

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>

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

I. INTRODUCTION

THE following pages are an attempt to give a brief account of the life of John Hooper sometime Bishop of Gloucester and Worcester, and to indicate something of his influence upon English Church History at the time of the Reformation.¹

As we piece together the story of John Hooper we shall find that we are writing of the most influential Englishman belonging to the group in Edward VI's reign which strove to introduce that trend of teaching which later became known as Puritanism. Hooper's puritanical emphasis is well-known and often emphasised. He appears in all Church History books as the bishop who refused to be consecrated wearing episcopal dress. It is also well known, but not so often emphasised, that Hooper spent two years in Zürich in close friendship with Zwingli's successor, Henry Bullinger. What is not so well known and therefore scarcely, if ever, emphasised is the fact that as far as can be ascertained Hooper never visited Geneva and Calvin. The theological school in which Hooper studied when he was abroad was that of Zürich. His chief teachers were Henry Bullinger and Ulrich Zwingli. It is true that the latter had been killed sixteen years before Hooper's arrival in Zürich, but Zwingli's teaching and influence in that town were very much alive then—as indeed they are today. The lessons Hooper learned in Zürich were not only theology from the pages of the text-book and from the clamour of the public disputation, but were also the working out of the theory in church practice. The lessons he learnt in Zürich were the very same lessons which Hooper in turn tried to teach the English Church. As we shall see he found the Church in England a most unwilling pupil. Nevertheless there were some in that Church who learned well of Hooper. The seeds he sowed in the reign of Edward VI bore fruit in the time of Elizabeth I in the plant of Puritanism.

The influence of Geneva on the later development of Puritanism is so marked that it is often forgotten that before this Geneva influence really began to make itself felt in England at the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth I there had been already a decade of Zürich influence working in the same direction. It is with this Zürich influence and its chief mediator, John Hooper, that this essay is concerned.

II. HOOPER'S LIFE BEFORE HIS ARRIVAL IN ZÜRICH

There is very little material out of which to reconstruct Hooper's life prior to his arrival in Zürich. Any would-be biographer must reconcile himself to the acceptance of the fact that for fifty of Hooper's sixty years there is almost no evidence of his activities. But the extraordinary activity of his last ten years more than compensates for this earlier lack. In view of this dearth of material any reconstruction of his earlier life must of necessity be conjectural.

The exact date of Hooper's birth is no longer known but it was probably about 1495. He was a West Countryman, a native of Somerset. His family seem to have been prosperous and sent their son to the University at Oxford. The University register shows that one John Hooper of Merton College graduated as Bachelor of Arts in 1519. It is generally assumed that this refers to our John Hooper though even this is not certain.² Having possibly made this one brief appearance into the light of history, Hooper disappears from view for twenty years. It seems almost certain that he disappeared into the shadows of the Cistercian Monastery in his native county at Cleeve.³ Here he would remain until the dissolution of that monastery by Henry VIII, under the Act of 1536.

A year or so later he is reported to have been in Oxford again and before long fell foul of Dr. Richard Smith, the Regius Professor of Divinity. Smith was a strong Romanist and it is possible that Hooper had already begun to show himself sympathetic towards certain trends of Reformation doctrine. After his clash with Smith Hooper left Oxford and gravitated to London, finding himself congenial employment as steward in the household of Sir Thomas Arundel. This involved the life of a courtier which Hooper found very pleasant and all went well until he came across certain writings of Zwingli and some of Bullinger's Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles.⁴ He was immediately attracted to the views of these Zürich teachers and studied these books very carefully. Before long Hooper had made this Zürich teaching his own and began to propagate it. When Arundel heard of this change in Hooper's mind he was very concerned and sent his erring steward to Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, to have these views argued out of him. This was easier said than done. The Bishop talked with Hooper in vain. Gardiner found what others were later to find, that Hooper stuck to his views with a tenacity which his opponents did not hesitate to call obstinacy. Eventually Gardiner had to admit defeat and sent Hooper back to Arundel. The exact year of Hooper's acceptance of Zürich

teaching cannot be fixed with any certainty but it was most probably in the early 1540's. This was an unfortunate time to choose to become a follower of Zwingli. The reaction towards the acceptance of Roman doctrine in the English Church was in full swing. 1539 had seen the issuing of the Six Articles Act, the bloody whip with six strings, which made denial of transubstantiation, to mention one string, punishable by death. The six articles reflect the reaction back to Roman doctrine. Gardiner was sympathetic towards this reaction. Hooper was now known to him as a man who would deny every one of the six articles. Not surprisingly Hooper felt that to remain in England was unwise and made up his mind to leave the country. But where was he to go? His thoughts turned towards Zürich. There he could meet and talk with Bullinger and with others who had known Zwingli; there he could learn more of the doctrine he had come to accept and could see for himself the practices of the Zürich church. So it was that one day the steward of Thomas Arundel's household disappeared and began his journey to Zürich. His way led through Strasbourg, and it is with Hooper's stay in this city that we finish with the need of conjecture and enter the realm of certainty. It is from Strasbourg that Hooper wrote the first of his letters to Bullinger—letters which are preserved in the Zürich archives as a minute part of the vast collection of Bullinger letters.⁵

The first news Bullinger received of Hooper's existence reached him about the beginning of February, 1546. Hooper was then in Strasbourg staying at the house of Richard Hilles, an English merchant. How long Hooper had been in Strasbourg is difficult to estimate; probably several months at least. It was on January 27th, 1546 that Hooper wrote his first letter to Bullinger.⁶ This letter was sent to Zürich together with two others; one from Richard Hilles,⁷ who had already been in correspondence with Bullinger for five years, and one from Ludwig Lavater,⁸ a Swiss student studying in Strasbourg, who belonged to a well-known Zürich family. Both Hilles and Lavater commended Hooper to Bullinger.

Hilles told Bullinger that Hooper was once at the court of the English king but is now "a disciple of Christ, the king of kings, and glowing with zeal and piety and most attached to your name among those of all other divines. . . ." Lavater wrote to Bullinger saying that he would be receiving a letter from an Englishman "who is most attached to you—a well educated man, most accomplished and most worthy of your friendship—to whom I would wish, if time permits, you should reply." Thus sponsored, Hooper's first letter reached Bullinger.

From this letter we can catch a fleeting glimpse of Hooper's background and development. Hooper wrote that his life as a courtier "living too much of a court life" and his practice of "impious worship" had been changed by reading and studying certain works of Zwingli and Bullinger.⁹ He had now come to see and understand what God was, to which knowledge he had come through "the goodness of God, for which I am solely indebted to him and to yourselves." Nothing now remains for him "but to serve my godly brethren in Christ and the ungodly for Christ." Hooper went on to tell Bullinger that his intention had always been to visit Zürich but that so far he had been prevented by illness and lack of funds. He was now going to risk a visit to England in order to try and find the means whereby he could live amongst them in Zürich.

