parkhurst.[219] There is no definite evidence that it was at his instigation that the "Prophesyings" began, but it is not unlikely. There is a letter of a later date from Parkhurst to certain people in Bury St. Edmunds written on February 16th, 1572 agreeing that the practice could well be extended to Bury. The letter begins: "For as much as the godly exercise of expounding the scriptures by way of 'prophesy' is seen daily to bring no small benefit and furtherance to the Church of Christ where the same is used within this diocese ..."[220] This clearly indicates that the practice was well

established in the Norwich diocese by 1572 and encouraged by Parkhurst. It is also interesting that the recipients of this letter are authorised to take charge of the " Prophesyings " and that *all* the clergy should attend. If they do not they are to be reported so that they may be " reformed." This apparent compulsion is the Zürich practice and not that reflected at Lincoln and Northampton where attendance was voluntary.

There were certainly other influences at work in the setting up of the Elizabethan " Prophesyings," notably the memory of the practice in A'Lasco's Strangers' Church in London in the reign of Edward VI.[221] But there seems also to be an influence which went out from Zürich through Hooper and his assemblies to Parkhurst, who came to Zürich and saw for himself the value of the practice before returning to England to take up office in the Church.[222]

In addition to these assemblies a second result of Hooper's visitation was that he made use of another Zürich idea and appointed superintendents.[223] The superintendent corresponded to the Zürich *Dekan*. In Zürich the area was divided into seven *Kapiteln*, each *Kapitel* having a *Dekan*. His task was to make certain that all was well in the realms of church order and preaching, and also to report to the Synod ministers who persisted in offences against ecclesiastical or moral laws.[224]

Unfortunately we know all too little about the superintendents in Hooper's diocese, but what little we know indicates that they had a similar function. Hooper mentioned the fact that he had " made superintendents in Gloucestershire " when he wrote to William Cecil, the secretary of the Council, on October 25th, 1552, and added that he was about to examine the clergy to see what progress they had made since the last examination.[225] He writes also concerning the superintendents and says : " If I commend not myself presently their well doings and see what is evil done I shall not see the good I look for." In his injunctions issued after his 1551 visitation, Hooper indicates the need of exhorting

> " such men as be already sworn before me in my visitation, with the
> church wardens, to take heed diligently of the manners and conditions
> of the parson, vicar, and curate of the parish and . . . of the
> parishioners and so by writing deliver . . . every quarter unto me, or
> to mine officers, all such faults and transgressions as shall be com-
> mitted by any of them . . . contrary unto God's laws and the king's
> in any unhonest life or false religion."[226]

It is very probable that these men of whom Hooper speaks were in fact the superintendents, who would thus have the task of making certain that the clergy and laity in their area obeyed the laws of doctrine and of the realm. John Foxe seems to confirm this when he speak of both John Rogers and Hooper agreeing on the policy of setting one superintendent over every ten churches, to help in

getting rid of " popish priests," and to ascertain that the minister did his duty in profiting both himself and his people.[227]

Hooper's Fifty Visitation Articles are of special interest in view of their similarity to the well known *Forty-Two Articles*. It is clear that Hooper based his articles on the *Forty-Two Articles* and on the articles which Bishop Ridley issued for his London diocese in 1550.[228] It is interesting to remark that the *Forty-Two Articles* were of course not officially issued until early in 1553. Thus Hooper anticipated them by nearly two years. It is however known that a set of articles, presumably similar to the *Forty-Two Articles,* was in existence before Hooper issued his. Hooper himself, writing to Bullinger on December 17th, 1549, and on February 5th, 1550,[229] expressly mentions with approval the fact that the Archbishop of Canterbury has some articles to which all preachers and lecturers in divinity must subscribe before they are allowed to begin their activities. Hooper also required subscription by his clergy to the Visitation Articles which he had issued, but it was clear that he was acting on his own responsibility. In fact, Hooper wrote to Cecil on July 6th, 1552 indicating what he had done and pleading " for the love of God, cause the articles that the king's majesty spake of when we took our oaths to be set forth by his authority. I doubt not but they shall do much good : for I will cause every minister to confess them openly before their parishioners."[230] Hooper wished to add the King's authority to his own in causing his clergy to subscribe to the articles.

In October, 1552, when Hooper was at Worcester, the diocese of which had been added to that of Gloucester, examining the cathedral clergy on their subscription to his articles, two canons, Joliffe and Jonson, refused to subscribe. A dispute followed, an account of which was published in 1564 in Antwerp by Joliffe.[231] This account, in Latin, preserves 19 of the articles in dispute and of these 10 coincide almost word for word with the Latin articles of the Forty-Two and 7 agree though less fully stated.[232] Thus it seems clear that some form of the *Forty-Two Articles* was in existence both in English and in Latin for some time before they were officially published.[233]

For our purpose, however, what is of particular interest is not so much where Hooper's articles agree with the *Forty-Two Articles* and with Ridley's Articles, but rather where they differ from them or go beyond them. It is in these differences between Hooper's and the other articles that we can catch a glimpse of Hooper's distinctive point of view. Therefore we may perhaps now remark on a few of these differences.

(a) While the first of the *Forty-Two Articles* defines the doctrine of the Trinity, Hooper puts this second in his set. At the head of Hooper's articles stands, as we might expect, the article concern-

ing the absolute authority of the Scripture. All things necessary for salvation are contained in the Old and New Testaments, and Hooper adds that the ministers must take care not " to establish and confirm any manner of doctrine . . . which cannot be duly and justly approved by the authority of God's holy Word."[234]

(b) In his article on the church Hooper differs from the Forty-Two in two points. The twentieth article of the Forty-Two says that " The visible church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men." Hooper omits the word " visible."[235] Secondly, Hooper adds an important clause which once again sheds doubt upon the accepted idea of apostolic succession in the Church.

