CHRIST CHURCH OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

Covenant and Reformed Identity in England

1525-1555

R. J. D. Wainwright
Trinity Term 2011

Submitted to the examiners for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of History

Ite et vos in vineam meam, et quod iustum fuerit dabo vobis.

St. Matthew's Gospel 20:4

Abstract

This study examines Reformed identity as an aspect of religious identity formation during the early Reformation period. It contributes towards an understanding of the character of the English Reformation by examining the reception of Swiss theology. The research is principally focussed upon the theological concept of covenant which blossomed in a distinctively bilateral and conditional form in early Reformation Switzerland. Patterns of thought discerned in English theology are related to this Swiss pattern, thereby assisting the process of identifying individual reformers according to continental models and elucidating an important theological development of the period. The concept of covenant had implications for contemporary discourses regarding the doctrines of justification and sanctification. It also made an impact upon sacramental theology in the way that sacraments were viewed as covenant signs. Despite the essential uniformity of the Swiss Reformed concept of covenant, three distinct emphases arose in Swiss Reformed sacramental theology with regard to the efficacy of the sacraments as means of grace. Having identified cases of English reception of the Swiss concept of covenant, their specific influences are determined using patterns of sacramental theology.

Chapter one considers the problems involved in discerning different forms of religious identity in this period. Evidence for Reformed identity in England from the 1520s to the 1550s is surveyed from various different angles. The transmission of Swiss ideas through the Low Countries is considered, and alternative explanations for the failure of English Lutheranism are evaluated, particularly Lollardy and humanism. Chapter two demonstrates the essential consistency of the concepts of covenant espoused by leading Swiss reformers. Chapter three examines the concepts of covenant of four English reformers. Chapter four highlights different patterns in Swiss sacramental theology, and chapter five analyses English cases in light of those Swiss models.

Long Abstract

This study concerns the process of religious identity formation in the first decades of the English Reformation. In particular, it investigates that form of religious identity defined here as Reformed identity. It is a study in ecclesiastical history, but it also has implications for understanding the socio-political history of the period. It is, moreover, a study in historical theology because it utilises complex theological discourses to make judgments about issues of religious identity formation and contributes towards an understanding of the reception of continental Reformation theology in England.

The Reformation was neither a uniform nor a consistent phenomenon. Apart from the obvious division between reformers who left the Roman Church and reformers who remained within it, there were regional and confessional variations within the evangelical movement itself. One of the starkest divisions emerged between the reformers of lower Germany and those of upper Germany and the Swiss Confederation which, unresolved, inexorably led to the confessional division between the Lutherans and the Reformed. From the early 1530s England underwent a magisterial Reformation which challenges attempts by historians to categorise it according to continental models. The general purpose of this thesis is to consider the phenomenon of religious identity as a way of describing and explaining the nature of the English Reformation and, more particularly, to explore the Reformed identity as part of that Reformation.

This research is principally focussed upon the theological concept of covenant which constituted a distinctive characteristic of the Reformed theology which developed in the Swiss Confederation and Geneva. Patterns found in Swiss concepts of covenant can be related to English concepts of covenant, allowing conclusions to be drawn about English reception of Swiss theology. The concept thereby assists in the identification of Reformed groups and individuals within the broader swathe of reformers generally. The covenant is also of intrinsic

interest as an important aspect of the intellectual and theological development of the early Reformation period.

The concept of covenant has its origin in the suzerainty treaties of the ancient Near East. The model was adopted in the Hebrew Scriptures to describe God's relationship with Noah, Abraham, Moses, David and the nation of Israel. In the New Testament Jesus Christ established a new covenant or testament at the Last Supper before his crucifixion. Christ was also described as the mediator of the new covenant in his blood. The covenant was an important concept in the theology of Augustine of Hippo and of the medieval schoolmen. Thus the covenant became an integral part of Christian theology. It refers to promises, conditions, rewards and sanctions to initiate, sustain and regulate the divine-human relationship. The Old and New Testament understandings of covenant are areas of continuing debate in biblical scholarship.

This research recognises the utility of the concept of covenant in providing an explanation for the soteriology associated with Reformed religious identity at the Reformation. The contemporary debates surrounding the doctrine of justification, especially its implications for the significance of good works and godly living, would necessarily be informed by different understandings of the divine-human relationship as governed by the biblical covenant hermeneutic. This begins to become apparent in the division between Martin Luther and the Reformed theologians regarding the rôle of the law in salvation and the life of the believer. Whereas Luther regarded the gospel as superseding the law, Reformed theologians saw the gospel as enabling the believer to fulfil the law. This difference of opinion could be explained to some degree by their different understandings of the divine-human covenantal relationship as, respectively, unilateral and unconditional, or bilateral and conditional.

The concept of covenant had considerable implications not only for justification and sanctification, but also for sacramental theology. Alternative interpretations of the Real

Presence of Christ in the elements and of the efficacy of the sacraments as mediators of grace emerged from different understandings of sacraments as divinely-instituted signs of the covenant. This thesis proposes that sacramentarianism (that is, the denial of the corporal presence of Christ in the elements) in the English Reformation may be intellectually understood in light of the Reformed concept of covenant. Furthermore, different versions of the concept of covenant produced different shades of sacramental theology, and this can be used as a tool in theological reception studies.

This study is thematic in structure but follows chronological and biographical sequences within the themes of religious identity, soteriology and sacramental theology. This structure facilitates examination of questions of religious identity and theology at a detailed and nuanced level, yet preserves a sense of historical change and development over time. It also contributes an awareness of the effect of practical realities in the lives of individuals upon their theological persuasions. It is further intended that this structure might facilitate the utility of chapters three and five as thorough reference guides to the English concepts of covenant examined.

The introduction to the study begins by defining Reformed identity and the concept of covenant in the early Reformation period. The historiography of the concept of covenant is then reviewed. This scholarship tends to concentrate on the origins of Puritanism and seventeenth-century federal theology and it is suggested that such an approach risks anachronism. The historiographical review proceeds to consider assumptions of English exceptionalism, noting the relatively recent revival of interest in the reception of continental patterns of Reformation. Finally the concepts of covenant and sacramental theologies of four English reformers – William Tyndale (c.1494-1536), Miles Coverdale (1488-1569), John Hooper (1495/1500-1555) and John Bradford (c.1510-55) – are proposed as a method of exploring English reception of Swiss Reformed ideas. The available historiography concerning these individuals is reviewed.

Chapter one deals with the problem of Reformed identity in England from the middle of the reign of King Henry VIII and throughout the reign of his son, King Edward VI. The difficulties involved in analysing groups and individuals in generalised categories of theological and political opinion are raised. The personal religion of Henry VIII is discussed because of its implications for the character of the English Church, drawing the conclusion that the Royal Supremacy was paramount in his religious self-identification. Evidence of Reformed identity before 1547 is explored, with particular attention given to individuals in London, the universities and the royal Court. It is argued that there was a greater incidence of Reformed identity than is generally assumed, and that it was not restricted to the exile community. The religious climate in the Low Countries is considered because that region formed part of the geographical corridor for the transmission of Swiss theology to England via the Rhineland. Lollardy and humanism are then evaluated as possible alternative explanations to continental Reformed influence for the rejection of Lutheran theology in England. Finally, the more clearly Reformed character of Edward VI's reign is surveyed.

Chapter two explores the concept of covenant espoused by three continental Reformed theologians: Huldrych Zwingli (1484-1531), Heinrich Bullinger (1504-75) and John Calvin (1509-64). The various historiographical assessments of the extent and nature of the concept of covenant in their thought are acknowledged. It is argued that they all exhibited a substantially similar bilateral and conditional concept of covenant. This is particularly controversial in the case of Calvin. This thesis maintains that the bilateral and conditional covenant may be considered to constitute a defining characteristic of Swiss Reformed theology in this period because it was held consistently by Zwingli, Bullinger and Calvin, but was not articulated by Lutheran theologians or the theologians of Strasbourg. This chapter forms the basis for comparison in the following chapter on English concepts of covenant.

Chapter three provides a detailed analysis of the concept of covenant in the theologies of four English reformers: Tyndale, Coverdale, Hooper and Bradford. Tyndale, Coverdale and Hooper indicated their views by choosing to go into exile under Henry VIII. Through a close-reading of their writings, it emerges that they all developed a bilateral and conditional concept of covenant resembling the Swiss model. The fourth case, Bradford, makes for interesting comparison because he did not experience exile. Although he was Reformed in his theology, that fact that he did not develop a bilateral concept of covenant can be attributed to his relatively limited engagement with Swiss theology and to the influence of Martin Bucer at Cambridge. The theological development of all these reformers is traced throughout their careers.

Chapter four examines the implications of the reciprocal concept of covenant for the sacramental theologies of Zwingli, Bullinger and Calvin. All of them understood the sacraments as symbolic covenant signs, but three distinct understandings of the importance of the sacraments to the communication of grace to the believer emerged. These differences may be used to trace the specific source of a reciprocal concept of covenant.

Chapter five analyses the sacramental theologies of Tyndale, Coverdale, Hooper and Bradford in light of the distinctive emphases of Zwingli, Bullinger and Calvin. Tyndale's, Coverdale's and Hooper's adoptions of Swiss emphases support the suggestion that their concepts of covenant were drawn from engagement with Swiss theology. Their developing Swiss influences are tracked by means of changes in their sacramental theologies. Bradford's sacramental theology is seen to exhibit traces of Swiss Reformed influence, giving rise to the suggestion that the influence of Bucer was diluted by Swiss ideas mediated to Bradford. It also shows that Swiss sacramental theology could be held apart from the covenantal ideas which underpinned it.

The findings of the research are rehearsed in the conclusion which reiterates the strong parallels between Swiss and English concepts of covenant. The covenant and its implications for

sacramental theology are commended as useful tools in the analysis of religious, and particularly Reformed, identity among the English élites. It is recognised that the concept has limited applicability to popular forms of religious identity but possible avenues of future investigation are proposed. Finally, consideration is given to the development of the concept of covenant in the post-Reformation period. It is suggested that the early Reformation concept was significantly different from later expressions and that investigations into its medieval antecedents would be the more fruitful direction for further research.

Acknowledgments

The funding for this research was provided by the Arts and Humanities Research Council. I am greatly indebted to my supervisors, Susan Brigden and Charlotte Methuen, who have together been generous Sibyls and patient Cassandras. I am grateful to Felicity Heal and Peter Marshall for agreeing to examine the thesis. Many others have given freely of their time, wisdom and stimulating discussion, including my college tutors, Christopher Haigh and Sarah Mortimer, and Diarmaid MacCulloch, Torrance Kirby, Peter Stephens, Steven Gunn, Alison Dalton, Sarah Apetrei, Christopher Brooks, Alan Coates, Pamela Stanworth, and Philip and Cynthia Johnston. I owe much to the friendship and expertise of fellow 'students with their pensive Citadels,' especially Mario Paganini, Elizabeth Ferguson, Boris Chrubasik, Eric Descheemaeker, Steffen Weishaupt and my cousin, Simon Burton, who, with Kirsty Pringle, checked the typescript. To my parents and sisters, for their faithfulness in the greatest virtue, this thesis is dedicated.

Christ Church, Oxford Robert J.D.Wainwright
Feast of St. John at the Latin Gate 2011

Contents

Abstract ii
Long Abstract iii
Acknowledgments ix
Abbreviations xii
Introduction 1
- Covenant and the Reformed Tradition 3
- Exception and Reception 10
- Covenant and the English Reformers 19

I. Reformed Identity 26
- Henry VIII 33
- English evangelicalism, 1525-47 41
- Early evangelicalism in the Low Countries 63
- Lollardy 67
- Humanism 72
- English evangelicalism, 1547-55 75

II. Swiss Concepts of Covenant 81
- Huldrych Zwingli 81
- Heinrich Bullinger 89
- John Calvin 96
- Conclusion 104

III. English Concepts of Covenant 106
- William Tyndale 106
- Miles Coverdale 123
- John Hooper 136
- John Bradford 150
- Conclusion 166

IV. Swiss Sacramental Theology 168
- Huldrych Zwingli 170
- Heinrich Bullinger 181
- John Calvin 192
- Conclusion 202

V. English Sacramental Theology 204
- William Tyndale 204
- Miles Coverdale 219
- John Hooper 230
- John Bradford 247
- Conclusion 260

Conclusion 263
- The Swiss Covenant Tradition 264
- English Reformed Identity 266
- Imprecisely Reformed 274
- Epilogue 280

Bibliography 282
Manuscripts 282
Printed Primary Sources 282
Secondary Literature 290
Unpublished Dissertations 309

Abbreviations

AM	John Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online.
ARG	*Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*
BQ	*The Baptist Quarterly*
CH	*Church History*
CO	*Ioannis Calvini opera quae supersunt omnia*, eds. G. Baum, E. Cunitz, and E. Reuss, 59 vols.
CR	*Corpus Reformatorum*, eds. K. Bretschneider *et al*., 101 vols. v.1-28: Philip Melanchthon, *Opera quae supersunt omnia* v.29-87: *CO* v.88-101: *HZSW*
CUP	Cambridge University Press
CLRC	*Courtenay Library of Reformation Classics*
EHR	*The English Historical Review*
ETL	*Ephemerides Theologicae Louvanienses*
HJ	*Historical Journal*
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUP	Harvard University Press
HZW	*Huldrych Zwingli: Writings,* eds. E.J. Furcha & H.W. Pipkin, 2 vols.
HZSW	*Huldreich Zwinglis Sämtliche Werke*, eds. E. Egli and G. Finsler, 14 vols.
JBS	*Journal of British Studies*
JEH	*Journal of Ecclesiastical History*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
LCC	*The Library of Christian Classics*
LP	*Letters and papers, foreign and domestic, of the reign of Henry VIII, 1509-1547*, eds. J.S. Brewer, J. Gairdner & R.H. Brodie, 21 vols. Citations refer to volume number then document number, e.g., *LP*, iv/2. #4396 is volume 4, part 2, document number 4396.
LW	*Luther's Works*, eds. J. Pelikan, H. Lehmann, *et al*., 55 vols.
LWHZ	*The Latin Works of Huldreich Zwingli*, ed. S.M. Jackson, 3 vols. v.1. (1912); v.2. ed. W.J. Hinke (1922), repr. *On Providence and other essays* (1983); v.3. ed. C.N. Heller (1929), repr. *Commentary on True and False Religion* (1981).
ODNB	*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*
OED	*Oxford English Dictionary*
OER	*Oxford Encyclopaedia of the Reformation*
OL	*Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation,* ed. H. Robinson, 2 vols. with continuous pagination.
OUP	Oxford University Press
PBA	*Proceedings of the British Academy*

PP	*Past and Present*
PS	The Parker Society
RQ	*Renaissance Quarterly*
RRR	*Reformation and Renaissance Review*
RSTC	Revised Short Title Catalogue
SCJ	*Sixteenth Century Journal*
SJT	*Scottish Journal of Theology*
TRHS	*Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*
TRP	*Tudor Royal Proclamations*, eds. P. Hughes & J. Larkin, 3 vols. Citations refer to volume number then document number, e.g., *TRP*, i. #30 is volume 1, document number 30.
TVZ	Theologischer Verlag Zürich
YUP	Yale University Press
ZL	*The Zurich Letters, comprising the correspondence of several English bishops and others, with some of the Helvetian Reformers, during the early part of the reign of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. H. Robinson, 2 vols.

[...]	Square brackets denote my own elipses within quotations.
	Quotations retain original spellings except where the meaning is obscure.
	Full titles are given in first citations. Thereafter short titles allow reference to be made to the bibliography.
	The place of publication is London unless stated otherwise.

Introduction

> The entire sum of piety consists in these very brief main points of the covenant. Indeed, it is evident that nothing else was handed down to the saints of all ages, throughout the entire Scripture, other than what is included in these main points of the covenant.
>
> *Heinrich Bullinger (1534)*[1]

IN 1534 Heinrich Bullinger (1504-75), the *Antistes* of Zürich, defined the divine covenant as the summary principle of the faith delivered to the saints. By then, the concept of covenant had been a current of theological inquiry in that city for over a decade and had been deployed in local controversies, yet it was specific neither to the reforms sweeping the Swiss Confederation nor to the Reformation movement more generally. In the Bible the covenant was God's arrangement with Abraham and his descendants defining the mechanics of salvation according to a divine promise; theologians had been reflecting on the biblical concept of covenant for centuries. During the Reformation, however, the concept of covenant received a distinct formulation from the reformers of Zürich and Geneva which made it a theological signature of Swiss Reformed influence further afield.[2] It is the aim of this thesis to increase understanding of Swiss influence on English Reformed identity from the 1520s until the 1550s. The concept of covenant is one important marker of that influence.

The purpose of this introduction is to explain how the divine covenant can be conceptualised and to establish the nature and extent of research to date. Firstly, different scholarly interpretations of covenant formulations on the continent are surveyed. Secondly, consideration is given to the historiography of English reception of the continental Reformation in general. Thirdly, an approach to English reception of Swiss concepts of covenant is advanced.

---

[1] Heinrich Bullinger, *A Brief Exposition of the One and Eternal Testament or Covenant of God, 1534*, trans. C.S. McCoy and J.W. Baker, in *Fountainhead of Federalism* (Louisville, KY: 1991), 112.

[2] For convenience, the adjective 'Swiss' will be used here to include Geneva, even though Geneva was not a member of the Swiss Confederation.

The term 'Reformed identity' requires brief justification before the concept of covenant is properly introduced. Although the formal process of confessionalisation did not begin until the 1560s, Erika Rummel believes that it is not anachronistic to think in terms of confessional trajectories in preceding decades.[3] The leading centre of Reformed thought during the 1520s was the city of Zürich under the spiritual oversight of Huldrych Zwingli (1484-1531), who was succeeded by Bullinger in 1531. Strasbourg was another important locus from 1523 until Martin Bucer (1491-1551) was forced to flee to England in the wake of the Augsburg Interim (1548). Only from the late 1540s did Geneva begin to assume pre-eminence, although John Calvin (1509-64) had enjoyed increasing influence since the 1530s.

The Reformed trajectory can be distinguished from other patterns of Reformation by its 'eminently ethical' understanding of redemption.[4] This understanding stood in continuity with a late-medieval nominalist conception of the Church as the 'guardian of morality,' a morality constituted upon the Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount.[5] According to Heiko Oberman, those who held this view understood 'reformation' as rejuvenation of the divine order by way of personal and communal renewal. In this respect Oberman argues that the medieval and Reformed traditions are together distinguished from the thought of Martin Luther (1483-1546) for whom 'reformation' involved a rejection of humanity's very attempt to renew itself.[6] The Reformed trajectory is, nonetheless, united with other patterns of Reformation in the

[3] Erika Rummel, *The Confessionalisation of Humanism in Reformation Germany* (Oxford: 2000), 4.
[4] Theodore Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain: Disciplinary Religion and Antinomian Backlash in Puritanism to 1638* (Chapel Hill, NC & London: 2004), 17, 77-79; Marshall Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism: a chapter in the history of idealism* (Gloucester, MA.: 1963), 48-49. On the continuity between medieval and Reformation priorities see Heiko Oberman, *The Dawn of the Reformation: Essays in Late Medieval and Early Reformation Thought* (Edinburgh: 1986), 18-38.
[5] Heiko Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought* (New York: 1966), 5; John Bossy, 'Moral Arithmetic: Seven Sins into Ten Commandments', in E. Leites (ed.), *Conscience and Casuistry in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: 1988), 215-217.
[6] Oberman, *Forerunners*, 9-10, 20. For an example of 'reformation' used in the sense of efforts towards renewal see John Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials, relating chiefly to religion, and the Reformation of it*, 3 vols. (Oxford: 1822), i/1, 72.

'normative centring' of the power for, and object of, moral rectitude around the *sola* formulae: *sola gratia, sola fide, solus Christus*.[7]

Covenant and the Reformed Tradition

The relationship established by God with Abraham and his descendants is described in Gen. 15 and 17 by the Hebrew word בְּרִית (*bĕrît*). In the Greek Septuagint (c.275-c.100 B.C.) this word was translated διαθήκη (*diathēkē*). The Latin Vulgate (A.D. c.380-c.405) rendered the term as *pactum* (pact) or *foedus* (league or covenant). These words all articulate the concept of covenant, but it is possible to understand this concept in two different ways. The concept could denote God's unilateral promise to Abraham which is passively received. Alternatively, it could refer to a bilateral agreement between God and Abraham in which both parties undertook mutual obligations. The persistence of this agreement might be subject to the fulfilment of conditions by one or both parties, and sanctions might be imposed if either party defaulted on their obligations.[8]

By the early sixteenth century the meaning of the words *pactum* and *foedus* had been conflated with *testamentum*, in the sense of a 'last will and testament.'[9] *Testamentum* usually tended towards the unilateral conception of covenant as God's unconditional promise or bequest. However, the bilateral, or mutual, and conditional concept of covenant was still a possible

[7] Berndt Hamm, *The Reformation of Faith in the Context of Late Medieval Theology and Piety*, trans. H. Heron, G. Wiedermann, and J. Frymire (Leiden & Boston: 2004), 20, 43.

[8] For biblical scholarship see: Klaus Baltzer, *The Covenant Formulary in Old Testament, Jewish and Early Christian Writings*, trans. D. Green (Oxford: 1971); E.P. Sanders, 'The covenant as a soteriological category in the nature of salvation in Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism', in R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs (eds.), *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Culture in Late Antiquity* (Leiden: 1976), 39-42; Ernest Nicholson, *God and His People: Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament* (Oxford: 1986), 97; Staffan Olofsson, *The LXX Version: a guide to the translation technique of the Septuagint* (Stockholm: 1990), 7; Menahem Haran, 'The *Bĕrît* "Covenant": its nature and ceremonial background', in M. Cogan, B. Eichler, and J. Tigay (eds.), *Tehillah Le-Moshe: Biblical and Judaic Studies in honour of Moshe Greenberg* (Winona Lake, IN: 1997), 205-208; Emanuel Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (Leiden & Boston: 1999), 92-93, 261-262; Georg Walser, *The Greek of the Ancient Synagogue: an investigation on the Greek of the Septuagint, Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament* (Stockholm: 2001), 169.

[9] Leonard Trinterud, 'The Origins of Puritanism', *CH*, 20/1 (1951), 43; cf. Derk Visser, 'Covenant', in H.J. Hillerbrand (ed.), *OER* (1; New York & Oxford: OUP, 1996), 442-445.

interpretation. A concept of covenant exhibiting both mutuality and conditionality may conveniently be referred to as a reciprocal concept of covenant.

Scholarly reflection on the Reformation concept of covenant has suffered from being attached to the study of post-Reformation federal theology.[10] In 1939 Perry Miller denied the significance of Reformation covenant ideas by asserting that the concept of covenant had 'not been known, or at least not emphasised' until New England Puritans introduced it during the first half of the seventeenth century. In his view the Puritans saw the covenant as a 'legitimate extension' of Reformed theology establishing 'the submerged grounds for moral obedience and for an assurance of salvation.'[11]

Miller's assertion of the late appearance of the conditional covenant – and only in New England at that – provoked a hunt for continental European precedents.[12] The self-conscious excavation of 'the origins of Puritanism' which ensued insinuated an anachronistic agenda into the interpretation of the Reformation concept of covenant. The assumption that the conditional elements of federal theology were inconsistent with Calvin's legacy encouraged the identification of alternative Reformed well-springs.[13] In 1951 Leonard Trinterud published a seminal article on the origins of Puritanism claiming that the unconditional 'testament' attributed to Geneva was only one version of the concept. He suggested that a conditional 'law-

[10] See the predominantly Anglo-American bibliography in Visser, 'Covenant', 445. There are few German-language studies of the early Reformation concept. See the bibliography in J.F. Gerhard Goeters, 'Föderaltheologie', in H. Balz et al. (eds.), *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* (11; Berlin & New York: 1983), 251-252.
[11] Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (2nd edn.; New York & London: 1954), 366-367, 374; cf. Perry Miller, *Errand into the Wilderness* (London & Cambridge, MA.: 1956), 82-89.
[12] Miller, *New England Mind*, 398.
[13] Important statements of the discontinuity thesis include Basil Hall, 'Calvin against the Calvinists', in G. Duffield (ed.), *John Calvin: a collection of distinguished essays* (Grand Rapids, MI: 1966), 19-37; R.T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (Oxford: 1979).

covenant' was the 'organising principle of the entire Rhineland reformation movement' (principally Zürich, Basle and Strasbourg).[14]

Trinterud's bifurcation of the Reformed tradition was maintained in articles by a number of scholars including Jens Møller in 1963, Richard Greaves in 1968, Michael McGiffert in 1982 and Robert Letham in 1983.[15] In 1980 Trinterud's thesis was definitively restated and expanded in a monograph by Wayne Baker, *Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenant: the Other Reformed Tradition*. Baker claimed that Bullinger represented the alternative to Calvin's predestinarian unilateral testament.[16] In 1990 David Weir tried to refine Baker's conclusions by arguing that post-Reformation federal theology was designed to 'bridge both worlds: that of the unilateral covenant and that of the bilateral covenant.'[17] However, in 1991 Baker and Charles McCoy argued that Bullinger had initiated a Federalist Reformed tradition which ought to be distinguished from the Calvinist Reformed tradition.[18]

The opposition of bilateral and conditional versus unilateral and unconditional covenants tended to include a judgment on conditionality. For Miller, conditionality was a positive comfort and moralistic counterweight to absolute predestinarianism, whereas later accounts accused it of promoting legalism at the expense of grace and election. According to those who

[14] Trinterud, 'Origins', 41, 45, 56.
[15] Jens Møller, 'The Beginnings of Puritan Covenant Theology', *JEH*, 14 (1963), 47-50; Richard Greaves, 'The Origins and Early Development of English Covenant Thought', *The Historian*, 31/1 (1968), 21-35; Michael McGiffert, 'Grace and Works: The Rise and Division of Covenant Divinity in Elizabethan Puritanism', *HTR*, 75/4 (1982), 472; Robert Letham, 'The Foedus Operum: some factors accounting for its development', *SCJ*, 14/4 (1983), 457-467. McGiffert accepts the dichotomy with the qualification that it went unacknowledged in the early Reformation.
[16] J. Wayne Baker, *Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenant: The Other Reformed Tradition* (Athens, OH: 1980), *passim.*
[17] David Weir, *The Origins of the Federal Theology in Sixteenth-Century Reformation Thought* (Oxford: 1990), 32.
[18] J. Wayne Baker and Charles McCoy, *Fountainhead of Federalism: Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenantal Tradition* (Louisville, KY: 1991), 24.

subscribed to the view that conditionality entailed legalism, the radical predestinarianism of Calvinist orthodoxy 'paralysed' the conditional covenant idea in federal theology.[19]

Since the 1980s there have been several notable critiques of Trinterud's thesis. In 1983 Lyle Bierma argued that all early Reformed expressions of the concept of covenant should be considered together.[20] He demonstrated in 1990 that the conditional covenant was not necessarily opposed to double predestinarianism, thereby undermining a basic assumption of the unilateral-bilateral dichotomy.[21] Peter Lillback's dissertation of 1985, published in 2001, suggested close associations between Calvin and other Swiss theologians on the concept of covenant.[22] In 2002 Cornelis Venema questioned Baker's view of Bullinger as the founder of a second Reformed tradition, arguing that Bullinger's and Calvin's doctrines of predestination were not responsible for two different concepts of covenant.[23]

These critiques form part of a more fundamental assault led by Richard Muller on the thesis of discontinuity between early and post-Reformation Reformed theology.[24] In two volumes discussing the foundation and development of the Reformed tradition, published in 2000 and 2003,[25] Muller rejected the view that unilateral and bilateral conceptions were 'mutually exclusive and held by different thinkers, to the point that the unilateral definition belongs to a more "predestinarian" approach and the bilateral definition to an approach that verges on

[19] e.g., Baker, *Other Reformed Tradition*, 204-215.
[20] Lyle Bierma, 'Federal Theology in the Sixteenth Century: Two Traditions?', *Westminster Theological Journal*, 45 (1983), 304-321.
[21] Lyle Bierma, 'The Role of Covenant Theology in Early Reformed Orthodoxy', *SCJ*, 21/3 (1990), 456.
[22] Peter Lillback, *The Binding of God: Calvin's Role in the Development of Covenant Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: 2001), 306.
[23] Cornelis Venema, *Heinrich Bullinger and the Doctrine of Predestination: Author Of "The Other Reformed Tradition"?* (Grand Rapids, MI: 2002), 111-112.
[24] See Richard Muller, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Grand Rapids: 1986). On this debate see Carl Trueman, 'Calvin and Reformed Orthodoxy', in H. Selderhuis (ed.), *The Calvin Handbook* (Grand Rapids & Cambridge: 2009), 474-476.
[25] Richard Muller, *The Unaccommodated Calvin: Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition* (Oxford: 2000); Richard Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (Oxford: 2003).

synergism in its emphasis on human responsibility.'[26] Bullinger's bilateral conception of the covenant did not preclude a Reformed predestinarianism nor did Calvin's predestinarianism prevent him from developing mutual themes in his commentaries and sermons.[27] In Muller's view, Reformed writers utilised both definitions of covenant and all of them upheld the monergistic soteriology of their confession. Predestination and covenant were neither in opposition nor in tension.[28]

The essential point of recent research is that theological diversity amongst Reformed theologians should not be misconstrued as indicative of multiple Reformed traditions. Muller has argued for the recognition of 'a single but variegated Reformed tradition, bounded by a series of fairly uniform confessional concerns but quite diverse in patterns of formulation.'[29] This implies the unity of the Reformed identity, not only between Reformation and post-Reformation Reformed thinkers, but also between contemporaneous Reformed thinkers, such as Bullinger and Calvin, who nonetheless had different theological emphases.[30]

Whilst the severance of any necessary link between predestinarianism and unilateral concepts of covenant exposes an untenable model, it does not imply that all Reformed theologians expounded mutuality between God and humanity to the same degree. The unilateral concept of covenant was assumed in one form or another by everyone, but only some took the further step of formulating reciprocal features.

This thesis contributes to the challenge to the view represented by Trinterud and Baker that the concept of covenant divided the Reformed theologians of Zürich and Geneva. Instead it is

[26] Muller, *After Calvin*, 9, 99.
[27] Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 183.
[28] Muller, *After Calvin*, 12-13, 99; Dewey Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525-1695* (Chapel Hill, NC: 1982), 10.
[29] Muller, *After Calvin*, 7-9.
[30] Ibid., 85-86; cf. John Whitgift, *The Works of John Whitgift, D.D.*, ed. J. Ayre, 3 vols. (PS, 1; Cambridge: 1851-53), 436; Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, 78; C.M. Dent, *Protestant Reformers in Elizabethan Oxford* (Oxford: 1983), 1.

suggested that the line of theological diversity should be drawn between the Swiss on the one hand and the Germans on the other. The theologians of Strasbourg are to be placed alongside the German Lutherans. It is argued here that Zwingli, Bullinger and Calvin formulated reciprocal concepts of covenant which constituted a unifying characteristic of Swiss Reformed theology. By contrast Luther and Bucer developed concepts of covenant without significant mutual or conditional elements. Detailed analysis of their theology is beyond the scope of this thesis but their concepts must be summarised at this stage.

Luther approached the concept of the covenant in terms of a testator's unilateral promise to his heirs. God promised Abraham and his descendants that they would inherit righteousness. In 1519 Luther distinguished between covenant and testament: 'He who stays alive makes a covenant; he who is about to die makes a testament.'[31] In 1520 he discussed testament in the context of the Eucharist, leaving no room for mutual participation or for conditions to be imposed on humanity.[32] Christ, in his humanity, had made a last will and testament. Humanity was entirely passive in receiving the inheritance of salvation unilaterally bequeathed by Christ's death.[33]

Bucer came close to Luther's view, albeit with idiosyncratic ambiguity. According to Nicholas Thompson, 'Bucer treated *testamentum* as a synonym for *foedus*' and, to a greater extent than Luther, 'emphasised the human side of the covenant.'[34] However, Bucer's bilateral themes should not be unduly emphasised; they are concentrated in his early work and have primary

[31] Martin Luther, *Lectures on Galatians* [1519 and 1535], ed. J. Pelikan (*LW*, 27; Saint Louis, MO: 1964), 268.
[32] Martin Luther, *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church* [1520], trans. A. Steinhauser (*LW*, 36; Philadelphia: 1959), 38.
[33] On Luther's view see: Kenneth Hagen, 'From Testament to Covenant in the Early Sixteenth Century', *SCJ*, 3/1 (1972), 8-15; Alister McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross: Martin Luther's Theological Breakthrough* (Oxford: 1985), 85-92; cf. Heiko Oberman, *The Reformation: Roots and Ramifications*, trans. A. Gow (Edinburgh: 1994), 94.
[34] Nicholas Thompson, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and Patristic Tradition in the Theology of Martin Bucer, 1534-1546* (Leiden & Boston: 2005), 105.

reference to the sacraments rather than salvation.[35] In *Grund und Ursach* [*Basic Principles*] (1524) he wrote that 'Christians renew their spiritual and everlasting covenant and testament in the Lord with holy food and drink,'[36] but Thompson explains that, for Bucer, the Christian offers 'nothing other than the obedience of faith' in the sense of patristic eucharistic sacrifice.[37] In *Epistola Apologetica* [*Apologetical Letter*] (1529) the sacraments are called 'a symbol and token of the covenant which God has made with us [by which] we are reminded of those things which it befits God to do for us and us, in turn, to do for God.'[38] While Luther placed sacrament and sacrifice in opposition, Bucer preserved the sacrificial element of 'grateful response' from humanity.[39] This was 'the Godward and human dimension of any "ceremony" appointed to seal God's covenant,'[40] rather than a reciprocal feature of the covenant itself.

In another of Bucer's early works, *Ennarationes in evangelia* [*Explanations of the Gospels*] (1527), Kenneth Hagen has noted that the *verum et aeternum Dei foedus* is defined as God's promise, requiring nothing of believers.[41] The unilateral sense is very clear in Bucer's mature writings. In *De Regno Christi* [*Of Christ's Reign*] (1551) *foedus* is understood as unilateral adoption: '*sollenique foederis divini, id est adoptionis in filios pactione, et sanctione*' (and a solemn pact and sanction of divine treaty, that is, of adoption as sons).[42] Peter Stephens' study of Bucer finds an overwhelming tendency towards understanding the covenant as God's promise of forgiveness.[43]

---

[35] Bucer also compared covenant renewal with oaths of citizenship and discipline: Amy Nelson Burnett, *The Yoke of Christ: Martin Bucer and Christian Discipline* (Kirksville, MO: 1994), 213, 218.
[36] Quoted in Thompson, *Eucharistic Sacrifice*, 115.
[37] Ibid.
[38] Quoted in Ibid., 118.
[39] Ibid., 120.
[40] Ibid., 285.
[41] Hagen, 'Testament to Covenant', 22-23. This also appears to be the sense of Bucer's *Apology concerning Christ's Supper* (1526) in D.F. Wright (ed.), *Commonplaces of Martin Bucer* (Abingdon: 1972), 323.
[42] Quoted in Møller, 'Beginnings', 54. My translation. See also the different applications of *testamentum* and *foedus* in Martin Bucer, *Confession on the Eucharist* (1550), in Wright (ed.), *Commonplaces*, 397.
[43] W.P. Stephens, *The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Martin Bucer* (Cambridge: 1970), 109-111, 115, 218, 246, 249, 265-266.

Exception and Reception

Serious attempts to study the English Reformation according to the patterns of continental Reformation have been made only in the last twenty years. The venture incites debate even before specific theological concepts can be invoked. A review of historiographical interpretations of the period from the 1520s to the 1550s reveals an almost unswerving assessment of England as an exception from continental patterns of Reformation, being characterised by political, rather than theological, change.

In 1825 S.R. Maitland questioned the trustworthiness of histories bequeathed by members and admirers of the 'puritan sect', in which he counted the likes of John Foxe (1516/17-87), Thomas Fuller (1593-1667), Gilbert Burnet (1643-1715) and John Strype (1643-1737).[44] In reacting against their allegedly unreliable accounts of the Reformation, nineteenth-century historians distanced the English experience from the populist doctrinal upheaval on the continent, stressing instead the reluctance of the English people to embrace reform, the avarice of the rulers who imposed it, and the apparently minimal effect reform had upon doctrine.[45]

In 1926 C.H. Smyth explained the Henrician Reformation as a diplomatic necessity, while 'the Edwardine Reformation was a dangerous and an unpopular experiment' whose 'alien influences [...] left the whole country seething with [...] heretics and sectaries of every description.' 'In the end,' wrote Smyth patriotically, 'it was not Protestantism that converted England from Catholicism, but the Spanish Match.'[46] The story told by Norman Sykes in 1938 of a thoroughly constitutional Reformation of the *Ecclesia Anglicana* reached its apogée during the Second World War with F.M. Powicke's epithetical 'act of state'. Cranmer, maintained

[44] S.R. Maitland, *Essays on Subjects Connected with the Reformation in England* (1849), 1, 22.
[45] See the survey by Patrick Collinson, 'The Fog in the Channel Clears: The Rediscovery of the Continental Dimension to the British Reformations', in P. Ha and P. Collinson (eds.), *The Reception of Continental Reformation in Britain* (*PBA*, 164; Oxford: 2010), xxvii-xxxvii.
[46] C.H. Smyth, *Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI* (Cambridge: 1926), 2-3, 6.

Powicke, 'was always the primate, the English theologian [...] seeking a settlement suited to English needs.'[47]

The rehabilitation of the religious character of the English Reformation began after the Second World War. In 1947 Gordon Rupp ventured to claim that 'the English Reformation is not wholly to be explained in terms of that conspiracy by which a lustful monarch and predatory gentry combined to plunder the Church and rend the unity of Christendom. It had, after all, something to do with the beliefs of Christian men.'[48] Rupp also countenanced recognition of some continental influence:

> We shall be wise if we refuse to imitate those historians who loved to glorify some imaginary and splendid isolation of the English Church, as though there was something inherently disreputable in borrowing from abroad [...]. Nevertheless, facts are facts, and it will be our business to note that even where our Reformers set their faces most steadfastly towards Wittenberg, Strasbourg or Zürich, their caps were tilted after an English fashion.[49]

In 1948 H. Maynard Smith seemed to have heeded Rupp's pleas in dividing his attention equally between 'The Political Reformation' and 'The Religious Reformation', but he retained English insularity. 'The great majority of quiet respectable folk had no desire for change,' he wrote, and the small minority whose humanism Luther did catalyse 'cared very little for Lutheran teaching.'[50] In 1950 T.M. Parker observed that the resemblances between England and the continent were 'closer than are sometimes admitted' but this concession does not appear to have inspired deeper examination of continental influence.[51]

---

[47] Norman Sykes, *The Crisis of the Reformation* (1938), 77-95; F.M. Powicke, *The Reformation in England* (1941), 1, 82.
[48] E.G. Rupp, *Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition (Mainly in the Reign of Henry VIII)* (Cambridge: 1949), xi.
[49] Ibid., 47-48.
[50] H. Maynard Smith, *Henry VIII and the Reformation* (1948), 356, 361-362, cf. 251-262.
[51] T.M. Parker, *The English Reformation to 1558* (1950), vii, cf. 27-28.

Between the 1950s and the 1970s interpretations were divided on the nature of the English Reformation, yet its insularity continued to be generally affirmed.[52] Historians with very different perspectives, such as Clifford Dugmore, Owen Chadwick and Sir Geoffrey Elton, maintained the uniquely political nature of the English Reformation.[53] On the other hand, research in local archives encouraged others to emphasise popular enthusiasm for reform originating, not on the continent, but in continuity and exchange with native, medieval traditions of dissent, specifically Lollardy. This approach was adopted not only by Geoffrey Dickens, but also by the medieval historian Margaret Aston.[54] In 1964 Dickens acknowledged that continental doctrines had exacerbated existing native conflicts, but this was lost beneath the fact that, 'if the English clergy were perturbed in 1536 by any doctrines save those of neo-Lollardy, they made extremely little of the fact.'[55] In the 1980s a number of different scholars, including Aston, Dickens, Susan Brigden, John Davis and Anne Hudson, came to similar conclusions about popular support for Reformation and its continuities with Lollardy.[56] In

[52] Although H.C. Porter noted numerous continental connections, he made no concerted attempt to integrate the English experience into continental patterns: H.C. Porter, *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Cambridge: 1958).

[53] C.W. Dugmore, *The Mass and the English Reformers* (1958), vii, 24-25, 58; Owen Chadwick, *The Reformation* (Harmondsworth: 1964), 97; G.R. Elton, *Reform and Reformation: England 1509-1558* (1977). See also G.R. Elton, *The Tudor Revolution in Government* (Cambridge: 1953); G.R. Elton, *England under the Tudors* (1955); G.R. Elton, *Policy and Police: The Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell* (Cambridge: 1972).

[54] e.g., A.G. Dickens, *Lollards and Protestants in the Diocese of York, 1509-1558* (Oxford: 1959); A.G. Dickens, 'Heresy and the Origins of English Protestantism', *Britain and The Netherlands: Anglo-Dutch Historical Conference 1962* (2; Utrecht & Amsterdam: 1964), 47-66; Margaret Aston, 'Lollardy and the Reformation: Survival or Revival?', *History*, 49 (1964), 149-170. These amplified an earlier estimation of sixteenth-century Lollardy by James Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation: A Historical Survey*, 4 vols. (1908-13). A related approach recognised the continental context of English humanist sympathies but not of English dogma. Reform was attributed to the humanist endeavour: see James McConica, *English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI* (Oxford: 1965); Maria Dowling, *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII* (1986). On humanism, see below p.72.

[55] A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation* (1st edn.: 1964), 37, 69, 81.

[56] Susan Brigden, 'Youth and the English Reformation', *PP*, 95 (1982); John Davis, *Heresy and Reformation in the South-East of England, 1520-1559* (1983); Margaret Aston, *Lollards and Reformers: Images and Literacy in Late Medieval England* (1984); A.G. Dickens, 'The Early Expansion of Protestantism in England 1520-1558', *ARG*, 78 (1987), 187-222; Anne Hudson, *The Premature Reformation: Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford: 1988); Susan Brigden, *London and the Reformation* (Oxford: 1989); Margaret Aston, 'Iconoclasm at Rickmansworth, 1522: Troubles of Churchwardens', *JEH*, 40/4 (1989), 524-552.

1989, however, the second edition of Dickens' *The English Reformation* anticipated a new awareness of 'the powerful European forces' exerted on Henrician England.[57]

From the mid-1970s revisionist historians began to reinvigorate the old interpretation of Reformation as slow and politically-driven.[58] Nevertheless, the exceptional nature of the English experience was a familiar feature of revisionist arguments, whatever the extent of their scepticism as to the popularity of reform. In 1984 J.J. Scarisbrick argued that 'the peculiar character of the English Reformation' was that its initiation, in the form of the Royal Supremacy and monastic dissolutions, 'officially owed nothing and in practice little to Protestantism.'[59] In 1992 Eamon Duffy's elegiac account of England's religious world before 'the stripping of the altars' proceeded without attempting any substantial engagement with the Reformation on the continent at all.[60] In 1993 Christopher Haigh scorned the assumption that 'what happened in England was simply a local manifestation of the wider European movement,' insisting that 'English Reformations' 'did not follow any general Continental pattern.' Although he recognised that there was borrowing from and coincidence with the continental Reformation, he argued that 'English Reformations' were 'different'.[61]

Students of continental history have shown a greater willingness to see England as one scene on the European stage. In 1991 Euan Cameron stated that 'Europe's offshore islands [...] were as readily exposed to the ideas of the Reformation as anywhere on the Continent.'[62] In 2002 Philip Benedict specifically censured early Tudor revisionists for displaying 'a much more

[57] A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation* (2nd edn.: 1989), 22. Dickens' analysis, like many contemporary studies, lacked great theological acuity. His observation reflected his own, largely derivative studies, of the German Reformation, e.g., A.G. Dickens, *The German Nation and Martin Luther* (1974).
[58] See the collected essays in Christopher Haigh (ed.), *The English Reformation Revised* (Cambridge: 1987).
[59] J.J. Scarisbrick, *The Reformation and the English People* (Oxford: 1984), 61.
[60] Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c.1400-c.1580* (New Haven & London: 1992).
[61] Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford: 1993), 12-13, cf. 340.
[62] Euan Cameron, *The European Reformation* (Oxford: 1991), 280; cf. the opposite impression given by G.R. Elton, *Reformation Europe 1517-1559* (1963), 122-123.

limited awareness of the larger world of European Reformation scholarship and its implications for their topic.'[63] His disapproval was vindicated in 2005 when George Bernard demonstrated no more concern for the continental Reformation than Duffy had thirteen years earlier.[64]

Benedict's criticism broaches one explanation for English exceptionalism: the relatively short supply of Anglophone scholarship of the European Reformation until the latter half of the twentieth century.[65] The first useful studies of Luther in English were pioneered by Roland Bainton in 1950 and Rupp in 1953.[66] The non-Lutheran Reformations trailed behind. Calvin studies were fuelled by the translation of François Wendel's French-language study in 1963 and the publication of T.H.L. Parker's English-language biography in 1975.[67] The first satisfactory study of Zwingli in English was written by George Potter in 1976, and only in 2002 was a complete history of the Swiss Reformation published in English by Bruce Gordon.[68] Gordon's contribution is the product of a growing awareness of the importance of continental influence on England which will be discussed below.

This historiographical survey reveals a concentration on political and devotional change. Felicity Heal, who in 2003 produced an integrated account of the Reformation across Britain and Ireland, suggests that this concentration encourages national studies. 'Historians of doctrine and ideas have found it easiest to transcend fixed boundaries,' she writes. 'But when the

[63] Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: a social history of Calvinism* (New Haven & London: 2002), 232.
[64] G.W. Bernard, *The King's Reformation: Henry VIII and the remaking of the English Church* (New Haven & London: 2005).
[65] See the surveys by Patrick Collinson, 'The Reformation', in E. Nicholson (ed.), *A Century of Theological and Religious Studies in Britain* (The British Academy; Oxford: 2003), esp. 191-195; Thomas Brady, 'From Revolution to the Long Reformation: Writings in English on the German Reformation, 1970-2005', *ARG*, 100 (2009), 48-64.
[66] Roland Bainton, *Here I Stand: a life of Martin Luther* (New York: 1950); E.G. Rupp, *The Righteousness of God: Luther Studies* (1953).
[67] François Wendel, *Calvin: the origins and development of his religious thought*, trans. P. Mairet (1963); T.H.L. Parker, *John Calvin: a biography* (1975).
[68] G.R. Potter, *Ulrich Zwingli 1484-1531* (Cambridge: 1976); Bruce Gordon, *The Swiss Reformation* (Manchester & New York: 2002).

reception of these ideas and their assimilation into the political mainstream is at issue, national historians have a tendency to revert to claims of local exceptionalism.'[69]

The confluence of historiography emphasising the popularity of reform with revisionist historiography produced a post-revisionist equilibrium in the last decade of the twentieth century and first decade of the twenty-first. Post-revisionism has had several effects. First, attention has shifted decidedly to the late sixteenth century when reform was inculcated on a national scale. Second, early Reformation studies have turned to the 'popular piety' or 'popular politics' of the majority who had been alienated from traditional religion but were yet to embrace new beliefs.[70] Third, a few historians have tackled 'the highly complex and multifaceted processes through which an English Protestant movement was formed and sustained, and a distinctive Protestant identity created.'[71] It is amongst this latter group that the capability of intellectual history to transcend national boundaries has, at least in part, been realised.

Students of England's debt to continental reform have often worked with intellectual or theological subjects. In 1992 Diarmaid MacCulloch claimed that 'to chronicle the theological story of the English Reformation is largely to chronicle the shifting influences from the Continent, and English assimilation of them or reaction against them.'[72] His subsequent work has repeatedly highlighted continental influences.[73] In 1994 Carl Trueman demonstrated that

[69] Felicity Heal, *Reformation in Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: 2003), 6-7.
[70] e.g., Beat Kümin, *The Shaping of a Community: the Rise and Reformation of the English Parish c.1400-1560* (Aldershot: 1996); Caroline Litzenberger, *The English Reformation and the Laity: Gloucestershire, 1540-1580* (Cambridge: 1997); Christopher Marsh, *Popular Religion in Sixteenth-Century England: Holding Their Peace* (Basingstoke: 1998); Ethan Shagan, *Popular Politics and the English Reformation* (Cambridge: 2003).
[71] The best example is Peter Marshall and Alec Ryrie (eds.), *The Beginnings of English Protestantism* (Cambridge: 2002), quotation at pp.12-13.
[72] Diarmaid MacCulloch, 'England', in A. Pettegree (ed.), *The Early Reformation in Europe* (Cambridge: 1992), 169.
[73] e.g., Diarmaid MacCulloch, 'Henry VIII and the Reform of the Church', in D. MacCulloch (ed.), *The Reign of Henry VIII: politics, policy and piety* (Basingstoke: 1995), 186; Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: a life* (New Haven & London: 1996), 173; Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (1999), 170f; Diarmaid MacCulloch, 'Heinrich Bullinger and

the radicalisation of the early English reformers was 'Luther's legacy' in spite of their modifications to Luther's theology.[74] In 1999 Richard Rex surveyed the early impact of continental theology at Cambridge.[75] Rory McEntegart argued in 2002 for the sincerity of English interest in the theological aspects of negotiations with the Lutheran princes during the 1530s.[76] In 2004 Alec Ryrie's study of Henrician reformers suggested identifications with Lutheranism.[77] A British Academy symposium held in 2007 was devoted to the subject of British reception of the continental Reformation and heard numerous papers concerned with the reception of ideas.[78] In the same year Peter Marshall claimed 'that the Reformation in these islands possesses not just a "European context" in which it can be helpfully viewed, but a European *dimension* from which it cannot meaningfully be separated.'[79] These and other studies have been important correctives to English exceptionalism, although it should be noted that many of them have concentrated upon specifically Lutheran connections. Further scrutiny of continental influences on England will be required for some time yet.

This investigation helps to establish the reciprocal concept of covenant as evidence of Swiss influence on English Reformed identity. Quentin Skinner stipulates that some very demanding conditions should be met before 'influence' can be ascribed: he requires (1) that there should be 'genuine similarity between the doctrines of *A* and *B*,' (2) 'that *B* could not have found the relevant doctrine in any writer other than *A*,' (3) 'that the probability of the similarity being

---

the English-Speaking World', *Heinrich Bullinger: Life – Thought – Influence: International Congress Heinrich Bullinger 2004*, 2 vols. (Zurich: 2007), ii. 891-934.

[74] Carl Trueman, *Luther's Legacy: Salvation and English Reformers, 1525-1556* (Oxford: 1994), 6.

[75] Richard Rex, 'The Early Impact of Reformation Theology at Cambridge University, 1521-1547', *RRR*, 2 (1999), 38-71. Rex's contribution demonstrates the revisionist contribution to the project.

[76] Rory McEntegart, *Henry VIII, the League of Schmalkalden and the English Reformation* (Woodbridge: 2002), 6-7.

[77] Alec Ryrie, *The Gospel and Henry VIII: evangelicals in the early English Reformation* (Cambridge: 2003), 145.

[78] Patrick Collinson and Polly Ha (eds.), *The Reception of the Continental Reformation in Britain* (*PBA*, 164; Oxford: 2010).

[79] Peter Marshall, 'Religious Exiles and the Tudor State', in K. Cooper and J. Gregory (eds.), *Discipline and Diversity* (Ecclesiastical History Society; Woodbridge: 2007), 283.

random should be very low.'[80] In this thesis 'influence' is used less stringently to refer to a form of reception. Studies of reception involve 'a question of tendencies, in part unconscious,' as Gottfried Locher makes clear: 'We should not expect an exact copy of the Zurich reformation. But when one or more of the aforementioned characteristics is seen to strive to take effect in programmatic form, then we may think in terms of relationship, repetition, or influence.'[81]

Loss of institutional unity in western Christendom contributed to a crisis of identity which, besides its social and political expressions, was fundamentally religious. Marshall's proposal that 'we should see the English Reformation primarily as a crucible of religious identity formation' begins to deal with the sense of dislocation that ensued after the collapse of the late-medieval Church.[82] The crisis was not only religious, but theological; it demanded reassessment, not only of the individual's relationship to the Church and to the state, but also of the way in which he related to God. It is impossible to understand religious identities without appreciating the theological discourses in the context of which they operated.[83]

Luther may have led the vanguard of the revolt against papal authority but his self-identification with *bona fide* Christianity did not win universal recognition from those who abandoned Rome. One such sceptic was the bishop of Winchester, Stephen Gardiner, who complained in 1541, 'You have not abolished the authority of Rome throughout the world, but you have appropriated it to yourselves, and transferred it to Wittenberg.'[84] Gardiner was addressing Lutherans, yet for some time – certainly since the late 1520s – Luther had been one

[80] Quentin Skinner, 'Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas', *History and Theory*, 8/1 (1969), 26.
[81] Gottfried Locher, *Zwingli's Thought: New Perspectives* (Leiden: 1981), 342-343.
[82] Peter Marshall, '(Re)Defining the English Reformation', *JBS*, 48/3 (2009), 583-584; cf. Susan Brigden, *New Worlds, Lost Worlds: the rule of the Tudors 1485-1603* (2000), x.
[83] On the implications of theology for all aspects of the human condition see Porter, *Cambridge*, 277; cf. Robert Kolb, *Luther's Heirs Define His Legacy: studies on Lutheran confessionalisation* (Aldershot: 1996), x. An example of a study of religious identity which marginalises doctrinal factors is Lucy Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism in Reformation England* (Oxford: 2000), 3, 14.
[84] Stephen Gardiner, *Contemptum humanae legis* [1541], in Pierre Janelle (ed.), *Obedience in Church and State: three political tracts by Stephen Gardiner* (Cambridge: 1930), 209.

among several leading reformers, and the cities of Zürich and Strasbourg had emerged as alternative models to Wittenberg of what was authentic and evangelical (gospel) Christianity. The radical reformer Melchior Hoffman even predicted that in 1533 Strasbourg would be instated as the New Jerusalem.[85] Cameron has described Luther as 'a leader who did not provide all the answers; an icon who commanded immense respect but could not be followed word for word.'[86] The enormous market for Luther's publications did not necessarily represent informed or uncritical support.[87] His belief in justification by faith alone and his concomitant attack on the meritorious value of human works for salvation were touchstones of Reformation theology, but they were assimilated by some who retained emphases on morality and obedience. Although ethical priorities might arise for a number of different reasons, in some cases it was the reciprocal concept of covenant that contributed powerfully to their formation. Conversely, the reciprocal covenant might be developed as a response to accusations of antinomianism against evangelical doctrine.

The Henrician Reformation saw dalliances with continental Lutheranism but doctrinally it is better to speak of an 'Anglo-Lutheran *moment*' rather than a 'movement.'[88] It is difficult to name individual English theologians who were authentically Lutheran. Even Robert Barnes (1495-1540), a friend and student of Luther's at Wittenberg, can be seen to have exhibited 'important areas of difference' on the law amongst other doctrines.[89] It is undoubtedly significant that the vast majority of Luther's works which were translated into English during the early Reformation did not concern his doctrine of justification.[90] Many Henrician reformers

[85] Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Reformation: Europe's House Divided 1490-1700* (2004), 188.
[86] Euan Cameron, 'The Search for Luther's Place in the Reformation', *JEH*, 45/3 (1994), 485.
[87] Lee Wandel, *The Eucharist in the Reformation: incarnation and liturgy* (Cambridge: 2006), 107-109.
[88] Ryrie, *Gospel*, 145; cf. Carl Trueman and Carrie Euler, 'The Reception of Martin Luther in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England', in P. Ha and P. Collinson (eds.), *The Reception of Continental Reformation in Britain* (*PBA*, 164; Oxford: 2010), 63; Heal, *Reformation*, 315; G.R. Elton, 'England and the Continent in the Sixteenth Century', in D. Baker (ed.), *Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent c.1500-c.1750* (Oxford: 1979), 11; Alister McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: a history of the Christian Doctrine of Justification* (3rd edn.; Cambridge: 2005), 258.
[89] Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 196-197; cf. Trueman and Euler, 'Reception of Luther', 65-67.
[90] Carrie Euler, 'Does Faith Translate? Tudor Translations of Martin Luther and the Doctrine of Justification by Faith', *ARG*, 101 (2010), 80.

who upheld salvation *sola gratia*, including Thomas Cranmer (1489-1556), differed from Luther in their assessment of the human condition in terms of moral disease rather than forensic guilt.[91] The effect was detrimental to the progress of radical solifidianism in English evangelicalism.[92]

This thesis begins to redress the lack of scholarly attention to continental religious influences other than Lutheranism on Henrician England. It traces the origins of the 'Zürich connection' which, according to Torrance Kirby, can be seen in operation when Bullinger and Peter Martyr Vermigli (1499-1562) became the 'chief architects' of Edward VI's Church.[93] These Edwardian links also deserve further exploration, for they foreshadowed the pre-eminent continental influence on Elizabethan religion exerted by Bullinger and Martyr through networks established during the Marian Exile, and via their publications.[94] After his return to England from exile in 1559, John Jewel wrote wistfully, 'O Zurich! O Zurich! how much oftener do I now think of thee than ever I thought of England when I was at Zurich!'[95] The prevalence of continentally-inspired Reformed theology in the Elizabethan Church of England was so great that Kirby has called it a 'flowering' of Zürich theology. Zürich certainly excelled Geneva as the point of reference.

Covenant and the English Reformers

The seventeenth century has acted as the scholarly base camp for explorations of the Reformation concept of covenant. Research has been preoccupied with its significance for post-Reformation federal theology and the presenting task has been to grapple with continental

[91] Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 19; cf. Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, 9; Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, 1-102.
[92] The progress of solifidian ideas is explored, and perhaps overstated, by D.B. Knox, *The Doctrine of Faith in the Reign of Henry VIII* (1961), esp. 1-78.
[93] Torrance Kirby, *The Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology* (Leiden & Boston: 2007), 3, 5.
[94] Ibid., 23; Diarmaid MacCulloch, 'The Myth of the English Reformation', *JBS*, 30/1 (1991), 14; Benedict, *Christ's Churches*, 232, 244-245; Joan O'Donovan, *Theology of Law and Authority in the English Reformation* (Grand Rapids: 2004), 91-127.
[95] Jewel to Peter Martyr, undated, *ZL*, i. 23.

expressions of the covenant within the Reformed tradition. Little interest has hitherto been shown in the development of the concept in England, but research into continental concepts of covenant has now progressed sufficiently to warrant extension of the investigation to the English Reformation. In addition, the recent historiography of the English Reformation encourages exploration of English concepts of covenant as part of a process of religious identity formation in the context of continental influences (see above p.15). The reciprocal concept of covenant can be used to illustrate the diffusion of Swiss Reformed theology into English Reformed identity.

The lack of any concentrated study of the concept of covenant in early English Reformation theology has permitted the assumption that it became significant only in the late sixteenth century. The most impressive account to date appeared in 2004 as a preliminary chapter to Theodore Bozeman's study of post-Reformation Puritanism. The chapter is valuable because it avoids the anachronisms of the Trinterud school. Bozeman claims that the majority of early English reformers 'either expressed no special interest in the covenant idea or expounded it, with [John] Bradford [1510-55], in noncontractual or unilateral terms.' Bozeman does, nevertheless, identify several early reformers as exponents of the reciprocal concept: Miles Coverdale (1488-1569), George Joye (1490/95-1553), William Tyndale (c.1494-1536), John Bale (1495-1563), John Hooper (1495/1500-1555), Thomas Becon (1512/13-67) and Edmund Allen (1510s-59).[96]

In this thesis the concept of covenant will be explored as a feature of English Reformed identity. The concepts of covenant articulated by Zwingli, Bullinger and Calvin will provide the basis for a systematic investigation of the concepts belonging to Tyndale, Coverdale and Hooper as three of those reformers rightly identified by Bozeman as espousing reciprocal themes. Bradford's concept of covenant will also be examined for the sake of comparison and

[96] Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 24.

in order to determine the reasons for variety within the English Reformed tradition. These four reformers are fairly representative of educated English reformism between the 1520s and 1550s: Tyndale and Hooper were Oxford men, while Coverdale, Bradford, and possibly Tyndale too, studied at Cambridge; Tyndale and Coverdale were Bible translators; Tyndale, Coverdale and Hooper experienced exile, Bradford did not; Coverdale and Hooper became bishops; Tyndale, Hooper and Bradford were martyred, Coverdale died an old man.

Of the selected reformers Tyndale has received by far the most scholarly attention. J.F. Mozley's landmark biography of 1937, complemented by S.L. Greenslade's essay of 1938,[97] had enduring value; they were succeeded in 1994 by David Daniell's biography with a literary bent.[98] The tenor of interpretation was set in 1948 when Maynard Smith called Tyndale 'an austere Puritan.'[99] Trinterud added theological credence to this in 1951 and 1962 with his remarks on the legal nature of Tyndale's conditional covenant motif.[100] In 1961 David Broughton Knox, echoed by Møller in 1963, accused Tyndale of 'overthrowing the whole basis of the Reformation' on the grounds that he attached God's promises to the fulfilment of conditions.[101] This interpretation was enshrined in 1964 in William Clebsch's conclusion that, while Tyndale's soteriology had been solifidian in the 1520s, in 1530 he adopted a 'bifocal theology of gospel and law' involving 'a twin justification, by faith before God and by works before men.'[102] By 1532, wrote Clebsch, 'Tyndale had revised his theology radically around the controlling notion of covenant, understood as a moralistic contract between God and man.'[103]

[97] J.F. Mozley, *William Tyndale* (1937); S.L. Greenslade, *The Work of William Tindale* (London & Glasgow: 1938).
[98] David Daniell, *William Tyndale: a biography* (New Haven & London: 1994).
[99] Maynard Smith, *Henry VIII*, 280.
[100] Trinterud, 'Origins', 39, 55; Leonard Trinterud, 'A Reappraisal of William Tyndale's Debt to Martin Luther', *CH*, 31 (1962), 39.
[101] Knox, *Doctrine of Faith*, 6; Møller, 'Beginnings', 51-52.
[102] William Clebsch, *England's Earliest Protestants, 1525-1535* (Westport, CT: 1964), 137-204, quotations at pp.155, 171.
[103] Ibid., 180. Clebsch locates Tyndale within Trinterud's thesis at pp.191 and 199.

This became the standard interpretation and was accepted in 1968 by Greaves who aligned Tyndale with Zwingli and Œcolampadius.[104]

Clebsch's thesis was broadly accepted by C.H. Williams in 1969 and by McGiffert in his article of 1981 dealing with Tyndale's concept of covenant. McGiffert addressed the specifically soteriological question of whether Tyndale saw works as efficacious and concluded that he was not really legalistic.[105] He then assented to Trinterud's thesis, reinforcing the view that Tyndale had little influence on later covenant theology.[106]

In 1994 Trueman reiterated McGiffert's denial of the contractual soteriology of Tyndale's concept. He claimed that it better resembled a familial relationship and that Tyndale had confined conditionality to an ethical imperative for Christians.[107] Trueman's more novel contribution was to argue that there had been no fundamental revision of Tyndale's soteriology in 1530-32.[108] However, although Trueman helpfully demonstrated Tyndale's early ethical emphases, he was so concerned to vindicate Tyndale of legalism that he allowed conditionality to have no bearing whatsoever on justification.[109] In 1996 Patrick Collinson judged that analysis of Tyndale had been 'vitiated' by the agenda seeking the origins of Puritanism.[110] This appears to be true of all previous studies save Trueman's. Another impediment has been the absence of any systematic survey of the concept of covenant throughout Tyndale's work.[111]

[104] Greaves, 'Origins', 26-27.
[105] C.H. Williams, *William Tyndale* (1969), 133-134; Michael McGiffert, 'William Tyndale's Conception of Covenant', *JEH*, 32 (1981), 174-180.
[106] McGiffert, 'Tyndale', 181-184.
[107] Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 108-119.
[108] Ibid., 101-108.
[109] Ibid., esp. 100-101.
[110] Patrick Collinson, 'William Tyndale and the Course of the English Reformation', *Reformation*, 1 (1996), 86f. For example, Trinterud, 'Origins', 39-45; Møller, 'Beginnings', 51-54; Greaves, 'Origins', 26-28.
[111] A study which does focus on the covenant but makes plainly implausible claims is Ralph Werrell, *The Theology of William Tyndale* (Cambridge: 2006). Werrell denies any continental influence on Tyndale at all.

The scarcity of interest shown in Coverdale is surprising. Almost nothing has been written by historians since Maynard Smith in 1948 and Mozley in 1953, both of whom devoted more print to his Bible translations than to the man himself or to his theology.[112] The only other significant studies, both from 1982, were Esther Hildebrandt's dissertation, which recounted Coverdale's exile abroad, and Celia Hughes' analysis of several episodes of his life.[113] There have been no assessments of his concept of covenant aside from Trinterud's comment that Coverdale's Bible translations were 'indifferent' to it.[114]

Hooper has attracted rather more attention than Coverdale but usually for his participation in the Vestment Controversy rather than his theology. In 1951 Trinterud claimed Hooper as an exponent of the 'covenant, or federal, school of thought.'[115] Morris West followed with three articles in 1954 and 1955 assessing Hooper's contribution to Puritanism. The first of these suggested that the covenant provided a framework for Hooper's theology,[116] a view vociferously contradicted by Møller in 1963.[117] In 1968 Greaves took a single sentence to note the significance of conditionality in Hooper's understanding of the Decalogue.[118] A *via media* was ploughed in 1992 by E.W. Hunt: although West had probably claimed too much, the covenant was 'by no means peripheral' to Hooper's thought.[119] In 1994 Trueman acknowledged in passing that Hooper had articulated a 'bilateral' concept of 'contract' which took effect only after reconciliation to God.[120] In 2003 Andries Raath and Shaun de Freitas identified Hooper as the link between Bullinger's federalism and Puritanism, implicitly

[112] Maynard Smith, *Henry VIII*, 326-335; J.F. Mozley, *Coverdale and His Bibles* (1953).
[113] Esther Hildebrandt, 'A Study of the English Protestant Exiles in Northern Switzerland and Strasbourg 1539-47, and Their Role in the English Reformation' (unpublished University of Durham Ph.D. thesis, 1982), 56-63, 154-157, 222-225; Celia Hughes, 'Coverdale's Alter Ego', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 65/1 (1982), 100-124.
[114] Trinterud, 'Origins', 44.
[115] Ibid.
[116] W.M.S. West, 'John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism [1]', *BQ*, 15/8 (1954), 356-359.
[117] Møller, 'Beginnings', 56.
[118] Greaves, 'Origins', 27.
[119] E.W. Hunt, *The Life and Times of John Hooper (c.1500-1555) Bishop of Gloucester* (Lampeter: 1992), 241.
[120] Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 230, 241.

fortifying Trinterud's and Baker's positions.[121] Alison Dalton's dissertation of 2008 explored influences on Hooper, placing him definitively in the Swiss camp, but she did not undertake extensive theological investigation.[122] David Newcombe's recent biography of 2009 took up Møller's denial of the significance of Hooper's concept but failed to provide supporting evidence from Hooper's writings.[123] A more satisfactory assessment is undoubtedly needed.

Historians often cite Bradford but without any extended analysis. His reforming career was brief and ended prematurely, yet the wealth of his writing deserves exploration. For Trinterud he was an emergent Puritan, apparently undeserving of further comment.[124] For Møller he participated in the formation of what would become Puritan covenant theology.[125] The most accomplished study remains Philip Johnston's 1963 dissertation which excelled both biographically and theologically.[126] In the same year Rupp delivered a commemorative sermon on Bradford, and in 1964 Sir Marcus Loane published a brief biography.[127] In 1968 Greaves described Bradford as reflecting Calvin's concept of covenant, thereby allocating him to the Calvinist, as opposed to Rhenish, tradition in Trinterud's model.[128] In 1975 Haigh's study of Lancashire included mention of Bradford, who was a native of that county, and in 1983 Hughes contributed a useful overview of Bradford's life and writings.[129] Andrew Penny's study of the mid-Tudor predestinarian controversy in 1990 involved Bradford's doctrine of election, a

[121] Andries Raath and Shaun de Freitas, 'From Heinrich Bullinger to Puritanism: John Hooper's Theology and the Office of Magistracy', *SJT*, 56/2 (2003), 208-230.
[122] Alison Dalton, 'John Hooper and His Networks: a study of change in Reformation England' (unpublished University of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 2008). I am grateful to Dr Dalton for supplying me with a copy of her thesis.
[123] D.G. Newcombe, *John Hooper: Tudor Bishop and Martyr* (Oxford: 2009), 42.
[124] Trinterud, 'Origins', 38.
[125] Møller, 'Beginnings', 56.
[126] P.F. Johnston, 'The Life of John Bradford, the Manchester Martyr, c.1510-1555' (unpublished University of Oxford B.Litt. thesis, 1963).
[127] E.G. Rupp, 'John Bradford, Martyr. ob. 1 July, 1555', *The London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, 6th series/32 (1963), 50-55; Marcus Loane, *Pioneers of the Reformation in England* (1964), 137-178.
[128] Greaves, 'Origins', 28; cf. Kendall, *Calvin*, 43-44.
[129] Christopher Haigh, *Reformation and Resistance in Tudor Lancashire* (Cambridge: 1975); Celia Hughes, 'Two Sixteenth-Century Northern Protestants: John Bradford and William Turner', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 66/1 (1983), 104-121.

theme which Trueman treated at greater length in 1994.[130] Subsequently Megan Wheeler's dissertation of 2006 has treated Bradford as a prisoner under Mary Tudor.[131] A clear evaluation of the covenant in Bradford's thought has not been attempted.

This investigation of the reciprocal concept of covenant as a marker of Swiss influence on English Reformed identity will begin in chapter one with a discussion of the complex question of religious identity. Some consideration will be given to the problems which pertain to analysis of developing and competing religious identities in England, and evidence for Reformed identity during the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI will be surveyed. Chapters two and three will examine the theological concept of covenant as a characteristic of Reformed identity and as an indicator of English reception of Swiss theology. The writings of each of the reformers selected will be examined in chronological order, with attention given to attendant views on justification, sanctification and predestination when these elucidate distinctively Reformed characteristics. This reception model will be developed further in chapters four and five through a similarly structured study of the concept's impression upon sacramental theology because sacramental controversy emerged at an early stage of the Reformation with acute relevance to the concept of covenant in both Swiss and English discourse.

[130] D.A. Penny, *Freewill or Predestination: the battle over saving grace in mid-Tudor England* (Woodbridge: 1990); Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 243-288.
[131] Megan Wheeler, 'Protestants, Prisoners and the Marian Persecution' (unpublished University of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 2006).

I. Reformed Identity

> Why then is your hypocritical erudition better than heresy? If indeed it is heresy. To true Christians it appears orthodox and perfectly Christian. I do not care if you, a hypocrite and almost totally ignorant of all good literature, and – what is worse – hater of Christ, think it unbearable. For how can light give pleasure to a man whose sight is poor and who surrounds himself with darkness?
>
> *John Lascells to James Prestwich (1538)*[1]

NEAR Durham, on 16 July 1538, a stranger, James Prestwich, cut a curious figure riding north in order to sail for France. His unconvincing story got him arrested, but he trusted that 'it is goddess wille that I sholde be taken here, and if I die, I shall die for my faith.' Prestwich's flight was a consequence of his quarrel with John Lascells. These erstwhile friends had been members of Sir Francis Bryan's household but, like many households and many friendships, they were shattered by Reformation strife: 'Prestwich had been condemned for maintaining the papal primacy; Lascells condemned the Pope.'[2]

As Christendom was torn by the religious upheavals of the sixteenth century, individuals were forced to reconsider, reinvent and redefine their religious identities, and to face the often heated consequences. The problem of definition has only augmented with the centuries and historians ought to proceed with caution. Following Anne Overell, we do well to avoid the fallacious notion that 'European influence on England came in orderly, separate waves, first Lutheran and later Swiss, then Calvinist, with Mary Tudor's Spanish and Italian advisers washed up in 1554 to provide a brief papalist interlude.' In reality Englishmen 'found doctrines and role models on a random basis.'[3]

[1] Translated in Susan Brigden and Nigel Wilson, 'New Learning and Broken Friendship', *EHR*, 112 (1997), 403.
[2] Ibid., 397, 410.
[3] Anne Overell, *Italian Reform and English Reformations, c.1535-c.1585* (Aldershot: 2008), 3.

Nowadays the Lutheran character of English reformism in the 1520s and 1530s cannot be assumed and is often contested. The broader characterisation 'evangelical' has instead gained consensus,[4] although it should not be equated with reformism generally. The word is derived from the Greek εὐαγγέλιον, meaning 'gospel', to which all Christians lay claim. During the Reformation, however, the term 'gospeller' was applied pejoratively in England to those attacking Church authority in preference for Scripture. In 1531 William Barlowe censured those 'most rifest and most busy to prate of the Gospell,' 'these new Gospellers [...] whych be raylers & gesters, vycyous lyuers & fals hypocrrytes without any conscyence.'[5] In this light, 'evangelical' reformism is appropriately defined relative to traditionalist reformism which broadly favoured the Roman position. There are cases which challenge strict parameters, such as the Meaux Circle in France,[6] Anne Boleyn in England,[7] Italy's *spirituali*,[8] and the peripatetic Erasmus of Rotterdam. Theirs was the acute experience of moderation, perhaps contradiction, and indecision.[9] Admittedly Barlowe allowed that a 'very few' gospellers simply wanted vernacular Scripture, but this minority deserves separate classification. The approach favoured

[4] Basil Hall, 'The Early Rise and Gradual Decline of Lutheranism in England (1520-1600)', in D. Baker (ed.), *Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent c.1500-c.1750* (Oxford: 1979); Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 75-80; MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, 2; Rex, 'Early Impact', 40n, 52-43; Nicholas Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism c.1530-1700* (Manchester & New York: 2001), 43; Ryrie, *Gospel*, xv-xvi.

[5] William Barlowe, *Dialogue on the Lutheran Factions*, ed. A. McLean (*CLRC*, 15; Appleford: 1981), 116-120.

[6] Jonathan Reid, 'France', in A. Pettegree (ed.), *The Reformation World* (London & New York: 2000), 212-216; Bruce Gordon, *Calvin* (New Haven & London: 2009), 193-194.

[7] Eric Ives, *Anne Boleyn* (Oxford: 1986), 313-328; James Carley, '"Her Moost Lovyng and Fryndely Brother Sendeth Gretyng": Anne Boleyn's manuscripts and their sources', in M. Brown and S. McKendrick (eds.), *Illuminating the Book: makers and interpreters* (1998), 270-272. See Heal, *Reformation*, 251-252.

[8] Exemplary among the *spirituali*, Gasparo Contarini emphasised faith but not solifidianism, seeking renewal within the Roman Church. Contrasts with Luther are made in Dermot Fenlon, *Heresy and Obedience in Tridentine Italy: Cardinal Pole and the Counter Reformation* (Cambridge: 1972), 9, 17-18; cf. Stephen Bowd, *Reform Before the Reformation: Vincenzo Querini and the Religious Renaissance in Italy* (Leiden: 2002), 218. The reformism of the *spirituali* was possible in the closing years of pre-Tridentine plurality but the perplexities involved ('not abandoning the doctrine of the Church, but believing in it more than in our wits,' said Contarini, quoted in Fenlon, *Heresy*, 65) were irreconcilable for some, like Peter Martyr Vermigli, Bernardino Ochino, and the more radical wing of Italian reformism in the 1540s and 1550s. See Bruce Gordon, 'Italy', in A. Pettegree (ed.), *The Reformation World* (London & New York: 2000), 285-292.

[9] See J.B. Ross, 'Gasparo Contarini and his friends', *Studies in the Renaissance*, 17 (1970), 217, 225.

here is to recognise the complexity of individual identities rather than relaxing the referential remits of taxonomy to embrace liminal figures.

Imprecise contemporary usage of the term 'Lutheran' is a case in point. In the Low Countries traditionalists classified all dissidents as '*lutheriaenen*' because Wittenberg was held responsible for all kinds of nonconformity, whether or not offenders had much in common with Martin Luther's doctrine. In practice the Habsburg authorities were tackling sacramentarian heresies (the denial of sacramental grace and of the corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist) which were not naturally Lutheran.[10] Similar examples are found in Spain, where the mystic *alumbrados* (illuminists) were dubbed Lutheran,[11] and in France, where dissenters of any kind were classified in this way.[12] In Zürich Huldrych Zwingli complained in 1523 that

> all teaching of Christ, regardless of who on earth proclaims it, is called Lutheran. Though a person may not even have read Luther's teachings and kept himself strictly to the word of God, they dare, nonetheless, to denounce him as Lutheran. This has happened to me.[13]

With such misnomers occurring across Europe, it is reasonable to assume that English 'Lutheranism' was composed of competing reformist identities.

There are numerous hazards to negotiate in discerning different types of evangelical within the reformist *milieux*. Attempts to identify early reformers with confessional groupings are problematic for two elementary reasons. Firstly, confessionalisation did not begin until the end of our period. Indeed, the Marburg Colloquy of 1529, far from exposing confessional

[10] Alastair Duke, *Reformation and Revolt in the Low Countries* (London & Ronceverte: 1990), 15, 19; Joke Spaans, 'Reform in the Low Countries', in R. Po-Chia Hsia (ed.), *A Companion to the Reformation World* (Oxford: 2004), 119-120.
[11] David Coleman, 'Spain', in A. Pettegree (ed.), *The Reformation World* (London & New York: 2000), 300-301.
[12] Reid, 'France', 212.
[13] Huldrych Zwingli, *Exposition and Basis of the Conclusions or Articles* [July 1523], *HZW*, i. 116. cf. Huldrych Zwingli, 'On Baptism [May 1525]', in G. Bromiley (ed.), *Zwingli and Bullinger* (*LCC*, 24; Philadelphia: 1953), 173.

distinctions, achieved consensus on fourteen of the fifteen points discussed.[14] The labels traditionally applied – 'Protestant,' 'Catholic,' 'Lutheran,' 'Zwinglian,' 'Calvinist,' 'sacramentarian,' 'Anglican,' 'papist' – are often anachronistic and usually lack precision in the English context. They could also be polemical and pejorative. In Zürich Zwingli rejected 'sacramentarian' as a 'term of reproach' and sought to redirect it against his opponents.[15] Henry VIII complained in 1545 of his subjects' name-calling because 'the one calleth the other Hereticke and Anabaptist, and he calleth hym again, Papist, Ypocrite and Pharisey.' Some were 'to[o] styff in their old Mumpsimus, other be to[o] busy and curious in their newe Sumpsimus.'[16] Other examples include the contemporary use of 'new learning' to smear evangelicalism with the taint of novelty,[17] the mysterious 'known men', and the 'Christian brethren'.[18]

To use confessional trajectories in the 1520s, 30s and 40s is, to some extent, an uncomfortable historiographical convenience; the true complexity of the situation must be kept in sight. Gury Schneider-Ludorff advocates a 'pluriform' interpretative model 'that heightens awareness of the simultaneous coexistence of a variety of positions, coalitions, and delimitations in dialogue with each other.' She argues that in territories (as opposed to cities) 'it was possible to tolerate the co-existence of the various groups for longer without any major political repercussions.'[19] This resonates fairly well with the *de facto* situation in England where, according to Peter

[14] *The Marburg Colloquy and the Marburg Articles*, trans. M. Lehmann (*LW*, 38; Philadelphia: 1971), 85-89.
[15] Huldrych Zwingli, *Friendly Exegesis, That Is, Exposition of the Matter of the Eucharist to Martin Luther* [February 1527], *HZW*, ii., 246.
[16] Quoted in Peter Marshall, 'Mumpsimus and Sumpsimus: The Intellectual Origins of a Henrician *Bon Mot*', *JEH*, 52/3 (2001), 512.
[17] Richard Rex, 'The New Learning', *JEH*, 44/1 (1993), 26-44. e.g., Heinrich Bullinger, *The Olde Fayth, an euydent probation out of the Holy Scripture, that the Christen Fayth (which is the right true, old & undoubted faith, hath endured sens the beginnyng of the worlde*, trans. M. Coverdale (Antwerp?: 1541; RSTC 4070.5), *3r.
[18] Rupp, *Studies*, 6-14. See below p.47.
[19] Gury Schneider-Ludorff, 'Philipp of Hesse as an example of Princely Reformation: a contribution to Reformation Studies', *RRR*, 8/3 (2006), 312.