It was not long before Bullinger received a second letter from Hooper.¹⁰ Seeking confirmation of the principle of his exile, he asks Bullinger for his advice on whether it is lawful for a godly man to be present at Mass and whether, to avoid being present at such a ceremony, it is necessary for a man to leave his own country.

These first two letters from Hooper were received by Bullinger in a friendly fashion. Lavater and Hilles wrote again to Bullinger on April 30th, 1546 with further news of Hooper. Lavater indicated that Hooper was pleased with the messages Bullinger had sent him and that the Englishman had asked the writer to greet Bullinger in his name.¹¹ The letter of Richard Hilles¹² informed Bullinger that Hooper had in fact returned to England to obtain money so that he might remain "always . . . far from the impurity of Babylon." He was expected back in Strasbourg before long on his way to Zürich, which was his ultimate destination. So it was that in the early months of 1546 the first seeds of a friendship between John Hooper and Henry Bullinger were sown; a friendship which was to influence the course of English Church History.

It was not only friendship that Hooper found in Strasbourg but romance also. He had been very ill during his stay with Richard Hilles and had been nursed by two sisters who came from the neighbourhood of Antwerp. One of the sisters was married to Valerand Poullain, a minister in Strasbourg, but the other was unmarried, and it was with her Hooper fell in love. Her name was Anne de Tscerlas. He left her in Strasbourg whilst he visited England but on his return, about the beginning of 1547, they packed their belongings and set off together for Zürich. When they reached Basle they stayed with friends and made preparations for their marriage. We know neither the exact date of their

marriage nor the church in which it was solemnised. There is no record of the marriage in the registers of the churches of St. Peter, St. Alban, St. Leonard and St. Martin, but it may well have taken place in the chief church, the Minster, the marriage register of which is lost. The nearest one can get to fixing the date is to say that they were almost certainly married sometime during the first three weeks of March, 1547. Dryander, a friend in Basle, records in a letter dated March 26th, 1547 that the Hoopers were married "a few days ago."¹³

Very soon after his marriage Hooper himself wrote again to Bullinger.¹⁴ He acknowledged the answer to his query concerning the attendance of a godly man at Mass—the answer he had received in Strasbourg the previous year. Bullinger, he wrote, had convinced him that "it was more advisable and consistent with godliness that I should rather endure the loss of home and fortune for Christ's sake, than participate in the ungodly worship of the Mass." He cannot express his thanks enough to Bullinger for his help so far and hopes to visit Zürich very shortly. It was in fact on March 26th, 1547 that Hooper and his wife left Basle for Zürich.

From what has been written thus far it is clear that even before Hooper arrived in Zürich itself he was under the influence of Zürich teaching. It had been the writings of Zwingli and Bullinger that had finally converted him to Protestantism. It was the steadfast profession of this Protestantism that had caused his exile and the decision to stay abroad had been confirmed by Bullinger himself. Clearly Hooper's mind was well prepared for the further lessons he was soon to learn from his Zürich teachers.

III. HOOPER IN ZÜRICH

Zürich in the middle of the sixteenth century was a town of some 6,000 inhabitants. Their dwellings hugged the banks of the River Limmat where it flowed out of the Lake of Zürich. From the midst of this town rose the twin towers of the Great Minster, the church founded centuries earlier at the traditional burial place of the Zürich martyr saints. It was to the Great Minster that Zwingli had been appointed "People's Priest" in 1519 and upon this church the Reformation had centred. Close by the Minster stood the Town Hall in which the famous public disputations of 1523 had been held, the first of which had resulted directly in the setting in motion of the Zwinglian reformation, and the second of which had indirectly resulted in the beginning of the Zürich Anabaptists. From the bridges across the river looking southwards could be seen the expanse of the Lake of Zürich some twenty miles in length with small villages clustered on its green banks. Beyond

the lake on clear days the rugged outline of the Alps could be seen white against the blue of the sky.

Zürich was a busy town for it stood on the route of a main thoroughfare leading south into Italy and north into Germany. Down this road the Hoopers travelled in the late March days of 1547, and it was through the north gate of the town that they came on March 29th. They brought with them two further letters of introduction to Bullinger; one from Myconius¹⁵ and the other from Dryander.¹⁶ Both these letters commended Hooper and his wife to Bullinger as being pious people who were sound in doctrine and worthy of Bullinger's friendship. Their arrival was deemed important enough by Bullinger to be recorded in his diary,¹⁷ and he adds that they stayed a few days in his house. On April 4th Bullinger wrote to Myconius: "The Englishman you commended to me I have been compelled to receive into my own home. . . . I use the word 'compelled' in a manner of speaking only for I received him willingly and heartily because one can see that he is sincere."¹⁸ Bullinger lived in a house in the square around the Great Minster which may be identified today as 4 *Zwingli Plats*. Later on in the same letter Bullinger indicates that the Hoopers will soon move into the family of John Jackly who lived just opposite to the house in which Zwingli had lived. Thus the Jacklys' house was just around the corner from Bullinger's in the narrow street today named *Kirchgasse*.

Henry Bullinger, the chief minister of Zürich, who welcomed the Hoopers, deserves to be better known than he is.¹⁹ He has always been overshadowed by Zwingli, yet it was Bullinger who established Zwingli's work in Zürich. Zwingli worked in Zürich for twelve years; Bullinger for forty. Bullinger carried on a quite phenomenal amount of correspondence with church leaders in many lands, offering them advice when they sought it—and it must be said on occasions when they did not. The influence of Bullinger on English Church History has yet to be estimated.

Bullinger was born in Bremgarten, a small town in Canton Aargau. He went first to the school in Bremgarten and then to the Latin school in Emmerich when he was twelve. In 1519 he entered the University of Cologne and whilst he was there studied the writings of the Church Fathers, especially those of Chrysostom, Ambrose, Origen and Augustine. It was while Bullinger was in Cologne that some of Luther's early writings came into his possession, notably *The Babylonish Captivity of the Church* and the treatise *On Christian Liberty*. The years 1521-22 were the turning point in Bullinger's religious development; he turned to the Bible and read the New Testament with the help of Jerome's commentaries. He recorded in his diary that he "began to abhor

Papal doctrine." At the same time he read Melancthon's *Loci Communes*. In April, 1522 Bullinger returned to Bremgarten and continued his study of the Bible and the Church Fathers. Further writings of Luther came into his possession and he moved towards the acceptance of Reformed doctrine. In 1523 he was invited to teach in the monastery school at Kappel and, as no vow nor any statement of faith was required of him, he accepted the invitation. His first duties were to teach the younger pupils Latin, but before long he was giving lectures on Biblical exegesis to the monks themselves. This was an odd situation to have a sympathiser with Reformed doctrine giving exegetical lectures in a monastery and results were soon forthcoming. By autumn, 1525 Mass was no longer said in the cloister chapel and in 1526 it was replaced by a simple service of the Lord's Supper.