> " . . . the church of God is not by God's word taken for the multitude or company of men, as of bishops, priests, and such other, but that it is the company of all men hearing God's word, and obeying unto the same; lest that any man should be seduced, believing himself to be bound unto any ordinary succession of bishops and priests, but only unto the word of God, and the right use of the sacraments."[236]

(c) On the question of good works, the twelfth article of the Forty-Two simply denies that works done before justification by faith are of value. Hooper agrees, but adds the positive side: " That good works do necessarily follow justification,"[237] and puts in an extra article insisting upon good works being required of " every Christian man."[238] This emphasis is typical of Hooper and may well derive from his covenant conception.

(d) Hooper reproduces the article on the ministry almost verbatim from the twenty-fourth article of the Forty-Two. He then makes two additions. First, he puts in a sentence condemning " all manner of simony in all kinds of ministers and orders of the ecclesiastical ministry."[239] Secondly, he adds an interesting statement which might appear to make his idea of the ministry one of function only. Hooper says

> " We understand by the ministry and know it not by the name alone, but by the work and administration in it, to the edifying of the church and body of Christ by the faithful administration of God's word and sacraments . . . from the which if a minister cease, he leaveth to be a minister, and should not be taken for one."[240]

In this connection we may note here an instance recorded in the diocesan records of Gloucester for the reign of Elizabeth I when, on December 10th, 1561, Robert Byocke, curate of Stroud, was accused of unlicensed preaching. Byocke, in evidence, claimed that he was " made minister " by Hooper in a room in the episcopal palace, no one else being made a minister at the same time. Byocke goes on:

> " All the orders that he had given unto him by the said bishop were given him at that one time, but what orders they were he, this deponent, knows not more than that the said bishop willed and charged him to go forward according to the words of the Bible, which he then

did hold in his hand, and to preach the same and to minister the sacraments. . . . And . . . he has preached and ministered the sacraments ever since unto this present day."[241]

This may well be an exceptional incident. But the fact that it could happen at all seems to indicate that Hooper's conception of the ministry was, in accordance with his whole outlook, very simple.

(e) In his article on the sacraments Hooper follows the twenty-sixth article of the Forty-Two fairly closely, but adds an introductory clause indicating that, as Christ's people in the Old Testament had the sacraments as seals, so also in the New Testament the sacraments were seals, " and with the same to be annexed into the society of one godly people."[242] The Church of the Old and New Testaments is one Church.

(f) Although Hooper was a staunch supporter of the throne he did not adopt the rendering of the *Forty-Two Articles* concerning the king's supremacy in the Church. The thirty-sixth Article of the Forty-Two stated : " The King of England is supreme head in earth next under Christ, of the Church of England, and Ireland." Hooper rejected the word ' head ' and substituted ' supreme magistrate and power ' and so anticipated the Elizabethan article in the *Thirty-Nine Articles* which also rejected the term ' head.'[243] The designation ' Head of the Church ' is reserved for Christ alone.

(g) Hooper adds an article on a subject which was much emphasised by Bullinger; the care of the poor. This care is commended to us by Christ and therefore it is very necessary that collections should be made in every parish church for the relief of the poor of the parish, and also for strangers.[244]

(h) The final emphasis which requires our attention in Hooper's articles is that of the need for absolute simplicity both in worship and in the church buildings. Hooper was, of course, not the only bishop in England working for this end, but he surpassed the others in his desire for simplicity. Hooper objected to the presence of altars, an objection shared, for example, by Ridley.[245] Hooper, however, in addition, opposed the retention of the partition between the people and the minister. In his *Sermons on Jonah* Hooper said :

" But this I would wish, that the magistrates should put both the preacher, minister, and the people in one place, and shut up the partition called the chancel, that separateth the congregation of Christ one from the other, as though the veil and partition of the temple in the old law yet should remain in the church; where, indeed, all figures and types ended in Christ."[246]

This demand is confirmed in his forty-third article. The article is almost word for word the same as Ridley's fifth injunction to the London diocese in 1550 concerning the replacement of altars by tables. Ridley, however, says concerning the position of the table,

that it should be placed " in such place of the choir or chancel, as shall be thought most meet by their discretion and agreement, so that the ministers with the communicants, may have their place separated from the rest of the people."[247]   Hooper's forty-third article says, on the other hand, that the table should be placed " so that the ministers and communicants may be seen, heard, and understood of all the people being present." This clearly goes much further than Ridley's injunction. But Hooper has not yet finished, he adds : " further, that the minister in the use of the communion and prayers thereof turned his face toward the people."[248] This is distinctly contrary to the Prayer Book of 1549 which was then in use, in which the minister stood or knelt before the altar.

The church buildings were to be stripped of every possible relic of Roman Catholicism. Hooper's injunction to this effect was extreme and deserves to be quoted, at least in part. He enjoins the clergy :

> " that you exhort your parishioners and such as be under your care and charge for the ministry of the church, that they take down and remove out of their churches and chapels all places, tabernacles, tombs, sepulchres, tables, footstalls, rood-lofts, and other monuments, signs, tokens, relics, leavings and remembrances, where such superstition, idols, images, or other provocation of idolatry has been used. And also that ye take away all the greis, ascences, and upgoings that heretofore went to any altar within your churches or chapels: and to take down all the chapels, closets, partitions, and separations within your churches, whereat any mass hath been said, or any idol, image, or relic used to be honoured: . . ."[249]

The only thing that could be left was the private pew which a man had " within the church for his quietness, for himself and his to hear the common prayer."[250] Glass windows were not to be broken but when they needed repairing or replacing no image or picture of any saint should be allowed to remain on the window. If it was desired for any painting on the glass then it should be only flowers or quotations from scripture.[251] Images painted on the walls of the churches were to be defaced.[252] This work must be done by the parishioners themselves.

The ideal church building which Hooper desired to see throughout his diocese was to be simple in the extreme. The walls and roof would be bare and windows as plain as possible. There would be a pulpit containing the Bible in English, and the paraphrases of Erasmus on the New Testament. There would also be a communion table " decently covered," baptismal font, pews for the people, a box for contributions for the poor and a chest in which to keep the baptismal and marriage registers. That was all. There can be little doubt that Hooper had in mind what he believed to be the apostolic simplicity of the churches he had seen in Zürich, and so he went beyond the other English Reformers in Edward's reign in his

striving for simplicity. It can also be seen that these points arise naturally out of Hooper's strict biblicism and his love of simplicity in church practice.[253]

These then are the most important points in which Hooper departs from the sources of his articles and injunctions. We shall, however, do well to notice one or two further points which he emphasises in his Visitation Book.