Marshall, 'a fair amount of popular confessionalisation preceded, accompanied, and sometimes opposed fitful attempts at state confessionalisation.'[20]

A second problem with confessional labels is that identification according to a checklist of conscious doctrinal and devotional characteristics fails to take account of the amorphous and idiosyncratic nature of personal religious affections.[21] Not only are religious identities more than the sum of their doctrinal parts, but confessional categories impose chimerical structures on complex and diverse paradigms. The reasons for, and experiences of, conversion are difficult to analyse. How did converts perceive their transition with regard to the contested nature of the Church? What were the repercussions for their participation in official religion?[22] Thomas Bilney was one who struggled to perceive the implications of his conversion reading Erasmus' *Novum Testamentum*.[23] A further difficulty is the evolutionary nature of these identities, exemplified by Thomas Hitton, a Maidstone preacher burnt in 1530, whom Sir Thomas More described as a Lutheran who had subsequently progressed to the opinions of Zwingli and Johannes Œcolampadius of Basle (1482-1531).[24]

In attempting to delineate divisions between shifting identities we stretch our retrospective vantage to its limits; as Brian Cummings points out, 'often the protagonists themselves could hardly quantify what the differences were. Indeed, in the effort to locate difference, a writer might deviate all too quickly into his own sense of contradiction.'[25] One example of an

[20] Marshall, '(Re)Defining', 584.
[21] The fictional aspect of autobiography is explored in Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: from More to Shakespeare* (Chicago & London: 1980).
[22] cf. Peter Marshall, 'Evangelical Conversion in the Reign of Henry VIII', in P. Marshall and A. Ryrie (eds.), *The Beginnings of English Protestantism* (Cambridge: 2002), 14-37. The same issues are discussed for the late and post-Reformation eras in Michael Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580-1625* (Cambridge: 1996), 2-4. Contemporaries would have struggled to articulate their own personal experiences, writes Anne Ferry, *The "Inward" Language: Sonnets of Wyatt, Sidney, Shakespeare, Donne* (Chicago & London: 1983), 40-42.
[23] John Davis, 'The Trials of Thomas Bylney and the English Reformation', *HJ*, 24/4 (1981), 775,777-778, 781, 787-778; cf. Marshall Knappen, 'William Tyndale – First English Puritan', *CH*, 5 (1936), 211; Collinson, 'Tyndale', 76.
[24] Davis, *Heresy*, 80.
[25] Brian Cummings, *The Literary Culture of the Reformation: grammar and grace* (Oxford: 2002), 13.

individual's confusion is the priest Robert Bayfield who, in 1531, was hard-pressed to distinguish between Luther and Zwingli: 'as touching Swingli & others, he thincketh that they hold the same doctrine, that Luther doth, how be it he supposeth they vary in some poyntes.'[26] Marshall advises that identities should be understood 'as social personae fundamentally constituted by and through forms of engagement and self-representation, very often polemical and political ones.' This incorporates 'the extent to which the religious situation at the time was fluid and indeterminate,'[27] a state of flux that encouraged individuals into a penumbra in which their religious identities could be obscured.

Some sense may be made of the internal contradictions of contemporary identities by the simple observation that these believers did not have as yet non-existent confessional parameters in mind. Their categories were drawn from the past, not the future. Archbishop William Temple reflected on historical Christian experience that

> as we look forwards, we peer into darkness, and none can say with certainty what course the true progress of the future should follow. But as we look back, the truth is marked by beacon-lights, which are the lives of saints and pioneers.[28]

The atavistic biblicism of the evangelicals, determined to comprehend their lives in terms of the scriptural narrative, and their concern to stand in the succession of the true Church – in whatever way they defined it against the late-medieval Church – evidences such an approach to their situation.[29] Luther, for his own part, had honed his theology gradually through a series of breakthroughs in his interpretation of Scripture.[30] He may have been a salutary guide to others

[26] John Foxe, *AM* [1563], iii. 538.
[27] Peter Marshall, *Religious Identities in Henry VIII's England* (Aldershot: 2006), vi, 4.
[28] William Temple, *Readings in St John's Gospel* (1939), 8.
[29] Biblicism is eminently expressed in the *Exhortation to the reading of scripture* in Thomas Cranmer, *Certayne Sermons, or Homelies appoynted by the Kynges Maiestie* (1547; RSTC 13640), A3v-B4v. An example of drawing inspiration from past believers is John Bale, *A Brefe Chronycle concernynge the examinacyon and death of the blessed martyr of Christ Syr Iohan Oldecastell the Lorde Cobham* (1544; RSTC 1276). See Graeme Murdock, 'The Importance of Being Josiah: an image of Calvinist identity', *SCJ*, 29/4 (1998); J.S. Coolidge, *The Pauline Renaissance in England: Puritanism and the Bible* (Oxford: 1970).
[30] Heiko Oberman, *Luther: Man between God and the Devil* (New Haven & London: 1989), 165-166.

seeking to define authority *sola scriptura*, but it ought not to be assumed that individuals' adoption of Reformed conclusion had first necessitated their passage through Lutheranism.

From this viewpoint the divisions within evangelicalism begin to collapse. Consider these words of the Elizabethan ecclesiastic John Jewel: 'As for those persons whom they upon spite call Zwinglians and Lutherians, in very deed they of both sides be Christians and good friends and brethren. They vary not betwixt themselves upon the principles and foundations of our religion.'[31] Given this perspective, Gordon Rupp observed well that English evangelicals 'were not concerned to avoid or seek to learn from Wittenberg or Geneva or Canterbury, but with the faith once for all delivered to the saints.'[32] There was consciousness of catholicity even if the term itself was contested.[33] There were those, especially within the Reformed camp like Martin Bucer and Thomas Cranmer, who exerted themselves in a quest to unite the various evangelical identities in opposition to Rome.[34]

A sensible degree of deconstruction is helpful, but we must resist the epistemic agnosticism that disallows 'true' historical judgment of 'reality'.[35] While religious identities lacked uniform coherence between individuals, there is the opposing risk of rejecting essential identity traits altogether. Christopher Haigh's term 'English Reformations' tends to obscure the fundamental parity of the Reformation as expressed in different places over time,[36] and a general tendency to deal only in terms of 'Catholicisms' or 'Lutheranisms' goes too far. Of course there was development, but a certain essentialism is required to prevent *reductio ad absurdum*. Brad

[31] John Jewel, *The Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury*, ed. J. Ayre (PS, 1; Cambridge: 1845), 69-70. On the Elizabethan Settlement, see p.118.
[32] Rupp, *Studies*, xiv-xv.
[33] Peter Marshall, 'Is the Pope a Catholic? Henry VIII and the Semantics of Schism', in E. Shagan (ed.), *Catholics and the 'Protestant Nation': religious politics and identity in early modern England* (Manchester: 2005); Diarmaid MacCulloch, 'Calvin: Fifth Latin Doctor of the Church?', unpublished lecture delivered at the University of Geneva: *Calvin et son influence 1509-2009* Conference (2009). I am grateful to Professor MacCulloch for supplying me with a copy of his typescript.
[34] Luc Racaut and Alec Ryrie, 'Introduction: Between Coercion and Persuasion', in L. Racaut and A. Ryrie (eds.), *Moderate Voices in the European Reformation* (Aldershot: 2005), 7-8.
[35] e.g., Hayden White, *The Content of the Form: narrative discourse and historical representation* (London & Baltimore: 1987), 27, 36-27, 44.
[36] Haigh, *English Reformations*.

Gregory has attacked the 'hermeneutic of suspicion' which breeds excessively tentative classifications of religious identity. For example, he condemns inverted commas around such terms as 'heretic' and 'superstition,' 'as though their contentiousness compels subjectivisation – implying that Protestants were not *really* heretics, Catholics were not *really* superstitious.'[37] Relativistic nominalism becomes otiose in making an art of stating the obvious. It can also risk becoming 'crassly functionalist' in its presentation of profound religious feelings and convictions.[38]

The studies in later chapters require close-reading of theological texts. Here it must be remembered that the application of identity labels requires precision because divisions could be so slight as to hang on parts of speech.[39] Specific doctrinal views may be assigned a particular label, but to identify a whole person with a dogmatic label without necessary qualification is foolhardy. In England no one reformer bequeathed a personalised 'ism', which suggests to Patrick Collinson that the English Reformation had considerable success in exalting scriptural authority.[40] We must at least contemplate a correct, if unconstructive, category of individual-ism, and, having acknowledged that ideal, may settle for a more pragmatic approach. The remainder of this chapter will seek to establish constructive grounds for the discussion of Reformed identity in England.

Henry VIII

Before Reformed identity amongst Henry VIII's subjects can be considered, his own religious identity requires review. Ever since the duke of Saxony concluded that 'he understands little of

[37] Brad Gregory, *Salvation at Stake: Christian martyrdom in early modern Europe* (London & Cambridge, MA: 1999), 13.
[38] On confessional allegiances amongst historians, see Marshall, '(Re)Defining', 571-574.
[39] Cummings, *Literary Culture*, 63-64, 214-216, 228-231.
[40] Patrick Collinson, 'England', in B. Scribner, R. Porter, and M. Teich (eds.), *The Reformation in National Context* (Cambridge: 1994), 86.

religion,'[41] historians have variously described Henry as: 'a Catholic – only a Catholic of sorts, but a Catholic nonetheless';[42] 'never a Lutheran; indeed, in some matters he was intransigently conservative';[43] a 'moderate reformist';[44] 'a man whose theological outlook came to resemble a magpie's nest';[45] 'as committed in 1547 as he had been in 1509 to maintaining religious uniformity.'[46]

When the *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum* against Luther was published in the name of Henry VIII in 1521, no one could have predicted the extent to which its purported author would allow Reformation to proceed in his realm after 1529. Although he eventually distanced himself from the *Assertio*, Henry never suffered his personal antipathy towards the Wittenberg reformer to abate, making it fanciful to label his programme 'Lutheran'.[47]

Henry's first positive encounter with the continental Reformation came in the person of Simon Grynaeus visiting England in 1531, but that Swiss reformer made no lasting impression, even though his Swiss colleagues approved the king's decision to divorce Katherine of Aragon.[48] 'Henry could be politely appreciative when continental reformers later sent him their works to augment his impressive library,' writes Diarmaid MacCulloch, 'but there is no evidence that their writings directly affected his thinking.'[49] In 1538 Henry expressed a wish to have a book presented by Heinrich Bullinger translated into English, but his single annotation was to declare one argument irrelevant.[50]

---

[41] John Frederick of Saxony to Philip of Hesse, 13 July 1536, quoted in McEntegart, *Schmalkalden*, 75.
[42] Christopher Haigh, 'Henry VIII and the German Reformation', in R. Bonney, F. Bosbach, and T. Brockmann (eds.), *Religion und Politik in Deutschland und Grossbritannien* (Munich: 2001), 40.
[43] J.J. Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII* (2nd edn.; New Haven & London: 1997), 399.
[44] Lucy Wooding, *Henry VIII* (London & New York: 2009), 186.
[45] Diarmaid MacCulloch, 'The Religion of Henry VIII', in David Starkey (ed.), *Henry VIII: a European Court in England* (1991), 160.
[46] Richard Rex, *Henry VIII and the English Reformation* (2nd edn.; Basingstoke: 2006), 107.
[47] *LP*, vii. #232.
[48] Gordon, *Swiss Reformation*, 299.
[49] MacCulloch, 'Reform of the Church', 162.
[50] *LP*, xiii/2. #373.

Consideration of Henry's humanist sympathies must anticipate discussion of humanism itself (see below p.72). In September 1527 he wrote to Desiderius Erasmus:

> Now, seeing the unwearied labours which you have suffered in the cause of Christianity, I am desirous of succouring your pious efforts, for I have myself felt for some years the same desire of restoring the faith and religion of Christ to its pristine dignity, and repelling the impious attacks of the heretics, that the Word of God may run on purely and freely.[51]

These sentiments seemed to bear fruit in the attack on absenteeism and superstitions to do with relics, shrines and miracles,[52] and in vernacular translations, including the Decalogue, Creed and Bible in 1538.[53] In the 1530s and 1540s some reforms could be seen as no more than typically Erasmian, including the regulation of feast days and Sundays, aiming to discipline religious expression, and the teaching of the Lord's Prayer, Decalogue and Creed in English.[54]

Henry's notion of 'pristine dignity' soon considerably surpassed the Erasmian ideal. He was prepared to disown the papacy, dissolve the monasteries and have images defaced. Purgatory was damned to vague impotence,[55] while confirmation, ordination and extreme unction were downgraded as sacraments. Nevertheless, he insisted on matrimony as a sacrament,[56] and refused to deny the pragmatic value of auricular confession, clerical celibacy, private masses and communion in one kind.[57] Moreover, he consistently held to the doctrine of Christ's Real Presence in the Mass by means of transubstantiation and never embraced the doctrine of justification *sola fide*. A humanist programme inadequately describes the powerful,

[51] *LP*, iv/2. #3438.
[52] *Iniunctions gyuen by the auctoritie of the Kynges Highnes to the clergie* (1536; RSTC 10084.7).
[53] *Iniunctions for the clerge* (1538; RSTC 10086).
[54] Rex, *Henry VIII*, 76.
[55] *Articles devised by the Kynges Highnes Maiestie* [Ten Articles] (1536; RSTC 10033.2), D3r-v.
[56] MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, 212.
[57] Ibid., 219-221.

multifarious and largely irreconcilable religious affections and theological convictions which the king harboured.[58] How is this unique blend to be explained?

A keen awareness of divine providence characterised much of Henry's life. As the 'godly prince', his kingship was an inviolable divine commission to which the English Church was obliged to yield. He aspired to the rôle of *Fidei Defensor* long before the pope bestowed the title and he retained it even after his break with Rome. Indeed, he always assumed the rôle of a Catholic king, not least for its ideological value, as Marshall writes, but equally because of his theological self-image.[59] His idiosyncratic notion of catholicity still defended a universal faith but substituted the universality of God's commissioning of princes for a singular papal authority.

Henry's personal struggles were also attributed to God's providence, or judgment. It was his marriages – annulling his first to Katherine of Aragon, condemning Anne Boleyn, grieving over Jane Seymour, smarting from Katherine Howard's infidelity – that particularly provoked Henry to theological reflection, seeking divine solace when events escaped his jurisdiction.[60] The 'King's Great Matter' was an act of atonement conceived as an attempt to right his original offence against God's prohibition against marrying his brother's wife which had resulted in childlessness (Lev. 18:16, 20:21) or, in his case, lack of male issue. Stephen Gardiner's *De Vera Obedientia* (1535) made the case for the king's conscientious obedience to divine law which was, suggests Richard Rex, 'the principle which underlies many of the apparently unrelated initiatives of his Reformation.'[61]

---

[58] Wooding's concentration on Erasmian humanism cannot explain Henry's theological position. Her analysis of his theology lacks precision: Wooding, *Henry VIII,* 188, 251.
[59] Marshall, 'Is the Pope a Catholic?', 29.
[60] Virginia Murphy, 'The Literature and Propaganda of Henry VIII's First Divorce', in D. MacCulloch (ed.), *The Reign of Henry VIII: politics, policy and piety* (Basingstoke: 1995), 148; Pamela Tudor-Craig, 'Henry VIII and King David', *Early Tudor England: proceedings of the 1987 Harlaxton Symposium* (Woodbridge: 1989), 194.
[61] Rex, *Henry VIII,* 16.

There is no question as to Henry's devoted piety, demonstrated not least in the activities of hearing divine service, alms-giving and so forth, but it was Henry who accommodated God. His personal Psalter reveals his self-identification with the biblical King David, functioning as an archetype of Christ. Indeed, he assumed Christ's preeminent position on the title-page of the Great Bible (1539), in contrast to the Coverdale Bible (1535). Consequently God's foes were also the king's and, more conveniently, *vice versa*.[62] His relationship with the Almighty was 'all-important, and the chief guarantee of his kingship.'[63] Arguably this reciprocity, 'by the grace of God,' explains the king's religious fervour. Beneath the rituals of religious observance were claims to authority, both secular and spiritual.

The 1530s, though fraught with challenges for the historian, are a most informative decade in attempting to comprehend the problem of religious identity in the Reformation. From the charge of *praemunire* against the clergy in 1531 to the Act of Supremacy in 1534 and the Act against the authority of Rome in 1536, this decade saw the subordination of the English Church to the Crown as the authority of the Supreme Head emerged in lieu of the supreme pontiff. This lends weight to J.J. Scarisbrick's belief that 'if there is any single thread to [Henry's] theological evolution it is his anticlericalism,'[64] but it may be cast more constructively.

As Henry VIII's princely identity was refashioned,[65] so was his religious identity, making it impossible to distil the political ideology from Henry's theological interests. Obedience to the Royal Supremacy itself became the effective end of his theology.[66] In May 1538 John Forest, an Observant Franciscan and confessor to the late Queen Katherine, was executed at Smithfield for heresy with these verses affixed to the gallows:

---

[62] Tudor-Craig, 'David', 183-205.
[63] Wooding, *Henry VIII*, 57.
[64] Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII*, 417.
[65] See Kevin Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: authority and image in sixteenth-century England* (New Haven & London: 2009), 84-87.
[66] Marshall, *Religious Identities*, 13; cf. Alec Ryrie, 'Divine Kingship and Royal Theology in Henry VIII's Reformation', *Reformation*, 7 (2002).

> And Forest the Frier
> That obstinate lier
> That wilfully shalbe dead
> In his contumacy
> The gospell do deny
> The king to be supreame head.[67]

Later, in December, a letter from Thomas, Lord Wentworth to Thomas Cromwell equated the 'word of God' with obedience: Thomas Becon was described as 'a true preacher of the word of God, a great setter forth of the king's most just and lawful title of supremacy.'[68] Perhaps there was no more perspicuous statement than Richard Sampson's '*Verbum Dei est, obedire Regi, non Episcopo Romano*.'[69] Reformist theologies of obedience did not so much create as give credibility to the Supremacy. In Henry's mind at least, justification by faith alone threatened to overturn this imperative by removing the need for charity and penance. He perceived in it the same potential for instability and licentiousness as the cheap grace he detested in Roman absolution and purgation. This is evidenced by one of his annotations on the Bishops' Book, which had asserted justification *sola fide* for the first time in an official English text.[70] Henry added, to receiving Christ's benefits by faith, the conditional caveat 'I doing my duty.'[71] The prospect of antinomianism threatened confidence in the religious infrastructure over which he sought Supremacy.[72]

A particularly incisive approach towards revealing the king's religious outlook is taken by Rory McEntegart's study of Anglo-Schmalkaldic relations. It facilitates comparison of religious identities as they interacted directly in theologically-charged political dialogue. Henry's overtures to the German states were indiscriminate on religious grounds until a major policy

---

[67] Foxe, *AM* [1563], iii. 628. On Forest's case, see Peter Marshall, 'Papist as Heretic: the burning of John Forest, 1538', *HJ*, 41/2 (1998), esp. 360.
[68] Quoted in Richard Rex, 'The Crisis of Obedience: God's Word and Henry's Reformation', *HJ*, 39/4 (1996), 890.
[69] Strype, *Memorials*, i/2, 175.
[70] *The Institution of a Christen Man* [The Bishops' Book] (1537; RSTC 5164), B2v, B4r, F3v.
[71] Corrections in Thomas Cranmer, *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556*, ed. J. Cox (PS; Cambridge: 1846), 89.
[72] Central government depended on local ties of 'goodwill and service' to exercise control, writes Helen Speight, '"The Politics of Good Governance": Thomas Cromwell and the government of the south-west of England', *HJ*, 37/3 (1994), 632-633.

shift occurred in late 1533. On 2 December Henry notified his ambassador in Paris of plans to send emissaries 'to the princes of Germany and others, to join ourselves in amity with them.' In light of 'the Pope's ungodly determination against us' the advance targeted the Protestant states: 'considering the injuries we have received, have required us no longer to endure these attempts of the Pope, but to find some remedy for them by a total abolition of his authority, and in so doing obtain the advice and assistance of the Princes aforesaid.'[73] The king's diplomatic policies were being harmonised with his anti-papal legislation in the Reformation Parliament.

Two particular considerations emerge from McEntegart's study as motivating Henry's interest in the Schmalkaldic League. Firstly, the potential repercussions of a General Council were a mutual and consistent concern for Henry and the German Protestants throughout the 1530s, making them natural allies.[74] In the 1530s the Schmalkaldic princes alone could offer the requisite military strength and, in the case of marriage alliances, noble connections. The Reformed city states of Switzerland possessed no comparable potency or sanguinity. Secondly, the expulsion of papal authority in England created a state of doctrinal uncertainty which the king, as Supreme Head, sought to resolve. In August 1534, three months before the Supremacy Act, the king initiated plans for 'how the false heresies which the bishop of Rome hath taught the people should be brought out of their conscience and hearts.' These included 'pamphlets against the doctrines of celibacy of the clergy, honouring of images and prayers for the dead to be printed before Parliament begins.'[75] Philip Melanchthon's moderate reputation made him an attractive consultant to Henry, and requests that he visit England became a regular feature of negotiations from 1534 onwards.[76] Thus there should be no doubt that Reformation was as central as political necessity to Henry's interest in the Schmalkaldic League.

[73] *LP*, vi. #1491.
[74] McEntegart, *Schmalkalden*, 33-37.
[75] *LP*, vii. #1043.
[76] McEntegart, *Schmalkalden*, 45-46; John Schofield, *Philip Melanchthon and the English Reformation* (Aldershot: 2006), 118.

It is important to emphasise Henry's sincere interest in theological discussion. On 15 December 1535 Bishop Edward Foxe told the League diet that 'the King, being devoted to the Gospel, is desirous of receiving an embassy from the princes and states of Germany that he may be informed as to the state of religion, and receive advice as to what to reform in England in matters relating to faith and religion.'[77] He did not want so much to replace Rome with Wittenberg as to employ Lutheran expertise in fashioning his own religious settlement.[78] This was exemplified in his appointment of men of diverse opinion to the discussion committee in June 1538; the Lutheran delegates received neither a wholly favourable nor wholly critical hearing. Moreover, during his progress of autumn 1538, the king showed himself capable of engaging with the theological questions personally, even if at other times he could be an inept, impatient and downright alarming theologian.[79]

McEntegart explains that Henry abandoned hopes of accommodation in May 1539, finally proceeding with the Six Articles on 28 June only when he 'was persuaded that the Germans had no further interest in theological negotiation.'[80] A mere three months later he was interested, in spite of differences on a few points of doctrine, in renewing negotiations on the basis of common enmity towards 'the bishop of Rome, his unholy superstitions and his self aggrandised power.'[81] Although Henry had never been prepared to swallow the Augsburg Confession as it stood, his candour about this discounts political manipulation of the League. Further evidence of his sincerity is that the impetus for negotiation was never the prospect of Franco-Imperial crusade and that negotiations persisted long after the *rigmarôle* of his divorce abated on Katherine of Aragon's death in January 1536.[82]

[77] *LP*, ix. #979.
[78] McEntegart, *Schmalkalden*, 48, 63.
[79] Ibid., 108, 118-127; Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII*, 404-405.
[80] McEntegart, *Schmalkalden*, 156, 166.
[81] Christopher Mont to John Frederick of Saxony and Philip of Hesse, September 1539 (Mont's commission was dated 15 August), quoted in Ibid., 173.
[82] Ibid., 64.

All this is not to suggest that the king was pushing a coherent and personal vision for Reformation. George Bernard's argument that Henry pursued a 'middle way' with 'clear and definitive religious purposes' is unpersuasive.[83] Although the king wanted his own religious settlement, that does not mean that he knew what he wanted his ultimate settlement to be.

If obedience is seen as Henry VIII's maxim,[84] we should be aware that the official Henrician statements of justification were never Lutheran in the proper sense. Between 1536 and 1543 the Ten Articles, enforced by the Injunctions of 1536 and 1538, were the only fully authorised statement regarding justification. A careful reading reveals that they rejected the Lutheran position of the Augsburg Confession: justification was not apprehended by faith alone but 'by contrition, and faythe ioyned with charitie.'[85] Nor were they Roman, for the basis of justification was singularly Christ's passion with no provision for graciously meritorious works.[86] In 1543 the King's Book essentially restored the Roman understanding which had been used *de facto* before 1536.[87] These were the official contexts in which religious identities developed.

English evangelicalism, 1525-47

Having explored Henry VIII's attempts to direct Reformation in England, the next task is to explore indications of Reformed identity within English evangelicalism. As noted above (see p.30), conversion could be a gradual process, so identities need not be based on a developed doctrinal position. Sacramentarianism was often the ultimate, rather than initial, step and other

[83] G.W. Bernard, 'The Making of Religious Policy, 1533-1546: Henry VIII and the search for the middle way', *HJ*, 41/2 (1998), 333; Bernard, *King's Reformation*, 240-243. Bernard's view is adopted without substantial qualification by Wooding, *Henry VIII*, 225, 250-251.
[84] On popular responses of deference and obedience, see Heal, *Reformation*, 221-225.
[85] *Ten Articles*, C3r-v; cf. B.J. Kidd (ed.), *Documents Illustrative of the Continental Reformation* (Oxford: 1911), 263-264.
[86] cf. Johann Eck, 'The *Confutatio Pontificia*: in reference to the matters presented [...] pertaining to the Christian Orthodox Faith [...] 3 August 1530', in J.M. Reu (ed.), *The Augsburg Confession: a collection of sources*, trans. J. Mattes & J. Bodensieck (Chicago, IL: 1930), 350-352.
[87] *The King's Book, or a Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for Any Christian Man* [1543] (Church Historical Society: 1932), 9, 39, 152-153, 158-159.

Reformed traits might long precede it, such as the harmonisation of law and Gospel and a disapproval of images. Still, Cranmer complained in 1538 'that error of the sacrament of the altar was so greatly spread abroad in this realm, and daily increasing more and more.'[88] The universities and the city of London, where Susan Brigden recognises that religious choices were 'demanded most immediately,'[89] will receive the greatest attention in this discussion.

In light of official religious policy, it is no wonder that English men and women were reluctant to nail their colours to any one mast. Identities had not only to be veiled but adaptable too.[90] As Rupp writes, 'England was not a quiet place for a man with a conscience. London during the Six Articles, the West in the time of Edward VI, all England in the time of Mary, these were places where men did not prudently noise abroad their secret thoughts.'[91] 'Dissimulation was the key to success,' observes Steven Gunn.[92] Religion involved political risk and acquiescence to official policy, policy which individuals hoped to accelerate, redirect or reverse without transgressing the limits of obedience to Henry VIII. Lying, mental reservation and equivocation (ambiguity calculated to precipitate misperception) were Nicodemite strategies commonly employed by reformers.[93] The pressure could be overwhelming: after his recantation, Robert Wisdom lamented 'his frailty and fearful weakness, whereby he for fear of death fell to this impiety [...] and desireth all faithful Christians to forgive him that offence.'[94] Under circumstances requiring 'hair-trigger sensitivity to the limits of royal tolerance and curiosity'[95] outward personae are fickle indicators of religious identity.

---

[88] Cranmer to Cromwell, 22 June 1538, Thomas Cranmer, *The Remains of Thomas Cranmer, D.D.*, ed. H. Jenkyns, 4 vols. (1; Oxford: 1833), 249.
[89] Brigden, *London*, 2.
[90] On taxonomies of reform, see Heal, *Reformation*, 243-253.
[91] Rupp, *Studies*, xv-xvi.
[92] Steven Gunn, 'The Structures of Politics in Early Tudor England', *TRHS*, 6th series/v (1995), 68.
[93] Susan Wabuda, 'Equivocation and Recantation During the English Reformation: The "Subtle Shadows" of Dr Edward Crome', *JEH*, 44/2 (1993).
[94] Quoted in Sherwin Bailey, 'Robert Wisdom under Persecution, 1541-43', *JEH*, 2 (1951), 186.
[95] Marshall, *Religious Identities*, 8.

Obedience to the royal will could be uncomfortable for people of any religious persuasion.[96] Cuthbert Tunstall, Edmund Bonner and Stephen Gardiner reverted to Roman allegiance under Mary Tudor, so due caution should be observed in ascribing more heartfelt approval of Henry VIII's policies to evangelicals. Thomas Becon's instruction to evangelicals to obey the ruler 'wythoute ony dissimulacion or Hypocrysy' seems ironic in light of his equivocal recantation in 1543. Apparently he felt he had discharged his 'duety to obey.'[97] Scarisbrick suggests that 'authentic Protestantism looked for a prince who would serve true religion, not one who would take upon himself the role of an autocratic *summus episcopus*.'[98] On the other hand, Cranmer was unswervingly persuaded that the Supremacy was the best means of constructing a godly realm. More cunning evangelicals anticipated the potential for legitimisation by their self-association with loyalty to the Crown.[99] Either way, this was the environment in which the king's subjects fashioned their religious identities. In the words of Sir Thomas Wyatt, charged with treason in 1541, 'all powers namely absolute ar so[re] roodes when theie fall into evell mens handes, and yet I saye their ar to be obeyed by expres lawe of god.'[100]

Persecution of evangelicalism by the English government began on 12 May 1521 when Cardinal Wolsey presided over the denunciation of Luther's opinions at Paul's Cross. Many of Luther's books were already available for burning on that occasion.[101] Persecution intensified after 1525 as the threat seemed to grow and it yields evidence of the circulation of Reformed opinions. Against the Swiss position, Johannes Fabri, the vicar-general of Constance, who was

[96] There were some who sincerely shared Henry VIII's vision of 'Catholic reform': Alec Ryrie, 'Paths Not Taken in the British Reformations', *HJ*, 52/1 (2009), 18-20.
[97] Thomas Becon, *A Pleasaunt Newe Nosegaye Full of Many Godly and Swete Floures* (1543; RSTC 1743), I2v.
[98] Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII*, 397.
[99] Diarmaid MacCulloch, 'Archbishop Cranmer: concord and tolerance in a changing Church', in O. Grell and B. Scribner (eds.), *Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation* (Cambridge: 1996), 200-201; Alec Ryrie, 'The Problem of Legitimacy and Precedent in English Protestantism, 1539-47', in B. Gordon (ed.), *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth-Century Europe* (1; Aldershot: 1996), 81-82; Ethan Shagan, 'Clement Armstrong and the Godly Commonwealth: radical religion in early Tudor England', in P. Marshall and A. Ryrie (eds.), *The Beginnings of English Protestantism* (Cambridge: 2002), 61-62.
[100] Quoted in Susan Brigden, '"The Shadow That You Know": Sir Thomas Wyatt and Sir Francis Bryan at Court and in Embassy', *HJ*, 39 (1996), 12.
[101] *LP*, iii/1. #1274.

visiting London, composed a riposte to Œcolampadius dated 1 April 1527 in which he praised English orthodoxy, simultaneously making Œcolampadius' condemnation of the cult of saints available in English.[102] Bishop John Fisher of Rochester, the chancellor of the University of Cambridge, also published a formidable defence against Œcolampadius in 1527. Fisher had corresponded with the anti-evangelical controversialist Johannes Cochlaeus about him in 1526.[103] It is significant that Fisher, as a leading defender of orthodoxy, bothered to include a Swiss reformer in his campaign; presumably Œcolampadius' views had spread far enough to concern Fisher. In 1531 Barlowe's *Dialogue* made available an outline of the eucharistic positions of Œcolampadius, Zwingli and Andreas Karlstädt.[104] When Cranmer examined John Frith in June 1533, he supposed Œcolampadius to be the source of Frith's sacramentarianism.[105] It was still felt necessary to publish against Frith's teaching in 1536, indicating its persistent popularity.[106] Œcolampadius was even condemned in the Pontefract Articles of the conservative Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536.[107] Reformed theology had gained a significant enough profile to be attacked by traditionalists, and their refutations inadvertently promoted its dissemination.

Censorship and controls on book imports were first introduced in early 1529, with severe restrictions being placed on continental imports in 1534.[108] These reveal which books were thought to be in circulation. Earlier, in October 1524, when Bishop Tunstall took informal steps against book imports from Germany, he was specifically concerned with Luther's errors.[109] By

[102] On Œcolampadius in Basle, see Amy Nelson Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation: ministers and their message in Basel, 1529-1629* (Oxford: 2006), 26-27.
[103] Richard Rex, 'The English Campaign against Luther in the 1520s', *TRHS*, 5th series/39 (1989), 96, 99, 101, 104.
[104] Barlowe, *Dialogue*, 52-54; cf. Henry Gold's condemnation of Karlstädt in 1534: *LP*, vii. #523.
[105] *LP*, vi. #661.
[106] Clebsch, *Earliest Protestants*, 130.
[107] Gordon, *Swiss Reformation*, 299.
[108] Lotte Hellinga, 'The Bookshop of the World: books and their makers as agents of cultural exchange', in L. Hellinga (ed.), *The Bookshop of the World: the role of the Low Countries in the book-trade 1473-1941* ('t Goy-Houten: 2001), 24.
[109] Brigden, *London*, 157.

the late 1520s, Wittenberg writers were already outnumbered by alternatives,[110] and Swiss Reformed texts were available in England fairly soon after their first publication. As early as 1526 an unspecified book of Zwingli's against Anabaptists was forbidden by Archbishop Warham,[111] and four Hanse merchants in London admitted to propagating works by 'Carolus Stadius' (Karlstädt) as well as by Luther.[112] The 1529 proclamation proscribed fifteen books, including two by the sacramentarian William Roye, four by William Tyndale, and Miles Coverdale's translation of Bullinger's *Christen state of matrimonye*.[113] Tunstall's prohibition of 1530 listed Zwingli's *Refutation of the Tricks of the Catabaptists* (1527), and soon the bishops also proscribed Zwingli's *Education of Youth* (1523), *Commentary on True and False Religion* (1525), *Original Sin* (1526), *Friendly Exegesis of the Eucharist* (1527), *On Providence* (1530), and six other titles – both commentaries and letters – including his other writings on the Eucharist.[114] John Foxe also specified ten titles by Œcolampadius, including eucharistic treatises and his commentary on Isaiah (1525), which contained extensive teaching on the covenant.[115]

George Joye's *The Souper of the Lord* (1533) was a summary and translation of Zwingli's *On the Lord's Supper* (1526). Joye preserved a strict Zwinglianism,[116] adding to the availability of Reformed eucharistic doctrine in England. In 1543 Joye was also responsible for a translation

[110] E.G. Rupp, 'The Battle of the Books', in P.N. Brooks (ed.), *Reformation in Principle and Practice: essays in honour of A.G. Dickens* (1980), 18.
[111] Gordon, *Swiss Reformation*, 299.
[112] *LP*, iv/1. #1962.
[113] *TRP*, i. #122.
[114] Foxe, *AM* [1563], iii. 502-504.
[115] Ibid. For the concept of covenant in Œcolampadius' Isaiah commentary, see Lillback, *Binding of God*, 83-87. See also the list of books confiscated from Bayfield, alias Richard Somersham, in 1531. Among the authors were Zwingli, Œcolampadius, Bucer and Capito: John Fines (ed.), *A Biographical Register of Early English Protestants and Others Opposed to the Roman Catholic Church, 1525-1558* (1; Abingdon: 1981), unpaginated.
[116] George Joye, *The Souper of the Lorde [...] the declaracion of the later parte of the .6. ca. of S. Johan [...] wheryn incidently M. Moris letter agenst Johan Frythe is confuted* (Antwerp: 1533; RSTC 24468). On the authorship of the treatise, previously ascribed to Tyndale, see: W.D.J. Cargill Thompson, 'Who wrote "The Supper of the Lord"?', *HTR*, 53 (1960); William Clebsch, 'More evidence that George Joye wrote the Souper of the Lorde', *HTR*, 55 (1962); cf. Clebsch, *Earliest Protestants*, 216-218.

of Zwingli's *Ratio Fidei* [*Account of the Faith*] (1530) which was published successively in Antwerp then London, although ostensibly in 'Ziiryk'.[117]

William Tolwin, rector of St Antholin in London, was apprehended with a satchel containing eighteen heterodox books in 1541. These included Lutheran and Lollard texts, but of particular interest is Zwingli's *On Providence* 'whych,' wrote John Bale in his account of 1543, 'that most notable clarke Huldricus Zuinglius wrote at the instaunt request of the ryght worshypfull lorde Phylypp the Landgraue of Hesse.'[118] Anabaptism was represented by Balthasar Hubmaier's *Catechysme of Pacimontanus* showing, in Brigden's opinion, that extreme brands of reformism might be 'spread by association with more moderate reform.'[119]

In the 1540s texts by Bullinger were available in translation, usually under another name; whether or not English followers knew the identity of Swiss reformers is superfluous. His *Christen state of matrimonye*, first prohibited in 1529 and valued for its covert evangelicalism, was republished in Antwerp in 1541, with another three editions printed in London by 1547 under the sponsorship of Thomas Becon.[120] Its popularity may have stemmed from its being purchased as a wedding gift.[121] More significant was Coverdale's translation in 1541 of Bullinger's *The Old Fayth* (1537).[122] The covenant was axiomatic to this fundamental work of theology.

The influence of Zwingli's Zürich Bible (1531) is to be found in English Bible translation through the mediation of Coverdale. Coverdale's translation from Latin and German probably used the Zürich edition rather than Luther's: the Psalms were a direct translation from

[117] Huldrych Zwingli, *The Rekening and Declaracion of the Faith and Beleif of Huldrik Zwingly Bisshoppe of Ziiryk the cheif town of Heluetia, sent to Charles V*, trans. G. Joye (Antwerp: 1543; RSTC 26138); cf. RSTC 26138.5.
[118] John Bale, *Yet a Course at the Romyshe Foxe* (Antwerp: 1543; RSTC 1309), 46v-57v, esp. 50r-v.
[119] Brigden, *London*, 337.
[120] Heinrich Bullinger, *The Christen State of Matrimonye*, trans. M. Coverdale (Antwerp: 1541; RSTC 4045); cf. RSTC 4046-58; MacCulloch, 'Bullinger', 911.
[121] Ryrie, *Gospel*, 126.
[122] Bullinger, *The Olde Fayth*.

Zwingli's; order and style were identical; even the same woodcuts were used.[123] Similarly Joye's English Psalter of 1534 was made from a Latin version of Zwingli's German Psalter.[124]

London was among the most likely entrances for continental ideas into England by virtue of its mercantile community (see below p.63). Most of the foreigners resident in London were 'Dutch', whether from the Hanseatic cities or the Low Countries.[125] In 1522, under examination by Cardinal Wolsey's commissioners, Adam Dolveyn, a 'Dutchman', admitted responsibility for the publication of a book containing notes by Cornelisz Hoen, whose sacramental theology was to influence Zwingli.[126] A refutation of Karlstädt's opinions by Luther was among the books brought to London in 1526 by the Hanse merchants already cited.[127] These incidents suggest that more extreme, sacramentarian versions of reformism were available in the City by the early to mid-1520s. An Anabaptist cell exposed in 1532 included at least two 'Flemings', one of whom was 'the bishop and reader to the Anabaptists.' Their books, estimated to number over three hundred, had been imported.[128]

An underground network of 'Christian brethren' was formed at an early stage in London, though it extended further afield.[129] Perhaps numbering only a few hundred in the late 1520s, it made a greater impact than its size might suggest. The Christian brethren relied on mutual support, financial contributions and dissimulation to further their common cause. It was they who sponsored the publication of sacramentarian literature, including perhaps William Roye's

[123] Gordon, *Swiss Reformation*, 300. For Tyndale's influence on Coverdale's Bible, see Clebsch, *Earliest Protestants*, 193.
[124] George Joye, *Dauids Psalter, diligently and faithfully translated by George Ioye* (Antwerp: 1534; RSTC 2372).
[125] Brigden, *London*, 136. See Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London* (Oxford: 1986), 12-22.
[126] Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities*, 19.
[127] *LP*, iv/1. #1962. See above p.45.
[128] *LP*, Addenda i/1. #809.
[129] The term 'Christian brethren', referring generally to evangelicals, was sometimes used interchangeably with the term 'known men', which usually denoted Lollards. Rupp refuses the conclusion that all the early evangelicals therefore had Lollard connections. Rather, the Christian brethren encompassed 'all who shared in the cause of the Reform, and especially the making of books': Rupp, *Studies*, 8. On Lollardy, see below p.67.

translation *A Brefe Dialog bitwene a Christen father and his stobborne Sonne* (1527), the first 'Zwinglian' book in English.[130] Widely used in Strasbourg, writes William Clebsch, *A Brefe Dialog* presented 'a highly spiritualistic interpretation of New Testament religion, after the fashion of Zwingli and his exaggerators.'[131] The original author was not, in fact, Zwingli but Wolfgang Capito, a leading reformer in Strasbourg.[132]

Some members of the Christian brethren, including 'Sir George Parker, Pathmere, Mershall [William Marshall?], preestes, Tho[ma]s. Keyle, mercer, Shreve [John Sheriff], surgeon and barber', held 'that the Sacrament of the Altar after the consecration is nother body nor blood but remaineth bread and wine.'[133] Parker was claiming in 1531 'that they had already 2,000 books out against the blessed Sacrament in the Commons' hands.'[134] This particular statement was not certainly sacramentarian – Parker himself drew on both Lutheranism and sacramentarianism – but radical opinions were acceptable within the brethren:[135] in 1531 John Tewkesbury, a London leather sealer, was executed for his belief that the sacrament 'is not the very body of Christe in fleshe & bloude as it was borne of the virgin Mary.'[136] In 1532 James Bainham said that 'Christes body is not chewed with teeth, but receiued by faith.'[137] During Frith's imprisonment in the Tower, a royal chaplain named Dr Currein complained that sacramentarianism was thriving due to Frith's writings.[138] 'One Andrewe, a tailor of London' was condemned with Frith in 1533 'for the self-same opinion.'[139]

[130] Brigden, *London*, 110, 124-115, 189-191.
[131] Clebsch, *Earliest Protestants*, 233.
[132] Anthea Hume, 'William Roye's "Brefe Dialogue" (1527): an English version of a Strassburg catechism', *HTR*, 60 (1967), 307-308.
[133] *LP*, Addenda i/1. #752.
[134] Ibid.
[135] Brigden, *London*, 401.
[136] Foxe, *AM* [1563], iii. 452. Although Luther could technically agree by distinguishing the resurrected body of Christ, this was undoubtedly not Tewkesbury's intended meaning.
[137] Foxe, *AM* [1563], iii. 550.
[138] Clebsch, *Earliest Protestants*, 103.
[139] *LP*, vi. #661.

Investigations in 1540 under the Six Articles exposed many such heretics: Thomas Cappes, a chaplain, believed 'that the blessed sacrament of the altar was but a memory and a remembrance of the Lord's death'; Richard White said 'that he did not think that Christ was in the sacrament of the altar within the "sepulture" b[ut in] heaven above.' To Henry Bird the sacrament was 'no better than a piece of bread,' while Thomas Trentham called it 'a very good thing but it was not as men took it, very God.' Ralph Bylby, a draper, and Christopher Dray, a plumber, likewise denied the physical presence of Christ.[140] The brethren were unable to save the sacramentary John Porter from martyrdom in 1542; Porter had spoken his mind at Calais in 1539 and worried Bishop Bonner by drawing crowds to St Paul's in 1541.[141]

The brethren counted some eminent figures among their number, like Thomas Keyle. He was joined in the Mercers' Company by the leading brethren George Robinson, Robert Packington (associated with Thomas Cromwell's agent Stephen Vaughan and murdered by conservatives in 1536),[142] Augustine Packington (who craftily funded Tyndale's work by buying up New Testaments for burning, financed by Tunstall, in 1530)[143] and Henry Brinklow. In 1542 Brinklow recommended Frith's writings on the sacrament to his readers and prayed for the reformation of the Eucharist in line with the cities of Zürich, Basle and Strasbourg.[144] Francis Denham, admitted to the Middle Temple in 1524, translated for the brethren, amongst other books, Francis Lambert's *De Causis Excœcationis* and had purchased Lambert's *Commentarii de Prophetia* in Paris sometime between 1526 and his arrest in 1528.[145] Richard Hilles did penance for his evangelicalism whilst he was an apprentice to a merchant taylor of London Bridge in 1532; when this Zwinglian enthusiast eventually initiated correspondence with

[140] *LP*, Addenda i/2. #1463.
[141] Muriel St. Clare Byrne (ed.), *The Lisle Letters*, 6 vols. (Chicago & London: 1981), v. #1515a; Brigden, *London*, 333, 339.
[142] On Robert Packington, see Marshall, *Religious Identities*, 61-79.
[143] Daniell, *Tyndale*, 196-197.
[144] Brigden, *London*, 182, 187n; Alec Ryrie, 'The Strange Death of Lutheran England', *JEH*, 53/1 (2002), 75.
[145] *LP*, iv/2. #4396; Brigden, *London*, 116.

Bullinger from Strasbourg in August 1540, he began by remarking 'how greatly I have always desired to write to you.'[146]

A number of the brethren were active in the book trade, such as the bookbinders John Birt and Michael Lobley and the book agent John Tyndale, who was active even after his abjuration in 1530.[147] John Gough supplied the books trafficked by Thomas Garrett in 1528.[148] Gough had been converted by reading the New Testament sometime before 1525 and, in 1532, supplied the unidentifiable *Confession of the citie of Geneva* to an Anabaptist sect. He was not himself Anabaptist – certainly not in his mature views – but he did exhibit many Reformed characteristics, such as his iconoclasm.[149] In 1538 the stationer Richard Reynolds, apparently a sacramentarian, was reported as thinking 'the Mass was nought, and the memento was bawdery, and after the consecration it was an idolatry.'[150] In January 1540 John Mayler, printer, grocer, and partner of Gough in the 1540s, called 'the blessed sacrament of the altar the baken god.'[151] Clearly some book traders were exposed to, and adopted, Reformed opinions.

An intriguing twist in the early progress of official Reformation in 1534 was the prohibition of discussion regarding the veneration of images, foreshadowing an official policy against images. Pamphlets were ordered against the 'honouring of images' and parliamentary bills were drawn up 'prohibiting, on a penalty of 10*l*., all offerings to images.'[152] This resembled Swiss priorities, bearing little relation to Lutheranism. In 1537 the Bishops' Book adopted the 'Zürich numbering' of the Decalogue (first used by Leo Jud in 1527) emphasising the prohibition of graven images. This had already been done 'from below' in Joye's primer of 1530 and

[146] *LP*, vi. #99; *OL*, 196; Susan Brigden, 'Thomas Cromwell and the "Brethren"', in C. Cross, D. Loades, and J. Scarisbrick (eds.), *Law and Government under the Tudors* (Cambridge: 1988), 36.
[147] Brigden, *London*, 190-191, 300.
[148] *LP*, iv/2. #4004.
[149] Alec Ryrie, 'Gough, John (d.1543/4)', *ODNB* (2004).
[150] Quoted in Brigden, *London*, 275.
[151] *LP*, Addenda i/2. #1463.
[152] *LP*, vii. #1043.

Marshall's of 1535.[153] The same year Marshall published a translation of Bucer's *Treatise declaring and showing that images are not to be suffered in churches*, thereby winning official approval.[154]

1538 saw popular attacks as well as officially organised iconoclasm. In May the famous rood at St Margaret Pattens was dismantled by thirty vigilantes led by Gough. His presence, and that of some Flemings, suggests to Brigden that their inspiration was 'Zwinglianism and Anabaptism [...] spreading in the capital among a few zealots' as distinct from native iconoclastic traditions,[155] yet iconoclasm was a campaign that had captured the royal imagination too. Publications attacking images always remained permissible, like Grafton's *Glasse for housholders* in 1542.[156]

In London, then, there were opinions concurrent with the Swiss position circulating from the mid-1520s. The numbers involved were undoubtedly small: only six percent of London wills in the 1530s expressed solifidian tenets,[157] and Reformed believers would represent but a portion of these. The point is that these ideas were available and were exerting themselves disproportionately to the number of adherents.

Traditionally Cambridge has been identified as the spring of educated reformism,[158] although the White Horse Inn is now considered something of a wild goose. The university was undoubtedly the leading centre for the discussion of reformist ideas but enthusiasts should not simply be labelled Lutheran. For example, Stuart Dunnan contends that Thomas Bilney and Hugh Latimer exhibited predominantly Lollard characteristics, while James McConica stresses

[153] Margaret Aston, *England's Iconoclasts: laws against images* (1; Oxford: 1988), 203-210, 239-241, 381; MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, 192.
[154] Martin Bucer, *A treatise declaring and showing that images are not to be suffered in churches*, trans. W. Marshall ([title page missing]: 1535; RSTC 24238).
[155] Brigden, *London*, 289-291. On popular iconoclasm in Zürich, see Lee Wandel, *Voracious Idols and Violent Hands: Iconoclasm in Reformation Zurich, Strasbourg, and Basel* (Cambridge: 1995), 61-101.
[156] Ryrie, *Gospel*, 43, 126-127; Anon., *A Glasse for Housholders* (1542; RSTC 11917), A6v-7r.
[157] Thirteen percent of wills were unequivocally evangelical in the 1540s: Brigden, *London*, 382-384.
[158] See Porter, *Cambridge*, 41-73; Winthrop Hudson, *The Cambridge Connection and the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559* (Durham, NC: 1980), 46-60.

the impact of Erasmian humanism.[159] In 1528 Tunstall examined Thomas Forman, sometime president of Queens' College in Cambridge and rector of All Hallows Honey Lane in London. It appears that Forman had not adopted Luther's sacramental theology,[160] so simply labelling him a Lutheran exaggerates the clarity of his identity. There were clearly multiple influences on the reformist identity even if certain features were Lutheran.

By the 1540s evangelicalism was the 'leading contender for Cambridge's religious identity.'[161] Until Edward VI's reign, Lutheran books were more popular there than those of Zwingli, Œcolampadius or John Calvin, although Bullinger and Bucer enjoyed a greater popularity than other Reformed writers.[162] Cambridge evangelicalism need not have been pre-eminently Reformed for there to have been Reformed influences on some students. Among the Reformed authors whose works were translated into English in the late 1530s were Bucer, Bullinger, Capito and Calvin, who was just commencing his career.[163] Of ninety-nine books owned by Cambridge testators between 1535 and 1547, forty-six were of Reformed authorship. Twenty of these were by Zwingli, Bullinger and Calvin,[164] representing a significant fifth of the market. If allowance is made for the high concentration of works by Luther in one particular library belonging to Oliver Ainsworth, then nearly a quarter of the sample can be assigned to these three Swiss reformers.[165] Calvin's ideas were also available in Albert Pighius' *De libero hominis arbitrio et divina gratia*, published in 1542, which attacked Luther and Calvin on the

[159] Stuart Dunnan, 'The Preaching of Hugh Latimer: a reappraisal' (unpublished University of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1991), 56, 101; McConica, *Humanists*, *passim.*
[160] Rex, 'Early Impact', 58.
[161] Ryrie, *Gospel*, 183.
[162] Rex, 'Early Impact', 62-63.
[163] Richard Rex, 'The Role of English Humanists in the Reformation up to 1559', in N.S. Amos, A. Pettegree, and H. van Nierop (eds.), *The Education of a Christian Society: Humanism and Reformation in Britain and the Netherlands* (Aldershot: 1999), 24.
[164] See Elizabeth Leedham-Green, *Books in Cambridge Inventories: Book Lists from Vice-Chancellor's Court Probate Inventories in the Tudor and Stuart Periods*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: 1986), ii. 160-163, 172-180, 813-814.
[165] Ibid., i. 82; cf. Ryrie, *Gospel*, 172.

subject of original sin and predestination. Roger Ascham, of St John's College, reported that the question was being debated in 1545.[166]

The University of Oxford deserves greater recognition for reformism than has been traditionally conferred, its then governors having sorely – and successfully – exerted themselves in protecting its reputation for orthodoxy.[167] According to Charlotte Methuen, German evangelical theology undoubtedly inspired a significant proportion of the supporters of humanist educational approaches in Oxford in the early 1520s.[168] There was an appetite for reformist literature: in 1520 a dozen of Luther's books were sold by John Dorne;[169] in 1528 Thomas Garrett (Forman's curate at Honey Lane and, before his execution in 1540, chaplain to Cranmer), was caught trafficking books to Oxford where he had 'distributed many books among the scholars,'[170] and sixty books were delivered to the prior of Reading. Garrett stocked over a hundred titles, sometimes selling fifty copies, and operated a discreet lending service.[171] Probably a majority of these books were Lutheran, but Jennifer Loach confirms that Garrett also sold texts by Œcolampadius.[172] Considering the wide circulation of such works in London, a selection of Reformed works could easily have been conveyed.

The late 1530s witnessed an exchange programme with Zürich involving a coterie of young men from Oxford, including Nicholas Partridge, John Butler, William Woodroffe and Nicholas

[166] Tyacke, *Aspects*, 43.
[167] Craig D'Alton, 'The Suppression of Lutheran Heretics in England, 1526-1529', *JEH*, 54/2 (2003), 248-252; cf. Rex, *Henry VIII*, 113; Ryrie, *Gospel*, 170-178.
[168] Charlotte Methuen, 'Oxford: Reading Scripture in the University', in T. Kirby, E. Campi, and F. James (eds.), *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli* (Leiden & Boston: 2009), 78.
[169] David Loades, 'Books and the English Reformation prior to 1558', in J. Gilmont (ed.), *The Reformation and the Book* (Aldershot: 1998), 266; S.L. Greenslade, 'The Faculty of Theology', in J. McConica (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford* (3; Oxford: 1986), 314.
[170] *LP*, iv/2. #3962; cf. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, 24.
[171] John Fines (ed.), *A Biographical Register of Early English Protestants and Others Opposed to the Roman Catholic Church, 1525-1558* (2; typescript: 1985), G3. Fines lists texts by Zwingli and Œcolampadius in Garrett's stock.
[172] Jennifer Loach, 'Reformation Controversies', in J. McConica (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford* (3; Oxford: OUP, 1986), 364.

Eliot, all of whom exhibited signs of Reformed identity.[173] Bucer and Bullinger took a personal interest, the latter meeting them to discuss Isaiah and encouraging other Swiss reformers to cultivate links with England.[174] In 1537 Rudolph Gwalther, Zürich's future *Antistes*, visited Oxford with Partridge as his guide. He praised Magdalen College for its humanist – and by implication evangelical – sympathies,[175] and made many friends, including John Parkhurst, who became the Elizabethan bishop of Norwich and Bullinger's voice in England. Gwalther later stated that Parkhurst had begun to profess 'pure faith in Christ' at that time; Parkhurst broke the Lent fast two years later in something akin to the Zürich sausage-eating of 1522.[176] The exchanges 'remained a spectacularly successful initiative,' as MacCulloch explains; 'the alumni of Zürich kept alive the Switzerland-Strasbourg-England circuit, and showed the way for others to join it, with major consequences for the Church of Edward VI.' If Cranmer did not maintain links with Bullinger himself, he did with Bullinger's English devotees,[177] and there was a direct link between them and the exiles that fled to Zürich in the wake of the Six Articles.[178]

It may be significant that Cromwell rather than Cranmer was the sponsor of the Zürich exchange. All the exchange students, who had rapidly developed passions for the Zürich model of reform, were 'only one remove' from Cromwell's inner circle, and MacCulloch considers that this could be indicative of the minister's own identity. This would explain how Cromwell could be so easily portrayed as a sacramentarian in 1540.[179] Cromwell was certainly advanced among theologically-curious laymen in obtaining in 1517 Erasmus's Latin New Testament. By the 1520s his friends and associates included both Lollards and evangelicals of varying hues,

[173] See Gilbert Burnet, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, 6 vols. (1825), iii/1, 204-205; George Gorham (ed.), *Gleanings of a few scattered ears, during the period of the Reformation in England* (1857), 17-18.
[174] Gordon, *Swiss Reformation*, 300; Hildebrandt, 'Protestant Exiles', 20-22.
[175] Tyacke, *Aspects*, 26.
[176] Ralph Houlbrooke, 'Parkhurst, John (1511?-1575)', *ODNB* (2004); Gordon, *Swiss Reformation*, 304.
[177] MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, 177, 184-175; cf. *OL*, 614-615, 627-618.
[178] Hildebrandt, 'Protestant Exiles', 22-23.
[179] MacCulloch, 'Bullinger', 900-901; cf. Burnet, *Reformation*, iii/1. 215.

and he was closely linked to those in Oxford and Cambridge who were attracted to Swiss reformism. The sacramentarian Coverdale had 'wasted no time in becoming one of Cromwell's protégés' in 1526, while the iconophobic William Marshall was quickly ushered into Cromwell's circle where he inspired the minister's poor law reforms.[180] In 1534 Cromwell licensed the publication of the French sacramentarian Antoine de Marcourt's *Boke of Marchaunts*.[181] As Brigden writes, 'whether Cromwell knew how far his friends and clients held such extreme convictions, whether he might have moved to them himself, can never be known.'[182] There is wisdom in John Guy's refusal to categorise Cromwell and one wonders if his contemporaries, like William Gray, were any more qualified to vouch for Cromwell's orthodoxy.[183]

McEntegart recognises Cromwell's 'insidious methods of working within the government.'[184] His determination to believe even as the king believed raises the possibility that he officially forbade more extreme opinions than he might personally have found admissible,[185] but this need not entail Bernard's conclusion that Cromwell was a mouthpiece for the king.[186] In 1536 Cromwell had a ring made inscribed in Latin with the words 'obedience breeds unity, unity peace of mind and steadfastness; steadfast peace of mind is a treasure beyond price.'[187] It is possible that Cromwell's self-understanding carried an implicit evocation of the Gospel as the pearl of great price in Mt. 13:46.

[180] Davis, *Heresy*, 70; Brigden, *London*, 289.
[181] Torrance Kirby, 'Wholesale or Retail? Antoine de Marcourt's *The Boke of Marchauntes* and Tudor political theology', *Renaissance and Reformation*, 28/2 (2004), 48.
[182] Brigden, 'Cromwell', 40, 45-46, 49.
[183] John Guy, *Tudor England* (Oxford & New York: 1988), 178; William Gray, *A balade agaynst malycyous sclaunderers* (1540; RSTC 1323.5).
[184] McEntegart, *Schmalkalden*, 191.
[185] R.G. Merriman (ed.), *Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell*, 2 vols. (Oxford: 1902), i. 279; Gunn, 'Structures', 69, 86.
[186] Bernard, *King's Reformation*, 521.
[187] Translated in Susan Brigden and Jonathan Woolfson, 'Thomas Wyatt in Italy', *RQ*, 58 (2005), 504.

This view of Cromwell admits both his description of John Lambert to Wyatt on 28 November 1539 as a 'miserable heretic sacramentary'[188] and Foxe's account that 'it is reported of many that Cromewel desired him of forgiuenes for that he had done.'[189] Brigden allows the possibility that Cromwell was personally prepared to turn a blind eye to sacramentarianism:

> Cromwell had never favoured sacramentaries; rather he had feared that their radicalism would prejudice the evangelical cause and threaten the free passage of the Word. Yet perhaps he had known Lambert among the City brethren, and regretted that his beliefs had brought him to martyrdom.[190]

That Cromwell would take action against his friends for the sake of long-term Reformation was evident in his arrest of Barnes and others after Robert Packington's funeral in November 1536.[191] On 8 October 1535 Cranmer suggested appointments to Cromwell for Calais's 'instruction in the word of God.'[192] Cromwell's support certainly perpetrated heterodoxy in Calais beyond his official licence, and we can only wonder at his intentions. In correspondence with Lord Lisle about heresy in Calais he omitted to define true doctrine and regarded the 'sacramentary' label as far from straightforward: 'it is sore to note any man for a Sacramentary unless he that shall be the author of the infamy know well what a Sacramentary is.'[193] From the scaffold on 28 July 1540, Cromwell insisted that he died 'in the Catholicke faithe,' yet significantly he also confessed to past heterodoxy:

> I dye in the Catholicke faithe not doubting of any article of my faithe, no, nor doubting of any Sacramentes of the churche for many hathe slaunder me that I haue bene a bearer of them & that I haue mayntayned evell opinions, yet all were not slaunders for as god hathe instruct so hathe the divell seduced, yet beare me recorde that I dye in the catholike faythe of holy churche.[194]

[188] Quoted in Brigden, *London*, 298.
[189] Foxe, *AM* [1563], iii. 625.
[190] Brigden, *London*, 298; cf. MacCulloch, 'Concord and Tolerance', 206.
[191] Brigden, *London*, 253.
[192] *LP*, ix. #561.
[193] Byrne (ed.), *Lisle Letters*, 526 and #1429.
[194] Parker Library, Cambridge: CCCC MS. 168, fo. 209r.

A salutary comparison to Cromwell might be drawn with Philip of Hesse who, in spite of his own eucharistic beliefs approximating to Zwingli's, chose to align Hesse with Wittenberg for political reasons. His policies nonetheless 'enabled various positions to co-exist, thus ensuring doctrinal pluriformity.'[195]

The Swiss style of reformism extended into Henry VIII's own household.[196] In December 1527 Richard Foster, yeoman usher at court, abjured his belief that 'a priest could not consecrate the body of Christ.'[197] There is no indication that Anne Boleyn, as the preeminent court evangelical from (and perhaps before) her royal marriage in 1533 until 1536, with her French links and humanist encouragement of Bible reading, promoted specifically Reformed opinions.[198] Nevertheless, in 1529 she commended Tyndale's treatise *The Obedience of a Christian Man* (1528) to the king.[199] She also patronised significant evangelical clergy, including Hugh Latimer and Nicholas Shaxton, but they had not then progressed in a Reformed direction.[200] Rather it was Cromwell who bequeathed a more radical strain of evangelicalism to the king's household.

In the 1540s 'the privy chamber was abuzz with heretics,' some of whom held Reformed opinions.[201] Sir Thomas Sternhold was certainly associated with the sacramentary Anthony Pearson executed in 1543. John Lascells, who quarrelled with James Prestwich, became a servant in the privy chamber and provided the evidence destroying Katherine Howard in 1541. He died for his sacramentarianism in 1546, along with Anne Askew, one of Katherine Parr's ladies-in-waiting.[202] Susan James believes that by 1544 Henry's last queen espoused a

[195] Schneider-Ludorff, 'Philipp of Hesse', 307-310.
[196] On the evangelical environment of the court see Heal, *Reformation*, 227-232.
[197] Quoted in Brigden, *London*, 127.
[198] cf. Maria Dowling, 'Anne Boleyn and Reform', *JEH*, 35/1 (1984), 30-46. The Placards Affair in Paris in 1534 involved the denunciation of the sacrifice of the Mass but it was not representative of French evangelicalism. Marguerite de Navarre was quick to distance herself from it. See Gordon, *Calvin*, 40-41.
[199] Ives, *Boleyn*, 161-163.
[200] MacCulloch, 'Reform of the Church', 168.
[201] Ryrie, *Gospel*, 48.
[202] Ibid., 202.

developed 'evangelical Lutheranism and the radical fringes of Calvinism.'[203] Her secretary, Walter Bucler, stayed in Strasbourg in 1545 with Hilles, who was committed to Zürich theology.[204] The king intervened to rescue George Blage from the stake in July 1546. Although he was an incorrigible sacramentary, he was also Henry's favoured 'pig'.[205]

There were others who might be suspected of concealing Reformed identities. Being so closely located to a hostile monarch made dissimulation a priority for such people. John Hooper wrote to Bullinger in 1546 of the 'chief supporters of the gospel' who had recently died. He claimed Sir Thomas Wyatt (d.1542) as 'a most zealous defender of yours and Christ's religion,'[206] yet Wyatt was more cryptic than Hooper's confident appraisal suggests; Wyatt's Psalm paraphrases evade easy doctrinal classification.[207] Hooper was also happy to recognise the duke of Suffolk (d.1545), Lord Chancellor Audley (d.1544), Sir Edward Baynton (d.1544), Sir Thomas Poynings (d.1545) and Dr William Butts (d.1545) as 'real favourers of the gospel' who had 'promoted the glory of God to the utmost of their power.'[208] Hooper himself claimed to have encountered Zwingli and Bullinger's writings 'when I was a courtier' in the late 1530s.[209] MacCulloch proposes that Hooper could have been influenced by the circle around Henry Fitzalan, Lord Maltravers, whose humanist credentials might have predisposed him to Zürich evangelicalism (on humanism see p.72).[210] Brigden observes that the earl of Surrey's contacts could also suggest experimentation beyond Lutheranism.[211]

---

[203] Susan James, *Kateryn Parr: the making of a queen* (Aldershot: 1999), 198-213. The term 'Calvinism' is rather anachronistic for this period.
[204] Ryrie, *Gospel*, 205.
[205] Ibid., 56; Brigden, *London*, 375.
[206] *OL*, 36-37.
[207] Susan Brigden, *Thomas Wyatt: the Heart's Forest* (forthcoming 2012). I am grateful to Dr Brigden for sharing the relevant chapter with me. See also Cummings, *Literary Culture*, 224-226.
[208] *OL*, 36-37.
[209] *OL*, 33.
[210] MacCulloch, 'Bullinger', 904-905; D.G. Newcombe, 'Hooper, John (1495x1500-1555)', *ODNB* (2004).
[211] Susan Brigden, 'Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, and the "Conjured League"', *HJ*, 37 (1994), 515.

Alec Ryrie's interpretation of evangelicalism in England between 1539 and 1547 requires attention because it tends to diminish the incidence of Reformed identity. He suggests that 'Reformed dominance was late in coming; that until shortly before the king's death the dominant strain of English evangelicalism was broadly Lutheran in its doctrine and non-confrontational in its politics.'[212] Ryrie advances his interpretation by suggesting that 'moderates' at home differed from those in exile in the following ways: firstly, they were more optimistic about the prospect of national conversion and consequently 'less exacting than the exiles about quite what that true faith might mean, concentrating on a simple willingness to hear the Gospel and on moral renewal.' They hoped 'to minimise and indeed to disguise any doctrinal divisions' to make conversion a less revolutionary step.[213] Secondly, they emphasised justification *sola fide* only, stopping short of its 'more provocative' implications for the Mass.[214] Thirdly, they avoided controversy regarding the Mass; there was 'a firm unwillingness on the part of any of these moderates to be associated with rejection of the Real Presence.'[215] In Ryrie's opinion, they best resembled Lutherans.[216]

In summary, Ryrie argues that between 1539 and 1543 the regime appeared sufficiently ambiguous to satisfy moderates 'willing to accept a slow pace of reform, if necessary a glacially slow pace, in the name of good order.' The silence of the Six Articles on justification made this viable.[217] However, in 1543 the restriction of Bible reading to the élites by the Act for the Advancement of True Religion, and the explicit denial of justification *sola fide* in the King's Book, 'piteously exposed' the fragility of conformism. When another crisis began in May 1546 focusing persecution on the question of the Real Presence, the moderate position proved untenable for the majority of its adherents. They were forced to abandon their subtle position – both theologically and politically – and to choose between Reformed defiance and

[212] Ryrie, 'Strange Death', 68. Ryrie, *Gospel*, 97-98, 107, 266-170.
[213] Ryrie, *Gospel*, 125-126.
[214] Ibid., 135-136.
[215] Ibid., 138.
[216] Ibid., 145.
[217] Ibid., 254.

traditionalist submission. Hence Ryrie sees 'a fundamental shift in evangelicalism's centre of gravity' in 1546.[218]

Several reservations must be expressed regarding Ryrie's interpretation. Although evangelicals at home did conform, it does not follow that they were all content to do so. A higher incidence of Reformed opinion may be supposed to have existed than was apparent under hostile circumstances. Whether ten, by Neelak Tjernagel's count, or twenty people, by Ryrie's, were executed as sacramentaries in 1539-47,[219] the threat itself was persecution enough to keep others quiet. MacCulloch writes of the 'curious ecumenism' of these years in which a great plurality of opinion was possible, albeit with 'murderous lunges against representatives of either religious wing.'[220] This lends weight to Schneider-Ludorff's pluriformity model (see above p.29).

Since exile might be an unrealistic choice, it is probable that only a fraction of those evangelicals seriously discontent with conformity went into exile in the 1540s.[221] Susan Wabuda has highlighted the reality that 'men who wanted to avoid losing their lives or contradicting their faith had little room for manoeuvre. Flight was not always possible.'[222] While some of those who had participated in the Zürich exchange went into exile, others remained, including Bartholomew Traheron and Nicholas Eliot, demonstrating that some

[218] Ibid., 249-256. cf. Ryrie, 'Strange Death', 89-91; *King's Book*, 152, 158-159.
[219] N.S. Tjernagel, *Henry VIII and the Lutherans: a study in Anglo-Lutheran relations from 1521 to 1547* (St Louis, MO: 1965), 238; Ryrie, *Gospel*, 23.
[220] MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, 275.
[221] This is not to deny subsequent differences between those exiles returning under Edward VI and the 'insular background' of those who had remained in England. See Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, 84. There were comparable differences after the Marian Exile, see below p.118. On religious exile generally, and with particular attention to religious conservatives, see Marshall, 'Religious Exiles', 263-284.
[222] Wabuda, 'Equivocation', 228-229; cf. Jonathan Wright, 'Marian Exiles and the Legitimacy of Flight from Persecution', *JEH*, 52/2 (2001), 220-243. Latimer may have been making for Switzerland when he was caught at Gravesend in July 1539, suggests Hildebrandt, 'Protestant Exiles', 12.

committed Zürichers were prepared to keep a low-profile in the face of the Six Articles' clear rejection of their position.[223]

In September 1540 the sacramentary Lascells advised the queen's servant William Smythwyke 'not to be too rash or quick in maintaining the Scriptures, for if we would let them alone and suffer a little time, they [the duke of Norfolk and Bishop Gardiner] would overthrow themselves.'[224] Not only moderates but radicals too were capable of optimistically biding their time.[225] Remaining in England offered opportunities to share the Gospel in person. Brinklow observed in 1545 that 'the Gospell was never more sincerely preached in the time of the apostles than it hath been of late in London' – significant acclamation and buoyancy coming from a sacramentary.[226]

Ryrie's judgment that Gough and Mayler 'presumably found the milk-and-water reformism that they were being forced to publish in the 1540s somewhat distasteful' seems an understatement.[227] As has been argued in this chapter, there is good reason to suspect that such men were compelled by circumstances 'to conceal more radical views,'[228] and Jennifer Britnell sees no reason to assume that Gough was content.[229] Christopher Bradshaw observes that to dissent openly from the Crown's position 'would have been an option, but polemically it would have been a disaster. Such dissent would have played right into the hands of Catholic propagandists.'[230] Maria Dowling agrees that mainstream evangelicals (who, when compared to more extreme groups, should include sacramentaries) feared a fringe 'who might try to bring

[223] MacCulloch, 'Bullinger', 909. At least six of the Marian exiles had previously visited Zürich during Henry VIII's reign: Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles: a study in the origins of Elizabethan Puritanism* (Cambridge: 1938), 42.
[224] *LP*, xvi. #101.
[225] cf. Ryrie's description of 'moderates' in Racaut and Ryrie, 'Between Coercion and Persuasion', 5.
[226] Quoted in Brigden, *London*, 256.
[227] Ryrie, *Gospel*, 120.
[228] Ibid.
[229] Jennifer Britnell, 'John Gough and the *Traité de la Différence des Schismes et des Conciles* of Jean Lemaire de Beiges: translation as propaganda in the Henrician Reformation', *JEH*, 46/1 (1995), 69.
[230] Christopher Bradshaw, 'The Exile Literature of the Early Reformation: "Obedience to God and the King"', in N.S. Amos, A. Pettegree, and H. van Nierop (eds.), *The Education of a Christian Society: Humanism and the Reformation in Britain and the Netherlands* (Aldershot: 1999), 112f.

about a too-rapid reformation and thus jeopardise the whole movement.'[231] Arguably the important difference between conforming and nonconforming evangelicals was not their doctrine (although Ryrie has demonstrated trends) but their circumspection. Just as censorship could be ambiguous, writes Cummings, 'so writers were attuned to the possibility of self-censorship and of self-concealment.'[232] Thus, Wyatt's paraphrases freed him to 'keep secrets without telling lies.'[233] As Rupp realised, the stability of Henry's Church in his last decade was secured by a general 'concern for the unity of the realm' by all who knew that obedience to the king was bound up with 'the safety of their own necks.'[234]

Ryrie's attempt to explain the theological polarisation at the end of Henry VIII's reign in terms of the political outflanking of the moderate position is unconvincing. It is hard to share Carrie Euler's affirmation of it.[235] Had moderates really been convinced Lutherans, their reaction need only have been to abandon their willingness 'to give the king the benefit of any possible doubt.'[236] They had nothing to gain from adding further doctrinal anathemas to what Ryrie claims were their largely procedural differences with the king. Indeed, by Ryrie's reasoning, moderates would surely have had reason enough to lose confidence in the regime much earlier, in 1539, when the Six Articles asserted transubstantiation and five hundred Londoners were arrested in one fortnight during the summer. The regime's essential implacability was certainly evident then and, as Brigden observes, 'those already won to protestantism were only strengthened in their awareness of being part of a persecuted community.'[237] Thus Ryrie's thesis contains difficulties. It seems more likely that sacramentarianism grew earlier and that,

[231] Maria Dowling, 'The Gospel and the Court: Reformation under Henry VIII', in P. Lake and M. Dowling (eds.), *Protestantism and the National Church in Sixteenth Century England* (London, New York & Sydney: 1987), 46.
[232] Cummings, *Literary Culture*, 11.
[233] Ibid., 224.
[234] Rupp, *Studies*, 128.
[235] Euler, 'Does Faith Translate?', 84.
[236] Ryrie, *Gospel*, 67.
[237] Susan Brigden, 'Popular Disturbance and the Fall of Thomas Cromwell and the Reformers, 1539-1540', *HJ*, 24/2 (1981), 274, 277. Euler does at least venture that the decline of Lutheranism might have started earlier than Ryrie suggests: Euler, 'Does Faith Translate?', 91.

through dissimulation, it remained concealed. After 1543, with both the evangelicals' moderate camouflage and their hope in the king's intentions disintegrating, the restraint of more radical preferences was invalidated.

Early evangelicalism in the Low Countries

During the 1520s and 1530s the English government began to perceive heresy as a foreign infection. A proclamation of 1535 expelling Anabaptists noted apprehensively that 'many strangers, born out of the King's obedience, are arrived and come into this realm.'[238] By the mid-1540s more than one in twenty London residents were foreigners.[239] In an equal but opposite manner, the minority of Englishmen who went into exile abroad signal the continental dimension to the English Reformation.[240]

According to Ryrie, evangelical exiles were typically quasi-Reformed, even self-professed devotees of Zwingli and Œcolampadius.[241] Many of them spent time in the Low Countries, which were a conduit for the transmission of Swiss and Upper German evangelicalism to England. Not only refugees, but merchants like Richard Hilles and Thomas Poyntz, and customers of the book trade would have easily encountered Reformed ideas.[242]

Geographical corridors for the dissemination of printed material between the Rhineland and London via the Low Countries are identifiable from the late fifteenth century, and the links had existed much earlier. Even at that early stage, writes Sorin Ciutacu, there was 'an amazing and

[238] *TRP*, i. #155.
[239] Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities*, 9-22.
[240] Marshall, 'Religious Exiles', 283.
[241] Ryrie, *Gospel*, 97-98, 107, 266-170.
[242] W.D.J. Cargill Thompson, 'The Two Regiments: the continental setting of William Tyndale's political thought', in D. Baker (ed.), *Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent c.1500-c.1750* (Oxford: 1979), 33.

staggering network.'[243] These links remained strong in the early sixteenth century,[244] connecting the printers of Strasbourg and Basle to England, and supported by the Frankfurt book fair every spring and autumn.[245] In October 1526 or 1527, Richard Hall, an ironmonger, wrote to Richard Harman in Antwerp requesting 'two books of the New Testament in English.'[246] In 1528 Tunstall reported to Cardinal Wolsey that 'the bringer of these books' to Gough 'this year past was a Dutchman from Antwerp, named Theodoryke, who was for some time in London, and has brought many books.'[247] Francis Denham also acquired some of his reforming texts from Antwerp, and Thomas Keyle was no doubt highly exposed to reformism by his connections in the printing trade and in Antwerp and Calais.[248]

Netherlanders were exposed to numerous strains of evangelicalism in the 1520s apart from Lutheranism. Indices of prohibited books included works by Karlstädt, Lambert, Œcolampadius and, from 1529, Zwingli. Many of these were printed in Antwerp – a precarious venture for publishers who were surely working to popular demand[249] – and a significant number were made available in English translation. One Antwerp printer used by Tyndale, Joannes Hillen van Hoochstraten, printed at least thirteen heretical books in English translation.[250] The exiled Simon Fish translated the *Sum of Scripture* from the Dutch while he was in Antwerp.[251] Maerten de Keyser, the first to print Tyndale's English New Testament, was prepared to put his name to this text even though he used false imprints in other reformist publications. Antwerp, a religious melting-pot and Tyndale's refuge, was unquestionably the centre of the English exiles' campaign: of forty-one evangelical books published in exile

[243] Sorin Ciutacu, 'Flemish-English Cultural Corridors: William Caxton and his cultural revolution', in L. Hellinga (ed.), *The Bookshop of the World: the role of the Low Countries in the book-trade 1473-1941* (t' Goy-Houten: 2001), 58.
[244] Loades, 'Books and the English Reformation', 270.
[245] Marcus Loane, *Masters of the English Reformation* (2nd edn.; Edinburgh: 2005), 75.
[246] *LP*, iv/2, 4693.
[247] *LP*, iv/2, 4073.
[248] Brigden, *London*, 116, 125.
[249] Duke, *Low Countries*, 31.
[250] Hellinga, 'Bookshop', 24.
[251] Brigden, *London*, 117.

between 1525 and 1535, thirty-six were printed in Antwerp.[252] Two more were printed in Strasbourg, and two of the Antwerp publications claimed to be from Strasbourg, highlighting the familiar trade routes through the Rhineland towards Switzerland.

Apparently the earliest local bookshop inventory extant is from Leuven in 1543. Almost all of its 513 books were printed between 1516 and 1543. Statistical analysis is but suggestive: approximately thirty-one percent of the books were printed in the German lands, of which forty-four percent were printed in Swiss or upper German towns, that is, nearly fourteen percent of the total inventory.[253] Reformed writings were thus readily available in the Low Countries, regardless of whether they formed the bulk of Dutch printing.

Whilst acknowledging Luther's catalytic contribution, Laurentius Knappert depicted the first decade of the Dutch Reformation as 'the sacramentarian period' because of the blending of Zwinglian eucharistic theology and Erasmian humanism, and because Luther's eucharistic understanding gained few adherents.[254] Few heretics were arrested in the 1520s because local sacramentaries had no interest in forming large conventicles, making them harder to detect. Moreover, the authorities doubted the efficacy of harsh persecution: on 1 February 1528 the Council of Holland reported that stern measures 'have not been as profitable as one might have expected; but we have found by experience that incarceration has brought to repentance' men

[252] Anthea Hume, 'English Protestant Books Printed Abroad, 1525-35: an annotated bibliography', in L. Schuster et al. (eds.), *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More* (8; New Haven & London: 1973), 1063-1091; cf. John King, 'Thomas More, William Tyndale, and the Printing of Religious Propaganda', in M. Pincombe and C. Shrank (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature, 1485-1603* (Oxford: 2009), 119.
[253] Pierre Delsaerdt, 'A Bookshop for a New Age: the inventory of the bookshop of the Louvain bookseller Hieronymus Cloet, 1543', in L. Hellinga (ed.), *The Bookshop of the World: the role of the Low Countries in the book-trade 1473-1941* (t' Goy-Houten: 2001), 86.
[254] Quoted in Duke, *Low Countries*, 6.

who would otherwise have been burnt. This was perhaps overly optimistic, as shown by the persistent heterodoxy of one prisoner named Jan Sartorius.[255]

In February 1521 the papal nuncio reported that spiritual interpretations of the Real Presence following 'Wycliff and Berengar of Tours' were widespread in the Low Countries.[256] However, the earliest incontrovertible case of Dutch sacramentarianism was recorded in May 1525, within months of the Real Presence first breaking into public controversy between European reformers.[257] That summer iconoclasm was added to sacramentarianism in Antwerp and Delft.[258] In 1526 Bucer's then memorialist understanding of the Eucharist was publicised at Antwerp in a free translation of Johannes Bugenhagen's Psalms commentary, and in 1527 a monk blamed Œcolampadius for Flemish sacramentarianism.[259] Justification *sola fide* was rarely mentioned explicitly.[260] Perhaps solifidian soteriology was poorly understood by the masses, or reformers could rely upon wider support if they attacked the Mass, images and the cult of saints. It may be that relatively relaxed policing by the authorities allowed these more Reformed currents to prevail. Whatever the reason, justification was not the focus, an observation which instantly evokes parallels with the Swiss programme.