Not until late in 1523 did Bullinger come into contact with Zwingli, but it was not long before they were close friends. We have seen that other Reformed influences were at work on the young Bullinger and he was not a follower of Zwingli in all his theological thought. In 1528 Bullinger entered the ranks of the evangelical ministers and returned to Bremgarten as Pastor during the following year. His reputation as a preacher quickly spread and when Zwingli was killed at the battle of Kappel on October 11th, 1531 Bullinger was suggested as a possible successor. On December 9th he was appointed to follow Zwingli at the Great Minster in Zürich. Thus Bullinger had been in Zürich for just over fifteen years when Hooper arrived and was then in his forty-third year. This meant that in all probability Hooper was several years older than Bullinger, but there was never any doubt as to who was the teacher and who the pupil.

Of Hooper's two years stay in Zürich very little written evidence remains. This is not surprising as there would obviously be little need for him to write to Bullinger when he was living only just around the corner. There are, in fact, one or two letters written by Hooper²⁰ to Bullinger during this time but they deal with affairs in England; a report of the Battle of Pinkey for example, which Hooper had probably received in English and translated into Latin for Bullinger. The only evidence of any journey away from Zürich, undertaken by Hooper was a short visit to Constance in 1548²¹ with an Englishman resident in Switzerland named Butler.

It is quite clear that the friendship between Bullinger and Hooper deepened as the months went by. They would meet and in a friendly fashion discuss theological matters. This is evident from the letters exchanged between the two men after Hooper's return to England and is confirmed by a contemporary witness,

Josiah Simler, in his account of Bullinger's life written in 1575.²² Further evidence that theirs was not merely an academic friendship is supplied by the fact that when Hooper's first child Rachel was christened in the Great Minster on March 29th, 1548, Henry Bullinger was one of the godparents.²³

It is not difficult to reconstruct the life and teaching that Hooper experienced in the Zürich of the mid-sixteenth century. Space allows us only to mention the more important aspects of this Zürich life and teaching and first of all reference must be made to the theological school in Zürich about which so little is written and yet whose methods and name came to play a part in the England of Elizabeth I.

THE ZÜRICH 'PROPHESYINGS'

Although Bullinger was the recognised leader of the Zürich church, there were other personalities whom Hooper met and from whom he learnt. The most notable of these were Conrad Pellican,²⁴ Theodore Bibliander²⁵ and Conrad Gesner.²⁶ In letters to Bullinger from England Hooper constantly sent greetings to these three and to their wives. It was not, however, only as private individuals that Hooper met them, but also in their capacity as teachers in the school in Zürich which Hooper undoubtedly attended. There had been a Latin school there for several centuries before the Reformation, but in 1523 the Zürich Council gave Zwingli permission to reorganise it with the aim of providing an opportunity for a study of the Bible and the exegesis of it. In June, 1525 Zwingli was able to put this plan into operation and a new school was opened. The instruction in Latin continued, but that part was separated from the new form of instruction which Zwingli called the *Prophezei*. This word was a new creation by Zwingli but is based upon 1 *Corinthians* xiv. 1. "Follow after charity, and desire spiritual gifts, but rather that ye may prophesy."

The "Propheying" had two parts. The first part was attended by the ministers of the town and also by the students preparing for the ministry. They assembled every morning except Friday and Sunday in the choir of the Great Minster at 8 a.m. each with a Bible. After a prayer together one of the students read in Latin the text to be discussed that day. Next, Jacob Ceperin (who soon died of overwork and was succeeded in December, 1525 by Pellican) translated the text into Hebrew and spoke of any linguistic difficulties. He then retranslated it into Latin showing, as he did so, any divergencies or mistakes in the original Latin text read. Zwingli (who was succeeded by Bibliander) then interpreted the same passage from the Greek Septu-

gint. While this was going on the students were not bound to remain silent but could ask questions and there was a general discussion of the text. This went on for about an hour and, finally, Zwingli summed up the discussion.

While this had been going on a congregation had assembled in the nave of the Great Minster and at the end of the theological discussion the second part of the "Prophesyings" began. This consisted of one of the city ministers, usually either Leo Jud or Megander, speaking in the Swiss language to the assembled congregation telling them what had taken place in the theological discussion and passing on the conclusions.

This was the original organisation of the "Prophesyings" under Zwingli. When Bullinger succeeded him he made one or two alterations. As he was already committed to preach daily in the Great Minster he felt that he had enough to do and so did not take over Zwingli's place in the school but appointed Bibliander. He did, however, give frequent lectures. He organised the first part of the "Prophesyings" more formally and moved it from the choir of the Great Minster to a lecture room in a nearby building. In addition to Bible exegesis there was systematic instruction in Latin, Hebrew and Greek. From 1541 onwards Natural Science was introduced, taught by Conrad Gesner. The character of Zwingli's original "Prophesyings" was, however, by no means lost. The lectures were still attended by the ministers of the town and there would still be discussion. In addition, there was still the second part of the "Prophesyings," the preaching in the vernacular to the people in the Great Minster.

Such then was the system of ministerial instruction in which Hooper shared during his stay in Zürich and it seems probable that it was not without influence upon him as we shall later see. It is clear also that the Zürich practice was one of the models upon which the well-known Elizabethan "Prophesyings" in England were based.

CHURCH PRACTICE IN ZÜRICH

We are fortunate in having an account of Zürich church practice which is almost contemporary with Hooper's stay in Switzerland. This account is by the same Ludwig Lavater whom Hooper had met in Strasbourg. It is contained in a book entitled *De Ritibus et Institutis Ecclesiae Tigurinae*, written in 1559.²⁷ The basis of Zürich practice is described by Lavater in these words: "Nothing is done in the Zürich church except that which was the practice in the church at the time of the apostles."²⁸ The importance of this basic principle cannot be overemphasised. It was the principle which Hooper made his own and which he tried

to force the other English Reformers to accept. It was the principle which he attempted to work out later in his own bishopric in Gloucester. It was this principle which was the ultimate cause of the lighting of his martyr's fire in the shadow of his own cathedral at Gloucester.

In Zürich Hooper saw a church devoid of all ceremonies which had come into being after apostolic times. He saw churches emptied of all images and statues, retaining only what furniture was absolutely necessary.²⁹ He saw churches without altars, having instead a simple table which was brought in whenever the Lord's Supper was celebrated.³⁰ He saw churches which did not glitter with gold, silver and jewels but rather churches which were simple buildings³¹ just as Hooper imagined the churches at Antioch, Corinth and Ephesus to be. He saw ministers in the churches who even when preaching and administering the sacraments wore no distinctive dress, but the respectable clothes of the ordinary citizen. They did not dress up like actors.³² He saw the congregation receive the Lord's Supper not on their knees but sitting. All this simplicity made a deep impression upon him and he came to equate simplicity with purity. Soon after Hooper left Zürich he sent a friend, Jan Utenhove, to Zürich recommending him to Bullinger with the words: "He is coming to you on my recommendation, that he may hear your godly sermons and theological lectures, and observe the mode of administering the Lord's Supper, which as it is most simple among you, so is it most pure."³³ This is surely a Puritan statement if ever there was one. It was written with reference to Hooper's experience of the Zürich church. It expressed an attitude which was to have far-reaching results.