The aim of Hooper in his bishopric may well be summed up by the twelfth question concerning the clergy to be asked of the parishioners. It reads : " whether they (the clergy) do diligently and often stir and provoke the people to the knowledge of God in Christ, after God's Word and also to obedience unto their king in their sermons and homilies every holy-day."[254] Hooper was always very practical in his suggestions, and more than once emphasises that if the people are to be taught by the clergy then they must be able to hear and understand what they say. All preaching must be in the vernacular and as the promises of Scripture should " heal, help, succour and comfort as well the poorest as the richest, the unlearned as the learned, him that sitteth next the church door, or nearest the belfry as him that sitteth in the chancel or nearest the chancel door," then when necessary the minister must come and stand in the body of the church and there reverently and plainly proclaim " the treasures and unspeakable riches of God's laws and promises." This makes certain that if any of the parish remain ignorant then their damnation will be upon their own heads and, says Hooper, " I and you shall this way deliver our own souls."[256] This bringing of the clergy into the midst of the people was, of course, most unusual in the English church of Hooper's day.

Hooper set a minimum standard of knowledge among the laity and says : " where knowledge of the Ten Commandments, the Creed and Paternoster lacketh in such as be of discretion, there lacketh God's grace and favour. . . ."[257] If people did not know the basic requirements of a covenant they could not enter it. Thus Hooper ordered the clergy to set aside certain days for the people to be tested by open confession of these three requirements " so that by this means (if curates be diligent) the people may come to the knowledge of God in Christ : of which, if they be ignorant of negligence or contempt they cannot be saved."[258]

It was to be the same in the Communion Service, to prevent any unrepentant person taking the Communion unworthily, the curate was, if possible, to make the communicants one after another individually repeat the Ten Commandments, Creed, the General Confession and the Lord's Prayer. If there were too many for this to be done, then the curate was to say these four things slowly, phrase by phrase, so that all might repeat them after him.[259]

Hooper's injunctions and interrogatories cover many other

points varying from the use of superstitious charms by midwives to the strict observance of a Sabbath day, but from the brief survey of his Visitation Book which we have given, it can be seen that he made a real attempt to put his theory into practice. The Bible was to be the basis of authority both for doctrine and for church practice, and Hooper's concern was that the message contained in the Bible should be conveyed to his people so that they might respond to it and obtain salvation.

HOOPER'S RELATIONS WITH HIS PEOPLE

There can be little doubt that Hooper was a severe man, both by disposition and in appearance. John Foxe relates the story of a man he knew who had a problem and visited Hooper to seek his advice. He knocked on Hooper's door, but when the bishop came the visitor was so " abashed at his austere behaviour " that he dared not go into the house but sought counsel elsewhere.[260] To balance this judgment we should also record that of Thomas Fuller, the 17th century church historian.

> " yet, to speak truth all Hooper's ill nature consisted in other men's little acquaintance with him. Such as visited him once, condemned him of over austerity: who repaired to him twice, only suspected him of the same; who conversed with him constantly not only acquitted him of all morosity, but commended him for sweetness of manner; which, saith my author, endeared him to the acquaintance of Bullinger."[261]

There are at least two instances recorded for us of Hooper's concern for the poor of his diocese. On April 17th, 1551, very shortly after his arrival in Gloucester, Hooper wrote an impassioned appeal to William Cecil on behalf of the poor asking for some Government action concerning high prices.

> " For the love and tender mercy of God, persuade and cause some order to be taken upon the price of things, or else the ire of God will shortly punish. All things be here so dear, that the most part of the people lacketh and yet more will lack necessary food."

Hooper complains of the money going into the pockets of the few rich people. He then goes on :

> " The prices of things be here as I tell ye; the number of people be great, their little cottages and poor livings decay daily; except God by sickness take them out of the world, they must needs lack. God's mercy give you and the rest of my lords wisdom to redress it, wherein I pray God ye may see the occasion of the evil and so destroy it."[262]

John Foxe records that he twice visited Hooper at Worcester and saw for himself how every day the bishop had a number of the poor to dinner, who " were served with hot and wholesome meats." Typically enough, before they were served they were examined on the Lord's Prayer, Creed and Ten Commandments by Hooper or one of his deputies. When the poor had been examined and

served, Hooper himself sat down to dinner and not before.[263] Hooper may have been severe, but he did not lack the virtue of humanity.

Hooper did not only exhort his clergy to their preaching of the Gospel to the people; he set them an example of remarkable zeal. Foxe, who was an eye-witness, records :

> " No father in his household, no gardener in his garden, nor husbandman in his vineyard was more or better occupied than he in his diocese amongst his flock, going about his towns and villages in teaching and preaching to the people there."[264]

To this and other testimonies of Hooper's energy given by Hooper's friends we can now add the report of another eye-witness, the unknown citizen of Gloucester who was the host of Joshua Maler, the visitor from Zürich. The citizen reported that Hooper did not fail to visit even the smallest village in his visitation and that in Gloucester itself for two consecutive months the bishop had preached three times every day.[265]

The energy which Hooper expended in travelling up and down his diocese, especially when Worcester was included in his area, was quite phenomenal. He had to try and be in two places at once for as soon as he stayed in Worcester any length of time, then, according to his standards, the Gloucester clergy were in need of correction. He spent, for example, the early part of the summer of 1552 in London for the session of Parliament, then in June he returned to Worcester. On July 6th he was back in Gloucester because of the " negligence and ungodly behaviour of the ministers there."[266] He returned to Worcester at the beginning of October to deal with the cathedral clergy there and was disputing with Canons Joliffe and Jonson. On February 2nd, 1553 he wrote to Cecil again, from Gloucester, saying that he had just completed a " long and full circuit from church to church in Worcester and Warwickshire."[267] This tour would thus be carried out in the height of winter. On July 10th, 1553, he was in Worcester having arrived there on July 3rd, " weary from his journey through the whole diocese of Gloucester."[268] That same day he was leaving on yet another visitation. It is thus obvious that the reports of Hooper's energy are founded on fact.