Antwerp, then, was a centre of Dutch heterodoxy, but significantly was also the headquarters of the English exiles hosted by the Merchant Adventurers. With regard to the problem of religious identity, it is important to observe that most Netherlanders were unaware that the various strands of evangelicalism from which they were borrowing were in competition. Confessionalisation had not yet begun and, according to Alastair Duke, it took 'many years'

[255] Quoted in James Tracy, 'Heresy Law and Centralisation under Mary of Hungary: conflict between the Council of Holland and the central government over the enforcement of Charles V's Placards', *ARG*, 73 (1982), 287-288.
[256] Quoted in B.J. Spruyt, 'Wessel Gansfort and Cornelis Hoen's *Epistola Christiana*: "the ring as a pledge of my love"', in F. Akkerman, G. Huisman, and A. Vanderjagt (eds.), *Wessel Gansfort (1419-1489) and Northern Humanism* (Leiden: 1993), 136.
[257] Duke, *Low Countries*, 19-20.
[258] Ibid., 42.
[259] Ibid., 21-22.
[260] Ibid., 51.

before Dutch evangelicals could differentiate between the theologies of Luther and Zwingli.[261] The prompt translation of the Marburg Articles into Dutch after the colloquy in 1529 would certainly have emphasised points of agreement. Since individual, self-fashioned identities were typical in the Low Countries, it is further justified to see English identities as similarly multifarious.

Lollardy

According to Duke, 'crude materialist rejections of the real presence' were common amongst the lower orders in the Low Countries, and he suggests that these popular sacramentarian currents 'probably hark back to late medieval oral traditions of dissent.' He believes that they are betrayed by their 'barbarous idiom and a country divinity far removed from the erudite theology of the major reformers.'[262] English sacramentarianism was incompatible with Lutheranism, and it is conceivable, particularly at the popular level, that sacramentarianism owed more to the native Lollard tradition derived from the teaching of John Wyclif (1328-84) than to Swiss Reformed theology.[263] As Duke says of the Low Countries, the influence of late-medieval dissent 'may not have been profound, but it should not be overlooked.'[264]

Prosecutions in Kent (1511), Coventry (1511-12), the West Country (1514) and the Chilterns (1521) suggest that Lollardy was flourishing apart from any rejuvenating impulse from the continent.[265] The heartlands of early English evangelicalism – Geoffrey Dickens' 'great crescent' – correlated with some of the areas which experienced renewed persecution of Lollards from the end of the fifteenth century: particularly Suffolk, Essex, London, Kent and

[261] Ibid., 57.
[262] Ibid., xii, 23.
[263] Ibid., 25. The historiographical debate on Lollard influence has resembled a war of attrition. Haigh suggests that proponents of the view that Lollardy prepared the ground for Reformation are reacting against the revisionist historiography of which he is a part: Christopher Haigh, 'Religion', *TRHS*, 6th series/vii (1997), 288-289, 293, 295.
[264] Duke, *Low Countries*, 28.
[265] For a complete geographical survey see J.A.F. Thomson, *The Later Lollards 1414-1520* (Oxford: 1965).

the Thames Valley.[266] Margaret Aston has shown how reformers made use of Lollard literature for propaganda purposes, while Anne Hudson cites cases of Lollards recognising the correspondence of Reformation teachings to their own beliefs.[267]

Often contemporary interrogators seem to have confused Lollard and evangelical heretics. This may be because inquisitorial methods had long been calculated to detect Lollardy. Obsolete questioning routines may have failed to penetrate superficial similarities. As Brigden points out, the preaching of Bilney sounded 'for all the world like Lollard invective.'[268] The term 'lollard' had been a generic synonym of 'heretic' for at least a generation and was used this way by John Bradford as late as 1548.[269] However, once investigators had been equipped with Fisher's *Assertionis Lutheranae Confutatio* and More's *Responsio ad Lutherum* (both 1523), they ought to have been competent to detect the new breed of heresy.[270] In December 1527 Tunstall's questioning of Bilney began with 'the assertions of Luther,'[271] but the anti-heresy proclamation of March 1529 encompassed 'all manner of heresies and errors, commonly called Lollardies.'[272]

Lollardy was primarily a phenomenon of the lower orders,[273] although it appealed to some significant families and clerics too.[274] Tantalising connections between Lollardy and the 'Christian brethren' (see above p.47) remain difficult to prove, and whilst the revival of

[266] Dickens, 'Early Expansion', 211.
[267] Aston, *Lollards and Reformers*, 222-224, 231-222; Hudson, *Premature Reformation*, 478-480, 501.
[268] Brigden, *London*, 112.
[269] Hudson, *Premature Reformation*, 446, 498-500; Petrus Artopoeus and John Chrysostome, *The Diuisyon of the Places of the Lawe and of the Gospell, gathered owt of the Hooly Scriptures by Petrum Artopoeum: wher unto is added two orations of prayeng to God made by S. Iohn. Chrisostome*, trans. J. Bradford (1548; RSTC 822), A8v.
[270] Richard Rex, *The Theology of John Fisher* (Cambridge: 1991), 88; Rainer Pineas, *Thomas More and Tudor Polemics* (London & Bloomington, IN: 1968), 14-28.
[271] Foxe, *AM* [1563], iii. 513.
[272] *TRP*, i. #122.
[273] Rupp, *Studies*, 2.
[274] Hudson, *Premature Reformation*, 467; MacCulloch, 'Reform of the Church', 160.

Lollardy in high London circles during the early sixteenth century seems suggestive,[275] Rupp advises that 'these men on the verge of orthodoxy should not properly be called "Lollards".'[276]

The extinction of academic Wycliffism in the universities by the 1430s meant that Lollardy had to survive without intellectual leadership.[277] Although it could perpetuate popular religious attitudes, it was not equipped to generate a sophisticated doctrinal programme. Reformation doctrine appeared first at the academic level via continental interactions and quickly seeped down the social order,[278] where Lollardy readily assisted its popular reception.[279] The direction of doctrinal influence was always from the academic evangelical to the Lollard.[280] Consequently, the intellectual independence of evangelicalism from Lollardy is well established.[281] Even amongst the exponents of Lollard influence, John Davis attributes educated reformism to humanism and Dickens concedes that 'the Cambridge intellectuals who first took up Lutheran and Zwinglian doctrines owed little to Lollardy.'[282] This may explain why Fisher did not worry himself with Lollardy.[283]

An important contribution to this debate is Patrick Hornbeck's study of doctrinal development within Lollardy. It reveals the extent to which so-called Wycliffites had drifted from their namesake by the sixteenth century, many becoming obsessed with the dramatic and visual aspects of religious practice. Since they retained much of Wyclif's expression without being either willing or able to articulate his predestinarian soteriology, there is a risk of being misled by their depositions. In particular, their partiality for the Epistle of James and its emphasis on

[275] Brigden, *London*, 85, 410.
[276] Rupp, *Studies*, 11.
[277] Jeremy Catto, 'Theology after Wycliffism', in J.I. Catto and Ralph Evans (eds.), *The History of the University of Oxford* (2; Oxford: 1992), 275; Richard Rex, *The Lollards* (Basingstoke: 2002), 132.
[278] cf. Duke, *Low Countries*, 33; Dickens, 'Heresy and the Origins of English Protestantism', 48-49.
[279] Dickens, *English Reformation* [2nd edn.], 14; Robert Whiting, 'Local responses to the Henrician Reformation', in D. MacCulloch, *The Reign of Henry VIII: politics, policy and piety* (Basingstoke: 1995), 223.
[280] Hudson, *Premature Reformation*, 478-479; Margaret Aston, *Faith and Fire: popular and unpopular religion 1350-1600* (London & Rio Grande, OH: 1993), 266.
[281] e.g., Thomson, *Later Lollards*, 219; MacCulloch, 'England', 173.
[282] Davis, *Heresy*, 65; Dickens, *Lollards and Protestants*, 10.
[283] Rex, *Lollards*, 121.

good works was inconsistent with the evangelicals' Pauline emphasis on justification and could hardly have given rise to it.[284]

By 1430 many Lollards had also departed from Wyclif's eucharistic theology of 'a real, spiritual, and yet not substantial presence.'[285] A century later they were far from unanimous. There was certainly a higher incidence of crude sacramentarianism amongst Lollards, yet Hornbeck cautions against a simple shift away from Wyclif's understanding of Real Presence because inquisitors tended to be interested in whether the elements remained after consecration rather than dissecting figurative understandings.[286]

The diversity of Lollard opinion makes it very difficult to quantify their contribution to evangelicalism, and almost impossible to link Lollardy to any individual reformer's doctrine. More evidence is needed for Davis's assertion that Lollardy produced a predilection for Swiss theology, although Brigden and MacCulloch are right to think that it had this potential.[287] An educated Englishman interacting with continental theology might instinctively have preferred Reformed over Lutheran eucharistic thought because of some pre-existent Lollard disposition. It may be, however, that closer comparisons can be made between Lollards and more extreme radicals like the Anabaptists.[288]

Of the leading reformers, Tyndale and Frith are most commonly suspected as having had formative Lollard influences. Rex has insisted that Lollard influence in Tyndale's Gloucestershire was 'small, discreet and localised' and he adduces evidence of Tyndale's close

---

[284] J. Patrick Hornbeck, *What is a Lollard? Dissent and Belief in Late Medieval England* (Oxford: 2010), 44-67; cf. Dickens, 'Heresy and the Origins of English Protestantism', 59; Hudson, *Premature Reformation*, 383.
[285] Hornbeck, *Lollard*, 75.
[286] Ibid., 76-103.
[287] Davis, *Heresy*, 65; Brigden, *London*, 276; MacCulloch, 'Reform of the Church', 168; Diarmaid MacCulloch, 'Putting the English Reformation on the Map', *TRHS*, 15 (2005), 80-81. There were further discrepancies over baptism and images which diminish the case for Lollard influence in the 1520s: Hudson, *Premature Reformation*, 302, 307, 469.
[288] See M.T. Pearse, *Between Known Men and Visible Saints: a study in sixteenth-century English dissent* (London & Toronto: 1994), esp. 17.

connections to thoroughly orthodox gentry.[289] The exposure of the Bristol conventicle probably occurred while Tyndale was away at Oxford, where his reading of the Greek New Testament is credited by David Daniell for inspiring his reformist vocation. Tyndale himself denied reliance on the Wycliffite gospels for his 1526 translations.[290] In Frith's case the evidence is circumstantial.[291] He protested to More that 'I do not allow this thing because Wickliffe, Œcolampadius, Tyndale, and Zuinglius so say, but because I see them in that place more purely expound the Scripture.'[292] 'The Wycliffite heritage,' suggests Theodore Bozeman, 'might have served them more as a broadly congenial native antecedent than as a substantive influence upon their theory of redemption.'[293]

The case for Lollard influence depends to a large extent on the reasoning *post hoc ergo propter hoc*,[294] which has its roots in the apologetic search for native antecedents of true religion by evangelicals like John Bale and John Foxe. Although Lollardy can be invoked to explain a choice of Reformed over Lutheran evangelicalism, continental Reformed influence might do just as well and with more substantive evidence. England could well have charted a Reformed course without any contribution from Lollardy, just as France, Scotland and the Netherlands embraced Swiss theology apart from any comparable heretical tradition.[295] It is clear that Lollardy did not produce the theological programme of the English Reformation.

---

[289] Richard Rex, 'New Light on Tyndale and Lollardy', *Reformation*, 8 (2003), esp. 147, 157, 171; Rex exposes methodological flaws undermining Donald Smeeton, *Lollard Themes in the Reformation Theology of William Tyndale* (Kirksville, MO: 1986). Gloucestershire was in fact typically traditionalist: Litzenberger, *Gloucestershire*, 28-29. Rex's caution was anticipated by Greenslade, *Tindale*, 24-26.
[290] David Daniell, 'Tyndale, William (c.1494-1536)', *ODNB* (2004); William Tyndale, *Doctrinal Treatises and Introductions to Different Portions of the Holy Scriptures*, ed. H. Walter (PS; Cambridge: 1848), 390.
[291] David Daniell, 'Frith, John (1503-1533)', *ODNB* (2004); Thomson, *Later Lollards*, 185-191.
[292] John Frith, *The Work of John Frith*, ed. N.T. Wright (*CLRC*, 7; Appleford: 1978), 342; Clebsch, *Earliest Protestants*, 122-123.
[293] Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 14; cf. Frith, *Works*, 344; Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, 9.
[294] e.g., G.J. Mayhew, 'The Progress of the Reformation in East Sussex, 1530-1559: the evidence from wills', *Southern History*, 5 (1983), 49.
[295] See Rex, *Henry VIII*, 111; Rex, *Lollards*, 120.

Humanism

Oscar Kristeller made the important point that 'Renaissance humanism was not as such a philosophical tendency or system, but rather a cultural and educational programme.'[296] Humanists were not committed to any particular theological outlook,[297] nor were they fundamentally opposed to medieval scholastic methods like *loci* and *disputationes*. There is little evidence of a struggle between scholasticism and humanism on intellectual grounds.[298] Rather, humanists sought to tackle 'scholastic problems, notably the absence of a refined use of classical languages and rhetoric that was rooted in the absence of sound philological training and against excessively speculative theological argument.'[299]

Humanists were proponents of classical ideals, eloquent forms of expression and, particularly, textual and philological scholarship utilising original sources *ad fontes*. Even Christian humanism, in applying these principles to religion by returning to the fount of Scripture and the Church Fathers, did not depart from the tradition of the schools in terms of methodology. As Charles Trinkaus writes, 'humanism, the classical-Christian rhetorical tradition, did not require, nor did it develop a systematic philosophy or a theology.'[300] For example, the pietistic *philosophia Christi* expounded by Erasmus cultivated a suspicion of certain tendencies within the schools and a concern over the apparent decay of Church and society.[301] Humanism was not committed to any particular confessional trajectory but was adapted to serve different confessional goals.[302]

---

[296] Paul Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought and Its Sources* (New York: 1979), 22.
[297] Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 42.
[298] James Overfield, 'Scholastic Opposition to Humanism in Pre-Reformation Germany', *Viator*, 7 (1976), 398.
[299] Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 44; cf. Overfield, 'Scholastic Opposition', 400. On scholasticism, see Muller, *After Calvin*, 75-76.
[300] Charles Trinkaus, *The Scope of Renaissance Humanism* (Ann Arbor: 1983), 243.
[301] cf. McConica, *Humanists*, 14-15.
[302] Rummel, *Confessionalisation of Humanism*, 8.

With this in mind, and remembering that Luther himself was misconstrued by many of his contemporaries to be extending the Erasmian programme,[303] it is surprising that humanism has been used to explain the divergence of English reformism from Lutheranism.[304] Closer examination reveals that humanism is not a convincing alternative to continental Reformed influence in explaining developments in English religious identity.

By the 1520s Oxford was being opened up to humanist and biblical scholarship,[305] which had already been thoroughly inculcated at Cambridge.[306] If humanism and evangelicalism could be linked then this might seem a straightforward explanation for Reformation developments. However, passionate humanists on the eve of the Reformation, like Fisher, More and John Stokesley, could be found amongst the staunchest conservatives a few years later, shocked at the evangelical perversion of humanist techniques. By contrast, other humanists placed their skills at the service of the evangelical cause. Humanism cannot be used, therefore, to explain why individuals emerged either as conservatives or evangelicals.

What can be said with greater confidence is that an evangelical convert espousing humanist learning might have a predilection for the Swiss variety of evangelicalism.[307] According to James McConica, Erasmus' popular *Enchiridion militis Christiani* [*Handbook of the Christian Soldier*] (1501) provided 'a stern and practical guide to pious living in the world.' His was 'a lay religion which exalts the vocation in the world to an unprecedented degree [...] it is less the

[303] Ibid., 15-18.
[304] For example, McConica proposed Erasmianism as the unifying and developing theme of the English Reformation: McConica, *Humanists*, 12. Dickens judged this too simplistic and McConica's treatment made him 'more than ever suspicious of blanket-words like "humanist" and "Erasmian": A.G. Dickens, 'Review of "English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI. By James K. McConica"', *History*, 52 (1967), 77-78. Wooding also tries to explain English doctrinal formulae on the basis of a humanist ideology: Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism*, 16-17, 96.
[305] Methuen, 'Oxford', 76; V.H.H. Green, *Religion at Oxford and Cambridge* (1964), 80-83.
[306] Rex, 'English Humanists', 23; Rex, 'Early Impact', 52.
[307] cf. Trueman and Euler, 'Reception of Luther', 65. Philip Melanchthon was not a straightforward humanist. Although he was more inclined to humanism than Luther, he was reluctant to disagree publicly with him.

redemptive than the ethical Christ who prevails in the Erasmian gospel.'[308] Humanist biblical criticism and practical piety, if imbued with evangelical fervour, found a comfortable niche in the Reformed concern for social transformation by living a renewed life.[309] Contrary to Luther, both Zwingli and Calvin were strongly influenced by this strand of humanism. Zwingli's reading of Erasmus in 1515 or 1516 was decisive for his approach to theology; he believed that humanist biblical exegesis revealed the necessary measures to transform communities morally, befitting their status as part of Christ's Church.[310] As Bruce Gordon writes, 'the appeal of [Zwingli's] humanist conceptions of doctrine and Church was extensive, and Zwingli used his wide range of personal connections with leading theologians and humanists in his evangelism to the European courts.'[311] Humanist scholars understood religion as a matter of public law over which the emergent state had some jurisdiction. Although Tyndale's *Obedience of a Christian Man* (1528), for instance, drew upon Luther's responses to the tumults of the mid-1520s, the theological model for a theocratic state was rather better expounded in Zürich.[312]

Although humanism and Zwinglianism shared some essential traits, Irena Backus shows that it was Bullinger who first established the link between humanist scholarship and Reformation. In his unpublished *Von warer under falscher leer* [*Of true and false teaching*] (1527) he attributed the revival of patristic studies and the revision of biblical texts to humanist endeavours in ancient languages and emergent literary criticism.[313] Bullinger, following Philip Melanchthon, encouraged the study of *bonae litterae* for 'their value in helping to interpret and understand sacred letters.'[314] Intensive engagement with classical scholarship constituted ideal preparation

[308] McConica, *Humanists*, 23, 33.
[309] W.P. Stephens, *Zwingli: an introduction to his thought* (Oxford: 1992), 70-71.
[310] Ibid., 14-15; Robert Walton, *Zwingli's Theocracy* (Toronto: 1967), 24, 220-221. See also Alister McGrath, 'Humanist Elements in the Early Reformed Doctrine of Justification', *ARG*, 73 (1982), 7-10.
[311] Bruce Gordon, 'Zurich and the Scottish Reformation: Rudolf Gwalther's *Homilies on Galatians* of 1576', in J. Kirk (ed.), *Humanism and Reform: the Church in Europe, England, and Scotland, 1400-1643* (Oxford: 1991), 207.
[312] Rex, 'English Humanists', 37.
[313] Irena Backus, 'Bullinger and Humanism', *Heinrich Bullinger: Life – Thought – Influence: International Congress Heinrich Bullinger 2004*, 2 vols. (Zurich: 2007), ii. 641.
[314] Bullinger, *Studiorum ratio* (1527/28), quoted in Ibid., 649. On Melanchthon, see Charlotte Methuen, *Kepler's Tübingen: stimulus to a theological mathematics* (Aldershot: 1998), 34-35, 96-97.

for biblical exegesis and Bullinger was able to maintain humanist methodology even after the 'theological and ecclesiological parting of the ways between Erasmus and the Reformation' in the mid-1520s.[315]

Most educated Englishmen were steeped in humanist principles by this period.[316] Their humanism seems plausibly to explain why evangelical converts would recognise attractions in the Reformed brand of evangelicalism, but humanism was not sufficient in itself to produce a Reformed evangelical.

English evangelicalism, 1547-55

There is a strong scholarly consensus regarding the predominantly Reformed nature of the Church of King Edward VI and the evangelicalism of those who suffered under Mary Tudor.[317] The defeat of the Schmalkaldic League at Mühlburg in 1547 threw Germany, and with it Lutheran influence on England, into disarray. Bucer's Strasbourg, a part of the Empire, also experienced turmoil. The Reformation's centre shifted decidedly into the Alps where the *Consensus Tigurinus* (1549) established a working stability between Zürich and Geneva,[318] in spite of the hostility of Basle and Bern.[319] As MacCulloch observes, 'the consolidation of this Reformed identity came just at the time when [...] Thomas Cranmer and the English evangelical leadership had also consciously moved out of step with Lutheranism in their eucharistic thought.'[320]

---

[315] Peter Opitz, 'Bullinger and Paul', in R. Holder (ed.), *A Companion to Paul in the Reformation* (Leiden & Boston: 2009), 244-245.
[316] McConica, *Humanists*; Dowling, *Humanism*; Frederic Seebohm, *The Oxford Reformers: John Colet, Erasmus, and Thomas More* (3rd edn.: 1911). See the critique of Seebohm in Daniell, *Tyndale*, 32-37.
[317] MacCulloch, *Militant*, 167-174; Ryrie, *Gospel*, 248; Catherine Davies, *A Religion of the Word: the defence of the Reformation in the reign of Edward VI* (Manchester: 2002), 18; Benedict, *Christ's Churches*, 235; McConica, *Humanists*, 250; Roland Bainton, *The Age of the Reformation* (Princeton: 1956), 57.
[318] Cameron, *Reformation*, 346-349; Heal, *Reformation*, 330.
[319] Gordon, *Swiss Reformation*, 176, 179.
[320] MacCulloch, *Militant*, 169-170.

The Edwardian establishment embraced the Reformed identity and welcomed the continental exiles who arrived ready to assist godly Reformation. Among them were the Reformed theologians Bucer and Peter Martyr Vermigli who were given strategic university chairs. Martyr attracted most of the visiting Swiss students to Oxford, recalling the earlier exchange,[321] and with Bernardino Ochino, Jan Laski, Martin Micron, and Jan Utenhove, he helped to mediate Zürich theology.[322] When Queen Jane was deposed by the Lady Mary's *coup* in 1553, it was to the Reformed cities that most exiles migrated.[323]

Dramatically unequalled by the Henrician or Elizabethan Reformations, Edward's Reformation was 'a revolutionary act, a dynamic assault on the past, a struggle to the death between Christ and Antichrist.' It was also a recasting of national culture, explains MacCulloch, 'a movement of hope and moral fervour.'[324] The Zürich model, with its strong social dimension, had much to offer the Edwardian programme by way of appropriating biblical narratives and typology.

In imitation of the Old Testament kings of Israel, ecclesiastical authority in Zürich was vested in the secular magistrate, aided by a 'prophet', the *Antistes*. The magistrate was obliged to lead the people into godly religion.[325] According to Gordon, 'this historical creation proved highly exportable and an attractive advertisement for the Swiss model of reform, especially in England under Edward VI.'[326] The potential for partnership between Reformed religion and the Royal Supremacy was obvious and most warmly enunciated by Edward himself:

> To the honourable and valiant Lords of Zurich, our right entirely beloved friends, [...] we [...] regard you with especial esteem, and exceedingly value your friendship

[321] MacCulloch, 'Bullinger', 913; Claire Cross, 'Continental Students and the Protestant Reformation in England in the Sixteenth Century', in D. Baker (ed.), *Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent c.1500-c.1750* (Oxford: 1979), 35-46.
[322] Ian Hazlett, 'Calvin and the British Isles', in H. Selderhuis (ed.), *The Calvin Handbook* (Grand Rapids & Cambridge: 2009), 119; Locher, *Zwingli's Thought*, 71; Gordon, *Swiss Reformation*, 302.
[323] Garrett, *Marian Exiles*, 8-10. On Jane Grey, see Eric Ives, *Lady Jane Grey: a Tudor mystery* (Oxford: 2009).
[324] MacCulloch, *Militant*, 9-11, 126.
[325] Stephens, *Zwingli*, 126-130.
[326] Bruce Gordon, 'The Changing Face of Protestant History and Identity in the Sixteenth Century', in B. Gordon (ed.), *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth-Century Europe* (1; Aldershot: 1996), 6.

> [...] there is also a mutual agreement between us concerning the christian religion and true godliness, which ought to render this friendship of ours, by God's blessing, yet more intimate. We therefore return you our warmest thanks for your singular and favourable disposition towards us, which you shall always find to be reciprocal on our part, whenever an opportunity shall present itself.[327]

Cranmer seemed similarly well-disposed: Hooper reported to Bullinger in 1551 that the archbishop

> could hardly refrain from tears, when he understood your feelings in regard to the king and to the kingdom, and also the perseverance of your church in these most lamentable times. He made most honourable mention both of yourself and of your profound erudition. [...] I know of a truth that he loves you from his heart.[328]

The godly examples of David, Solomon, Josiah and Hezekiah, adopted by Henry VIII and celebrated by Reformed apologists, were impressed upon the young sovereign by many, including Calvin, who dedicated his Isaiah lectures to Edward in 1550, citing the model of Hezekiah.[329] Dowling's contention that 'Edward was not brought up as a godly young Josias, but after the renaissance model of a Christian prince' is unequal to the evidence.[330] For example, Cranmer, in his coronation sermon on 20 February 1547, preached:

> Your majesty is God's vice-gerent and Christ's vicar within your own dominions, and to see, with your predecessor Josiah, God truly worshipped, and idolatry destroyed, the tyranny of the bishops of Rome banished from your subjects, and images removed. These acts be signs of a second Josiah, who reformed the church of God in his days.[331]

---

[327] Edward VI to the Zürich Senate, 20 October 1549, *OL*, 1. Hooper presented a copy of Bullinger's commentary on the book of Kings to Edward on Ascension Day 1550: Dalton, 'Hooper's Networks', 58. He reported the king's continuing good-will to Bullinger on 27 October 1551, *OL*, 96.
[328] Hooper to Bullinger, 1 August 1551, *OL*, 93.
[329] Hazlett, 'Calvin and the British Isles', 120-121. Hazlett advises against underestimating Calvin's influence in England relative to other continental reformers. Meanwhile, Pettegree argues for the limited influence of Calvin in England relative to the influence of Zürich: Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities*, 72-73.
[330] Dowling, *Humanism*, 214; cf. Murdock, 'Josiah', 1048-1049; Aston, *Iconoclasts*, 247-250; Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, 448.
[331] Cranmer, *Miscellaneous Writings*, 127.

In a Court sermon on 5 April 1549, Latimer advised Edward to imitate Josiah who had 'reformed his father's ways who walked in idolatry.'[332] The tutors around the king had significant responsibility for his theological precocity, which made him at times more determined than his councillors, as when he refused to tolerate his sister Mary's conservatism.[333] John Cheke's unambiguously Reformed nephew, Jean Belmaine, was Edward's French tutor from 1544. He took the opportunity to encourage the king in his opinions: Edward translated from French the first book of Calvin's *Institutes* as a gift to his royal father.[334] It is curious, therefore, that Loach refuses to accept 'any deep or informed interest in Protestant theology' in Edward.[335] By contrast, W.K. Jordan accepts that Edward was an 'advanced Protestant [...] genuinely and deeply pious' even while emphasising his concern for the Supremacy.[336]

There was undoubtedly relief for Edward's evangelical subjects that previously concealed views could be openly expressed;[337] take Latimer's exhortation above, for example, or the guarded opinions of Cheke in his preface to his Latin translation of Plutarch's *De Superstitione* (1545/46) compared with his later candour before his royal pupil.[338] John King highlights the 'unprecedented degree of religious toleration and freedom of speech, reading, and publication' under Protector Somerset which allowed vast numbers of Reformed books and tracts to be printed.[339] Of course the evangelical clique exercising power still upheld obedience to the Supremacy, as exemplified by the Vestments Controversy (see below p.148). Obedience,

---

[332] Hugh Latimer, *Sermons of Hugh Latimer*, ed. G. Corrie (PS; Cambridge: 1844), 175; cf. John Hooper, *An answer vnto my lord of Wynthesters booke intytlyd a detection of the deuyls sophistrye wherwith he robith the vnlernyd people of the trew byleef in the moost blessyd sacrament of the aulter* (Zurich: 1547; RSTC 13741), Q2r.
[333] Burnet, *Reformation*, ii/1. 227; David Loades, *The Reign of King Edward VI* (Bangor: 1994), 17.
[334] William Jones, 'Uses of Foreigners in the Church of Edward VI', *Numen*, 6 (1959), 143; Gordon Kipling, 'Belmaine, Jean (fl.1546-1559)', *ODNB* (2004).
[335] Jennifer Loach, *Edward VI* (New Haven & London: 1999), 135, 158.
[336] W.K. Jordan (ed.), *The Chronicle and Political Papers of Edward VI* (1966), xxii.
[337] Jordan, *Young King*, 68; Dale Hoak, *The King's Council in the Reign of Edward VI* (Cambridge: 1976), 180; Dent, *Oxford*, 4.
[338] John McDiarmid, 'John Cheke's Preface to *De Superstitione*', *JEH*, 48/1 (1997), 118-120.
[339] John King, *English Reformation Literature: The Tudor Origins of the Protestant Tradition* (Princeton: 1982), 26, 84-86.

Somerset told the Essex rebels in 1549, remained 'the principal lesson of Scripture to subjects.'[340] Yet Edward's government countenanced aggressive reform on a biblical scale. Evangelicals who had trodden the boundaries of Henrician orthodoxy might now count on tacit approval, if not outright support.[341]

The brokering of the *Consensus Tigurinus* by Bullinger and Calvin in 1549 was pivotal for the direction of English sacramental theology.[342] Official pronouncements on the Eucharist were avoided in 1547-48 pending the Swiss decision, and Cranmer kept quiet his personal conversion to a spiritual presence.[343] Although he was seen as a disciple of Bucer by the Zürichers, Cranmer had moved beyond Bucer towards Bullinger's position.[344] 'Once the agreement was achieved,' writes MacCulloch, 'tensions relaxed' and the Swiss Reformation became the basic, working model of English evangelical aspirations.[345]

Amongst the abolition of chantries and images and the foundations of schools and hospitals which constituted the social revolution of these years, one aspect of reform deserves particular attention for its contribution to a Reformed English identity: the Bible was placed at the centre of communal life to a degree unprecedented in England. Although Cromwell had attempted to make the Bible available in every parish through the Injunctions of 1536,[346] in July 1547 the Edwardian regime commanded open access in churches both to the Bible and to Erasmus's *Paraphrases*, suggesting that interpretative engagement with Scripture was crucial to the Christian life. In a further revival of Cromwell's programme, there were to be sermons 'every quarter of the year at the least wherein they shall purely and sincerely declare the word of

[340] Quoted in MacCulloch, *Militant*, 122.
[341] Foreign threats undoubtedly contributed to official moderation, see Hoak, *King's Council*, 174-177.
[342] The *Consensus* was published in England in 1552 as an appendix to Jan Laski and John Calvin, *Breuis et dilucida de sacramentis ecclesiae Christi tractatio* (1552; RSTC 15259).
[343] MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, 378-379.
[344] Ibid., 380-383, 391-392.
[345] MacCulloch, *Militant*, 170-174.
[346] MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, 166.

God.'[347] The official homily exhorting Bible reading, with a loaded marginal reference to Psalm 1, concluded:

> Let vs heare, reade, and knowe, these holy rules, iniunccions, and statutes of our christian religion [...]. Lette vs with feare, and reuerence laie vp (in the cheste of our hartes) these necessarie and fruitfull lessons. Lette vs night and daie muse, and haue meditacion, and contemplacion in theim. Lette vs ruminate, and (as it wer) chewe the cudde [...]. Let vs praie to God, (the onely aucthor of these heauenly meditacions) that we maie speake, thynke, beleue, liue, and depart hence, accordyng to the wholesome doctrine, and verities of theim.[348]

This emphasis allowed the reformers to reorganise national culture around the dual authorities of Scripture and Supremacy. While the Supremacy maintained order as it had done under the first Supreme Head, now Scripture was deployed in the quest for a godly society. The people were given a new history and identity, modelled by Zürich and drawing inspiration from the word of God. English writers were concerned, explains Gordon, 'to employ myths and historical memories to construct a literary vision of national identity' as God's elect nation.[349]

It is evident, then, that the Reformed identity was prevalent in England at the highest levels under Edward VI. The English leadership clearly valued the relationship with Zürich and drew inspiration from it. While the Reformed identity did not become dominant in English evangelicalism until Edward's reign, it has been shown that there is good reason to believe it had substantial influence and support much earlier, in spite of Henry VIII's hostility towards it. A significant, though admittedly small, minority had access to Swiss ideas in the 1520s and this number undoubtedly grew throughout the 1530s. It has also been suggested that a relatively large, if cautious, number of Reformed individuals can be posited in the 1540s.

[347] *TRP*, i. #287.
[348] Cranmer, *Homelies*, B4r-v.
[349] Gordon, 'Changing Face', 6, 19.

II. Swiss Concepts of Covenant

> But this is the fate of the church, that the majority overpower the better part; and though many things may be improved, there are nevertheless some causes of offence still remaining. Meanwhile this reformation must not be counted lightly of; in this kingdom especially, where there existed heretofore in the public formularies of doctrine true popery without the name.
>
> *Francis Dryander to Heinrich Bullinger (1549)*[1]

FRANCIS Dryander's sage remarks to Heinrich Bullinger following the publication of the first Book of Common Prayer in 1549 were one of numerous measurements of the English Reformation against the standard of Zürich. The influence of Swiss reformism extended from forms of worship to political theory, social policy and theology. Before English reception of the Swiss concept of covenant can be explored, it is necessary to determine the Swiss model. Huldrych Zwingli, Heinrich Bullinger and John Calvin have been called, respectively, the 'initiator of covenant theology,' the 'designer of the first paradigm of covenant thought,' and 'the first of the early theologians to integrate the covenant concept extensively into his theological system.'[2] Together they contributed a distinctive Swiss formulation of the concept.

Huldrych Zwingli

Zwingli was never a monk. Whereas Luther entered a cloister in his tortured search for the *acceptatio Dei*, Zwingli remained in the world: an army chaplain in the Italian Wars, a priest in the popular pilgrimage centre of Einsiedeln, and 'people's priest' in Zürich. While Luther's

[1] Dryander to Bullinger, 5 June 1549, *OL*, 351.
[2] Lillback, *Binding of God*, 311. Johannes Œcolampadius also formulated a bilateral concept of covenant, which is summarised in Lillback, *Binding of God*, 83-87; cf. Peter Opitz, 'The Exegetical and Hermeneutical Work of John Oecolampadius, Huldrych Zwingli and John Calvin', in M. Sæbo (ed.), *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: the history of its interpretation*, 3 vols. (Göttingen: 2008), ii. 411-412; Trinterud, 'Origins', 41; E.G. Rupp, *Patterns of Reformation* (1969), esp. 26-27.

theological quest was primarily personal,[3] Zwingli's theology emphasised social and political applications.

Zwingli witnessed the bloodshed of Marignano in 1515 and plague in 1519-20. These experiences helped to shape his pastoral priorities. His preaching focussed primarily, not on the value of works for salvation, but on the immediate problem of idolatry. He lamented the consequences of rapacious Swiss mercenary service, the ceremonies which had displaced true worship, and the venerated images which had usurped the 'true images of God,' that is, the poor. From his personal experience, he recognised the idolatry of lust and unchaste behaviour.[4] Zwingli's diagnosis of the human condition revealed present, as well as eschatological, condemnation. By denying their true allegiance to Christ, Swiss troops received the wages of sin and provoked divine retribution. False worship was no less pathogenic. The wounds of Christendom could be healed only by God's grace.[5]

Recognition of idolatry, false worship, and disloyalty to God led Zwingli to present his theology in terms of broken relationship and accomplished reconciliation to God's lordship. Salvation was the restoration of a life of true worship under God's law. It may be said that God's sovereignty, or glory and honour, was the consistent conviction colouring Zwingli's theology.[6] Humanity's salvation was proximate to this theocentrism. These elements of sovereignty and worship, loyalty and disloyalty, law and service, were harmonised in Zwingli's concept of covenant.

---

[3] Oberman, *Luther*, 128; Bernhard Lohse, *Martin Luther's Theology: its historical and systematic development*, trans. R. Harrisville (Edinburgh: 1999), 33-34.
[4] Walton, *Zwingli's Theocracy*, 32-36; Lee Wandel, *Always among us: images of the poor in Zwingli's Zurich* (Cambridge: 1990), 59-71; Stephens, *Zwingli*, 13-16, 68.
[5] Huldrych Zwingli, *Commentary on True and False Religion* [March 1525], *LWHZ*, iii. 49, 132; cf. Walton, *Zwingli's Theocracy*, 26-28.
[6] W.P. Stephens, 'Huldrych Zwingli: the Swiss Reformer', *SJT*, 41/1 (1988), 31. For the chief characteristics of Zwinglianism see Locher, *Zwingli's Thought*, 342.

The concept of covenant underlay Zwingli's exposition of the articles that he had presented at the First Zürich Disputation in January 1523,[7] which had elicited the city council's support for evangelical preaching. Thus Zwingli's concept antedates the Anabaptist controversy.[8] He explained that 'God promises to enter an eternal covenant with us, the sure and faithful heirs of David. Earlier everyone understood this covenant to have been made and grounded in the blood of Christ who is an eternal God; hence, the covenant, too, is eternal'.[9] The permanence of the covenant allowed Zwingli to present it as the ongoing basis for human relationship with God.

Explicit discussion of the eternal covenant appeared under Zwingli's eighteenth article. Here he wrote that '*testamentum*, *pactum* and *foedus* are often used interchangeably in Scripture. But *testamentum* is used most often. We therefore refer to it here.' He explained that *testamentum* 'means "legacy" [*erbgmächt*], but it is also used to mean "agreement" [*verstand*] or "covenant" [*pundt*], the latter of which one usually makes between two people for the sake of peace.'[10] *Erbgmächt* implies a long-established inheritance. It was a Swiss legal term denoting a conditional variety of last will and testament, distinct from Roman Law, wherein the beneficiary was obliged to demonstrate his fulfilment of the testator's requirements.[11] This interpretation of *testamentum* allowed Zwingli to establish the reciprocal operation of the legacy unilaterally initiated by God. He assigned primacy to this bilateral sense of the term, the opposite of Luther's unilateral definition of *bund* (*pundt*). Zwingli did not, however, exclude the unilateral sense altogether since

[7] On the so-called 'First Zürich Disputation' see Heiko Oberman, *Masters of the Reformation: the emergence of a new intellectual climate in Europe*, trans. D. Martin (Cambridge: 1981), 213-236; Gordon, *Swiss Reformation*, 57-61.
[8] Those who suggest that Zwingli developed the concept in response to the Anabaptists include: G.W. Bromiley, *Baptism and the Anglican Reformers* (1953), 38; Letham, 'Foedus Operum', 460; McGiffert, 'Grace and Works', 469; Goeters, 'Föderaltheologie', 246. In fact it was not restricted 'as a rule' to his defence of infant baptism, as has been claimed by Møller, 'Beginnings', 47 and Weir, *Federal Theology*, 10. Robert Walton locates the origin of Zwingli's concept in 1519-22: Walton, *Zwingli's Theocracy*, 36. Œcolampadius' concept of covenant appeared in 1523-24, also prior to the Anabaptist controversy: Lillback, *Binding of God*, 83.
[9] Zwingli, *Exposition of the Articles*, *HZW*, i. 124.
[10] Ibid., 106; *CR*, lxxxix. 131.
[11] See Hagen, 'Testament to Covenant', 16-17.

> where there is a testament it can be executed only after the death of him who made it [...].Therefore Luke calls the blood of Christ not only "the blood of the testament" [*das blůt des testamentes*] but rather "testament" [*das testament selbs*, 'the testament itself'] in the following words, "This drink (I thus translate [*tütsch*, German] 'poterion'), is the new testament [*testament*] or covenant [*pündtnus*, alliance] in my blood which is poured out for you." These words bring to our attention that the New Testament is confirmed [*gevestet*] by the blood of Christ.[12]

The unilateral was thus subordinate to the bilateral meaning. Zwingli undoubtedly assigned priority to a bilateral pact

> which one makes between two people for the sake of peace. In this sense one speaks of the Old or the New Testament, that is: the covenant [*pundt*], agreement [*verstand*] and commitment [*pflicht*] which God has entered in with the patriarchs and which in Christ he entered in with the whole world.[13]

Zwingli united the Old and New Testaments under the essential category of covenant between two parties: God and humanity.[14]

Zwingli clearly appreciated the biblical covenant pattern. Whenever an 'agreement [*verstand*] was reached in the Old Testament between God and the friends of God, it was customary to strengthen the same through blood and sacrifice.'[15] The same types were repeated in the New Testament:

> For when God made a covenant [*pundt*] and legacy [*erbgemächt*] with the people of Israel and their descendants, that is: a testament [*testament*], death and bloodshed were involved – but of dumb animals only, as stated earlier. But when Christ made his testament [*testament*] with humankind, an alliance [*verpüntnus*] and legacy [*erbgemächt*] which would last unto all eternity, he did not sacrifice by killing animals but by offering himself.[16]

---

[12] Zwingli, *Exposition of the Articles*, 107; *CR*, lxxxix. 132. I have modified the English translation to accord with the German in this and the following quotations from the *Exposition*.
[13] Zwingli, *Exposition of the Articles*, 106; *CR*, lxxxix. 131; cf. Hagen, 'Testament to Covenant', 19-20.
[14] Zwingli had previously recognised covenantal continuity between the Testaments in his *Supplication to Hugo, bishop of Constance* (2 July 1522), cited in Lillback, *Binding of God*, 82.
[15] Zwingli, *Exposition of the Articles*, 106.
[16] Ibid.; *CR*, lxxxix. 131.

The language of testamental execution and covenantal ratification were interwoven: Christ's death 'executes' the testament; 'strengthens' his legacy; constitutes a covenantal 'seal and sign'; 'confirms' the New Testament; 'affirms' the testament and is 'a seal of that which has been agreed once.'[17]

Zwingli's location of the believer's righteousness in Christ emphasised the centrality of Christ's fulfilment of covenantal obligations on humanity's behalf without undermining the basic reciprocity of the agreement. Zwingli understood believers to be reputed righteous by virtue of their union with Christ. That is, Christ is apprehended as 'our perfection before God'; the believer's justifying righteousness is extrinsic.[18] However, in his treatise *On Divine and Human Righteousness* (also written in July 1523), Zwingli could write that, by grace, guaranteed by Christ, the believer 'is made righteous through faith.'[19] The appearance of imputation and impartation can be reconciled by appreciating the reputation of the believer who both possesses and is possessed by Christ.[20] Christ was so central to humanity's fulfilment of the covenant in redemption that Zwingli identified the two; in his *Commentary on True and False Religion* (March 1525) Christ 'is our propitiation, therefore also our covenant and testament, which God has made with us.'[21]

Zwingli's *Subsidiary Essay*, a eucharistic treatise of August 1525 directed against Erasmian traditionalists, again treated of the covenant. In it Zwingli explained that Christ's testament was 'an agreement [*conditio*] promised by God' similar to the Abrahamic 'compact [*pactum*] or covenant [*foedus*]' in Gen. 17. The Abrahamic covenant was a relationship 'thought worthy by God in his grace to enter into.' It had clearly specified terms, 'and these terms [*conditiones*] are the real covenant [*foedus*] itself,' thereby emphasising the imposition of reciprocal conditions.

[17] Zwingli, *Exposition of the Articles*, 107.
[18] Ibid., 25; cf. Zwingli, *True and False Religion*, 118, 148.
[19] Huldrych Zwingli, *Divine and Human Righteousness* [July 1523], *HZW*, ii. 12.
[20] Ibid., 12-13; cf. W.P. Stephens, *The Theology of Huldrych Zwingli* (Oxford: 1986), 159-160; McGrath, 'Humanist Elements', 10, 18-19.
[21] Zwingli, *True and False Religion*, 72; cf. Hagen, 'Testament to Covenant', 17.

All but one of the terms dealt with God's commitment to be the God of Abraham, to bless him and his descendants. The only condition placed upon Abraham was 'you will walk before me most uprightly,' which Zwingli explained to mean worship and faithfulness.[22]

Zwingli moved seamlessly to discussion of Christ's covenant as the solution to the lasting problem presented by the Abrahamic covenant. He warned that 'the covenant which was struck with Abraham is so strong and valid that unless you keep it you will not be faithful.' That is, if Zwingli's Christian contemporaries could not claim that 'the Lord is your God and you are worshipper of him only [...] you have no reason to boast that you are faithful.'[23] Herein Zwingli's understanding of justifying faith in the context of a lifestyle of true worship can be appreciated.

Having depicted humanity as defaulting on its covenantal commitments so as to sunder relationship with God, Zwingli presented Christ as the restitution provided on humanity's behalf by God himself, in accordance with his promise of restoration to Adam: 'he gives himself freely to you and casts himself into death for you by which he might reconcile you to himself.' Thus Christ himself discharges mankind's penalty for violating the conditions. The Abrahamic terms of relationship with God were then replaced, because

> when Christ, slain for us, appeased the divine justice and became the only approach to God, God entered into a new covenant with the human race [...]. This new covenant or testament, then, is the free remission of sins which God has bountifully granted us through his Son. They, therefore, that trust in God through Christ and lead their own to this trust [...] are themselves circumcised, just as

[22] Huldrych Zwingli, *Subsidiary Essay, or Crown of the Work on the Eucharist* [August 1525], *HZW*, ii. 223; *CR*, xci. 499. It is hard to accept Wayne Baker's view that Zwingli failed to affirm clearly mutual responsibilities and did not hold faith to be a condition. See Baker, *Other Reformed Tradition*, 16; Baker and McCoy, *Fountainhead*, 21.

[23] Zwingli, *Subsidiary Essay*, 224. The problem of unfaithfulness was framed as self-love in Huldrych Zwingli, *An Account of the Faith of Huldreich Zwingli submitted to the German Emperor Charles V, at the Diet of Augsburg. 3 July 1530*, *LWHZ*, ii. 40.

> Abraham and his seed were circumcised, but with the circumcision of Christ, which is baptism, Colossians 2:11.[24]

Here, Zwingli sets out the substantial continuity of the covenant between Abraham and Christ.[25] He also makes the point that God's promises are fulfilled in Christ.

In 1526 Zwingli responded with his address *On Original Sin* to concerns that he held 'an unusual doctrine with regard to the pollution of human descent.' The covenant model is clarified in the second part of the treatise, which explores the consequences of original sin. The covenant constitutes, in a discussion of Gen. 17, a climactic summary of the argument: 'For between those whose God He is and Himself there is established a friendship; if there is established a friendship, no damnation because of the condition of birth can intervene.'[26] Zwingli equates God's covenantal relationships established with Abraham and with Christians, causing his readers to apprehend his whole discourse on original sin in covenantal terms: Adam's legal guilt; his descendants' propensity to idolatry; the consequences of enmity of God; God's faithful promise of reconciliation by satisfying the demands of his righteousness; and the sacraments attached to the agreement.[27]

The covenant model was used in *Original Sin* even though the reader was not repeatedly apprised of it.[28] This is characteristic of Zwingli's soteriological discussions. He was primarily concerned to communicate the implications and applications of the covenant, so the absence of direct discussion of the covenant itself need not indicate its absence from his reasoning. It was sometimes implicit as a spiritual premise but it was certainly not 'incidental.'[29] On the contrary,

---

[24] Zwingli, *Subsidiary Essay*, 224.
[25] Zwingli's appreciation of the continuity of the Church from the postlapsarian Adamic covenant, through Abraham, to Christ is discussed by Jaques Courvoisier, *Zwingli: a Reformed Theologian* (1964), 50.
[26] Huldrych Zwingli, *Declaration of Huldreich Zwingli regarding Original Sin, addressed to Urbanus Rhegius, 15 August 1526*, *LWHZ*, ii. 20.
[27] Ibid., 7-17.
[28] Bullinger confirms this reading, see Lillback, *Binding of God*, 98.
[29] David Steinmetz, *Reformers in the Wings: from Geiler von Kayserberg to Theodore Beza* (2nd edn.; Oxford: 2001), 95.

Zwingli 'raises it to the position of a leading thought in the understanding of Scripture.'[30] Its implicit use can be detected in two important works prepared for the Emperor Charles V and Francis I of France respectively, *Ratio Fidei* [*Account of the Faith*] (1530) and *Expositio Fidei* [*Exposition of the Faith*] (1531).[31]

The covenant was usually made most explicit in Zwingli's discussions of the sacraments. Zwingli published what was perhaps his most significant contribution to the Eucharist Controversy in February 1527, the *Friendly Exegesis* addressed to Luther, in which he continued to employ the covenant idea. Zwingli located the ancient covenant-making ritual of cleaving or 'cutting a covenant' in Dt. 6:13 and 10:20, and he quoted Moses: '"You shall worship the Lord, your God, and him only you shall *proskollēthēsē*, that is, cleave to." And Christ repeated that this was to be taken in the sense that the heart was to cleave to no other thing save God alone [Mt. 4:10].'[32]

Towards the end of the *Friendly Exegesis* Zwingli gave a definition of the covenant which was resoundingly Christocentric: 'For the testament [*testamentum*] or covenant [*foedus*] is that Christ the Son of God is ours, and that through him we have been elected into the number of the children of God. And all this was accomplished [*perfectum*] and ratified [*sancitum*] by his death.'[33] Thus the reciprocal agreement governing the relationship between God and humanity had, at its centre, the possession by mankind of Christ in order to meet the price of their reconciliation to familial relationship with God.

The relationship between covenant and election was dealt with in the closing section of Zwingli's *Refutation of the Tricks of the Catabaptists* (July 1527). Particularly interesting is

[30] Locher, *Zwingli's Thought*, 219.
[31] Zwingli, *Account of the Faith*, e.g. 38-43; Huldrych Zwingli, *A Short and Clear Exposition of the Christian Faith preached by Huldrych Zwingli* [...] *thus far not printed by anyone and now for the first time published unto the world* [...] *1536* [July 1531], *LWHZ*, ii. 245-246, 253, 264-245.
[32] Zwingli, *Friendly Exegesis*, *HZW*, ii. 305.
[33] Ibid., 362; *CR*, xcii. 746; cf. Joel Beeke, *Assurance of Faith: Calvin, English Puritanism, and the Dutch Second Reformation* (New York: 1991), 28.

Zwingli's assertion of the unity of the covenant throughout salvation history, beginning with the covenant that God conceived for Adam. He implied a pre-temporal conception but, perhaps significantly, not a prelapsarian implementation of the covenant.[34] Zwingli proceeded to consider testamental continuity and discontinuity and maintained the dependence of salvation upon divine election: 'the elect are ever elect, even before they believe.'[35]

Zwingli's concept of covenant focussed his soteriology upon Christ. Not only had Christ ratified the agreement between God and humanity in his own blood, but he had fulfilled the reciprocal obligations required of mankind. Furthermore, the covenant constituted Zwingli's rationale for righteous living in allegiance to Christ.

Heinrich Bullinger

In 1522 Bullinger began his career as a lay teacher in the Cistercian house at Kappel, where he refused both monastic vows and attendance at Mass. Between 1523 and 1529 he undertook to reform the monastery by expounding Scripture, before leaving for parochial ministry. He first met Zwingli in 1524 and spent time studying at Zürich in 1527. Following Zwingli's death at the battle of Kappel on 11 October 1531, Bullinger assumed religious oversight of Zürich in December. He exerted himself to consolidate the legacy of his divisive predecessor and friend whose martyrdom had traumatised the Zürichers. Like Zwingli he held a high view of the rôle of the magistrate as the shepherd of God's people, maintaining Zwingli's priorities for social order and godly living.[36]

While Zwingli's concept of covenant has hitherto received limited recognition, it is more widely known that Bullinger developed the covenant into an explicit 'constitutive dogmatic

[34] Huldrych Zwingli, 'Refutation of the Tricks of the Catabaptists [1527]', in S.M. Jackson (ed.), *Selected Works of Huldreich Zwingli* (Philadelphia: 1901), 219-221.
[35] Ibid., 242. See Lillback, *Binding of God*, 98-106. For Zwingli's treatment of election see Stephens, *Theology of Zwingli*, 99-106.
[36] Gordon, *Swiss Reformation*, 141.

principle.'[37] Consequently it is important to recognise that Bullinger acknowledged a debt to Zwingli in this area. He wrote in 1527: 'God has through [Zwingli] set forth for us in a clear way, as no one has done for a thousand years, the chief point of his religion [...] namely, the understanding of his one eternal covenant [...] God has now made it plain to us through him.'[38]

Bullinger's concept of covenant began to emerge in the early 1520s. A marginal annotation to his *De scripturae negotio* (*On the use of Scripture*) (1523) implied the unity of the Testaments insofar as 'the New Testament is nothing other than the interpretation of the Old.'[39] The concept became explicit in *Von dem Touff* (*On Baptism*) (late November or early December 1525), where he wrote that God 'made a covenant [*pundt*], testament [*testament*] or will [*gmächt*] with the fathers Adam, Enoch, Noah and especially clearly and explicitly with Abraham and his seed for eternity.' The bilateral nature of the Abrahamic covenant was asserted: humanity gave something 'in return [*herwyderumb*].'[40]

De institutione et genuine eucharistiae usu epistola (*Letter on the institution and use of the genuine Eucharist*) (December 1525) already expressed Bullinger's mature theology of the covenant.[41] Here he wrote that Christ 'explains and makes fresh the covenant of God' which remains unchanged: 'Now therefore when Christ calls this cup a new testament, no one should

---

[37] Steinmetz, *Reformers in the Wings*, 95; cf. Ulrich Gäbler, *Huldrych Zwingli: his life and work*, trans. R. Gritsch (Philadelphia: 1986), 158; Benedict, *Christ's Churches*, 59; MacCulloch, *Reformation*, 178. Wayne Baker is the leading proponent of this view. His analysis of Bullinger is instructive (see Baker, *Other Reformed Tradition*; Baker and McCoy, *Fountainhead*). However, Baker argues that Bullinger's concept of covenant was distinct from those of his contemporaries (esp. Baker, *Other Reformed Tradition*, appendices A-C). This has been rightly contested by Richard Muller, 'Review of "Fountainhead of Federalism"', *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 63 (1994), 89-91; Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 126; Lillback, *Binding of God*, 81-106; Venema, *Bullinger and Predestination*, *passim*. Baker competently defends his analysis of Bullinger himself in J. Wayne Baker, 'Heinrich Bullinger, the Covenant, and the Reformed Tradition in Retrospect', *SCJ*, 29/2 (1998), 359-376.

[38] Quoted in Lillback, *Binding of God*, 98, cf. 113; cf. W.P. Stephens, 'Bullinger and the Anabaptists with reference to his *Von Dem Unverschamten Frevel* (1531) and to Zwingli's writings on the Anabaptists', *RRR*, 3 (2001), 100-101, 106-107; Goeters, 'Föderaltheologie', 247.

[39] Quoted in Baker, *Other Reformed Tradition*, 4-5. Baker incorrectly asserts that Bullinger pre-empted Zwingli by two years in unifying the Testaments (see above p.84).

[40] Quoted in Ibid., 4-6.

[41] Ibid., 9.

imagine that God began a new covenant with the human race.'[42] The eternal nature of the covenant convinced Bullinger that the Old Testament contained the whole will of God. In his *Antwort an Burchard* (*Answer to Burchard*) (1528) he explained that the Pentateuch included the 'entire testament' of salvation, defining 'testament' (*testament*) in terms of 'a covenant' (*pundt*) and 'an alliance' (*pündtnus*). Again the point was made that mankind is not a passive recipient of a unilateral bequest, for the 'sum total of all Scripture, toward which all Scripture always aims' is none other than that 'this covenant [*pundt*] has been performed continually on both sides.'[43]

Although the important elements of Bullinger's covenant thought had been expressed several times between 1525 and 1533,[44] they were definitively expounded in his account of history, *De testamento seu foedere Dei unico et aeterno* (*Concerning the one and eternal testament or covenant of God*) (1534). This was composed during a period of controversy over the relationship between ecclesiastical and civil authorities to which Bullinger had contributed *What the duty of the magistrate is in the church of Christ, who lawfully defends it against the seditions of heretics and the attacks of tyrants* (1534). His advice to magistrates depended on the unity of the Testaments and the enduring validity of Old Testament models.[45] *De testamento* sought to unite the testimonies of the prophets and apostles by employing the covenant hermeneutic.[46]

De testamento began with an etymological discussion of the different words associated with the concept of covenant. Bullinger presented three possibilities. Firstly, בְּרִית (*bĕrît*, translated *diathēkē* or *testamentum*) sometimes signifies '*hereditatem quae testamento obvenit*' (the

[42] Quoted in Ibid.
[43] Quoted in Ibid., 12.
[44] Baker, 'Retrospect', 360-361.
[45] J. Wayne Baker, 'Church, State, and Dissent: the crisis of the Swiss Reformation, 1531-1536', *CH*, 57/2 (1988), 148; cf. Opitz, 'Bullinger', 250-251, 260-251.
[46] Bullinger, *Brief Exposition*, 117-130.

inheritance that results from a will).[47] Secondly, *diathēkē* means '*pactum & conventum & pollicitationem*' (pact, agreement, promise), so *testamentum* in Scripture means '*promissione, nec quauis, sed iureiurando fermata*' (a promise, not of any sort, but confirmed by oath).[48] Thirdly, *diathēkē* means '*pactum*' or '*foedus*.' Bullinger argued that this third meaning best corresponded with *bĕrît*.[49] *Foedus* (or *pundt* in the German edition) was therefore to be the subject of the exposition, consistent with Zwingli's definition of *testamentum* as *pundt*. Bullinger explained the ancient Near Eastern ritual of covenant-making to establish peace between hostile parties, noting that 'a pig was "horribly" (*foede*), that is, cruelly, slain' in the ceremony. This was the human custom used by God to enter into fellowship with mankind.[50] Gen. 17:1-14, wrote Bullinger, followed the covenant pattern precisely:

> First, the passage explains who bound themselves together [*couenerint*], namely, God and the descendants of Abraham. Second, the text states the conditions under which they bound themselves together [*conditionibus couenerint*], specifically that God wished to be the God of the descendants of Abraham and that the descendants of Abraham ought to walk uprightly before God [*integre coram Deo debeat ambulare*]. Third, it is explained that the covenant [*foedus*] is made between them forever. And finally, [the entire covenant] is confirmed with a specific ceremony in blood.[51]

Entry into ancient covenants was mutual but 'the chief negotiator who confirms [*foecialis*] the covenant [*pactum*] gives agreement with formalised words and ceremonies.'[52] It was therefore possible for Bullinger to hold that the covenant was reciprocal yet maintain its gracious nature by unilateral initiation: God, 'who holds the primacy in this covenant [*foedere*],' 'joined himself in covenant [*foedere*] with miserable mortals corrupted by sin [...] we are saved solely

[47] Heinrich Bullinger, *De Testamento Seu Foedere Dei Unico & Aeterno Heinrychi Bullingeri Brevis Expositio* (Elektronische Bibliothek Schweiz; Zurich: 1534), A2v; Bullinger, *Brief Exposition*, 101.
[48] Bullinger, *De Testamento*, A3r-v; Bullinger, *Brief Exposition*, 102.
[49] Bullinger, *De Testamento*, A3v; Bullinger, *Brief Exposition*, 103. For Bullinger these meanings were mutually supportive, see Aurelio Garcia, 'Bullinger's *De Testamento*: The Amply Biblical Basis of Reformed Origins', *Heinrich Bullinger: Life – Thought – Influence: International Congress Heinrich Bullinger 2004*, 2 vols. (Zurich: 2007), ii. 674.
[50] Bullinger, *Brief Exposition*, 102-103.
[51] Ibid., 104; Bullinger, *De Testamento*, A5v.
[52] Bullinger, *Brief Exposition*, 103; Bullinger, *De Testamento*, A4r.

through the goodness and mercy of God.'[53] God's responsibility in the covenant was, consequently, to be himself, 'the all-sufficient God, the God of the faithful and the rewarder of those who fear him.'[54]

The revelation of the divine nature made 'demands from us in return, and what is fitting for us to do [*quid nos facere conueniat*].'[55] 'These,' wrote Bullinger, 'are our duties; these things must be observed by us [...]. It is our duty to adhere firmly by faith to the one God [...] and to walk in innocence of life for his pleasure.' These conditions were later summarised as 'partly faith in God and partly love of the neighbour.' Like Zwingli, Bullinger contrasted godly duties with false worship and idolatry.[56] According to Wayne Baker, from the German edition it is clear that Bullinger uses *integer* (uprightly) in a moral sense.[57] The moral law of the Decalogue paraphrased the conditions of the covenant, but these could be traced back to Adam.[58]

Both divine and human responsibilities were fulfilled in Christ, making Bullinger's concept of covenant thoroughly Christocentric. God fulfilled his promise by revealing himself in Christ and Christ confirmed the covenant relationship in his blood. Moreover, the apprehension of Christ's righteousness was the means by which faith discharged mankind's responsibilities: 'this same Jesus is the inheritance itself which has been bequeathed to those who trust in the

[53] Bullinger, *Brief Exposition*, 105, 108; Bullinger, *De Testamento*, A6v, B3v. This distinction offsets criticism of Baker's reading as synergistic by Muller, *Christ and the Decree*, 41-44. It also undermines Strehle's view that Bullinger's teaching is synergistic: Stephen Strehle, '*Fides aut Foedus*: Wittenberg and Zurich in conflict over the Gospel', *SCJ*, 23/1 (1992), 15-17. On Bullinger's qualified expression of double predestination, see W.P. Stephens, 'Predestination or Election in Zwingli and Bullinger', *Heinrich Bullinger: Life – Thought – Influence: International Congress Heinrich Bullinger 2004*, 2 vols. (Zurich: 2007), i. 322; Beeke, *Assurance*, 32.
[54] Bullinger, *Brief Exposition*, 109.
[55] Ibid., 108-109; Bullinger, *De Testamento*, B3v.
[56] Bullinger, *Brief Exposition*, 111, 116-117; cf. Garcia, '*De Testamento*', 679. Salvation by works was implicitly rejected.
[57] Editorial note on Bullinger, *Brief Exposition*, 104n.
[58] Ibid., 113, 135. Bullinger did not imply a prelapsarian covenant here. cf. Steinmetz, *Reformers in the Wings*, 95.

one and eternal covenant of God.' This, too, is the work of God who, as humanity's 'protector, confederate, and saviour,' supplies Christ as liberator.[59]

The consistency of Bullinger's covenant thought is demonstrated in his sermon series the *Decades* (1549-51)[60] by the referral of his readers to *De testamento* (1534) and to *Der alt gloub* (*The old faith*) (1537) 'which treatises I know to be familiar among you.'[61] In short, Bullinger taught that the covenant was initially made with Adam immediately after the Fall, and renewed with Noah, Abraham and Moses. He specified the mutuality, duration, conditions and signs of the covenant. The salvific import in Pauline terms was that humanity 'is justified by grace through faith.'[62]

Bullinger held that God's word is reliable on the basis of his irrevocable '*foedus*'.[63] The whole of Scripture was to be received as authoritative, therefore, 'even because we are Christians.' Although certain elements of the Old Testament had been abrogated or surpassed by Christ, others remained binding.[64] The testament was always one, so there was but one means of salvation at all times. This was Bullinger's key point, as Richard Muller emphasises,[65] although he did not refrain from extensive discussion of Testamental continuity and discontinuity.[66]

Scripture was to be interpreted according to the law of love towards God and neighbour.[67] Love was required in the keeping of God's commandments, evidenced by John 14:23-24 and Moses' teaching around Dt. 6:5. The whole heart must be faithful to God alone and, with regard to

[59] Bullinger, *Brief Exposition*, 110, 116.
[60] The covenant concept is traced throughout the *Decades* in Baker, 'Retrospect', 364-366.
[61] Heinrich Bullinger, *The Decades of Henry Bullinger*, ed. T. Harding, 5 vols. (PS; Cambridge: 1849-52), iii/8. 299. I discuss *Der alt gloub* in the context of its influence on its English translator Miles Coverdale, see p.118 below.
[62] Bullinger, *Decades*, iii/6. 169-175, cf. v/9. 434.
[63] Ibid., i/4. 93-94; Heinrich Bullinger, *Sermonum decades quinque, de potissimis Christianae religionis capitibus* (Zurich: 1557), 14. The PS editor translates *foedus* as both 'league' and 'covenant'.
[64] Bullinger, *Decades*, i/2. 58-59; cf. iii/58. 299, v/292. 250-291.
[65] Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 126.
[66] Bullinger, *Decades*, iii/8. 236ff.
[67] Ibid., i/3. 77.

neighbours, 'fulfil the duties of love and civil humanity.'[68] It is unsurprising, then, that eighteen sermons were devoted to law and an exposition of the Decalogue where 'the conditions of the league [*conditionibus foederis*] were at large written.'[69] Bullinger implied the immutability of the covenant conditions by noting the similarity between the preface to the Decalogue and 'the words of the covenant [*foederis*] which God made with Abraham, and in Abraham with all faithful believers.'[70] The first table 'teacheth us the perfect way to love uprightly and holily in the sight of God. The second is the rule whereby we have to learn our duty toward our neighbour [...] in these two tables are so nearly contained all and every duty looked for at men's hands.'[71] Humanity's obligations to God were explicit: 'if he will be mine, then I again of duty must be his [...]. Wherefore in this commandment there is required at our hands, that we do not only acknowledge the true God, and so to stay there; but also, that we do take and account him for our God.'[72]

Nevertheless, Christ remained at the centre of the covenant promise, with all the Old Testament foreshadowing his appearance.[73] As in *De testamento*, total reliance upon God was taught. God, wrote Bullinger, 'is the life and righteousness of both the people [Jews and Gentiles]: which righteousness he bestoweth on them by faith: therefore faith doth justify or make them both righteous.' God in Christ is the locus of humanity's righteousness, for 'God alone is righteous,'[74] and in this sense righteousness is bestowed on believers. Christ acted as the means for the fulfilment of the promise:

> God the Father, through the Son, doth pour himself wholly with all good things into the faithful, whom he quickeneth and filleth with all goodness, and last of all

[68] Ibid., i/10. 182-183, 190.
[69] Ibid., iii/6. 169; Bullinger, *Sermonum decades*, 121.
[70] Bullinger, *Decades*, ii/2. 215; Bullinger, *Sermonum decades*, 40.
[71] Ibid., ii/2. 217; cf. Philip Melanchthon, *Loci Communes Theologici* [1535], ed. W. Pauck (*LCC*, 19: 1969), 53-57.
[72] Bullinger, *Decades*, ii/2. 217.
[73] Ibid., iv/1. 13-19.
[74] Ibid., iv/1. 44-45.

> doth take them up to himself [...]. This doth true faith believe [...] that God in Christ doth communicate to the faithful life and godliness.[75]

Undoubtedly Christ's righteousness is the righteousness by which humanity fulfils its part in the covenant.[76] Like Zwingli, Bullinger located Christ at the centre of his concept of covenant. Christ was integral to Bullinger's explanation of salvation history, social responsibility and the believer's duty to God.

John Calvin

Calvin cannot be linked with any of the French reformist movements in the 1520s, but his legal studies in 1528-30 would have 'cast in relief the central intellectual and spiritual questions of the French Renaissance,' writes Bruce Gordon.[77] Certainly he would have been *au fait* with conciliarist contract theories and he could hardly have avoided the concept of covenant, a core feature of late-medieval *pactum* theology.[78] Calvin spent about twenty-four years of his life interacting with, and shaping, the Swiss Reformed *milieu*. In 1535-36 he encountered various reformers in Basle, including Bullinger.[79] Then, in 1536, at Guillaume Farel's behest, Calvin settled in Geneva. Expelled in 1538, Calvin matured as a reformer in Bucer's Strasbourg until he agreed to return to Geneva in 1542, assured of Zürich's support.[80] In a passage that could as well describe Zwingli, Gordon writes that 'for Calvin the core of Christianity was the proper worship of God. The decision that he could not live with false religion had been the defining moment of his life.' Indeed, Calvin's departure from France had been 'his deliverance from idolatry.'[81]

---

[75] Ibid., i/4. 95.
[76] Ibid., iv/2. 91.
[77] Gordon, *Calvin*, 17, 20.
[78] Lillback, *Binding of God*, 36-38.
[79] Gordon, *Calvin*, 47-64.
[80] Ibid., 85-102; Bruce Gordon, 'Calvin and the Swiss Reformed Churches', in A. Pettegree, A. Duke, and G. Lewis (eds.), *Calvinism in Europe, 1520-1640* (Cambridge: 1994), 69.
[81] Gordon, *Calvin*, 195.

Calvin's concept of covenant has been a focus of academic debate. While Perry Miller has questioned its existence altogether,[82] others see it as peripheral, or distinct from Zürich theology (see above p.5). Jens Møller differentiates between Calvin's emphasis on grace and obedience and the Puritans' contractual relation of these two 'in the vein of Zürich.'[83] More strongly, Leonard Trinterud argues that Calvin's concept of covenant was incompatible with a reciprocal agreement. Instead, he contends that Calvin's covenant was unilateral and unconditional.[84] Baker agrees that Calvin 'simply amplified the idea of testament,' faith being 'only a hypothetical condition.'[85]

Even if exposure to Swiss society did fail to impress upon Calvin's mind the covenantal forms so familiar to Zwingli and Bullinger, there can be no doubt that Calvin's legal training would have led him to consider the question of covenant independently. However, Muller believes that the strong influence of Bullinger's *De testamento* on Calvin's general view of the covenant is undeniable.[86] Lillback has convincingly demonstrated and explored the extensive integration of a mutual, conditional covenant hermeneutic in Calvin's theology.[87] He concludes that there was substantial agreement with Bullinger, and that Calvin's doctrine of predestination was thoroughly reconciled with the covenant.[88] However, Lillback's study focuses upon the 1559

[82] Miller, *New England Mind*, 366-367; Miller, *Errand*, 62.
[83] Møller, 'Beginnings', 64-67.
[84] Trinterud, 'Origins', 56; cf. Greaves, 'Origins', 32.
[85] Baker, *Other Reformed Tradition*, 193-195. Joel Beeke rejects a dogmatic historiographical tendency to treat a unilateral covenant as exemplary but to disparage bilateral formulations: Beeke, *Assurance*, 44n.
[86] Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 126. Muller notes that Calvin's *Épitre a tous amateurs de Jésus-Christ* [*Letter to all those who love Jesus Christ*], written as a preface to the New Testament of Olivetan's French Bible (1535), 'presents a survey of salvation-history [...] in which Calvin's theology parallels Bullinger's earlier treatise on the covenant,' i.e., *De testamento* (1534): Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 23. See also Goeters, 'Föderaltheologie', 247.
[87] Lillback, *Binding of God*, 126-230. This is affirmed by Cornelis Venema, *Accepted and Renewed in Christ: the 'Twofold Grace of God' and the interpretation of Calvin's theology* (Gottingen: 2007), 183-190.
[88] Lillback, *Binding of God*, 306ff; cf. McGiffert, 'Grace and Works', 469. One of Lillback's main concerns, peripheral to this study, is to refute the thesis of discontinuity between Calvin and later federal theologians, e.g., Weir, *Federal Theology*, 9-10, 32. On that debate see Trueman, 'Calvin and Reformed Orthodoxy', 474-476.

edition of the *Institutes of the Christian Religion*,[89] and there are obvious qualifications to be made in light of the fact that the covenant was not among the *loci* discussed in any of the editions. This investigation explores elements of Calvin's concept of covenant that appeared earlier in his career.[90]

The first edition of the *Institutes* was published at Basle in 1536. While there was no specific etymological discussion, Calvin reasoned that 'since the Lord calls his promises "covenants" [*foedera*] and his sacraments "tokens" of the covenants [*symbola foederum*], a simile can be taken from the covenants [*foederibus*] of men.' He then referred, like Bullinger, to the ancient ratification practice of slaying a pig.[91] Calvin also described sacraments as 'seals' (*sigillum*) of God's 'testament or promise' (*testamentum seu promissio*).[92] It seems that Calvin considered *foedus*, *testamentum* and *promissio* to be synonymous, thereby incorporating discussion of God's promise into his concept of covenant.

Calvin believed that Christ was made incarnate 'to enter a covenant [*foedus*] with us.'[93] The agreement had been initiated by God but it was clearly implied that mankind was also bound, discounting any notion of a unilateral testament. The sense of mutual responsibility began with God's lordship and the problem of sin. Divine service and obedience are 'due him by right,' explained Calvin, 'for his nature's sake alone.'[94] Conversely, 'we call sins "debts" because we owe penalty or payment for them to God.'[95] Humanity's failure and inability to give God his due does not exculpate him from responsibility, for

[89] Lillback, *Binding of God*, esp. 126-193.
[90] Ideally Calvin's commentaries and sermons would also be explored. In them Muller finds 'numerous bilateral covenant arguments,' as in Calvin's commentary on Gen. 17 and the bilateral covenant language of Calvin's Deuteronomy sermons: Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 154-155, 183.
[91] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* [1536], trans. F.L. Battles (Grand Rapids, MI: 1986), 88; *CO*, i. 102.
[92] Calvin, *Institutes* [1536], 124; *CO*, i. 142.
[93] Calvin, *Institutes* [1536], 18; *CO*, i. 30.
[94] Calvin, *Institutes* [1536], 15.
[95] Ibid., 81.

> we do not cease to owe the very things we cannot supply. Inasmuch as we are God's creatures, we ought to serve his honour and glory, and obey his commandments. And we are not allowed to excuse ourselves by claiming that we lack ability and, like impoverished debtors, cannot pay our debt [...] we have not discharged our duty, as was fitting. Yet man is swollen with arrogance and ambition and blinded by self-love.[96]

Mutual responsibility was codified in the Mosaic Law. Calvin evidently did not use God's 'promise' in a unilateral sense because he included conditions: 'For the Lord promises that, if anyone should perfectly and exactly fulfil by his effort whatever is commanded, he will receive the reward of eternal life [Lev. 18:5].'[97] Again, 'this condition, that we should carry out the law – *upon which the promises depend* and by which alone they are to be performed – will never be fulfilled.'[98] That mutuality continued into the New Testament era is demonstrated by the conditionality of Christ's promise.[99] Calvin explained that it 'will be fulfilled for none except those who possess a sure and unvarying persuasion that it has to be fulfilled for them.' This must not be misconstrued as unconditional, for God is obliged to fulfil his promise only for 'those who have faith. When, therefore, faith fails, the promise will not remain in force.'[100]

Although faith was the sole condition for justification, under the third use of the law believers were further 'called to sanctification. The function of the law consists in this: by warning men of their duty, to arouse them to pursue holiness and innocence.'[101] Therefore humanity's duty continued after justification under the persisting validity of the moral law which constituted, in short, the law of love: 'to worship God with pure faith and piety [...] to embrace men with

[96] Ibid., 16. The problem of self-love is reminiscent of Zwingli's discussion, see above n.23.
[97] Ibid., 17.
[98] Ibid., 33. My emphasis. By 1559 Calvin taught that the Mosaic Law was intended to 'strengthen [the Jews'] expectation' of the fulfilment of the Abrahamic covenant in Christ: John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. J.T. McNeill, trans. F.L. Battles, 2 vols. (*LCC*; Louisville & London: 1960), 348 (II. vii. 1). See the useful discussion of covenant and law in Kendall, *Calvin*, 27.
[99] Conditionality was not restricted to the Mosaic covenant as suggested by Letham, 'Foedus Operum', 463.
[100] Calvin, *Institutes* [1536], 34.
[101] Ibid., 177.

sincere affection.' The law does not constrain the believer by necessity but represents God's will, which true believers desire to obey.[102]

All responsibilities contained in the covenant are fulfilled by Christ. 'In Christ alone,' wrote Calvin, we find 'the good will of God the Father towards us'[103] and, again, 'this is the new covenant that God in Christ has made with us.'[104] For Zwingli and Bullinger, Christ fulfilled the covenant through union with the believer, thereby becoming the believer's righteousness. Similarly, wrote Calvin, 'if we partake of Christ, in Him we shall possess all the heavenly treasures and gifts of the Holy Spirit which lead us into life and salvation.'[105] However, Calvin accented the imputation of Christ's righteousness:

> But Christ's righteousness, which alone can bear the sight of God because it alone is perfect, must appear in court on our behalf, and stand surety for us in judgment. Received from God, this righteousness is brought to us and imputed to us, just as if it were ours.[106]

For Calvin, Christ's righteousness was detached and imputed to the believer. It was 'brought to us' and 'put on as our own,' 'just as if it were ours.'[107] Although Zwingli and Bullinger would have said that the believer is 'made righteous,' they did not conceive of Christ's righteousness being transported in any way. For them, the believer's righteousness was not so much Christ's as Christ himself (see above pp.85, 94).

Finally, Calvin asserted the continuity of the Old and New Testaments in the context of his sacramental teaching. He claimed that the people of the Old Testament were pointed to

[102] Ibid., 215; cf. I.J. Hesselink, *Calvin's Concept of the Law* (Allison Park, PA: 1992), 36.
[103] Calvin, *Institutes* [1536], 59-60.
[104] Ibid., 152.
[105] Ibid., 18.
[106] Ibid., 35.
[107] Ibid., 34-35.

Christ.[108] Moreover, the promise or covenant with Abraham was 'the very same thing' promised to Christians.[109]

Although Calvin was not expounding the covenant in particular, all the essential elements of the concept, alongside the synonymous idea of promise, were present in the 1536 edition of the *Institutes*. For a catechetical work the covenant would not have been a natural framework, but it still underpinned Calvin's teaching.

The close relationship of 'covenant' and 'promise' originated in the earliest editions of the *Institutes*. The 1536 edition used the terms synonymously (see above p.98).[110] The 1539 edition spoke with more precision of the covenant ('*foedus*') including the promises ('*promissionem*') of eternal life,[111] while the 1541 edition described the promise as being 'comprised [*comprinses*] in that Testament [*Testament*].'[112] They were not so much synonymous as inextricably related.[113]

Lillback describes one passage in the *Institutes* on the sacraments of the Church as perhaps 'the most conclusive evidence of Calvin's adherence to a mutual covenant.'[114] It illustrates the early development of Calvin's concept of covenant.[115] The material originating in 1536 is very limited,[116] but in 1539 Calvin introduced the idea that humanity reciprocates God's promise in

[108] Ibid., 93.
[109] Ibid., 102.
[110] Mutual conditionality is what distinguished Calvin's use of 'promise' from Luther's unilateral understanding.
[111] *CO*, i. 817; cf. Beeke, *Assurance*, 59; Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 884 (III. xx. 25), 1334 (IV. xvi. 11), 1347 (IV. xvi. 24).
[112] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion: 1541 French Edition*, trans. E. McKee (Grand Rapids, MI & Cambridge: 2009), 387; John Calvin, *Institution de la Religion Chrestienne* [1541], ed. J. Pannier (Paris: 1961), iii. 10.
[113] On the consequent necessity of the atonement and Christ's covenant after God's gracious decree to redeem, see Paul Helm, *John Calvin's Ideas* (Oxford: 2004), 333-339.
[114] Lillback, *Binding of God*, 167. On the significance of Calvin's covenant in uniting God's majesty and paternity: Marijn de Kroon, *The Honour of God and Human Salvation: a contribution to an understanding of Calvin's theology according to his Institutes*, trans. L. Bierma and J. Vriend (Edinburgh & New York: 2001), 42-44.
[115] Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 1296 (IV. xiv. 19), cf. 685 (III. vi. 1), 1327 (IV. xvi. 4).
[116] Calvin, *Institutes* [1536], 93.

the sacraments: '*Ut enim illic se pollicetur Dominus* [...] *ita pietatis ac innocentiae professione illi nos mutuo obligamus*' (For as in them the Lord promises … so do we, in turn, bind ourselves to him),[117] or, in the 1541 edition, '*aussi mutuellement nous nous obligeons à luy de le server*' (we also mutually promise ourselves to him to serve him).[118] Again, in the 1539 edition, sacraments are '*professionis notae, quibus palam in Dei nomen iuramus, fidem illi vicissim nostrum obstringentes*' (marks of profession, by which we openly swear allegiance to God, binding ourselves in fealty to him). Consequently, Calvin argued, '*Scite ergo Chrysostomus ipsa alicubi pactiones nuncupat*, […] *quibus in vitae puritatem ac sanctimoniam obstringimur*' (In one place therefore Chrysostom has appropriately called them covenants, … by which we pledge ourselves to purity and holiness of life).[119] This was appropriate, added Calvin in 1559, 'since there is interposed here a mutual agreement [*mutua*] between God and ourselves' in which 'God leagues [*confoederat*] himself with us.'[120] It seems that the concept of mutuality was present from 1539.