THEOLOGICAL LESSONS OF ZÜRICH

It was while he was in Zürich that Hooper began his literary activities, writing three works during his stay there.³⁴ It is beyond the scope of this present essay to give a detailed account of the theological thought of Hooper and to show its close connection with that of the Zürich theologians.³⁵ It must suffice for us to indicate certain leading ideas of Hooper which are of importance for the understanding of his subsequent actions in England and therefore for the estimation of his place in English Church History.

(a) *The Question of Authority*

The ultimate authority from which all teaching on doctrine and practice must be taken is the Bible, the Old and New Testaments. Nothing may be countenanced which is not prescribed in Scripture; of that Hooper is absolutely convinced. "Now the

orator of God must persuade with none other arguments or words than the master of the School, Christ, hath taught, the prophets and apostles written. It is no orator of Christ's that, contrary unto his canons, the rules and precepts, would persuade in the Church anything more than is prescribed in the Scripture; the which is most perfect and sufficient to persuade in cause of religion all things."³⁶ We have seen that the principle of the Zürich church practice was that of confirmation to the church of the apostles. Hooper adopted this principle and applied it strictly. "Which was the most pure Church?" he asks. "The Church before the doctors wrote that only was taught by the simple text and word of the apostles, or the Church that hath been taught this many years by the blind doctrine of men?"³⁷ It is a rhetorical question. The traditions of men and of the Church and even the creeds are to be followed only in so far as they are in accordance with God's word. In a sermon preached before King Edward VI Hooper said: "The word of God wherewith he governeth and ruleth his Church is a sceptre of iron and not a rod of willow to be bowed with every man's finger, neither a reed to be broken at man's will."³⁸ This principle applied both to doctrine and practice and is a foundation stone of all Hooper's life and teaching.

(b) *The Covenant between God and Man*

Hooper was not, and would never have claimed to be, a particularly deep or original thinker. It is not to be expected that he should have produced a carefully thought out theological system. The chief purpose of his writings was to make plain to his ordinary readers that they were sinners and that God in Christ had offered them salvation from their sins. Hooper wished to show his readers the way of that salvation, the way of the Christian life and the way of worship. It is, however, possible to detect something of a framework within which Hooper set his thoughts. This framework is the idea of the Covenant between God and man.

Hooper believed that God wills that all men should be saved, but that at the same time God gives to every man according to his acts. The mercy and justice of God extend to include the wish that every man should be saved, that in fact to all men is given the opportunity of salvation. But in some way this salvation depends upon man's reaction to this merciful offer of God, both at the time when he first accepts it and in his maintenance of that acceptance throughout his whole life.

It is no accident that the first three Biblical citations Hooper gives after his statement that God wills all men to be saved are the promise of the bruising of the serpent's head in *Genesis* iii. 15, and the two accounts of the promise to Abraham of a seed in

Genesis xv. and *Genesis* xvii. In these instances Hooper sees God in covenant relationship with man, promising the blessing of the seed, but at the same time requiring of Abraham, for example, in *Genesis* xvii. 1. "Walk before me and be thou perfect." Hooper goes into details concerning this covenant relationship between God and man in his introduction "*Unto the Christian Reader*" at the beginning of his *Declaration of the Ten Commandments*.³⁹

He begins by saying that there can be no contract, peace, or alliance between two persons unless the persons who are entering into the contract agree upon the terms of the contract.⁴⁰ The Ten Commandments then are nothing else "but the tables or writings that contain conditions of peace between God and man, and declareth at large how and to what the persons named in the writings are bound unto one another."⁴¹ Hooper refers back with a scriptural reference *Genesis* xvii. to the Covenant of God with Abraham. The Ten Commandments are the conditions of this Covenant. The contents of these conditions on one side, "bind God to aid and succour, keep and preserve, warrant and defend man from all ill, both of body and soul, and at last to give him eternal bliss and everlasting felicity."⁴² On the other side of the Covenant man is bound, "to obey, serve and keep God's commandments, to love him, honour him, and fear him above all things."⁴³ If man made no attempt to do so, then God was released from his obligations. These were the terms of the contract agreed to by both parties.

This Covenant did not first come to Sinai with the Ten Commandments. The Covenant was made, after the Fall, with Adam, and with his seed in *Genesis* iii. 15.⁴⁴ But it is more plainly expressed in *Genesis* xv. and xvii. where God, after the Covenant is renewed with Abraham, promises to bless in the seed of Abraham all the people of the world.⁴⁵ God has thus deigned out of his great mercy to make a Covenant with undeserving man.

This Covenant was sealed by the blood of circumcision which act was the sign and seal the "sphragis" of the agreement.⁴⁶ Christ came and died a death in blood as a confirmation of this Covenant made between God and man, for on the basis of *Hebrews* ix. 16ff. there must be a confirmation of the Covenant by the death of the testator, and a Covenant confirmed with blood.⁴⁷

This then was the Covenant which God made with men. He would be their God, He would send Christ to die as a confirmation of the fact of the Covenant, and in that death make it possible for man to have eternal life. Hooper believed that this offer of God in this Covenant, this promise of grace, applied to all men. God wished all men to be saved, i.e. He wished to be the protector and

preserver of all men and to lead them to everlasting life, according to his side of the Covenant. This was the content of the promise of grace. Hooper says: "The Scripture answereth that the promise of grace appertaineth unto every sort of men in the world, and comprehendeth them all."⁴⁸ On the other hand, however, God gives to all men according to their acts, so Hooper goes on to say: "Howbeit within certain limits and bounds, the which if men neglect or pass over they exclude themselves from the promise of Christ."⁴⁹ If men fail to embrace by faith the opportunity and make no attempt to walk before God and to be holy then they would be judged according to their acts, or rather by their failure to believe and walk in the right paths.