On at least two occasions Martin Micron wrote to Bullinger asking him to write to Hooper and suggest that he unite prudence and Christian lenity with severity of discipline.[269] Micron does not indicate in what sphere of activity Hooper was showing this extreme severity but he may well have been referring to the diocesan court which dealt with breaches of ecclesiastical and moral law. The court until Hooper's arrival, had been largely run by lay officials, but Hooper took over the position of supreme judge which was his by right, although that right had not been exercised by his pre-

decessors for many years. Hooper's dealings in the diocesan court
have been efficiently and accurately described by F. D. Price in his
article on the Gloucester Diocese under Bishop Hooper,[270] and it
only remains for us to emphasise one or two points concerning
Hooper's dealings with the people in this court.

John Foxe records that Hooper, in his judging, "was indiffer-
ent to all men, as well rich and poor."[271] John Ab Ulmis, however,
records an accusation that Hooper "acted with severity in the dis-
charge of his function towards trades people and those of the lower
orders, but was lax and indulgent with those of higher rank."[272]
Hooper denied this accusation, saying: "you may punish me with
death if I fail to convince you of the impartiality of my proceedings
towards all alike."[273] The accusation was, it seems, sufficiently
answered when Sir Anthony Kingston, an influential man, was
accused of adultery in Hooper's court. At first he refused to appear
but when he eventually did appear and was rebuked by Hooper, he
abused and struck the bishop. Hooper laid the matter before the
king's Council and consequently Kingston was fined £500 and
handed over to Hooper to do penance.[274] This was not an isolated
instance of Hooper punishing the rich.[275] In addition, there are
instances of cases which were being tried in Hooper's absence in
which the people involved requested adjournment until the bishop's
return so that he could deal with the case himself.[276] On some
occasions the cases before the court were settled by the personal
intervention and arbitration of the bishop. F. D. Price, who spent
many months studying the records of Hooper's court, remarks

> "Under Hooper, the personal touch of the bishop regularly shines
> through the dull, formal records of the diocesan administration, bring-
> ing together unhappy husbands and wives, restoring concord among
> families divided against themselves over disputed wills, pointing out
> their follies to gossiping and quarrelling women and giving good
> advice to all and sundry."[277]

But Hooper's severity must not be overlooked. His chief
method of punishment was that of public penance. But it was
penance with a difference. In the days of his predecessors the
guilty person's penance was that of a ritual act calling for a bare-
footed march round the church or churchyard, clad only in a sheet
and carrying a lighted candle. The march finished up at the
High Altar with the saying of the Paternoster one or more times.
Hooper, however, made the act of penance full of meaning. He
usually retained the penitent's dress so that there could be no doubt
at all as to what was taking place, but the chief point of the act of
penitence was a public declaration of contrition. The guilty person,
instead of carrying a candle and saying so many Paternosters had
to state the offence that he had committed and appeal for forgive-
ness. This public act of penance was usually ordered to be carried

out in two places—in the church from which the penitent came, and at the high cross in Gloucester on Saturday, being market day. The number of times the act is repeated varied with the seriousness of the offence and with the age and health of the offender. Normally the number ranged from between two and five acts in each place. To take two examples. Thomas Tycull of Haresfield was found guilty of bawdry and sentenced :

> " to go penitently in his shirt only, barefoot, barelegged and bareheaded, three Saturdays next after the coming, about the high cross in Gloucester, and in like manner three Sundays following in his parish church of Haresfield."[278]

John Parry of Brockworth was ordered :

> " to say openly standing upon the high cross that this penance I am commanded to do for that I have committed adultery with a woman whom upon mine oath before I declared to be an honest woman and in like manner six Sundays following in the parish church of Brockworth."[279]

The theory that lay behind Hooper's actions in ordering this public penance did not arise from the fact that penance of itself had any worth before God. It was an act to cause the offender to examine his conscience and to make certain that he was genuinely repentant of his offence. But probably more important in Hooper's mind was the effect these public acts of penance had upon those who saw them. It was an attempt to discourage them from any similar offence, and also to show that to be a Christian meant to live according to the Law of God. Once again we can perhaps see Hooper's covenant idea in practice. He did his best to make sure that the people once in the covenant relationship stayed within it. " Walk before me and be ye perfect " was God's demand to the people of the covenant. Hooper wanted to see that demand obeyed.

Hooper's teaching forever emphasised the importance of the individual, and the necessity of the individual making his response to God's offer of the covenant which brought salvation and life. It is clear that in his bishopric Hooper directed his energies to putting that into practice. He first endeavoured to raise the standard of the clergy, but that was only his first task, it was not to be an end in itself. His ultimate aim, as he so often stated it, was that the clergy might preach properly to the individual people. He felt the responsibility for their salvation. In the situation in which he found himself, with so much ignorance among the clergy, and consequently with people both ignorant and indifferent, Hooper had no option but to adopt the policy that he did. First, of ascertaining that the people knew at least the basic facts of God's dealing with men as they are contained in the Commandments, Creed and Lord's Prayer. Secondly, to endeavour to keep the people on the right path, by kindness where possible, but if not, by the use of discipline.

This emphasis on the individual, his salvation, his subsequent behaviour, and all that that emphasis entails; together with the simplicity of worship and of church buildings, resulting from the absolute authority of the Bible in doctrine and practice, is the basis of religious Puritanism. It is possible to extract from Hooper's writings his idea of a Christian man.[280] It is a conception in which one can glimpse the shadow of the soberly dressed Puritan as he journeys through life with his Bible in his hand interpreting it strictly, and severely exhorting his family and his neighbours to hear the Gospel. The Puritan figure is on the threshold and is knocking at the door.