The 1539 edition made conditionality more explicit than the 1536 edition. Calvin stated: '*hac enim conditione deus noster est, ut in medio nostri habitet*' (he is our God on this condition, that he dwell among us).[121] Of course, God is bound by his nature to fulfil his responsibilities, for '*nihil ad bonorum omnium affluentiam, adeoque salutis certitudinem deesse, modo nobis Dominus sit in deum*' (we lack nothing for an abundance of all good things, and for assurance of salvation, so long as the Lord is our God).[122] Likewise, conditions are explicitly assigned to humanity: for example, in the 1539 edition, it is considered fair for an adult entering into the

[117] *CO*, i. 952.
[118] Calvin, *Institution* [1541], iii. 217; Calvin, *Institutes* [1541], 506.
[119] *CO*, i. 952. For other examples of Calvin's use of pact, see Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 1087 (IV. v. 3), 1088 (IV. v. 4), 1136 (IV. vii. 17); *CO*, ii. 800-801, 835.
[120] Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 1296 (IV. xiv. 19); *CO*, ii. 956.
[121] *CO*, i. 807; cf. Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 435 (II. x. 8).
[122] *CO*, i. 806.

covenant to learn its conditions beforehand (‘*quoniam eum, qui adulta demum aetate in foederis societam recipitur* […] *eius conditiones antea perdiscere aequuem est*’).[123]

All the workings of the covenant were explicitly Christocentric in the 1536 edition, and this element was emphasised again in 1539.[124] Joel Beeke astutely observes that ‘Calvin directs sinners to Christ and to the promise almost as if they were synonymous.’[125] Indeed, Calvin’s Christology was ‘worked out in the history of the covenant,’ writes Cornelis van der Kooi,[126] for Christ’s death becomes humanity’s reconciliation via the covenant.

Calvin’s concept of the unity of the Testaments was developed properly in the 1539 edition.[127] There he wrote that ‘*patrum omnium foedus adeo substantia et re ipsa nihil a nostro differt, ut unum prorsus atque idem sit*’ (the covenant made with all the patriarchs is so much like ours in substance and reality that the two are actually one and the same).[128] Consequently, the Abrahamic covenant applies to the children of Christians today no less than it did to Jewish infants.[129] However, a distinctly new development in that edition was the eternal nature of the covenant. For example, Calvin wrote that ‘*pertinere ab initio mundi ad novum testamentum filios promissionis*’ (the children of the promise have belonged to the new testament from the beginning of the world).[130] Not only were the elect included in the covenant at Creation, but it would also endure forever, for it was ‘*aeternum et nunquam interiturum semel sanctivit*’ (once established as eternal and never-perishing).[131] Calvin explained differences in administration of

[123] *CO*, i. 985; cf. Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 1151 (IV. viii. 2), 1347 (IV. xvi. 24).
[124] Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 431 (II. x. 4), 454 (II. xi. 4). Calvin’s teaching on righteousness in 1536 was retained in subsequent editions. The believer was ‘clothed’ with Christ’s innocence and ‘furnished’ with righteousness: Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 779 (III. xiv. 12), cf. 524 (II. xvi. 16).
[125] Beeke, *Assurance*, 48.
[126] Cornelis van der Kooi, ‘Christology’, trans. G. Sheeres, in H. Selderhuis (ed.), *The Calvin Handbook* (Grand Rapids & Cambridge: 2009), 259.
[127] Muller points to this as a continuity between Zwingli and Calvin: Muller, *Unaccommodated Calvin*, 124-125.
[128] *CO*, i. 802; cf. Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 429 (II. x. 2), 434 (II. x. 7).
[129] *CO*, i. 971; cf. Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 1328 (IV. xvi. 5).
[130] *CO*, i. 825; cf. Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 459 (II. xi. 10).
[131] *CO*, i. 821; cf. Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 454 (II. xi. 4).

the covenant as its manifestations becoming increasingly radiant during the course of biblical history.[132]

Thus, the concept of covenant had emerged in Calvin's theology by 1536 and had developed reciprocal features by 1539. He demonstrated a concern, similar to Zwingli and Bullinger, to place Christ at the centre of his discussion of the covenant.

Conclusion

This chapter has identified consistency between the concepts of covenant developed by Zwingli, Bullinger and Calvin. All three agreed that the covenant was unilaterally initiated by God, but that it operated bilaterally between God and humanity. Obligations, which acted as conditions for the fulfilment of salvation, were imposed on each party. While God was obliged to grant salvation to those pleading Christ's atonement, humanity was required to strive for godliness in accordance with divine law. The consequences of defaulting on these conditions amounted to covenantal sanctions.

From 1523 Zwingli used the covenant to structure a Christocentric soteriology directed towards true worship according to God's law. He understood Christ's atonement as both the ratification of the covenant and the fulfilment of the righteous demands which the covenant makes upon mankind. A life of godliness and true worship would receive God's promised blessing and salvation. Bullinger was indebted to Zwingli's enunciation of the covenant, which he perceived to be the principal idea in theology. He refined the concept in its detail and expanded it in its application to the community more generally. He particularly sought to place contemporary Christian obligations to please God and to love neighbour in the context of salvation history. Calvin's concept of covenant developed in the late 1530s in line with the Zürichers, apparently

[132] Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 446; cf. Peter Opitz, 'Scripture', trans. R. Giselbrecht, in H. Selderhuis (ed.), *The Calvin Handbook* (Grand Rapids & Cambridge: 2009), 238-239, 243.

drawing on their ideas. All the main elements of his concept were present by 1539. Thus, the leading theologians of Zürich and Geneva shared a consistent concept of reciprocal covenant.

III. English Concepts of Covenant

> And so shall hys ryghteousnesse upon theyr chylders children: euen unto suche as kepe his couenaunt. And are mindful of his commaundementes, to fulfyll them.
>
> *Psalm 103:17-18*.[1]

AMONGST the most theologically sophisticated of the early English evangelicals were those who went into exile on the continent. They moved in closer proximity to the mainstreams of Reformation and many of them appear to have been carried along by the Reformed current. This chapter analyses the reciprocal concept of covenant in the writings of William Tyndale, Miles Coverdale and John Hooper, three exiles whose formulation of the covenant is suggestive of their exposure to Swiss Reformed theology. Wayne Baker has gone so far as to hypothesise that they each developed their concepts 'in connection with their contacts with Zürich' specifically.[2] The fourth figure investigated in this chapter is John Bradford, an Edwardian evangelical who never experienced exile and received limited exposure to Swiss theology. It is suggested below that his unilateral concept of covenant resulted from alternative influences which would not have commended reciprocity to him.

William Tyndale

Tyndale was born in Gloucestershire and probably studied at both Oxford and Cambridge.[3] In 1524, at the age of thirty, he moved permanently to the continent, living mainly in Antwerp. The earliest of his extant writings was printed at Cologne in 1525: the prologue to his English New Testament. Although select material was appropriated from Luther's German New Testament prologue (1522), Tyndale's prologue was twice as long and demonstrated his

[1] Miles Coverdale, *The Psalter or Boke of Psalmes Both in Latyn and Englyshe* (1540; RSTC 2368), fol. lxxxvii.
[2] J. Wayne Baker, 'Zwinglianism' (*OER*, 4; New York & Oxford: 1996), 326.
[3] Daniell, *Tyndale*, esp. 49-54.

independence of mind. He was no more dependent on Luther than were contemporary Zürich reformers.[4] In the couple of pages that did follow Luther closely, Tyndale explained 'newe testament' as when a man

> shall dye appoynteth hys goodds to be dealte and distributed after hys dethe amonge them which he nameth to be hys heyres. Even so Christ before hys dethe commaunded and appoynted that suche evangelion[,] gospel[,] er tydyngs shulde be declared through oute all the worlde and there with to geve unto all that beleve all his goodds that is to saye his lyfe.[5]

The understanding of testament is apparently unilateral. There is insufficient detail to be sure whether faith was a conditional prerequisite in Tyndale's view. The apprehension of Christ by faith is affirmed yet emphasis falls on the rehabilitation of humanity which cannot initiate its own salvation because of the bondage of the will. Owing to original sin, humanity is 'full of the naturall poyson where of all synfull deds spryng.'[6] Christ's work is primarily regenerative, effectively involving the impartation of a proleptic righteousness to the believer.[7] When the elect are plucked out of Adam and grafted into Christ we 'consent to the lawe and love it inwardly in oure hert and desyre to fulfyll it.'[8] Even if Tyndale's 'testament' here appears to be concurrent with Luther's, his ethical emphasis on the fulfilment of the law was undoubtedly different. Since Tyndale did not conceive of justification as a forensic declaration elicited by faith, reciprocity would have been a natural development of his concept.

---

[4] Trinterud, 'Reappraisal', 24-26, 41; Daniell, *Tyndale*, 119-127. Trinterud believes that 'Tyndale's greatest debt was first to Christian humanism and then to the German-Swiss reformers of Zurich and Basle.'

[5] William Tyndale, *The New Testament* [*Cologne Fragment*, 1525] (Cologne: 1525; RSTC 2823), A3r. The bequeathing of Christ's 'lyfe' may anticipate the apprehension of Christ and his righteousness by the believer enunciated in 1528. See below n.21.

[6] Ibid., A4v-B1r. This emphasis is more akin to Zwingli than to Luther, see above p.87.

[7] Tyndale understood justification as the healing of human infirmity, generally translating *dikaioō* as 'make righteous.' In five of the thirty-one New Testament verses containing the verbal forms of *dikaioō*, Tyndale preferred 'account' or 'reckon righteous.' This makes for interesting comparison with Zwingli, see above p.85. See also n.21 below and Knox, *Doctrine of Faith*, 5-8, 19; Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 84-94. Luther himself allowed a breadth of interpretation, primarily, but by no means exclusively, using language of declaration and acquittal: see Lohse, *Luther's Theology*, 260.

[8] Tyndale, *Cologne Fragment*, B1r; cf. Hall, 'Lutheranism in England', 110.

Tyndale's *Prologue to the Epistle to the Romans* (1526) also demonstrates that he was not slavishly dependent upon Luther.[9] It departed from Luther's own version by specifying thrice that God was not satisfied by outward works 'only'. Whereas Luther wrote that 'faith alone makes a person righteous,'[10] Tyndale claimed that 'nowe is the sprite no nodyr [other] wyse geven then by fayth only,' which allowed him to preserve the subsequent importance of works to the fulfilment of the law. Such fulfilment required that works be done with love from 'the botome of the hert.'[11] Herein lay Tyndale's soteriological interest: the effect of faith in creating desire to fulfil the law. Whereas Luther had weighted his remarks upon the freedom to work 'without compulsion' brought by faith,[12] Tyndale enthused that faith gives 'strengthe to worke the dedes of the lawe with love even as the lawe requireth.'[13] His emphasis was not solifidian so much as on true godliness. He did not, however, relate this to his concept of testament.

Tyndale's first treatise, *The Parable of the Wycked Mammon* (May 1528), was inspired by Luther's *Sermon von dem unrechten Mammon* (1522). Although it expounded justification by faith, Tyndale was undoubtedly more interested in Luther's teaching on the works appropriate after justification.[14] The clearest indication of a concept of covenant is located in a marginal note: 'God hath made an everlastynge covenaunt with us yt we shuld no more go astraye after oure good intent.' The adjacent text refers to a testament which is apparently bilateral: owing to humanity's helplessness 'God made a testamente betwene him & us wherin is contayned bothe what he wolde have us do, and what he would have us to [ask] of him. Se therefore yt thou do nothyng to playse god with all but that he commaundeth.'[15] Although this testament was initiated unilaterally by God, it was the first time Tyndale mentioned a relationship carrying

[9] Trueman and Euler, 'Reception of Luther', 64.
[10] Martin Luther, *Preface to the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans* [1522], trans. C. Jacobs (*LW*, 35; Philadelphia: 1960), 368.
[11] William Tyndale, *A compendious introduccion, prologe or preface vnto the pistle off Paul to the Romayns* (Worms: 1526; RSTC 24438), A2v-A3v, A4v.
[12] Luther, *Preface to Romans*, 371; cf. Trinterud, 'Reappraisal', 27-31.
[13] Tyndale, *Romayns*, A5r; cf. O'Donovan, *Law and Authority*, 59-62.
[14] McGiffert, 'Tyndale', 175n; Euler, 'Does Faith Translate?', 85.
[15] William Tyndale, *A treatyse of the iustificacyon by faith only, otherwise called the parable of the Wyked Mammon* [1528] (Southwarke: 1536; RSTC 24455), I8r; cf. Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 110.

reciprocal responsibilities.[16] This was exceptional, however, because Tyndale did not usually make mutuality explicit. Elsewhere in the treatise God is understood to have made a testament in Christ's blood, with all who trust in Christ's blood.[17] Conversely the bishops 'wolde devyde you from Christ and his holy testament & ioine you to the pope to beleve in his testament and promises.'[18]

Undoubtedly Tyndale considered God's testament to be at the core of the Gospel message, even if a bilateral concept of covenant was peripheral in his thought in 1528. It is nonetheless possible with hindsight to detect many of the themes that would eventually become a consolidated concept of covenant. God's law 'requireth impossible thynges of us,' so the right response is faith in 'the glad tydyngs & promyses which God hath made and sworne to us in Christ.' This faith should be unwavering, befitting the fact that God 'cannot but fulfyl his promyses.' Not only are his promises necessarily delivered, they also endure perpetually, for 'Goddes worde onely lasteth for ever and that whiche he hathe sworn doth abyde, when al other thinges peryshe.'[19] This promised salvation is elicited specifically by repentance which involves 'consentinge to the law and belevyng the promyses,' or cleaving to God's promises,[20] because 'the consent of the hart unto the law, is unite & peace betwene god & man.'[21] Luther, by contrast, had written in 1520 that the first concern of every Christian should be 'to strengthen faith alone and through faith to grow in the knowledge, not of works, but of Christ

[16] This is 'clearly in the line of Zürich theology,' writes Møller, 'Beginnings', 51.
[17] Tyndale, *Mammon*, H2v, H5r, M6v.
[18] Ibid., A5v. The 'testament of the pope' recurs in William Tyndale, *The exposition of the fyrst epistle of Seynt Jhon with a prologge before it* (Antwerp: 1531; RSTC 24443), D2v; William Tyndale, *An exposicion vppon the v. vi. vii. chapters of Mathew* (Antwerp?: 1533?; RSTC 24440), L3v.
[19] Tyndale, *Mammon*, A8r-B2v.
[20] Ibid., B6v, E8v, H2r.
[21] Ibid., F3v-4r, cf. I3v. For Tyndale, justification is based specifically upon the apprehension of Christ's righteousness as one's own. Tyndale echoed Luther in writing that 'by good dedes shalt thou be saued, not which thou hast done, but which christ hath done for ye. For christ is thin[e], & al his dedes are thy dedes. Christ is in the[e] & thou in him knyt together inseparable.' However, Tyndale went beyond Luther when he wrote: 'Moreover thy harte is good, right holy & iust. For thy harte is no enemye to the lawe but a frend & a louer. The law & thy hart are agreed & at one, & therfore is God at one with the[e]': Idem.

Jesus.'[22] Although Tyndale did not emphasise it, in practice repentance functions as a condition: 'if we do repent again, we have always mercy laid up for us.' Subsequently the believer turns himself to God's commandments, which Tyndale expounded as duties. He used the term 'law of love' to link love for God with seeking 'the honoure of god in all men, & to drawe (as much as in hym is) all men unto god.'[23]

It has been said that Tyndale's next book, published five months later, pleased Henry VIII.[24] *The Obedience of a Christian Man* (October 1528) defended evangelical doctrine from charges of licence by teaching 'what obedience God requyreth of vs vnto father and mother[,] master[,] lorde[,] kinge & all superiours.'[25] The *Obedience* exhibited numerous examples of Tyndale's use of 'testament' as God's promise, good news or last will.[26] He observed that judicial authority extended to the 'turke or sareson' even though they were 'not vnder the everlastinge testamente of God in Christe.' Indeed, only true believers are included under this testament: 'few of vs which are called Christen be and even no mo[re] then to whom God hath sente his promyses and powred his sprite in to their hertes to beleve them and thorow fayth graven lust in their hertes to fulfill the lawe of love.' Infidels, whether Turks or nominal Christians, are instead under the 'testamente of the lawe naturall' which contains 'promyses of worldly thinges.'[27] Later, assailing Bishop Fisher's sermon of 11 February 1526 against Luther, which had recently become available in print, Tyndale insisted that the Gospel included not only the four evangelists but the 'open preachinge of Christe and the holy testamente and gracious

[22] Martin Luther, *The Freedom of a Christian* [1520], trans. H. Grimm (*LW*, 31; Philadelphia: 1957), 347.
[23] Tyndale, *Mammon*, H3r, cf. G2r.
[24] Mozley, *William Tyndale*, 142.
[25] William Tyndale, *The Obedience of a Christen Man and how Christen rulers ought to governe* (Antwerp: 1528; RSTC 24446), C1v.
[26] Ibid., C2r, I5v, I6v, L4r, L7v-L8v, M5v, O7r, P6v, Q7r, R2v, R7r-v, S8r, T3v, V3r, V5v.
[27] Ibid., G4v-G5r.

promises that God hath made in Christes bloude to all that repente and beleve.' Christ, the testament and the promises were to be found in all Scripture.[28]

There were some occasions when Tyndale deployed a bilateral concept of covenant. It is evident that the testament made demands upon humanity since it was possible to be 'disobedient vnto Gods testamente.' Those who sought to offer satisfaction other than Christ's blood were trying to 'compell God to obeye' another testament.[29] Tyndale attacked 'hypocrites' who put their trust in outward works thinking that 'the saynt for weringe soch a garmente and for soch deades is become so glorious in heven. Yf I doo lyke wise so shall I be also.' Rather than enjoying God's liberality, such people make saints into mediators 'and of their blinde imaginacion make a testamente or bonde betwene the saynt and them[,] the testamente of Christes bloude cleane forgoten.'[30] In this instance Tyndale used the words 'testamente' and 'bonde' interchangeably for an agreement 'betwene' two parties, suggesting that this testament is mutual and at least implying mutuality in Christ's testament. Similarly, the apostles' preaching of Christ had been accompanied by miracles confirming the promises and eternal testament which 'God had made betwene man & him in Christes bloude.'[31] God, in contrast to inconstant human kings, is reliable because he 'hath also made vs promyses and hath sworne: ye hath made a testamente or a covenaunt and hath bound him selfe and hath sealed his obligacion with Christes bloude and confirmed it with myracles.'[32] Tyndale uses the terms 'testament' and 'covenaunt' here to express God's obligation. Later in the text, humanity's responsibilities are said to have been appointed in Scripture and consist, with regard to God, of believing his testament.[33] Humanity's responsibilities are not, it seems, part of the testament,

[28] Ibid., H4v-H5r.
[29] Ibid., I6v.
[30] Ibid., E5r.
[31] Ibid., P4v.
[32] Ibid., P7v-P8r.
[33] Ibid., T7v.

although the fact that servants in 'covenauntes' with their masters are to obey them as God is perhaps suggestive.[34]

Tyndale's translation of the Pentateuch finally appeared in January 1530,[35] delayed by his involvement in a shipwreck *en route* to Hamburg.[36] The bilateral concept of covenant was much stronger than in his earlier works, beginning in the preface, which mentioned 'the everlastinge testament[,] promises[,] and a[p]poyntemente made betwene god & vs.'[37] In the Genesis text Tyndale variously translated *bĕrît* as 'apoyntement' (Gen. 6:18; 9:13), 'covenaunte' (Gen. 15:18), 'bonde' (Gen. 9:9, 11-12; 17:7, 13, 19, 21; 21:27, 32; 26:28; 31:44), and 'testamente' (Gen. 9:15-17; 17:7, 9-11, 13-14). At the end of Genesis 'a table expoundinge certeyne wordes' offered two possible definitions of 'testament'. The first was 'an appoyntement made betwene god and man.' The second was 'goddes promyses.' Tyndale clearly understood the former to indicate a bilateral appointment because he cited Gen. 17, where circumcision

> representeth the promyses of god to Abraham on the one syde and that Abraham and his s[e]ed shuld circumcyse and cut off the lustes of their fleshe on the other

[34] Ibid., D4r.

[35] See Dahlia Karpman, 'William Tyndale's Response to the Hebraic Tradition', *Studies in the Renaissance*, 14 (1967), 115; G. Lloyd Jones, *The Discovery of Hebrew in Tudor England: a third language* (Manchester: 1983), 115-123. Tyndale may have acquired Hebrew at Wittenberg in 1524. Arguments in favour of his visit there are made by Mozley, *William Tyndale*, 51-53 and Preserved Smith, 'Englishmen at Wittenberg in the Sixteenth Century', *EHR*, 36 (1921) 422-433. If Tyndale did visit, Luther's influence must have been limited since Tyndale denied confederacy with Luther: William Tyndale, *An Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue*, ed. H. Walter (PS; Cambridge: 1849), 147. No substantive details of the alleged visit were recorded by Foxe, *AM* [1583], viii. 1100. Further arguments against the visit are advanced by Daniell, *Tyndale*, 109, 297-302, 306-309; E.G. Rupp, *Six Makers of English Religion 1500-1700* (1957), 18. Tyndale did not limit himself to Luther's translations but also made use of Zürich scholarship: Clebsch, *Earliest Protestants*, 142.

[36] Foxe, *AM* [1583], viii. 1101. There is no contemporary evidence of Tyndale's being in Hamburg, but the details of Foxe's account are persuasive: after travelling in two ships, Tyndale spent Easter (28 March) until December 1529 in Hamburg, assisted by Miles Coverdale, residing in the house of Margaret van Emmerson, during an outbreak of sweating sickness. Tyndale may have left Antwerp following official searches for him in summer 1528 and his official denunciation in January 1529. Coverdale's presence is also plausible. See Mozley, *William Tyndale*, 150-153; Loane, *Masters*, 82-83. Hamburg's Reformation was secured in 1528-9 making it a good sanctuary for Tyndale's work. Foxe is correct about what was an unusual and sudden outbreak of sweating sickness in Hamburg that year. Perhaps a shipwreck experience explains Tyndale's selection of Jonah for his next translation.

[37] William Tyndale, *The Pentateuch* (Antwerp: 1530; RSTC 2350), W.T. to the reader. This work is unpaginated.

> syde to walke in the wayes of the lorde: As baptyme which is come in the roume therof now signifieth on the one syde how that all that repent and beleue are washed in Christes bloud: And on the other syde how that the same must quench and droune the lustes of the flesh to folow the steppes of Christ.[38]

The appointment made requirements of both parties: God should fulfil his promises and Abraham should mortify sin and live a godly life. Tyndale appeared to favour the bilateral meaning by his consistent rendering of *bĕrît* as 'covenaunt' in the 1534 revision of the text. Certainly the meaning of 'testament' as God's promise receded in the revision, although Tyndale presumably also simply intended to translate the same Hebrew word consistently with the same English word.[39]

In the Exodus prologue from the 1530 edition Tyndale explained that God reliably acts for those who 'beleve his promises and herken vnto his commaundmentes and with pacience cleaue vnto him and walke with him: euen so shall he do for vs, yf we receaue the witnesse of Christ with a stronge faith and endure paciently folowinge his steppes.'[40] It seems likely that Tyndale had in mind the condition of Gen. 17:1 to 'walke before me and be vncorrupte.' Indeed, Tyndale suggested the basic continuity of the Old and New Testaments when he wrote that 'the newe testament was euer, euen from the beginning of the world,' since Christ was always promised. Those who default and 'falle from the fayth of the promyses and love of the lawe and ordinaunces of god' are forsaken by God 'for oure dishonouringe of his name and despisinge of oure neghboure.' Then 'god persecuteth us because we abuse his holye testament, and because when we knowe the truth we folowe it not.' Thus, in the Pentateuch prologues, Tyndale sought to show the relevance of the covenantal imperatives and sanctions of the Old Testament to the Christian.

---

[38] Ibid., A table expoundinge certeyn wordes.
[39] William Tyndale, *The Firste Boke of Moses called Genesis newly correctyd and amendyd by W.T* (Antwerp: 1534; RSTC 2351).
[40] Tyndale, *Pentateuch*, Exodus Prologue. On claiming God's faithfulness, see McGiffert, 'Tyndale', 174.

It can be argued that Tyndale's emphasis on godliness in the Exodus prologue does not undermine the gracious basis of justification. Justification on the basis of meritorious works is disqualified since Tyndale wrote that 'it is not sayde of that testament he that worketh shall lyue: But he that beleveth shall lyue.' Rather, the condition for receiving the promises of Christ is faith alone, 'in whiche promyses the electe were then iustifyed inwardly before God.'[41] The promises deliver justification by sending the Spirit: 'the sprete entreth the hart [of those who believe] and quyckeneth it, and geueth her lyfe and iustifieth her.' Faith is the means of receiving the Spirit, but justification is graciously based on the Spirit's action on the heart. The Spirit 'also maketh the lawe a lyuely thing in the herte, so that a man bringeth forth good workes of his awne ac[c]ord without compulsion of the lawe, without feare of threateninges or cursinges.'[42] Rather than law, it is love which 'compelleth me,' and both 'the fayth of the promyses and love of the lawe' are required by God for the individual to be justified. A lack of works indicates their absence and is deserving of 'persecution' by God.[43]

The closing passages of *The Practice of Prelates* (late 1530), which concern Henry VIII's 'Great Matter', show the essential unity of the Old and New Testaments in Tyndale's theology. The Mosaic Law was divided into three parts: ceremonial, penal and natural.[44] The ceremonial laws 'cease assone as christ had offered upp the sacrifice of his bodye and bloude for us,' but had functioned in part to signify to the Jews 'the promysse and appoyntement made betwene

[41] Tyndale, *Pentateuch*, Exodus Prologue.
[42] Ibid.; cf. Luther, *Freedom of a Christian*, 348-349.
[43] Tyndale, *Pentateuch*, Exodus Prologue. Tyndale is 'extremely vague' on the atonement (Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 88) and although the synthesis here seems justified it is important to remember that Tyndale did not utilise an *ordo salutis* framework (Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 87n). In a separate category was justification 'outwardly before the world by kepynge of the lawe and ceremonies' in the sense that works declare the righteousness of the believer in the sight of God. Tyndale was not expounding 'double justification' (wherein justification is partly based on works) since outward justification is only a testimony of the justifying work of the Spirit on the heart and corresponds to what is more commonly known as 'sanctification.' cf. Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 102-104; Fenlon, *Heresy*, 53-61. Tyndale's position has therefore been misrepresented by Knox who accuses him of 'overthrowing the whole basis of the Reformation!': Knox, *Doctrine of Faith*, 6, 19-21. Knox's criticism is valid only if the 'basis of the Reformation' is defined as Luther's solifidianism.
[44] cf. Melanchthon, *Loci Communes*, 53f. Tyndale probably had access to the 1521 edition.

god and man.'[45] Penal laws bound the Jews only. However, the natural law, the law of faith and love requiring belief, trust and love of God, 'pertayneth unto all nacyons indifferentlye.' This law applied apart from Moses and 'whosoever hath this lawe graven in his harte this same kepeth all lawes.' Tyndale expounded these laws from the Decalogue. He emphasised the efficacy of natural law to propagate true worship of God.[46] This is not legalism, since Tyndale was discussing the life of worshipful obedience of the loving Christian under God's testament rather than the forensic justification of the sinner.[47]

1531 was a prolific year of publication for Tyndale. In May his translation of Jonah appeared, reiterating justification by grace with a reminder that 'the fulfillynge of the law is a fastfayth in christes bloud coupled wt our profession & submyttinge ourselues to lerne to doo better.'[48] A willingness to become godly was essential: 'On the one syde' God treats with compassion 'his electe which submitte them selues as scolers to lerne to walke in the wayes of his lawes & to kepe them of loue.' 'On the other side' those who do not meet this condition, 'they that hardened their hertes & synned of malice & refused mercie that was offered them & had no power to repent perished at the later ende with all confusion & shame mercilessely.'[49] Within God's sovereign choice there was both blessing and curse, yet the emphasis was on the ability of the believer to act so as to elicit God's compassion. Jonah was the story of 'an obligacion

[45] William Tyndale, *The Practyse of Prelates, whether the kinges grace maye be separated from hys quene, be cause she was his brothers wyfe* (Antwerp: 1530; RSTC 24465), H8r. See below p.118.
[46] Ibid., I1r.
[47] Clebsch misconstrues Tyndale's increased emphasis on mutuality in 1530 as a radical innovation. Tyndale's first mention of a 'bipartite agreement' was in 1528 (see above p.108) not in *The Practice of Prelates* as Clebsch suggests (Clebsch, *Earliest Protestants*, 161). Trueman's impression of fundamental consistency in Tyndale's writings obscures the increased emphasis on mutuality, and his observations on forensic justification do not reflect Tyndale's own focus on God's promise to 'kepe them that kepe his lawes' after justification: Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 106-107, 119; Tyndale, *Practyse of Prelates*, H7r; cf. C.S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century excluding Drama* (Oxford: 1954), 182f; Cargill Thompson, 'Two Regiments', 26. McGiffert's study concentrating on conditionality and works in Tyndale's theology exonerates him from charges of legalism: see McGiffert, 'Tyndale', 167-184.
[48] William Tyndale, *The Prophete Ionas* (Antwerp: 1531; RSTC 2788), A4r.
[49] Ibid., A4v-A5r.

betwene God and thy soule'[50] in which the believer could exercise the will and ability to be godly by faith in God's promise implanted in the heart:

> with Jonas let them that wayte on vanities & seke god here & there & in euery temple saue in their hertes goo & seke thou the testament of god in thyne hert. For in thyne hert is the worde of the law & in thyne hert is the worde of fayth in the promises of mercie in Jesus Christe. So that yf thou confesse with a repentynge herte & knowlege and surely beleue that Jesus is lorde ouer all synne thou art saffe.[51]

Thus faith was a part of Tyndale's concept of true worship according to the testament, giving confidence in the attainment of victory over sin.

In July 1531 Tyndale's *Answer* to Sir Thomas More's barbed *Dialogue concerning heresies* (1529) was published. Tyndale wrote that 'the testament of Christ's blood' is received by Christians and 'in it' they 'walketh and serveth God in the spirit,'[52] suggesting that believers' participation in the testament is not passive. The testament was the forgiveness of sins, built not on works but on faith in Christ's blood. Works deserved no reward, whether their motivation was 'worldly' or 'heavenly'.[53] Particularly noteworthy with regard to Tyndale's *Answer* is William Clebsch's detection of the influence of *Vom Alten und Neuen Gott* by Joachim Vadian, the reformer of St. Gall and an imitator of Zwingli.[54] This connection increases the likelihood of Tyndale's acquaintance with other Swiss Reformed theological works.[55]

In the autumn of 1531 Tyndale applied his consolidated concept of covenant to the New Testament. He revised his New Testament prologue of 1525 as *A Pathway into the Holy*

[50] Ibid., A6r.
[51] Ibid., C3r.
[52] Tyndale, *Answer*, 108-109.
[53] Ibid., 200, 204.
[54] Clebsch, *Earliest Protestants*, 169-170.
[55] Wayne Baker believes that Tyndale could easily have accessed Zwingli's writings: Baker, *Other Reformed Tradition*, 208-209; Zwingli's influence is also asserted by Gregory Miller, 'Huldrych Zwingli', in C. Lindberg (ed.), *The Reformation Theologians: an introduction to theology in the early modern period* (Oxford: 2002), 165. Bullinger's influence is inferred to explain Tyndale's interest in covenant by Collinson, 'Tyndale', 87. Ralph Werrell's view that Tyndale was completely at odds with continental concepts of covenant seems difficult to sustain: Werrell, *Tyndale*, 46-47.

Scripture with a dozen additions achieving a more nuanced biblical theology of the Christian life. That God fulfils his promises 'for his [Christ's] sake' affirmed justification by grace through faith: 'Christ bringeth the love of God unto us, and not our own holy works.' Nonetheless, at the point of justification 'we receive love unto the law, and power to fulfil it, and grow therein daily.'[56] Tyndale opposed attempts to fulfil the law by 'outward deeds' with the truth that 'love only is the fulfilling of the law.' The believer fulfils the law by having faith, consenting to the righteousness of the law, thereby justifying God its maker, and having the desire to fulfil it. This is the love that fulfils the law: although they cannot 'always' fulfil it in their lives, they genuinely want to.[57] The convert experiences a shift from desire for the devil's law to a desire for God's.[58] Although 'we know that good deeds are rewarded, both in this life and the life to come,' they are not rewarded with justification in the sight of God.[59] Instead Tyndale writes of sanctification wherein 'we wax perfecter alway' and perform the true worship of God 'with working according to the doctrine, and not with blind works of our own imagining.'[60]

The covenant hermeneutic which underpinned the *Pathway* was explained in Tyndale's *Exposition of the fyrste epistle of seynt Jhon* published in September 1531. He traced the concept of covenant historically to the ancient world,

> when a loue day or a truse was made betwene man and man the couenauntes were rehersid: and upon that they slewe bestes in a memorial and remembraunce of thappoyntement only.[61]

[56] Tyndale, *Treatises*, 11.
[57] Ibid., 12-13.
[58] Ibid., 17-19.
[59] Ibid., 20.
[60] Ibid., 23. The *Pathway* is traduced as religion subsumed under morality by Clebsch, *Earliest Protestants*, 168. On the contrary, morality was put to the service of piety, writes McGiffert, 'Tyndale', 175. Tyndale was making an impassioned call to a life of worship in truth and love which is different from the ethical imperatives seen by Clebsch, yet more profound than a simple reaffirmation of good works proving inward justification observed by Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 102.
[61] Tyndale, *Exposition of the fyrst epistle of Seynt Jhon*, H1r-v.

In view of humanity's natural inability to understand Scripture, Tyndale invoked appreciation of the covenant as the necessary tool for comprehension:

> If our hertes wer taught thappoyntment made between god & us in Christes bloud when we wer baptised we had the kay to open the scripture & light to se & perceyve the true meaning of it & the scripture shulde be easy to understonde. And because we be not taght that profession is the cause whi the scripture is so darke & so fare passinge our capacyte.[62]

The true worship of God is 'to love hym for his mercye,' which love is expressed in good works and personal holiness.[63] Immediately followed 'the conditions of the peace that is made betwene God & us in Christes bloude':

> The lawe is set befor us unto which if we consent and submit oure selves to be scholers therof then are not only al oure forsinnnes forgiven both *p*[*o*]*ena* and *culpa* (with our holy fathers licence ever) but also al our infirmities weknes pronite [proneness] redinese and motions unto sinne are pardoned and taken awarth and we translated frome under the damnation of the lawe [...]. So that we shal not henceforth as longe as we forsake not our profession be iudged by the rigournese of the lawe But chastised if we do amyse as children that ar under no lawe.[64]

This mutual, conditional covenant was described by Tyndale as an 'indentyd obligation'[65] binding on both parties. It was unilaterally initiated by God for salvation, confirmed by his Spirit, and carried the threat of damnation for the impenitent covenant-breaker:

> For first God which alone hath powere to helpe or hurte hath made apoyntment betwixt hym & us in Christes bloude & hath bounde hym self to g[i]ve us what so ever we [ask] in his name testifiynge therto that ther is no nother name to be savyd by & that he wilbe a father unto us & save us bothe in this life & in the lyfe to come & take us from under the damnation of the lawe & set us under grace and mercie to be scholers only to learne the lawe and that our unperfect dedes shalbe taken in worth ye and thought at a tyme we marre al thoroue oure infirmitie yet if we turne agayne that shabe forgeuen us mercifully so that we shalbe under no

[62] Ibid., A5v.
[63] Ibid., B8r.
[64] Ibid., B8v, cf. C5r, C6v.
[65] Ibid., C5v. According to the *OED*, 'an indenture was a deed between two or more parties with mutual obligations, executed in two or more copies, all having their tops or edges indented or serrated for identification and security.'

> damnation: which testament is confirmed with signes and wonders wrought thorowe the holy gost.[66]

Tyndale's literary output during 1531, and his exposition of 1 John pre-eminently so, was the fruit of a consolidation of the concept of covenant which had probably begun in 1529. His writings became more robust in their treatment of the Christian life as compared, for instance, to his Romans Prologue of 1526. The reciprocal covenant was not so much an innovation in Tyndale's theology as the amplification of aspects of his earlier concept of testament. This is suggested by Tyndale's enduring preference for the word 'testament' in 1530-31, albeit redefined as 'appointment'.[67]

The remainder of Tyndale's writings exhibited a soteriology harmonised, but not practically altered, by the consolidated concept of covenant already established by 1531.[68] His *Exposicion vppon the v. vi. vii. chapters of Mathew* (1533)[69] claimed them as 'the keye and the dore' of Scripture, and his prologue contained 'the whole somme of the couenaunt made betwene God and vs, vppon which we be baptised to kepe it.'[70] Emphasising the conditionality of God's promises, Tyndale wrote that they 'are all made on this condition or covenant on our party, that we henceforth love the law of God, to walk therein, and to do it, and to fashion our lives thereafter.' The promise of justification was not, however, based on law-keeping but, like a king pardoning a murderer, the condition that 'he henceforth keep the law' was imposed,

[66] Ibid; cf. King, 'Printing of Religious Propaganda', 113.
[67] Clebsch is incorrect to claim that the 'appointment' meaning first appeared in the *Exposition* since Tyndale had given this definition of 'testament' in his Pentateuch glossary twenty-one months earlier. See the otherwise useful analysis in Clebsch, *Earliest Protestants*, 172-173.
[68] On Tyndale's *Brief Declaration of the Sacraments* see below p.118. Therein Tyndale claimed that faith without godliness was insufficient for salvation: 'they only, w[hich] turne to god to kepe hys Lawes shall haue mercye for chrysts sake': William Tyndale, *A Briefe Declaration of the Sacraments* (1548; RSTC 24445), C3r.
[69] Tyndale, like other Reformed theologians, argued that, in the Sermon on the Mount, Christ was restoring the Old Testament law from the corruption of the Pharisees, a 'spiritual Isaac' re-digging the wells of Abraham. Christ was not introducing new legislation. This opposed both the Roman argument that Christ instituted new 'counsels of perfection' and the Anabaptist rejection of Old Testament commands on the basis of Christ's new law. I am indebted to Dr Sarah Mortimer for discussion of this point.
[70] Tyndale, *Mathew*, title page. McGiffert argues that Tyndale's continued relation of the covenant to the New Testament undermines Clebsch's view that engagement with the Pentateuch was seminal for its 'discovery': McGiffert, 'Tyndale', 175n.

meaning that the law must be kept to remain in God's favour following justification.[71] This meant, for example, that in the case of the petition from the Lord's Prayer, 'if thou wilt entre in to the couenaunt of thy lorde God, and forgeue thy brother: then what so euer thou hast committed agaynst God, if thou repent and [ask] him forgeuenesse, thou art sure that thou art so absolued by these wordes, that none in heauen ner erthe can bynde the.'[72]

The righteousness of the Christian was consequently based upon faith and also upon consent in the heart to the goodness of the law and submission to it.[73] At the point of conversion, or reconciliation, righteousness was entirely alien (it 'cometh of God altogether'), but after atonement and reconciliation 'we be partlye ryghtwesse in oure selves and unrightwese' reflecting our degree of sanctification.[74] Tyndale was nonetheless at pains to separate the discharge of mankind's duty from God's decision to bind himself to the promise of justification. For his part, God was always righteous unless he could be shown to be breaking his own promise to 'them that kepe covenaunt with him.'[75] God had promised to help the believer to keep his part of the covenant, to accept imperfect faith and effort, and to forgive failure.[76]

---

[71] William Tyndale, *Expositions and Notes on Sundry Portions of the Holy Scriptures, together with the Practice of Prelates*, ed. H. Walter (PS; Cambridge: 1849), 6-7 (the corresponding leaf A3r-v is missing in the 1533 edition being used here).
[72] Tyndale, *Mathew*, K3v-4r.
[73] Ibid., C6r.
[74] Ibid., K6r. This seems to be a more nuanced understanding than in the Romans prologue (1526) where righteousness is equivalent to a faith that changes the believer's nature. See Tyndale, *Romayns*, A7r-v. It is also sounds similar to Luther's formulation '*simul iustus et peccator*', but Tyndale was not teaching extrinsic justification. See Martin Luther, *Lectures on Romans*, ed. H. Oswald (*LW*, 25; St Louis, MO: 1972), 260.
[75] Tyndale, *Mathew*, C8v-D1r; cf. Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 113-116; Collinson, 'Tyndale', 88. Trueman and Collinson distinguish Tyndale's 'covenant' from a legalistic 'contract' making salvation conditional on human works. The term itself seems unproblematic if understood as the Latin *contractio* (a drawing-together), see McGiffert, 'Tyndale', 174; cf. Clebsch, *Earliest Protestants*, 189-190. The unmerited, familial nature of the relationship – like the parent who promises a child 'a good thynge for the doynge of some trifle' (Tyndale, *Mathew*, K6r) – can be held together with the image of a king pardoning a murderer: Tyndale, *Expositions*, 7; Tyndale, *Mathew*, A3r-v.
[76] Tyndale, *Mathew*, M7r-v. On the wholly gracious nature of reward, which amounts to sanctification, see Emma Disley, 'Degrees of Glory: Protestant Doctrine and the Concept of Rewards Hereafter', *JTS*, 42/1 (1991), 74-75, 100.

Why, asked Tyndale, should God bless those who dishonour him? Those who keep the law receive temporal blessing while those who break it are punished.[77] He divided humanity in two: those who 'entre' and 'kepe the covenaunt' who need 'feare no Bugges [bugbears],' and those who 'wilt not come with in the covenaunt' or 'have professed it and [...] cast the yoke of the lorde from of thy necke.' Both of the latter were 'bounde by these woordes so fast that none in heaven or in erthe can lowse the.'[78] The covenant thus contained imminent sanctions against transgressors.

The new prologue to Tyndale's revised English New Testament (November 1534) emphasised the concept of covenant as being what readers needed if they were to understand Scripture. It began: 'Here thou hast (most dear reader) the new testament or covenant made with us of God in Christ's blood.' The 'general covenant' referred to God's binding himself to the promise of mercy in Christ for those who keep his laws. Within this general covenant were subsidiary covenants (or promises) which Tyndale noted in the margins (he cited Mt. 5:7, 6:14, 7:7). Whenever there was a 'promise' lacking mention of a 'covenant', 'there must thou understand a covenant. For all the promises of the mercy and grace that Christ hath purchased for us, are made upon the condition that we keep the law.'[79] Again, 'on that condition that we love and work, is mercy given us.'[80] Faith yielded salvation 'according to the covenants and appointment made between God and us.' Both faith and active repentance were needed to 'begin a Christian man.' Repentance involved fighting against 'our corrupt nature perpetually' to keep God's law.[81] God aided this ongoing battle by chastening the believer until 'he be at utter defiance with his flesh.' Antinomianism was excluded by the conditionality of covenant membership which was maintained by good deeds: 'Let us walk in the fear of God, and have our eyes open unto both parts of God's covenants [faith and law], certified that none shall be partaker of the

[77] Tyndale, *Mathew*, F5r, cf. L3r, M5v-M6r.
[78] Ibid., K4r.
[79] William Tyndale, *The New Testament* [1534], ed. D. Daniell (New Haven & London: 1995), 4-5.
[80] Ibid., 274. Trueman thinks that this means that 'a justified man can finally fall away,' but Tyndale was not discussing the doctrine of perseverance: Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 87n.
[81] Tyndale, *New Testament* [1534], 4-5.

mercy, save he that will fight against the flesh, to keep the law.'[82] Those who refuse God's offer of covenant mercy and 'will not come under the covenant' become more degenerate through the withdrawal of grace. Unbelievers were liable because the 'general covenant' applied to all humanity, whereas in 1528 the 'testament' was a promise to believers only (see above p.110). Meanwhile, those who have a faith 'built on the sand of their own imaginations, and not on the rock of God's word according to his covenants' – seen by a lack of love for God's law – will face judgment with a sense of desperation.[83]

Finally, in 1535, in his exposition of Sir William Tracy's ardently evangelical will, Tyndale made it clear that a person must discharge a covenantal requirement in order to benefit from God's promise. He wrote that 'God neuer made promes but apon an appoyntment or couenaunt vnder which who so euer wyll not come can be no partaker of the promes.' God's promise was always conditional on a proper response and, having responded, 'damnable is yt alto to leaue the couenaunt made yn Chrystes bloude.'[84]

Tyndale's concept of covenant gradually evolved from being one strand of his theology in 1525 into his central understanding of God's testament by 1530. Although it is not possible to identify the influence of particular individuals or texts upon him, it seems likely that Swiss Reformed theology contributed to his concept of covenant.[85] Tyndale's early ethical emphases were harmonised within the covenant framework which co-ordinated the justifying work of the Spirit with the responsibilities of the believer in the pursuit of godliness. One of his principal aims in the 1530s was to equip Christians with the covenant framework that they would need to understand Scripture.

---

[82] Ibid., 7.
[83] Tyndale, *New Testament* [1534], 5-6.
[84] See John Frith and William Tyndale, *The Testament of Master Wylliam Tracie Esquier, expounded both by William Tindall and Ihon Frith* (Antwerp: 1535; RSTC 24167), A6r, A8r; cf. McGiffert, 'Tyndale', 179-180.
[85] See Clebsch, *Earliest Protestants*, 199; Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 117-118. Tyndale's own Bible study could have sufficed for the development of his concept, claims Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 23.

Miles Coverdale

When the Luther controversy broke in England in the early 1520s, Coverdale was an Augustinian friar in Cambridge under the reformist prior Robert Barnes. This Yorkshireman became, in the words of John Bale, 'one of the first to make a pure profession of Christ.'[86] In 1527 he was studying Scripture under the patronage of Thomas Cromwell,[87] and by Lent 1528 Foxe recounts that he had abandoned regular orders when he toured Essex preaching in favour of a commemorative understanding of the Eucharist and against the veneration of images.[88]

Later that year Coverdale began his first exile to the continent to escape Bishop Tunstall's wave of persecution,[89] and he must have completed the first of his translations of continental theology about this time. He chose a Zürich text: Bullinger's *Christen state of matrimonye*.[90] Bullinger defined wedlock as a 'couenaunt' which he explained in terms of God's covenant with his people and wrote that this covenant required 'the good consent of them both,' man and woman.[91] From this Coverdale might have begun to appreciate Bullinger's idea of mutuality in the biblical concept of covenant.

Coverdale's travels allowed him to be in Hamburg to help Tyndale prepare his Pentateuch in 1529.[92] He was a colleague, therefore, at the very time when Tyndale's concept of testament

---

[86] Quoted in Mozley, *Coverdale*, 3.
[87] Miles Coverdale, *Remains of Myles Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter*, ed. G. Pearson (PS; Cambridge: 1846), 490-491.
[88] Foxe, *AM* [1570], viii. 1228-1229.
[89] Mozley, *William Tyndale*, 121.
[90] The translation was recorded in a list of prohibited books: *TRP*, i. #122.
[91] Bullinger, *The Christen State of Matrimonye*, unpaginated leaf between 3v and 4r. This reprint from 1541 is the earliest extant copy of Coverdale's translation.
[92] See n.36 above and John Vowell (ed.), *The Antient History and Description of the City of Exeter* [...] *with a catalogue of all the bishops to the year of our Lord 1578* (Exeter: 1765), 279; Mozley, *Coverdale*, 4-5; Hildebrandt, 'Protestant Exiles', 56. Coverdale's command of Hebrew and Greek was very limited but he would have been a valuable English proof-reader. There is no reason to identify Coverdale as Tyndale's earliest assistant in the production of the New Testament in 1525-26, that is, the 'faythfull companyon which now hath taken another vyage apon him to preach Christ where (I suppose) he was never yet preached': Tyndale, *Mammon*, A2r. Coverdale was in London with Barnes in February 1526 when Tyndale's New Testament appeared there. Otherwise he was in Cambridge. It is not impossible that Tyndale first met him in Cambridge earlier in the decade.

was consolidated into a bilateral, conditional form. He returned with, or followed, Tyndale to Antwerp, where he worked as a printer's assistant for Martin de Keyser, Tyndale's publisher.[93] Coverdale was certainly in Antwerp when John Rogers arrived in 1534, for he and Rogers were described by George Joye in February 1535 as Tyndale's 'two discipl[es] that gaped so longe for their masters morsel,' that is, the revised New Testament.[94] Coverdale must, therefore, have been very familiar with Tyndale's mature concept of covenant, even assisting Tyndale with the translations which would eventually be incorporated into Matthew's Bible (1537).[95]

In October 1535, five months after Tyndale's arrest, Coverdale published his own English Bible, supplementing the texts of Tyndale and Joye with his own translations. He relied heavily upon the Zürich Bible and Luther's recently published German Bible.[96] Coverdale's prologue emphasised the divine law of the Pentateuch, mentioned that God comforts 'with his promes' in Genesis, and explained how the New Testament was related to those promises: 'the New Testament or Gospell, is a manyfest and cleare testymony of Christ how God perfourmeth his ooth and promes made in the olde Testament, how the New is declared and included in the Olde, and the Olde fulfylled and verifyed in the New.'[97] For Coverdale, the divine promises harmonised the Testaments, but he did not attempt to delineate mutuality or conditionality in the prologue. In his translation of Gen. 15 and 17 he consistently translated *bĕrît* as 'covenant', following Tyndale's revisions of 1534. In 1537 Coverdale's prologue to *A goodly treatise of faith, hope, and charitie* emphasised the necessity of good works to 'true fayth' and being

[93] J.P. Gelbert, *Magister Johann Bader's Leben und Schriften, Nicolaus Thomae und seine briefe* (Neustadt: 1868), 275.
[94] George Joye, *An Apolgye made by George Ioye to satisfye (if it maye be) W. Tindale to pourge & defende himself ageinst many sclaunderouse lyes fayned vpon him* (1535; RSTC 14820), C6v; cf. John Foxe, *AM* [1576], xi. 1439.
[95] Foxe, *AM* [1576], viii. 1074; Miles Coverdale and William Tyndale, *The Byble* [...] *truly and purely translated into Englysh by Thomas Matthew*, ed. John Rogers (Antwerp: 1537; RSTC 2066).
[96] Miles Coverdale, *Biblia the Bible* [...] *faithfully and truly translated out of Douche and Latyn in to Englishe* (Cologne?: 1535; RSTC 2063). Scholars have successively favoured Zürich, Cologne, Marburg, and now Antwerp as the likely place of publication: David Daniell, 'Coverdale, Miles (1488–1569)', *ODNB* (2004). See above p.47. On the influence of Zwingli and Zürich on Coverdale see Miller, 'Zwingli', 165; Gordon, *Swiss Reformation*, 299-300.
[97] Miles Coverdale, *Biblia the Byble* [...] *faithfully translated in to Englyshe* (Southwark?: 1535; RSTC 2063.3), +5v-+6r. Clebsch observes that Coverdale 'adopted Tyndale's covenant theology' in the preface: Clebsch, *Earliest Protestants*, 193.

'made righteous': 'By thys workynge or endeuoure to please God' there comes hope of eternal life, 'not of dewtye [...] but only of Gods bounteous goodnesse and mercye.'[98] Coverdale's insistence on godly living in order to enjoy God's promise was consistent with Tyndale's emphases but the concept of covenant was not made explicit.

It was from the early 1540s that significant evidence of Coverdale's concept of covenant emerged. This inevitably raises the question of why Coverdale appeared to be indifferent to the concept in the 1530s despite his collaboration with Tyndale.[99] The explanation is probably political. As explained above (see p.39), official negotiations with the German Lutherans presented the most promising prospect for evangelical progress in England between 1534 and 1539. Coverdale returned to England late in 1535 and translated several Lutheran texts in 1537 and 1538,[100] no doubt mindful of renewed talks with the Saxons from the summer of 1537, the inclusion of Robert Barnes on the discussion committee the following year,[101] and the publication of the Bishops' Book (1537), which asserted justification *sola fide*.[102] In 1538 Coverdale was in Paris, occupied with Cromwell's commission to revise Matthew's Bible. He seemed eager to express the loyalty of those working on the revision to the Crown, reporting to Cromwell on 30 October 1538: 'all we, that be here of the king's nation, are even of one heart and humble mind toward God and our sovereign.' He was also prepared to censor his personal views on unspecified 'dark places of the text,' writing on 13 December: 'As for any private

[98] Miles Coverdale, *A goodly treatise of faith, hope, and charite necessary for all Christen men to know and to exercyse themselues therein translated into Englyshe* (Southwark: 1537; RSTC 24219.5), A1v.
[99] Trinterud, 'Origins', 44. It is arguable that Trinterud's examination of English Bibles before 1550 demonstrates neither indifference to mutuality nor preference for a unilateral promise, but rather the interchangeable meaning of 'testament'. In Taverner's Bible (1539) 'testament' was defined as 'the olde testament (that is to saye the couvenaunt [...]. The newe testament consysteth [...] in the sprite, which is gyven thorow fayth, and which doth write his lawes in our hertes.' The marginal note to Gen. 17 reads: 'Testament is in scripture taken for the moste parte for a couvenant bargayne or leage': Richard Taverner, *The Most Sacred Bible* [...] *translated into English* (1539; RSTC 2066), 'definitions' and 5r. The covenant teaching in Matthew's Bible might have influenced many readers (Møller, 'Beginnings', 54) and Clebsch points out that the majority of Tyndale's Bibles printed from 1535-52 included the prologues and notes of 1534 which contained covenant teaching: Clebsch, *Earliest Protestants*, 188-189.
[100] RSTC 16999; 18878; 16979.7; 17000. Coverdale included no prologues to reveal his evaluations of these texts.
[101] McEntegart, *Schmalkalden*, 78, 92-93, 108.
[102] *Institution of a Christen Man*, B2v, B4r, F3v.

opinion or contentious words, as I will utterly avoid all such [...] if it be your lordship's good pleasure that I shall so do.'[103] In February and March 1539 he was in Newbury exhorting people still favouring the pope 'to increase in due obedience towards the king's highness.'[104] The Great Bible was printed in April, a month before Lutheran negotiations finally collapsed. In the Genesis text, 'testament', 'covenant' and 'bond' were used interchangeably to translate *bĕrît*, in spite of Tyndale's and Coverdale's consistent preference for 'covenant' in 1534 and 1535 respectively.[105] In the late 1530s Coverdale exemplified the kind of cunning conformity to official Reformation discussed in chapter one (see above p.42f).[106] His earlier propensity to Swiss theology could easily have been a hindrance, and plenteous evidence of his concept of covenant from the early 1540s seems to suggest that he had been hiding his views.

In response to the Act of Six Articles (28 June 1539) Coverdale returned into exile and made directly for Strasbourg with his new wife, arriving in the autumn of 1540. For three years, writes Esther Hildebrandt, he was 'a student of the Reformation, somewhat in the style which Hooper was to adopt.'[107] The Coverdales were made welcome by another newly-wed couple, John Calvin and Idelette de Bure.[108] Perhaps they discussed the concept of covenant developed by Calvin in the first edition of his *Institutes* in 1536 (see above p.98). Certainly, Coverdale utilised the concept in his subsequent publications.

Before the end of 1540 Coverdale published at Marburg his *Fruitfull lessons, vpon the passion, buriall, resurrection, ascension, and of the sending of the holy Ghost*. It was modelled on

[103] Coverdale, *Remains*, 492-498.
[104] Ibid., 498-502.
[105] *The Byble in Englyshe* [The Great Bible] (Paris & London: 1539; RSTC 2068); cf. Trinterud, 'Origins', 44.
[106] Bozeman asks, of the Bibles produced by Coverdale, Rogers and Cranmer in the 1530s, 'what reader of their prefaces reasonably could infer that justification by faith only is its definitive message?' Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 22.
[107] Hildebrandt, 'Protestant Exiles', 57-58. It was during this period that Coverdale took his doctorate from Tübingen University. The choice of Strasbourg seems significant because Coverdale's sister and brother-in-law first went to Wittenberg, and Coverdale could have done the same: Mozley, *Coverdale*, 8. On the significance of evangelicals choosing exile in 1539-40, see above p.60. On Hooper, see below p.118.
[108] Coverdale, *Remains*, 526.

Zwingli's treatise *A brief commemoration of the death of Christ out of the four Evangelists*, but was so expanded as to be substantially original.[109] Coverdale must have begun it before, or very soon after, his flight abroad. Its primary concern is to teach sanctification and godly living after the example of Christ,[110] and some notable points are made: love fulfils all the law and must be expressed through the keeping of God's precepts;[111] grace will be withdrawn from those who do not work;[112] the commandments are kept by means of God's strength in us;[113] salvation depends upon faith and submission to Christ's yoke.[114]

The covenant principle of interpretation is not everywhere explicit but when it comes to the surface it does so forcefully. Coverdale prayed, with reference to the eternal and mutual covenant, 'O Lord Iesu Christ, drawe thou our hearts vnto thee, ioyne them together in vnseparable loue, that they may feruently burne: that wee may abide in thee, & thou in vs, & that the euerlasting couenant betweene vs may stand sure for euer.'[115] The passionate love which defines the relationship is inescapable, and Coverdale located it within a familial context in which Christians enjoy fellowship with the Trinity. Christ's incarnation and atonement made this relationship possible:

> Christ also calleth those that bee his, not seruants, but friends and brethren: he will be our God, and wee his people: our father, we his children: and his couenant which he hath made with vs, shall bee euerlasting, for it is sealed and confirmed

[109] Hildebrandt, 'Protestant Exiles', 57-58. Coverdale must have had access to a manuscript copy before Leo Jud published Zwingli's text in 1544. See Locher, *Zwingli's Thought*, 366. *Fruitfull Lessons* is dated 1540-47 in Miles Coverdale, *Writings and Translations of Myles Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter*, ed. G. Pearson (PS; Cambridge: 1844). The earliest extant copy dates from 1593.
[110] Miles Coverdale, *Fruitfull Lessons, vpon the Passion, Buriall, Resurrection, Ascension, and of the sending of the Holy Ghost gathered out of the foure euangelists: with a plaine exposition of the same* (1593; RSTC 5891), ¶1r-¶2v. According to Bozeman, 'this work assesses the human condition largely in terms of personal and social "wickedness and iniquity" and gives far more play to the self's moral reconstruction and empowerment than to pardon and comfort': Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 19n.
[111] Coverdale, *Fruitfull Lessons*, C2v.
[112] Ibid., D3v, F1r.
[113] Ibid., D4r.
[114] Ibid., G3r-v.
[115] Ibid., T4v.

> with the bloud of his onely begotten sonne. Now haue wee fellowshippe and companie with God the father, the sonne, and the holy Ghost.[116]

Perseverance in covenant relationship depended upon God's sanctification of believers to conform them to his pleasure. Another prayer a couple of paragraphs later asked for faith and love to

> lead a godly and heauenly lyfe vpon earth. Set vp the spirituall kingdome of Christ Iesu in our hearts, that in vs thy name may be sanctified and thy will performed: that wee may become thy virtuous children, and neuer displease thee our gracious father[,] that we continuing stil in thy mercifull couenant, doe neuer fall away from the companie and fellowship of thee and thy soune.[117]

The godly activities of the believer are properly attributed to God, but the covenant makes it possible to talk of believers doing the work of the Father. In preaching, for instance, the apostles were said to absolve from sin 'for the gracious father of his aboundant loue and kindnesse (and by reason of the couenant that he hath made with vs) doeth oft ascribe vnto vs many things, which can properly belong vnto none, saue onely to himselfe.'[118] Yet 'note this condition wel,' wrote Coverdale in the margin: we will be forgiven only if we believe on Christ to the point of hating sin and actively desiring heavenly things.[119] Grace is promised to us 'so farre as we abide in his couenants.'[120]

On 7 December 1540 Coverdale 'mourned sore' to read a treatise written against his late superior's protestation of faith at the stake.[121] Barnes had been burnt at Smithfield on 28 July. Coverdale's 'theologically gritty'[122] *Confutacion of that treatise, which one Iohn Standish made agaynst the protestacion of D. Barnes* (1541) reveals his personal convictions at the time and,

[116] Ibid., Z2r-v.
[117] Ibid., Z3r.
[118] Ibid., Hh1r.
[119] Ibid.
[120] Ibid., Oo3r.
[121] John Standish, *A Lytle Treatyse* [...] *against the Protestacion of Roberti Barnes at the tyme of his death* (1540; RSTC 23209).
[122] Daniell, 'Coverdale, Miles'.

according to the colophon, it was printed at Zürich. Much of it was concerned with defending evangelical doctrine against charges of antinomianism: 'we are bound to do good workes to the which though god ioyne his louing promes (as he doth comonly thorow out the scripture) yet calleth he not them the satisfaction to him for sinnes.' Even though works which God requires of humanity cannot make satisfaction for sin, God adds 'a louinge promes to the fulfillers therof.'[123] It is noteworthy that Coverdale saw the predicament of sinners in terms of the covenant: those 'that haue broken their couenaunt with god.' Restoration was possible, 'though we haue fallen from the profession of our faith,' through repentance.[124] Then the believer cheerfully tries to obey:

> to them that loue god are his commaundementes not greuous (not thorow anye possibilite of man) but partly because Christ hath taken awaie the curse of the lawe and deliuered them from the he[a]uy burthens of their soules and partly because they deli[g]te in gods commaundementes and esteme his word sweter then hony as Dauid did. For loue maketh all thinges light.[125]

Coverdale approved of Barnes' teaching men to do good works and his threatening damnation to those who do not do them. Coverdale believed that God had commanded that good works be done in order that believers might be justified outwardly before men.[126] Then he came to the point and explained the covenantal principle undergirding his argument:

> Now to do good dedes, to bring forth good frutes, to walke in a new life, to shew gods wonderfull workes, to lead an honest conuersacion in the world, what is it els, but to shew and set forth our profession, the life that we haue promised and taken us to at the font stone, euen the holy couenaunt and appoyntment that we haue made with the eternall god?[127]

---

[123] Miles Coverdale, *A confutacion of that treatise, which one Iohn Standish made agaynst the Protestacion of D. Barnes in the yeare. M.D.Xl. wherin, the Holy Scriptures (peruerted and wrested in his sayd treatise) are restored to their owne true vnderstonding agayne* (Zurich: 1541; RSTC 5888), E4r, L8r-v.
[124] Ibid., F7v.
[125] Ibid., G8r.
[126] Ibid., H8v.
[127] Ibid., H9r.

The baptismal covenant was clearly bilateral because the Christian entered into it with God. For Coverdale the obligations imposed under this appointment were inescapable:

> Is not oure profession the promes and couenaunt that we haue made with god to seke his glory and oure neghbours profet euen to loue him with all oure herte with all our soules and with all oure strength and oure neghbour as oure selues In the which two pointes hangeth all the lawe and the Prophetes? Are not we bound then (by gods commaundement) to set forth the glory of god oure neghbours profit and loue to them both?[128]

Coverdale seems to overemphasise mutuality in these examples when he writes that humanity makes the covenant with God rather than *vice versa*. However, in the context of Coverdale's discussion of Gen. 18:16-33, where God reveals his intention to destroy Sodom, Coverdale claimed that God was willing to reveal this to Abraham 'because Abraham was vnder his couenaunt and did faithfully cleue to his promes and because he knew that Abraham wolde commaunde his children and housholde to kepe the waie of the lorde.'[129] Abraham's covenant faithfulness through trust and obedience to the covenant and promise belonging to God is clear.

Coverdale selected Bullinger's *Der alt gloub*, or *Antiquissima Fides et vera Religio* (1537) for the first of his translations at Strasbourg.[130] He published this chronological overview of the Bible in 1541 as *The olde faith*,[131] which was particularly significant because it was the first English translation of a continental covenant text.[132] Scripture, Coverdale wrote in his prologue, imputes the cause of justification to faith, 'not without other vertues folowynge but without any other worke or dede iustfyenge.'[133] False believers fail to 'lyue thereafter' and 'practise not the

[128] Ibid., I2v.
[129] Ibid., L6r.
[130] Coverdale's publications of Bullinger's *Christen state of matrimonye* in 1541 and 1543 (RSTC 4045 and 4046) were editions of his earlier translation, probably completed in 1528.
[131] Coverdale almost certainly produced his *Confutation of Standish* before working on this translation, but Coverdale had probably considered Bullinger's writing before 1541 and so Bullinger's influence is not impossible in the earlier work.
[132] McGiffert, 'Grace and Works', 472-473; Baker, *Other Reformed Tradition*, 209.
[133] Bullinger, *The Olde Fayth*, *4r.

lawe of godly loue' consistent with 'the effectuous the workynge and lyuynge fayth that Abraham and Rahab had.'[134] Importantly,

> where as by theyr profession ooth & allegiaunce (which they owe to theyr mooste hye soueraygne the kynge of heauen) they shulde in a vertuous conuersacion maynteyne all godlynesse are become euen enemies suppressours and ouerthrowers therof.[135]

The believer is clearly bound to godly living by an oath, indicating that the divine-human relationship carries reciprocal responsibilities.

Coverdale's concept of covenant was undoubtedly augmented by Bullinger's discussion, which began with Eden where 'it was equall that man [...] shulde shew thankfulnesse and obedience unto God [...]. Yee God him selfe [...] requyreth the same of him and that by the meanes of the commaundement.'[136] The Fall prompted God's 'devyce' of salvation through Christ and this, determined from eternity, was available from the time of Adam.[137] Love and obedience were demanded of Adam, signified by a sacrament, and this command was revealed to be a covenant with Adam when it was renewed with Noah:

> Noe also was he, with whome God first renued the covenant made with Adam. For it is but one covenaunt onely even the foresayde promesse & ende made by God unto Adam. Howe beit the same covenaunte was afterwarde at certayne tymes renewed by reason of certayne occasions.

Coverdale would have understood from Bullinger that the covenant had operated consistently throughout salvation history because 'what soever pertayneth to [God's] couenaunt' with Adam would 'surely and constantly' be made good for Noah. Similarly, the laws given to Noah were part of the law written on human hearts concerning the love of God and neighbour.[138] The same

[134] Ibid., *5v.
[135] Ibid., *6r.
[136] Ibid., A3v-4r.
[137] Ibid., A5r.
[138] Ibid., B8r-v.

covenant applied to Abraham: 'all thys now is but one promes one sauyoure and one faith. Abraham also beleued in Jesus Christ and was saued by fauth.'[139] Although 'God then made a couenaunt with Abraham when he ordeyned the circumcision[,] it serveth more to the confirmacion of oure holy christen faith then to the mayntenaunce of the Jewish ceremonyes.'[140]

Coverdale would also have noted that Bullinger used the terms 'testament' and 'covenant' synonymously.[141] The covenant extended into the New Testament era when true religion consisted of true faith and innocent life and, although outward virtue could not justify, 'the children of God are bounde to kepe them selves from the workes of darckenesse and to applye them to lyve in righteousnes and in the light.'[142]

In exile Coverdale was free to compose and translate Reformed theological works using the concept of covenant. The Cromwellian project of the 1530s was over. He had known of Bullinger for at least thirteen years when in 1541 he sent his *Confutation of Standish* to be printed at Zürich and published *The olde fayth*. Perhaps these projects triggered their correspondence in September 1541 which could plausibly have included theological consultation.[143] On 27 July 1542 Coverdale recalled how Bullinger had received his letters kindly and with a favourable interpretation. He expressed his 'pain' at being unable to join Richard Hilles and Henry Butler on their visit to Zürich in the summer of 1542, for he was 'very anxious to enjoy your society, and to behold your church.' He was nonetheless grateful for the benefit of Bullinger's ministry and friendship at a distance.[144]

---

[139] Ibid., C1v.
[140] Ibid., C2v-C3r.
[141] Ibid., C7v.
[142] Ibid., F8v-G1r, cf. E8r, F7r.
[143] Much is yet unknown about Coverdale's network and correspondence, according to Hildebrandt, 'Protestant Exiles', 154.
[144] I suggest that Coverdale's letter, dated 27 July, should be assigned to 1542, contrary to the opinion of the Parker Society editor who suggests the range of years 1543 to 1548: Coverdale, *Remains,* 502-503.

From September 1543 Coverdale concentrated on his rôle as assistant pastor and headmaster at Bergzabern, where he finally learnt Hebrew. There he opposed the 'ravings of the Anabaptists' who, being generally 'tolerated,' caused 'great misfortune to the people.'[145] He chose to keep a low profile and his direct influence on fellow exiles was diminished,[146] but he was visited by Bucer and corresponded with other reformers.[147] Hilles reported that Coverdale's translation of *Der alt gloub* had caused Bullinger's book to be 'much commended' by English evangelicals,[148] which is evidence of the circulation of its ideas.[149]

In October 1545 Coverdale translated from German *The defence of a certayne poore Christen man* by 'a right excellent and noble prince,' adding a *Short Recapitulation unto the Reader* which summarised its intention

> to put the (moste Christen reder) in remembrance of some paerte of thy dewty: and to render thanckes unto the lorde for the great strength and power he gaue unto this Christen prynce to confesse his lord & god before all men hym shalle the lorde confesse agayne before the father of heven.[150]

Coverdale reassured the persecuted Christian of God's covenanted justice:

> For evyn as owre lorde and god doeth all ways and at all tymes preserue kepe and defende the poore persecuted & afflicte in al extremities: so doeth he caste downe

---

Coverdale's initial letter in September 1541 could have been sent with Hilles' letter to Bullinger from Strasbourg on 25 September 1541. In a second letter, dated 23 November 1541, Hilles seems to assume that Bullinger at least knew of Coverdale. Bullinger certainly sent greetings to Coverdale in his replies to Hilles, who had visited Zürich by the time of his letter to Bullinger dated 18 December 1542. See *OL*, 221, 223, 229; David Loades, 'Hilles, Richard (c.1514–1587)', *ODNB* (2004). On 15 April 1545 Hilles thought that Coverdale was 'somewhat known' to Bullinger 'both by my commendation, and also by his own letters sent to you some time since.' Perhaps Coverdale had not corresponded with Bullinger since 1542, but Hilles appears to have forgotten that he himself had written of Coverdale to Bullinger only six months earlier: *OL*, 247.

[145] Coverdale, *Remains*, 521; Daniell, 'Coverdale, Miles'.

[146] Hildebrandt, 'Protestant Exiles', 154-155, 160.

[147] Coverdale, *Remains*, 510.

[148] *OL*, 245.

[149] MacCulloch, 'Bullinger', 911.

[150] Miles Coverdale, *The defence of a certayne poore Christen man who els shuldhaue bene condemned by the popes lawe* (Antwerp: 1545; RSTC 5889), E7r-8r.

> and never rayse up agayne all soche that so obstinatly and wilfully resistyth his eternall testament and worde.[151]

God's reliability and humanity's duty, as well as the sanctions imposed on covenant-breakers, were thus appended to a treatise which had not itself employed the concept.

On 8 July 1546 Coverdale's books were condemned in England and in September a dozen were burnt.[152] However, Edward VI's accession in January 1547 prompted reprints of several of them in London, including his Bullinger translations.[153] He was summoned home in 1548 and served first as almoner to Katherine Parr before becoming a royal chaplain. He was consecrated bishop of Exeter in August 1551. These rôles reduced his literary output: in 1549 he contributed considerably to the English translation of Erasmus' *Paraphrases*; in 1550 a new edition of his 1535 Bible translation was published by Froschauer in Zürich, and he translated the *Precious Pearl* by the Zürich pastor Otto Werdmüller.

As one would expect of a Zürich text, this latter work contained the themes of mutuality and conditionality. The careful burdens of a governor or father fell upon God while 'our partes and duty is no more, but to trust and beleue in hym, and to serue in that vocacyon & condycyon of lyfe wherevnto we are called & appointed of god, faithfully.'[154] Readers were invited to 'consider & wey, as it were in a true balance the righteousnes, which god requireth of vs on the one syde, & again the whole trade of our life, on the other syde.'[155] Since we have not conformed to God's law, Christ treats the believer as a scholar and disciple and 'makyth condicions wyth him most necessary for euery Christen man, whyche are expressyd in the. xvi. chapter of Mathew,' that is, the requirement to take up our cross and follow him. The word of

[151] Ibid.
[152] *LP*, xxi/1, #1233; Daniell, 'Coverdale, Miles'.
[153] RSTC 2756, 4048, 4048.5, 4071, 20423.
[154] Otto Werdmüller, *A spyrytuall and moost precyouse pearle teachyng all men to loue and imbrace the crosse* [...] *sett forth by the Moste Honorable Lorde, the Duke Hys Grace of Somerset*, trans. M. Coverdale (1550; RSTC 25255), K3v.
[155] Ibid., B3v.

God becomes 'the rule, whereby we should be orderyd'[156] and God requires that our awareness of sin and judgment grow so that we repent 'and so daylye amende and waxe better.'[157] Godliness was never required for justification but, being inseparable from faithfulness, was imperative afterwards.

Although he had encountered the concept of covenant during his early work with Tyndale, Coverdale utilised it in his own way. During the late 1530s, the priority of Bible translation, combined with political pragmatism, led to an absence of Reformed theology in Coverdale's publications. However, his second exile permitted theological engagement and expression, initially with Bullinger. Coverdale, unlike Tyndale, tended to expound a theology of good works grounded in the legal and familial categories of the covenant, rather than explaining the concept of covenant itself. Evidence from his declining literary output during the late 1540s and 1550s indicates continued engagement with Zürich theology, as well as the growing influence of Calvin.[158]

Coverdale's third, Marian exile is beyond the bounds of this study, but it reaffirmed his Swiss Reformed links. In February 1555 he went first to Denmark,[159] soon continued to Bergzabern, before moving in 1557 to Aarau and in 1558 to Geneva.[160] This was a period of radicalisation for Coverdale who, back in England from 1559, was among the more recalcitrant nonconformists.[161] The question of whether his conception of covenant changed considerably as a result of these experiences still needs investigation.

---

[156] Ibid., D1v.
[157] Ibid., E3r.
[158] Calvin's influence on Coverdale may have begun from as early as 1540 but seems to have increased in the mid-1540s: see below p.118.
[159] Coverdale refused preferment in Denmark. This may have been because the Danish king required exiles to conform to Lutheranism, which would be further evidence of Coverdale's Reformed convictions. See Garrett, *Marian Exiles*, 132-134; Andrew Pettegree, *Marian Protestantism: Six Studies* (Aldershot: 1996), 58-59.
[160] Garrett, *Marian Exiles*, 52.
[161] Hildebrandt, 'Protestant Exiles', 61-63; Dickens, *English Reformation* [1st edn.], 131.

John Hooper

Of wealthy parentage, Hooper took a degree from Oxford in 1519 and entered the Cistercian house at Cleeve in Somerset that was dissolved in 1536.[162] Afterwards he became steward to the conservative courtier Sir Thomas Arundell in whose service (see above p.58) he nevertheless encountered 'certain writings of master Huldruch Zwinglius' and Bullinger's Pauline commentaries. He later described to Bullinger how 'I thought it well worth my while, night and day, with earnest study, and an almost superstitious diligence, to devote my entire attention to your writings.'[163] His conversion must have occurred by mid-1539 since Arundell arranged for Bishop Gardiner to conduct a 'long conference with M. Hooper 4. or 5. dayes together'[164] within five months of the enactment of the Six Articles.

Hooper felt sufficiently threatened to hasten to Paris but soon returned into the service of Arundell's evangelical nephew, Sir John St. Loe, in Somerset.[165] There he remained until 1543 or 1544 when

> he was agayne molested and laid for: whereby he was compelled (vnder the pretence of being Captayne of a ship going to Ireland) to take the Seas, and so escaped he (although not without extreme perill of drowning) through Fraunce, to the higher partes of Germany.[166]

[162] Newcombe, *Hooper,* 9-13; Dalton, 'Hooper's Networks', 15-17; Robert Dunning, 'The last days of Cleeve Abbey', in C. Barron and C. Harper-Bill (eds.), *The Church in Pre-Reformation Society* (Woodbridge: 1985), 59. Rex asks if Hooper might have been a friar rather than a monk: Richard Rex, 'Friars in the English Reformation', in P. Marshall and A. Ryrie (eds.), *The Beginnings of English Protestantism* (Cambridge: 2002), 47.
[163] Hooper to Bullinger, Strasbourg, 27 January [1546], *OL,* 33-34. On the greater influence of Zwingli and Bullinger relative to Calvin see West, 'Hooper [1]', 346, 363; Locher, *Zwingli's Thought,* 365n; Newcombe, *Hooper,* 40. On Hooper's deteriorating relationship with Bucer in 1547-49, see Newcombe, *Hooper,* 33-34.
[164] Foxe, *AM* [1583], xi. 1526.
[165] Ibid., xi. 1527.
[166] Ibid.

He matriculated at Basle University for the academic year 1545-46 and applied himself to the study of Hebrew, but by January he was recuperating from illness in Strasbourg.[167] He wrote to Bullinger on 27 January of his intention, 'in about a month's time,' to visit his father, who was hostile to reform, to obtain his inheritance 'wherewith I may be able to subsist upon my slender means among you at Zürich.' Ready to immerse himself in Zürich theology, he explained that 'by reason of my love and respect towards you, I had often proposed to visit you, though I have always been prevented hitherto' by ill-health and parental opposition.[168] This trip home occasioned two brief imprisonments in Exeter before he returned to Basle and the house of Simon Grynaeus.[169] In February 1547, shortly after the accession of Edward VI in England, Hooper married Anna de Tscerlas and in March they moved to Zürich.[170]

For two years Hooper studied under Bullinger at Zürich.[171] Three treatises date from this seminal period of his life and all exhibit a concept of covenant. In April 1547 he obtained Gardiner's book on the Eucharist and in September published a refutation, *An answer vnto my lord of wynthesters booke*, before the official doctrine of the Eucharist in England had begun to change. Hooper began by comparing Gardiner to the Jews in Rom. 9-11 where Paul discusses 'there departure and reiection ffrom the promesse of god.'[172] Thus, on the second page of his prologue, Hooper introduced the possibility of abandoning the divine promise. He proceeded to expound the imperative to learn doctrine and godliness from God's law. The Mosaic Law, he wrote, 'was not yeuen to be wroten in perschement or paper but in the hart of man not to bable and prate of it, but to lyue as it byddyth. not to bare it in the bosom but to shew it unto the

[167] Hildebrandt, 'Protestant Exiles', 75, 146; Foxe, *AM* [1583], xi. 1527; *OL*, 251-252; cf. Dalton, 'Hooper's Networks', 36-37.
[168] *OL*, 34-35.
[169] Ibid., 41; Hooper, *Wynthester*, G2v-3r; Newcombe, *Hooper*, 25-26.
[170] Hildebrandt, 'Protestant Exiles', 75-76; *OL*, 42.
[171] *OL*, 635; West, 'Hooper [1]', 352-353; Dalton, 'Hooper's Networks', 38.
[172] Hooper, *Wynthester*, A2v.

worold in godly conuersacyon and uertues lief.' Obedience to this same authority in Scripture was demanded of the Christian.[173]

In the course of this discussion of his sacramental theology (see below p.231) Hooper affirmed the unity of the Testaments by connecting God's people from Adam to the apostles: 'As well was the promes of eternall lief made unto them as unto us, as well they belyuid to be sauyd by Christ as we. They were of Christes church as well as we.'[174] Christ was 'the Mediatour betwene god and man from the beginning.'[175] Israelites and Christians are together God's people by virtue of receiving the same promise which establishes 'the unyon peace and concord betwen god and us [...] the loue and peax that is betwen god and us.'[176] The relationship is unilaterally initiated by God but continues bilaterally. Like Zwingli, Bullinger and Calvin, Hooper's explanation of the sacraments as sealing an agreement revealed his mutual conception of this relationship which was contractual and covenantal:

> As the seale annxyd unto the wryting is a stablyshment an makyng [good] of all thinges conteynid and specified within the wryting this is usid in all bargayns, exchanges, purcheses an contractes. When the mater intreydyd betwene too partes is fully concludyd upon, it is confirmyd with obligacions sealyd entrechangeble that for euer those sealys may be awytnis of souch couenantes as hath ben agreyd upon betwen the booth parthes.[177]

No man, Hooper supposed, would pledge a debtor's obligation prior to agreeing a contract with his creditor. Likewise, a contract is needed between humanity and God. The first step is revelation from, and repentance of enmity towards, God:

> There must ffyrst be had acommunicacion betwen god, an[d] the man to know how he [the man] can mak ony contract of frendshippe with his ennymie, the lyuing god[.] He confessith his default and desirith mercy, usith no purgacion, nor translation of his sinne.