All this necessarily means that there is only one Covenant and that the Church of the Old and New Testaments is one and the same.⁵⁰ Naturally also the sacraments before Christ are different only in form and not in essence to those of the Church after the coming of Christ. "As well was Christ delivered unto them in the use of their sacraments as unto us, but not so openly . . . the sacraments of the Old Testament and of the New in effect be one."⁵¹

Thus with one Covenant and one Church from the time that the first promise was offered to Adam so there is always the same content of the command which man must fulfil, "Walk before me and be thou perfect." Failure to follow this way meant exclusion through man's own fault. "Cain was no more excluded until he excluded himself than Abel; Saul than David, Judas than Peter."⁵² These men failed to hold to the content of this command. What then is the content of this command? The negative side is that: "the contemners of God, or such as willingly continue in sin and will not repent,"⁵³ are excluded from the general promise of grace. The positive side is that those who in faith repent and attempt to conform their lives to the Law of God are reckoned as members of this Covenant.⁵⁴ Naturally Hooper is concerned with this in relation to the people of his day rather than the days of the Old Testament and interprets it chiefly in the light of the Christ who has come, not as in the Old Testament as the Christ who was to come. Hooper says clearly to his readers, "we have the Scripture daily in our hands, read it and hear it preached. God's mercy ever continue the same. Let us think verily that now God calleth, and convert our lives to it. Let us obey it, and beware we suffer not our foolish judgments to wander after the flesh."⁵⁵ The way into the Covenant is that of repentance and faith and the way to remain within it is to live the Christian life.

In view of this covenant relation it is not surprising to find Hooper's continual and urgent emphasis on the absolute necessity

for a repentant man's Christianity to show itself in his everyday life. For it is possible for a man having accepted the promise offered in the Covenant to be damned if "by accustomed doing of ill he fall either in a contempt of the Gospel, will not study to live thereafter, or else hateth the Gospel because it condemneth his ungodly life."⁵⁶ In other words, if he fails to keep his side of the Covenant. This strong, almost fanatical, ethical demand is reflected in all Hooper's activities in England.

Hooper's conception then is of a Covenant, made after the Fall, and a Covenant which binds God only in so far as men make some response to his promise of grace. The Covenant is a conditional promise on the part of God to which man must respond in obedience before this obligation of God can be brought into action. It cannot be said that there is a fully developed covenant theory running obviously throughout all Hooper's works. The clearest statement of it is that given above. Nor is it perhaps possible to fit everything Hooper says in all his works into such a theory, but we believe that in so far as there is a theological system in Hooper's mind, it is that of the Covenant, in the sense enumerated above. This is not unexpected. For if we ask, who was the first theologian in the Reformation to produce such a covenant theory as the basis of his theological thought we find that the answer is Henry Bullinger. It is present in the works of Zwingli, but it is first systematised in Bullinger⁵⁷ and it can be shown that the source of Hooper's thought is almost certainly these Zürich theologians.

(c) *The Lord's Supper*

For Hooper the Lord's Supper is the sacrament to the Church today as the Passover was to the Children of Israel. They are both memorial meals; the latter was appointed "to be a memory of the thing done in Egypt," the former "to be a memory of the thing done in Mount Calvary."⁵⁸ The institution of the Lord's Supper is of the order of Christ and to change the order of it in any way is "as much as to say Christ is a fool and knew not how to celebrate the ceremony that represented his own death."⁵⁹ In the words of institution the bread and wine do not change substantially but are put to a different use and it is interesting to note that both Hooper and Bullinger use the same illustration to make this point clear, that of wax and a king's seal.⁶⁰ Wax alone is of little value but when the seal of a king is upon it then this wax, although substantially still wax, takes on an entirely different value. It represents the king. To deny the king's seal and to say it is only a piece of wax is no less treason and contempt than contempt of the king himself. So it is with the bread and the wine, which by

divine choice and by the word of institution become as the seal of the king himself, and therefore cannot be reckoned as merely bread and wine.

What Hooper says about the meaning of the Lord's Supper can best be summarised in three Latin phrases. It is first of all *memoria et recordatio*.⁶¹ It is a memorial of the Lord's death, but it is more than that. It is a recalling to mind of the benefits of that death. It is a rethinking of the situation. By *recordatio* Hooper probably means what Zwingli meant by his newly-coined word *Wiedergedächtnis*. In partaking of the bread and wine a believer not only remembers what Christ did (*memoria*), but in thinking through this (*recordatio*) he comes to realise that the benefits of Christ's act on Calvary appertain to him now. Secondly, the Lord's Supper is a *communicatio et participatio*.⁶² It was instituted by Christ not only as a memorial of his death but also "to confirm and manifest our society and communion in his body and blood, until he come in judgement."⁶³ The Lord's Supper is a time of participating in a special way in the fellowship of the Church and in communion with Christ. In this communion the Church manifests to the world the unity of its members and its unity with Christ, the Head. The third point is that the Lord's Supper is a *sacrificium*.⁶⁴ Hooper distinguishes two sorts of sacrifices. There is a propitiatory sacrifice which obtains remission of sins; this is a "once for all" sacrifice and was the one that Christ made on Calvary. This is the equivalent of the Greek word *Hilastikon*. This sacrifice in the Lord's Supper can only be a memorial. There is also, however, a sacrifice of joy (*Eucharistikon*). This can be repeated by men. This sacrifice of joy should be repeated at the Lord's Supper as man recalls how great are the benefits of the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ.

There must be careful preparation for the Lord's Supper both by minister and people. Of the form Hooper says "the more simple it is, the better it is, and the nearer the institution of Christ and his apostles."⁶⁵ All that is required is bread, wine, a table and a white table-cloth."⁶⁶ The table should be placed in a position where it is clearly visible to all present. The minister should prepare himself carefully, seeking a fervent spirit to teach the truth to his hearers and to exhort them to recall and rethink the work of Christ.⁶⁷ The people should prepare themselves by confession of sin and repentance, and by reconciliation to their neighbours.

The service should normally take place in a church but when the ministry is corrupt and the sacraments used contrary to the institution of Christ then "every man may in his private chamber with his Christian and faithful brothers communicate according

unto the order of Scripture."⁶⁸ This statement could well form a basis of separatism from any church which recognised any authority alongside that of the Bible, be it reckoned the authority of the Church or of tradition. Doubtless Hooper had in mind the Roman Catholic Church when he wrote. But the principle could also have been applied against the Church in England, as indeed it was, not long after. The order of service should be as close as possible to that of Christ at the institution of the Lord's Supper.⁶⁹ The minister must call all to repent and examine their consciences. He must then preach the death of Christ and redemption as Christ did. The preaching is to be in the vernacular and clearly audible. In all that he does the minister must turn and face the people.⁷⁰ After the preaching comes prayer together as Christ prayed with his disciples, then follow the words of institution and the distribution of the sacraments. The bread should be broken by the minister and given to the people, not thrust into their mouths. The people should not receive the sacrament kneeling but sitting.⁷¹ The final act of the service is one of thanksgiving and a collection of alms for the poor.

It will be seen from what we have mentioned earlier that this conception of the simple form of the Lord's Supper looks to be very similar to that current in the reformed church in Zürich during Hooper's stay there. A detailed comparison confirms this impression.⁷² Hooper's ideas on the meaning of the Lord's Supper may also be traced to lessons learnt in the Zürich school. For the Zürich theologians the Lord's Supper was a memorial meal, and a time of recalling and rethinking the benefits of Christ's death. It was for them also a time of communion together manifesting to the world the fellowship of Christians in the Church and providing an opportunity to offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving.