DEATH OF HOOPER

Hooper's bishopric lasted only two years and five months. In July, 1553 Edward VI died. The Earl of Warwick attempted to place on the throne Lady Jane Grey. Hooper claims that he did not support her for she was not the lawful successor to the crown. Mary Tudor, who was a Roman Catholic, was next in succession, and Hooper rode around his diocese rallying support for Mary.[281] Lady Jane Grey's reign lasted nine days and she was replaced by Queen Mary. Hooper, known to be one of the extreme Reformers, was clearly in danger from the newly established Roman Catholic regime. But he refused to leave his people and flee abroad. He was arrested in September, 1553 and imprisoned in London. In March, 1554 he was deprived of his bishopric and in January, 1555 he was accused of heresy. The principal charges against him were that he had broken the vow of celibacy and that he denied the real bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist. He refused to alter his views and was condemned to death. On February 4th, 1555 he was degraded and the next day, early in the morning, he left on his last journey to Gloucester. He was to die in the place where he was once the bishop, and so it was that on February 9th, 1555, he was burnt at the stake with great suffering, being three-quarters of an hour in the flames before he died. Today in Gloucester at the place of his death there stands a monument which bears the inscription :

> " Gloria Soli Deo. For the witness of Jesus and for the Word of God 'not accepting deliverance' John Hooper bishop of Gloucester and Worcester was burnt to ashes on this spot. February 9th anno domini 1555."

VII. CONCLUSION

We must now draw together the threads of our argument. In the Introduction we suggested that in our brief telling of the story of John Hooper we should discover that he learned his theological lessons in Zürich and that he attempted to teach those same lessons to the English Church. We have endeavoured to show the truth of those two statements in the foregoing pages. What then is the implication of what we have seen? To answer that question we

must first put another. What is the place of John Hooper in English Church History? He was a Reformer, that is clear—but he was more than that. There is a title which Hooper bears in almost all the histories of the reign of Edward VI. That title is the "Father of Nonconformity."[283] But care must always be taken to define what is meant by "Nonconformity." Thomas Fuller writing in 1655 said :

> "For now nonconformity, in the days of King Edward was conceived; which afterward in the reign of Queen Mary (but beyond the sea at Frankfort) was born; which, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, was nursed and weaned; which, under King James, grew up a strong youth, or tall stripling; but, towards the end of King Charles's reign, shot up to the full strength and stature of a man, able, not only to cope with, but conquer, the hierarchy, its adversary."[284]

In the twentieth century the Free Churches in England are spoken of as "Nonconformist Churches." This is an extension of the original meaning. Originally the term Nonconformist applied to those ministers within the State Church in England who did not conform to certain rites laid down by the authority of the Church. True Nonconformity was originally a movement within the English State Church. This is the movement of which Hooper is the father.

Hooper was not a Separatist, although his teaching on occasions, if taken literally, was radical enough to point in that direction.[285] Hooper himself however had no wish to separate from the State Church. He wanted to work within it and to reform it from the inside according to his own principles. That was the difficulty. His principles were not in agreement with those of the men in power. Hooper was required to conform to certain ecclesiastical rites—he refused—and so became, in his refusal, a "Nonconformist." It is true that he later conformed, but nevertheless the protest had been made; the Nonconformist movement had begun.[286]

There is however a title for Hooper in English Church History which is today less open to misunderstanding than "Father of Nonconformity" and yet means the same thing. This title is "Father of English Puritanism." For Puritanism as it developed in England in the reign of Elizabeth I was none other than this Nonconformist movement. It was the refusal of men within the State Church to conform to rites as demanded by the authority of that church. Puritanism and Nonconformity at first were one and the same movement. The problem as it first clearly showed itself in Elizabeth I's reign was, as with Hooper, difficulty over vestments. The principle that Hooper had striven for was invoked. The Church must be reformed according to the Word of God—not only in doctrine, but also in church practice. This was the root of the matter.

Hooper himself stood, of course, in the Reformation tradition with his emphasis on, for example, justification by faith. This was orthodox teaching shared by all the English Reformers. The

cleavage between Hooper and the English bishops came chiefly on the question of the absolute authority of the Bible. Two presuppositions lie at the root of Hooper's arguments. The first is that there must be a scriptural warrant for all that is done in public worship and therefore the authority of the Church to decree rites and ceremonies is denied. When it is answered that this should not be pushed so far as to include small matters, like vestments, which are things indifferent, then the second presupposition is stated, that the matters in dispute are not indifferent, for they are relics of popery and are not scriptural. This was the heart of Hooper's teaching, and it was the heart of English Puritanism.

The first English Puritans agreed with the Elizabethan State Church on basic doctrines, but in church practice the Puritan's rigid appeal to Scripture caused disagreement.[287] As the result of this appeal, the Puritans followed Hooper and refused to wear clerical vestments; they desired to empty church buildings of all altars, images, ornaments, etc., and leave only the necessary furniture. As the name " Puritan " probably suggests,[288] they wished to purify the English Church by removing all relics of the unreformed Church and restoring what they considered to be the simplicity of the apostolic Church. For them, simplicity meant purity. They wanted a clean break, not only with medieval doctrine in the English Church, but also with medieval practices. There could be no half measures, all church practices must have scriptural warrant.

To illustrate this point—and the illustration could be multiplied many times—we quote from the first Puritan admonition to Parliament from the year 1571. The Puritans suggest concerning the sacraments, among other things :

> " That people be appointed to receive the sacrament rather sitting for the avoiding of superstition than kneeling."
> " That both the sacrament of the Lord's Supper and baptism also may be administered according to the ancient purity and simplicity."
> " And finally that nothing be done in this or any other thing but that which you have the express warrant of God's Word for."[289]

This might well be Hooper speaking. The flames at Gloucester had silenced his voice sixteen years previously, but his teaching lived on and bore fruit in Elizabethan Puritanism.