[173] Ibid., B3r.
[174] Ibid., D4v.
[175] Ibid., R4v.
[176] Ibid., E2r.
[177] Ibid., F2v. For Zwingli, Bullinger and Calvin on sacraments as seals of the covenant, see below pp.118, 118 and 118.

Rather, humanity pleads Christ's atonement for sin:

> But onlie besechithe mercy, and lay[e]th Christ to gayge [to accept the challenge] and saith for asmouch as thow hast yeuen thy only sone for the sinne of the worold mercyfull lord, hast thow not likewice yeuen all thing unto sinners that repent with hym. Then likewice lord for[g]eue me, and be my god, booth in fayth and also in thy sacramentes.[178]

Humanity must also make a promise of godliness:

> and as trewlie shall I serue the[e] during my lief as thes[e] wordes passe my mo[u]the, I renownce the deuil, the worold an sinne upon this fayth and promesse mad[e] to god we be markyd in godes mark. An[d] none other wice. For the church euer teachyth amendement of life before he promese grace.[179]

The establishment of the contract thus involved repentance, faith in Christ and a promise by the believer to God. The Church could not confidently promise that God would be gracious unless all of these were evident. Reception of God's promise of grace was conditional upon that determination to amendment of life which accompanied genuine repentance in Christ. Godliness, achieved by grace,[180] was vital to perseverance in God's promise or testament:

> let them cast the testament into the fier, for they know to there damnacion that will not folow there knolege. To be achristiane it is not so light as men make it, of all the craftes in the worold it is the hardyst, not to pratle and prate of it. But to practyse it in lief. For it is a sciens practyue and not speculatyue. Consisti[ng] in Actione & non in lingua.[181]

Christian obligation occasioned Hooper's repetition of his earlier point about the authority of Scripture in that 'God hath bound his church and all men that be of the churche to be obedient unto the word of god.'[182] In the Decalogue specifically 'is euery mannes office and dewty describid, what is to be donne whether it be to wardes god or man.' Consequently Hooper, in

[178] Hooper, *Wynthester*, F2v.
[179] Ibid., F3r.
[180] Ibid., X4r.
[181] Ibid., F3r-v.
[182] Ibid., F4r.

line with Zürich soteriology, attacked solifidian reductionism: 'But faith is aryght persuacion and willing consent unto the [w]hole word of god. For he that sayth, Credes in deum patrem, filium, & spiritum sanctum, the same god saith, Ambula coram me & esto integer, What auaylith the bragg of fayth, where as is no uerteues lief.'[183] This invocation of Gen. 17:1 to 'walk before me and be blameless' implies that Hooper was cognisant of the requirements of the Abrahamic covenant. The heavenly bliss enjoyed by the patriarchs 'appertainith not to souche as know only the faythe of them,' warned Hooper, 'but unto souche as obey the commaundement of god as they dyd.'[184] Moreover, unscriptural practice, or making an alternative, idolatrous covenant, was equivalent to treason against a prince and had comparable consequences:

> the kyng of equite is bound to kyll the body of thes treatur and god can do nolesse of his iustice then kyll booth body and soulle of this ydolater if he repent not. And as noman is permittid to by or sell or to mak ony other contractes in ony Realme for his commodite except in the doyng therof he obserue the law of the land, nomore can noman use to bargayne or contract with god for his commodite in t[h]e churche of Christes, except he obserue the lawes prescribid by god.[185]

It was this concern for scriptural godliness that prompted Hooper's calls throughout the treatise for pure practice informed by expository preaching.[186]

Hooper's second treatise was entitled *A declaration of Christe and of his office* (December 1547). Trueman calls it 'an English expression of Zurich theology' and compares Hooper's concept of covenant here with Bullinger's and Tyndale's.[187] The treatise was addressed to Protector Somerset and concerned the priest-king rôle of Christ, a motif favoured by the Edwardian regime (see above p.77). A covenant hermeneutic was not pressed on the reader, but

[183] Ibid., G4r.
[184] Ibid., M3v.
[185] Ibid., S2v.
[186] e.g. Ibid., Q4v-R1r, T1r.
[187] Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 208, 214; cf. Heal, *Reformation*, 332.

the concept undoubtedly informed Hooper's discourse. The only explicit reference to God's 'pact' specifies its conditionality and sanctions:

> souche as be sanctified by Christe must lyue an honest and holy lief or else his sanctification auaylith not, as god for soke the chylder of Israel for sinne so wil he do us, they were electyd to be his people with this condition si audiendo audieris [*sic*.] uocem uocem [*sic*.] meam, & custodieris pactum meum Exo. 19. Eritis mihi in peculium de cunctis populis [if, when hearing, you (sing.) hear my voice and keep my pact, you (pl.) will be my own/for myself out of all the peoples]. He that fauoryd not the Israelites but toke cruell uengence upon them because they walkid not in there uocation will do and dooth dayly the same unto us, Rom. 11.[188]

Election as God's people carries the condition of heeding God's word and keeping his pact on pain of punishment for defaulting. Later, Hooper described the reciprocal responsibilities of the relationship unilaterally imposed by God. This included the prospect of reward for obedience:

> as god hath bound hymselfe by his promes to be our god and helper for Christ, so hathe he bound man by his commaundement to be his seruant and in his worde to folow Christ and in Christ god for the commaundementes sake untill souche tyme as thend wherfore man was made be optaynid, whiche is eternall foelicite and man restoryd and made like unto the ymayge of god.[189]

There were other implicit suggestions of the concept. For example, Hooper approved of those who fast to improve their prayerfulness: they 'doothe well and as they be bound to do.'[190]

Owing to Christ's sacrificial office, Hooper concluded that justification is by faith, but this is conditional. Faith in the divine promise to justify on the basis of Christ's meritorious sacrifice obliges God to remit sin and have favour on believers 'whiche he is bound to do for his promesse sak[e].'[191] However, while 'sole fayth and only exclude the merites of other uertews and optaynith soly remission of sinne for Christes sake,' it 'exclude not other uertews to be present at the conuersion of euery sinner.' These virtues or 'workes that go before iustificacion,

[188] John Hooper, *A Declaration of Christe and of His Offyce* (Zurich: 1547; RSTC 13745), K1r.
[189] Ibid., L4r.
[190] Ibid., D1r.
[191] Ibid., F2r.

nether those that folow iustification deserue remission of synne'[192] but still 'it be necessary and requysyt that in the iustification of a synner contricion to be present and that necessaryly cherite and uertews lieffe moost folow.'[193] Without a virtuous life God's grace is received 'inuayne'.[194] David Newcombe describes Hooper's doctrine as '*conditionally* unconditional.'[195]

Christ not only justifies but also sanctifies his people.[196] By sanctification Hooper 'means none other but a trew knolege of God in Christ' which brings awareness of how 'wear clensid by Christ' of the uncleanness caused by Adam's sin. On the basis of this expiation God 'doothe not only remitt the sinnes wrowght willyngly agaynst the word of God, but also the imperfection and naturall concupiscens whiche remaynythe in euery man as long as the nature of man is mortall.'[197] Indeed, Christ insists upon his Father's obligations: 'thow must most holy father sanctifie them, and accept them as sanctified.'[198] Thus God forgives the imperfection of believers, both making them holy and counting them as holy, which is a plainly Reformed view. They are restored to be 'apt for thy kingdom,' enabling them to be godly: we 'must lyue an honest and holy lief or else his sanctification auaylith not.'[199] Like justification, sanctification is efficacious only to the godly and so it is conditional. Hooper's soteriology is covenantal in all but name.

[192] Ibid., G1r-v.
[193] Ibid., F2v.
[194] Ibid., G5r.
[195] Newcombe, *Hooper*, 65.
[196] Hooper does not seem to have understood sanctification as a process since he wrote that 'affter we be sanctified' it is our office to proclaim Christ's power: Hooper, *Christe and His Offyce*, I8r-v.
[197] Ibid., I3r. Like Zwingli, Hooper understood original sin as a disease. See Hooper, *Christe and His Offyce*, L5v; cf. above p.87.
[198] Hooper, *Christe and His Offyce*, I4r. Hooper appears to teach the impartation, as well as imputation, of righteousness, cf. above p.85.
[199] Ibid., K1r.

The preface to Hooper's third Zürich treatise, *A declaration of the ten holy commaundementes of allmygthye God,*[200] was dated November 1549, although it was actually published in 1548. It began with a bold statement of the mutual, conditional covenant:

> for asmouche as there can be no contract peace aliaunce or confederacye betwene too persones or more except fyrst the persones that will contract agre within them selfes vpon souche thinges as shal be contractyd as thow right well knowyst: also seyng these ten commaundementes ar nothing else but the Tables or wrytinges that contayne the conditions of the peace betwene God and man Gen. 19. and declarithe at large how and to what the persones namyd in the wrytinges ar bounde unto the other [...]. It is necessary to know how God and man was made at one that souche conditions could be agreyed upon and confirmyd [...]. The contentes wherof byndithe God to ayede and succur kepe and preserue warrant and defend man from all yle boothe of body and solle and at the last to yeue him eternall blysse and euerlasting felicite [...]. Man bounde of the other part to obey serue and kepe Godes commaundementes to loue him honor him and fere him aboue all thinges.[201]

Hooper commented on how surprising it was, in light of sin, 'now we se bound in le[a]ge to gather as very frendes' God and mankind in 'aliaunce and confederacye.' Mercy was the only explanation: God's 'testament' confirmed by the death of the testator, Christ.[202] This operated 'within certaine limetes and bondes: the whiche if men neglect or passe ouer they exclude them selfes from the promes in Christ.'[203] Such boundaries were transgressed by those

> whiche will not h[ea]re nether receaue the promes of the gospelle: or else after he hathe receauid it by accustomid doing of ile he fall ether in a contempt of the gospell will not studie to liue there after or else hat[eth] the gospell because it condemnithe his vngodly liefe.[204]

The promise of salvation was demonstrated by the Ninevites who received Jonah's warning 'and toke God for there God and God toke them to be his people.' The Ninevites 'likewyce promisyd obedience vnto his holy Lawes and commaundementes,' and Hooper prayed that God

[200] Hooper's doctrine of predestination in this treatise, expressed in a similar style to Bullinger's doctrine, led to conflict with followers of Calvin. See above p.6; Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 215ff; Strehle, '*Fides aut Foedus*', 13-14.
[201] John Hooper, *A Declaration of the Ten Holy Commaundementes of Allmygthye God* (Zurich: 1548; RSTC 13746), A2r-v; cf. Trinterud, 'Origins', 43.
[202] *Ten Holy Commaundementes,* A3r-v.
[203] Ibid., A5r.
[204] Ibid., A8r.

would give us grace to do the same 'that thowghe we be infirme and weacke to all vertewes we exclude not oure selfes by contempt or negligence from the grace promisid to all men.'[205]

The observance of the law, as a covenantal condition for continuing in grace, was integral to Hooper's soteriology. Newcombe is wrong therefore to suggest that Hooper's 'book on the commandments and adoption of Bullinger's covenant theology' can be separated from his wider concern for salvation.[206] Morris West rightly understands Hooper's view that if people fail to believe in Christ and act accordingly, 'they would be judged according to their acts, or rather by their failure to believe and walk in the right paths.'[207] Hooper acknowledged this difficulty of explaining how 'the workes of the law cannot deserue remission of synne nor sa[ve] man and yet God requyrythe our diligens and obedi[e]nce vnto the Lawe.'[208] By themselves, human works were like Israel's 'le[a]ge and confederatie' with Egypt which excluded God and 'auaylid nothing.' Believers were not to trust more in 'confederacie with men: th[a]n in God.'[209] On the other hand, mercy was assured to all those who entered 'aliaunce' with God, but 'if they think to haue God for there God let them obserue his aliaunce.' Just as 'Godes mercy is commune for all men whiche is the fyrst part of the condicion expressyd in the le[a]ge so alike is the obedience towardes the law requiryd of all men.'[210]

These three treatises encapsulated the essential theological position held by Hooper for the rest of his life.[211] It appears that West is justified, in spite of Jens Møller's criticisms, in seeing Hooper's reciprocal concept of covenant as the controlling idea in his theology.[212] Newcombe

[205] Ibid., B2r-v.
[206] Newcombe, *Hooper*, 42-43; cf. Hooper, *Ten Holy Commaundementes*, 36.
[207] West, 'Hooper [1]', 358.
[208] Hooper, *Ten Holy Commaundementes*, 19.
[209] Ibid., 42.
[210] Ibid., 211-212, cf. 209.
[211] Newcombe, *Hooper*, 43.
[212] West, 'Hooper [1]', 356-359; Møller, 'Beginnings', 56.

argues that West's conclusions rely too much upon Hooper's exposition of the Decalogue,[213] but the influence of the covenant idea upon Hooper's sacramental, Christological and soteriological thought can be detected in all his Zürich treatises. The pastoral nature of Hooper's writing may not have lent itself to a systematic exposition of the covenant, but that foundation had already been laid by his Zürich mentors.[214]

On 16 May 1549 Hooper returned to London where he was promptly engaged in controversy by readers of his treatise on the Decalogue.[215] He was undeterred by Cranmer's cold reception, which he blamed on the influence of Bucer, and was determined to disseminate Zürich teachings in public lectures twice daily.[216] Those who favoured him called him 'a true friend of the liberties of the church and commonwealth of Zürich, and their defender from every calumny,'[217] and even 'the future Zwingli of England.'[218] His influence and popularity grew throughout the year and by 27 December he could report that Cranmer 'is now very friendly towards myself.'[219] He lectured in London and at Court in early 1550, and his efforts bore fruit on 5 February when Cranmer ordered him to deliver the Lenten addresses at Court, for which he selected the book of Jonah 'which will enable me freely to touch upon the duties of individuals.'[220] His avowed aims when he came to preach were to show the unity of evangelical doctrine with that of the prophets and apostles, in contrast to Rome, and to 'declare whych way the synfull worlde may be reconcyled vnto God.'[221] Duty and salvation were closely related.

---

[213] Newcombe, *Hooper*, 42, 42n.
[214] Raath and de Freitas, 'Bullinger', 221-222.
[215] Dalton, 'Hooper's Networks', 103-107.
[216] *OL*, 64-65; Dalton, 'Hooper's Networks', 53-54.
[217] John Stumphius to Bullinger, May 1549, *OL*, 462.
[218] Martin Micron to Conrad Pellican, quoted in W.M.S. West, 'John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism [2]', *BQ*, 16/1 (1955), 24. About this time Hooper disputed with Anabaptists as Zwingli had done.
[219] *OL*, 71.
[220] Ibid., 75.
[221] John Hooper, *An ouersight, and deliberacion vpon the holy prophete Ionas: made, and vttered before the Kynges Maiestie, and his Moost Honorable Councell, by Ihon Hoper in Lent last past. Comprehended in seuen sermons* (1550; RSTC 13763), 5r.

Hooper used his seven Jonah sermons to present a Zürich-inspired reform programme to the king and privy councillors, and these sermons undoubtedly contain his core beliefs.[222] As was typical of Hooper, the technical terminology of covenant does not appear in the transcript, but the concept is present. The obligation which humanity is required to discharge is a recurrent theme which makes the divine-human relationship conditional on humanity's obedience to divine law. Hooper reasoned in the prologue (written for publication in September 1550) that just as a human prince expects adherence to his 'statutes, lawes, and testament,' so God stipulates precise obedience:

> Shulde not the same glory, maiesty, and honour be geuen vnto the lawes and testament of Christ, that is sealed wyth hys precious bloude? The worde of God wherwyth he gouerneth and ruleth his church, is a septer of yron. Psal. ii. and not a rod of wylowe to be bowed wyth euerye mans finger, either a rede to be broken at mans wyll.[223]

Christ's 'lawes and testament' function together, emphasising the legislative significance of Christ's death and suggesting that Hooper utilised 'testament' in the same mutual sense as Tyndale (see above p.112). The impetus for Hooper's call for 'a perfecte and Apostolicall reformacion' sprang not from the New Testament but the Old, 'seynge I see in the writynges of the Prophets, God to require the obseruacion of his lawe onely.'[224] Thus the two Testaments were held together and the Mosaic Law had enduring relevance.

The first sermon began with the premise that children of God must 'know perfectly the nature and condicion of hys fathers wyl' in order to fulfil their duties contained in Scripture.[225] Hooper attacked those who diminished the offence of disobedience to God, illustrating the consequences of Jonah's disobedience to his duty and vocation.[226] 'We se our duetye,' said Hooper in his second sermon, 'that as GOD freelye geueth healpe, so we muste trayuell, and do

[222] West, 'Hooper [2]', 26-27.
[223] Hooper, *Ionas*, +3v.
[224] Ibid., +5v-+6r.
[225] Ibid., 1r-v.
[226] Ibid., 16v-17r.

the beste we canne wyth prayer, not onelye to receyue, and obtayne the free helpe of God, but also to kepe it.'[227] Doing our best, dependent nonetheless upon the grace of God, is required, and there should be expectation of success in the fulfilment of duty.

In his third sermon Hooper included godliness within the true Christian profession, saying that 'the people shoulde heare the word of God, geue faithe vnto it, and folow it,'[228] and in the fourth he warned that 'Gods promyse appertayneth' to 'he that wyl study the amendement of lyf' but not to the 'impenitent and neuer myndynge synner to amende.' 'The former promyses were not so sweete,' remarked Hooper, mindful of God's judgment, 'but these threatnynges be as bytter.'[229] Godly living was not required merely as a declaration of faith in the eyes of the world.[230] Like Jonah we must 'liue obedyentlye vnto the commaundement of god [...] and not vse healthe and quyetnes as an occasyon to syn, libertie, & filthines of lyfe.'[231] His fifth sermon began by placing obedience second only to right judgment of Scripture in the pleasures of God, subjecting godliness to the standards of God rather than the world.[232]

Jonah's example teaches us 'to be diligente, we see all our doinges, actes, and obedience to be according, and as the worde of God biddeth.'[233] Meanwhile the repentance of the Ninevites, preached Hooper in the sixth sermon, shows 'that to afflicte the bodye wyth fastynge, to praye, and to chaunge the olde wycked lyfe is verye expediente to wynne hys [God's] fauoure.' The king's hope of divine mercy in spite of divine wrath reminds us of 'the fyghte & battayle that is alwayes betwene the spyrite, and the flesh aboute Goddes promises.'[234] In other words, in the seventh sermon, 'al the threatnings of god be condicionally, that is to say: to fal vpon vs if we

[227] Ibid., 26r.
[228] Ibid., 45v.
[229] Ibid., 69v-70r.
[230] Ibid., 73v.
[231] Ibid., 96r.
[232] Ibid., 99v-100r; cf. Newcombe, *Hooper*, 130-131.
[233] Hooper, *Ionas*, 111r.
[234] Ibid., 161v-162r.

repent not of our [evil] de[e]ds.'[235] The Ninevites having repented, God 'coulde do none other then saue them,'[236] indicating that he is bound by the terms of his promise. The condition remains at the Last Judgment when good works will be counted since 'God sleepeth not but seeth all oure actes, aud noteth oure dooynges.'[237] Finally Hooper urged, 'let vs therfore beleue and amende, or els we must peryshe.'[238] Both faith and godliness were necessary for salvation.

The Vestment Controversy that engulfed Hooper's appointment as bishop of Gloucester from April 1550 until his consecration on 8 March 1551 demonstrated the rigidity of his devotion to the practices of Zürich, even against the counsels of Bucer, Vermigli, Calvin, and Bullinger himself. Jan Laski, the overseer of the London Stranger Church, was Hooper's only faithful supporter of note.[239] Hooper lost official support and then caused further embitterment by the illicit publication of his *Godly confession and protestacion of the christian fayth* in December 1550, which is of interest here for its plain statement of the place of works in Hooper's soteriology.[240] Not only is belief in the promises of God achieved entirely by grace apart from works, but all the believer's works and obedience towards God throughout their lives depend upon mercy and grace, for Christ's sake, to be of value before God.[241] Hooper never considered his calls for amendment of life to depart from dependence upon grace and it was with this intention that he summarised humanity's obligation thus: 'Vnto god they owe both bodye and soule, to laude and prayse him according to gods boke. To cal vpon him in the daies of their

[235] Ibid., 164r.
[236] Ibid., 165v.
[237] Ibid., 180r.
[238] Ibid., 183v.
[239] See West, 'Hooper [2]', 30-42, esp. 41n; John Opie, 'The Anglicising of John Hooper', *ARG*, 59/2 (1968), 171; Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities*, 30-45; Dalton, 'Hooper's Networks', 59-72, 107-116. Bullinger's letter to Utenhoven, dated 8 November 1551, conjectured that the experience might help Hooper to trust less in himself and more in God: Gorham (ed.), *Gleanings*, 276.
[240] John Hooper, *A Godly Confession and Protestacion of the Christian Fayth, made and set furth by Ihon Hooper, wherin is declared what a Christian manne is bound to beleue of God, hys kyng, his neibour, and hymselfe* (1550; RSTC 13757). *A Brief and Clear Confession*, also appearing about this time, was not Hooper's work, according to D.S. Ross, 'Hooper's Alleged Authorship of *A Brief and Clear Confession of the Christian Faith*', *CH*, 39/1 (1970), 18-29.
[241] Hooper, *Godly Confession*, C1r-v. Works were never to be held in higher estimation than the merits of Christ: John Hooper, *A funerall oratyon made the xiiij. day of Ianuary* [...] *vpon the texte wrytyne in the Reuelatyone of Sayncte Iohne. ca. 14* (1549 [1550]; RSTC 13753), B2v-3r.

trouble, and vpon none els, to conforme both their doctrin & their lyues, to promote and set forth the glory of God.'[242]

Like Coverdale, Hooper's episcopal exertions distracted him from further publication,[243] but his activities spoke of his Zürich commitment, particularly his establishment of a version of the Zürich prophesyings in his diocese.[244] In his fifty Visitation Articles (1551) he stressed the necessity of good works following justification and that they were required of 'every Christian man.'[245] Morris West notes that this emphasis was typical of Hooper and plausibly suggests derivation from his concept of covenant, both here and in the ordering of public penance.[246] Hooper recovered his popularity within the Edwardian establishment, shown by Cranmer's letter to Bullinger on 20 March 1552 describing Hooper as being 'in such great esteem among us [...] and is at this time living in my house upon the most intimate terms, during the sitting of parliament.'[247]

The king's death was the harbinger of Hooper's imprisonment and eventual martyrdom outside his cathedral on 9 February 1555. He was the first English bishop to suffer death at the stake,[248] and his commitment to Zürich theology won from his persecutors the appellation of 'greatest hereticke in all England.'[249] Hooper's concept of covenant, honed in Zürich, caused him to emphasise humanity's obligation to keep divine law. Although human works by themselves were worthless for salvation, the conditions of the divine league included, not only God's gracious promise of mercy, but the requirement that believers strive for godliness in dependence upon Christ.

---

[242] Hooper, *Godly Confession*, H1v-2r.
[243] The dedicatory epistle to his unpublished *De vera ratione inveniendae et fugiendae falsae doctrinae* (December 1554) is recorded in Strype, *Memorials*, iii/1, 283-284; iii/2, 267-273.
[244] W.M.S. West, 'John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism [3]', *BQ*, 16/2 (1955), 68-69.
[245] John Hooper, *Later Writings of Bishop Hooper*, ed. C. Nevinson (PS; Cambridge: 1852), 121-122.
[246] West, 'Hooper [3]', 72, 79.
[247] *OL*, 23-24.
[248] Newcombe, *Hooper*, 229.
[249] Foxe, *AM* [1583], xi. 1535.

John Bradford

When Bradford visited the continent during the 1540s, he went to assist military operations in France rather than to escape religious persecution. His affections eventually did become evangelical, but Philip Johnston is right to suggest that Bradford's prologues to works of continental theology 'do not bear the hallmark of a great mind brought to bear upon them.'[250] Indeed, considering Bradford's contribution to the Edwardian Reformation, his engagement with continental theology was surprisingly limited, apart from Bucer's teaching at Cambridge. The conjecture of this thesis that Swiss Reformed theology was the source of the reciprocal concept of covenant is sustained by the fact that Bradford, whose concept lacked significant mutual or conditional elements, was hardly touched by Swiss theology. His ethical emphases stopped short of reciprocal obligation.

Between 1544 and 1547 Bradford ably served Sir John Harington, vice-treasurer of the English forces at Boulogne, as an auditor and confidential clerk. Foxe justly described Bradford as living 'as a child of this world;'[251] in other words, as Gordon Rupp puts it, he was 'fiddling the accounts.'[252] With Harington's assistance he left Boulogne to read civil law at the Inner Temple in April 1547 and about this time became an evangelical.[253] After his conversion, Foxe says that 'Bradford did forsake his worldly affaires, and forwardnes in worldlye wealthe'[254] under the guidance of Hugh Latimer, who was not afraid to threaten unscrupulous accountants with the choice of 'either restitution, or else endless damnation.'[255]

---

[250] Johnston, 'Bradford', 109.
[251] Foxe, *AM* [1563], v. 1241.
[252] Rupp, 'Bradford', 50.
[253] Foxe's account could imply that Bradford's conversion occurred before leaving Harington's service, but Johnston observes that 'there is certainly no hint that he became acquainted with Continental Reformed Theology [whilst abroad], and to adduce such in the face of non-existent evidence would be ingenious but inappropriate': Johnston, 'Bradford', 19.
[254] Foxe, *AM* [1563], v. 1241.
[255] Latimer, *Sermons*, 262; cf. John Bradford and Thomas Sampson, *Two Notable Sermons. Made by that worthy martyr of Christ Maister Iohn Bradford, the one of repentance, and the other of the Lordes*

Bradford's extreme anxiety about his complicity in a fraud committed by Harington against the Crown gives an insight into his thoughts about what God demands of the believer. He sought the advice of a Manchester trader, John Traves, 'an old and intelligent friend whose religion,' according to Christopher Haigh, 'was following a similar course' to Bradford's own.[256] In February 1548 Traves counselled Bradford on his fears of dying without making amends:

> God hath given you a desire to pay it, but not a power. Is God so cruel, trow ye, that he will exact of you to do that that is impossible for you to do? Are ye able to pay it? Then pay it. Are ye not able? Have a continual desire, which is to be begged of God, to pay; and in the name of God work so long as ye live, as God shall lead you toward the payment of it. And, if ye die before the satisfaction, yet I think ye shall go without peril; for I believe the sin is forgiven already for Christ's sake. There remaineth then by the doctor's mind but restitution; and I believe that you have *animum restituendi* [a spirit of restitution]; and [he that] earnestly laboureth and followeth upon God's preparation toward the restitution, the same hath made a good restitution, if he die before a full restitution.[257]

Traves's advice is fairly consistent with the late-medieval 'theology of piety,' placing minimal human effort in tension with the sufficiency of Christ's atonement. In order for Bradford to benefit from Christ's satisfaction, he must exercise a genuine desire to make satisfaction.[258] Although he has, in reality, contributed nothing to his salvation by his 'labour,' his 'labour' is accepted by God. Bradford's reply in early March went beyond Traves in demonstrating a stronger conviction of humanity's total inability to act in his own power:

> You know the cross, the fatherly cross, the loving Lord hath laid upon me; but I am little or nothing moved therewith; I work therein (yet not I, but God's Spirit), not of a repentant faithful mind, but, I cannot tell how, of a slothful, blind, [w]retchless intent.[259]

Supper neuer before imprinted (1574; RSTC 3500.5), A4v. Bradford was exposed to Reformed theology implicit in Latimer's sermons, writes Hughes, 'Two Northern Protestants', 106.

[256] Haigh, *Lancashire*, 170.

[257] Traves to Bradford, February 1548, John Bradford, *The Writings of John Bradford, M.A., Martyr, 1555. Containing Letters, Treatises, Remains*, ed. A. Townsend (PS, 2; Cambridge: 1853), 3.

[258] Bradford seems to have shared this view: Johnston, 'Bradford', 27.

[259] To Traves, early March 1548, Bradford, *Writings 2*, 5.

Bradford interpreted 'tribulations' as 'the cognizances of God's election, the letter *Thau*, the instruments which work *suspiria aeternae vitae* [the sighs of eternal life], and therefore to be embraced.'[260] The elect are provoked to work, or, more precisely, the Holy Spirit in them works.[261] When Bradford's restitution was completed a couple of years later, he assigned the credit to God: 'God wrought the restitution of the great thing [...] the which benefit should bind me to all obedience.'[262]

On 22 March 1548 Bradford wrote again to Traves, lamenting his own obstinacy in responding to God. He used a series of mixed metaphors related to God's call that demonstrate his interconnected reading of the Old Testament: 'I hide me with Adam in the garden, I play not only Samuel running to Eli, but I play Jonas running to the sea, and there I sleep upon the hatches, tumbling into Jezebel's bed.'[263] He saw himself as being too feeble even to answer God's summons, so he attributed salvation entirely to God, recognising that 'it cometh not of man, it cometh not of works, to repent, to believe, to fear, and to love. Work thou therefore in me, for Jesus Christ's sake, which am thy creature and most unthankful hypocritical servant.'[264]

Bradford severely doubted his own ability to become a minister of God's word. While in London he undertook what he hoped to be the first of many translations of theological texts in order to avoid being an 'unprofitable and idle member.'[265] He chose to begin with *The division of the places of the lawe and of the Gospell* by Petrus Artopoeus, a Lutheran theologian in Szczecin.[266] In his prologue Bradford urged the theological use of the law and the sweetness of

[260] Ibid. The Hebrew letter 'thau' supposedly represented the 'mark' of election in an allusion to Ezek. 9:4.
[261] As Trueman observes, 'in situations where [Bradford] is dealing with a troubled conscience, he almost always points towards Christ as the sole means of assurance. It is only when faced with complacency that he goads individuals into action by stressing the moral imperatives of Christianity': Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 274.
[262] To Traves, about February 1550, Bradford, *Writings 2*, 33.
[263] To Traves, 20 March 1548, Ibid., 13. Bradford had similarly cited Jezebel (Rev. 3:20-22) in his previous letter, highlighting his feelings of hypocrisy: Bradford, *Writings 2*, 5.
[264] To Traves, 22 March 1548, Bradford, *Writings 2*, 13-14.
[265] To Traves, late-May/early-June 1548, Ibid., 21.
[266] Artopoeus and Chrysostome, *Diuisyon of the Places*.

the Gospel of Christ before proceeding to condemn antinomian 'carnall gospellers.' God's 'testament' was mentioned only as the promise of salvation which the gospellers say the papists will never 'loke upon.'[267] The sole significance ascribed to godliness was to 'proue whether ye be in fayth [...] for fayth is not, where the feare of God is not.'[268] There was no indication of mutual or conditional concepts in this work.

In the same volume Bradford published two orations by John Chrysostom on prayer. His preface emphasised the numerous 'duetyes' which constitute a right response to the Gospel,[269] mindful of the fact that God's wrath, both in the Old Testament and today, is ignited by 'wanton receyuyng' of his word, by which he meant 'ingratitude and unthankfulness.' Together with repentance the Gospel 'cryeth for amendment of liuyng [...] God regardeth more obedience than sacrifice [...] if we wyll obey hym, we shall eate the good thynges of the lande.' Obedience, particularly in prayer, was the God-given means to 'exercyse' the faith that was needed to 'reteygne and kepe styll the grace of God gyuen unto us.'[270] Bradford still held faith to be the sole basis on which the Christian is justified before God, yet he considered obedience to be important to the enjoyment of the continuing blessing of God's grace. Although this has vestiges of a mutual covenant concept, Bradford did not develop his theology in that direction.

In the summer of 1548 Bradford went up to Cambridge to read divinity; having taken his M.A. in October 1549, he became a fellow of Pembroke Hall.[271] His theological indebtedness to the Regius Professor of Divinity, Martin Bucer, whose lectures he attended, was 'truly decisive.'[272] Bradford was also conversant with the works of numerous patristic and medieval theologians,

[267] Ibid., A6r.
[268] Ibid., A8r.
[269] Ibid., N5v.
[270] Ibid., N6r-7r.
[271] See Haigh, *Lancashire*, 166-167.
[272] Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 251n. For general comparisons see Johnston, 'Bradford', 49-52, 109-119. Johnston concludes that Bradford's primary theological debt was to Bucer. Bradford did translate some passages of Bucer, but it is otherwise hard to establish a 'clear demonstrable relationship between Bucer's writings and those of Bradford,' writes Basil Hall, 'Martin Bucer in England', in D.F. Wright (ed.), *Martin Bucer: reforming church and community* (Cambridge: 1994), 157n.

as well as those of Erasmus, Ridley, Melanchthon, and Œcolampadius.[273] When, in the context of a discussion about transubstantiation at his examination in 1555, Bradford referred to those who had influenced him, it was in the negative: 'my faith is not builded on Luther, Zwingli, or Œcolampadius, in this point and indeed, to tell you truly, I never read any of their works in this matter [of the Eucharist].' He was, nonetheless, prepared to vouch that 'as for their persons, whatsoever their sayings were, yet do I think assuredly that they were and are God's children and saints with him.'[274] It may be significant for Bradford's concept of covenant that he claimed that he had engaged with the sacramental theology of neither Zwingli nor Œcolampadius, nor, indeed, Luther.[275]

Bradford's personal piety at Cambridge was remarkable for its depth of emotion and discipline.[276] He understood profoundly that he must one day give 'account even for every hair-breadth' of his sin.[277] His meditations (collected for publication in 1562) may profitably be considered here for their explicit reference to the concept of covenant. His *Meditation on the Ten Commandments* drew ethical principles from the Decalogue in line with Reformed theology. He considered how God

> vouchsafed [...] gratiously to enrich me concerning fortune, frends, liuinge, name [... and that I] should be called into the number of thy people, enroledde in thy boke, & now in thy couenaunt, so that thou with all that euer thou hast arte mine.

Bradford clearly places the covenant relationship after election. This relationship involves the possession of God with all his benefits through the 'couenaunt of peace vnfallible and

[273] Johnston, 'Bradford', 59-60; Haigh, *Lancashire*, 171; Bradford, *Writings 2*, 55n.
[274] John Bradford, *The Writings of John Bradford, M.A., Martyr, 1555. Containing Sermons, Meditations, Examinations, &c*, ed. A. Townsend (PS, 1; Cambridge: 1848), 525.
[275] In Bradford's treatise on the Mass the names of Calvin, Viret, Bullinger and Hooper are printed in the margin where his text reads 'dyuerse haue wrytten of it ynough,' but this is more likely to be an editorial insertion than an indication of Bradford's own influences. See John Bradford, *The Hurte of Hering Masse* (1561; RSTC 3494), A2v.
[276] Bradford and Sampson, *Two Notable Sermons*, A5v; Strype, *Memorials*, iii/1, 363. Marcus Loane remarks on 'an intolerance and an intensity in his nature which were just as vivid as his gentleness or his piety. This strand [...] was the result in part of his firm grasp of the Reformed Theology, and in part of his clear knowledge of God's grace in his own experience': Loane, *Pioneers*, 159.
[277] To Traves, late-May/early-June 1548, Bradford, *Writings 2*, 20.

euerlasting,' which is spoken of in the same breath as the relationships enjoyed by Abraham and the Israelites.[278] Bradford reflected that in Christ's blood 'shedde vpon the crosse, ye hast made a couenaunt with me, whiche thou wilt neuer forget.' God had promised 'that thou art and wilt be my lord and my god, that is, thou wilt forgeue me my sinnes and be wholy mine.'[279] For Bradford, God guides us in all that we do:

> most iustely and reasonably thou requirest that as thou arte my lord god: so I should be thy seruaunt and one of thy people: As thou haste giuen thyself wholy vnto me, to be mine with all thy power wisedome &c (For he that geueth himself geueth all he hath) so shuld I be wholy thine, and geue ouer myself vnto thee to be guided with thy wisedome, defended with thy power, holpen, releiued, and comforted by thy mercy.[280]

This passage concerns the covenant relationship once salvation has been granted. God's covenant 'iustely and reasonably' elicits an appropriate response, but with no suggestion of human obligation, for Bradford had a stronger sense than Tyndale, Coverdale or Hooper of God working through believers. Humanity should submit itself to God, not only because those who do not fear the Lord will perish, but also that blessing may be poured out, 'that thou mightest reueale thy sonne to me, and thy mercye might be vpon me from generacion to generacion.'[281] Humanity's part in the relationship does not attain the reciprocal character of a mutual covenant.

Bradford considered reasons 'to put my trust in thee, to loue, feare, and obey thee.' These reasons were 'not only in respect of the hurt which els will ensew, but also in respect of the commoditie that herby cometh vnto me.'[282] Although this 'commoditie' is received by relating

[278] John Bradford, *Godlie Meditations vpon the Lordes Prayer, the Beleefe, and Ten Commaundementes* [...] *a Defence of the Doctrine of Gods Eternall Election and Predestination* (1562; RSTC 3484), F1r-v.
[279] Ibid., E8v. Greaves, assuming that Calvin's concept of covenant was unilateral, claims that Bradford's concept was a reflection of Calvin's concept: Greaves, 'Origins', 25, 28.
[280] Bradford, *Godlie Meditations* [...] *Defence of Election*, F1v-2r.
[281] Ibid., F2v; cf. Gen. 17:7.
[282] Ibid., F3r.

properly to God, the alternative 'hurt' is being the poorer, having rejected God's benefits, rather than a punishment for disobedience. Bradford acknowledged that

> in times paste horribly I haue broken this thy lawe, in trusting in thy creatures, calling vpon them, louing, fearing, and obeying many thinges besydes thee, and rather then thee [...] by reason wherof I am worthy of eternall damnation.

This led him to reiterate the assurance of Christ's atonement on account of which God graciously grants salvation to those who believe.[283] There is a sense in which faith operates as a condition when Bradford recognises that God could fairly object 'that I doe not beleue, and therfore notwithstandinge thy trueth & promise, in that I beleue it not, thou maiest most iustly after thy Iustice, dampne me.' However, this being so, Bradford's advice is that the faithless should cast themselves on God's mercy, rather than urging them to work at their faith.[284]

The other explicit references to the covenant also concerned divine promises. In *A confession of sinnes, and a praier for the mitigation of goddes wrath and punishment for the same,* Bradford prayed, with regard to salvation: 'indue vs wyth thy holie spirit according to thy couenant and mercy.' Bradford unequivocally stated that it is God who acts in us, and that it is divine action which accomplishes all that is required of God's children:

> write thy law in our hartes & so to worke in vs, that we maye now begyn and goe forwardes in beleuing, liuing, fearing, obeyng, praying, hoping & seruinge thee as

[283] Ibid., G1r-v. Similar to Tyndale (see above n.21), Bradford based justification on the apprehension of Christ's righteousness: he was made incarnate so that we 'by hym myghte be made thy chyldren, children of grace, communicatinge with him rightuousnes, holines, & immortality by the working of the spirit, as he communicated wyth vs fleshe and bloude [...] by the working of the same holy spirit': Bradford, *Godlie Meditations* [...] *Defence of Election,* E7v-8r. Hence the importance of mystical union in Bradford's concept of covenant, 'that I mighte dwel in thee and thou in me': Idem., F3r. This informed his understanding of imputation as well as the law-Gospel dialectic in a *Comparison between the old man and the new* in John Bradford, *Godly Meditations vppon the Ten Commaundementes, the Articles of the Fayth, and the Lords Prayer* [...] *a Comparison Betweene the Old Man and the New: the Lawe and the Gosple* (1567; RSTC 3493.5), 92-96. However, Bradford did not teach 'double justification' as has been suggested by Hughes, 'Two Northern Protestants', 115-117; cf. Trueman, *Luther's Legacy,* 282-283.

[284] Bradford, *Godlie Meditations* [...] *Defence of Election,* F3r-v.

> thou doest requyre most fatherly and most iustly of vs, acceptinge vs as perfecte throughe Christ and by imputation.[285]

Although the Christian should follow a godly pattern of life, Bradford's point is that God works this in his people, accepting them by virtue of the imputed, alien righteousness of Christ.

In *A prayer for the remission of sinnes*, Bradford implored God to remember his 'promise & euerlasting couenant' of Isaiah 54:9. God's oath that he will never again be angry as in the time of Noah is called the 'bond of my peace' which 'shal not faile thee.' Again, Bradford emphasised the divine action working in the Christian by means of the covenant written on his heart:

> that I maye loue thee with all my harte for euer: that I may loue thy people for thy sake: that I may be holy in thi sight through Christ: that I may always not only striue against sinne, but also ouercome the same daily more and more, as thy children doe, aboue all thinges desiringe the sanctification of thy name, the comming of thy kingdome, the doyng of thy will here on earth as it is in heauen.[286]

Similarly, in *The Flesh and the Spirit*, Bradford explained that 'so much as we are regenerate and endued with God's Spirit, we do strive and fight against all the powers of our souls and bodies.'[287] The practical outworking of Bradford's position, writes Johnston, is that 'godly living is of paramount importance to the elect.'[288] However, godliness is characterised as a response to having been chosen by God, rather than a responsibility of being elect.

In the fly-leaves of his copy of Tyndale's New Testament Bradford wrote that although the Spirit-empowered works of the Christian are yet imperfect, through faith imperfection is not 'imputed or laid to their charge for the covenant's sake.' Therefore the regenerate man 'never can nor will sin against God,' and is 'free to do good and nothing else.' This righteousness in

[285] Ibid., N2v.
[286] Ibid., N6r-v.
[287] Bradford, *Writings 1*, 301-302
[288] Johnston, 'Bradford', 145.

God's sight, insofar as believers 'walk in his laws,' gives 'certainty of salvation.' Bradford's focus was on God's covenanted means of accepting believers 'finally and perpetually,' rather than on ethical instruction.[289]

Bucer encouraged Bradford to become a preacher and on 10 August 1550 Ridley ordained him deacon with licence to preach.[290] Before Bucer died in February 1551, Bradford urged him to remember Christ's promises and 'to consider who he was, what he taught, and what steadfastness, faith, and devotion, he had always exercised,' and the satisfaction made by God alone. Bradford's confidence for salvation was based on faith, but a faith characterised by discipline. Bucer seems to have felt that Bradford's advice was too introspective since, according to Nicholas Carr's report, Bucer was concentrating wholly 'upon Christ crucified, that God dwelt in his heart, and [...] nothing but heaven and a speedy departure from this body.'[291]

In December 1551 Bradford became a royal chaplain, one of six élite, itinerant preachers.[292] Ridley likened him to Latimer and John Knox in his sharp rebuke of social ills.[293] According to Haigh, Lancashire evangelicalism came to include 'a pronounced Puritan strain' in response to Bradford's preaching.[294] Throughout 1552 Bradford toured Lancashire and Cheshire, and that summer he preached his *Sermon of Repentance* (published in July 1553).[295] In it the concept of covenant was used explicitly only in reference to complacent law-breakers: Bradford asked, 'tell me nowe good brother why do you so lightely consyder Gods cursse, that for your sinnes past you are so careles as though you had made a couenaunt with death and damnation as the

[289] Bradford, *Writings 1*, 250-251.
[290] Foxe, *AM* [1563], v. 1242. Bradford's objection at his ordination, unspecified by Foxe, was almost certainly against the invocation of the saints, not vestments, since Ridley would never have conceded the latter in the midst of Hooper's Vestments Controversy. Bradford was probably ordained priest eventually: Johnston, 'Bradford', 217.
[291] Nicholas Carr to John Cheke, Bradford, *Writings 2*, xxiii-xxiv.
[292] Jordan (ed.), *Chronicle*, 101.
[293] Nicholas Ridley, *The Works of Nicholas Ridley*, ed. H. Christmas (PS; Cambridge: 1843), 59.
[294] Haigh, *Lancashire*, 175.
[295] For general discussion see Johnston, 'Bradford', 164-180.

wicked dyd in Esayes time?'[296] The reference is to Isaiah 28:15-18 where the covenant with death and hell requires nothing of sinners. In Bradford's sermon, as in Isaiah, humanity initiates an anti-covenant which is neither reciprocal nor conditional.

Johnston observes of this sermon that 'in Bradford's redemptive scheme, it is difficult to see anything but the doctrine of substitutionary atonement.'[297] The exclusion of human merit from justification is a pervasive concern.[298] To understand the value of works we must appreciate that in Bradford's theology 'repentance and its resultant, godly living, are synonymous.'[299] Bradford asserted that 'pennaunce is the thynges whereto all the scripture calleth vs.' He defined penance as 'a hartye sorow for our sinnes, a good hope or truste of pardone thorough Christe, whiche is not withoute an earneste purpose to amende, or a new lyfe.' Repentance, faith and the intention of godliness 'must be continuallye in vs, and not for a lent season, as we haue thoughte[.] This must increase dayly more and more in vs, without this we cannot be saued.' It is God who provides these three 'partes' of penance unto salvation.[300]

For Bradford the distinction between law and Gospel was that

> these promyses of the gospell doe not hange on the condicion of oure worthynesse as the promyses of the law do: but they depende and hange on Godsses [*sic*.] trueth, so that they cannot, but be perfourmed to al them which lay holde on them by faith, I had almost sayd which cast them not away by vnbelefe.[301]

Bradford assumes belief when he asserts the unconditionality of the Gospel promise. Recipients must not 'wyth Sathan say, GOD is false.' If they declare God to be a liar, 'GOD is faythful, and cannot denye himselfe: as thou shalt feele by hys plages in hell, for so dishonoringe God to

[296] John Bradford, *A Sermon of Repentaunce* (1553; RSTC 3496), D5r.
[297] Johnston, 'Bradford', 173.
[298] e.g., Bradford, *Repentaunce*, B7r-C2r, H2r.
[299] Johnston, 'Bradford', 164.
[300] Bradford, *Repentaunce*, C5r, 6v.
[301] Ibid., F1v-2r.

thinke that he is not true.'[302] Assurance stems from the reliability of God's word and can only be forfeited by incredulity.

The truly faithful believer is always one who attempts to be godly, since the faithful have the Spirit 'to worke in you, with you, & by you here in this lyfe, sanctificacion.' The faithful are exhorted not to 'moleste the good spyryt of God by rebellinge agaynste it, when it prouoketh and calleth you to go on forewardes, that he which is holy, myght yet be more holy, he whyche is righteous myghte be more righteous.'[303] Bradford's understanding of God's call to holiness was integrated into the reception of God's benefits by faith. He was particularly concerned to show that the godly works required of humanity were done through the internal action of the Spirit, and his teaching was constructed to be as consistent as possible with his understanding of grace from first to last.

In November 1552 Ridley identified Bradford as a potential bishop,[304] and Bradford was invited to preach before the king in Lent 1553.[305] Shortly after Edward's death in July 1553 Bradford published his translation of Melanchthon's *A treatyse of prayer*, using the preface to blame God's wrath on the impiety of the English people.[306] However, Bradford did not depict this retribution as a covenantal sanction.

On 16 August 1553 Bradford was imprisoned in the Tower, whence he contributed to the public divisions over the resumption of the Latin rite a treatise on *The Hurt of Hearing Mass*, warning 'week gospellers' not to conform under worldly pressure.[307] Bradford built his

[302] Ibid., F4r.
[303] Ibid., H5v-6r.
[304] Ridley to John Gate and William Cecil, 18 November 1552, Ridley, *Works*, 337.
[305] Bradford and Sampson, *Two Notable Sermons*, A3v-4r. On the assumption that Bradford was ordained, it seems reasonable to speculate that he, like Hooper, might have been made a bishop following his Court sermons had not Edward VI died. For John Knox's account of Bradford's preaching at Court, see Bradford, *Writings 1*, 111.
[306] Philip Melanchthon, *A Godlye Treatyse of Prayer*, trans. J. Bradford (1553; RSTC 17791), A3r, A4v.
[307] Bradford, *Hurte of Hering Masse*, E4v. Bradford was by far the most prolific of the prison writers, producing some 128 items: Wheeler, 'Protestants, Prisoners', 75, 102. His enduring respect for the

argument on God's law in the Decalogue: 'out of the furste table I haue shewed that euery commaundemendemente [*sic*.] theirin is broken by hearinge & seynge Masse [...] so could I shew out of the second table that it is a breach of all and euerye commaundementes there.'[308] His first point reiterated, yet again, the propriety of godliness:

> [when God] hath tolde vs what he is vnto vs: euen oure lorde and oure god, wyth all that euer he is and hathe [...] then of equitee he requireth that we shulde be content wyth hym and geue oure selues to hym to be hys wyth all that euer we haue [...]. [God] demaundeth the soule, wyll, vnderstan[d]ynge, and harte, that is our fayth feare, loue, thankefulnes, inuocasion, & inwarde adoracion, or worshippynge to be gyuen to hym onelye, and for hys sake as he shall appoynte [...]. He generallye requereth for the outwarde seruyce of hym, that we shulde followe his worde in seruinge of hym.[309]

God has given himself to humanity, and humanity must act as God's possession. Of equity mankind must worship God alone and serve God according to his express instruction, but again, Bradford did not relate this to the covenant.

Bradford was transferred to the King's Bench in the spring of 1554. In the summer he entered into controversy with sectarian 'free-willers' who sought, in this dispute, to preserve human free-will in salvation.[310] Trueman claims that election was axiomatic to Bradford's soteriology.[311] Although a predestinarian emphasis need not preclude a bilateral concept of covenant (see above p.6), it seems to have done so in Bradford's case. Thomas Freeman writes that 'Bradford and his associates felt obliged to defend predestination at almost any cost: assurance of immutable election was a paramount concern of their followers.'[312] The most obvious source of his doctrine of election is Bucer, although Calvin's predestinarianism had

---

national Church under Mary is seen as indicative of a Swiss ecclesiology by Hughes, 'Two Northern Protestants', 115.

[308] Bradford, *Hurte of Hering Masse*, C5v.

[309] Ibid., B7r-v.

[310] Thomas Freeman, 'Dissenters from a Dissenting Church: the Challenge of the Freewillers, 1550-1558', in P. Marshall and A. Ryrie (eds.), *The Beginnings of English Protestantism* (Cambridge: 2002), 134-135.

[311] Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 256; cf. Johnston, 'Bradford', 135-136.

[312] Freeman, 'Dissenters', 135; cf. J.W. Martin, 'English Protestant Separatism at its Beginnings: Henry Hart and the Free-Will Men', *SCJ*, 7/2 (1976), 69.

begun to circulate in England.[313] Bradford had probably attended Bucer's lectures on Paul's epistle to the Ephesians in 1550-51 and he shared Bucer's emphasis on divine revelation over human reason.[314]

Writing to the free-willers, Bradford contended that God's will to save the elect was 'determined, and therefore immutable.'[315] From a human perspective, God 'doth seem in some things to alter his will, before not determined, but dependant on man's behaviour,' yet God's will is not altered 'in respect of himself.' Thus, Jonah declared to the Ninevites that 'God's sentence pronounced was not determined but hanged upon condition [...] as by the alteration of it we perceive.'[316] Meanwhile, 'the sentence of God for those which he hath given to Christ' is seen to be determined both by Christ's prayer in John 17:20-26 and by the fact that they 'refuse [redemption] not finally.' It is possible to distinguish between what is determined and what is undetermined 'by the word and of the end.'[317]

Similar to Luther's argument in *De Servo Arbitrio*,[318] Bradford rejected a synergistic interpretation of salvation that implied the insufficiency of Christ's atonement to elicit grace:

> if you will say that salvation dependeth partly on ourselves, and not simply, wholly and altogether on God's mercy and truth in Christ and his merits, you deny salvation to come of grace, contrary to the prophets and apostles; for grace to us is not but in respect of grace to Christ.[319]

Bradford suspected that the free-willers were 'adversaries to grace by maintaining free-will' and he assumed that they must lack assurance 'because you are never certain of your power

[313] Hazlett, 'Calvin and the British Isles', 120-121.
[314] Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 251n; cf. Heal, *Reformation*, 331. Bucer's lectures would also account for Bradford's emphasis on discipline. Bucer said that the knowledge of election 'actively kindles in us a zeal for purity' and 'an amazing longing and desire to cleave to the benefits of God': Martin Bucer, *Lectures on Ephesians* (1550-51), in Wright (ed.), *Commonplaces*, 109-111.
[315] To a free-willer, 1554, Bradford, *Writings 2*, 129.
[316] Ibid., 130.
[317] Ibid.; To Cole and Sheterden, Ibid., 133.
[318] Martin Luther, *De Servo Arbitrio* [1525], trans. P. Watson (*LCC*, 17; Philadelphia: 1969), 178.
[319] To a free-willer, Bradford, *Writings 2*, 130.

how much and free it is.'[320] The denial of human cooperation was fundamental to Bradford's defence of salvation by grace.[321] The development of a reciprocal concept of covenant would have militated against his line of argument.

Nevertheless, the unconditional nature of Bradford's concept of covenant did not permit antinomianism. He insisted that, as 'God's providence bindeth not our hands, so it hindereth not in us any good thing, but rather provoketh us thereunto mightily.'[322] Christians 'pray, watch and fast, and do good deeds, and yet still hang on God's eternal and immutable decree and grace in Christ.' These activities do not 'infirm their faith' regarding their election; instead they are recognised as 'God's instruments to their salvation' on the understanding that God 'can and will make his counsel to stand for ever, as we see he doth with the elect infants without these things.'[323]

Bradford's *Defence of the doctrine of gods eternall election and predestination* was written in late 1554. In the dedication, written on 11 October 1554, he claimed that faith in divine election was 'the whole sum' of what God 'requireth of us,'[324] yet faith not only undermined human 'power, ableness, and choice,' but also

> enforceth men to love and carefully travail for their brethren [...]. It provoketh to piety, and is the greatest enemy to ungodliness that can be, by teaching us of what dignity we be [...]. It maketh man wholly and continually to give over himself to be careful, not for himself, but for his brethren and those things which make to God's glory.[325]

[320] Ibid.
[321] Penny, *Freewill or Predestination*, 116. Bradford's determination to exclude human cooperation might fruitfully be compared with later Puritan attitudes: see below p.118. On the free-willer view that God's promise was contingent on mankind's actively putting himself under the covenant, see Martin, 'English Protestant Separatism', 65, 71-72.
[322] Bradford, *Writings 2*, 130-131.
[323] Ibid., 131; cf. Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 224.
[324] Bradford, *Writings 1*, 307.
[325] Ibid., 308.

Bradford argued that godliness was

> grounded in predestination in Christ. For who liveth 'godly,' but he that believeth? and who believeth but such as are 'ordained to eternal life?' Who liveth 'justly,' but such as love their neighbours? and whence springeth this love, but of God's election 'before the beginning of the world, that we might be blameless by love?' Who liveth 'soberly' but such as be holy? and who are they but only those that be endued with the Spirit of sanctification? Which is the 'seal' of our election, which by election do believe.[326]

Godliness was an assurance, rather than a requirement, of election, but they were closely linked in the treatise.[327] Bradford pointed out that Christ had attributed 'to election the cause of finall perseuerance.'[328] God 'cannot condemne the penitent and beleuer, for that were against his promise,' wrote Bradford, and believers were exhorted to claim the promise: 'Let us therefore labour, studie, crye and praye for repentance and faith, and then cannot we be damned.'[329]

In the second part of Bradford's treatise on election he discussed the relationship between election and the covenant. He reported the opinion of a free-willer that election

> putteth away (saith he) the covenaunt of god p[ar]tely on gods parte, but wholly on mans p[ar]te. On gods parte (saieth he) bicause christ is denyed to be a generall savior [...] he writeth that election putteth away the covenaunt on mans behalf wholy for it taketh away (saieth he) the power and holynes, w[hi]ch god hath before given from hym.[330]

Bradford did not hesitate to deny that Christ was a 'generall savior' because that would, he believed, lead either to universalism or to a denial of divine sovereignty. To the accusation that election confounds human 'power and holynes,' Bradford responded that Paul 'taketh from

[326] Ibid., 309.
[327] Bradford, *Godlie Meditations* [...] *Defence of Election*, O6r.
[328] Ibid., O8v.
[329] Ibid., P1v.
[330] Bodleian Library, Oxford: MS. Bodl. 53, fos. 59r. Only part one of the treatise was published in 1562.

man the thought which is the best part of any good workes[.] As for the consent and deede elsewhere he taketh it from man and gevethe it to god.'[331]

Bradford progressed to attack the free-willer's view that 'as god called in adam all men so all men came in Adam: unto him whereuppon he made the covenaunt.' Bradford objected that Adam had not responded to God's call in Gen. 3, 'much lesse all in hym.'[332] Bradford also criticised the free-willer for making humanity's response to God into the basis of the covenant: 'Agayn gode[s] covenaunt whose grounde is his mercy and truthe: he maketh now our coming so greatly dothe he Impugne the mercie and goodnes of god.' In Bradford's view, the free-willer had failed to discern 'betweene the fre promes and covenaunt, for els he would not call the fre promes a covenaunt but on gode[s] behalf onlye: ffor what is required here on mans behalf if he have respect to infants and children which can not beleve[?]'[333] For Bradford, the word 'covenant' implied responsibility and ought to be applied only to God's unilateral action in salvation. Although God had made covenants both with David and Jeroboam in 1 Kgs 11:34-39, Bradford claimed that the free-willer 'confoundethe the covenaunts as appearethe by his testimonies: and examples. the covenaunt to David and Jeroboam were not a like as a child can tell that readeth the booke of the kinge.'[334] David and Jeroboam were both required to keep God's law but, as Bradford suggests, the Davidic covenant was distinguished by the fact that it was ultimately unconditional.

Bradford's prison disputes strongly suggest that his concept of covenant was subordinated to his emphasis on unconditional election, prompting the development of a unilateral version of the concept. In this respect Bradford's predestinarian theology, although similar to Calvin's, had different theological consequences. In January 1555 Bradford was transferred from the King's Bench to the Compter Prison. There he composed farewells to those he had known and

[331] Ibid. fol. 59v.
[332] Ibid.
[333] Ibid.
[334] Ibid. Greaves cites this passage to show that Bradford took more care than Calvin to distinguish between the free promise and covenant of grace: Greaves, 'Origins', 28. See above p.98.

preached to.[335] In his *Exhortation to the brethren throughout the realm of England*, he reminded them that they had 'made a covenant with God to forsake yourselves in this world and Satan also.'[336] It was the first time that Bradford had written of humanity making a covenant with God, but he did not develop the idea. Bradford himself forsook this world for the next at the stake on 30 June 1555.

Conclusion

This analysis of the writings of four English reformers has revealed their engagement with, and strongly pastoral approach to, the concept of covenant. Although logical theological exposition tended to give way to the achievement of their didactic ends, Tyndale, Coverdale and Hooper developed their understandings of covenant in a direction comparable with the Swiss reformers explored in chapter two. While they had been directly exposed to continental theology during their periods in exile, Bradford imbibed other influences and his concept of covenant did not come to resemble the Swiss formulation.

Tyndale's reading of Swiss Reformed theology, although highly likely, must be inferred. His development of a reciprocal concept of covenant in 1529-31 was probably precipitated by his own work on the Pentateuch, although his reading of Swiss texts would have encouraged this extension of his earlier ethical emphases. He co-ordinated faith and love within the covenant framework so that it was incumbent upon the believer to fulfil the law in the context of the gracious indwelling of the Spirit. While Tyndale's gradual accentuation of ethical emphases is striking, in Coverdale's case there is a concentration of evidence of his covenant thought in the early 1540s. It is probable that Coverdale's concept initially arose through Tyndale's influence, but his direct links with Zürich theology are clearer than Tyndale's. Coverdale made available in English Bullinger's *Der alt gloub*, thereby disseminating covenant ideas among English-

[335] cf. Wheeler, 'Protestants, Prisoners', 90.
[336] Bradford, *Writings 1*, 415. On the importance of suffering in Bradford's theology and its link to godliness and reward, see Johnston, 'Bradford', 161-162.

speakers. Coverdale applied the legal and familial nature of mutual obligation in his writings with an emphasis on sanctification. He maintained his interest in Swiss ideas throughout Edward VI's reign, but by that time Hooper was the most renowned exponent of Zürich theology in England. Hooper's concept of covenant had been fully developed in Zürich between 1547 and 1549. It was the basic principle expounded, explicitly and implicitly, in his writings. The covenant guaranteed God's salvation to believers on the condition that they met the requirements of faith and godliness. Tyndale, Coverdale and Hooper all exhibited a reciprocal concept of covenant consistent with that of Zwingli, Bullinger and Calvin.

Bradford's continental influences were largely indirect, although the most significant was Bucer's teaching at Cambridge. Bradford aspired to high moral standards for his personal relationship with God and he developed strong ethical impulses in his theology. However, his concept of covenant cannot account for this. For Bradford, following Bucer, God's eternal decree made it impossible to attribute anything to humanity in salvation that could be construed as a condition. Owing to the particular circumstances of the free-will controversy in 1554, he applied 'covenant' to God's unilateral commitment only, since he could not risk assigning any salvific efficacy to human action, even if it were within the context of God's sovereign grace.

The similarity between the Swiss reformers and Tyndale, Coverale and Hooper in their reciprocal concept of covenant points to the reception of Swiss theology into English Reformed identity. Bradford's unilateral concept of covenant, under Bucer's influence, appears to confirm the link between the development of a reciprocal covenant and Swiss influence. The next two chapters will add further definition to these influences through an examination of the covenant idea in relation to sacramental theology.

IV. Swiss Sacramental Theology

> Whoever honours idols, before and after holds them in his heart as god, that is, as father or helper. For this reason they are idols. For who honours the stone ape in the fish market or the golden hen in the small tower? Who burns candles before them? No one. For what reason? For the reason that man perceives divine help in no ape or hen.
>
> *Huldrych Zwingli (1525)* [1]

TRANSUBSTANTIATION of the bread and the wine into the body and blood of Christ in the course of the Mass was declared to be *de fide* by the Fourth Lateran Council (1215).[2] Communicants received divine grace through the corporal reception of Christ. The efficacy of the sacrifice of the Mass made it the elaborate centrepiece of the sacramental cycle which would be shaken by Martin Luther's rejection, not only of transubstantiation, but of five medieval sacraments in his treatise *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church* (1520).

In Luther's opinion baptism and the Eucharist alone contained divine promises confirmed by a sign. He wrote that 'in every promise of God two things are presented to us, the word and the sign, so that we are to understand the word to be the testament, but the sign to be the sacrament.'[3] It was the Eucharist rather than baptism that generated fierce debate between magisterial reformers when the *Abendmahlsstreit* (Supper controversy) erupted in 1525 between the Swiss and upper German reformers and the Lutherans. The Eucharist was the only subject on which agreement could not be reached when Philip of Hesse arranged for Luther and Zwingli to meet at the Marburg Colloquy of 1529.[4]

---

[1] Huldrych Zwingli, *Answer to Valentin Compar* (1525), translated in Lee Wandel, 'The Body of Christ at Marburg, 1529', in R. Falkenburg, W. Melion, and T. Richardson (eds.), *Image and Imagination of the Religious Self in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Turnhout: 2007), 204-205.
[2] Gary Macy, 'The Dogma of Transubstantiation in the Middle Ages', *JEH*, 45/1 (1994), 23, 40.
[3] Luther, *Babylonian Captivity*, *LW*, xxxvi. 44. On signs, see Cameron, *Reformation*, 157.
[4] *Marburg Colloquy and Articles*, *LW*, xxxviii. 85-89.

Luther insisted that Christ's 'real flesh and real blood are present in no other way and to no less a degree than the others [the Romanists] assert them to be under their accidents.'[5] His explanation of the Eucharist as 'Christ's testament' united his sacramental theology to his definition of a testament, compact, or covenant as a unilateral and unconditional last will and testament.[6] His understanding of the Real Presence was inextricable from his conception of Christ's testament. Similarly Martin Bucer concentrated his sacramental theology upon the 'divine promises' and united the sacraments to an understanding of testament akin to Luther's.[7]

Zwingli, Bullinger and Calvin developed equally vibrant sacramental theologies which were similarly integrated into their concepts of covenant. Unlike Luther, their high regard for the Eucharist did not depend upon the belief that Christ was physically present in the elements.[8] Although their concepts of covenant all conformed to the reciprocal pattern, they offered different interpretations of Christ's spiritual presence in the sacraments and of the relationship between the sacraments and their spiritual signification. While all of them agreed that the Holy Spirit conferred grace, they differed on the utility of the sacraments as instruments, means, mediators or vehicles of grace. Many of the developments in Swiss sacramental thought from the 1520s until the 1550s arose from attempts at concord amongst evangelicals. The brokering of the *Consensus Tigurinus* (1549), when comparable agreement with the Lutherans had proved elusive, was partly due to the shared covenantal basis of distinct sacramental understandings between Zürich and Geneva.

---

[5] Luther, *Babylonian Captivity*, 29. The term 'consubstantiation' does not accurately describe Luther's position because he rejected the Aristotelian language of 'substance' and 'accident'.
[6] Ibid., 38; cf. Hagen, 'Testament to Covenant', 10; Lohse, *Luther's Theology*, 175.
[7] See pp.8, 118, and Ian Hazlett, 'Eucharistic Communion: Impulses and Directions in Martin Bucer's Thought', in D.F. Wright (ed.), *Martin Bucer: reforming church and community* (Cambridge: 1994), 75; Stephens, *Zwingli*, 79; Stephens, *Bucer*, 216-219; Gordon Jeanes, *Signs of God's Promise: Thomas Cranmer's sacramental theology and the Book of Common Prayer* (2008), 144. For Bucer's account of the development of his sacramental theology towards Luther's position in the early 1530s see Martin Bucer, *Account of the Concord entered into in 1536 at Wittenberg* (1536), in Wright (ed.), *Commonplaces*, 357-358.
[8] There is much confusion in Basil Hall's claim that 'a covenant theology is always inimical to a sacramental theology': Hall, 'Lutheranism in England', 110. Hall refers to a bilateral covenant, thereby restricting 'sacramental theology' to Luther's concept of unilateral testament.

Huldrych Zwingli

Zwingli located the sacraments within his concept of covenant, arguing that they existed primarily for the covenant community, the Church, rather than the individual.[9] Zwingli's sacramental theology was predicated upon his Christology; his primary concern was to uphold the unique efficacy of Christ's Passion for salvation. A positive statement of the sacraments for Zwingli was one which maintained Christ's exclusive sufficiency for the people of God.

In his exposition of the eighteenth of his Sixty-Seven Articles (1523) Zwingli contrasted Christ's sacrifice with the sacrifice of the Mass. His Christocentric conception of the covenant is evident in his ascription of the Roman profanation of the Eucharist to ignorance of the covenant, which he already understood to be bilateral and conditional (see above p.83). He complained: 'that which is a testament, legacy or covenant and memorial, they have called a sacrament or offering.'[10] Zwingli's contention was that the legacy of peace (or the peace agreement) which the sacrament signified could not be a sacrifice or offering to God. Even the Roman definition of sacrament as 'a sign of a holy thing' was inconsistent with the assertion of Christ's corporal presence in the elements, for what did Christ's corporal body and blood signify? Zwingli would agree to the definition of *sacramentum* as 'a sure sign or seal,'[11] but not as the oblatory means of grace inferred by Romanist theologians. Like Luther, he considered a sacrament to be a particular kind of sign 'on which God has spoken an express word and made a promise in his word,'[12] but he proceeded in the same article to place God's promise in a bilateral, covenantal context (see above p.83),[13] noting 'the likeness of the words of Moses (by which he affirmed the testament), to the words of Christ, concerning his blood.'[14] Thus, an

[9] Courvoisier, *Zwingli*, 64.
[10] Zwingli, *Exposition of the Articles*, *HZW*, i. 98.
[11] Ibid., 99.
[12] Ibid., 100.
[13] Ibid., 106-107.
[14] Ibid., 106.

understanding of sacraments as confirmations of God's covenant was already emerging in Zwingli's theology in 1523.

Zwingli's sacramental theology was intended to uphold salvation *solus Christus* in the face of perceived threats during the Eucharist controversy. In November 1524 he expounded the 'figurative language of Christ' in John 6:63 – 'It is the Spirit who gives life; the flesh profits nothing' – to prove that 'salvation can come in no other way than through Christ, and therefore not through the sacramental eating of bread and wine.'[15] The importance of the sacraments had to be found elsewhere than as vehicles of grace.[16] Zwingli believed that he had identified a category error in the evaluation of the sacraments by his Romanist and Lutheran opponents.

In *Of Baptism, Rebaptism and Infant Baptism* (May 1525) Zwingli affirmed that 'only Jesus Christ and no external thing can take away the sins of us Christians and make us holy.' Since Christ has superseded any other means of atonement, including the Mass, 'we are not to hope in them or look to them for justification.' Faith in Christ alone is sufficient, but the Old Testament sacraments were 'transformed' 'as a concession to our frailty: "for a bruised reed shall he not break."'[17] That is, sacraments do not effect salvation or have 'power to take away sin and to make us holy,' but they do make allowance for humanity in the weakness of sin. Zwingli's intention was to 'let the sacraments be real sacraments' pointing to, rather than displacing, that which they signify.[18] He held the significatory function of the sacraments in high estimation:

> the word "sacrament" [*sacramentum*] means a pledge of allegiance [*pflichtszeichen*]. If a man sews on a white cross, he proclaims that he is a Confederate [...]. Similarly the man who receives the mark of baptism is the one who is resolved to hear what God says to him, to learn the divine precepts and to live his life in accordance with them. And the man who in the remembrance or Supper gives thanks to God in the congregation testifies to the fact that from the

[15] Huldrych Zwingli, *Letter to Matthew Alber concerning the Lord's Supper* [November 1524], *HZW*, ii. 135-137.
[16] For comparable criticism by Œcolampadius, see Jaroslav Pelikan, *Reformation of Church and Dogma (1300-1700)* (The Christian Tradition, 4; Chicago & London: 1984), 188-189.
[17] Zwingli, 'Baptism', in Bromiley (ed.), *Zwingli and Bullinger*, 130-132.
[18] Ibid., 131.

> very heart he rejoices in the death of Christ and thanks him for it. [...] So baptism is a sacrament that pledges [*verpflicht*] us to Jesus Christ. The memorial reminds us that Christ suffered death for us. They are signs and pledges [*zeichen und verpflichtungen*] of the holy things. You find the true meaning of these things in the requirement [*pflichtung*] of circumcision and the thanksgiving of the Easter Lamb.[19]

The sacraments are proclamations and testimonies of obedience, resolution, commitment, determination, membership of the Church, gratitude and jubilation. Like a soldier's uniform or the ring of a faithful spouse, they are rich and emotive signs and badges of the reality signified.[20] Zwingli's sacramental theology was not 'merely' memorialist; rather, the sacraments recalled the meaning of the divine covenant and the atonement themselves.

What, then, for Zwingli was the connection between signifier and signified? In the *Subsidiary Essay* (August 1525) Zwingli taught that the 'testament, covenant or agreement [*testamentum, foedus aut pactum*]' was won by Christ's blood, the 'blood of the testament.' Christ's blood was not itself the testament but 'that through which the testament [*testamentum*] of free remission was made and confirmed.' The Eucharist was 'the symbol or figure of the blood of the testament [*testamenti*],'[21] two removes from the testament itself. The connection was tropological:[22]

> The figure, therefore, receives the name of the thing typified [...]. The sacrament, therefore, of the covenant and testament [*foederis et testamenti sacramentum*], if you use "sacrament" for the external sign of the chief covenant or oath [*principali foederis aut iurisiurandi*], is baptism; the symbol of the passion of Christ, through which this covenant [*foedus*] and testament [*testamentum*] was perfected [is the Eucharist or commemoration].[23]

[19] Ibid.; *CR*, xci. 218. I have modified the English translation to accord with the German.
[20] Zwingli, *True and False Religion*, *LWHZ*, iii. 180-181; Stephens, *Theology of Zwingli*, 190.
[21] Zwingli, *Subsidiary Essay*, *HZW*, ii. 225; *CR*, xci. 501.
[22] For Zwingli on the tropological sense of scripture, referring to figurative meaning, see Zwingli, *Friendly Exegesis*, *HZW*, ii. 352, 355; Zwingli, *Original Sin*, *LWHZ*, ii. 20-21; Zwingli, *Account of the Faith*, *LWHZ*, ii. 52.
[23] Zwingli, *Subsidiary Essay*, 225; *CR*, xci. 501.

In other words, God has established terms 'and these terms are the real covenant itself. But there are added to covenants signs, which though also called by the name of covenants yet are not covenants.'[24]

To summarise the specific signification of the sacraments, in 1523 Zwingli saw them as signifying God's covenantal promise. By May 1525 Zwingli's emphasis had shifted towards understanding them as humanity's pledge rather than God's,[25] but the latter idea had been revived again by August.[26] Both were valid significations in Zwingli's theology: sacraments were a 'sign of duty' and a sign of 'effected grace.'[27] Gerrish suggests that Zwingli's use of the word 'pledge' (*sicherung*) recedes by 1530.[28] In fact, this simply represents the reversion of its use specifically for divine assurances, as in the *Exposition of the Articles* (1523) and the *Commentary on True and False Religion* (March 1525).[29] Mankind's pledge was recast as 'certifying' grace and an 'oath of allegiance.'[30]

On the utility of the sacraments as means of grace, Zwingli maintained that God worked spiritually on the heart and could not be tied to the sacraments. In 1525 he acknowledged 'a mistake which once deceived me [...] that signs are given for the confirmation of an existing faith [...]. But this is not so.' While miraculous signs ('*wunderzeichen*') can confirm faith, 'seals [*zeichnenden*] and pledges [*pflichtenden zeichen*], like circumcision under the old covenant,' cannot.[31] Similarly,

> baptism in the New Testament is a covenant sign [*pflichtzeichen*]. It does not justify the one who is baptised, nor does it confirm his faith, for it is not possible

[24] Zwingli, *Subsidiary Essay*, 223.
[25] Stephens, *Theology of Zwingli*, 181, 192.
[26] Zwingli, *Subsidiary Essay*, 223-224.
[27] Zwingli, quoted in Locher, *Zwingli's Thought*, 215-216.
[28] B.A. Gerrish, *The Old Protestantism and the New: essays on the Reformation heritage* (Edinburgh: 1982), 120; cf. Zwingli, *Account of the Faith*, 39.
[29] Zwingli, *Exposition of the Articles*, 112; Zwingli, *True and False Religion*, 100, 123-124; Zwingli, *Exposition of the Faith*, *LWHZ*, ii. 253; cf. B.A. Gerrish, *Continuing the Reformation: essays on modern religious thought* (Chicago & London: 1993), 64.
[30] Zwingli, *Account of the Faith*, 47; Zwingli, *Exposition of the Faith*, 259.
[31] Zwingli, 'Baptism', 138-139; *CR*, xci. 227-228.

> for an external thing to confirm faith. For faith does not proceed from external things. It proceeds only from God who draws us. Therefore it cannot be grounded in any external thing. The same applies to the Lord's Supper as well.[32]

In 1526, Zwingli wrote that God had not 'so bound His grace and spirit and election [...] that he refused to draw unto Himself any but those that were signed with this sign.'[33] 'Blessedness and grace are from election,' he explained, 'not from the participation in signs or sacraments.'[34] The sacraments could neither effect salvation nor mediate grace:

> Signs, therefore, are nothing but externals, by which nothing is effected in the conscience but faith is the only thing through which we are blessed [...] they are by no means themselves spiritual, nor do they perfect anything spiritual in us, but they are the badges, as it were, of those who are of the spirit.[35]

Grace is mediated by the Spirit through faith, and Zwingli took this to its logical conclusion: the sacraments themselves perfect nothing.

The fact that Zwingli could agree with Luther on the fifteenth article produced at the Marburg Colloquy (1529) demonstrates how closely Zwingli's theology allowed him to associate the work of the Spirit with the sacraments. Article 15 stated that God had ordained the Eucharist 'in order that weak consciences may thereby be excited to faith by the Holy Spirit.'[36] This might have been indicative of a development in Zwingli's thought. In *Ratio Fidei* (1530) he admitted the possibility that the Spirit might occasionally act in relation to the external sign. However, this admission was appended to his insistence that the Spirit dispenses grace directly to the soul:

> a channel or vehicle is not necessary to the Spirit, for He Himself is the virtue and energy whereby all things are borne; neither do we read in the Holy Scriptures that visible things, as are the sacraments, carry certainly with them the Spirit, but if

[32] Ibid.
[33] Zwingli, *Original Sin*, 12.
[34] Ibid., 20.
[35] Ibid., 29.
[36] *Marburg Colloquy and Articles*, 88.

> visible things have ever been borne with the Spirit, it has been the Spirit, not the visible things that have done the bearing.[37]

Sacraments 'are so far from conferring grace that they do not even convey or dispense it.'[38] Nevertheless, Zwingli did not consider the sacraments to be devalued by their inability to mediate grace. They

> should be religiously cherished, that is, highly valued and treated with honour. For though they are unable to bestow grace, they nevertheless associate visibly with the Church us who have been received into it invisibly; and this should be regarded with the highest veneration, since with their administration the words of the divine promise are declared and pronounced.[39]

To suggest, as Gerrish does, that in Zwingli's view 'the sacraments merely testify in public that grace has been received in private,' does not do justice to Zwingli's understanding.[40]

The possibility of a relationship between signs and the work of the Spirit, anticipated in the Marburg Articles and *Ratio Fidei*, became clearer in *Expositio Fidei* (1531), wherein Zwingli 'seems to allow that things happen together at two levels.'[41] Zwingli continued to define the spiritual eating of Christ as 'trust in spirit and heart upon the mercy and goodness of God.' Sacramental eating, 'if we wish to speak accurately, is to eat the body of Christ in heart and spirit with the accompaniment of the sacrament.'[42] Therefore truly 'sacramental' eating cannot occur without faith.[43] Zwingli also maintained his view that 'none but the Holy Spirit giveth faith [...] and no external thing giveth it. Yet the sacraments do work faith, but historical faith [*fidem faciant sacramenta, sed historicam*]: that is, call to mind that a certain thing once took place, the memory of which is thus refreshed.'[44] Hence the sacraments give historical faith (*fides*) to believers and unbelievers alike that Christ indeed suffered, 'but that he suffered for

[37] Zwingli, *Account of the Faith*, 46.
[38] Ibid.
[39] Ibid., 48.
[40] Gerrish, *Old Protestantism*, 119.
[41] Stephens, *Theology of Zwingli*, 189.
[42] Zwingli, *Exposition of the Faith*, 252.
[43] Ibid., 254.
[44] Ibid.; *CR*, xciii. 151-152.

us, it signifies to the pious believer only. For no one knows that Christ suffered for us, save those whom the Spirit within has taught to recognise the mystery of divine goodness.' Therefore saving faith or trust (*fiducia*) is not mediated by the sacraments: 'nothing gives confidence [*fiduciam*] in God except the Spirit.'[45] Zwingli's opinion that the sacraments could not confirm faith had not fundamentally altered since 1525; it had become more nuanced.

Zwingli enumerated seven virtues of the sacraments, all consistent with his theology. The only apparent anomaly is the sixth virtue: sacraments 'bring increase and support to faith [*fidei*].'[46] Zwingli does not mean that faith itself is confirmed or strengthened, but that 'all the senses, are as it were, reclaimed and redeemed from fleshly desires, and drawn into obedience to faith.'[47] The 'contemplation of faith' is aided indirectly by the sacraments because they are 'a sort of bridles by which the senses, when on the point of dashing away to their own desires, are checked and brought back to the service of heart and of faith.'[48] Thus Zwingli consistently rejected the idea that the sacraments were vehicles of grace.