There still remains the problem of the presence of Christ at the Lord's Supper. It was differences of opinion over this question that went a long way towards causing the tragic division among the Protestant churches in the Reformation.⁷³ On this point Hooper stands firmly with the Swiss church, and more especially with Zürich.

Although Hooper, like Zwingli, Bullinger, Calvin and Bucer denies any idea of a corporeal presence at the Lord's Supper, he does speak of a real presence of Christ. "The thing present in this sacrament is Christ himself, spiritually; the thing absent is Christ's body, corporeally."⁷⁴ Christ himself can be present to the believer by faith. His body may be in heaven "and yet extends his virtue by the operation of the Holy Ghost into my soul by the means of faith, which at the time of the receiving of the sacrament

is in my soul."⁷⁵ Hooper makes clear what he means by taking the sun as an example. The sun remains in one place in the heavens and extends his beams and lights the earth. So Christ's body remains in heaven, yet where faith is, there he is spiritually (i.e. not substantially) present. Thus the virtue of this presence expels all darkness and sin out of the heart.⁷⁶ It is interesting that Zwingli, Bullinger, Calvin and Bucer all use the example of the sun to illustrate how they think of Christ's presence at the Lord's Supper, and as Dr. Cyril Richardson points out, the use they make of this illustration shows clearly the difference between their points of view.⁷⁷

Zwingli uses the analogy of the sun to show that Christ can be present in one place in heaven, by his humanity but everywhere present by his divinity. This does not divide the unity of the Person. Zwingli says "An example is the sun, whose body is in one place while its power pervades all things."⁷⁸ Bullinger follows Zwingli as may be seen from the twenty-first article of the second Helvetic Confession. "The Lord is not absent from his church celebrating the supper. The sun is absent from us in the sky, yet is nonetheless efficaciously present to us, how much more Christ the sun of righteousness, absent from us in heaven in his body is present to us not indeed bodily but spiritually by life-giving operation." For Zwingli and Bullinger there is no question of a substantial relationship between the believer and the body of Christ in heaven, the relation is spiritual.

Calvin and Bucer on the other hand use the analogy of the sun to indicate that the sun's rays share the substance of the sun and suggest although the body of Christ is in heaven it is still possible for believers to participate in its substance. Calvin writes: "For if we see that the sun, in sending forth its rays upon the earth, to generate, cherish and invigorate, in a manner transfuses its substance into it, why should the radiance of the spirit of Christ be less in conveying to us the communion of his flesh and blood?"⁷⁹

In his use of the analogy of the sun it can be seen that Hooper stands with Zürich. The presence is spiritual. There is no thought and no possibility of a substantial presence. For Hooper, where faith is, there Christ is present spiritually. On occasions we find Hooper also speaking of a sacramental presence⁸⁰ as did his teachers in Zürich. The king of kings has set his seal upon the bread and the wine, and although substantially still bread and wine they are put to new use, tokens of his body and blood. With his faith heightened by such tokens, the believer will naturally be more aware of the spiritual presence of the Lord at the Supper and this heightened awareness is the sacramental presence.

IV. THE RETURN FROM EXILE

While Hooper had been sitting at the feet of the Zürich teachers, the situation in England had been rapidly changing. Henry VIII had died and had been succeeded by his son, Edward VI, a boy of ten. In consequence the government of England had been placed in the hands of a Regency Council under the leadership of the Duke of Somerset. The news which reached Zürich from England during Hooper's stay was varied. An attempt had been made to remove Roman Catholic practices, a successful attempt in many respects, but what the eventual doctrine would be which would replace the Roman was not at all certain. John Ab Ulmis, a Swiss student in Oxford, writes to Bullinger on August 18th, 1548 concerning the waverings and uncertainties of Cranmer, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and says that the catechism which he published in 1548 contained a Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper.⁸¹ Burcher the Merchant, writing from Strasbourg on October 29th, 1548,⁸² also gives this information and adds that this book has given rise to fightings among the common people because of their diversity of opinions. Peter Martyr was already in Oxford and, according to a letter from John Ab Ulmis to Bullinger, was not a Lutheran, nor yet "inclining to your opinion" concerning the real presence at the Lord's Supper.⁸³ Thus the position in England as the news reached Zürich at the end of 1548 was that the Mass was banished, that the Protestant doctrine was being accepted, but as to what form of Protestantism would eventually triumph, whether Lutheran or another, was not certain. In the summer of 1548 Bullinger had sent a book to the Archbishop of Canterbury and also a letter which consisted of "a grave and learned admonition as to his episcopal duties" followed by "a subtle transition to the Eucharist."⁸⁴ The result desired was not forthcoming, for Ab Ulmis writes: "We entertain but a very cold hope that he will be aroused even by your most learned letter" for Cranmer had fallen "into so heavy a slumber."⁸⁵

It seems likely that Hooper, towards the end of 1548, when this situation in England, with all its uncertainties and doubts, became clear, began to turn his thoughts towards a return to England. He had already fired two shots in the form of his *Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book* and *The Declaration of Christ and His Office*, but shots fired from such a distance as Zürich would make little noise in London. Bullinger doubtless realised this, and would see how much impact a man of Hooper's uncompromising personality would make in England in the present uncertain situation. It seems that they had talked together of the risks involved in a return to England,⁸⁶ especially as it was known

that Mary, who was next in succession to the throne, was a Roman Catholic. Yet there was no reason to expect that Edward would die, and anyhow risks must be run for the sake of the Gospel. The chief reason for Hooper's exile had been that a godly man should not attend Mass, and now Mass was banished from England. Hooper was an Englishman and now England had need of all the preachers she could find. Such were the arguments which might well be used to urge Hooper to return to England. They were the arguments which we believe Bullinger did use. At any rate, in January, 1549 Hooper had made up his mind to return for, on January 18th, John Rudolph Stumph, a Swiss student bound for England, wrote to his father that "the Englishman I have discovered returns to his native land in two months with his wife and child."⁸⁷ Preparations for the return went on, and on March 12th, Stumph tells his father that his books, together with Hooper's left Zürich by carrier on the previous day.⁸⁸ So the day of departure came, noted in Bullinger's diary as March 24th, 1549.⁸⁹ The farewells were said⁹⁰ and down the road northwards to Basle in the company of Stumph, the student bound for Oxford, went John and Anne Hooper with their baby daughter, Rachel.