Although this was the heart of the matter it was not only their strict appeal to Scripture for church practice as well as for doctrine that characterised the Puritans. There was also the emphasis upon the individual and his experience of salvation. Salvation was an individual thing which each man must come to experience for himself. It is not through church ceremonies that a man comes to faith and salvation but through hearing and reading the Word of God, through a personal recognition of sin, and a turning away from it. There must be a personal visit to the cross of Calvary and a return free from the burden of sin. There is no need for a priestly ministry

to intercede; every man, be he minister or layman, rich or poor, may come to God through Christ. The minister's task was zealously to point out to the individual, from the Word of God, the road of salvation. But the individual, having been shown the road, may and must travel it alone. This Puritan emphasis reached its peak in Bunyan's figure of Christian in the *Pilgrim's Progress*. As G. M. Trevelyan remarks : " The lonely figure of the first paragraph in *Pilgrim's Progress*—the poor man seeking salvation with tears, with no guide save the Bible in his hand . . . is the representative Puritan of the English Puritan epoch."[290]

More than a century separated Hooper and Bunyan, yet the emphasis on the individual and his own personal experience of the journey on the road to salvation is present in Hooper. We remarked earlier that in Hooper the Puritan figure was knocking at the door. During the following century the door was opened wide and that figure came in and made himself at home in English Church History.

Not unconnected with this emphasis on the individual is the covenant theology which played such a large rôle in later Puritan theology.[291] God offered the covenant to all believers, but an individual can enter it only through his personal decision. We have seen that this too is basic in Hooper. Along with this also goes the Puritan emphasis on the living of a good life. The life of those who are within the covenant. We have seen Hooper's emphasis on discipline as he attempted to keep the people on the right way. In Elizabeth I's reign the Puritans, under the influence of Geneva, heightened this discipline and made it, alongside the Word and Sacraments, a third mark of the true Church.

This strictness was not limited to the Church but extended to family life. In the century after Hooper's death the unit of the Puritan family developed, with its family piety, strictness of life, and consequent high moral standards. It is therefore interesting to recall what John Foxe wrote of the home of a man he visited.

" In every corner thereof there was some smell of virtue, good example, honest conversation and reading of Holy Scriptures. There was not to be seen in his house any courtly rioting or idleness; no pomp at all; no dishonest word; no swearing could there be heard."[292]

This could clearly be a pattern of a 17th century Puritan home. Yet the household of which Foxe wrote is none other than that of John Hooper himself.

Thus there can be little doubt that Hooper, in his call to reform the Church according to Scripture and to return it to the state of apostolic simplicty, in his theology of the covenant between God and man, in his emphasis upon the soul and salvation of the individual, in his family life, and indeed in his whole life and

thought, sowed the seeds of Puritanism in the England of Edward VI. Hooper rightly bears the title of " Father of Nonconformity," or better " Father of English Puritanism."[293]

Hooper's place in English Church History is thus fixed. We are now in a position to answer the first question we asked. What is the implication of Hooper's relationship to Bullinger and to Zürich? It is this. As Hooper learned most of his teaching from Zürich, then to Zürich in a measure, the origins of English Puritanism must be traced. There is no need to list again the ideas for which Hooper was indebted to Zürich. Let it suffice to recall that it was from his own experience of the theory and practice of the Zürich church that he learned the all-important call which lay at the heart of Puritanism—the call for an absolute reform according to the Word of God, not only in doctrine but also in church practice, and a return to the simplicity of the apostolic Church.

Hooper, the man who was chiefly responsible for sowing the seed of Puritanism in the England of Edward VI, was a follower of Zürich. But when Mary came to the throne of England and the seeds were taken out of England by the exiles to Frankfort and elsewhere, the soil in which they were planted was chiefly Genevan soil. So it was that when the young plant of Puritanism was brought back by the returning exiles in 1558 it looked very much like a Genevan plant. As it grew in the England of Elizabeth I Puritanism developed still more Genevan characteristics; so much so that in the past there has been a general tendency to attribute the origins of Puritanism entirely to Geneva. Now it is becoming obvious that this solution over-simplifies the issue. The truth of the matter probably is that the origins of Puritanism cannot be traced entirely to any one single place or person. We, too, must therefore take care not to over-simplify by concluding that the origins of Puritanism lie entirely in Zürich. Nevertheless, we believe that it can be seen that in so far as Hooper was the chief influence leading towards Puritanism in England under Edward VI, to that extent at least, the origins of Puritanism lie not in Geneva, the city of Calvin, but rather in Zürich, the city of Zwingli, and of Hooper's faithful friend and teacher, Henry Bullinger.

NOTES

[206] There is now no copy of the original edition of this book extant. The source from which we learn of its existence is a manuscript in the Morrice Collection of Manuscripts in the Dr. Williams's Library in London.

[207] Hooper, when writing to his clergy signs himself " Brother and Fellow-Preacher." L.Wr. p. 98.

[208] The oldest copy of the result of this visitation is also among the Morrice Collection of Manuscripts in the Dr. Williams's Library, London. There is a typed copy of this in the Gloucester City Library in the Hockaday Collection, VI. 2. James Gairdner produced a summary of the Visitation in the *English Historical Review*, Vol. XIX (1904), pp. 98-121.

[209] See *English Historical Review, op. cit.,* p. 111 and p. 118.

[210] L.Wr., p. 132.

[211] *Ibid.*

[212] *Ibid.*

[213] See *English Historical Review,* op. cit., p. 105. The fact that Parkhurst was already in possession of his living in 1551 would seem to suggest that Miss Garrett is not strictly accurate when she writes of Parkhurst: "Just before the accession of Mary he had received the rich living of Cleeve in Gloucestershire." C. H. Garrett, *The Marian Exiles.* Camb. 1938, p. 244.

[214] Gee & Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History,* Lond. 1896, p. 380-381.

[215] It is possible that Parkhurst was the bearer of the letter written from prison by Hooper to Bullinger on May 29th, 1554. Z.S.A. E. II 369: 41; E.T. p. 66; O.L. 1, p. 103.

[216] See J. Strype, *Annals of the Reformation under Elizabeth.* Vol. II, 1. Oxford 1824, pp. 133-140, and J. Strype, *Life of Edmund Grindal,* Oxford 1821, pp. 260-262.

[217] See F. Blanke, " Zwingli's ' Prophezei ' und die Anfänge des Puritanismus " in *Neue Zürcher Zeitung,* No. 1175, June 29, 1939.

[218] State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth, addenda XII. 27 (Calendar 1601-1603, p. 552). Edward Gaston to Haddon in a letter dated October 16, 1564.