In *Of Baptism* Zwingli understood baptism as 'a covenant sign'[49] and 'an initiatory sign or pledge' by humanity to God.[50] The signification included: (1) pledging individuals to God, (2) pledging ourselves to God, (3) testifying that pledge to others, and (4) imposing obligation. Firstly, baptism marked out sheep for the true shepherd,[51] 'dedicating,'[52] 'introducing' or 'pledging'[53] individuals to Christ's salvation. Secondly, in baptism 'we bind ourselves to God.'[54] In this sense 'it is like the cowl which is cut out for initiates into an order,'[55] signifying their intention to learn the rule, or their commitment to mortify sin 'like the soldier at his

[45] Zwingli, *Exposition of the Faith*, 255; *CR*, xciii. 152.
[46] Zwingli, *Exposition of the Faith*, 258. There is no distinction between *fides* and *fiducia* here.
[47] Ibid.
[48] Ibid., 259.
[49] Zwingli, 'Baptism', 138, 141; cf. Zwingli, *True and False Religion*, 121.
[50] Zwingli, 'Baptism', 141, 145-151, 156.
[51] Ibid., 145.
[52] Ibid., 146.
[53] Ibid., 151.
[54] Ibid., 148.
[55] Ibid., 141.

enlistment.'[56] Thus it begins a 'process of development'[57] in sanctification. Thirdly, baptism is 'given and received for the sake of fellow-believers.'[58] It is a public testimony of the pledge to our neighbour,[59] an 'outward sign that we are incorporated and engrafted into the Lord Jesus Christ.'[60] In other words, it is a mark of communion with Christ's body, the Church.[61] Fourthly, baptism conferred obligations in that 'it requires us to amend our lives, to turn to Christ and to believe in him.'[62] Zwingli maintained throughout that faith results from divine election, so baptism itself neither justifies nor confirms faith, nor is there necessarily any correlation between water-baptism and saving faith.[63]

Like the Anabaptists, Zwingli considered baptism to be a symbol of belonging to God, but he anathematised their innovation of believers' baptism.[64] As early as May 1525 Zwingli defended infant baptism on the basis of continuity with circumcision and the inclusion of the offspring of believing parents in the covenant community.[65] Both depended upon the unity of the Testaments, with Christian children having no less right to the sacrament of initiation than Jewish children. As already noted, over the summer of 1525 he accentuated the significance of sacraments as God's covenant pledge rather than humanity's, making baptism more readily applicable to infants. In August 1525 Zwingli wrote that 'baptism is just as much the symbol of the Christian people that has received from God the covenant that his son should be ours, as circumcision was once the symbol that the Lord should be their God and they should be his people.'[66] In *On Original Sin* (1526) he asserted that infants are to be given the 'token' because

[56] Ibid., 147.
[57] Ibid., 146.
[58] Ibid., 136.
[59] Ibid., 148; cf. Zwingli, *True and False Religion*, 184.
[60] Zwingli, 'Baptism', 156.
[61] Zwingli drew no particular distinction between visible and invisible churches.
[62] Zwingli, 'Baptism', 169.
[63] Ibid., 135, 138. See Stephens, 'Bullinger and the Anabaptists', 98-99.
[64] Gäbler, *Zwingli*, 128-129.
[65] Stephens, *Theology of Zwingli*, 203.
[66] Zwingli, *Subsidiary Essay*, 224.

'our children are included in the covenant just as much as they were, for we are sons of the promise.'[67]

It is hard to gauge the importance of the Dutch theologian Cornelisz Hoen to Zwingli's eucharistic theology. Their views were not identical, but Zwingli claimed that Hoen's letter had helped him to identify *est* as the 'trope' he already suspected in the words *hoc est corpus meum*.[68] The rendering *hoc significat corpus meum* first appeared in his *Letter to Matthew Alber* on 16 November 1524.[69] The symbolic understanding seems implicit, however, in his earlier descriptions in 1523 of the Eucharist as a covenantal 'seal' or memorial of Christ's sacrifice: 'the term "memorial" has its name from the custom we have, namely, that whenever we eat and drink the body and blood of Christ – which are a testament of Christ – we do so in remembrance of that which has been transacted only once.'[70] The body and blood are really eaten, but only by faith, signified by the elements which 'make more concrete to the simple of heart the essential nature of the testament.' Believers are 'strengthened in their faith through the visible act,' and the faith which recognises the signification strengthens the soul, rejoicing in salvation.[71] As Gottfried Locher helpfully explains, the memorial 'displays the soul's power of actualisation and awareness' in that 'the past is brought into our present time, becoming contemporary with us and effective in us' (rather than the believer being transported back to Calvary); the Holy Spirit 'renders present' the death of Christ.[72] Additionally, the Eucharist proclaims or testifies to Christ's salvation.[73] This public aspect was enlarged in *A Proposal Concerning Images and the Mass* (May 1524), in which the Eucharist signified 'an inward and

[67] Zwingli, *Original Sin*, 21, cf. 30. See also Zwingli, 'Refutation' in Jackson (ed.), *Selected Works*, 235-236; Zwingli, *Account of the Faith*, 42-46; Stephens, *Theology of Zwingli*, 206-211, 215.
[68] B.J. Spruyt, *Cornelius Henrici Hoen (Honius) and his Epistle on the Eucharist (1525)* (Leiden & Boston: 2006), 205-208. On their use of the ring metaphor, see idem., 91.
[69] Zwingli, *Letter to Alber*, 138.
[70] Zwingli, *Exposition of the Articles*, 103-104, 107, 111; cf. Stephens, *Theology of Zwingli*, 218-221.
[71] Zwingli, *Exposition of the Articles*, 115.
[72] Locher, *Zwingli's Thought*, 59, 222-223. Zwingli coined the term *Wiedergedächtnis* to describe this recollection of Christ's Passion: see West, 'Hooper [1]', 360. Christ's Passion is made present to the faithful. See also Dugmore, *The Mass*, 10.
[73] Zwingli, *Exposition of the Articles*, 114-116.

outward union of Christian people' in which we 'testify to all men that we are one body and brotherhood.'[74] Gerrish has suggested the label 'symbolic memorialism' for Zwingli's sacramental theology. This is convenient provided that 'memorialism' is appreciated in its full scope.[75]

In the *Letter to Alber* (November 1524), besides spiritual eating and the figurative words of consecration,[76] Zwingli expounded the communal, confessional purpose of the Eucharist. This sacrament does 'nothing but make it plain to your brother that you are a member of Christ, and one of these who trust in Christ.' The intention is to testify that you reject idolatry and faithfully believe, to unite with other Christians in 'this oath of allegiance as it were (whence it is called a sacrament),' and to 'bind' yourself to the Christian life under sanction of excommunication.[77] The themes of mutuality and conditionality are evident here within a communal context. In 1527 the communion of believers was called 'the people of the blood of Christ,' which Zwingli understood as the blood of the testament (see above p.172), hence he identified the Church by the covenant.[78] The Eucharist was so important that unworthy participation was 'treason' against the Church communion:

> It would be a small matter to put a morsel into one's mouth or to taste a cup with the edge of one's lips, but it is not a small thing to have done this in the church of Christ. Those who do this give evidence of themselves that they are of that body and people who have faith in Christ, the Son of God, and who give thanks for the death he underwent for us. He who sho[w]s the password to the enemy is adjudged worthy of the punishment of Mettius. And whoever sits down at this banquet (which is not just a password but a public profession and sacrament), and

[74] Quoted in Stephens, *Theology of Zwingli*, 225.
[75] Gerrish, *Old Protestantism*, 128. Gerrish does not clarify the positive implications of Zwingli's position. In 1523 Zwingli's term 'memorial' was a polemical reaction to late-medieval teaching and in 1531 the believer is said to recognise God's grace in the memorial: Zwingli, *Exposition of the Articles*, 111; Zwingli, *Exposition of the Faith*, 255. For Gerrish's classifications of Reformed sacramental theology as symbolic memorialism, parallelism, and instrumentalism, see B.A. Gerrish, *Grace and Gratitude: the eucharistic theology of John Calvin* (Edinburgh: 1993), 167.
[76] Stephens, *Theology of Zwingli*, 228-229.
[77] Zwingli, *Letter to Alber*, 141-142.
[78] Zwingli's ecclesiology was based on the visible parish, but it was not a major feature of his theology. Positive ecclesiological ideas did not occupy much space in contemporary reforming literature: Peter Blickle, *Communal Reformation: the quest for salvation in sixteenth-century Germany*, trans. T. Dunlap (London & New Jersey: 1992), 126.

> straightway does the same by sacrifices to idols, is that one not guilty of treason? Does this person not only betray the body and blood of Christ, to which he falsely pretends to give thanks for his redemption, but also that congregation which is distinguished by the name of the body and blood of Christ because of the public profession?[79]

The nature of the Real Presence was Zwingli's primary interest in his *Subsidiary Essay* (1525). Christ's blood was necessary to establish the testament, and Christians drink 'a symbol of the blood of the testament.'[80] As with circumcision and baptism, the Paschal lamb symbolising the Passover corresponds with the Eucharist, one commemoration substituted for another. As the Jews ate the lamb as a figure, so Christians eat Christ figuratively in the Eucharist.[81] Zwingli then discussed sensible faith: the physical eating of Christ's bodily flesh makes faith a 'silly notion' and 'blind recklessness.'[82] Zwingli further rejected a spiritual feeding on flesh as paradoxical. Instead, the eating of bread signifies faith in Christ because 'that is salutary and like bread unto humans.'[83] Sensible faith upholds salvation *solus Christus* by trusting the 'new covenant or testament' granted through Christ, which Zwingli expounded at length.[84]

In *The Lord's Supper* (February 1526) Zwingli introduced the argument of Christ's bodily session at the right hand of the Father,[85] yet in his *Answer to Strauss's Book* (January 1527) he could write that Christ is present to the believer because 'the faithful have the body and blood of Christ present in the mind.' Conversely, 'in contemplation, faith, hope, and love' the believer is present with Christ in heaven.[86] Bodily, Christ was 'truly absent', wrote Zwingli in his *Friendly Exegesis*, but by alloiosis we may speak of Christ's flesh as 'true meat' (John 6:55) because '"flesh" is used to mean the divine nature.'[87] Lee Wandel explains that the

[79] Zwingli, *Friendly Exegesis*, 295-297.
[80] Zwingli, *Subsidiary Essay*, 200.
[81] Ibid., 210.
[82] Ibid., 214-220.
[83] Ibid., 219-220.
[84] Ibid., 223-225.
[85] Stephens, *Theology of Zwingli*, 237; cf. Locher, *Zwingli's Thought*, 177.
[86] Quoted in Stephens, *Theology of Zwingli*, 243.
[87] Zwingli, *Friendly Exegesis*, 322, 327. Alloiosis is a rhetorical device whereby words describing one object are used of another so that the meaning of a proposition is not literally but figuratively true. The

substantial bread could, 'following Zwingli's sense of human psychology, be connected in the mind to the body of Christ, and that connection was not simply 'spiritual' or even, in the modern language, psychological, but visceral.'[88] This reasoning was summarised in *Ratio Fidei*.[89] In *Expositio Fidei* Zwingli argued that the spiritual eating of Christ could be independent of the sacraments altogether (see above p.175).[90]

Zwingli's sacramental theology was clearly formed around the concept of the covenant sign. It was his guiding conviction that the sacraments are signs of Christ's historic ratification of the covenant. He was careful to separate signs from spiritual realities, but in 1529-31 he showed a willingness to allow a supporting rôle to the sacraments in augmenting faith.

Heinrich Bullinger

Bullinger's sacramental theology was not strictly Zwinglian but, in his capacity as Zwingli's successor at Zürich, he often defended a Zwinglian position. Like Zwingli, Bullinger emphasised the covenantal significance of the sacraments, but he was more comfortable with the idea that the spiritual reality was received in conjunction with the sign. He nevertheless maintained that the sign could not confer grace. Gerrish has labelled this view 'symbolic parallelism'.[91]

Zwingli and Bullinger discussed the Eucharist on their first acquaintance on 12 September 1524. Bullinger recorded in his diary that 'I in good faith expounded to him my views, which I drew from the writings of the Waldensians and the books of Augustine.'[92] In a letter to

---

one is named, the other understood. See Richard Cross, 'Alloiosis in the Christology of Zwingli', *JTS*, 47/1 (1996), 113-119.

[88] Wandel, 'Body of Christ', 206. Wandel offers valuable insights into the importance of different conceptions of body and matter in the Eucharist controversy.

[89] Zwingli, *Account of the Faith*, 49.

[90] Zwingli, *Exposition of the Faith*, 252.

[91] Gerrish, *Old Protestantism*, 124, 128.

[92] Quoted in Paul Rorem, *Calvin and Bullinger on the Lord's Supper* (Alcuin Club; Nottingham: 1989), 14. Rorem provides the most thorough account of Bullinger's position available in English. He suggests

Christoph Stiltz on 27 February 1526, Bullinger echoed Zwingli's understanding of the connection between signifier and signified (see above p.172). Linking covenant and sacrament, Bullinger maintained that

> the testament is the blessing or forgiveness of sins, Christ is the mediator of the testament, the dead body and blood of Christ are truly the revealing and sealing of the testament, the bread and wine are symbols of the confirmed testament, which remind [us] of redemption and union.[93]

Thus sacraments were signs of Christ's confirmation of God's testament. Their purpose was to commemorate Christ's revelation and accomplishment of redemption from sin and his union with believers. This is indistinguishable from Zwingli's view. Bullinger concurred with Zwingli's insistence that the Holy Spirit was neither reliant upon the sacraments nor utilised them as vehicles of grace.[94] In *De origine erroris, in negocio eucharistiae, ac missae* [*The origin of the error, in the matter of the Eucharist, and of the Mass*] (1528) Bullinger attacked the Roman understanding of the Mass as a sacrifice,[95] just as Zwingli had done in 1523. Bullinger repeatedly affirmed the sacraments as God's proclamation and confirmation of the present work of the Spirit on the heart.[96]

After Zwingli's death in 1531 it is likely that Bullinger initially felt compelled to uphold Zwingli's sacramental theology publicly. The Zürichers' confidence in the Reformation had to be restored. Moreover, the theologians of Bern strongly opposed deviation from Zwingli's teachings.[97] Bullinger's comments on the sacraments in *De Testamento* (1534) pertained

---

that Bullinger may have been influenced by Wessel Gansfort (1419-89). On Gansfort, see Spruyt, 'Gansfort and Hoen', 134. The argument for 'Bullingerism' is overstated by George Ella, *Henry Bullinger: shepherd of the churches* (Eggleston, Durham: 2007), 97-102.

[93] Quoted in Rorem, *Supper*, 13. Rorem supposes the influence of Luther's *Babylonian Captivity* here, which Bullinger had read in 1520/21. However, the approximation with Zwingli and the conditional understanding of *erbgmächt* in Switzerland (see above p.83) make it unlikely that Bullinger drew indiscriminately upon Luther.

[94] Rorem, *Supper*, 16.

[95] Ibid., 13.

[96] Ibid., 15. Rorem believes that Bullinger held this view from the early 1520s.

[97] Amy Nelson Burnett, 'Heinrich Bullinger and the Problem of Eucharistic Concord', *Heinrich Bullinger: Life – Thought – Influence: International Congress Heinrich Bullinger 2004*, 2 vols. (Zurich:

principally to the concept of covenant. He generally followed Zwingli's commemorative line that sacraments were 'symbols of the covenant [*foederis*] and of divine grace already confirmed through Christ.' The contemplation of the visible led to thoughts of the invisible. Bullinger concentrated on the covenantal significance of the sacraments, avoiding questions of sacramental power and efficacy. Circumcision had been administered to those to whom God had already offered grace and covenantal relationship, binding them to himself.[98] It was the consecration of that covenant with blood, 'testifying' (*obtestantes*, Bullinger's preferred term) to the penalty which would apply to those who 'entered into covenants [*foedera*]' with God but 'did not stand firm by the pacts [*pactis*].'[99] 'Despising' the sign was serious because it showed contempt for the covenant that it signified, but Bullinger reassured parents that infants who died without the sign of baptism were 'saved by the grace and mercy of God.'[100] While the Old Testament sacraments had prefigured Christ's confirmation of the covenant, the New Testament sacraments signified 'completion of the most perfect justification.' Meanwhile there was continuity in that 'the entire covenant [*foedus*] was contained in the sacrament of the covenant [*sacramento foederis*, that is, circumcision]; in the same manner, the entire essence of the renewed covenant [*foederis*] is contained in our sacraments.'[101] Baptism and the Eucharist testified to the same covenant with the same conditions.

In 1536 Bullinger helped to compose the First Helvetic Confession at Basle, where he first encountered Calvin. The framing of the articles was influenced by Bucer, who hoped to unite the Swiss and Lutheran reformers, and the articles won Luther's approval.[102] While Zwingli had admitted a correspondence between spiritual realities and their signification in the sacraments, the Confession claimed that the sacraments consisted of '*signis simul et rebus*

2007), i. 239. See also J.N. Bakhuizen van den Brink, 'Ratramn's eucharistic doctrine and its influence in sixteenth-century England', in G. Cuming (ed.), *Studies in Church History* (2: 1965), 64.
[98] Bullinger, *Brief Exposition*, 132; Bullinger, *De Testamento*, F3v.
[99] Bullinger, *Brief Exposition*, 130; Bullinger, *De Testamento*, F1v-2r.
[100] Bullinger, *Brief Exposition*, 131.
[101] Ibid., 132.
[102] Alan Cochrane (ed.), *Reformed Confessions of the Sixteenth Century* (1966), 97-98.

constant' (both signs and essential things).[103] Zwingli, had he lived to comment, could have affirmed the statement that '*in rebus ipsis totus fructus sacramentorum est*' (the entire fruit of the sacraments lies in the thing itself).[104] However, he probably would not have agreed that, in the Eucharist, Christ may '*suis vere ad hoc offerat*' (truly offer to his people) his body and blood.[105] By contrast, Bullinger's agreement testifies to his belief that sign and reality occur in parallel,[106] and indicates that the idea of the sacraments 'offering' communion with Christ was not incompatible with his position.

Luther's scathing description in 1544 of Zwingli as 'an enemy of the holy sacrament and a full-blown heathen'[107] prompted Bullinger's *Warhaffte Bekanntnus* [*True Confession*] (February 1545), a strident defence of Zwinglianism denouncing Luther's own understanding of the Real Presence as heretical.[108] Here Bullinger asserted that remembrance of Christ's sacrifice was the 'real chief part and purpose' of the Eucharist.[109] Such sacramental remembrance could not occur correctly in the absence of true faith; faith gave the sacrament value. Thus Zwingli's complex memorialism was reiterated: 'the one who has truly eaten the flesh of Christ and has drunk his blood is the one who believes in Christ, true God and human crucified for us. Thus believing is eating and eating believing.'[110] Like Zwingli, Bullinger restricted the means of grace to faith, leaving the sacraments to point to this means and to exercise the faith which receives grace: 'the Lord of the church keeps his suffering and our redemption in fresh

---

[103] '*Confessio Helvetica Prior* (1536)', in P. Schaff (ed.), *The Creeds of Christendom* (3; Grand Rapids, MI: 1977), 223. Gerrish translates *simul* as 'at the same time', but there is no equivalent in the German version: '*in Zeichen und wesentlichen Dingen*' (in sign and essential things). See Gerrish, *Old Protestantism*, 123.
[104] '*Confessio Helvetica Prior*', 223.
[105] Ibid., 225.
[106] Gerrish, *Old Protestantism*, 123.
[107] Martin Luther, *Brief Confession Concerning the Holy Sacrament* [1544], trans. H. Lehmann (*LW*, 38; Philadelphia: 1971), 289-290.
[108] This and the next paragraph rely upon Rorem, *Supper*, 18-26; cf. Burnett, 'Eucharistic Concord', 240. Calvin urged restraint on Bullinger in a letter dated 25 November 1544: Gorham (ed.), *Gleanings*, 27-29. On 3 December 1544 Bullinger invited Melanchthon to Zürich, but Melanchthon's failure to respond ended Bullinger's interest in conciliation: Gordon, 'Calvin and the Swiss Reformed Churches', 71.
[109] Quoted in Gerrish, *Old Protestantism*, 123.
[110] Quoted in Rorem, *Supper*, 19-20.

remembrance in the church so that he might refer to and point out his grace and great gifts, which are received in faith, faith which he exercises through these external acts.'[111]

Bullinger wrote to Melanchthon on 1 April 1546, soon after Luther's death: 'the gifts of life are conferred and exhibited by God himself alone; nevertheless they are received by us by faith, are announced by the Word, and are sealed by the Sacraments.'[112] If Bullinger had rallied to the public defence of Zwinglianism, his privately-circulated opinions in *Absoluta de Christi Domini et Catholicae eius Ecclesiae Sacramentis tractatio* [*Complete Treatise on the Sacraments of our Lord Christ and His Catholic Church*] (1546) also suggest his agreement with Zwingli in denying that the sacraments give grace, despite his own view of the analogy between signs and the spiritual reception of grace. The sacraments, argued Bullinger, almost certainly against Melanchthon's *Confessio Augustana Variata* (1540),[113] 'do not exhibit [*non exhibere*] that which they signify.' That is, 'they do not give grace, neither have grace included in them.'[114] Sacraments could not confer grace because they did not contain it.[115]

The sixth and seventh sermons of Bullinger's *Fifth Decade* (1551) practically reproduced the text of the *Absoluta*, and therefore represent Bullinger's thought at a time prior to the *Consensus Tigurinus* (1549). Bullinger repeatedly denied that the sacraments confer grace or justify participants.[116] If grace is defined as God's favour, he asked, 'doth not the very gross absurdity of the thing plainly prove, that grace is not contained in the signs?' The elect 'enjoy the things before they be partakers of the signs.'[117] Like Zwingli, Bullinger argued that 'the sign and the thing signified do retain their natures distinguished in the sacraments.'[118] If forced

[111] Quoted in Ibid.; cf. Pelikan, *Reformation of Church*, 204.
[112] Gorham (ed.), *Gleanings*, 37.
[113] *Confessio Augustana Variata*, Article 10: '*De coena Domini docent quod cum pane et vino vere exhibeantur corpus et sanguis Christi vescentibus in Coena Domini*.' Philip Melanchthon, *Opera quae supersunt omnia*, eds. H. Bindseil (*CR*, 26; Brunswick: 1858), 357.
[114] Quoted in Rorem, *Supper*, 21-26. I have amended the English translation.
[115] See Ibid.
[116] Bullinger, *Decades*, v/7. 302-304.
[117] Ibid., v/7. 309, 311.
[118] Ibid., v/6. 274.

to choose, he wrote, 'I had rather confess them to be void than full,' but in his opinion they were 'effectual' and 'full' without being instruments of grace.[119] As Bullinger had written to Melanchthon, Abraham's circumcision was 'not, indeed, vain and useless, although he was justified.'[120]

Bullinger defined a sacrament in covenantal terms as 'a mark or token whereby a thing is understood, as slaughter by blood';[121] 'through partaking of the sacraments, we are bound to God and to all the saints, as it were by obligation; and that God himself also, by the testimony of the sacraments, hath, as it were by an oath, bound himself to us.'[122] Thus Bullinger understood sacramental 'testimony' in the context of an oath and mutual obligation, integrating his sacramental theology into his concept of covenant.[123] Obligation was created between God and believers, as well as amongst individuals within the Church, yet it was the covenant that bound and the sacraments that 'visibly gathered.'[124] Bullinger, like Zwingli, drew a comparison with soldiers' oaths of allegiance: 'we are bound by them, as by an oath, to the true worship of one God.'[125] Bullinger also quoted Zwingli's metaphor of a ring given as an assurance of fidelity by an absent husband to his wife, even though Bullinger's own version of this image usually expressed a present 'promise, or covenant' being made ('passing') between a bride and bridegroom,[126] reflecting his willingness to construe the sign and the spiritual reality in parallel.

[119] Ibid., v/7. 314.
[120] Gorham (ed.), *Gleanings*, 37.
[121] Bullinger, *Decades*, v/6. 227, 240. See above p.92.
[122] Ibid., v/6. 235.
[123] Ibid., v/6. 235, 245, 280; v/237. 294. Mutuality is particularly explicit in v/7. 318-19.
[124] Ibid., v/7. 333-334.
[125] Ibid., v/6. 235; v/237. 333.
[126] Ibid., v/6. 238; v/237. 324-225; cf. Spruyt, *Hoen*, 87-91.

In the sacraments, wrote Bullinger, God visibly represents his kingdom 'to renew it afresh, and by lively representation to maintain the remembrance of the same among us.'[127] The theme is Zwinglian, but the accent is Bullinger's. He explained that, to appreciate the sacraments,

> we have to mark the analogy, which is a certain aptness, proportion [...] without this analogy, the reason of a sacrament cannot be fully and perfectly understood: but this analogy [...] offereth to the beholder, without any labour at all, the very αναγωγη [*anagoge*], that is to say, the hidden and secret meaning of the sacrament.[128]

The characteristic emphasis of Bullinger is that the sacraments offer to the participant a symbol of the promised grace conferred by God. Bullinger praised God's wisdom in employing covenantal signs to testify to his faithfulness:

> as in making leagues, or in confirming promises in earnest and weighty matters, men use signs or tokens of truth to win credit to their words and promises; even so the Lord, doing after the manner of men, hath added signs of his faithfulness and truth in his everlasting covenant and promises of life.[129]

Bullinger related God's sacraments to ancient covenant-making rituals wherein the parties passed between the two parts of a torn carcass in order to symbolise covenantal sanctions.[130] The 'sacraments' of the Old Testament covenant could be compared with their New Testament counterparts.[131]

Bullinger rejected the physical presence of Christ in the sacraments on the basis of the absence of a covenant: God does not 'tie himself to the signs [...]. For in no place has Christ promised to be present corporally [...] but mystically and sacramentally.'[132] Christ was seated at the Father's right hand. Bullinger refuted the existence of another covenant ostensibly appointing grace in

[127] Bullinger, *Decades*, v/6. 242.
[128] Ibid., v/6. 244.
[129] Ibid., v/6. 245.
[130] Ibid.; cf. Melanchthon, *Loci Communes*, 134.
[131] Bullinger, *Decades*, v/6. 289-290; v/287. 298-301.
[132] Ibid., v/6. 253.

the sacraments.[133] He used the image of a wax seal to explain how Christ might be present symbolically in the sacraments:

> Wax, before it be sealed, is common and usual wax; but when, by the king's will and commandment, that which is engraven in the king's seal is printed in the wax, and is set to evidences and letters patent, by and by it is so esteemed, that whoso shall deface the sealed evidences is attached as guilty of treason.[134]

Unbelievers cannot benefit from sacramental testimony because they do not appreciate the signification. Believers 'corporally and sensibly [...] receive the signs, but,' in parallel, 'spiritually they possess, comprehend, renew, and exercise the things signified.'[135] The signs are 'superfluous or vain' except for those 'who receive them by faith.'[136]

Circumcision was equivalent to baptism which, as in Zwingli's later writing, was administered on the basis of covenantal election rather than present faith. God commanded paedobaptism as a sign of his commitment.[137] Jewish boys were circumcised 'and were in league with God.' Christian infants were likewise to be sealed and, 'when they come to age and commit wickedness [...] they are received again by faithful repentance.'[138] The relationship between signifier and signified was clear: 'they therefore which before by grace invisibly are received of God into the society of God, those selfsame are visibly now by baptism admitted into the selfsame household of God.'[139]

Bullinger entered the discussions with Calvin that preceded the *Consensus Tigurinus* (May 1549) defending his long-held view that the sacraments did not confer grace. On 26 May 1548 he stated that 'Christ communicates himself totally to us in his Spirit, by faith, insofar as this is necessary for our salvation'; the sacraments 'testified' to the word and it was thereby

[133] Ibid., v/7. 311.
[134] Ibid., v/6. 270; cf. Calvin, *Institutes* [1536], 87.
[135] Bullinger, *Decades*, v/6. 279.
[136] Ibid., v/7. 340.
[137] Ibid., v/7. 313.
[138] Ibid., v/7. 323.
[139] Ibid., v/7. 329, cf. 344.

'inculcated'.[140] This view of the sacraments as testifying to, or symbolically offering, God's covenant promise represented Bullinger's parallel understanding of the relationship between sign and reality (see above p.187). Consequently, he resisted Calvin's understanding of the sacraments as conferring the grace which they signify:

> It is God who saves and receives us in grace. But this you [Calvin] ascribe to an instrument through which it is worked, some implement or flow-sluice or canal, the very sacraments, through which grace is infused into us [...]. But we do not believe this [...]. God alone works our salvation [...]. God, and no created thing, confers and indeed confers through the Spirit and faith [...]. The sacraments neither offer nor confer, nor are they instruments of offering and conferring, but they signify, testify, and seal.[141]

In the *Consensus Tigurinus* Calvin acquiesced to Bullinger's terms in order to achieve unity between Zürich and Geneva.[142] The conferral of grace was established before the sacraments were introduced: Article 5 stated that, for Christ to be 'exhibited' or given to us, he 'must be made one with us, and we must be ingrafted into his body.'[143] In Article 6, the sacraments were said to 'testify' to an existing 'spiritual communion' which 'all who believe' have with Christ 'by his Spirit.'[144] Bullinger's understanding had clearly prevailed over Calvin's.

These articles are revealing of Bullinger's differences with Zwingli as well as Calvin. Article 7, on the purpose of the sacraments, described them in covenantal terms as 'contracts', 'marks and badges of Christian profession and fellowship or fraternity,' and 'incitements to gratitude and exercises of faith and a godly life.'[145] Perhaps this placated the Zwinglian clergy of Zürich.[146] The sacraments' 'principal' purpose was 'that God may, by means of them, testify, represent, and seal his grace to us.' This meant, firstly, that the sacraments made 'a deeper impression on

[140] Quoted in Rorem, *Supper*, 29.
[141] Quoted in Ibid., 34.
[142] Gordon, *Calvin*, 179; cf. Burnett, 'Eucharistic Concord', 234; Ella, *Bullinger*, 13-14.
[143] 'Mutual Consent as to the Sacraments [*Consensus Tigurinus* (1549)]', in H. Beveridge (ed.), *John Calvin: Tracts and Letters* (2; Edinburgh: 2009), 213. Article 5 was inserted in July 1549.
[144] Ibid., 214.
[145] Ibid.
[146] Rorem, *Supper*, 42.

the senses, by bringing the object in a manner directly before them, while they bring the death of Christ and all his benefits to our remembrance, that faith may be the better exercised.'[147] This was as much Bullinger's view as Zwingli's (see above p.176). Secondly, however, the principal purpose indicated 'that what the mouth of God had announced is, as it were, confirmed and ratified by seals.'[148] This reflected Bullinger's emphasis on the analogous relationship between sign and reality. Hence, in Article 8, in view of the sacraments' true testimony, God 'truly performs inwardly by his Spirit that which the sacraments figure to our eyes and other senses; in other words, we obtain possession of Christ.'[149] The sacramental signification and spiritual reality were, in Bullinger's view, both present occurrences in parallel with one another. This is much more characteristic of Bullinger's position than Zwingli's.

Article 9 also represented Bullinger's view as opposed to Zwingli's. Although sign and reality may be distinguished from one another, they cannot be 'disjoined': 'though we distinguish, as we ought, between the signs and the things signified, yet we do not disjoin the reality from the signs, but acknowledge that all who in faith embrace the promises there offered receive Christ spiritually.'[150] Nevertheless, in Article 10 Bullinger qualified Calvin's view that the sacraments confer grace: it is not the sacraments, but the promise annexed to the sacraments, 'whose office it is to lead us to Christ by the direct way of faith – faith which makes us partakers of Christ.'[151] Bullinger's view was that the sacraments offer, or represent, the divine promises which themselves confer grace.

Although the sacraments were described in Article 13 as 'instruments by which God acts efficaciously when he pleases,' this was qualified so as to exclude Calvin's interpretation. According to Article 12, when God 'uses the instrumentality of the sacraments, he neither infuses his own virtue into them nor derogates in any respect from the effectual working of his

[147] '*Consensus Tigurinus*', 214.
[148] Ibid.
[149] Ibid., 214-215; cf. Rorem, *Supper*, 42-43.
[150] '*Consensus Tigurinus*', 215.
[151] Ibid.

Spirit, but, in adaptation to our weakness, uses them as helps.'[152] Thus, in Article 14, 'the whole effect resides in his Spirit' and, in Article 15, 'the Spirit alone is properly the seal' because 'all these attributes of the sacraments sink down to a lower place, so that not even the smallest portion of our salvation is transferred to creatures or elements.'[153] This definition of instrumentality, reflecting Bullinger's doctrine, disqualified any sense that the sacraments conferred grace. While Bullinger and Calvin could agree, in Article 17, that the sacraments did not confer grace 'on all' participants irrespective of faith, Bullinger could not accept any statement on how they might confer grace to the elect.[154] Article 19 stated explicitly that without the use of the sacraments 'believers receive the reality which is there figured.' They already have communion with Christ by faith. Nevertheless, Bullinger and Calvin, like Zwingli, believed that 'inasmuch as faith is confirmed and increased by the sacraments, the gifts of God are confirmed in us, and thus Christ in a manner grows in us and we in him.'[155] However, Article 20 stated that this 'advantage' was not temporally restricted 'as if the visible sign, at the moment when it is brought forward, brought the grace of God along with it.'[156] The *Consensus* contained only sacramental doctrine with which Bullinger was comfortable.

The eighth and ninth sermons of the *Fifth Decade* (1551) tackled practical issues regarding the sacraments and were doctrinally consistent with those sermons first drafted for the *Absoluta*.[157] Bullinger encouraged parents not to delay baptism of their child because Moses disapproved of delaying circumcision. Christians were to be mindful of God's words in Gen. 17:14 that the uncircumcised boy 'shall be cut off from his people, because he hath broken my covenant.'[158] However, the infant who dies before baptism is 'received into the covenant by the grace of

[152] Ibid., 216.
[153] Ibid., 216-217.
[154] Ibid., 217; cf. Rorem, *Supper*, 44-45.
[155] '*Consensus Tigurinus*', 218.
[156] '*Consensus Tigurinus*', 218; Rorem, *Supper*, 44.
[157] Rorem, *Supper*, 52.
[158] Bullinger, *Decades*, v/8. 366.

God' regardless.[159] All children of Christians are already 'joint partners in the league' by virtue of God's promises, 'fastened [to Christ] with the spiritual knot of the covenant.'[160]

The ninth sermon placed eucharistic communion in the context of the covenant. Bullinger noted that the Eucharist was called the 'breaking of bread' by Luke, and observed that 'in times past firm leagues were performed by breaking of bread.'[161] He explained that 'the church is joined and united unto Christ in the holy supper by a most strait league: and to conclude, the members themselves are therewith joined very fast together.' This mutual 'agreement' was also described as a 'testament.'[162] As in most of Zwingli's writings, God was the initiator.[163] Bullinger described eucharistic communion, both with Christ and with other believers, as 'a league or confederacy. We are knit invisibly with Christ and all his members by unity of faith and participation of one Spirit.'[164] Bullinger finished with a warning against Satan's schemes to corrupt 'the token of a covenant never to be broken.'[165] In effect, Satan's attack on the sacrament of the covenant was an attack on the Christian league.

Bullinger's sacramental theology was similar to Zwingli's in its covenantal context and denial that the sacraments mediated grace. Its distinctive emphasis was on the analogy between sign and reality, allowing that the sacraments offered, by way of testimony, God's promise of grace.

John Calvin

Calvin drew a strong link between covenant and sacrament,[166] closely identifying the spiritual reality with the external sign. He believed that the sacraments were vehicles employed by the Spirit to confer the grace that they signified. Consequently Calvin came closer than either

[159] Ibid., v/8. 372; cf. Bullinger, *Brief Exposition*, 131.
[160] Bullinger, *Decades*, v/8. 377, cf. 383, 87-89.
[161] Ibid., v/9. 402.
[162] Ibid., v/9. 402-403.
[163] Ibid., v/9. 469.
[164] Ibid., v/9. 467.
[165] Ibid., v/9. 477-478.
[166] Lillback, *Binding of God*, 242-263.

Zwingli or Bullinger to Luther's understanding of the sacraments. In 1540 he signed Melanchthon's *Confessio Augustana Variata* and was assigned to a Lutheran delegation at the Worms Colloquy with the Strasbourg reformer Johannes Sturm.[167] However, like Zwingli and Bullinger, Calvin denied the physical presence of Christ in the elements and by 1545 Luther had come to group him among the sacramentarians.[168]

Although Calvin moved towards the sacramental positions of Wittenberg and Strasbourg in the late 1530s, the first edition of his *Institutes* (1536) drew on Zwinglian themes. Calvin defined a sacrament as 'an outward sign by which the Lord represents and attests to us his good will toward us to sustain the weakness of our faith'; in other words, 'a testimony of God's grace,'[169] or 'ceremonies by which the Lord wills to exercise and confirm the faith of his people.'[170] Like Zwingli, Calvin emphasised God's provision 'for the ignorance of our mind and for the weakness of our flesh.' Human faith 'is slight and feeble unless propped on all sides and sustained by every means,' hence the sacraments 'confirm and seal the promise itself,' like seals confirming government documents.[171]

Although Calvin drew on Luther's 'testament' concept from the *Babylonian Captivity*, he did not associate it with a unilateral and unconditional promise.[172] On the contrary, Calvin identified 'promise' and 'covenant' in such a way as to define the 'token' or sacrament in relation to ancient covenant rituals. He asked what distinguished a ritual slaughter of a pig from any other killing except its signification of ratifying 'the laws of covenants.' Again, the ratification is to make humanity more certain of God's fidelity: the sacraments 'lead us by the

[167] Gordon, *Calvin*, 99-100.
[168] Ibid., 170.
[169] Calvin, *Institutes* [1536], 87.
[170] Ibid., 93.
[171] Ibid., 87, 92; cf. Melanchthon, *Loci Communes*, 133; Gordon, 'Calvin and the Swiss Reformed Churches', 66.
[172] Calvin, *Institutes* [1536], 116.

hand as tutors lead children.'[173] Conversely, exclusion from the token signifies exclusion from the promise.[174]

Nevertheless, Calvin's sacramental theology clearly differed from Zwingli's. He attacked Zwingli's views that 'faith cannot be made better'[175] and that the sacraments signify God's act of receiving the believer, although he accepted that baptism serves 'our confession before men.'[176] Calvin argued that God had established the sacraments 'to nourish, exercise, and increase' faith and that they 'offer us mercy and grace.'[177] Furthermore, while Calvin placed 'no power in creatures,' he believed that the sacraments were 'means and instruments' of grace: God 'nourishes faith spiritually through the sacraments.'[178]

Calvin was careful, nonetheless, to exclude any misperception that sacraments could 'justify and confer grace [...] apart from faith' or 'bring [...] those things given us by divine bounty.'[179] He warned that they ought not to become objects of faith themselves. Instead, faith 'ought to rise up to him, the author of the sacraments.'[180] While the Zürichers recognised only the blessing of the Spirit, claimed Calvin, he identified three blessings:

> For first, the Lord teaches and instructs us by his Word. Secondly, he confirms it by the sacraments. Finally, he illumines our minds by the light of his Holy Spirit and opens our hearts for the Word and sacraments to enter in, which would otherwise only strike our ears and appear before our eyes, but not at all affect us within.[181]

[173] Ibid., 88, cf. 92.
[174] Ibid., 89-90.
[175] Ibid., 88. Calvin does not appear to be aware of Zwingli's more nuanced position in 1529-31, see above p.118.
[176] Calvin, *Institutes* [1536], 90-91, 94; cf. Alexandre Ganoczy, *The Young Calvin*, trans. D. Foxgrover and W. Provo (Edinburgh: 1987), 151-153.
[177] Calvin, *Institutes* [1536], 88.
[178] Ibid., 90.
[179] Ibid., 91-92.
[180] Ibid., 90.
[181] Ibid., 88-89.

The 'ancient sacraments [circumcision and Temple sacrifices] looked to the same purpose to which ours now tend: to direct and almost lead men by the hand to Christ.'[182] Sacraments show the essential unity of the Testaments: circumcision and baptism indicate cleansing from sin; sacrifices and the Eucharist indicate God's satisfaction. All point to the work of Christ.[183] Baptism, then, performed two functions for Calvin: to 'serve' and strengthen our faith before God and our confession before men. Baptism achieves the former by testifying to our cleansing, our mortification and our union with Christ. The believer is offered certainty of these things. Calvin can say that 'Christ's purity has been offered us in it' and 'in baptism we are covered and protected by Christ's blood.'[184] Baptismal vows therefore include a 'plea for pardon' (justification) and a 'petition for help' (sanctification), so that humanity's obligations are met by grace.[185] It is, like Zwingli's baptism, 'an initiation into faith.'[186] Confession before men was briefly explained from 1 Cor. 1:13 where

> in being baptised in Christ's name, they had devoted themselves [*devovisse*] to him, sworn allegiance [*iurasse*] to his name, and pledged their fealty [*fidem obstrinxisse*] to him before men. As a result, they could no longer confess any other but Christ alone, unless they chose to renounce the confession they had made in baptism.[187]

The reciprocal obligation towards Christ is evident here, and it sounds remarkably like Zwingli's view. Baptism, explained Calvin, is to be received 'from the hand of God' and 'we should see and ponder spiritual things in the physical.' He denied that grace is 'bound and enclosed in the sacrament' and even seems to contradict his earlier general discussion by further denying that baptism 'is an organ and instrument to confer [grace] upon us.' Here it is only a token of grace from which 'we obtain only as much as we receive in faith.'[188] Although

[182] Ibid., 93.
[183] Ibid., 93-94.
[184] Ibid., 94-98.
[185] Lillback, *Binding of God*, 247.
[186] Calvin, *Institutes* [1536], 120.
[187] Ibid., 98; *CO*, i. 114.
[188] Calvin, *Institutes* [1536], 99; cf. David Steinmetz, *Calvin in Context* (Oxford & New York: 1995), 164-165.

God's promise in baptism remains 'fixed and firm and trustworthy,' a child benefits only when he grows old enough to have faith in it. Faith is so emphasised by Calvin that he even attributes the salvation of an elect infant who dies to faith.[189] By contrast, a lack of faith is 'evidence of our being accused before God,'[190] later clarified as being rendered 'chargeable before God.'[191] The sacraments thus express the sanctions of the covenant.

The Eucharist confirms that Christ's body and blood are given to us, and Calvin suggested three reasons, the first of which is to strengthen faith. Believers recognise their union with Christ and his union with them in the sacrament. Calvin's understanding of Presence is that these benefits are 'so perfectly promised in this sacrament, that we must certainly consider him truly shown to us, just as if Christ himself present were set before our gaze and touched by our hands.' Believers are to perceive an analogy between the physical elements and the spiritual significance of sealing and confirming God's promise.[192] Importantly, the elements are not body and blood but 'the testament in body and blood.'[193] Secondly, the Eucharist strengthens believers' witness, 'publicly and all with a single voice to confess openly before men that for us the whole assurance of life and salvation rests upon the Lord's death, that we may glorify him by our confession, and by our example exhort others to give glory to him.' Thus it is an exercise in remembrance and proclamation.[194] Thirdly, the Eucharist exhorts believers to unity in Christ and is a 'pledge' of mutual love.[195] Calvin wrote that 'as often as we partake of the symbol of the Lord's body, as a token given and received, we reciprocally bind ourselves to all

[189] Calvin, *Institutes* [1536], 100-102. Calvin's position attempts to reconcile Zwingli's emphasis on initiation with Luther's dual emphasis on promise and faith, cf. Lohse, *Luther's Theology*, 300.
[190] Calvin, *Institutes* [1536], 99.
[191] Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 1315 (IV. xv. 15).
[192] Calvin, *Institutes* [1536], 102-103.
[193] Ibid., 107.
[194] Ibid., 109.
[195] Ibid., 109-110.

the duties of love.'[196] The mutual commitment undertaken by believers is therefore akin to that between God and believers.

The following year, in 1537, Bucer and Wolfgang Capito subscribed to Calvin's *Confession of Faith concerning the Eucharist* in an attempt to deflect suspicion that Strasbourg was conceding too much to the Lutherans. With brevity Calvin stated that participation in Christ occurred through the Spirit 'but in such a manner that he really feeds us with the substance of the body and blood of the Lord to everlasting life.' This participation was offered 'under the symbols of bread and wine.'[197] Christ's symbolic yet 'substantial' presence in the elements was thus asserted.

The ancient origin of the sacraments as covenantal seals was expanded in the 1539 edition of the *Institutes* where Abraham's circumcision was described as 'the seal of the covenant by faith in which he had already been justified.' The believer was to look beyond the physical elements to 'contemplation of those lofty mysteries [*sublima mysteria*] which lie hidden in the sacraments'[198] – 'we are lifted up to heaven with our eyes and minds, to seek Christ there in the glory of his Kingdom.'[199]

The sacraments were instituted by God to 'establish and increase faith,' but Calvin clarified that they do not contain 'some secret force' in themselves. Rather, they benefit faith when the Spirit works through them:

> Therefore, I make such a division between Spirit and sacraments that the power to act rests with the former, and the ministry alone is left to the latter – a ministry

[196] Ibid., 112.
[197] John Calvin, 'Confession of Faith Concerning the Eucharist (1537)', in J. Reid (ed.), *Calvin: Theological Treatises* (22: 1954), 168.
[198] Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 1280 (IV. xiv. 5); *CO*, i. 941.
[199] Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 1381 (IV. xvii. 18); *CO*, i. 1009.

> empty and trifling [*inane ac frivolum*], apart from the action of the Spirit, but charged with great effect when the Spirit works within and manifests his power.[200]

By assigning credit to God's preparation of the heart to receive the sign, Calvin argues that he avoids doing an injustice to the Spirit who 'transmits those outward words and sacraments from our ears to our soul.'[201] Calvin resisted both divorcing sign from mystery, alluding to Hoen and Zwingli, and immoderately exalting signs, alluding to Luther. However, his scepticism towards the Zwinglian position was not hostile: he recognised that there was no unanimity amongst Christians and refrained from the vitriol of which he was capable. His understanding was couched in the phrase 'it seems to me.' The difference, he wrote, is that for Hoen and Zwingli 'eating is faith; for me it seems rather to follow from faith.'[202] 'Eating is the result and effect of faith,' by which Calvin meant an infusion of Christ's life into believers.[203] Calvin perhaps overestimated his distance from Zwingli's position, which allowed that both faith and the soul are 'strengthened' (see above p.175). However, Calvin conceived of eating as occurring 'under the symbols' of the elements ('*sub panis symbolo*'),[204] assigning the Eucharist an instrumentality uniformly rejected in Zürich. In terms of the covenant, Christ unites his body with believers in the sacrament, and that unity is exhibited ('*exhibetur*') in the bread.[205] In 1559 Calvin described the bread as Christ's body 'because it is the covenant in his body.'[206]

On the believer's part, the sacraments represent vows of perfect obedience, 'marks of profession, by which we openly swear allegiance to God, binding ourselves in fealty to him.' Calvin drew attention to the 'covenantal' significance.[207] This binding of God and humanity is

[200] Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 1284 (IV. xiv. 9); *CO*, i. 944.
[201] Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 1285 (IV. xiv. 10); *CO*, i. 945.
[202] Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 1365 (IV. xvii. 5); *CO*, i. 999.
[203] Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 1365 (IV. xvii. 5).
[204] Ibid., 1381 (IV. xvii. 18); *CO*, i. 1009.
[205] *CO*, i. 1014.
[206] Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 1384 (IV. xvii. 20).
[207] Ibid., 1296 (IV. xiv. 19); cf. Ronald Wallace, *Calvin's Doctrine of Word and Sacrament* (Edinburgh: 1953), 141.

the basic significance of the sacraments for Calvin.[208] The believer cannot invalidate the sacrament through violation of the reciprocal covenant itself, for 'the symbol of the covenant remained ever firm and inviolable by virtue of the Lord's institution.' The 'sole condition of repentance' allowed covenant-breakers' restoration 'into the covenant.'[209]

The 1539 edition of the *Institutes* saw the addition of Calvin's chapter on paedobaptism (IV. xvi). Arguing, like Zwingli and Bullinger, for an essential continuity of the covenant of circumcision, Calvin wrote that '*per baptismum Deo initiamur, ut eius populo adscibamur, et ipsi mutuo in eius nomen iuremus*' (through baptism we are initiated by God, we are reckoned his people, and in turn we swear fealty to him). For the Jews, circumcision had been their first entry into the church ('*primus illis erat in ecclesiam ingressus*').[210] Entry into a covenant community is clearly intended and infants of both Testaments enter into a common covenant by hereditary right ('*haereditario iure*').[211] Rejection of infant baptism is therefore a 'violation of the will of God.' It is not 'superfluous' for

> God's sign, communicated to a child as by an impressed seal, confirms the promise given to the pious parent, and declares it to be ratified that the Lord will be God not only to him but to his seed; and that he wills to manifest his goodness and grace not only to him but to his descendants even to the thousandth generation [Ex. 20:6].[212]

Calvin argued that infants, even from the womb, can be saved by God due to his prerogative of regeneration; this in spite of their lack of understanding and inability to 'swear to the provisions of the covenant.' Adults, by contrast, who wish to enter the 'fellowship of the covenant' must 'learn its conditions' before receiving the sign.[213] Participation in the Eucharist was reserved for

[208] Lillback, *Binding of God*, 246.
[209] Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 1317 (IV. xv. 17).
[210] *CO*, i. 970; cf. Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 1327-1329 (IV. xvi. 4-6).
[211] *CO*, i. 985; cf. Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 1347 (IV. xvi. 24). Calvin clearly explained his covenantal understanding of paedobaptism to John Knox on 8 November 1559: Gorham (ed.), *Gleanings*, 418.
[212] Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 1331-1332 (IV. xvi. 8-9), cf. 1336-38 (IV. xvi. 14-15).
[213] Ibid., 1340-1347 (IV. xvi. 17-24), quotations at 1347.

adults because only they were capable of self-examination and remembrance.[214] Both infant offspring and adult proselytes are Abraham's descendants. The Jewish people still have a claim on Christ to 'discharge the pledge made once for all by his Father [...] for the salvation of the Jewish nation.' However, natural covenant-members could be 'forsaken' if they became complacent and disobedient in their reciprocal obligations.[215]

Calvin's *Short Treatise on the Lord's Supper* (1541) was written at the high ebb of his hopes for *rapprochement* between the Lutherans and the Swiss.[216] Calvin explained that believers' 'heavenly inheritance' is not only to be grasped in the future but that God 'has already in a measure installed us in its possession.' Believers are already 'translated' into life and, to be sustained in it, they feed on the 'spiritual bread' of the Word, the 'instrument by which Jesus Christ, with all his benefits, is dispensed to us.' Calvin argued that what pertains to the Word also belongs to the Eucharist. Weak human faith fails to receive Christ from teaching and preaching alone, so God attaches signs to the Word 'to sign and seal in our consciences the promises contained in his gospel concerning our being made partakers of his body and blood.' The signs also promote praise and sanctification.[217] The Eucharist, then, is a testimony or mirror of contemplation of the benefits of Christ. Believers cannot enjoy his benefits until they receive him, and he is 'given' in the Eucharist. Therefore 'the manner and substance of the sacraments is the Lord Jesus Christ, and the efficacy of them are the gifts and blessings which we have by means of him.' The Eucharist is 'frivolous and useless' without 'the true communication of Jesus Christ [...] offered us in the Supper.'[218] Believers are to look beyond the symbol to that signified, for God certainly performs it and 'we must then receive in the Supper the body and blood and Jesus Christ.' The sacraments further 'impel us to do our duty'

[214] Ibid., 1353 (IV. xvi. 30).
[215] Ibid., 1336-1337 (IV. xvi. 14-15); cf. Lillback, *Binding of God*, 252, 255-256.
[216] John Calvin, 'Short Treatise on the Lord's Supper (1541)', in J. Reid (ed.), *Calvin: Theological Treatises* (*LCC*, 22: 1954), 164-166.
[217] Ibid., 143-144.
[218] Ibid., 145-146.

in gratitude, public confession and holy living.[219] Thus, they are signs which are instrumental in communicating Christ to believers.

The 1543 edition of the *Institutes* was consistent with Calvin's teaching in the *Short Treatise*. Sacraments were defined not only as signs to sustain weak faith, as in earlier editions, but signs in which 'we in turn attest our piety toward him [God] before men [*apud homines testamur*].' That signified now included reciprocal or 'mutual attestation of our piety.'[220] In the Eucharist God 'in some measure renews, or rather continues, the covenant which he once and for all ratified with his blood (as far as it pertains to the strengthening of our faith).'[221]

Concerning the instrumentality of sacraments, Calvin stated that God 'imparts spiritual things under visible ones.'[222] Likening sacraments to preaching, he argued that Paul glories in the ministry of the Spirit (2 Cor. 3:6) 'as if the power of the Holy Spirit were joined by an indissoluble bond to his preaching.' Divinely ordained instruments really express the power of the Spirit, 'nevertheless, this distinction is to be kept: we should remember what man can do of himself, and what is reserved to God.'[223] Calvin endeavoured to strike this balance. One sentence in the 1536 edition had read:

> we are said to receive, obtain, and acquire what we believe given to us by God, whether we first recognise it, or become more certain of it as previously recognised.[224]

By 1543 the same sentence had been significantly altered to:

> we are said to receive, obtain, and acquire what, according as our faith is aware, is shown forth to us by the Lord [*nobis a Domino exhibetur*], whether when he first

[219] Ibid., 148-149.
[220] Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 1277 (IV. xiv. 1); *CO*, i. 938-939.
[221] Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 1361 (IV. xvii. 1).
[222] Ibid., 1278 (IV. xiv. 3); *CO*, i. 940.
[223] Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 1286-1287 (IV. xiv. 11); *CO*, i. 945-946.
[224] Calvin, *Institutes* [1536], 99.

> testifies to it, or when he confirms more fully and more surely what has been attested.[225]

Calvin's modifications serve to exaggerate the rôle of faith in apprehending the significance of the sacrament and to stress the primacy of God in testifying and confirming that significance over humanity's recognition of it. Sacramental instrumentality and efficacy depended upon divine activity. The same distinction governed his separation of baptism from the grace of regeneration: children of Christians are adopted by God before birth 'when he promises that he will be our God and the God of our descendants after us [Gen. 17:7].'[226] The natural lineage of the covenant promise is thus maintained after Christ.

It seems, then, that Calvin's sacramental theology was essentially complete by 1539 and fully integrated with his concept of covenant. While the covenant was sometimes obscured by his concerns in the Eucharist controversy, the definition of sacraments as covenant seals was the consistent basis of Calvin's sacramental theology.

Conclusion

The concept of covenant was central to the sacramental theologies of Zwingli, Bullinger and Calvin, but they each came to different conclusions about the relationship between grace and the sacraments. Zwingli's prioritisation of the uniqueness of Christ's historic work led him to deny altogether that sacraments could confer grace. He regarded sacraments as tangible memorials of divine faithfulness and human allegiance. Only in 1529-31 did he concede that the sacraments could support faith indirectly. To a great extent Bullinger defended and shared the Zwinglian position, but he amplified Zwingli's connection between sign and reality, emphasising the analogous rôle of the sacraments in testifying to, or offering, the promise of grace without conferring grace themselves. Calvin's position was characterised by the idea that

[225] Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 1315 (IV. xv. 15); *CO*, i. 965.
[226] Ibid., 1321 (IV. xv. 20).

the sacraments conferred the grace that they signified. This stemmed from his close identification of covenant and sacrament. For Calvin, sacraments had no intrinsic worth except as seals of the covenant in Christ's body, but as such they conveyed Christ himself.

This examination has demonstrated that the concepts of covenant belonging to Zwingli, Bullinger and Calvin are distinguishable, not on the basis of any variation between their concepts, but according to the distinct sacramental theology that each of them developed from their concept. In the next chapter these distinctions will undergird an investigation of the sources of reciprocal covenant themes in the English context.

V. English Sacramental Theology

> Hast thou auctority to absolue me or geue me penaunce[?] Nay, thou maist kepe shepe. Christ saied mas[s] upon the Mount of Calvary and that is suffisient for my soule.
>
> *Archibald of Faversham (1543)*[1]

SACRAMENTAL controversy as it unfolded in England exhibited the 'theological mediocrity' that Alister McGrath sees in the English Reformation generally.[2] When read *à propos* of continental contributions, the English discourse seems more preoccupied with pastoral application. Diarmaid MacCulloch has commented upon 'the English lack of capacity for abstract theological invention.'[3] When more sophisticated sacramental doctrine is found in England, continental influence may be suspected.[4] The reception of the Swiss concept of covenant by English evangelicals had significant implications for their sacramental theology. This chapter shows how sacramental theology can be used to suggest particular continental sources of English concepts of covenant.

William Tyndale

Baptism, wrote Tyndale in his *Prologue to Romans* (1526), 'signifieth the mortifyinge of sinnes and the newe life of grace.'[5] Although the Holy Spirit 'laboureth and enforceth to kill the remnaunte of sinne and luste which remayne in the flesshe after oure iustifinge,' Tyndale opined that 'we are not so fre from sinne thorowe fayth that we shuld henceforth goo vppe and doune ydle carlesse and sure of oure selves as though there were nowe no more sinne in vs.'[6] It was only a passing reference to the sacrament, but in it Tyndale linked the sign with sanctification: in order to 'fulfill oure bapti[s]m' we must 'tame oure bodies and to compell the

[1] Parker Library, Cambridge: CCCC MS. 128, p.64.
[2] McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, 258.
[3] MacCulloch, 'England', 169.
[4] See Collinson, 'Fog in the Channel Clears', xxx.
[5] Tyndale, *Romayns*, B4r.
[6] Ibid.

members to obeye the sprite and not the appetites.' This was equivalent to living in light of regeneration through Christ's death and resurrection rather than living in order to fulfil any kind of baptismal vow.[7]

Tyndale began to engage more particularly with the sacraments in *The Obedience of a Christian Man* (1528). There he defined a sacrament as 'an holy signe and representeth allwaye some promise of God.'[8] It functioned as 'an outwarde signe that maye be sene to signifie[,] to represente and to put a man in remembraunce of some spirituall promyse which can not be sene but by fayth only.'[9] His exemplar was the rainbow of Gen. 9 to 'represent and signifie vnto all men an othe [oath] that God sware to Noe and to all men after him.'[10] The definition of the promise in terms of God's oath makes clear that the sacramental 'remembraunce of the promyses' had only God's commitments in view.[11]

Following Luther, Tyndale claimed that only baptism and 'the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ' were properly called sacraments. Marriage, ordination, anointing, penance and confirmation had 'no promise coupled therwith,' and the final two were signified in baptism anyway.[12] A short paragraph emphasising the necessity of faith 'when thou seist the sacrament or eatest his body or drinkest his bloude' implied the bodily presence of Christ in a manner consistent with Luther's understanding of Christ's presence in the elements.[13] The promise signified was the forgiveness of sins. Tyndale asserted that communicants were 'saved and justified' by seeing the sacrament, eating the bread, or drinking the wine 'yf [...] thou have this promyse fast in thine herte (that his body was slayne and his bloud shed for thy synnes) and

[7] Ibid.
[8] Tyndale, *Obedience*, M1r.
[9] Ibid., M7r.
[10] Ibid., M1r.
[11] Ibid., O1r.
[12] Ibid., M3r.
[13] Ibid., M1r-v; cf. Martin Luther, *The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ – against the Fanatics* [1526], trans. A. Steinhauser (*LW*, 36; Philadelphia: 1959), 335, 343; Martin Luther, *That These Words of Christ, "This Is My Body," etc., Still Stand Firm against the Fanatics* [1527], ed. R. Fischer (*LW*, 37; Philadelphia: 1976), 64.

belevest it.' Participation was efficacious only to the believer. A marginal note clarified that 'the promyse which the sacrament preacheth iustifieth only,'[14] thereby excluding the Roman idea of eucharistic sacrifice in which, Tyndale claimed, they 'make us believe that the work itself, without the promise, saveth us; which doctrine they learned of Aristotle.'[15]

Tyndale's two paragraphs on baptism in the *Obedience* began by insisting that God's promise be taught to the people in English. Paedobaptism was assumed, and the priest, 'appon this faith [of the congregation] baptiseth the childe.'[16] As with the Eucharist, the ceremony itself was said to avail nothing 'but thorow the worde it purifieth and clenseth vs.'[17] This is at least consistent with Luther's language, if not with regard to the value of the ceremony.[18] Tyndale defined the 'worde' as God's promise. He established a close connection between the preaching of the word and the administration of the sacraments, reminiscent of Luther's position in 1526.[19] He compared baptism to preaching in that both 'represent' the divine promise in Christ and thereby have salvific value, but only to those who believe the word. Baptism

> preacheth vnto vs that we are clensed with Christes bloudeshedinge which was an offeringe and a satisfaction for the sinne of all that repente and beleve consentinge and submittinge them selves vnto the will of God. The plunginge in to the water signifieth that we dye and are buryed with Christ as concerninge the olde lyfe of synne which is Adam. And the pullinge out agayne signifieth that we rise agayne with christe in a new lyfe full of the holy goost which shall teach vs and gyde vs and worke the will of God in vs.[20]

Evidently it is Christ's atonement, rather than baptism, that is of real efficacy for believers, but the sacrament, like preaching, presents an opportunity to believe God's promise. In his discussion of penance Tyndale added that 'repentaunce and all the good deades which

[14] Tyndale, *Obedience*, M1v.
[15] Ibid., O3r.
[16] Ibid., M1v.
[17] Ibid., M2r.
[18] See Lohse, *Luther's Theology*, 299.
[19] cf. Luther, *Sacrament of the Body and Blood*, 349.
[20] Tyndale, *Obedience*, M2r.

accompanie repentaunce to sley the lustes of the flesh are signified by bapti[s]m.'[21] The sign of baptism reminds believers that their inclusion in Christ's atonement assumes that they will battle for holiness. Although this could be interpreted as the believer's mutual responsibility, Tyndale did not link baptism to a bilateral understanding of testament.

Tyndale rejected the idea that the Holy Spirit was received through ceremonies, arguing instead that the Spirit was 'received through preaching of the faith.'[22] Tyndale concluded that, since the sacraments also preach God's word, they

> therfore iustifie and minister the sprite to them that beleve as Paul thorow preachinge the Gospell was a minister of righteousnes and of the sprite vnto all that beleved his preaching [...]. Christes sacramentes preach the fayth of Christ as his apostles did and therby iustifie.[23]

Tyndale's primary interest in 1528 seems to have been to oppose late-medieval beliefs about the efficacy of the ceremonies themselves. At this stage his sacramental theology seems to have been closer to Luther's than to Zwingli's, but as shown above (see p.111), Tyndale was already beginning to exhibit traits more characteristic of Zürich theology.

A mutual concept of covenant became central to Tyndale's theology between 1528 and 1530. In his earlier works the sacraments had not even been related to his peripheral notion of covenant, but in his Pentateuch prologues (1530) they were integrated. In addition, his Pentateuch prologues were conspicuous for their omission of the physical presence of Christ in the sacraments, firmly distancing Tyndale from Luther.

In the glossary to Genesis (see above p.112), Tyndale defined a sacrament as 'a signe representinge soch an appoyn[t]ment and promeses;' that is, a sign representing the bilateral

[21] Ibid., M7r.
[22] Ibid., O2r.
[23] Ibid., O8v.

appointment 'betwene god and man and goddes promyses.'[24] In the Old Testament the rainbow was a sign of God's promise of preservation to Noah, which was apparently unilateral. Meanwhile circumcision signified both God's promise to Abraham and, 'on the other side,' Abraham's obligation to 'circumcyse and cut off the lustes of their fleshe [...] to walke in the wayes of the lorde.' Baptism had now 'come in the roume' of circumcision and so 'signifieth on the one syde how that all that repent and beleue are washed in Christes bloud: And on the other syde how that the same must quench and droune the lustes of the flesh to folow the steppes of Christ.'[25] For Tyndale, like Zwingli, baptism had come to signify a reciprocal obligation of godliness following the model of circumcision.

In the Leviticus prologue Tyndale argued that sacrifices and ceremonies helped the Jew to serve God according to the 'appoyntement made betwene him and God.' The Jewish ceremonies had spoken to them 'after their awne capacyte' in the era 'before Christ [...] in the infancye and childhod of the worlde,' but now,

> as the shadowe vanisheth awaye at the comynge of the light, euen so doo the ceremonyes and sacrifices at the comynge of Christ, and are henceforth no moare necessarye then a token left in remembraunce of a bargayne is necessary when the bargayne is fulfilled.[26]

The New Testament sacraments, by contrast, perform a different function from those of the Levitical cult. Once we have come to know Christ, ceremonies continue to be useful as

> figures, that is to saye allegoryes, similitudes or examples to open Christ and the secrettes off God hyd in Christ euen vnto the quycke, and to declare them more lyuely and sensebly with them than with all the wordes of the worlde. For similitudes haue more vertue and power with them than bare wordes, and lead a

[24] Tyndale, *Pentateuch*, A table expoundinge certeyne wordes. This text is unpaginated.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Ibid., Leviticus Prologue.

> mans wittes further in to the pithe and marye [marrow] and spirituall vnderstondinge of the thinge, than all the wordes that can be imagined.[27]

This pedagogical function of the sacraments is not identical to Zwingli's notion of accommodation to humanity's weakness (see above p.171), since Tyndale wrote here of the 'vertue and power' of the signs. He believed that the sacraments were designed to aid remembrance of the bargain with God, like 'a ringe of a rush aboute one of their fingers.'[28] Tyndale's use of the ring metaphor is too brief to be identified with either Zwingli's or Bullinger's use of it (see above p.186), but the ring was equivalent to an oath confirming a bargain: 'it is not ynough to make a bargayne with wordes onlye, but we must put thereto an o[a]th and geue ernest to confirme the faithe off the person with whom it is made.'[29] Tyndale was certainly more confident than Zwingli (see above p.175) in his repeated statement that the sacraments were 'a token and remembraunce to sturre vppe their faythes wyth all,' suggesting that they strengthen faith in God's promises so that believers can hold God to his commitments.[30]

A more clearly Zwinglian comparison (see above p.177) can be drawn from Tyndale's use of the military metaphor for baptism. It was 'oure comen ba[d]gge and sure ernest and perpetuall memoriall that we pertayne vnto Christ and are separated from all that are not christes' (that is, those who are not pledged to God), just as circumcision signified that the Jews 'were all so[l]diars off God to warre his warre and separatinge them from all other nacyons disobedient vnto God.'[31] Baptism was not only the sign of initiation into God's people. It further signified that we should walk in godliness, echoing the Genesis glossary. The emphasis here is on baptism as God's action rather than humanity's,[32] although in the Numbers prologue it is stated explicitly that Christians 'hast vowed in thy baptyme [...] that thou shuldest wayte on his will

[27] Ibid.
[28] Ibid.
[29] Ibid.
[30] Ibid.
[31] Ibid.
[32] cf. Zwingli, *Subsidiary Essay*, *HZW*, ii. 224.

and commaundmentes and puryfye thy membres acordynge to the same doctryne that hath purifyed thyne harte.' The sacrament signifies reciprocal obligations; humanity enjoys God's help and 'the comforte of the rewarde to come,' which is based on God's goodness rather than human merit.[33]

Tyndale expounded a concept of sacramental instrumentality in the Leviticus prologue as he had done in the *Obedience*, referring, for instance, to 'the nature power and frute or effecte of bapti[s]m.' The Jewish ceremonies 'saued them and iustified them and stode them in the same steade as oure sacramentes doo vs: not by the power of the sacrifice or deade it selfe, but by the vertue of the faith in the promysse whiche the sacrifice or ceremonye preached and wherof it was a token or sygne.' Again, 'the sacramentes clense vs and absolue vs of oure synnes as the preastes doo, in preachinge of repentaunce and faith.'[34] Tyndale held that 'if bapti[s]m preach me the wasshing in christes bloude, so doth the holy gost accompany it,'[35] thereby connecting the work of the Spirit with the faithful reception of the sacraments.

Tyndale also linked Jewish ceremonies with Christian preaching and sacraments in *The Practice of Prelates* (1530). Here his emphasis was on their signification rather than instrumentality. Ceremonies were

> signes that put men in remembraunce other of the benefites of god done all readye as the esterlambe: ether signes of the promysse and appoyntement made betwene god and man as circumcysion: or signes that testifye unto the people that the wrath of god is peaced and their synnes forgeuen as all maner sacrifyces: which all cease assone as christ had offered upp the sacrifyce of his bodye and bloude for vs. And in steade of them come the open preachinge of christ and oure signes which we call sacramentes.[36]

[33] Tyndale, *Pentateuch*, Numbers Prologue.
[34] Ibid., Leviticus Prologue.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Tyndale, *Practyse of Prelates*, H8r-v. The influence of Swiss Reformed theology is noted by Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 106n.

There were, then, several possible significations: memorials of God's blessings, signs of the covenant, and confirmations of the atonement. This wealth of meaning was held together in Tyndale's sacramental theology as different aspects were emphasised for polemical ends.

The human obligation contained in the sacrament of baptism and mentioned in the Numbers prologue was clearly identified in Tyndale's prologue to Jonah (1531). In Jon 2:9 the prophet declares that he will 'paye that I haue vowed that sauinge cometh of the lorde.' Tyndale commented: 'to beleue that god only is the sauer [saviour] is the thynge that all the Jewes vowed in theyr circumcision as we in oure bapti[s]m. Which vowe Jonas now tawght with experience promiseth to paye.'[37] The baptised Christian is, therefore, under obligation to recognise God as the only saviour, which is the condition of faith. Trusting in the sacraments without consciousness of this signification is a form of idolatry.[38] To another error – that baptism does not cleanse from subsequent sin – Tyndale answered that the ongoing application of that sign to infants renews its signification for the whole community:

> though when we synne of frailtie after oure bapty[s]m we receaue the sygne no moare yet we be renewed agayne thorow repentaunce and faith in Christes bloude whych twayne the sygne of bapty[s]m ever contynued amonge vs in baptisynge oure younge childern doeth euer kepe in mynde and call vs backe agayne vn to oure profession if we be gonne astraye & promiseth vs forgeuenesse.[39]

In Tyndale's view, therefore, paedobaptism involves not only the individual but the community.

Tyndale's *Answer* to Sir Thomas More (1531) tackled numerous questions relating to 'sacraments, ceremonies, or signs (three words with one signification).'[40] Tyndale's focus was to dispute More's traditional doctrine. Tyndale argued that the sacraments, like the word of

[37] Tyndale, *Prophete Ionas*, B4v, cf. C3v.
[38] Ibid., B5r.
[39] Ibid., C4r-v.
[40] Tyndale, *Answer*, 74.

God, are to be believed, not to be the object of belief.[41] He argued that 'the priest toucheth not Christ's natural body with his hands,' but affirmed that

> he that repenteth toward the law of God, and at the sight of the sacrament, or of the breaking, feeling, eating, chamming [chewing], or drinking, calleth to remembrance the death of Christ, his body-breaking and blood-shedding for our sins, and all his passion; the same eateth our Saviour's body and drinketh his blood through faith only, and receiveth forgiveness of all his sins thereby.[42]

Here Tyndale's understanding of participation comes close to Zwingli's position, with its emphasis on memorialisation and 'faith in the doctrine.'[43] Thus,

> the shewing, breaking, and eating of the host, the shewing and drinking of the cup of Christ's blood, and the words, and the consecration, help us not a pin, nor are God's service; save only in that they stir up our repenting faith, to call to mind the death and passion of Christ for our sins.[44]

Sacraments were no more than aids to the weak, possessing no intrinsic value. All sacraments signify that we should 'keep the faith purely and the law of love undefiled,'[45] which is consistent with a signification of a reciprocal relationship between God and mankind. Baptism makes demands in signifying 'that I must repent of evil, and believe to be saved therefrom by the blood of Christ.'[46]

A similar point was made in the strongly covenantal *Exposition of the fyrste epistle of Seynt Jhon* (1531) where baptism is described as the 'sacrament of repentance.' Tyndale noted significations of commitments pertaining both to God and to humanity:

> For the plunging in to the water as it betokenith on the one parte that christ hathe washed oure soules with his bloude euen so on the other part it signifieth that we

[41] Ibid., 180.
[42] Ibid., 162-163.
[43] Ibid., 172; cf. Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 106n.
[44] Tyndale, *Answer*, 177.
[45] Ibid., 30.
[46] Ibid., 171.

> haue p[ro]mised to quench & sley the lustes of the fleashe with prayer fasting & holy meditacion after the doctrine of Christ.[47]

Tyndale explained that the Jews 'could beleue no wordes thoughe an aungell had spoken without a token [...]. And likewise what so euer they were bidde to doo they must haue had a token of remembraunce thoughe it had bene but a ringe of a rushe.'[48] Tyndale repeated the 'ring of rush' image from his prologue to Leviticus, but of greater interest is the use of the sign to confirm what the Jews had been told to do. 'Euen so,' Christian sacraments are 'oure memorialles and signes of remembraunce only,' recalling us to our profession.[49] In the case of the Eucharist,

> to kepe this testament euer in mynde [...] he left vs with the sacrament or signe of his body and bloude to strengthe oure faithe and to certify oure conscience that oure synnes were forgiuen assone as we repentyd and had reconcyled oure selues unto oure brethern: & to arme oure soules thorou the contynuall remembraunce of Christes deeth unto the despising of the worlde mortifyeng of the fleashe and quenching of the lustes and thurst of worldly thinges.[50]

Tyndale allowed a positive function of the Eucharist in strengthening assurance of forgiveness that was consistent with Zwingli's contemporary view (see above p.181). Alongside assurance was the call to arms against sin which must accompany repentance and faith. The Eucharist signified mutuality in the redemptive bargain:

> the sacrament was ministred for the confirmation of the faith of the gospell & of the testament made betwen God and vs of forgiueness of synnes in Christes bloude for oure repentaunce and faith: as ye se howe after all bargens there is a signe therof made.[51]

[47] Tyndale, *Exposition of the fyrst epistle of Seynt Jhon*, C2r, cf. G5r.
[48] Ibid., H1v.
[49] Ibid., H1v-2r.
[50] Ibid., H3r.
[51] Ibid., H4v.

Thus, both sacraments included some signification on humanity's part, either of initiation into Christ's body, or continuing faithfulness and love as a member of Christ's body.[52]

The *Exposicion vppon the V. VI. VII. Chapters of Mathew* (1533) made mention of sacraments in a broader sense. Good works 'are as it were verye sacramentes and visibile and sensibile signes, tokens, yernest, obligacions, wittnesses, test[i]monies,' in the sense that they provide confirmation of God's faithfulness to his promise.[53] Of course works, like sacraments, do not avail justification. 'God onlye iustifieth vs as cause efficient or workeman,' wrote Tyndale, clearly in line with Zürich emphases. He affirmed that 'God promiseth to iustifie whosoeuer is baptised to beleue in Christ, and to kepe the law of God,'[54] yet, as Zwingli had emphasised, 'the wasshynge' simply testifies to God's commitment. It helps those whose faith is weak,

> as the popes lettres doo certifie the beleuers of the popes pardones. Now the letters helpe not or hindre, but that the pardon were as good without them as with them, saue onlye to stablishe weake soules that coulde not beleue excepte they reade the letters, loked on the seale and saw the printe of saynt Peters keyes.[55]

For Tyndale, the value of the sacraments was to confirm the reliability of God's promise to those who doubted.

Tyndale's single most important work of sacramental theology was *A briefe declaration of the sacraments*, written sometime after 1533.[56] He began by observing that the Hebrews instituted signs as memorials 'yf any notable thyng chaunced among them.' 'Lykewyse in all the couenauntes,' he explained, 'they not onely promysed one to another & sweare theron. But also set vp signes & tokens therof and gaue the places names to kepe the thynge in mynde.'[57] The

[52] Ibid., H3v; cf. Clebsch, *Earliest Protestants*, 172-173.
[53] Tyndale, *Mathew*, K6v.
[54] Ibid.
[55] Ibid., K7r.
[56] Tyndale, *Sacraments*. This is the earliest extant edition. See Clebsch, *Earliest Protestants*, 185. *The Souper of the Lorde* (1533) is now attributed to George Joye rather than Tyndale: Cargill Thompson, 'The Supper of the Lord', 77-91; Clebsch, 'More Evidence', 63-66.
[57] Tyndale, *Sacraments*, A2r.

sacraments reminded the Hebrews to hold God to his promises, 'byndyng him with his owne wor[d]es and brynging fourth the oblygation and seale thereof in all tymes of necesite and temptation.'[58]

The Hebrews were also reminded of their obligations to God. The sacrament of circumcision 'bounde' the whole community to God 'to truste in hym and to kepe hys lawes.' This included females without the sign in their own bodies. Physical circumcision was of no intrinsic worth except to aid those who are 'truly circumcysed in the hart & soul before god' to fulfil their profession. Those who bore the physical sign but were not 'truly circumcysed' were all the more liable to condemnation, for God was 'not bounde to them but hadde good ryght therby to punyshe them.'[59]

Whether or not a Hebrew infant had been circumcised, it had become part of God's covenant 'assone as it lyuing in the mothers wombe.' The Abrahamic covenant had stipulated that a boy must die if he had not been circumcised by the eighth day (Gen. 17:12-14), but this was due to his parents' contempt of the signified covenant rather than the necessity of the sign for salvation.[60] As for Zwingli, circumcision provided the basis for Tyndale's understanding of paedobaptism. The covenant in Christ's blood applies to all believers and their 'sede assone as it hath life in the mothers wombeyer [womb ever before] the sygne be put on.' It is God's covenant rather than the sacrament which saves, yet baptism is 'comanded to be put on at due time to styr vp faith of the couenaunt that saueth vs.'[61]

The covenantal nature of the Christian sacraments was repeatedly expressed by Tyndale. Signs had been instituted

[58] Ibid., A3v.
[59] Ibid., A4r-v.
[60] Ibid., A4v-5r.
[61] Ibid., A5r.

> in all [God's] promyses and couenauntes not for hys necessitye, but for oures, that suche thynges shulde be a wytnesse and testymony betwene hym and vs to confyrme the fayth of his promys, that we shuld not wauer or doubt in them, when we loke on the seales of hys oblygac[i]ons, wher with he hath bound hym selfe, and to kepe the promyses and couenauntes beter in mynde, and to make them the more depe synke into our harts, & to be more earnestlye regarded, and that we shulde [ask] what such thyngs mente, and why god commaunded them to be obserued that ignoraunce shulde not excuse, yf we knowe not what we ought to do and beleue.[62]

Numerous points are raised here. The sacraments were 'not a seruice to god, but a seruice to man, to put him in minde of the couenant & to styrre vp fayth and loue w[hich] are goddes spyrytual sacrifyce in mans hart.'[63] This might suggest that faith, which Tyndale saw as a human obligation towards God (see above p.213), is God's work in the heart, thereby placing mutuality in a clearly gracious context. However, it should probably be interpreted as Tyndale's reiteration of the spiritual sacrifice required by God from humanity. The sacraments were instituted 'for our infyrmities sake,'[64] in the sense that humanity's faith in God's promise is weak. Although words might be doubted in retrospect, 'a manne is more sure of that he heareth seythe, feleth, smelleth and tasteth, then that he heareth only.'[65] By way of example, Tyndale, like Bullinger (see above p.186), compared the Eucharist with an engagement ring: 'If a yonge man breake a rynge betwene him & a mayde doth not the facte testyfye and make a presumpcyon to all men, that hys hart meant as hys wordes spake.'[66] Furthermore, the sacraments are testimonies: Christ used the elements of bread and wine to signify 'the couenaunt of hys bodye and bloud.'[67] The Eucharist is a memorial of God's 'euerlastyng testament and mercyfull Promysse' that Christ's blood 'was shedde for vs, for the remyssyon of our Synnes.'[68]

[62] Ibid., C1v.
[63] Ibid., A7r.
[64] Ibid., A5v.
[65] Ibid., B7v-8r.
[66] Ibid., B8v.
[67] Ibid., B4v.
[68] Ibid., B3v.