As Hooper turned his face toward England it was with the conviction that he had found the church which in practice and in doctrine was the right one—the church of Zürich. It conformed closely to the Church of the apostles in all its simplicity and that was the criterion by which to judge all churches. Hooper felt it his mission to make the church in England as like the church in Zürich as possible. Hooper returned to England with his beliefs fixed. He was going to an England where it seemed the leaders were uncertain as to the best form of Reformed church to build. Into this uncertainty Hooper was going to bring certainty. He had no doubts. He knew what he believed and why he believed it and he was prepared to die for his beliefs. He knew that he had left behind him in Zürich firm friends who would stand behind him in his mission. He knew that he could turn at all times to Bullinger for help and that Bullinger would not let him down.⁹¹ Bullinger never did let him down, nor indeed did Hooper fail Bullinger. It was circumstances beyond the control of both of them which caused the mission to fail in its ultimate object. But although Hooper did not succeed in moulding the English church according to the Zürich pattern we shall see that his doctrines and practices learnt from Zürich helped to set in motion a movement which has had a profound effect upon the church in England. That movement is Puritanism.

(To be continued)

FOOTNOTES.

¹ This essay is a summary of a Thesis submitted to the Theological Faculty of the University of Zürich. A typewritten copy of the original thesis is in the *Zentralbibliothek* in Zurich under the title of *A Study of John Hooper with Special Reference to his Contact with Henry Bullinger*. Two further copies are in the possession of the present writer and are available for consultation.

² It is interesting to note that a friend of Hooper's, a merchant named Burcher, says that Hooper went to Cambridge. See *Epistolarum Tigurinarum Parker Society, Cambridge, 1848* (hereafter referred to as E.T.) p. 441 English translations of these letters are in two volumes of *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation* ed. Hastings Robinson, Parker Society, Cambridge 1846 and 1847 (hereafter O.L. 1 and 2). The present reference is O.L. 2. p. 680.

³ J. Strype *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, Oxford, 1822, Vol. III, Part 2, p. 276, Catalogue of Originals contains a copy of the sentence passed on Hooper on January 29th, 1554, in which Hooper is described as *presbyterum, olim monachum domus sive monasterii de Cliva, ordinis Cisterciensis*.

⁴ E.T. p. 21, O.L. 1 p. 33.

⁵ Much of the evidence used in this essay is derived from the correspondence which Bullinger had with England and with Englishmen in the years 1546-1555. Most of the originals of the letters are to be found in the Archives in Zürich. References to letters in the Zürich Archives are introduced by Z.S.A. In some cases however the original of the letter is no longer extant or is not available in Zürich, in such cases reference is made to the manuscript copy in the Simler Collection in the *Zürich Zentralbibliothek*. In working through the Simler Collection I was assisted by some notes made by the late Dr. Rudolph which were lent to me by Prof. H. Straumann. References to letters in the Simler Collection are introduced by S.C. As far as possible, in the case of published letters, reference is also made to the collection of letters in which they appear.

⁶ Z.S.A. E. II 343:377; E.T. p. 21; O.L. 1 p. 33.

⁷ Z.S.A. E. II 343:345; E.T. p. 166; O.L. 1 p. 250.

⁸ S.C. S. 59:46; Original is Manuscript F. 39:733 in Zürich *Zentralbibliothek*.

⁹ Z.S.A. E. II 343:377; E.T. p. 21; O.L. 1 p. 33. It cannot be said with certainty precisely what writings of Zwingli and Bullinger these were. Bullinger's commentaries were published in one volume in 1537 and in 1538 his commentary on II Thessalonians was translated into English. Zwingli's works were circulating in England during the 1530's and it is interesting to note that Cranmer in a letter to the reformation leader in St. Gall, Vadian, in 1537 claims to have read almost everything that had been written by Zwingli. (*Cranmer Works*, Parker Society, Vol. II, p. 344).

¹⁰ Z.S.A. E. II 369:194; E.T. p. 24; O.L. 1 p. 38.

¹¹ S.C. S. 59:73. Original is Manuscript F. 39:727 in Zürich *Zentralbibliothek*.

¹² Z.S.A. E. II 343:346; E.T. p. 169; O.L. 1 p. 254.

¹³ Z.S.A. E. II 366:36.

¹⁴ Z.S.A. E. II 345:422; E.T. p. 25; O.L. 1 p. 40.

¹⁵ Z.S.A. E. II 343:347; S.C. S. 63:177.

¹⁶ Z.S.A. E. II 366:36; S.C. S. 63:178.

¹⁷ Heinrich Bullinger's *Diarium*, ed. Emil Egli, Basel 1904, p. 35 published in *Quellen zur Schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte II herausgegeben vom Zwingliverein* in Zürich.

¹⁸ Z.S.A. E. II 342:170; S.C. S. 63:190.

¹⁹ There is no book on Bullinger (1504-1575) in English, and few in German.

See C. Pestalozzi, *Heinrich Bullinger, Leben und ausgewählte Schriften*. Elberfeld, 1858.

F. Blanke, *Die Junge Bullinger*. Zürich, 1942.

A. Bouvier, *Henri Bullinger Réformateur et Conseiller oecuménique*. Zürich, 1942.

A. J. vant'Hoof, *De Theologie van Heinrich Bullinger in betrekking tot de Nederlandsche Reformatie*, Amsterdam, 1888.

²⁰ Z.S.A. E. II 343:381; S.C. S. 68:115. About Nov., 1548, also S.C. S. 68:114, probably about the same time.

²¹ See the letter from Butler to Thomas Blaurer. E.T. p. 412; O.L. 2 p. 635. The note 3 on this page is incorrect. Thomas was the brother of Ambrose Blaurer.

²² In *Narratio de ortu, vita et obitu reverende viri D. Henrici Bullingeri, 1575 p. 22*. Under the year 1547 we read *Ioannes quoque; Hopperus postea Glocestris episc. in Anglia et martyr, iisde temporibus Tigurum venit cum uxore, Bullingero familiarissimus, cum quo de omnib. cap. religionis tū precipae de sacramentis sepe disseruit, et que nostrorum esset sententia exquiries, et qd adversariorum obiectis respondendum sit discere cupiens: quae autem ipsius sententia fuerit, et quam consentanea doctrinae nostrarum ecclesiarum, scripta sanctissimi martyris testantur a viro Cl. Ioanno Foxo historiae martyrum Anglicorum inserta.*

²³ The extant baptismal register of the Grossmunster records this baptism.

²⁴ Pellican was a Hebrew scholar. In the Simler Collection S. 65:143 there is a letter from Hooper to Pellican which bears this inscription "*Præceptoris suo colendissimi ac Domino D. Conr. Pellicano vir de omni pietate ac religione viri optima merito.*" In the letter Hooper thanks Pellican for books borrowed.

²⁵ Bibliander later, in 1552, dedicated a book to Hooper.

²⁶ Conrad Gesner was well-known for his researches in the fields of medicine and natural history.

²⁷ For simplicity reference is given to the 1702 edition of *De Ritibus et Institutis Ecclesiae Tigurinae* the pages of which are numbered.

²⁸ *De Ritibus op. cit.* p. 0.

²⁹ *Ibid.* p. 19.

³⁰ *Ibid.* p. 19.

³¹ *Ibid.* p. 19.

³² *Ibid.* p. 17.

³³ Z.S.A. E. II 343:42; E.T. p. 36; O.L. 1 p. 56.