[219] Parkhurst, although a bishop, did not disguise the direction in which his sympathies lay. In 1561 we find Cecil, the Secretary of State, writing to Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, after a visitation by the Queen to the Norwich area stating the Queen's displeasure at the lack of uniformity in Parkhurst's bishopric and of his failure to enforce the commands issued by the authority of the church. Cecil writes: " the Bishop of Norwich is blamed even of the best sort for the remissness in ordering his clergy . . . surely I see a great variety in ministration. A surplice may not be borne here." J. Strype, *Life and Acts of Matthew Parker,* Vol. I, p. 214. Oxford 1821. See also *Life and Acts of Matthew Parker,* Vol. II, p. 36.

[220] " Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, to Mr. Thomas Fowle, Mr. John Handson and Mr. John Grundye: for the setting on foot of the exercise of ' prophesy ' at Bury St. Edmunds." J. Strype, *Annals, op. cit.,* Vol. II. 2, p. 194.

[221] For an examination of this see W. Bellardi, *Die Geschichte der ' Christlichen Gemainschaft '* in *Strassburg* (1546-1550). Leipzig, 1934, pp. 116-118. See also Bellardi's *Die Vorstufen der Collegia Pietatis Speners* (Dissertation Breslau 1929), in which he deals with the history of the " Prophesyings " in England.

[222] The Elizabethan " Prophesyings " were of course strongly supported by many bishops and it was a refusal to suppress these exercises that caused the sequestration of Grindal, Archbishop of Canterbury in June, 1577.

[223] It is interesting to note that Parkhurst also set up superintendents in his diocese in Norwich. They were to watch over every minister and parishioner and were to report to the synods. They were also appointed moderators of the " Prophesyings." Strype, *Annals, op. cit.,* Vol. II. 2, p. 696f.

[224] See E. Dollfuss Zodel, *Bullinger's Einfluss auf das zürcherische Staatswesen von* 1531-1575, Zürich 1931, p. 20. Also L. Lavater, *De ritibus, op. cit.,* p. 95.

[225] L.Wr., p. xix.

[226] L.Wr., p. 134.

[227] J. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments, op. cit.,* vol. VI, p. 610.

[228] For Ridley's Articles see his *Works.* Parker Society, Camb. 1841, p. 319f.

229 Z.S.A. E. II 343 : 457 and Z.S.A. E. II 369 : 12/13; E.T. p. 46 and p. 48; O.L. 1, p. 71 and p. 76.

230 L.Wr., p. xviii.

231 The title of this work is "Responsio venerabilium sacerdotum, Henrici Joliffi et Roberti Jonson, sub protestatione facta, ad illos articulos Ioannis Hoperi, episcopi Vigorniae nomen gerentis, in quibus a catholica fide dissentiebat; una cum confutationibus ejusdem Hoperi, et replicationibus reverendissimi in Christo patris bonae memoriae Stephani Gardineri, episcopi Vintoniensis, tunc temporis pro confessioni fidei in carcere detenti." Antverpiae, MDLXIIII. ex Officina Christopheri Plantini.

232 For a comparison of these Latin articles recorded by Joliffe and the *Forty-two Articles,* see C. Hardwick, *History of the Articles of Religion,* 3rd edition, 1876, p. 78.

233 It is interesting that Constant in his *Introduction of the Reformation into England* 1547-53, Vol. II, 1941, p. 296 and note 3, suggests that the similarity of Hooper's Articles to the Forty-two is due to Hooper's influence on the Forty-two and not vice-versa.

234 L.Wr., p. 120.

235 L.Wr., p. 120-121.

236 *Ibid,* p. 121.

237 *Ibid.*

238 *Ibid,* Article VIII.

239 *Ibid,* p. 123.

240 *Ibid.*

241 Gloucester Diocesan Records (hereafter G.D.R.), XVIII, 49-50.

242 L.Wr., p. 124.

243 The Article on Royal Supremacy in the *Thirty-Nine Articles* reads: " The Queen's majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England, and other of the dominions, under whom the chief Government of all Estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, doth appertain. . . . "

244 L.Wr., p. 127.

245 Cf. the famous occasion June 11, 1550 when Ridley pulled down the altar of St. Paul's and replaced it with a table, *Chronicle of the Grey-friars of London,* ed. J. Nichols, Camden Society, 1852, p. 67.

246 E.Wr., p. 491.

247 Ridley *Works, op. cit.,* p. 319-320.

248 L.Wr., p. 128. It is interesting that this practice is today found in England but only in the Free Churches.

249 L.Wr., p. 135.

250 *Ibid.*

251 *Ibid,* p. 138.

252 *Ibid,* p. 138-9.

253 It should not be forgotten that Hooper seems to have spent some years of his life as a member of the Cistercian Order. The rule of this Order was very austere and demanded simplicity in life, dress and church practice. It is not however possible to discover how strictly the sixteenth century Cistercians in Cleeve Abbey where Hooper probably had been, had held to this Rule. Hooper never refers to his time as a monk in his writings, but it is interesting to conjecture whether the " Puritanism " of the Cistercians had any conscious or unconscious effect on his own enthusiasm in this direction.

254 L.Wr., p. 144.

255 *Ibid,* p. 131.

256 *Ibid.*

257 *Ibid,* p. 133

258 *Ibid.*

259 *Ibid,* p. 132-3.

[260] J. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments, op. cit.,* Vol. VI, p. 639.

[261] T. Fuller, *The Church History of Britain,* Vol. II, *op. cit.,* p. 374.

[262] The letter is printed in Bradford, Vol. II, p. 395f.

[263] J. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments, op. cit.,* Vol. VI, p. 644.

[264] *Ibid,* p. 643.

[265] S.C. S. 200, p. 28.

[266] Letter in L.Wr., p. xviii.

[267] Letter in *Report of Historical Commission,* Cecil I, No. 422, p. 107.

[268] Hooper writing to Cecil, *ibid,* No. 464, p. 125.

[269] See Z.S.A. E. II 369 : 103; E.T. p. 374; O.L. 2, p. 576 and Z.S.A. E. II 369 : 96; E.T. p. 328; O.L. 2, p. 498.