Alongside this commemoration of God's action is the indication of how humans ought to believe and act. This is particularly clear in baptism, an initiation into Christ's Church, 'wherby we be bound to beleue in Chryst & in the father thorow hym for the remissyon of sinnes & to kepe the law of Chryst to loue e[a]ch other as he loued vs.' Tyndale succinctly summarised its reciprocal, conditional nature, including its sanction: 'by baptysme we be bound to god & god to vs, and the bond and seale of the couenaunt is wryten in our fleshe by whych seale or wryting God chalengeth fayth and loue vnder paine of iust dampnacyon.'[69] The sign is sufficiently important, and imposes such obligation, that the baptised apostate or unbeliever is under 'greatter dampnacyon [...] by the reason of the sygne and ba[d]ge and of there owne consent, graunt and promysse' which gives God 'more ryght to callynge of them the kepyng of hys law.'[70] As with circumcision, 'they baptysed in the flesh & not in the hart hath no part in [Christ's] bloud.'[71] We must in practise 'beleue and cleaue fast to the profession of our baptysme.'[72]

The Eucharist, Tyndale explained, takes the place of the Passover as baptism replaces circumcision.[73] It is used to rehearse the 'couenaunt and testament.'[74] As well as preaching the atonement, the Eucharist marks the culmination of repentance and therefore, claimed Tyndale, it pronounces absolution. The penitent participant has asked God's forgiveness, satisfied his neighbours and submitted himself to the discipline of the congregation.[75] Compared to the terms of the Mosaic covenant, Christians are 'partakers of a more easy & kynde testamente, vnder w[hich] yf you synne thorowe fragylyte[,] you shalbe warned louingli & receyued to

[69] Ibid., A5v.
[70] Ibid., B5r.
[71] Ibid., A6r.
[72] Ibid., B3r.
[73] Ibid., A8v.
[74] Ibid., C5v.
[75] Ibid., B4r-v.

merci yf you wyl turne agayne and amende.'[76] The participant makes a resolution to godliness, offers thanksgiving and renews his obligations:

> Howe muche he is bounden for Chrystes sake to loue hys neyghbour, to helpe hys neade, and to beare hys infyrmitye, and to forgeue hym if he haue offended and desyre forgeuenes, promysyng to amende, where vnto Chryste byndeth all that wyll be partakers of hys Bloude.[77]

Hence Tyndale's paraphrase of Christ's words of institution emphasises their significance for the mutual covenant:

> Take bread and wyne and reherse the couenaunt and testament ouer them[.] How that my body was broken and mi bloud shed for them & the[n] geue[n] [to] them the people to eate and drynke, to be a sygne an earneste and the seal of the testament, and cry vppon them withowt sesing to beleue in me only for remyssyon of sinnes, & not to dispraue how weak so euer they be, only yf they hange on me & desyre powre to kepe the lawe after my doctryne and ensample of my lyfe and do morne & be sory by cause they can not do that good thynge whych they wold.[78]

The beneficiaries of atonement, those for whom 'the body was geuen to death & the bloud shed,' were limited to those who continue in faith and obedience to the law, who, in comparison to the numbers who 'loue not the law,' are 'very fewe [...] euen that lytle Flocke that gaue them selues whollye to followe Chryst.'[79] Unworthy reception for Tyndale meant participation without 'forsakyng the olde luste of his flesh' or 'porposynge to folowe chryst,' an action which counts the 'bloude of the testamente [...] as an vnholye thing.'[80] It demonstrates blasphemous contempt for the significance of the sacrament.

Alongside this particularly covenantal conception of the sacraments Tyndale repeatedly implied that they were not instruments of grace, emphasising that only cognisance of their signification was beneficial. Without understanding the sacraments 'be clene vnprofitable.' They are 'bokys

[76] Ibid., C4r-v.
[77] Ibid., B5v.
[78] Ibid., C5v-6r.
[79] Ibid., C2v-3r.
[80] Ibid., C6r.

of storyes only and that ther is none other vertu in them then to [testify] the couenauntes and promysses made in chrysts bloud.'[81] It is quite possible to be saved without sacraments, by preaching only, yet the daily rehearsal of the covenant in the Eucharist is a powerful *aide-mémoire*.[82] The sacrament, properly understood from John 6, is but 'a confyrmacion to weake conscyences,' yet it is 'in no wyse to be dyspysed how beyt many haue lyued by fayth in the wyldernes which in 20. 30. or 40. yers haue not receyued the sacrament.'[83] In view of this Zürich-style sacramental theology, it is no surprise to find the later Tyndale rejecting the Lutheran understanding of Christ's presence in the Eucharist as tantamount to transubstantiation.[84]

Although Tyndale had shared much of Luther's sacramental theology in the 1520s, his views developed in 1529-30 towards the Zürich position as his covenantal ideas assumed centre-stage. His understanding progressed in the 1530s so that, while he could imaginably have been comfortable with Bullinger's later doctrine, he may have found the contemporary Zürich position restrictive. He affirmed Zwingli's views on the sacrament as a memorial together with a complex sense of the sacraments as having a power for the believer which excelled acts of historical remembrance. This suggests the residual effect of late-medieval or Lutheran influences earlier in Tyndale's life in spite of his theoretical exclusion of sacramental instrumentality.

Miles Coverdale

The earliest indication of Coverdale's Reformed sacramental theology dates from early 1528, from the recantation of Thomas Topley, a friar who had read *Wyclif's Wicket*. Initially Topley

[81] Ibid., B5r.
[82] Ibid., B6r-v.
[83] Ibid., D1r-v.
[84] Ibid., C7v-8r, cf. E6v-7r. Tyndale's dismissal of corporal presence militated against his own plea to John Frith not to 'meddle' with a divisive issue amongst evangelicals: Tyndale, *Treatises*, liii-liv. This might explain why the *Briefe Declaration* was not immediately printed.

was troubled by the book 'which did make the Sacrament of Christes body, in forme of bread, but a remembraunce of Christes Passion.' On hearing Coverdale preach, however, Topley's 'mynde was sore withdrawen from that blessed Sacrament, in so much that I tooke it then but for the remembraunce of Christes body.'[85] This deposition suggests that Coverdale had rejected the physical presence of Christ in the Eucharist to adopt a commemorative view.

Direct evidence of Coverdale's sacramental theology is scarce before the 1540s.[86] In view of his rejection of the physical presence of Christ and his translation of Bullinger's *Christen state of matrimonye* around 1528, Coverdale was certainly more Reformed than Tyndale when they collaborated in 1529.[87] None of Coverdale's continental translations executed in the 1530s were concerned with sacramental theology, although *The original and sprynge of all sectes and orders by whome, wha [when] or w[h]ere they beganne* (1537) might be suggestive. This catalogue included some sects which 'are not farre from Christ nor his fayth yet the moost parte (specyally of them that be brought in by the B. of Rome) are no lesse contrary vnto Christ, then were the false prophetes in tymes past.'[88] Neither the Lutherans nor the Reformed were included as 'sects', but the utraquism of the Hussites gained quiet approval for its dissent from Rome, and the Waldensians were praised: 'They haue no image at all, they knele not afore them nor pray to them. They say the sacrament ought not be worshipped, but Christ at the ryghthand of hys father, & God in sprete & truth.'[89] A passing reference was made to baptism in Coverdale's prologue to *A goodly treatise of faith, hope, and charitie* (1537), stating that 'it is not ynough to be baptysed' and to know the articles of faith which 'a Christian is bounde to

[85] Foxe, *AM* [1570], viii. 1228; cf. Hudson, *Premature Reformation*, 481.
[86] On the 1530s, see above p.118.
[87] I have suggested that Tyndale's concept of covenant influenced Coverdale's (see above p.118). It is equally possible that Coverdale's sacramental theology and awareness of Bullinger's work made an impression on Tyndale.
[88] Miles Coverdale, *The original and sprynge of all sectes and orders by whome, wha[n] or were they beganne. Translated out of Hye Dutch in Englysh* (Southwarke: 1537; RSTC 18849), +2r.
[89] Ibid., 47v-48r.

beleue & to know' if these are not practised in godly living.[90] These clues from the 1530s are limited but they are consistent with a broadly Reformed view.

Coverdale's residence in Strasbourg overlapped from 1540 to 1542 with that of Calvin, who at that time was still hoping for reconciliation with the Lutherans on the Eucharist. However, in 1540-41 it was with the sacramental theology of Zürich that Coverdale's writings exhibited a greater affinity. Commenting on Acts 2:37-41 in his *Fruitfull lessons, vpon the passion, buriall, resurrection, ascension, and of the sending of the holy Ghost* (1540), Coverdale gave directions on 'how faithfull beleeuers vse themselues in the outward Sacraments.' The prior 'inspiration of the holy Ghost in theyr hearts' was emphasised first of all, something which seems not to be a part of Tyndale's presentation. This direct work of the Spirit was the means of hearing 'the eternall word preached, giuing credite vnto it, & gladly receiuing it.'[91] Coverdale evidently recognised that the sacraments could therefore seem superfluous, since 'without the presence of Gods spirite vnprofitable is the worde preached, vnprofitable are the Sacraments ministred.'[92] Nonetheless, like Zwingli (see above p.175), he stressed that believers 'doo not afterward despise the outward Sacraments, which GOD hath instituted for the welfare of his Church: but vse the same with all obedience, good will and reuerence.' The sacraments were for mankind's benefit and would be embraced gladly by true believers. Indeed, only those with true faith could profit from them; others would be hurt by their use.[93]

Believers know that baptism is an external washing that has no expiatory value, but they respect the wisdom of Christ's institution of 'outward tokens' which are, firstly, wrote Coverdale, 'to couple and knit together the members of his holy Church, in obedience and loue one towards another, whereby they knowing one another among themselues, might by such

[90] Coverdale, *Goodly Treatise*, A1v.
[91] Coverdale, *Fruitfull Lessons*, Oo3r.
[92] Ibid., Qq3r.
[93] Ibid., Oo3r.

exteriour things, stirre and prouoke one another to loue and godlynesse.'[94] The congregation is the locus of blessing; grace is not received in the sacraments. As well as signs of love amongst the brethren and spurs to love and godliness, sacraments are, secondly, 'euidences of the promise & grace of God, which they after a visible and palpable manner, do set forth declare, and represent vnto vs.'[95] Thus, the sacraments have a practical function among believers by virtue of what they signify about God. Following Zwingli, Coverdale claimed that they are used most devoutly and reverently by those who are already 'certified and assured of the gracious fauour of God.'[96]

Coverdale expounded four things which proceed from faith in Christ from Acts 2:42: apostolic doctrine, fellowship amongst believers, the breaking of bread, and prayer. The third of these was 'the token of the new and everlasting covenant, which Christ upon the cross confirmed with his body and blood.'[97] Bread and wine were ideal symbols due to their traditional significance:

> And euen from the beginning of the world, it hath alw[a]yes beene the vse among men, that with breade and wine, they haue made and confirmed great friendshippe and league: And euen so Christ with the distributing of the bread among his disciples, would establish an euerlasting friendship with them.[98]

The covenantal friendship and league established by Christ was signified in the Eucharist, 'a joyful and glorious memorial of Christ's death,' marked with thanksgiving.[99] Coverdale listed the various purposes of such 'tokens':

> to signifie and represent vnto vs high and greate things, to gather together and vnite the Church, that beeing dispearsed euerie where ouer the face of the whole earth, might gather together into one communion and fellowshippe in Christ, and bee made partakers of his promises, and inioye those comfortable blessings which hee

[94] Ibid., Oo3v.
[95] Ibid.
[96] Ibid.
[97] Coverdale, *Writings*, 418. The corresponding page is missing from the 1593 edition.
[98] Coverdale, *Fruitfull Lessons*, Qq2v.
[99] Coverdale, *Writings*, 418.

> hath promised from the beginning, namely, such as bee faithfull and true beleeuers, and that the exteriour and outwarde sense, might from all corporall thinges bee withdrawen to that which is spirituall.[100]

In commemorating the covenant, the Church is united in its enjoyment of participation in Christ and his promised benefits. Among those things signified are the 'renewal' of the divine promise and the fellowship of the Church. The outward senses are presented with these significations and are consequently freed from worldly preoccupations for contemplation of the spiritual. Coverdale wrote that Christ had instituted the Eucharist

> that over and besides faith, which inwardly liveth in the heart, the outward senses also might have somewhat to stir and draw them unto that, which faith inwardly considereth and looketh upon.[101]

Here Coverdale's exposition resembles Zwingli's teaching in *Expositio Fidei* about sacraments reclaiming the senses from worldly desires (see above p.176). Coverdale's treatise was based on one by Zwingli (see above p.127), so it is unsurprising to find it largely in agreement with Zürich theology. At the end of the section the covenantal significance of the Eucharist was reiterated by Coverdale, drawing on the parallels with Old Testament ceremonies:

> To the intent then that this excellent and worthie propitiation and sacrifice should not [be] out of theyr eyes and heartes, he added visible signes, not bare signes, but seales of his couenant (as was the Circumcision and Passah [Passover]) and common tokens of loue and friendshippe amongst men, euen bread and wine, which haue no bloud, to declare that all bloud for sinne is onely in Iesus Christ, Christs minde was also, in one bodie to couple and knit together in one bodie the whole multitude of his Church.[102]

Coverdale is perfectly consistent with Zwingli in denying that sacraments are 'bare signes' and in affirming their function in displaying amity between the brethren.

[100] Coverdale, *Fruitfull Lessons*, Qq1v.
[101] Coverdale, *Writings*, 418.
[102] Coverdale, *Fruitfull Lessons*, Qq2r-v.

Coverdale's *Confutacion of that treatise, which one Iohn Standish made agaynst the protestacion of D. Barnes* (1541) made occasional reference to the sacraments. Since Barnes had held to the physical presence of Christ in the Eucharist, Coverdale was obviously reluctant to discuss the subject at length, brushing Barnes' understanding aside with the general exoneration that Barnes 'wold haue the sacrament rightly vsed and acording to holy scripture.'[103] In a discussion of 1 Cor. 11 Coverdale outlined the proper preparation for the Eucharist, beginning with detailed self-examination against the standards of God's commandments,

> and by occasion therof haue hartely [ac]knowleged and confessed oure synnes[,] beynge sory and penitent for them[,] beleuynge stedfastly in the promises of god[,] receaued the absolucion of his worde[,] entred in to true repentaunce and ernest amendment of oure liuinge[,] beinge reconciled and at one with all men purposinge without fayle so to contynue till oure lyfes ende[.] Then to come and suppe with the lorde.[104]

The supper at the Lord's Table assumed that the participant had already completed the process of repentance and received absolution of sin from God's word. The meal should be shared only by the faithful, who were committed to God, to godliness, and to one another.

If the Eucharist spoke of the commitment and godly resolve of communicants, baptism had been the call to realise it. Baptism was given, not to describe a present state, but 'to the intent that we shulde now [walk] in a new life.' It is the ordination, choice and call of God in baptism, yet on humanity's part baptism is 'our profession[,] the life that we haue promised and taken us to at the font stone[,] euen the holy couenaunt and appoyntment that we haue made with the eternall god.'[105] Baptism is an initiation into that life to which God calls his people and that his people themselves enter into. This was not a profession of faith but a profession of the life of

[103] Coverdale, *Confutacion of Standish*, K5r.
[104] Ibid., D8r.
[105] Ibid., H9r; cf. Zwingli's developing emphases on p.118 above.

the covenant. Coverdale, Barnes and Standish were, at least, united in their 'abhorrence' of 'the Anabaptistes heresie concerning the bapti[s]me of infauntes.'[106]

Coverdale's understanding of the sacraments at this time was influenced by Bullinger with whom he corresponded and whose account of salvation history he translated as *The olde fayth* (1541). As the first continental covenant text translated into English, it is important to appreciate how Bullinger's argument would have reinforced Coverdale's figurative understanding of sacraments as memorials, aids for the weak and symbols of Church unity.

Bullinger explained that both the covenant of circumcision and the Passover were figures of salvation by faith in Christ to come. Circumcision 'serueth more to the confirmacion of oure holy christen faith then to the mayntenaunce of the Jewish ceremonyes.'[107] Likewise, the Hebrews in Egypt were saved 'for the bloudes sake of the blessed sede that was promised,' 'oure Easter lambe & passeouer,' rather than the 'bloud of beastes.' Their deliverance was 'a figure of the true redempcion [...] thorow Jesus Christe.'[108]

According to Bullinger, God gave signs to 'set the cause of Jesus Christ clearly afore the eyes of the people,' as with the 'lambe of the Passeover' or the 'serpent in the wildernesse.' Those who saw it 'had a token of health' in the sign, but the believer 'was not made whole by the outward thynge whiche he sawe.' Plainly 'the outward beholdynge of the brazen serpent saued not them that were poisoned.'[109] Abraham had become 'gods frende and iustified or made righteous' many years before he was outwardly circumcised.[110] Faith was the essential component in both cases. Bullinger described the rites of the Jews as

> sacramentes and tokens of heauenly inuisible good thynges and were not the heauenly riches themselues. Wherfore they nether serued nor pleased God that

[106] Ibid., C6r.
[107] Bullinger, *The Olde Fayth*, C3r.
[108] Ibid., C5r, cf. G3r.
[109] Ibid., D1r.
[110] Ibid., C2v.

> used and did soche seruyce without fayth and lyftinge up of the mynde. But they that put their trust in God cleuynge onely unto hym & lifting up their hertes higher and remayned not in the visible thynge[,] those pleased God.[111]

Bullinger's emphasis on engagement with the heart and mind rather than contemplation of the visible suggests that the heavenly riches are 'not in the visible thynge.' The 'outwarde visyble and corporall thynge' could not serve God who is a spirit. Rather, his people 'shulde lift up their myndes aboue the same [the sacrament] to the spirituall thynges[,] pondrynge the mercy of God.' According to Bullinger, 'faithfull consideracion (whiche is the true beleue)' pleases God and, since it was helped by the Jewish sacraments, their performance pleased God too, 'not for the letters sake but by reason of the sprete.'[112] The idea that tokens are aids in humanity's weakness is also articulated in Bullinger's text. Weak mankind is more capable of understanding 'spirituall heauenly thynges [...] whan they are shewed unto it by corporall visible thynges.' Since Christ's himself has now been revealed, the outward sacraments of the Mosaic Law are obsolete.[113]

These ideas were applied to the New Testament sacraments near the end of Bullinger's book:

> With suche sacramentes thorow outward visible fourmes (for our infirmities sake) pleased it the lord to shew & set before our eyes his hevenly & invisible grace: not that we shuld continue still hanginge in the visible thing but that we shulde lyft up our myndes & with a true beleue to holde fast[,] to prynte sure in oure myndes[,] to worshippe[,] and to enioye the thinges that faith sheweth us by the outward sacraments. With these outward sacraments also hath it pleased him to open[,] declare and shewe unto us his grace and louynge kyndnesse.[114]

The sacraments point the mind to Christ, signifying that God has given himself wholly to his people. Faith, not the sacraments, is God's instrument of grace: 'For the outward enioyeng of the sacramentes of it selfe alone doth not reconcile us with God: but yf they be used with fayth

[111] Ibid., D1v-2r.
[112] Ibid., D2v.
[113] Ibid., D4r.
[114] Ibid., G5r.

than (as S. Peter saieth. Act. xv.) thorow faith doth God purifye the hertes.'[115] If the sacraments occasion the contemplation of God, their purpose is twofold: they are a 'remembraunce' of God's blessings and they gather together believers 'to marke us in hys churche and people & to put us in remembraunce of oure dewty[,] how we are one body together and ought to applye our selues to all righteousnsse.'[116]

Coverdale's work on Bullinger's text would have reinforced the Zwinglian themes in his sacramental theology, but his acceptance of Zürich theology was not, or rather, did not remain, exclusive. At the end of 1542 Coverdale briefly visited his brother-in-law, John MacAlpine, who had become a chaplain to King Christian III of Denmark and a professor of theology at Copenhagen. Coverdale was sufficiently interested in Denmark's Lutheran Reformation to produce, in 1544, *The Order that the Church and Congregation of Christ in Denmark, and in many places, countries and cities of Germany, doth use*.[117] However, the order concentrated upon the practical administration of the sacraments, rather than sacramental theology, so when Coverdale commended it as 'not varying from the moste wholsome doctrine'[118] he seems to be trying to present the Lutheran practices as agreeing with his own position.

The manner of feeding on Christ was construed realistically in *The Order*. It stated that 'we at his supper in the Sacrament, shoulde eate his very body and drynke his very bloude,'[119] which are in 'the Sacramente in fourme of breade [...] also in the fourme of wyne.' They 'nouryshed and fedde our soules' with 'spiritual and heauenly foode.'[120] This Lutheran, corporal language

[115] Ibid.
[116] Ibid.
[117] Miles Coverdale, 'The Order that the Churche and Congregacion of Christe in Denmarke […] doth vse', in M. Coverdale (ed.), *A Faythfull and Moost Godlye Treatyse Concernyng the Most Sacred Sacrament of the Blessed Body and Bloude of Our Sauioure Chryst* (1548), E3r-F8v. The first edition of *The Order* was burnt at Paul's Cross in 1546. See Hildebrandt, 'Protestant Exiles', 58; Daniell, 'Coverdale, Miles'.
[118] Coverdale, 'Denmarke', E3v.
[119] Ibid., E6v.
[120] Ibid., E8v-F1r; cf. Cranmer's similar exhortation in the second Book of Common Prayer: *The Two Liturgies, A.D. 1549, and A.D. 1552: with other documents set forth by authority in the reign of King Edward VI*, ed. J. Ketley (PS, Cambridge: 1844), 275.

was balanced with a description of the Eucharist as 'a sacramente of continuall thankfulnesse, of daylye remembraunce and of charitable vnyte,'[121] which would be easier to reconcile with Coverdale's Reformed views. The petition at baptism also fitted with it being a sign of God's promise, the sign of baptism following regeneration itself: 'graunt to this childe the gyfte of fayth, wherin thou wylt seale and assure his hert in the holy gost, according to the promes of thy sonne, that the inward regeneracion of the spirite may be truely represented by the outwarde baptysme.'[122] Thus, Coverdale's presentation of the Danish Order highlights the emergence of common evangelical practices rather than Coverdale's attraction to Lutheran sacramental theology. Later, in 1555, he would decline preferment by the Danish king.

Coverdale's interest in Lutheran Denmark may be explained by his engagement with Calvin's work, particularly Calvin's *Short Treatise on the Lord's Supper* (1541) which was intended as a formulation that Luther might approve.[123] Calvin's eirenic account of the Eucharist controversy might have persuaded Coverdale to reconsider his position:

> When Luther began to teach, he regarded the matter of the Supper in such a way, that, with respect to the corporal presence of Christ, he appeared ready to leave it as the world generally conceived it. For while condemning transubstantiation, he said that the bread was the body of Christ, insofar as it was united with him. [...] On the other hand, there arose Zwingli and Œcolampadius, who [...] thought it wrong to dissimulate; since this view implied an execrable idolatry, in that Jesus Christ was adored as if enclosed under the bread. Now because it was very difficult to remove this opinion, rooted so long in the hearts of men, they applied all their mind to decry it [...]. While they were absorbed with this point, they forgot to define what is the presence of Christ in the Supper in which one ought to believe, and what communication of his body and blood one there received.[124]

How early Coverdale read this treatise is unknown. He still hoped to visit Zürich in mid-1542,[125] and according to J.F. Mozley, he was shocked by Luther's violent attack on the

[121] Coverdale, 'Denmarke', F1r.
[122] Ibid., F2r.
[123] On Calvin's text, see above p.118.
[124] John Calvin, 'Short Treatise on the Lord's Supper (1541)', in Reid (ed.), *Calvin: Theological Treatises*, 164-165.
[125] See above p.118.

eucharistic theology of Zwingli and Œcolampadius in 1544.[126] However, his work on the Danish Order is, perhaps, indicative of a growing conviction that the Zwinglian position needed to be recast in a less polemical form. He wrote affectionately to Calvin in March 1548, enclosing his own translations (presumably into Latin) of the new English Order of Holy Communion, which appeared to advance an instrumental understanding of the Eucharist: Christ 'doth vouchesaufe in a Sacrament and misterye, to geue us his sayd body and bloud spiritually, to fede and drynke upon.'[127] Coverdale's adoption of Calvin's position was confirmed in 1548 by his publication of Thomas Broke's translation of the *Short Treatise*.[128]

Coverdale retained Broke's preface to *A faythfull and moost godlye treatyse concernyng the most sacred Sacrament of the blessed body and bloude of our sauioure Chryst* (1548), adding only a short commendation. Broke attacked the 'natural, essencial, and real presence' of Christ advanced by traditionalists and Lutherans.[129] Christ did not mean 'that he had chaunged the nature of bread into the nature of fleshe.'[130] Rather, the elements represent 'the misterie of the participation you haue in me by fayth.' The Eucharist was a commemoration and sign of 'communion' with Christ.[131] It was also a confirmation of grace, although Broke would not go so far as to 'deny it to be possible for any man to tarye in Christe or to haue Christe taryinge in hym vnlesse he receyue these visible sacramentes or signes.' Broke clarified:

> No doubte (christian reader) the belefe & truste in Christe, is the mea[n]e wherby Christ taryeth in vs and we in hym. But thys beliefe and trust are established and confirmed by the vse of these visi[b]le signes. As thys beliefe and truste therfore, are necessarye to the abydynge in Chryst: so is the vse of these holye Sacramentes also, for that it is the establyshment and confirmyng of the sayd beleue and trust.

[126] Mozley, *Coverdale*, 10.
[127] Coverdale, *Remains*, 525; *The Order of the Communion* (1548; RSTC 16458.3), A4r.
[128] John Calvin, *A faythfull and moost godlye treatyse concernyng the Most Sacred Sacrament of the Blessed Body and Bloude of our Sauioure Chryst*, trans. Thomas Broke (1548; RSTC 4411).
[129] Ibid., A4v.
[130] Ibid., A4r.
[131] Ibid., A5r.

> To all them therfore to whom this beleue and trust are necessarie: are these sacred Sacramentes also necessary.[132]

Clearly Coverdale had endorsed the symbolic instrumentalist understanding of the sacraments propounded by Calvin.[133] Its relation to the concept of covenant in Calvin's theology (see above pp.181-202), although hardly discussed in this particular treatise, would have been consistent with Coverdale's earlier views, which he would have found no cause to abandon. His handful of later writings did not deal with the sacraments.

John Hooper

John Foxe did not specify the subject upon which Bishop Gardiner sought to instruct Hooper during their 'conference of learning' in 1539. He did imply that Richard Smith's contemporary dislike of Hooper concerned the pronouncements of the Six Articles which enforced, among other things, belief in transubstantiation and communion in one kind.[134] At this time Hooper was voraciously reading books by Zwingli and Bullinger, so there is ample ground to suppose that he had rejected the physical presence of Christ in the Eucharist by 1539, especially when his first publication, in 1547, was a reaction to Gardiner's *A Detection of the Devil's Sophistrie, wherwith he robbeth the unlearned people, of the true byleef, in the most blessed Sacrament of the aulter* (1546).[135]

---

[132] Ibid., B1r-v.
[133] e.g., Ibid., B6r; cf. Gerrish, *Grace and Gratitude*, 167. I would argue that Celia Hughes is incorrect as to the general direction of Coverdale's development. He was not moving away from Luther but towards him, inasmuch as he was moving from the Zürich position towards Calvin's. See Hughes, 'Coverdale', 103-105.
[134] Foxe, *AM* [1583], xi. 1526; cf. Dalton, 'Hooper's Networks', 14.
[135] Stephen Gardiner, *A Detection of the Deuils Sophistrie wherwith he robbeth the vnlearned people, of the true byleef, in the Most Blessed Sacrament of the Aulter* (1546; RSTC 11591.3).

The Zürichers' formulation of the concept of covenant was the basis for Hooper's view of the sacraments.[136] His refutation of Gardiner, *An Answer vnto my lord of wynchesters booke*, was published at Zürich in September 1547.[137] It constituted his most extensive exposition of sacramental theology. The signature Zwinglian argument against Christ's physical presence in the Eucharist, that Christ's human body was at God's right hand and therefore could not be in the elements, was made enthusiastically by Hooper. He mocked the notion that Christ would repeatedly descend 'at the commanudement of euery pryst when he speakyth these wordes *Hoc est corpus meum*.' Christ would return corporally only at the end of the world, so Hooper enjoined his readers to 'belyue Chrystes body to be really and corporally in the sacrament when tho[u] seist him there with thy corporall yeies and not before.'[138] Like Zwingli, Hooper held that baptism and the Eucharist 'in effect be one' with circumcision and the Passover, representing Christ's promise unto Christ's Church; a correct understanding of one ensures a correct understanding of both.[139] Hooper used the word '*foederis*' (covenant) of circumcision, in the same way that Noah's rainbow was 'a signe of the couenant betwen god and him.'[140] The sacraments provide opportunities for the 'exercyse' – rather than strengthening – of faith and, departing from Zwingli's view, for 'godly conuersacion' with Christ, but Hooper clarified that this was 'not bodely, yet in spryt.' The physical consumption of Christ is excluded by the fact that we eat him spiritually in the same way as Old Testament believers did prior to his Incarnation.[141]

These opportunities to exercise faith stemmed from the institution of sacraments as 'externall signes' which 'sett before oure yeis the benefitz of gods mercy dew unto oure faith in Christ.' In this respect they are comparable to 'seals and confirmacions of godes promises where he

[136] Trueman notes that the 'idea of a bilateral arrangement between God and man is also central to Hooper's sacramental theology, indicating the Reformed roots of his theology': Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 213n.
[137] Hooper, *Wynthester*.
[138] Ibid., B4v, cf. K3v-4r.
[139] Ibid., D4v, cf. O1v, Q1r.
[140] Ibid., O3r, cf. P1v.
[141] Ibid., E1r.

warrantyd and assuryd his churche openlye that he would be her god, and she to be his spouse for euer.'[142] Their reference to the divine-human relationship is clear, including the condition of faith. The covenantal language of sealing and confirming was explained by Hooper in terms of the sealing of 'bargayns, exchanges, purcheses an[d] contractes.' 'These wrtingz and seales makith not the bargaine,' wrote Hooper. Rather, the seal is 'awytnis of souch couenantes as hath ben agreyd upon betwen the booth parthes [parties].'[143]

Hooper's analogy between sacraments and seals did not imply that the sacraments were 'a bare signe and token of [Christ's] death only.' There was a great difference between the royal arms depicted in stained glass and a prince's seal on a charter containing 'the princes right and title that he hathe unto his Realme.'[144] Following Bullinger, Hooper wrote that the prince's seal would be esteemed as much as the charter which it confirmed, 'thowghe the mater of the seale be nothing but wax.' Owing to its function, the seal commands respect; contempt of the seal is tantamount to treason against the prince himself.[145] Hooper also followed Zwingli and Bullinger in his formulation of the analogy of the sun and sunlight:

> as the sone in heauen dooth extend downe his beames, and ligthyn the hearthe. So dooth Christes body, by fayth in sprit, expulse all darknis and sinne out of the hart mouith not bodely, but is euery where, where faythe is spiritually, an at one tyme.[146]

Just as sun beams are present though the sun is absent, so Christ is spiritually present while being physically absent in heaven.[147]

---

[142] Ibid., D4v-E1r.
[143] Ibid., F2v; cf. Newcombe, *Hooper*, 77.
[144] Hooper, *Wynthester*, O3v
[145] Ibid.; cf. Bullinger, *Decades*, v/6. 270.
[146] Hooper, *Wynthester*, O4r; cf. Zwingli, *Account of the Faith*, *LWHZ*, ii. 50.
[147] Morris West explains that Calvin and Bucer (to whom Luther may be added) used the same analogy to argue for the believer's participation in Christ's substance on the basis that the sun transmitted its substance in its beams: West, 'Hooper [1]', 362; cf. Calvin, *Institutes* [*LCC*], 1373 (IV. xvii. 12). Bucer's analogy is quoted and discussed in Thomas Cranmer, *Writings and Disputations* […] *relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, ed. J. Cox (PS; Cambridge: 1844), 90-91.

According to Hooper, the sacraments are 'tokens' 'because of godes promis and contract made with his churche.'[148] The nature, use and office of a sacrament is 'to shew unto us [o]uttwardly, that the merites of Christ is made oures for the promes sake, which god hath made unto those that belyue.' These sacraments outwardly apply by faith the grace, mercy and benefits of God to the faithful recipient. However, these are not conveyed by the sacraments as if the believer 'were not before assuryd of the same graces and benefites representid by the sacramentes.'[149] The signifier is not the same as that signified: 'as circumsicion was an under signe and cutting away of the fore ffleshe[,] thalliance sign[i]fied by the signe, was the knot and chayne where with all, god and Abraam was co[u]plid to gather as ffrendes thone to be as master, thother as seruaunt.'[150] Clearly, that which was signified was the bilateral covenant between God and humanity. The rainbow of Gen. 9 was the 'arke of his allyaunce betwen hym, of the one party, man, and best of the other party.'[151]

The sacraments testify to existing benefits, declaring 'unto the church of Christ' that the faithful recipients truly are 'the people that god hath chosen.' The benefits of Christ's death belong to the believer now. Using Zwingli's favoured metaphor, they are 'a ba[d]gge and open signe of godes ffauour unto us.' The recipients, for their part, 'by this liuery declare our selfes to lyue and dy in his fayth agaynst the deuyll the worold and sinne.'[152] The reciprocal signification was further elucidated by Hooper's insistence that outward participation was of no value apart from an existing relationship with God. The sacrament 'makyth not the unyon peace and concord betwen god and us but it ratifith[,] stablisshyth and confirmyth, the loue and peax that is betwen god and us before.'[153]

[148] Hooper, *Wynthester*, P3r.
[149] Ibid., E1v.
[150] Ibid., R2r, cf. R3v-4r.
[151] Ibid., P3v.
[152] Ibid., E1v.
[153] Ibid., E2r.

Hooper was keen that the sacraments should be used more often and more reverently, and that participants should be properly instructed: 'he that ys ygnorant of the causes can neuer iudge aright of theffect.' They are 'signes and remembrances' of God's will for his people and, for Hooper, the effect ought to be the study of God's word in Scripture.[154] He speculated that not one in a thousand Christians 'knowith what a sacrament is, more then an Asse. And to souch the sacramentes be not profetable, but damnable.'[155] Only Christians with understanding should be allowed to participate. An inward faith and an outward profession were first of all required 'to acertayne the church, that he is godes ffrende, and reconsilid in Christ.' It would be 'praeposterous,' wrote Hooper, for the sacrament to be administered before this were ascertained, 'lik as if the Kynges maiestis officers, shuld [g]eue his lyuery, unto him that the Kyng neuer ment, to take into his seruise. So to we[a]re, his liuere without profeit.'[156] To partake of the sacraments was to be declared 'the membres of one church. Wear unit[ed] and knyt to gather, made one by one sprit of trewyth.'[157] Conversely, the Church was differentiated from everyone else in declaring itself 'to be deuidid ffrom all other nacions that use not the same sacramentes,' which suggests the exclusivity of the covenant people. This distinction was not, however, to obscure the testimony of God's will in his sacraments.[158]

In baptism 'we ar consecratyd, dedicatid and offeryd unto god, and godes name inuocatid upon us.' It is a mark assuring us of forgiveness received spiritually by faith, which Hooper assumed here would occur before the ceremony, although it was not faith but 'the promesse made unto thy father and his posterite' in Gen. 17 which constituted the basis for baptism.[159] Baptism declared to the whole Church the 'secret' dwelling of Christ in the heart and stood as a 'record of this loue, amyte, peax, an concord, that is betwen god and hym by Christ.' Thus, it also

[154] Ibid., F3v-4r, cf. N2r.
[155] Ibid., G4v.
[156] Ibid., H1r.
[157] Ibid., I1r.
[158] Ibid., P4r-v.
[159] Ibid., E2r-v.

marked the 'the acceptacion of this crystenid person into the comune wealth of his sauid people.'[160]

This signification of entry into the Church was considered so necessary by Hooper that only those people 'thus callid openly into the uisible church and congregacion (except death preuent the act)' were 'appertayning unto god.'[161] His insistence on baptism did not betray a doctrine of baptismal regeneration; it was a measure against those who held the sacrament in contempt as 'not of god.' No faithful Christian should omit to be baptised by a Church-appointed minister, and parents who failed to bring their children for baptism were censured.[162] However, Hooper condemned emergency baptism by midwives because this implied the necessity of the external sacrament for salvation, 'as thowgh his holy sprit could not be caryd by fayth into the penitent and sorowfull consciens except it ryd allwayes in a cheroot [chariot] and externall sacrament.'[163] Hooper, like Bullinger and Calvin, did not deny that the sacrament could be an occasion of grace but, like Bullinger, he was determined to preserve the independence of the Spirit's activity. He was insisting on the necessity of spiritual baptism being proclaimed whenever possible.

Perhaps because Hooper's criticism of midwives appeared to muddle his defence of paedobaptism, he proceeded to reaffirm paedobaptism's covenantal basis. The sacraments must be applied to all those to whom the promise 'Ero deus tuus & seminis tui post te' (I shall be your God & [the God] of your offspring after you) pertained, including infants of believers. Hooper agreed that baptism signified the salvation of the elect but denied that all the elect received the sign. The elect without the sign certainly included unbaptised infants of believers ('of whois saluacion we may not dout'), while the infants of infidels could not be excluded with

[160] Ibid., E2v.
[161] Ibid., E2v, cf. P3v-4r.
[162] Ibid., E2v, E3v.
[163] Ibid., E2v-3r.

confidence since their destination was unknown.[164] Hooper's treatment of election as a mystery is reminiscent of Bullinger's.[165]

The delay between God's promise in Gen. 12 and the institution of circumcision in Gen. 17 indicated to Hooper that the sacraments were not the giving, but the confirmation, of God's promise to mankind. Abraham received the sacrament already assured of God, so he did not seek God in the sign. The precedence of faith over sacrament meant that the parents of a 'specheles infant' were 'bo[u]nd to [g]eue accompt of his fayt[h], before he be Christenid,' and Hooper claimed confidently that 'Abraam belyuid. Thinfant belyuith, Cornelius belyuid.'[166] Presumably this was deduced from the promise of Gen. 17.

Christ's words of institution at the Last Supper precluded, for Hooper, any change in the elements at the Eucharist.[167] One of his arguments was that a physical presence would falsify Christ's words, 'for he bid them do it in t[h]e Remembraunce of hym.' The memorial itself could not be the object of remembrance. 'As many men use to remem[b]re aweyghty mater, by alitle ring upon there finger,' the ring had to point to something else: 'If Christes moost honorable body were present corporally in the sacrament it were no nede remembraunce at all, for the thing present, presentith it selfe without thealpe of memory.'[168] However, Hooper positively taught that Christians are 'pertakers of the spirituall graces and communion of Christes body and blud representyd by the breade.' Although 'that gloriouse body of Christe, be in heauen, that this holy and moost honorable sacrament representyth, yet when with trew penitence we receaue the externall sacrament, faith receauithe theffect of that precious body representyd by the sacrament.'[169] Here Hooper is unusually imprecise regarding whether or not the sacrament is an instrument of grace, so this passage could concur both with Bullinger's and

[164] Ibid., E3r.
[165] cf. Baker, *Other Reformed Tradition*, 210.
[166] Hooper, *Wynthester*, F1r.
[167] On Hooper's confutation of transubstantiation, see Newcombe, *Hooper*, 82-83.
[168] Hooper, *Wynthester*, H1v.
[169] Ibid., H3v.

Calvin's views.[170] A similar lack of clarity around the connection between the sacrament and the Spirit's work is evident in Hooper's explanation that

> when the minister delyuerith unto me the thing that is in his poure to delyuer to say the bread and wynne rehersing the wordes of Christes institucion, the holy goost deliuerithe unto my fayth which is mountyd and ascendid into heauen the precious body and bludd of my sauiour Iesus Christ spiritually, and not corporally, so dooth the merites of this precious body in heauen fede my poure wrechid soule upon therthe, and no contradiction or impossibilite for Christes body so to do.[171]

The ascent of faith into heaven to feed on Christ is reminiscent of Calvin's description of participation in the 1539 edition of the *Institutes* (see above p.197), but Calvin's view is clearer in Hooper's statement that the mind is not only reassured 'by deuine operacion of godes sprit that his sinnes be for gyuen, but also by thobiect representyd unto thexternall senses.'[172]

Eucharistic participation was designed not only to confirm our own union with God but 'to shew the le[a]ge of amyte unto the church' and to understand better the meaning of 'communion.' It was a pledge of allegiance to Christ:

> for as all the trew subiectes, sworn to the Kyng by there fayth and alegaynce, ar prest, and redy, where so euer the se the Kynges Baner spleyde, resort ther unto and say, what so euer the Kyng hath to do, or with whom so euer he hath Ennymite with all, I will associat my selfe, to be of this part, tyde what be tyde may, happe well, or woo. Vnto this prince I unit my liefe, and death, the cause. He is my lord, the making good and reason of the cause. I am his sworn subiect fayth yeuen, and mi consciens bound. Therefore to manifest myne obedience and loue, by this baner I procleame liefe and death agaynst his contraries.[173]

[170] This kind of distinction, supporting comparisons with Bullinger and Calvin rather than Zwingli, is lost in Newcombe's generalisation that Hooper's sacramental theology was 'entirely Zwinglian': Newcombe, *Hooper*, 79. Dalton rightly recognises that there was some distinction between Zwingli and Bullinger, but implies that it concerned corporal presence rather than the reception of grace: Dalton, 'Hooper's Networks', 86n.
[171] Hooper, *Wynthester*, O4r.
[172] Ibid., N4v.
[173] Ibid., I1v.

Another metaphor Hooper used was the surrendering of the keys of a city to a prince as a sign of obedience.[174] Each individual does this in the Eucharist, which was 'institutyd by Christ, to confirme and manifest oure societie and communion in his body and blud untill he cumme to iudgment.'[175] The effect of reception depended on having a community of fellow believers, so Hooper prohibited 'priuat masse or receauing of the sacrament by one man.' The sick person must receive it in the company of 'souch other as shalbe present at the declaracion of his fayth.'[176] At least three people, including the minister, were required. The prime significance of the Eucharist as being for the congregation is reinforced by Hooper's remark that someone who cannot participate in the congregation (perhaps due to ill-health) is 'nothing the warse Christiane man.'[177]

Hooper's presentation of his sacramental theology in the *Answer* to Gardiner was so thorough that his subsequent writings on the subject could only reiterate what had been stated. The covenantal themes tended to be overshadowed by the pastoral priorities of later works, but having established their place in Hooper's theology, it is not difficult to detect their ongoing influence.

At the end of the *Answer* Hooper defended the sacramentarianism of Tyndale and Frith and, acknowledging that Luther and Bucer upheld a corporal presence, concluded that faith 'commithe not into the so[u]lle of man because he is lernid.'[178] In Hooper's next work, *A declaration of Christe and of his office* (1547), he referred again to Luther 'who preachyd the gospell of iustificacion noman better yet in the cause of the sacrament he [erreth] concerning

[174] Ibid., P2r-v.
[175] Ibid., M1r.
[176] Ibid., L2v.
[177] Ibid., L3r.
[178] Ibid., X3r-v.

the corporall precens of Christes naturall body that there is no man can [err] more.'[179] Apparently Hooper equated the seriousness of Luther's error with that of transubstantiation.

Hooper sought to correct error by reiterating in the *Declaration* a number of his established covenantal ideas about sacraments as 'signes tokens and testimonijs of the promesse.'[180] The mode of reception of Christ in the Eucharist was compared with the Hebrew sacrament of the serpent in the desert (Num. 21:8-9):

> Not to eat his body, transformid into the form of bred, or in the bred with the bread: under the bread, behind the bred or before the bread, corporally, or bodely substancially, or realli, inuisible, or ani souch wayes as mani men to the great iniurijs of Christes body dooth teach, but as the children of Israel only by fayth eat the body spiritually not yet born, so by faythe dooth the Christianes eat hym now being ascendyd into heauen.[181]

Hooper perceived those who believed in the corporal presence of Christ, both Romanist and Lutheran, to be denying the integrity of the natural, physical body of Christ in heaven. They claimed that the 'trewe body' was in the elements 'and yet lackith all the qualites and quantites of a body.'[182] At the Last Supper Christ had not instituted a corporal presence but 'a memory of the body slayne resuscitatyd, ascendid into heuen and from thense to cum unto iudgment.' By means of spiritually eating and drinking 'that sacrament the promis of god [is] sealyd and confirmid in us.'[183]

Later in the treatise Hooper attacked the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, warning that attribution of the forgiveness of sin to the sign was offensive. Baptism was the mark and declaration of entry into the Church, 'so that externall baptisme was but an inauguracion or externall consecracion of these that first belyuyd and were clensid of there sinne.' Baptism

[179] Hooper, *Christe and His Offyce*, C5v.
[180] Ibid., I8v.
[181] Ibid., F8v.
[182] Ibid., H6r-v.
[183] Ibid., G8r-v.

itself causes no additional change in a person.[184] However, 'souch as be baptisyd must remembre, that penenc[e] and fayth presedyd this external signe and in Christ the purgacion was inwardely optaynyd before the externall signe was yeuen.' They are encouraged to reflect on the spiritual benefits of their repentance and faith, 'at the contemplacion of the which faith God purchith [purges] tha soule.'[185] The Spirit appears to work alongside the sacrament here.

Although baptism does not change the state of the person, Hooper wrote that the act of baptism pleases God because he has commanded its administration. All these thoughts were explained with a topical analogy to the accession and coronation of Edward VI a few months earlier:

> Like as the Kynges maiestie that now is: immediatly a[f]ter the deathe of his father was the trewe and legittym[at]e Kyng of Inglond, right heyre unto the crowne and receauid his coronacion not to make hym self there by Kyng, but to manifest that the Kyngdom apperteynid unto hym before, he takith the crowne to confirm his right and title, had all inglond sayd nay and by forse contrary unto godes lawes and manns lawes with an exteriour ceremony and pompe crownid ony other man he shuld haue byn an adulterous and wronge King, with all his solemnites and coronation. Thowgh this ceremony confirm and manifest a King in his Kyngdom yet it makith not a King.[186]

The Christian becomes a brother of Christ and heir to eternal life as soon as he believes, regardless of sacramental ratification. Nevertheless, baptism is the 'lyuerye of god [...] which no Christiane shuld neglect.'[187] Just as it was possible for a traitor to be crowned, so an infidel could be baptised invalidly.[188]

The last of Hooper's Zürich treatises, *A declaration of the ten holy commaundementes of allmygthye God* (1548), presented more starkly than before the human promise signified in the sacraments. Hooper warned against failure to perform

[184] Ibid., I5v. Hooper mentioned in passing that infants should be examined concerning repentance and faith before baptism.
[185] Ibid., I6r.
[186] Ibid., I6v-7r.
[187] Ibid., I7v.
[188] Ibid., I8r.

> the thing they promes in Godes name by ony othe or vow made according to the law of God, whether it be betwene man and God as in the holie Sacrament of Baptisme and the holie super of the lord where as we swere and promes to lyeue after his will and pleasure.[189]

The sacraments were humanity's oath to God, promising obedience. It was similar to binding oneself 'to ony condicions or promeses by the inuocation of Godes name.' Defaulting on such a vow brought down 'not only the law of God but also the law of man' in retribution.[190]

As well as stating this God-ward action, Hooper continued to give priority to the human-ward confirmation and testimony of God's promise. God had given various signs to assure people of his promise to help the good and punish the bad. Hooper cited the Flood and the Ark (Gen. 6-8); the rescue of Lot from the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 19); the Exodus from Egypt and entry into the Promised Land (Ex. 12; Josh. 3-4), and the preservation of Joshua and Caleb (Num. 13-14). God's provisions for the flowers of the field and the birds of the air (Mt. 6:26-30) were 'seales and confyrmations of Godes promisis.'[191] These analogies help to clarify Hooper's understanding of the dominical sacraments as tangible representations of God's commitment to humanity.

Just as the Bible contains 'what we ar bound to do the workes that God commaundithe vs to do,' and the addition of human works robs the Scriptures, so, wrote Hooper, 'those that attribute more then is dewe or lesse then is dew vnto the holie Sacramentes institutyd by Christ committithe sacrilege.' Some add too much by asserting the sacraments to be a means of grace; others take too much by reducing them to mere signs differentiating the Church from outsiders, like the gowns of Roman citizens.[192]

[189] Hooper, *Ten Holy Commaundementes,* 96.
[190] Ibid.
[191] Ibid., 28.
[192] Ibid., 186.

In Hooper's view it was plain, not only from Scripture but also to reason, that the bread of the Eucharist was no more alive than the Golden Calf had been. The Church had no more right to 'change the testament of christ' by claiming a corporal presence than 'to change manes testament nor to add or take ony thing from it but to execute and do euery thing as it is there expressid and none other wice.'[193] Since 'all Sacramentes be of one nature,' Hooper invoked Paul's exposition of the verb 'to be' in the context of the sacrament of circumcision (Rom. 4:11): 'is' meant 'signifythe or confirmithe.' He proceeded to unravel literal interpretations of *hoc est corpus meum*.[194] The corporal presence misled people and 'would mak them be lyue that a phantasie or dreme of a bodie that hathe nether quantite nor qualite to be a trew body.'[195] Hooper appealed to John 6:47-63 to say that to eat Christ's body was to believe in him. Rather than a fleshly distribution, 'this Sacrament was and shuld be a memory of his blessyd passion and paynes suffryd in the fleshe.'[196]

Hooper attacked the authenticity of the Roman Church, arguing that Christ himself was 'minister of this holie sacrament and the churche or people that receauid it to be the elect.' Hence Christ and the apostles were the 'trew[,] old[,] and Catholicke churche.' In denying what Hooper understood to be dominical and apostolic teaching, the Roman Church revealed itself to be neither true, ancient nor catholic.[197]

On 19 June 1548 Hooper wrote to Bucer about his hopes for a new era of graciousness amongst evangelicals following Luther's death in 1546. He was concerned that Bucer might continue to 'burden the consciences of men' with Luther's opinions. He reflected: 'After the dispute with Zuinglius and Œcolampadius respecting the [Lord's] supper had begun to grow warm, [Luther] did violence to many passages of scripture [...] that he might establish the corporal presence of

[193] Ibid., 64-65.
[194] Ibid., 191.
[195] Ibid., 187.
[196] Ibid., 190-191.
[197] Ibid., 66.

the body of Christ in the bread.'[198] Hooper sought to position himself between Bucer's view, that 'the true and natural body of Christ [is] corporally exhibited to me in any supernatural or heavenly manner,' and what he understood to have been Zwingli's view, that the Eucharist was a 'bare sign.' He was particularly keen to exonerate both himself and the Zürichers from this Zwinglian caricature. He explained that he understood the Eucharist as

> a sign of the good-will of God towards me, and an outward testimony of his promise of grace. Not that this promise is applied to me by means of any sacrament, but because the promise previously applied to me by faith is thereby confirmed.[199]

Christ's body was exhibited no differently in the sacrament than in Scripture, continued Hooper, after drawing comparisons with circumcision, and it was eaten by believing, as evidenced by John 6. Indeed, Christ had to be brought to the sacraments by faith because he would not be found in them without it. The sealing of God's promise was the 'chief' among many ends of the sacraments.[200] This was certainly not to reduce them to 'bare signs,' but it was important that the Holy Spirit should not be tied to the administration of the sign. The visible signs prompt recognition of 'things insensible and invisible.'[201]

Although Hooper had once appeared to approach Calvin's understanding of the connection between the sacrament and the work of the Spirit (see above p.237), here he seems to reject Calvin's view. In his concluding remarks to Bucer, Hooper wrote that he had never thought of writing against Calvin, even though Calvin's commentaries on 1 Corinthians 'displeased me exceedingly.'[202] Whether or not this is an allusion to 1 Cor. 10 on the Eucharist, Hooper clearly did not see himself as a deliberate imitator of Calvin's theology.

[198] Hooper to Bucer, 19 June 1548, *OL*, 46.
[199] Ibid., 47.
[200] Ibid.
[201] Ibid., 48.
[202] Ibid.

En route back to England, Hooper wrote to Bullinger from Antwerp on 26 April 1549. He was comforted that the introduction of the Interim in East Friesland would mean the return of Jan Laski to England to counter the influence of Peter Martyr Vermigli, Bernardino Ochino and Bucer who, Hooper erroneously believed, 'so stoutly defend Lutheranism.'[203] By 27 December he was more confident, reporting to Bullinger that Cranmer 'entertains right views as to the nature of Christ's presence in the supper' and that 'his sentiments respecting the eucharist are pure, and religious, and similar to yours in Switzerland.' He counted another five or six bishops as being sound, even though he found public practice to be 'very far from the order and institution of our Lord.'[204]

The opportunity for Hooper to articulate his sacramental theology before Edward VI came in Lent 1550, in his fifth Court sermon on Jonah. He chose to concentrate on confuting the corporal presence and correcting sacramental practice, leaving little time for positive theological exposition. He began with the basic point that there were two sacraments and that God used them to confirm with 'visyble woordes' that 'the mercye of God saueth the faithfull and beleuers.' This also occurred inwardly by the Holy Spirit 'who testifieth by his spirite with our spirit.'[205]

Hooper offered seven arguments against corporal presence. Firstly, Christ's glorified body is physical.[206] Secondly, the commemorative nature of a sacrament requires that the thing being

[203] Hooper to Bullinger, 26 April 1549, Ibid., 61. Hooper failed to distinguish Vermigli and Ochino from Bucer, labelling them all as defenders of 'Lutheranism' because he believed that they were not in agreement with Zürich theology. See Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities*, 28-29. Vermigli's eucharistic theology was generally mistaken as being Lutheran when he arrived in England. Only on 2 March 1549 did he make his affinity with Bullinger clear: John ab Ulmis to Bullinger, 2 March 1549, *OL*, 388; Philip McNair, 'Peter Martyr in England', in J.C. McLelland (ed.), *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Italian Reform* (Waterloo, Ontario: 1980), 103-104.
[204] Hooper to Bullinger, 27 December 1549, *OL*, 71-72. Hooper may have contributed to the definition rather than the content of Cranmer's eucharistic theology. See Peter Newman Brooks, *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist: an essay in historical development* (2nd edn.; Basingstoke: 1992), 108; Dalton, 'Hooper's Networks', 86.
[205] Hooper, *Ionas*, 116r-v.
[206] Ibid., 118r-119r.

remembered be absent.[207] Thirdly, the Eucharist commemorates Christ's past and complete sacrifice.[208] Fourthly, the only coming of Christ to be expected from Scripture is at the Last Judgment, not in the elements.[209] Fifthly, the doctrine of the corporal presence had caused the Eucharist to become an occasion of idolatry.[210] Sixthly, that Christ's death is to be proclaimed only until he is present.[211] Finally, the Mass destroys Christ's institution.[212] Hooper preached that the minds of communicants were not to be 'affyxed in the sygnes and elementes of the sacraments, but in heauen.'[213] The sacraments had been named after the thing they represented, 'to confirme, & not to exhibit grace, to helpe, and not to giue faythe: to seale, and not to wynne the promyse of God.' Thus they testify to what is already the case: that we are saved and regenerate.[214]

Hooper's sixth sermon began with a sacramental reading of Christ's words of institution, recognising that this was a 'trope'.[215] Sacramental participation in Christ was symbolic:

> We must therfore lyfte vp oure myndes into heauen when we fele oure selues oppressed with the burden of sinne, and ther by fayth apprehend and receaue the bodye of Christe slayne and kylled, & hys precious blud shed for our offences: and so by faith apply the vertue, efficacie, and strength of the merites of Christ to our soules, and by that meanes quit oure selues from the daunger, damnacion, and curse of God. And thus to be partaker of the worthynes and deseruyngs of Christes passion, is to eate the body & to drynke the blud.[216]

[207] Ibid., 119r-120v.
[208] Ibid., 121r.
[209] Ibid., 121v.
[210] Ibid., 122r-123v.
[211] Ibid., 123v.
[212] Ibid., 124r.
[213] Ibid., 127r.
[214] Ibid., 129v.
[215] Ibid., 133v-134r.
[216] Ibid., 136v.

It is clear that grace is received spiritually and not by means of the sacrament. Again from John 6, 'the flesh profiteth nothynge.' Christ, said Hooper, used the terms 'believe' and 'eat' interchangeably.[217]

'What auayleth it,' then, 'to haue anye Sacrament?' asked Hooper. The sacraments were designed to combat the devil's schemes. They demonstrated that grace applied to individual believers and not only as a general promise. Those of weak faith who 'dout' because of their afflicted consciences are reassured that God is reliable and are shown, by means of the sacrament, that Christ is their only saviour.[218] This recognition and experience of grace through participation concurred with Bullinger's position:

> the mynde is eleuated and lyfte vp into heauen: perswadyng hym selfe by faythe, that as truly appertaineth vnto hym the promyses and grace of God throughe the merites and death of Christ, as he sensibly, and outwardly receiueth the sacramente and wytnes of gods promyses.[219]

Hooper's pastoral priority in these sermons was clear: he applied baptism as God's promise by insisting that only humans should be baptised; the christening of bells was superstitious, and nothing but water was needed: no 'Oyle, salte, Crosse, lyghtes.' These ought to be abolished because they obscure the simplicity of Christ's institution, and Hooper facetiously suggested that the king's council should 'prepare a shyp as sone as maye be, to sende them home agayne to theyr mother church.'[220]

A few months later Hooper's *Godly confession and protestacion of the christian fayth* (1550) reiterated the links between circumcision and baptism, the Passover and the Eucharist along covenantal lines. As confirmations of God's promise, 'they hange annexed, as a seale vnto the

[217] Ibid., 136v-137r.
[218] Ibid., 137r-v.
[219] Ibid., 146r.
[220] Ibid., 141v-142r.

writynge.'[221] Baptism is the mark of acceptation into God's people and of the 'proper iustice,' that is, righteousness, given to us by God.[222] Hooper rejected, here, baptism as humanity's promise of obedience because this was being used to 'defraud the young chyldren of baptisme.' Infant baptism was justified as a sign of what God had done; it was not a profession of humanity's obedience.[223] However, this did not remove the reciprocal element since circumcision had still meant that Abraham 'was bound to work in a godly life,' even though the sacrament had not confirmed his obedience.[224] This is completely consistent with what he had written in his *Answer* to Gardiner, if slightly more nuanced and adapted for polemical purposes. The Eucharist was described, once again, as a 'remembraunce of Christes death, a seale & confirmation,' the signification of which included an exhortation 'to mutual loue, and godlye lyfe.'[225]

Hooper had rejected the physical presence of Christ in the Eucharist by 1539. When he expounded his sacramental theology in Zürich, relating it to his reciprocal concept of covenant, he exhibited views similar to Bullinger and, occasionally, Calvin, although it seems highly unlikely that Hooper meant to affirm Calvin's position.

John Bradford

The major doctrinal preoccupation of Bradford's writings besides the defence of election was the confutation of Roman eucharistic doctrine. Just as his presentation of the concept of covenant lacked many of the features of a bilateral arrangement, so his understanding of the sacraments concentrated primarily, but not exclusively, on their obsignation of the divine promise.

[221] Hooper, *Godly Confession*, G2r-v.
[222] Ibid., G3r.
[223] Ibid., G3v.
[224] Ibid., G4r.
[225] Ibid., G4v.

Bradford's earliest comments on the Eucharist appear in his preface to Petrus Artopoeus' *Division of the places of the lawe and of the Gospell* (1548). He questioned the possibility that those who say Mass could be trusting in Christ for salvation because the Mass itself is deemed to be 'a Sacryfyce propyciatorye.'[226] In Bradford's view, humanity could make no offering without denigrating the perfection of Christ's historic oblation.[227]

There is no further direct evidence of Bradford's sacramental theology prior to his going up to Cambridge in the summer of 1548, by which time the Zürich position, with its focus on spiritual reception, was ascendant in official circles. In August Bartholomew Traheron wrote to Bullinger about Bradford's most obvious influence at the time, Hugh Latimer: 'As to Latimer, though he does not clearly understand the true doctrine of the eucharist, he is nevertheless more favourable than either Luther or even Bucer.'[228] A few weeks later Traheron reported that 'Latimer has come over to our opinion respecting the true doctrine of the eucharist.'[229] Even allowing for Traheron's biases, it is significant that Bradford was engaging with people who were considered more favourable than Bucer to the sacramental theology of Zürich.[230]

Philip Johnston has demonstrated Bradford's view that 'no sacrament can be purely symbolical, no sacrament can be only automatic, without due regard to the faith of the believer.'[231] Johnston rightly excludes Roman or Zwinglian characterisations of Bradford's position, proceeding to draw comparisons with Bucer and Calvin.[232] The undoubted importance of Bucer's teaching to Bradford demands such attention. Bucer understood the sacraments as symbols and tokens of

[226] Artopoeus and Chrysostome, *Diuisyon of the Places*, A3r.
[227] Ibid., A4r.
[228] Traheron to Bullinger, 1 August 1548, *OL*, 320.
[229] Traheron to Bullinger, 28 September 1548, Ibid., 322.
[230] On connections with Latimer and the Swiss preacher Augustine Bernhere see Susan Wabuda, 'Shunamites and Nurses of the English Reformation: the activities of Mary Glover, niece of Hugh Latimer', in W. Sheils and D. Wood (eds.), *Women in the Church* (Oxford: 1990), 340-341; Bradford to Bernhere and Mistress Hales, June 1555, Bradford, *Writings 2*, 251.
[231] Johnston, 'Bradford', 126.
[232] Ibid., 123-128. On the church fathers and the sacraments in Bradford's thought, see Johnston, 'Bradford', 66-72.

God's covenant, but he saw humanity's part more as a grateful response to God's promise than a reciprocal obligation.

While Bradford was at Cambridge, Bucer wrote to Peter Martyr about the recent disputation on the Eucharist held at Oxford between 28 May and 1 June 1549. Bucer explained his desire to avoid 'words which deny the real and substantial presence of Christ in the Sacrament.'[233] In his view the apostles had spoken of the 'presence, not the signification and absence, of the Lord'; Christ's presence was 'not feigned, and verbal only, but real and of the very substance of Christ.'[234] For Bucer, the Eucharist was not designed so that 'faith, excited concerning Christ truly absent, is increased through the Spirit of Christ, by His benefits brought to mind and by meditation.'[235] This was clearly directed against the Zürich position.[236] Bucer wrote to Johannes Brenz in 1550 expressing his extreme disappointment with Martyr's book on the Eucharist. Bucer argued for the physical presence of Christ revealed in spite of 'reason':

> when we reply, that no one supposes a local presence of Christ in the Supper, they again say that the body of Christ cannot be understood to be present anywhere without being locally circumscribed. The sum therefore of their argument is to this effect. Reason does not comprehend what you teach respecting the exhibition and presence of Christ in the Supper; therefore these teachings are not true, and the Scriptures which seem to prove them must be otherwise interpreted. Let us pray for these persons.[237]

In his *Confession on the Eucharist* (1550) Bucer attacked the use of words such as '*ficte et accidentaliter*' (imaginarily and accidentally) to describe reception of the Eucharist and,

[233] Bucer to Martyr, 20 June 1549, Gorham (ed.), *Gleanings*, 84.
[234] Ibid., 86. See Basil Hall, 'Cranmer, the Eucharist and the Foreign Divines in the Reign of Edward VI', in P. Ayris and D. Selwyn (eds.), *Thomas Cranmer: churchman and scholar* (Woodbridge: 1993), 235-236.
[235] Gorham (ed.), *Gleanings*, 88.
[236] Vermigli took a similar position to Bullinger on the Eucharist: Peter Martyr Vermigli, *The Oxford Treatise and Disputation on the Eucharist*, ed. J.C. McLelland (Kirksville, MO: 2000), xxv.
[237] Bucer to Brentius, 15 May 1550, *OL*, 544. See the amendments in Porter, *Cambridge*, 66.

although he refrained from reiterating his dislike of 'signification', his preferred formulation was '*reipsa et substantiam eius*' (in his real self and in his substance).[238]

Bradford's sacramental theology clearly allowed more space for signification than Bucer's. Celia Hughes points out that Bradford invented the word 'obsignation' – meaning ratification or confirmation using a seal – to describe the action of the sacrament.[239] It is very unlikely that Bradford got this from Bucer, for it resembles Jan Laski's term '*obsignare*' (to affix a seal) rather than Bucer's preferred term '*dare*' (to give).[240] This is not to deny that Bradford attempted to portray a mystical presence of Christ as Bucer desired, but he placed it in a more clearly symbolic context.

In his *Meditation on the Lord's Prayer,* Bradford thanked God that he had been born of Christian parents so that he enjoyed the assurance of being 'brought into thy church by baptisme, which is the Sacrament of Adoption.' [241] Baptism signified God's action and, as a sign of initiation, baptism required belief in God's action, both in the remission of sin and in the 'sanctification and holines, to be wrought of thee in me by thy grace and holy spirit.'[242] Baptism testified to what God had done and would do for the believer. Building on this understanding of sacraments, Bradford described our forgiving our neighbour's sins as 'a sacrament vnto vs' because it assures us that God will likewise forgive us.[243] For him the sacraments were not only commemorations of God's grace but also conferred grace. He contemplated the work of the Spirit through the ministry of word and sacrament to propagate,

[238] Martin Bucer, *Confession on the Eucharist* (1550), in Wright (ed.), *Commonplaces*, 394.
[239] Hughes, 'Two Northern Protestants', 113 and the *OED*. For examples of Bradford's usage see Bradford, *Writings 1*, 101, 395; Bradford, *Writings 2*, 289.
[240] Laski to Bucer, June 1545, Gorham (ed.), *Gleanings*, 31.
[241] Bradford, *Godlie Meditations* [...] *Defence of Election*, A8r. cf. Bromiley, *Baptism and the Anglican Reformers*, 110-111.
[242] Bradford, *Godlie Meditations* [...] *Defence of Election*, A8r.
[243] Ibid., C6r.

enlarge and govern God's kingdom of grace.[244] Through these ministries 'the holye ghost is and wilbe effectuall.'[245]

Bradford went on to describe baptism, in his *Meditation on the Ten Commandments*, as 'the seale of thy couenaunt' that confirms God's commitment to the believer. Bradford claimed that 'thy holye name was not in vaine called vpon me' in baptism,[246] which suggests that he was keen to avoid disconnection of the visible sign from the spiritual signification. He compared baptism to circumcision, which had been called God's covenant, even though it was really 'but the signe of thy couenaunt in dede.' The sacrament could be conflated with the covenant itself because it 'is a most true testimonial and witnes therof.'[247] Similarly, Bradford wrote of the Eucharist as being a spiritual tasting of Christ because tasting referred to faith: 'for confirmation of my faithe, that is, to learne spiritually to taste Christs body broken and his bloude shedde for the remission of my synnes.'[248]

Bradford described Christ's spiritual presence in sensuous terms. He identified the chief function of the sacraments as 'visible and palpable wordes, to the obsignation and confirmacion of the faithe of all suche as vse the same after thy commaundementes.'[249] The sacraments also contributed to the instruction of God's faithful people in his law[250] because the ministries of the word and sacraments were 'meanes wherby thy holye spirite is effectuall to worke in oure hartes sanctification.'[251]

In his apparently private *Meditation on the Lord's Supper* (unpublished until 1848) Bradford called the bread and wine 'signs and symbols [...] sanctified in Christ's body and blood, to

[244] Ibid., B7r.
[245] Ibid., B8v.
[246] Ibid., E8v.
[247] Ibid., F1r; cf. Johnston, 'Bradford', 129.
[248] Bradford, *Godlie Meditations* [...] *Defence of Election*, G5r.
[249] Ibid., G4v.
[250] Ibid., G2v.
[251] Ibid., G4r.

represent the invisible communion and fellowship of the same.'[252] Christ is 'the food of the soul' which is received for the believer's spiritual refreshment and reception into immortality. Baptism is likewise symbolically credited with God's regeneration and adoption of his people, engrafting them into his Church.[253] Bradford wrote of the Eucharist as a 'figure and image [...] in visible signs.' In this sense it is a confirmation and 'assured witness' of union with Christ that strengthens faith in the efficacy of Christ's death and 'renews' the 'covenant which thou once hast stricken in thy blood.'[254] The Christian is comforted by the sacrament which witnesses to his mystical communion with Christ who is truly 'exhibited and given' to the believer.[255]

Bradford's emphasis in this meditation was on the 'chiefest and almost the whole pith of the sacrament,' that Christ had been offered for us historically, 'for else it would little help us to have thy body and blood distributed now, except they had been given for our redemption and salvation.'[256] The elements 'represented' the body and blood which were themselves 'the seal of spiritual life.' Communicants should 'stick not in the corporal things, and things which are object to our eyes, hands, taste and feeling, as the papists teach [...] but that we may arise to the consideration of spiritual things.' Therefore, Bradford prayed that he would consider the sacrament 'not to exhibit and give the body simply and without further consideration, but rather to obsign and confirm the promise.'[257] His focus was thus not on receiving Christ in the sacrament but on the idea that

> thy sacrament doth send us to thy cross, O Christ, where this promise indeed was performed, and most fully on all sides accomplished: for we cannot to salvation feed on thee or eat thee, O Christ, except thou hadst been crucified; and this we do

[252] Bradford, *Writings 1*, 260.
[253] Ibid.
[254] Ibid., 260-261.
[255] Ibid., 261.
[256] Ibid., 262.
[257] Ibid.

> when with lively sense we apprehend and catch hold on the efficacy of thy death.[258]

This commemorative, historical emphasis on apprehending Christ's Passion in the mind is surprisingly Zwinglian in the scheme of Bradford's theology.

In his *Sermon of Repentance* preached in 1552, Bradford included 'not to communicate hys Sacramentes' as one 'foule spotte' under divine law.[259] He described the clothing made by God for Adam and Eve in Gen. 3:21 as 'a visible sacramente and token of his inuisyble loue & grace, concerning theyr soules' because, Bradford thought, it represented the promise of deliverance by Christ.[260]

In 1553 Bradford wrote his treatise *The Hurt of Hearing Mass* which offered little in the way of constructive eucharistic doctrine. That the commemorative function was at the forefront of his thinking is suggested by his one positive description of the Eucharist as a 'memoriall of hys deathe and passion.'[261] He also claimed that the Romanists' adoration rather than distribution of the elements meant that 'god is not bounde to kepe his promyse thys is my bodie because it is condicyonal, requiryng our obedience of taking and eating.'[262]

Owing to the influx of prisoners following Wyatt's Rebellion in the spring of 1554, Bradford shared a cell in the Tower with Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley. Latimer recalled that they had searched the Scriptures and 'we could find in the testament of Christ's body and blood no other presence, but a spiritual presence.'[263] It seems very likely that Bradford was significantly influenced by the sacramental theologies of these three divines. Gordon Jeanes argues that

---

[258] Ibid., 263.
[259] Bradford, *Repentaunce*, D1v-2r.
[260] Ibid., F7r.
[261] Bradford, *Hurte of Hering Masse*, B4r.
[262] Ibid., D6r. This is consistent with Bucer's idea that there are reciprocal responsibilities in ceremonies: see above p.8.
[263] Hugh Latimer, *Sermons and Remains of Hugh Latimer*, ed. G. Corrie (PS; Cambridge: 1845), 258-259.

Cranmer's mature position, impressed on Bradford through the Books of Common Prayer, was distinct from Bucer's and most closely resembled Bullinger's.[264] If Bradford had neglected the theology of the *Consensus Tigurinus* up until this point, he could hardly have done so now (see above p.164).

Soon afterwards Bradford sent the manuscript of his *Sermon on the Lord's Supper* to Oxford for perusal by Ridley who was imprisoned there.[265] Bradford began by comparing baptism to circumcision, arguing that baptism, as a sealing of entry into Christ's body, is equivalent to engrafting into the 'covenant and league with God':

> christian parents seem to be no less bound to offer their infants and babes to be baptised, that they may be taken and accounted of us as members of Christ's mystical body, wherein they are received and sealed, than were the Hebrews their children to be circumcised and so to be taken as pertaining to the covenant and league with God, wherein they were engraffed, alonely the circumstance of the eighth day, not necessary to be observed, being now abrogate.[266]

Bradford then gave nine reasons against transubstantiation,[267] in the course of which he said that 'as by baptism we are engraffed into Christ, so by the supper we are fed by Christ.'[268] This helps to explain the kind of reception of which Bradford conceived, because his concept of engrafting at baptism was clearly figurative: 'in the Lord's supper is given unto us the communion of Christ's body and blood, that is, grace, forgiveness of sins, innocency, life, immortality, without any transubstantiation or including of the same in the bread.' Engrafting

[264] Jeanes, *Signs of God's Promise*, 163-171; cf. Bradford's position with Cranmer's *Answer to a Crafty and Sophistical Cavillation devised by Stephen Gardiner* (1551): 'I do not say that Christ's body and blood be given to us in signification, and not in deed. But I do as plainly speak as I can, that Christ's body and blood be given to us in deed, yet not corporally and carnally, but spiritually and effectually': Cranmer, *Writings*, 37. Compare also Ridley's allowance of Christ's Real Presence in the sense of 'something that appertaineth to Christ's body': Ridley, *Works*, 213; cf. Wheeler, 'Protestants, Prisoners', 96; Hughes, 'Two Northern Protestants', 111-112; Locher, *Zwingli's Thought*, 362-364.
[265] Ridley to Bradford, May 1554, Bradford, *Writings 2*, 93.
[266] Bradford, *Writings 1*, 82-83.
[267] Ibid., 84-92.
[268] Ibid., 88. Johnston observes that Bradford 'very frequently links his theories concerning the correct usage of the Lord's Supper, to right observance of the rite of Baptism': Johnston, 'Bradford', 125.

into Christ's natural body is only achieved by virtue of the fact that Christ is simultaneously the head of the mystical body.[269]

Bradford continued to define the Eucharist, not as 'bare bread and a naked sign,'[270] but as a token of God's gracious disposition. He gave an illustration of a 'token' sent by 'a loving friend' and said that one would miss the point of the gift if 'thou considerest not the mind of thy friend that sendeth or giveth thee the thing, and according thereto to esteem and receive it.' Likewise, in the sacrament, one should consider 'the mind of thy lover Christ' and not the elements themselves. The sacrament was to be valued for what it signified about Christ.[271] Bradford warned against reducing the sacrament to 'a sign or a figure of his body; except you will discern betwixt signs which signify only, and signs which also do represent, confirm, and seal up, or (as a man may say) give with their signification.'[272]

In most respects Bradford seems to have been attacking straw-men. The obstacle for Zürichers would have been his suggestion that the sign gives what it signifies. Like Bucer, Bradford wanted to portray signs as 'exhibitive,' 'a declaration of a gift, yea, in a certain manner a giving also,' so that baptism 'is also a very cleansing from sin' and the Eucharist 'a partaking of the Lord's body.'[273] He was not denying that the sacraments were 'sacramental and external signs' nor that the reality was 'tied to the element otherwise than sacramentally and spiritually.' His much less ambitious intention was to ensure 'that they might be discerned from significative

[269] Bradford, *Writings 1*, 89. Bradford's understanding of eucharistic reception echoes Cranmer's second Book of Common Prayer wherein 'we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood, then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us, we be one with Christ, and Christ in us': *Two Liturgies*, 274.
[270] Bradford, *Writings 1*, 92.
[271] Ibid., 93.
[272] Ibid., 93-94.
[273] Ibid., 94. Trueman rather misleads in claiming that Bradford says that baptism 'actually *is* such a cleansing' while omitting Bradford's explanation that they are 'sacramental and external signs' which are 'exhibitive and representative' of a spiritual action: Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 285.

and bare signs only, and be taken for signs exhibitive and representative.'[274] In this respect Bradford's view seems concurrent with Calvin's symbolic instrumentalism.

Bradford's reverence for the elements stemmed from their being 'ordained to serve for food of the soul,' which involved a 'spiritual, figurative, sacramental, or mystical' change. He affirmed no other presence of Christ than 'by grace, a presence by faith, a presence spiritually' and used the argument – shunned by Bucer – that 'Christ's body is only in heaven.'[275] Nevertheless, Christ's presence was such that 'reason knoweth not,' one that could be discerned only 'with the ears and eyes of the Spirit and of faith,' which is more reminiscent of Bucer's objection to absence.[276] Bradford compared the spiritual 'coupling' of Christ's body and blood to the sacrament with the proposition that a man's wife is 'with her husband one body and flesh, although he be at London and she at York.'[277]

Among the five benefits of participation listed by Bradford was receiving 'remission of our sins and confirmation of the new Testament.' The Eucharist testified to God's promise. The other benefits were union with Christ; life with God; reception of Christ as both God and man, and 'by faith an increase of incorporation with Christ and among ourselves which be his members.'[278] This final benefit shows that the Eucharist also had a communal purpose as well as declaring God's promise. Bradford went on to deny that weak humanity could receive Christ 'with so much light and by such sensible assurance' through 'only meditation of Christ's death or hearing of his word' as compared to receiving the sacrament. In the sacrament Christ entered the heart by stimulating of all the senses. Since the sacraments were so efficacious in this regard, Bradford considered that 'the apostle full well calleth the sacraments obsignations or

[274] Bradford, *Writings 1*, 94.
[275] Ibid., 95.
[276] Ibid., 96-97. Locher overstates the 'Zwinglian content' of Bradford's eucharistic theology: Locher, *Zwingli's Thought*, 358-359.
[277] Bradford, *Writings 1*, 99.
[278] Ibid.

"sealings" of God's promise,' with a reference to circumcision in Rom. 4.[279] By the calling to mind of Christ's Passion in the Eucharist, Christ is 'beholden with the eyes of faith' and those present are called to repentance and their faith in God's mercy is strengthened.[280] The benefits of this certainty made 'this supper *eucharistiam*, "a thanksgiving."'[281]

Shifting the focus, Bradford asked why the Eucharist had been instituted, answering in terms of commemoration and assurance of the benefits of Christ's death. He concentrated on the latter, with the encouragement that 'you, worthily receiving this sacrament, shall receive remission of all your sins, or rather certainty they are remitted; and that you are even now God's darlings, temples, and fellow-inheritors of all the good that ever he hath.'[282] The testamental signification is particularly clear here, as well as the metaphorical sense in which Bradford sometimes speaks of the sacraments as intrinsically salvific. The worthy reception which he mentions consisted of preparing the conscience in faith and repentance.[283] The joy of sacramental union with Christ included, for Bradford, the attempt to 'live worthy of your profession' and 'have society with the works of light,' and was placed in the context of the unilateral covenant: 'Now God hath renewed his covenant with you: in God's sight now you are as clean and healed from all your sores of sins.' 'Godliness and virtue' were essentially a response to divine grace but they were not without warning against 'idleness, lest the devil come "with seven spirits worse than himself," and take his lodging; and then your latter end will be worse than the first.'[284]

Bradford's treatise entitled *An Exhortacion to the carienge of Chrystes crosse* (early 1550s) was published by the Marian exiles and identified transubstantiation, propitiatory sacrifice, 'prayers for the dead & to the dead' as the '4. pillours' supporting the Mass.[285] His aim was the

[279] Ibid., 101.
[280] Ibid., 102-104.
[281] Ibid., 105.
[282] Ibid., 107-108.
[283] Ibid., 108; cf. *Two Liturgies*, 274.
[284] Bradford, *Writings 1*, 109-110.
[285] John Bradford, *An Exhortacion to the Carienge of Chrystes Crosse wyth a true and brefe confutacion of false and papisticall doctryne* (Wesel?: 1555?; RSTC 3480.5), 62-67.

pulling down of these pillars. Since a sacrament required that the sign should have 'some similitude' with that signified, transubstantiation, by annihilating the bread and wine, destroyed the sacrament.[286] Instead, the faithful receive, not Christ's body, but 'euen whole Chryste, into whom they are incorporate.'[287] This rather brief statement is Bradford's definition of reception here which 'shall suffyse to the declaracyon of our faith, concerning the Lordes supper, whervnto agreeth the Catholik church and al the fathers.' He referred his readers to Cranmer's *Defence of the true and catholic doctrine of the sacrament* (1550) for more detail,[288] which is a further indication of the archbishop's influence on him. Bradford went on to argue that Christ's sacrifice was applied by believing in it, by preaching and by prayer. The sacrifice could not be reiterated, nor was it applied by the sacraments.[289] Bradford also made an incidental statement on baptism: it is administered on the basis of God's election or, if the child is of age, faith, since he can declare God's promise. The whole purpose of baptism is to declare the divine promise.[290]

In *Another treatise of election and freewill* (1554?) Bradford stated that 'a man regenerate (which we ought to beleue of oure selues, I meane that we are so by our baptisme, the sacrament ther of requiring no lesse faith) a man I say regenerate, that is, borne of god, hath the spirite of god.'[291] Bradford clearly recognised two baptisms: one spiritual, one sacramental. The sacrament demands that we believe that the spiritual event has occurred. Similarly, in *A Treatise against the fear of death* Bradford almost conflated the spiritual and sacramental baptisms when he wrote that the poor Christian conscience 'by baptism is brought into God's church and made a member of the same "through faith".'[292]

[286] Ibid., 74; cf. the same argument in Hooper, *Ionas*, 119r-120v.
[287] Bradford, *Chrystes Crosse*, 76.
[288] Ibid., 77. For analysis of Cranmer's *Defence*, see MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, 462-469.
[289] Bradford, *Chrystes Crosse*, 88-89.
[290] Ibid., 126.
[291] Bradford, *Godlie Meditations* [...] *Defence of Election*, N3r.
[292] Bradford, *Writings 1*, 347.