³⁴ These three works were: *An Answer to Stephen Gardiner's book on the Lord's Supper, A Declaration of Christ and His Office, A Declaration of the Ten Commandments.*

These works may be found in *Early Writings of John Hooper* ed. Samuel Carr, Parker Society, Cambridge, 1843 (hereafter E.Wr.). A second volume of Hooper's works was published by the Parker Society at Cambridge in 1852 and entitled *Later Writings of Bishop Hooper* (hereafter L.Wr.) ed. Charles Nevinson. This volume however contains a work *A brief and clear Confession of the Christian Faith* which, as I hope to show elsewhere, does not seem to have been written by Hooper. See original thesis pp. 21-28 for details.

³⁵ This I have attempted to do in detail in my thesis pp. 94-178.

³⁶ E.Wr. p. 105.

³⁷ E.Wr. p. 343.

³⁸ E.Wr. p. 436.

³⁹ E.Wr. pp. 255-270.

40 E.Wr. p. 255.

41 E.Wr. p. 255.

42 E.Wr. p. 255.

43 E.Wr. p. 256.

44 E.Wr. p. 258.

45 E.Wr. p. 259.

46 E.Wr. p. 133.

47 E.Wr. p. 251.

48 E.Wr. p. 259.

49 E.Wr. p. 259.

50 E.Wr. p. 126.

51 E.Wr. p. 126.

52 E.Wr. p. 259.

53 E.Wr. p. 262-3.

54 E.Wr. p. 263.

55 E.Wr. p. 265.

56 E.Wr. p. 264 and p. 76-77.

57 It appears in Zwingli's *In catabaptistarum strophas elenchus* 1527—see especially pp. 414-424 in Vol. III of Schuler and Schultess edition of Zwingli's works. Bullinger's systematic treatment of the idea is in his *De Testamento seu Foedere Dei Unico* published in 1534. For a discussion of the origins and influence of this Covenant theology see G. Schrenk *Gottesreich und Bund im älteren Protestantismus* which is Vol. V. in *Beiträge zur förderung christlicher Theologie* Gutersloh, 1923. Schrenk however almost ignores the development of the Covenant theology in the British Isles. For our purpose see the article by L. J. Trinterud "The Origins of Puritanism" in *Church History*, March, 1951, published by the American Society of Church History. This article deals almost exclusively with the Covenant idea and is a summary of its influence in Puritanism. This Covenant theory naturally raises the question of Predestination. I have dealt at length with this problem in Hooper in the original thesis pp. 116-121 and came to the conclusion that Hooper once again stands with Bullinger's teaching of the 1540's in that his writings show a clear cut doctrine of Election. Hooper has one class the elect, but does not speak of the other class of the reprobate. God elects men to life, but the devil and man combine to cause man's downfall. That is as far as Hooper will go.

58 E.Wr. p. 125.

59 E.Wr. p. 187.

60 E.Wr. p. 191 and Bullinger's *Decades* Vol. IV Parker Society, Cambridge, 1852, p. 270 (hereafter referred to as Dec. IV).

61 L.Wr. p. 515.

62 L.Wr. p. 394.

63 E.Wr. p. 175.

64 L.Wr. p. 520.

65 E.Wr. p. 534.

66 E.Wr. p. 534.

67 E.Wr. p. 534.

68 With this we may compare Hooper's advice given in a letter from prison to "Certain godly persons instructing them how to behave at the beginning of a change of religion." (L.Wr. p. 589) 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."

69 E.Wr. p. 61.

70 L.Wr. p. 128. This was a most revolutionary demand in England in the middle of the sixteenth century.

⁷¹ E.Wr. p. 536. It should be noted that this protest against kneeling at the Lord's Supper was made in a sermon preached by Hooper in 1550 two years before the better known protest of John Knox.

⁷² For details of the Zürich order see *De Ritibus* op. cit. pp. 52-59, Bullinger's Commentary on *Hebrews* x: 16 contained in *In omnes Apostolicas Epistolas, divi videlicet Pauli XIII et VII Canonicas Commentarii H. Bullingeri*. Froshauer, Zürich 1549, p. 709, and for Bullinger's own ideal see Dec. IV p. 406-7. Bullinger's closing sentence is "*Hic ritus coena domini et simplicissime et optimus est, quem apostoli a domino Christo acceptum omnibus nationibus custodiendum tradiderunt.*"

⁷³ The failure of Luther and Zwingli to agree on this very point at Marburg in 1529 after they had agreed on all other points of doctrine is the supreme illustration of this point.

⁷⁴ E.Wr. p. 209.

⁷⁵ E.Wr. p. 191.

⁷⁶ E.Wr. p. 192.

⁷⁷ C. C. Richardson *Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist* Seeburg-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, 1949, p. 23ff.

⁷⁸ *Ad Carolam Fidei Ratio, Schuler and Schultess*. Huldrici Zwingli Opera Completa Editio Prima Vol. IV p. 12. There is evidence to suggest that Hooper had this Zwingli work open before him as he wrote on this point.

⁷⁹ *Institutes* Book IV chapter xvii: 12 and xvii: 19. For Bucer see a quotation from his commentary on Matthew xxvi given on p. 90 of *Cranmer's Works*, Vol. I, Parker Society, Cambridge, 1843.

⁸⁰ L.Wr. p. 389, and Bullinger Dec. IV, p. 463.

⁸¹ S.C. S. 67:165; E.T. p. 251; O.L. 2 p. 381.

⁸² Z.S.A. E. II 343:375; E.T. p. 416; O.L. 2 p. 642.

⁸³ Z.S.A. E. II 335:2092; E.T. p. 249; O.L. 2 p. 378. The date of this letter is Ascension Day, 1548.

⁸⁴ We learn of this letter to Cranmer from Ab Ulmis's letter of August 18th 1548. S.C. S. 67:165; E.T. p. 251; O.L. 2 p. 380.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

⁸⁶ This fact is recalled in the remarkable last letter which Bullinger wrote to Hooper in prison. The letter is in Foxe *Acts and Monuments* ed. S. R. Cattley, London, 1838, Vol. VI, p. 675 ff.

⁸⁷ S.C. S. 69:35.

⁸⁸ S.C. S. 69:36.

⁸⁹ Bullinger's *Diarium*, op. cit. p. 37, line 1.

⁹⁰ An account of the parting conversation between Hooper and Bullinger is given in Foxe op. cit. Vol. VI, p. 538.

⁹¹ Hooper records his debt to Zürich in a letter to Bullinger. "If I am able to effect anything, and if my slender powers are of any benefit to the Church of Christ, I confess and by the blessing of God I will confess, as long as I live, that I owe it to yourself and my masters and brethren at Zürich . . ." Z.S.A. E. II 343:457. E.T. p. 46; O.L. 1 p. 73. The correct date of this letter is December 17th, 1549.

W. MORRIS S. WEST.