[270] Published in *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeo-logical Society,* 1938, Vol. 60, pp. 51-152. Anyone working on the G.D.R. must be grateful to two men. First, to F. H. Hockaday who put them in order, and secondly, to F. D. Price who worked patiently through the "dog Latin" in which they are written to produce his article. Mr. Price is always accurate when dealing with the diocesan records but his statements about Hooper's general life and background must sometimes be received with caution.

[271] J. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments, op. cit.,* Vol. VI, p. 644.

[272] Z.S.A. E. II 369 : 101; E.T. p. 291 : O.L. 2, p. 441.

[273] *Ibid.*

[274] *Ibid.* Cf. J. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments, op. cit.,* Vol. VI, p. 654, where Kingston at Hooper's burning, thanks Hooper for the influence for good the bishop had been in his life.

[275] Cf. G.D.R. VI. 8, 37, 90, 100, and 104, where Edward Myll, the Squire of Harescombe made appearances on the charge of adultery and was punished. F. D. Price, *op. cit.,* p. 86.

[276] Cf. G.D.R., Vol. VI, 113. F. D. Price, *op. cit.,* p. 74.

[277] F. D. Price, *op. cit.,* pp. 82-3.

[278] G.D.R., VI. 1. F. D. Price, *op. cit.,* p. 90-91 (spelling modernised).

[279] G.D.R. VI. 100. F. D. Price, *op. cit.,* p. 91 (spelling modernised).

[280] See Original Thesis, pp. 172-176.

[281] L.Wr., pp. 556-7.

[282] The details of Hooper's death are given in J. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments, op. cit.,* Vol. VI, pp. 656-659. Foxe does not hesitate to give all details and they do not make pleasant reading.

[283] As so often happens, the writer who first coined this title is not easy to trace but it was well established by the time Canon Dixon wrote his *History of the English Church* in 1885. The title will arise naturally from the idea of the "Nonconformist infant" which Fuller gives in the quotations cited in the next note.

[284] T. Fuller, *The Church History of Britain, op. cit.,* Vol. II, p. 373.

[285] We may note, for example, Hooper's statement that when the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is used contrary to the institution of Christ then "every man may in his private chamber with his Christian and faithful brothers, communicate according to the order of scripture." E.Wr., p. 173. With this we may compare Hooper's advice written in a letter from prison to "certain godly persons instructing them how to behave at the beginning of the change of religion." Hooper writes: "There is no better way to be used in this troublesome time for your consolation than many times to have assemblies together of such men and women as be of your religion in Christ." L.Wr., p. 589.

[286] See Fuller's quotation given earlier in this section. James Gairdner remarks: "Hooper's struggle with authority demands special notice in church history. It was quite unprecedented in character; but in the days of Elizabeth he had many followers. He was the beginner of what, by the

commencement of the seventeenth century and probably earlier still, had received the name of nonconformity." *Lollardy and the Reformation in England,* Vol. III, 1908-13, p. 276.

[287] Cf. the remarks of Miller and Johnson speaking of the later Puritans' differences with Archbishop Laud. "If the bishop submitted to the Bible as God's Word, received it by faith and reinforced his faith with rational convictions—very well then, let him accept it and act accordingly. Let him not, once he has established its authority then turn about and explain away a good part of it, invent reasons to prove that only some portions are God's law, that the Bible is not binding on every point on which it speaks but merely on some few. If the Bible declares God is three persons in one, let that be believed, said the Puritans; if the Bible says that wigs are an abomination unto the Lord: let that also be believed.

"And there the Anglican protested, and the fight began." *The Puritans,* New York, 1938, p. 43.

[288] The origin of the name " Puritan " is not quite certain. A. F. Scott Pearson on page 18 of his book, *Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism,* Cambridge, 1925, says that he has found it in prominent use in documents in the sense in which we understand it from the year 1572 onwards. It is likely therefore that its origins lie several years prior to this date, but they are obscure. It is quite possible that the name originated from certain Separatists who used the name to designate the purity of their groups. John Stow records: "About that tyme were many congregations of the Anabaptists in London, who cawlyd themselves Puritans or unspottyd Lambs of the Lord." *Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles,* ed. J. Gairdner, Camden Society, XXVIII, Lond. 1880, p. 143. It is not possible to date Stow exactly but there is a report in the Calendar of State Papers Spanish II.7 (1568) which gives a similar statement of those claiming "stainless religion." It is not unlikely that the name as we understand it was taken up and applied to the group in the Elizabethan church who protested against vestments and who caused the Vestment Controversy of the winter of 1567-8.

[289] Printed in Frere & Douglas, *Puritan Manifestoes,* 1907, p. 14.

[290] G. M. Trevelyan, *English Social History,* 1946, p. 234.

[291] See especially Perry Miller, *The Marrow of Puritan Divinity,* Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, XXXII, 1936, p. 247-300, and the same author's *The New England Mind,* New York, 1939, p. 365. Appendix B. of this book, p. 502f., gives a chronological bibliography of publications concerning Covenant Theology from William Perkins onwards. See also Ralph Bronkema, *The Essence of Puritanism,* Goes, Holland 1929, p. 100-124.

[292] J. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments,* op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 64. See also L. Schücking, *Die Familie in Puritanismus,* Leipzig, 1929, especially p. 84. "Die ganze Puritanische Bewegung wurzelt ja letzten Endes in der Familie und ist ohne sie nicht zu denken."

[293] That Hooper was recognised as a forerunner by the exiles in Frankfort, where, as Fuller said, nonconformity was born, is clear from references made to him first by John Knox in his Frankfort sermon of March, 1555, and secondly, in the famous Supplication to the Senate of Frankfort in the same month of 1555. These instances are recorded in *Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfort in Germany* (W. Whittingham), p. 55 and p. 58. As August Lang says of Hooper: "His genuine Zwinglian radicalism for practical reform was doubtless the spark which later, first in Frankfort, and then in England under Elizabeth, lit the first flame of the spirit of Puritanism." *Archivefür Reformationsgeschichte,* 38, 1941, p. 234. (My translation).

W. MORRIS S. WEST.