The fact that the dates of so many of Bradford's works are unknown makes it difficult to discern development in his sacramental theology. His prison letters, however, are unusual in the scheme of his theology in their understanding of baptism as the Christian's vow, which presumably reflects the pastoral challenges with which he was faced. In September 1554 Bradford urged his friends in Coventry to choose suffering over compromise with Rome:

> you have professed in baptism to fight under the standard of your Captain Christ: and will you now, for peril's sake, leave your Lord? You made a solemn vow that you would forsake the world: and will you be foresworn and run to embrace it now? You sware and promised to "leave all and follow Christ:" and will you now leave him for your "father, your mother, your children, your lands, your life," &c.?[293]

This passage is reminiscent of Zwingli's metaphor for baptism as a soldier's oath of allegiance. A month earlier Bradford had told Humphrey Hales that in baptism we 'have vowed and solemnly sworn to forsake the world.'[294] In 1555 he encouraged Joyce Hales not to forget 'your profession made in baptism, which Christ requireth of all that will be his disciples, namely to "deny yourself and take up your cross,"'[295] and he described another correspondent as 'a man of God' who 'by profession in baptism have forsaken the world.'[296] Forsaking the world was a recurrent aspect of humanity's baptismal 'vow' for Bradford, a term synonymous with the 'solemn profession' against the 'fancy of the flesh [...] as also against the devil and the world, in our baptism.'[297] The Gospel and promise, as well as the sacraments and their 'substance,' Christ, required 'of every one that is baptised, and brought into God's church' that they be 'persuaded' of God's 'new covenant' to forgive and preserve his elect.[298] The only comparable example of reciprocity in baptism outside the prison letters appears in Bradford's undated

[293] To Hopkins and others, 2 September 1554, Ibid., 396.
[294] To Humphrey Hales, 5 August 1554, Bradford, *Writings 2*, 105; cf. *Exhortation to the brethren in England* in Bradford, *Writings 1*, 417-418.
[295] To Joyce Hales, 14 March 1555, Bradford, *Writings 2*, 203; cf. Susan Wabuda, 'Henry Bull, Miles Coverdale, and the Making of Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*', in D. Wood (ed.), *Martyrs and Martyrologies* (Oxford: 1992), 249.
[296] To Shallcross and his wife, 1555, Bradford, *Writings 2*, 235.
[297] To men who relieved the prisoners, undated, Bradford, *Writings 1*, 384.
[298] To certain free-willers, 1 January 1555, Bradford, *Writings 2*, 166-167.

Comparison between the old man and the new (published in 1567) where he wrote that baptism requires 'under paine of damnation' that we be regenerate. That is, having had our regeneration testified to us in the sacrament, we should strive to realise it by trying not to doubt it.[299]

Bradford took a final opportunity in early 1555 to express his understanding of the Real Presence in his 'farewell letters'. He used much the same formula in his *Farewell to the City of London, Farewell to Lancashire and Cheshire*, and *Farewell to Walden*: 'in the supper of Christ [...] is a true and very presence of whole Christ, God and man, to the faith of the receiver, (but not to the stander by or looker upon,) as it is a true and very presence of bread and wine to the sense of men.'[300] The eating of Christ was 'sacramentally and spiritually' in 'remembrance' of his sacrifice.[301]

Bradford was influenced by Swiss sacramental theology only indirectly. Bucer was responsible for his 'mystical' conception of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, although he understood this to occur by 'obsignation'. Although Bradford's sacramental theology was related to his unilateral concept of covenant, the connection was not developed extensively.

Conclusion

The sacramental theologies of Tyndale, Coverdale and Hooper bore the marks of their concepts of covenant and, although they may have lacked a degree of technical abstraction, they can be helpfully interpreted according to continental patterns. Tyndale's broadly Lutheran sacramental theology of the 1520s was developed around 1529 by his emphasis on the covenantal significance of the sacraments. Comparisons with Swiss Reformed theology are most easily drawn in 1530-31 when Tyndale enthused over the Zwinglian understanding of sacraments as covenantal memorials and vows (although covenant seals were not emphasised). This was

[299] Bradford, *Godly Meditations* [...] *Old Man and the New*, 92.
[300] *Farewell to the City of London*, Bradford, *Writings 1*, 435-436, cf. 450, 456.
[301] To Hopkins and others, 2 September 1554, Ibid., 393.

tempered in subsequent years as Tyndale went beyond contemporary Zürichers in allowing that the signs exerted a greater power for the believer than the benefits of historic remembrance only, although he stopped short of ascribing instrumentality to them.

Coverdale's eucharistic position was sacramentarian by 1528 and there is no reason to suppose he departed from it. During the 1530s his translation of Lutheran texts omitted sacramental theology and there were oblique indications that he maintained Reformed views on the Eucharist. In the early 1540s Coverdale embraced the sacramental theology of Zürich integrated with the concept of covenant. Initially, in 1540, Zwingli's thought was influential, but in 1541 Bullinger was the obvious source. Perhaps as early as 1544, but certainly by 1548, Coverdale's sacramental theology moved towards Calvin's. This would not have entailed any discernible shift in his concept of covenant.

Hooper had abandoned traditional beliefs on the Eucharist by 1539, but it was not until 1546 that he fully expounded his sacramental theology. It is inaccurate to describe it as Zwinglian because he clearly embraced characteristics of Bullinger's, and even Calvin's, views. In 1547 he made the reciprocal elements of the covenant in relation to the sacraments more explicit, but there was no change in his theology.

The Swiss Reformed elements of Bradford's sacramental theology were received second-hand and were not closely related to the covenantal aspects of his understanding. By contrast, Bucer's major influence may be gathered from Bradford's exhortatory *Farewell to Cambridge*: 'Remember the readings and preachings of God's prophet and true preacher, Martin Bucer.'[302] Bucer's teaching was certainly reflected in Bradford's expression of a 'mystical' presence of Christ in the Eucharist,[303] but it cannot be ignored that he maintained Christ's presence in the

[302] *Farewell to Cambridge*, Ibid., 445.
[303] Conference with Weston, Ibid., 546.

bread principally 'by signification.'[304] Bradford denied dependence on Luther, Zwingli or Œcolampadius for his sacramental theology (see above p.154). However, Swiss theology, especially that of Bullinger and the *Consensus Tigurinus*, was mediated to him by through his colleagues and Cranmer's publications. This explains Bradford's departures from Bucer's position.

Where Swiss concepts of covenant were adopted by Englishmen, their sacramental theologies evidence this reception. It is possible to associate Tyndale with a broadly Swiss Reformed position from the time the covenant became the controlling idea in his theology. Coverdale's general sacramentarianism did not initially depend on a concept of covenant, but covenantal elements of his sacramental understanding were developed in line with his apprehension of Swiss Reformed theology. Hooper's reception of Bullinger's theology is clear in the integration of the covenant to his sacramental thought. Meanwhile, it is clear from Bradford's theology that Swiss Reformed ideas about Christ's presence could be received without the more profound sacramental implications of the reciprocal concept of covenant.

[304] Conference with Alphonsus a Castro, Ibid., 533. See Johnston, 'Bradford', 130.

Conclusion

> Man, wylt thou lyue ryght vertuously,
> And with God reygne eternally,
> Then must thou kepe these commaundements ten
> That God commaunded to all men. Kirieleyson.
>
> *Miles Coverdale (c.1535)* [1]

MILES Coverdale versified the Decalogue sometime before 1539. The product was not a theological statement of his developing concept of covenant but it memorably instilled the practical implications of covenant relationship. The refrain *Kyrie eleison* (Lord have mercy) suggested the inability of humanity to meet the requirements of God's commandments. Righteousness according to scriptural precept and its gracious deliverance through Christ were the leading ideas in Reformed thought during the Reformation.

This thesis has investigated English Reformed identity during the early Reformation with particular reference to the concept of covenant. Chapter one considered the problems arising from the study of religious identity and surveyed evidence of Reformed identity in early Reformation England. Chapter two constructed a model of Swiss Reformed concepts of covenant which formed the framework for an exploration of English evangelicals in chapter three. The impact of the concept of covenant upon sacramental theology in the thought of Swiss and English evangelicals was examined in chapters four and five. To conclude this study the theological investigations of chapters two to five will be reviewed and related both to the questions of identity raised in chapter one and to the historiographical survey in the introduction.

[1] Miles Coverdale, *Goostly Psalmes and Spirituall Songes drawen out of the Holy Scripture* (1535?; RSTC 5892), B3r.

The Swiss Covenant Tradition

Huldrych Zwingli, Heinrich Bullinger and John Calvin all articulated a concept of the divine covenant which was bilateral and conditional. The reciprocal concept of covenant thus constitutes a characteristic element of Swiss Reformed theology, uniting the leading reformers of Zürich and Geneva. Since the reciprocal covenant was different from the unilateral concepts expressed by Martin Luther and Martin Bucer,[2] it serves as a marker for the proliferation of Swiss theology.

Zwingli's Christocentric soteriology was structured according to his concept of covenant which emerged in 1523. His point of departure was the socio-political turmoil he witnessed in Switzerland which he interpreted as being the result of anthropocentric worship and unfaithfulness to God. In his opinion, the solution was a return to God's law, which taught true worship. Through worshipping God appropriately and being faithful to him, humanity would fulfil its covenantal obligations to God and thereby elicit God's promised blessing and salvation. However, fallen humanity was incapable of discharging these obligations; only through union with Christ could humanity become righteous by virtue of the apprehension of Christ's righteousness. Although Zwingli accepted the importance of faith, his emphasis was on union with Christ and Christ's fulfilment of what is demanded, which tended to concern ethical regeneration accomplished and perfected by Christ.

The social aspects of Zwingli's soteriology were maintained and accentuated by Bullinger. He counted himself indebted to Zwingli for reviving appreciation of the importance of the divine covenant. From the mid-1520s Bullinger developed a concept of covenant and contributed a refinement of its details and a broadening of its communal implications. This he did by defining humanity's obligations as love of God and of neighbour, an ethic which he expounded from the

[2] The influence of Philip Melanchthon's concept of covenant, although beyond the scope of this study, deserves investigation.

Decalogue. Like Zwingli he emphasised Christ's fulfilment of the conditions on humanity's behalf as the basis for salvation.

That Calvin shared the concept of covenant articulated by the Zürichers has been demonstrated in the emergence of covenant themes in Calvin's theology as early as 1536, and a reciprocally-binding, conditional covenant by 1539. Calvin's covenantal soteriology was thoroughly Christocentric; he emphasised union with Christ as the means of fulfilling the conditions of the covenant. However, future study might usefully illuminate the difference between the Zürichers' consideration of righteousness as being imparted through this union, and Calvin's preference for the language of imputation.

The consistency of Swiss concepts of covenant confirms Richard Muller's arguments against Trinterud's thesis that a Rhineland 'law-covenant' existed which was separate from Calvin's allegedly unilateral notion of 'testament'. It is impossible to sustain a bifurcation of the Swiss Reformed tradition according to different covenant models. As Lyle Bierma and Cornelis Venema have shown, Wayne Baker's attempt to ground that disjunction in the doctrines of election expressed by Bullinger and Calvin is unpersuasive. In order to distinguish between the variegated positions of Zwingli, Bullinger and Calvin it is instead necessary to examine their respective applications of the covenant to sacramental theology. They shared an understanding of the sacraments as covenant signs denoting reciprocal obligations, but it has been shown that they assigned varying degrees of importance to those signs for the believer's experience of divine grace.

Zwingli's sacramental theology, like his soteriology, was Christocentric in that he refused to grant anything which he considered to belong to that which was signified to the signs themselves. The value of the sacraments was solely derivative from the historic work of Christ. He had strong polemical reasons for denying that the sacraments communicated grace, emphasising instead that the Holy Spirit needed no vehicles and that faith itself – which a

person either had or did not have – apprehended Christ. As early as 1523 Zwingli associated the sacraments with the covenant and from the mid-1520s came to see them as rich signs of humanity's allegiance to God as well as commemorations and ratifications of God's promise. Baptism was the sacrament of initiation into the covenant; the Eucharist was the sacrament of faithfulness to the community living under its precepts.

While Zwingli understood the sacraments primarily as human activities, Bullinger saw them as God's proclamation and confirmation of the Spirit's work on the heart. In this sense he was not a Zwinglian but he often chose to defend Zwingli's teaching and concentrated on the reciprocal, covenantal significance of the sacraments. His own view, which became more public in the late 1540s, was that the sacraments testify to grace by analogy, sealing the promise of grace conferred by God. To some extent, Bullinger's position was moulded against Calvin's in that Bullinger carefully denied sacramental instrumentality even if it were credited to the Spirit. He succeeded in enshrining his understanding in the *Consensus Tigurinus* (1549).

Yet another view was taken by Calvin who held that the sacraments were in some sense instruments of grace. In 1536 he defined sacraments as covenantal tokens expressing reciprocal obligations, but went beyond testimonial function to assert that they actually offer what they signify. By 1539 he saw the binding of God and humanity into reciprocal relationship as their primary purpose. He remained hopeful for an agreement with the Lutherans into the early 1540s even though he understood Christ's presence in the Eucharist to be spiritual. The later 1540s witnessed Calvin's willingness to compromise for the sake of agreement with Zürich in the *Consensus Tigurinus*.

English Reformed Identity

The significance of the European dimension of the English Reformation is reinforced by this study. The doctrine of covenant and the theology of the sacraments found in Reformation

England not only suggest the reception of continental theology in general but also help to indicate the influence of particular patterns of Reformation on English Reformed identity. William Tyndale, Miles Coverdale and John Hooper all experienced exile on the continent; all came to exhibit reciprocal concepts of covenant consistent with Swiss Reformed theology. It is highly likely that their exposure to Swiss ideas was the impetus for the development of their concepts. Through examination of their sacramental theologies it has been possible to track the different Swiss influences upon them.

As early as the mid-1520s Tyndale differed from Luther on the ability of the Christian to fulfil the law. The gradual refinement of his ethical concerns through the following decade bears out Carl Trueman's thesis of continuity in Tyndale's thought and confutes William Clebsch's arguments for a radical legalisation of Tyndale's theology around 1530. Initially, however, as far as the concept of covenant was concerned, Tyndale's definition of 'testament' in his Romans Prologue (1526) concurred with Luther's unilateral understanding.

An early sign of development appeared in May 1528 in a lone reference to a reciprocal testament unilaterally initiated by God in *The Parable of the Wicked Mammon*. Even if the reciprocal concept was at this stage peripheral, it is clear that God's testament had already become central to Tyndale's understanding of the Gospel and, moreover, that he had the principles in place to expand the concept. He had already strayed from Luther's soteriology by teaching the impartation of extrinsic righteousness through union with Christ. A few months later, in *The Obedience of a Christian Man*, there were several examples of a mutual 'testament', a term used interchangeably with a 'bond' between two parties. Tyndale used 'covenant' explicitly only when describing God's obligation, but there were hints that the concept might apply to humans too.

Clebsch's exaggerated thesis does at least highlight the importance of the development occurring in Tyndale's concept in 1529-31. In January 1530 Tyndale's Pentateuch made it clear

that the word 'testament' was to be understood primarily as a bilateral covenant. In the revision of 1534 the word 'covenant' had been adopted throughout. The legalism supposedly detected by Clebsch and David Broughton Knox in Tyndale's mature theology stems from the careful distinction made by Tyndale between the means and basis of justification: the former is faith alone; the latter is imparted righteousness through union with Christ. In *The Practice of Prelates* (1530) Tyndale invoked natural law summarised in the Decalogue as the standard for the true worship required of a believer. His description of the covenant as an indented obligation in the exposition of 1 John (1531) marked the completion of the maturation of his concept since 1529.

Tyndale's exposition of law and covenant in the 1530s supports inferences of the influence of the Swiss reformers on Tyndale. Even more evident is that the maturation of Tyndale's concept of covenant around 1529 ended his espousal of Lutheran sacramental theology in favour of a Swiss approach. This emerged as almost Zwinglian in 1531, although his views during the mid-1530s were more positive about the benefits of the sacraments for the believer than those of contemporary Zürichers, including Bullinger.

Coverdale first translated a work by Bullinger in around 1528. This study has contended that he was Tyndale's disciple throughout the years of Tyndale's exposition of the reciprocal concept of covenant, 1529-35. The Coverdale Bible (1535) shows Zürich influences and, in Clebsch's opinion, exhibited Tyndale's concept of covenant. However, the remainder of Coverdale's writings in the 1530s yield no sign of the concept. It has been argued here that this is explicable on political rather than theological grounds.

Return into exile revealed Coverdale's high view of the covenant. His *Fruitful Lessons* (1540), modelled on a work by Zwingli, exhibited the concept and, although it was not central to the treatise, its bilateral and conditional nature was unequivocal. The concept was clearly foundational to the argument of his *Confutation of Standish* (1541) published at Zürich. Later

that year Coverdale produced the first English translation of a continental covenant text, written by his correspondent Bullinger: *The old faith* was circulated and received to great acclaim by its English readership.

Coverdale's interest in Zürich theology continued into Edward VI's reign but his sacramental theology reveals shifts in his primary influences. He had held sacramentarian opinions since 1528 at least and it seems probable that he maintained them throughout the 1530s. By 1540-41 his sacramental theology was consistent with the opinions of the Zürichers, apparently moving from Zwinglianism towards Bullinger's strain. This moderating trend continued as Calvin's influence succeeded Bullinger's sometime between 1544 and 1548, but Coverdale never moved so far as to endorse the Lutheran position in which he took cursory interest.

Hooper was strongly influenced by Zürich theology and by Bullinger in particular. His conversion to Swiss reformism occurred in 1538-39 and he studied briefly in Basle in 1545. Evidently he had intended for some time to visit Zürich and finally moved there in 1547 for a period lasting two years. This study has found, contrary to the views of Jens Møller and David Newcombe, that all three of Hooper's Zürich treatises exhibited evidence of a robust concept of the bilateral and conditional covenant. Thus, Morris West was correct to regard it as foundational to Hooper's theology. Trueman, who also made the comparison between Hooper and Bullinger's concepts, underplays its soteriological significance in Hooper's theology.

Hooper's proselytisation on behalf of Zürich theology confirms that his concept of covenant remained stable after his return to England in 1549. His conduct during the Vestment Controversy demonstrated a fervour untempered by Bullinger's diplomatic acuity. Examination of Hooper's sacramental theology likewise suggests that from the late 1530s Zürich theology maintained a constant influence over him. The important figure was Bullinger; Hooper was never a Zwinglian, nor was he consciously attracted to Calvin's opinions.

The case of John Bradford offers a counter-example to Muller's judgment that unilateral concepts of covenant should not be linked with more predestinarian theologies. Indeed, it was specifically Bradford's predestinarian emphasis, which was unusual amongst contemporary English reformers, which prompted his decision not to invoke a reciprocal concept of covenant to support his Reformed emphasis on godliness. The primacy of unconditional election provides the best explanation for his refusal to expound his moral priorities as conditional obligations. In this respect his predestinarian emphasis had a different effect to Calvin's. Bradford's contrasting conclusions further suggest the utility of the concept as an indicator of Swiss influence on the English.

Bradford's evangelical conversion in 1547 brought him under the influence of Hugh Latimer who was, at around that time, won to Zürich eucharistic doctrine. For perhaps three years Bradford struggled for assurance of his salvation; he perceived his own obstinacy in the face of God's call and felt intense guilt over past misconduct. He was acutely aware that he ought to receive salvation with thankful obedience, and yet he made no link to the covenant. In Cambridge from 1549 until 1551 Bucer exerted a seminal influence on Bradford; it was probably due to Bucer's lectures, coupled with Bradford's personal struggles, that the doctrine of election became axiomatic for Bradford's theology. However, all that Bradford believed to be required for assurance was faith. The limits of his moralism were evident in the controversy with the free-willers, in which he sought to maintain determinism without fatalism. Moreover, his concept of covenant lodged any conditionality with God, thereby excluding effective mutuality.

Although Bucer was responsible to a significant extent for Bradford's unilateral concept of covenant, Bradford's sacramental theology suggests an indirect Swiss influence. The impact of the *Consensus Tigurinus*, even before its publication in England in 1552, and the mediation of Zürich sacramental theology via Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley, Cranmer's eucharistic treatises

and the Books of Common Prayer, appear to explain the peculiarities of Bradford's position where it diverged from Bucer's.

It is apparent from this study that Swiss sacramental theology was received more widely into early English Reformed thought than the Swiss concept of covenant. Where the reciprocal covenant was adopted, sacramental theology can be used to determine its specific origin. The unilateral concept articulated by Bradford would seem to confirm its association with Bucer as well as Luther. The concept of covenant can therefore be utilised to measure Swiss influence on English Reformed identities.

The chronological distribution of the reciprocal concept of covenant in early English Reformed theology can be gauged using several additional examples. Predictably, the concept is most evident in the writings of other exiles, namely George Joye, John Bale and Edmund Allen.[3] In 1534 Joye defined a testament as 'a promyse a [bar]gyn or a couenaunt wherby God hath promysed testifyed and declared his Godly wil and mercyfull plesure vnto vs agreinge with vs vpon certayne condicions.'[4] Bale, who became a sacramentary in 1530,[5] described baptism in 1547 as 'a couenaunt of a good conscience to god' wherein the person being baptised 'bindeth him selfe or maketh a couenaunt with god: that from thens forth he wyll lyue after hys wyll.'[6] When Allen translated a Zürich catechism in 1550, he decided that it was unnecessary to render the German word *bundt* into English:

> if God haue receaued vs into hys bundt & frendship [...] it is conuenient and mete that we kepe the condicion conteined in the bundt namely that we walke godly and verteously in his sight that is to do that he commaundeth & eschew that he

[3] The exile John Frith did not use the term 'covenant' but employed many conditional ideas to spur Christians to do their duty, e.g., Frith, *Works*, 230-233, 239-241, 269-270, 277. See Trinterud, 'Origins', 40.
[4] George Joye, *The Subuersion of Moris False Foundacion* (Emden [Antwerp]: 1534; RSTC 14829), 52v and ff.
[5] Jesse W. Harris, *John Bale: a study in the minor literature of the Reformation* (Urbana, IL: 1940), 20; Møller, 'Beginnings', 55.
[6] John Bale, *A bryefe and plaine declaracion of certayne sentences in this litle boke folowing to satisfie the consciences of them that haue iudged me therby to be a fauourer of the Anabaptistes* (1547; RSTC 1035), A6r.

> forbiddeth. [...] For fayth and baptisme bind vs to obey God vnto whom we be bounde as with an othe.[7]

Bundt, which literally meant 'covenant', had been defined bilaterally by Zwingli (see above p.83) and apparently Allen was confident that his Edwardian readership would appreciate this reciprocal quality. The reciprocal covenant was also expressed by some evangelicals who did not experience exile. The equivocal Thomas Becon explained in 1543 that the Abrahamic covenant was made with all the faithful, hence

> God require of vs also, that we walke before hym and be perfecte that we stedfastelye cleaue vnto him by stronge faythe, as the onelye and sole Authore of al goodnes, & so institute oure lyfe, that we maye breath nothynge but purite, innocency, holynes & intergrite, all the tyme of our lyfe in this worlde. Thus doyng, God wyl be our God, yea our almyghty God, our strong defender, and our sufficient great rewarde, no lesse than he was Abrahams. Therfore as Abraham walked before God, so let vs do. By this means shall God be no lesse beneficiall to vs, than he was to Abraham. If ye were the sonnes of Abraham, sayth Christ, ye woulde do the worckes of Abraham.[8]

These cases suggest that Tyndale was not a lone voice at the beginning of the English Reformation. Joye, Coverdale and Bale also held reciprocal covenant ideas in the 1530s and it is interesting to conjecture mutual influences.[9] These ideas were continued in the 1540s and 1550s by Becon, Coverdale, Hooper and Allen, suggesting a relatively even distribution of a theology of reciprocal covenant throughout the early English Reformation.

The Swiss-influenced theologians examined in this study were among the most precocious examples of the English Reformed identity surveyed in chapter one. The utility of the covenant in analysing Reformed identity among the theologically-educated élites is not easily reproduced at the popular level. This is not to deny the doctrinal interest of lay people, whom Geoffrey

[7] Edmund Allen, *A Shorte Cathechisme: a briefe and godly bringinge vp of youth* (Zurich: 1550; RSTC 361), E1r-v, cf. C7r, D2v, E2r.
[8] Thomas Becon, *A New Yeares gyfte more precious than golde* (1543; RSTC 1738), M6v-M7r; cf. Becon, *Newe Nosegaye*, E7r-v, G2v.
[9] John Bale, *A tragedye or enterlude manyfestyng the chefe promyses of God unto man by all ages in the olde lawe from the fall of Adam to the incarnacyon of the Lorde Iesus Christ* (Wesel: 1547; RSTC 1305). The play was first performed in 1538.

Dickens pictured 'talking of Scripture on the ale bench.'[10] Peter Blickle's study of popular Reformation in upper Germany in the mid-1520s found that peasants took a genuine theological interest in Zwingli's preaching. They were convinced of the close relationship between the Gospel and 'godly law', but Blickle concludes that the distinction between these concepts was 'undoubtedly beyond the peasants' mental powers of abstraction.'[11] As Felicity Heal and Clive Holmes write of England, 'deep ideological engagement with the new order must have been the prerogative of a small minority in the Reformation years.'[12] While popular sacramentarianism made significant progress in England and might have owed something to Swiss theology as well as to Lollardy, communication of the concept of covenant was not a priority for educated reformers. Its influence might be observed in the disciplinary themes of pastoral theology,[13] but it would be nearly impossible to trace definitively in the socio-political context until specific appeals were made to it later in the century.

Recent historians of the formation of English Protestant identity, especially Trueman and Alec Ryrie, have concentrated upon its Lutheran traits. It is far from clear, however, that Luther's opinions ever gained significant currency in England. Although Reformed evangelicals were in a minority before 1547, chapter one has argued for an upward correction of estimates of Reformed identity. The Reformed label can be applied to individuals in London, both universities and the Court. Oxford even established an exchange programme with Zürich in the late 1530s, sponsored by the Vice-Gerent in Spirituals himself. The dissemination of continental Reformed texts from the 1520s, reports of thriving sacramentarianism from the early 1530s, spontaneous iconoclasm, and exposures under the Six Articles all suggest that the

[10] Dickens, *English Reformation* [2nd edn.], 375.
[11] Blickle, *Communal Reformation*, 47, cf. 17, 42-43, 201.
[12] Felicity Heal and Clive Holmes, *The Gentry in England and Wales, 1500-1700* (Basingstoke: 1994), 357.
[13] See McGiffert, 'Tyndale', 182-184; King, *Literature*, 320-322, 352-355; Ralph Houlbrooke, *Church Courts and the People during the English Reformation, 1520-1570* (Oxford: 1979), 67-68, cf. 200-201. On the application of disciplinary themes by Tyndale and Frith, see R.J.D. Wainwright, 'Covenant, duty and obligation in the thought of William Tyndale and John Frith' (unpublished University of Oxford M.St. thesis, 2008), 33-44.

Swiss-influenced sector of English evangelicalism was at least exerting a significant influence in this period.

Imprecisely Reformed

The question of the origins of Puritanism and of federal theology has been consciously avoided here, but this study has ramifications for that debate. Federal theology was introduced into Reformed thought in 1562 by Zacharias Ursinus (1534-83).[14] The so-called *Doppelbund* included a covenant of works and a covenant of grace. Wayne Baker and Charles McCoy describe this as a Federalist Reformed tradition which acted as an alternative to the Calvinist Reformed tradition. They thus see Bullinger and Calvin as the originators of two separate but related traditions. Muller has sought to demonstrate the essential unity of these alleged alternatives (see above p.6).

According to Michael McGiffert, the intention of federal theology was, on the one hand, to define formal limits of covenantal conditionality and, on the other, to bind everyone formally to the moral law. The integrity of the covenant of grace was upheld by confining the law to the parallel covenant of works.[15] The dilemma between legalism and antinomianism was evaded through this conveniently abstract division of human obligation and divine grace into different economies. Consequently 'puritans were freed to be as puritanical as they pleased – to do helpful and holy things, to serve God and love neighbour, without running the risk of a bad conscience.'[16] The relationship between grace and law was clearly defined so as to ensure the integrity of both concepts.

[14] Weir, *Federal Theology*, 22. Muller claims that the doctrine of covenant in later Reformed theology derived its substance from Bullinger, Wolfgang Musculus, Ursinus, and Caspar Olevian more than Calvin: Muller, *After Calvin*, 86.
[15] McGiffert, 'Grace and Works', 467, 497-498; Michael McGiffert, 'From Moses to Adam: the making of the Covenant of Works', *SCJ*, 19/2 (1988), 137, 145-146.
[16] McGiffert, 'Grace and Works', 468.

A significantly different attitude to the concept of covenant in the early Reformation has emerged from this study which separates it from later developments. The early reformers who espoused a reciprocal concept of covenant were content to co-ordinate faith and law without any formal theological protection for the principle of *sola gratia*, which they successfully upheld in practice. These different attitudes can be correlated with different stages of English reception of continental ideas.

Early Reformed continental theology imbued late-medieval and humanist moral reform with the striking implications of the sole sufficiency of Christ for salvation.[17] Righteousness could be attained only through union with Christ and was defined according to his law summarised in the Decalogue. Scriptural law displaced the rules of the late-medieval Church and had to be obeyed in response to the gift of grace in order to maintain covenant relationship with God. Potentially passive participation in the patterns of late-medieval devotion gave way to the imperative to strive for personal and communal godliness. Moreover, the external forms of public devotion were reworked to express true worship. This contrasted with Luther's radically solifidian approach which stripped human works of their salvific efficacy altogether, yet was prepared to tolerate those material symbols and patterns of late-medieval devotion which were not perceived to be complicit in works-righteousness.[18]

When English Reformed evangelicals had their moment under Edward VI, they implemented the dogmatic changes modelled by Zürich: salvation *sola gratia*, *solus Christus*, *sola scriptura*. However, they retained practices and structures which they did not consider to be contrary to Scripture, like clerical vestments, kneeling at communion, certain holy days and the Church polity, even though these purported adiaphora had been abolished in continental Reformed

[17] William Bouwsma, 'The Two Faces of Humanism: Stoicism and Augustinianism in Renaissance Thought', in H. Oberman (ed.), *Itinerarium Italicum: the profile of the Italian Renaissance in the mirror of its European transformations* (Leiden: 1975), 15-16; J.M. Stayer, 'Zwingli before Zurich: Humanist Reformer and Papal Partisan', *ARG*, 72 (1981), 55-67; McGrath, 'Humanist Elements', 5-20; Rummel, *Confessionalisation of Humanism*, 24-25, 38, 41-42.

[18] On Luther's and Zwingli's different attitudes to the connection between reforming the spiritual and the material, see Wandel, 'Body of Christ', 207-211.

churches.[19] This judicious approach had affinities with Luther's attitude; it arose not through default of indolence or any particular yearning for late-medieval tradition, but because these symbols and structures were not judged inimical to godliness by leading reformers.

During Mary Tudor's reign numerous English evangelicals, like their Henrician predecessors, sought refuge in Zürich, but exile congregations were also founded in other locations, including Emden, Frankfurt and Geneva.[20] The exiles were able not only to experiment amongst themselves with alternative ecclesiastical structures, but to observe the achievements of aggressive reform in places like Geneva. Coverdale's radicalisation during this period is a case in point (see above p.135). The effect was to broaden and to intensify the continental influence upon English Reformed identity between the reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth I.

In 1559 the makers of the Elizabethan Settlement were evangelicals who had remained in Marian England, not exiles returning from the continent. Their model of reform was not Calvin's Geneva but the Zürich-influenced Church of Edward VI. The Elizabethan Act of Uniformity (1559), Book of Common Prayer (1559) and Thirty-Nine Articles (1563) restored, but did not move beyond, the doctrinal and liturgical state of the Church of England in 1552.[21] Adiaphora were retained by the Elizabethan hierarchy on the basis that superstitious intentions, rather than traditional practices, were truly culpable. It was a sound, if precarious, position to defend.[22] In the case of vestments Bullinger acknowledged, albeit reluctantly, that these could

[19] Benedict, *Christ's Churches*, 240.
[20] See Garrett, *Marian Exiles*, 47ff.
[21] MacCulloch, 'Putting the English Reformation on the Map', 87-89.
[22] See Euan Cameron, *Enchanted Europe: superstition, reason, and religion 1250-1750* (Oxford: 2010).

be used in good conscience.[23] The erstwhile exiles, eager for further reform, were confronted with an English Church already aspiring to the Christocentric godliness of Zürich theology.[24]

The tensions within the Elizabethan Church seem to represent these different periods of continental Reformed influence. Whilst the establishment preserved Swiss theology as it had been received under Edward VI, the advocates of further reform reflected that same influence as they had encountered it in exile during the 1550s. Theodore Bozeman argues that the imperious spirit of these advocates, who earned the epithets 'precise' and 'Puritan', was derived from concepts forged in the dialogue between the early English reformers and continental Reformed theologians.[25] This is undoubtedly true, but it is important to recognise that continental Reformed theology itself was an evolving influence and that the Marian exiles, unlike most Elizabethan evangelicals, had seen for themselves how it applied in Switzerland. The significance of their direct experiences should not be underestimated. It is clear that these Puritans 'pushed beyond mid-Tudor precedents to harder values.'[26] From the 1570s they began to see the potential of the concept of covenant as 'a heaven-sent auxiliary to an ethically strenuous programme' for individuals and the nation.[27] By 1600 Puritanism had taken a 'pietistic turn' wherein the moral elements of covenant theology became intimately concerned with behavioural regulation and the 'new science and praxis of piety.'[28]

The early Reformed concept of covenant was not nearly so 'precise' in its definitions of godliness. Faith and godliness were the two poles of a carefully balanced soteriology. The covenant had real conditions within a gracious context. It was not locked into particular

[23] Heinrich Bullinger, *The iudgement of the godly and learned father M. Henry Bullinger [...] declaring it to be lawfull for the ministers of the Churche of Englande, to weare the apparell prescribed by the lawes and orders of the same realme* (1566; RSTC 4063); cf. *ZL*, ii. 136-140.
[24] Torrance Kirby, 'Peter Martyr Vermigli's Political Theology and the Elizabethan Church', in P. Collinson and P. Ha (eds.), *The Reception of the Continental Reformation in Britain* (*PBA*, 164; Oxford: 2007), 85-91, 104-106.
[25] Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 60.
[26] Ibid., 30.
[27] Ibid., 37.
[28] Ibid., 85-86; cf. Heal, *Reformation*, 336-338; Benedict, *Christ's Churches*, 246.

ecclesiastical structures or practices which varied between England and Switzerland. This balance was increasingly upset by the Puritan attempt to define the implications of Christ's law in all areas of life.[29] In the process Puritan federal theology struggled to reconcile conditionality with solifidianism in the experience of the godly.[30] Federal theology ought not to be seen as Bullinger's concept of covenant overtaking Calvin's, for Bullinger and Calvin were in agreement on this point. Moreover, the official position of the English establishment probably owed more than the precisianists to Zürich theology.

The consistencies between medieval ideas of God's *pactum* and early Reformation covenant thought seems a more natural focus for scholarly attention in the Reformation period than post-Reformation developments.[31] The early reformers were products of their medieval heritage; they were occupied with the threshing of medieval theology. Reformed theology stood in continuity with late-medieval soteriologies in which humanity's reciprocal action in salvation was defined in terms of love for God. This condition, as expressed by the Tübingen theologian Gabriel Biel (d.1495), was that people must do their best, or what is in them (*facit quod in se est*). The fulfilment of this condition elicits habitual grace from God, who contractually accepts this as meriting salvation.[32]

[29] cf. McGiffert, 'Grace and Works', 465, 485; Heal and Holmes, *The Gentry*, 360.
[30] cf. Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 253-254; McGiffert, 'Moses to Adam', 148.
[31] On late-medieval concepts of covenant see: Berndt Hamm, *Promissio, Pactum, Ordinatio: freiheit und selbstbinding Gottes in der scholastischen gnadenlehre* (Tübingen: 1977); Martin Greschat, 'Der Bundesgedanke in der Theologie des späten Mittelalters', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 81 (1970), 44-63; Heiko Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and late medieval Nominalism* (Cambridge, MA.: 1963), esp. 100-205; Oberman, *Dawn*, 204-233; Alister McGrath, *The Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation* (Oxford: 1987), 76-82. The same issues highlighted by Paul Helm's critique of McGrath's study (see Helm, *Calvin's Ideas*, 321-323) are discussed by Oberman, *Harvest*, 100-103. See also McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, 153-154 and Alister McGrath, '*Homo Assumptus*? A study in the Christology of the *Via Moderna* with particular reference to William of Ockham', *ETL*, 60 (1984), 288.
[32] Oberman, *Harvest*, 133, 140-141, 153, 161-162; Oberman, *Forerunners*, 168; John Farthing, *Thomas Aquinas and Gabriel Biel: interpretations of St. Thomas Aquinas in German Nominalism on the eve of the Reformation* (Durham, NC & London: 1988), 162-164; cf. Olli-Pekka Vainio, *Justification and Participation in Christ: the development of the Lutheran doctrine of justification from Luther to the Formula of Concord (1580)* (Leiden & Boston: 2008), 29.

Biel referred to Christ as *legislator*, more than *salvator, noster* and taught that humans have the innate power to love God for God's own sake,[33] yet Biel was part of what Berndt Hamm describes as 'the late-medieval endeavour to transfer the weight of salvation from the side of the spiritual quality and activity of mankind to the side of God's gracious, saving mercy.'[34] *Facere quod in se est* was not a means of earning salvation through personal effort but an insistence on a minimal level of repentance. It stressed the inadequacy of human merit and the need for divine assistance. In Strasbourg, Johannes Geiler von Kayserberg (1445-1510) settled on *facere quod in se est* to express a self-doubting reliance upon the mediation of Christ, Mary and the saints. Love for God was most meritorious when it discounted its own merit.[35]

Facere quod in se est was a flexible condition gratuitously measured to the ability of the individual sinner. For Johannes von Paltz (d.1511), Luther's colleague at Erfurt, even attrition – the desire to be contrite (*doleo quod non doleo*, I grieve that I do not grieve) – was sufficient:

> offer to the one who was offered for you, because he so willed it, as much as you have: at least a good will (*bonam saltem voluntatem*) and, by virtue of his sacrifice, have confidence that you will be saved![36]

The condition that humans must do their best in loving God was developed by early Reformed theologians within an even more radically gracious economy that excluded human merit altogether.[37] As already observed, salvation *sola gratia* was informally held together with the requirement for godliness.[38] Johannes Œcolampadius defined the covenant as the 'law of love.'[39] Similarly, Zwingli had 'no qualms about identifying faith and love within the existential movement of trust in God.'[40] The early Reformed theologians did not feel the need

[33] See Oberman, *Harvest*, 108-119.
[34] Hamm, *Reformation of Faith*, 119.
[35] Ibid., 81-82.
[36] Johannes von Paltz, *Coelifodina* (1502), quoted in Ibid., 93-94.
[37] Oberman, *Masters*, 278; cf. Alister McGrath, 'Justification and the Reformation: the significance of the doctrine of justification by faith to sixteenth century urban communities', *ARG*, 81 (1990), 13-17.
[38] See Oberman, *Forerunners*, 39-40.
[39] See Letham, 'Foedus Operum', 462.
[40] Hamm, *Reformation of Faith*, 152.

for Luther's radical solifidianism to show that human love for God did not contribute meritoriously towards justification.[41]

Even this brief sketch of late-medieval *pactum* theology suggests the pivotal location of early Reformed concepts in the history of covenant thought: salvation *sola gratia* was impressed and human obligation was scripturally redefined, but there was no attempt to regulate the reciprocal economy until the emergence of federal theology.This balanced position was reflected in the English reception of Swiss Reformed theology under Henry VIII and Edward VI.

Epilogue

For four decades, from the 1520s to the 1550s, the Swiss Reformed concept of covenant was poised between medieval *pactum* ideas and the emergence of federal theology. A relationship of mutual agreement and conditional obligation between God and humanity formed the basis of a theology in which divine grace and human works were held together. Grace and law were carefully balanced; both were affirmed but their equilibrious relationship was not formally defined. The law of love embraced, but did not replace, the obligations of fidelity. The reciprocal covenant became a marker of the proliferation of Swiss Reformed theology and this thesis has found its traces upon the process of identity formation in the English Reformation. Further definition of this influence has been achieved through examination of its impact upon sacramental theology.

The transmission of the reciprocal concept of covenant encourages future investigation of the links between England and Switzerland in the 1520s to 1550s. English Reformed identity grew in significance from the 1520s, and between 1547 and 1553 the kingdom was reformed in accordance with Zürich theology. This reception had a formative influence upon the Elizabethan Settlement. Although the Elizabethan Church of England may have appeared

[41] Ibid., 150-151.

imprecisely Reformed to Puritan eyes, the links forged between England and Switzerland in the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI had ensured that it was in step with Zürich.

Bibliography

Manuscripts

Bodleian Library, Oxford

MS. Bodley 53, fos. 48v-61v: John Bradford, A treatyse of predestinacion.

Parker Library, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge

MS. CCCC 128: Documents relating to Archbishop Cranmer.

MS. CCCC 168, fos. 209r-v: Speech of Cromwell, earl of Essex, at his execution.

Printed Primary Sources

ALLEN, EDMUND, *A shorte cathechisme: A briefe and godly bringinge vp of youth* (Zurich: C. Froschauer, 1550; RSTC 361).

ANON., *A glasse for housholders* (London: Richard Grafton, 1542; RSTC 11917).

ARTOPOEUS, PETRUS and CHRYSOSTOME, JOHN *The diuisyon of the places of the lawe and of the Gospell, gathered owt of the hooly scriptures by Petrum Artopoeum: wher unto is added two orations of prayeng to God made by S. Iohn. Chrisostome*, trans. J. Bradford (London: [S. Mierdman for] Gwalter Lynne, 1548; RSTC 822).

Articles devised by the kynges highnes maiestie [The Ten Articles] (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1536; RSTC 10033.2).

BALE, JOHN, *Yet a course at the Romyshe foxe* (Antwerp: Olyuer Iacobson [A. Goinus], 1543; RSTC 1309).

---, *A brefe chronycle concernynge the examinacyon and death of the blessed martyr of Christ syr Iohan Oldecastell the lorde Cobham* (Antwerp, 1544; RSTC 1276).

---, *A bryefe and plaine declaracion of certayne sentences in this litle boke folowing to satisfie the consciences of them that haue iudged me therby to be a fauourer of the Anabaptistes* (London, 1547; RSTC 1035).

---, *A tragedye or enterlude manyfestyng the chefe promyses of God unto man by all ages in the olde lawe from the fall of Adam to the incarnacyon of the lorde Iesus Christ* (Wesel: Dirik van der Straten, 1547; RSTC 1305).

BARLOWE, WILLIAM, *Dialogue on the Lutheran Factions*, ed. A. McLean (*CLRC*, 15; Appleford: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1981).

BECON, THOMAS, *A new yeares gyfte more precious than golde worthy to be embrased no lesse ioyfully than thankfully of euery true christen man* (London: Iohn Mayler for Iohn Gough, 1543; RSTC 1738).

---, *A pleasaunt newe nosegaye full of many godly and swete floures* (London: Ioh[a]n Mayler for Ioh[a]n Gough, 1543; RSTC 1743).

BEVERIDGE, HENRY (ed.), *John Calvin: Tracts and Letters* (2; Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 2009).

The Byble in Englyshe […] *truly translated after the veryte of the Hebrue and Greke textes, by ye dylygent studye of dyuerse excellent learned men, expert in the forsayde tonges* [The Great Bible] (Paris: Francis Regnaut; London: Rychard Grafton & Edward Whitchurch, 1539; RSTC 2068).

BRADFORD, JOHN, *A sermon of repentaunce* (London: S. Mierdman for Iohn Wight, 1553; RSTC 3496).

---, *An exhortacion to the carienge of Chrystes crosse wyth a true and brefe confutacion of false and papisticall doctryne* (Wesel?: H. Singleton?, 1555?; RSTC 3480.5).

---, *The hurte of hering masse* (London: Wyllyam Copland for Wyllyam Martyne, 1561; RSTC 3494).

---, *Godlie meditations vpon the Lordes prayer, the beleefe, and ten commaundementes* [...] *a defence of the doctrine of gods eternall election and predestination* (London: Rouland Hall, 1562; RSTC 3484).

---, *Godly meditations vppon the ten commaundementes, the articles of the fayth, and the Lords prayer* [...] *a comparison betweene the old man and the new: the lawe and the gosple* (London: William Seres, 1567; RSTC 3493.5).

---, *The Writings of John Bradford, M.A., Martyr, 1555*, ed. A. Townsend, 2 vols. (PS, Cambridge: CUP, 1848/53).

BRADFORD, JOHN and SAMPSON, THOMAS, *Two notable sermons. Made by that worthy martyr of Christ Maister Iohn Bradford, the one of repentance, and the other of the Lordes supper neuer before imprinted* (London: Iohn Awdely and Iohn Wyght, 1574; RSTC 3500.5).

BROMILEY, G.W. (ed.), *Zwingli and Bullinger: Selected Translations* (*LCC*, 24; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953).

BUCER, MARTIN, *A treatise declaring and showing that images are not to be suffered in churches*, trans. William Marshall ([title page missing], 1535; RSTC 24238).

BULLINGER, HEINRICH, *De testamento seu foedere dei unico & aeterno Heinrychi Bullingeri brevis expositio* (Zurich: Christopher Froschauer, 1534).

---, *Sermonum decades quinque, de potissimis Christianae religionis capitibus* (Zurich: Christopher Froschauer, 1557).

---, *The Christen state of matrimonye*, trans. M. Coverdale (Antwerp: M. Crom, 1541; RSTC 4045).

---, *The olde fayth, an euydent probation out of the holy scripture, that the christen fayth (which is the right true, old & undoubted faith, hath endured sens the beginnyng of the worlde*, trans. M. Coverdale (Antwerp?: Thomas Vautroullier, 1541; RSTC 4070.5).

---, *The iudgement of the Godly and learned father M. Henry Bullinger* [...] *declaring it to be lawfull for the ministers of the Churche of Englande, to weare the apparell prescribed by the lawes and orders of the same realme* (London: William Seres, 1566; RSTC 4063).

---, *The Decades of Henry Bullinger*, ed. T. Harding, 5 vols. (PS; Cambridge: CUP, 1849-52).

---, *A Brief Exposition of the One and Eternal Testament or Covenant of God, 1534*, trans. C.S. McCoy and J.W. Baker, in *Fountainhead of Federalism: Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenantal Tradition* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991), 99-138.

BURNET, GILBERT, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, 6 vols. (London: Baynes & Son, 1825).

BYRNE, MURIEL ST. CLARE (ed.), *The Lisle Letters*, 6 vols. (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1981).

CALVIN, JOHN, *A faythfull and moost godlye treatyse concernyng the most sacred Sacrament of the blessed body and bloude of our sauioure Chryst*, trans. Thomas Broke (London: John Day, 1548; RSTC 4411).

---, *Calvinism by Calvin; being the substance of discourses delivered by Calvin and the other ministers of Geneva on the Doctrines of Grace* [c.1551], eds. R. Govett and C. Malan (London: James Nisbet & Co., 1840).

---, *Calvin's Calvinism: a treatise on the eternal predestination of God* [1552], trans. H. Cole, 2 vols. (London: Wertheim & MacIntosh, 1856).

---, *Ioannis Calvini opera quae supersunt omnia*, eds. G. Baum, E. Cunitz, and E. Reuss, 59 vols. (*CR*, 29-87; Brunswick: Schwetchke et Filium, 1863-1900).

---, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. J.T. McNeill, trans. F.L. Battles, 2 vols. (*LCC*; Louisville & London: Westminster John Knox Press, 1960).

---, *Institution de la Religion Chrestienne* [1541], ed. J. Pannier, 4 vols. (Paris: Société d'Edition "Les Belles Lettres", 1961).

---, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* [1536], trans. F.L. Battles (Grand Rapids, MI: William Eerdmans, 1986).

---, *Institutes of the Christian Religion: 1541 French Edition*, trans. E. McKee (Grand Rapids, MI & Cambridge: William Eerdmans, 2009).

COCHRANE, ALAN (ed.), *Reformed Confessions of the Sixteenth Century* (London: SCM, 1966).

COVERDALE, MILES, *Biblia the Bible* [...] *faithfully and truly translated out of Douche and Latyn in to Englishe* (Cologne?: E. Cervicornus and J. Soter?, 1535; RSTC 2063).

---, *Biblia the Byble* [...] *faithfully translated in to Englyshe* (Southwark?: J. Nycolson, 1535; RSTC 2063.3).

---, *Goostly psalmes and spirituall songes drawen out of the holy Scripture, for the comforte and consolacyon of soch as loue to reioyse in God and his Worde* (London: J. Rastell for Iohan Gough, 1535?; RSTC 5892).

---, *A goodly treatise of faith, hope, and charite necessary for all Christen men to know and to exercyse themselues therein translated into englyshe* (Southwark: James Nicolson, 1537; RSTC 24219.5).

---, *The original and sprynge of all sectes and orders by whome, whan or were they beganne. Translated out of hye Dutch in Englysh* (Southwarke: James Nicolson for Jhon Gough, 1537; RSTC 18849).

---, *The Psalter or boke of Psalmes both in Latyn and Englyshe* (London: Ricardus Grafton, 1540; RSTC 2368).

---, *A confutacion of that treatise, which one Iohn Standish made agaynst the protestacion of D. Barnes in the yeare. M.D.XL. Wherin, the holy scriptures (peruerted and wrested in his sayd treatise) are restored to their owne true vnderstonding agayne by Myles Couerdale* (Zurich: C. Froschauer, 1541; RSTC 5888).

---, *The defence of a certayne poore Christen man who els shuldhaue bene condemned by the Popes lawe. Written in the hye Allmaynes tonge by a right excellent and noble prynce, and translated into Englishe* (Antwerp: S. Mierdman, 1545; RSTC 5889).

---, *Fruitfull lessons, vpon the passion, buriall, resurrection, ascension, and of the sending of the holy Ghost Gathered out of the foure Euangelists: with a plaine exposition of the same* (London: Thomas Scarlet, 1593; RSTC 5891).

---, *Writings and Translations of Myles Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter*, ed. G. Pearson (PS; Cambridge: CUP, 1844).

---, *Remains of Myles Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter*, ed. G. Pearson (PS; Cambridge: CUP, 1846).

COVERDALE, MILES and TYNDALE, WILLIAM, *The Byble* [...] *truly and purely translated into Englysh by Thomas Matthew*, ed. John Rogers (Antwerp: Matthew Crom for Richard Grafton and Edward Whitchurch, 1537; RSTC 2066).

CRANMER, THOMAS, *Certayne sermons, or homelies appoynted by the kynges Maiestie* (London: Rychard Grafton, 1547; RSTC 13640).

---, *The Remains of Thomas Cranmer, D.D.*, ed. H. Jenkyns, 4 vols. (Oxford: OUP, 1833).

---, *Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556, Relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, ed. J. Cox (PS; Cambridge: CUP, 1844).

---, *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556.*, ed. J. Cox (PS; Cambridge: CUP, 1846).

FOXE, JOHN, *Acts and Monuments*, The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online (Sheffield: HRI Online Publications, 2011). <http://www.johnfoxe.org>, accessed 17 July 2011.

FRITH, JOHN, *The Work of John Frith*, ed. N.T. Wright (*CLRC*, 7; Appleford: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1978).

FRITH, JOHN and TYNDALE, WILLIAM, *The testament of master Wylliam Tracie esquier, expounded both by William Tindall and Ihon Frith* (Antwerp: H. Peetersen van Middelburch?, 1535; RSTC 24167).

GARDINER, STEPHEN, *A detection of the Deuils sophistrie wherwith he robbeth the vnlearned people, of the true byleef, in the most blessed sacrament of the aulter* (London: Ihon Herforde, 1546; RSTC 11591.3).

GORHAM, GEORGE (ed.), *Gleanings of a few scattered ears, during the period of the Reformation in England* (London, 1857).

GRAY, WILLIAM, *A Balade agaynst malycyous sclaunderers* (London: Iohn Gough, 1540; RSTC 1323.5).

HOOPER, JOHN, *An answer vnto my lord of wynthesters booke intytlyd a detection of the deuyls sophistrye wherwith he robith the vnlernyd people of the trew byleef in the moost blessyd sacrament of the aulter* (Zurich: Augustyne Fries, 1547; RSTC 13741).

---, *A declaration of Christe and of his offyce* (Zurich: Augustyne Fries, 1547; RSTC 13745).

---, *A declaration of the ten holy commaundementes of allmygthye God* (Zurich: Augustin Fries, 1548; RSTC 13746).

---, *A funerall oratyon made the xiiij. day of Ianuary* [...] *vpon the texte wrytyne in the Reuelatyone of Sayncte Iohne. Ca. 14* (London: S. Mierdman for Edwarde Whitechurch, 1549 [1550]; RSTC 13753).

---, *A godly confession and protestacion of the christian fayth, made and set furth by Ihon Hooper, wherin is declared what a christian manne is bound to beleue of God, hys Kyng, his neibour, and hymselfe* (London: John Daye, 1550; RSTC 13757).

---, *An ouersight, and deliberacion vpon the holy prophete Ionas: made, and vttered before the kynges maiestie, and his moost honorable councell, by Ihon Hoper in lent last past. Comprehended in seuen sermons* (London: Ihon Daye and Wylliam Seres, 1550; RSTC 13763).

---, *Early Writings of John Hooper, D.D.*, ed. S. Carr (PS; Cambridge: CUP, 1843).

---, *Later Writings of Bishop Hooper*, ed. C. Nevinson (PS; Cambridge: CUP, 1852).

Iniunctions for the clerge (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1538; RSTC 10086).

Iniunctions gyuen by the auctoritie of the kynges highnes to the clergie (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1536; RSTC 10084.7).

The Institution of a Christen Man [The Bishops' Book] (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1537; RSTC 5164).

JANELLE, PIERRE (ed.), *Obedience in Church and State: three political tracts by Stephen Gardiner* (Cambridge: CUP, 1930).

JEWEL, JOHN, *The Works of John Jewel, bishop of Salisbury*, ed. J. Ayre (PS, 1; Cambridge: CUP, 1845).

JORDAN, W.K. (ed.), *The Chronicle and Political Papers of Edward VI* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1966).

JOYE, GEORGE, *The souper of the Lorde* [...] *the declaracion of the later parte of the .6. ca. of S. Johan* [...] *wheryn incidently M. Moris letter agenst Johan Frythe is confuted* (Antwerp: Niclas Twonson [N. Hill?], 1533; RSTC 24468).

---, *Dauids Psalter, diligently and faithfully translated by George Ioye, with breif arguments before euery Psalme, declaringe the effecte therof* (Antwerp: Maryne Emperowr, 1534; RSTC 2372).

---, *The subuersion of Moris false foundacion where upon he sweteth to set faste and shove under his shameles shoris, to vnderproppe the popis churche* (Emden [Antwerp]: Jacob Aurick [G. von der Haghen], 1534; RSTC 14829).

---, *An apolgye made by George Ioye to satisfye (if it maye be) w. Tindale to pourge & defende himself ageinst many sclaunderouse lyes fayned vpon him* (London: J. Byddell, 1535; RSTC 14820).

KIDD, B.J. (ed.), *Documents Illustrative of the Continental Reformation* (Oxford: OUP, 1911).

The King's Book, or A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man [1543] (Church Historical Society; London: SPCK, 1932).

LASKI, JAN and CALVIN, JOHN, *Breuis et dilucida de sacramentis ecclesiae Christi tractatio in qua & sons ipse, & ratio, totius sacramentatiae nostri temporis controuersiae paucis exponitur: naturáque ac uis sacramentorum compendio & perspicuè explicatur* (London: Stephanum Myerdmannum, 1552; RSTC 15259).

LATIMER, HUGH, *Sermons of Hugh Latimer*, ed. G. Corrie (PS; Cambridge: CUP, 1844).

---, *Sermons and Remains of Hugh Latimer*, ed. G. Corrie (PS; Cambridge: CUP, 1845).

Letters and papers, foreign and domestic, of the reign of Henry VIII, 1509-1547, eds. J.S. Brewer, J. Gairdner, and R.H. Brodie, 21 vols. (London, 1862-1910).

LUTHER, MARTIN, *Luther's Works*, ed., H. Lehmann, J. Pelikan, et al., 55 vols. (American ed., St. Louis: Concordia/Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press/Fortress Press, 1955-86).

---, *De Servo Arbitrio* [1525], trans. P. Watson (*LCC*, 17; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), 100-334.

MELANCHTHON, PHILIP, *A godlye treatyse of prayer*, trans. J. Bradford (London: S. Mierdman for Iohn Wight, 1553; RSTC 17791).

---, *Opera quae supersunt omnia*, eds. K. Bretschneider & H. Bindseil, 28 vols. (*CR*, 1-28; Brunswick: Schwetchke et Filium, 1834-60).

---, *Loci Communes Theologici* [1535], ed. W. Pauck (*LCC*, 19; London: SCM, 1969).

MERRIMAN, R.G. (ed.), *Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell*, 2 vols. (Oxford: OUP, 1902).

The Order of the Communion (London: Richard Grafton, 1548; RSTC 16458.3).

Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation, ed. H. Robinson, 2 vols. (PS, Cambridge: CUP, 1846/47).

REID, J. (ed.), *Calvin: Theological Treatises* (22; London: SCM, 1954).

REU, J.M. (ed.), *The Augsburg Confession: a collection of sources* (Chicago, IL: Wartburg Publishing House, 1930).

RIDLEY, NICHOLAS, *The Works of Nicholas Ridley*, ed. H. Christmas (PS; Cambridge: CUP, 1843).

SCHAFF, PHILIP (ed.), *The Creeds of Christendom* [online], 3 vols. (3; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1977). <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/creeds3.i.html>, accessed 15 July 2011.

STANDISH, JOHN, *A lytle treatyse* [...] *against the protestacion of Roberti Barnes at the tyme of his death* (London: Robert Redman, 1540; RSTC 23209).

STRYPE, JOHN, *Ecclesiastical Memorials, relating chiefly to religion, and the reformation of it*, 3 vols. (Oxford: OUP, 1822).

TAVERNER, RICHARD, *The most sacred Bible* [...] *translated into English, and newly recognised with great diligence after most faythful exemplars* (London: John Byddell, for Thomas Barthlet, 1539; RSTC 2066).

Tudor Royal Proclamations, eds. P.L. Hughes and J.F. Larkin, 3 vols. (New Haven & London: YUP, 1964).

The Two Liturgies, A.D. 1549, and A.D. 1552: with other documents set forth by authority in the reign of King Edward VI, ed. J. Ketley (PS; Cambridge: CUP, 1844).

TYNDALE, WILLIAM, *The New Testament* [Cologne Fragment, 1525] (Cologne: H. Fuchs?, 1525; RSTC 2823).

---, *A compendious introduccion, prologe or preface vnto the pistle off Paul to the Romayns* (Worms: P. Schoeffer, 1526; RSTC 24438).

---, *The Obedience of a Christen Man and How Christen Rulers Ought to Governe* (Antwerp: J. Hoochstraten [Martin de Keyser?], 1528; RSTC 24446).

---, *The Pentateuch* (Antwerp: Johan Hoochstraten, 1530; RSTC 2350).

---, *The practyse of prelates, Whether the Kinges grace maye be separated from hys quene, be cause she was his brothers wyfe* (Antwerp: Joannes Hoochstraten, 1530; RSTC 24465).

---, *The exposition of the fyrst epistle of seynt Jhon with a prologge before it* (Antwerp: M. de Keyser, 1531; RSTC 24443).

---, *The prophete Ionas* (Antwerp: M. de Keyser, 1531; RSTC 2788).

---, *An exposicion vppon the v. vi. vii. chapters of Mathew which thre chaptres are the keye and the dore of the scripture* [...] *before the booke, thou hast a prologe very necessarie, contaynynge the whole somme of the couenaunt made betwene God and vs, vppon which we be baptised to kepe it* (Antwerp?: J. Grapheus?, 1533?; RSTC 24440).

---, *The firste boke of Moses called Genesis newly correctyd and amendyd by W.T* (Antwerp: M. de Keyser, 1534; RSTC 2351).

---, *A Treatyse of the Iustificacyon By Faith Only, otherwise called the Parable of the Wyked Mammon* [1528] (Southwarke: Iames Nycolson, 1536; RSTC 24455).

---, *A briefe declaration of the sacraments* (London: Robert Stoughton, 1548; RSTC 24445).

---, *Doctrinal Treatises and Introductions to Different Portions of the Holy Scriptures*, ed. H. Walter (PS; Cambridge: CUP, 1848).

---, *An Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue*, ed. H. Walter (PS; Cambridge: CUP, 1849).

---, *Expositions and Notes on Sundry Portions of the Holy Scriptures, together with the Practice of Prelates*, ed. H. Walter (PS; Cambridge: CUP, 1849).

---, *The New Testament* [1534], ed. D. Daniell (New Haven & London: YUP, 1995).

VERMIGLI, PETER MARTYR, *The Oxford Treatise and Disputation on the Eucharist*, ed. J.C. McLelland (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2000).

VOWELL, JOHN, *The Antient History and Description of the City of Exeter* [...] *with a catalogue of all the bishops to the year of our Lord 1578. Collected chiefly by John Vowell, alias Hooker* (Exeter: Andrews and Trewman, 1765).

WERDMÜLLER, OTTO, *A spyrytuall and moost precyouse pearle Teachyng all men to loue and imbrace the crosse* [...] *Sett forth by the moste honorable lorde, the duke hys grace of Somerset*, trans. M. Coverdale (London: S. Mierdman for Gwalter Lynne, 1550; RSTC 25255).

WHITGIFT, JOHN, *The Works of John Whitgift, D.D.*, ed. J. Ayre, 3 vols. (PS; Cambridge: CUP, 1851-53).

WRIGHT, D.F. (ed.), *Commonplaces of Martin Bucer* (Abingdon: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1972).

The Zurich Letters, comprising the correspondence of several English bishops and others, with some of the Helvetian Reformers, during the early part of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, ed. H. Robinson, 2 vols. (PS, Cambridge: CUP, 1842/45).

ZWINGLI, HULDRYCH, *The rekening and declaracion of the faith and beleif of Huldrik Zwingly bisshoppe of Ziiryk the cheif town of Heluetia, sent to Charles V*, trans. G. Joye (Antwerp: Widow of C. Ruremund, 1543; RSTC 26138).

---, *Selected Works of Huldreich Zwingli*, ed. S.M. Jackson (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1901).

---, *Huldreich Zwinglis Sämtliche Werke*, eds. E. Egli and G. Finsler (*CR*, 88-101; Berlin: C.A. Schwetschke; Leipzig: M. Heinsius Nachfolger; Zürich: TVZ, 1905-1991).

---, *The Latin Works of Huldreich Zwingli*, ed. S.M. Jackson, 3 vols. (Durham, NC: Labyrinth, 1912-83).

---, *Huldrych Zwingli: Writings*, eds. E.J. Furcha and H.W. Pipkin, 2 vols. (Allison Park, PA.: Pickwick, 1984).

Secondary Literature

ALTHAUS, PAUL, *The Theology of Martin Luther* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966).

AMOS, N. SCOTT ET AL. (eds.), *The Education of a Christian Society: Humanism and the Reformation in Britain and the Netherlands*: *papers delivered to the Thirteenth Anglo-Dutch Historical Conference, 1997* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999).

ASTON, MARGARET, *Lollards and Reformers: Images and Literacy in Late Medieval England* (London: Hambledon Press, 1984).

---, *England's Iconoclasts: Laws Against Images* (I; Oxford: OUP, 1988).

---, 'Iconoclasm at Rickmansworth, 1522: Troubles of Churchwardens', *JEH*, 40/4 (1989), 524-552.

---, *Faith and Fire: Popular and Unpopular Religion 1350-1600* (London & Rio Grande, OH: Hambledon Press, 1993).

BAILEY, SHERWIN, 'Robert Wisdom under Persecution, 1541-43', *JEH*, 2 (1951), 180-189.

BAINTON, ROLAND, *Here I Stand: a life of Martin Luther* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1950).

---, *The Age of the Reformation* (Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1956).

BAKER, DEREK (ed.), *Reform and Reformation: England and the continent c.1500-c.1750* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1979).

BAKER, J. WAYNE, *Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenant: the other Reformed tradition* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1980).

---, 'Church, State, and Dissent: The Crisis of the Swiss Reformation, 1531-1536', *CH*, 57/2 (1988), 135-152.

---, 'Zwinglianism', in H.J. Hillerbrand (ed.), *OER* (4; New York & Oxford: OUP, 1996).

---, 'Heinrich Bullinger, the Covenant, and the Reformed Tradition in Retrospect', *SCJ*, 29/2 (1998), 359-376.

BAKER, J. WAYNE and MCCOY, CHARLES, *Fountainhead of Federalism: Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenantal Tradition* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991).

BALTZER, KLAUS, *The Covenant Formulary in Old Testament, Jewish, and Early Christian Writings*, trans. D. Green (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971).

BEEKE, JOEL, *Assurance of Faith: Calvin, English Puritanism, and the Dutch Second Reformation* (New York: Peter Lang, 1991).

BENEDICT, PHILIP, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism* (New Haven & London: YUP, 2002).

BERNARD, G.W., 'The making of religious policy, 1533-1546: Henry VIII and the search for the middle way', *HJ*, 41/2 (1998), 321-349.

---, *The King's Reformation: Henry VIII and the remaking of the English Church* (New Haven & London: YUP, 2005).

BIERMA, LYLE, 'Federal Theology in the Sixteenth Century: Two Traditions?', *Westminster Theological Journal*, 45 (1983), 304-321.

---, 'The Role of Covenant Theology in Early Reformed Orthodoxy', *SCJ*, 21/3 (1990), 453-462.

BLICKLE, PETER, *Communal Reformation: The Quest for Salvation in Sixteenth-Century Germany*, trans. T. Dunlap (London & New Jersey: Humanities Press International, 1992).

BOSSY, JOHN, 'Moral arithmetic: Seven Sins into Ten Commandments', in E. Leites (ed.), *Conscience and Casuistry in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: CUP, 1988), 214-234.

BOWD, STEPHEN, *Reform before the Reformation: Vincenzo Querini and the religious renaissance in Italy* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

BOZEMAN, THEODORE, *The Precisianist Strain: Disciplinary Religion and Antinomian Backlash in Puritanism to 1638* (Chapel Hill, NC & London: University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

BRADY, THOMAS, 'From Revolution to the Long Reformation: Writings in English on the German Reformation, 1970-2005', *ARG*, 100 (2009), 48-64.

BRIGDEN, SUSAN, 'Popular disturbance and the fall of Thomas Cromwell and the reformers, 1539-1540', *HJ*, 24/2 (1981), 257-278.

---, 'Youth and the English Reformation', *PP*, 95 (1982), 37-67.

---, 'Thomas Cromwell and the "brethren"', in C. Cross, D. Loades, and J. Scarisbrick (eds.), *Law and government under the Tudors* (Cambridge: CUP, 1988), 31-49.

---, *London and the Reformation* (Oxford: OUP, 1989).

---, 'Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, and the "Conjured League"', *HJ*, 37 (1994), 507-537.

---, '"The shadow that you know": Sir Thomas Wyatt and Sir Francis Bryan at court and in embassy', *HJ*, 39 (1996), 1-31.

---, *New Worlds, Lost Worlds: The Rule of the Tudors 1485-1603* (London: Penguin, 2000).

---, *Thomas Wyatt: the Heart's Forest* (Faber & Faber, forthcoming 2012).

BRIGDEN, SUSAN and WILSON, NIGEL, 'New Learning and Broken Friendship', *EHR*, 112 (1997), 396-411.

BRIGDEN, SUSAN and WOOLFSON, JONATHAN, 'Thomas Wyatt in Italy', *RQ*, 58 (2005), 464-511.

VAN DEN BRINK, J.N. BAKHUIZEN, 'Ratramn's Eucharistic Doctrine and its Influence in Sixteenth-Century England', in G. Cuming (ed.), *Studies in Church History* (2; London: Thomas Nelson, 1965), 54-77.

BRITNELL, JENNIFER, 'John Gough and the *Traité de la Différence des Schismes et des Conciles* of Jean Lemaire de Beiges: Translation as Propaganda in the Henrician Reformation', *JEH*, 46/1 (1995), 62-74.

BROMILEY, G.W., *Baptism and the Anglican Reformers* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1953).

BROOKS, PETER NEWMAN, *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist: An Essay in Historical Development* (2nd edn.; Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992).

BURNETT, AMY NELSON, *The Yoke of Christ: Martin Bucer and Christian Discipline* (Kirksville, MO: SCJ Publishers, 1994).

---, *Teaching the Reformation: Ministers and their Message in Basel, 1529-1629* (Oxford: OUP, 2006).

CAMERON, EUAN, *The European Reformation* (Oxford: OUP, 1991).

---, 'The Search for Luther's Place in the Reformation', *JEH*, 45/3 (1994), 475-485.

---, *Enchanted Europe: Superstition, Reason, and Religion 1250-1750* (Oxford: OUP, 2010).

CAMPI, EMIDIO and OPITZ, PETER (eds.), *Heinrich Bullinger: Life – Thought – Influence: International Congress Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575), 25-29 August 2004*, 2 vols. (Zurich: TVZ, 2007).

CARGILL THOMPSON, W.D.J., 'Who wrote "The Supper of the Lord"?', *HTR*, 53 (1960), 77-91.

CARLEY, JAMES, '"Her moost lovyng and fryndely brother sendeth gretyng": Anne Boleyn's Manuscripts and Their Sources', in M. Brown and S. McKendrick (eds.), *Illuminating the Book: Makers and Interpreters* (London: British Library, 1998), 261-280.

CATTO, JEREMY, 'Theology after Wycliffism', in J.I. Catto and Ralph Evans (eds.), *The History of the University of Oxford* (II; Oxford: OUP, 1992), 263-280.

CLEBSCH, WILLIAM, 'More evidence that George Joye wrote *The Souper of the Lorde*', *HTR*, 55 (1962), 63-66.

---, *England's Earliest Protestants, 1525-1535* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1964).

COLLINSON, PATRICK, 'England', in B. Scribner, R. Porter & M. Teich (eds.), *The Reformation in National Context* (Cambridge: CUP, 1994), 80-94.

---, 'William Tyndale and the Course of the English Reformation', *Reformation*, 1 (1996), 72-97.

---, 'The Reformation', in E. Nicholson (ed.), *A Century of Theological and Religious Studies in Britain* (The British Academy; Oxford: OUP, 2003), 187-213.

COLLINSON, PATRICK and HA, POLLY (eds.), *The Reception of Continental Reformation in Britain* (*PBA*, 164; Oxford: OUP, 2010).

COOLIDGE, J.S., *The Pauline Renaissance in England: Puritanism and the Bible* (Oxford: OUP, 1970).

COURVOISIER, JAQUES, *Zwingli: A Reformed Theologian* (London: Epworth, 1964).

CROSS, RICHARD, 'Alloiosis in the Christology of Zwingli', *JTS*, 47/1 (1996), 105-122.

CUMMINGS, BRIAN, *The Literary Culture of the Reformation: Grammar and Grace* (Oxford: OUP, 2002).

D'ALTON, CRAIG, 'The Suppression of Lutheran Heretics in England, 1526-1529', *JEH*, 54/2 (2003), 228-253.

DANIELL, DAVID, *William Tyndale: a biography* (New Haven & London: YUP, 1994).

---, 'Coverdale, Miles (1488–1569)', *ODNB* (OUP: 2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6486> accessed 14 July 2009.

---, 'Frith, John (1503-1533)', *ODNB* (OUP: 2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10188> accessed 14 July 2009.

---, 'Tyndale, William (*c.*1494-1536)', *ODNB* (OUP: 2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27947> accessed 2 October 2009.

DAVIES, CATHERINE, *A Religion of the Word: the defence of the Reformation in the reign of Edward VI* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002).

DAVIS, JOHN, 'The Trials of Thomas Bylney and the English Reformation', *HJ*, 24/4 (1981), 775-790.

---, *Heresy and Reformation in the south-east of England, 1520-1559* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1983).

DENT, C.M., *Protestant Reformers in Elizabethan Oxford* (Oxford: OUP, 1983).

DICKENS, A.G., *Lollards and Protestants in the Diocese of York, 1509-1558* (Oxford: OUP, 1959).

---, *The English Reformation* (1st edn.; London: B.T. Batsford, 1964).

---, 'Heresy and the Origins of English Protestantism', *Britain and The Netherlands: Anglo-Dutch Historical Conference 1962* (2; Utrecht & Amsterdam: J.B. Walters, 1964), 47-66.

---, 'Review of "English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI. By James K. McConica"', *History*, 52 (1967), 77-78.

---, *The German Nation and Martin Luther* (London: Edward Arnold, 1974).

---, 'The Early Expansion of Protestantism in England 1520-1558', *ARG*, 78 (1987), 187-222.

---, *The English Reformation* (2nd edn.; London: B.T. Batsford, 1989).

DISLEY, EMMA, 'Degrees of glory: Protestant doctrine and the concept of rewards hereafter', *JTS*, 42/1 (1991), 77-105.

DOWLING, MARIA, 'Anne Boleyn and Reform', *JEH*, 35/1 (1984), 30-46.

---, *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII* (London: Croom Helm, 1986).

---, 'The Gospel and the Court: Reformation under Henry VIII', in P. Lake and M. Dowling (eds.), *Protestantism and the National Church in Sixteenth Century England* (London, New York & Sydney: Croom Helm, 1987), 36-77.

DUFFY, EAMON, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c.1400-c.1580* (New Haven & London: YUP, 1992).

DUGMORE, C.W., *The Mass and the English Reformers* (London: Macmillan, 1958).

DUKE, ALASTAIR, *Reformation and Revolt in the Low Countries* (London & Ronceverte: Hambledon Press, 1990).

DUNNING, ROBERT, 'The last days of Cleeve Abbey', in C. Barron and C. Harper-Bill (eds.), *The Church in Pre-Reformation Society* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1985), 58-67.

ELLA, GEORGE, *Henry Bullinger: Shepherd of the Churches* (Eggleston, Durham: Go Publications, 2007).

ELTON, G.R., *The Tudor Revolution in Government* (Cambridge: CUP, 1953).

---, *Reformation Europe 1517-1559* (London: Collins, 1963).

---, *Policy and Police: the Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell* (Cambridge: CUP, 1972).

---, *England under the Tudors* (2nd edn.; London: Methuen & Co, 1974).

---, *Reform and Reformation: England 1509-1558* (London: Edward Arnold, 1977).

EULER, CARRIE, 'Does Faith Translate? Tudor Translations of Martin Luther and the Doctrine of Justification by Faith', *ARG*, 101 (2010), 80-113.

FARTHING, JOHN, *Thomas Aquinas and Gabriel Biel: Interpretations of St. Thomas Aquinas in German Nominalism on the Eve of the Reformation* (Durham, NC & London: Duke University Press, 1988).

FENLON, DERMOT, *Heresy and Obedience in Tridentine Italy: Cardinal Pole and the Counter Reformation* (Cambridge: CUP, 1972).

FERRY, ANNE, *The "Inward" Language: Sonnets of Wyatt, Sidney, Shakespeare, Donne* (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1983).

FINES, JOHN (ed.), *A Biographical Register of Early English Protestants and others opposed to the Roman Catholic Church, 1525-1558*, 2 vols. (1; Abingdon: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1981. 2; typescript: West Sussex Institute of Higher Education, 1985).

GÄBLER, ULRICH, *Huldrych Zwingli: His Life and Work*, trans. R. Gritsch (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986).

GANOCZY, ALEXANDRE, *The Young Calvin*, trans. D. Foxgrover and W. Provo (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987).

GARRETT, CHRISTINA, *The Marian Exiles: A Study in the Origins of Elizabethan Puritanism* (Cambridge: CUP, 1938).

GELBERT, J.P., *Magister Johann Bader's Leben und Schriften, Nicolaus Thomae und seine Briefe* (Neustadt: A.P. Gottschict-Witter, 1868).

GERRISH, B.A., *The Old Protestantism and the New: Essays on the Reformation Heritage* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1982).

---, *Continuing the Reformation: Essays on Modern Religious Thought* (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1993).

---, *Grace and Gratitude: The Eucharistic Theology of John Calvin* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993).

GOETERS, J.F. GERHARD, 'Föderaltheologie', in H. Balz et al. (eds.), *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, 38 vols. (11; Berlin & New York; Walter de Gruyter: 1983), 246-252.

GORDON, BRUCE, 'Zurich and the Scottish Reformation: Rudolf Gwalther's *Homilies on Galatians* of 1576', in J. Kirk (ed.), *Humanism and Reform: the Church in Europe, England, and Scotland, 1400-1643* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991), 207-219.

--- (ed.), *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth-Century Europe* (1; Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996).

---, *The Swiss Reformation* (Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 2002).

---, *Calvin* (New Haven & London: YUP, 2009).

GREAVES, RICHARD, 'The origins and early development of English covenant thought', *The Historian*, 31/1 (1968), 21-35.

GREEN, V.H.H., *Religion at Oxford and Cambridge* (London: SCM Press, 1964).

GREENBLATT, STEPHEN, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

GREENSLADE, S.L., *The Work of William Tindale* (London & Glasgow: Blackie & Son, 1938).

---, 'The Faculty of Theology', in J. McConica (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford* (3; Oxford: OUP, 1986), 295-334.

GREGORY, BRAD, *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, MA. and London: HUP, 1999).

GRESCHAT, MARTIN, 'Der Bundesgedanke in der Theologie des späten Mittelalters', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 81 (1970), 44-63.

GUNN, STEVEN, 'The Structures of Politics in Early Tudor England', *TRHS*, 6th series/v (1995), 59-90.

GUY, JOHN, *Tudor England* (Oxford & New York: OUP, 1988).

HAGEN, KENNETH, 'From Testament to Covenant in the Early Sixteenth Century', *SCJ*, 3/1 (1972), 1-24.

HAIGH, CHRISTOPHER, *Reformation and Resistance in Tudor Lancashire* (Cambridge: CUP, 1975).

--- (ed.), *The English Reformation Revised* (Cambridge: CUP, 1987).

---, *English Reformations: religion, politics, and society under the Tudors* (Oxford: OUP, 1993).

---, 'Religion', *TRHS*, 6th series/vii (1997), 281-299.

---, 'Henry VIII and the German Reformation', in R. Bonney, F. Bosbach, and T. Brockmann (eds.), *Religion und Politik in Deutschland und Grossbritannien* (Munich: K.G. Saur, 2001), 31-42.

HALL, BASIL, 'Calvin against the Calvinists', in G. Duffield (ed.), *John Calvin: a collection of distinguished essays* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1966), 19-37.

---, 'Cranmer, the Eucharist and the Foreign Divines in the Reign of Edward VI', in P. Ayris and D. Selwyn (eds.), *Thomas Cranmer: Churchman and Scholar* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1993), 217-258.

---, 'Martin Bucer in England', in D.F. Wright (ed.), *Martin Bucer: Reforming church and community* (Cambridge: CUP, 1994), 144-160.

HAMM, BERNDT, *Promissio, Pactum, Ordinatio: Freiheit und Selbstbinding Gottes in der scholastischen Gnadenlehre* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1977).

---, *The Reformation of Faith in the Context of Late Medieval Theology and Piety*, trans. H. Heron, G. Wiedermann, and J. Frymire (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2004).

HARAN, MENAHEM, 'The *Bĕrît* "Covenant": Its Nature and Ceremonial Background', in M. Cogan, B. Eichler, and J. Tigay (eds.), *Tehillah le-Moshe: Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honour of Moshe Greenberg* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 203-219.

HARRIS, JESSE W., *John Bale: A Study in the Minor Literature of the Reformation* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1940).

HAZLETT, IAN, 'Eucharistic communion: impulses and directions in Martin Bucer's thought', in D.F. Wright (ed.), *Martin Bucer: Reforming church and community* (Cambridge: CUP, 1994), 72-82.

HEAL, FELICITY, *Reformation in Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: OUP, 2003).

HEAL, FELICITY and HOLMES, CLIVE, *The Gentry in England and Wales, 1500-1700* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994).

HELLINGA, LOTTE (ed.), *The Bookshop of the World: the role of the Low Countries in the book-trade 1473-1941* ('t Goy-Houten: Hes & De Graaf, 2001).

HELM, PAUL, *John Calvin's Ideas* (Oxford: OUP, 2004).

HESSELINK, I.J., *Calvin's Concept of the Law* (Allison Park, PA: Pickwick, 1992).

HOAK, DALE, *The King's Council in the Reign of Edward VI* (Cambridge: CUP, 1976).

HORNBECK, J. PATRICK, *What is a Lollard? Dissent and Belief in Late Medieval England* (Oxford: OUP, 2010).

HOULBROOKE, RALPH, *Church Courts and the People during the English Reformation, 1520-1570* (Oxford: OUP, 1979).

---, 'Parkhurst, John (1511?–1575)', *ODNB* (OUP: 2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21362> accessed 21 December 2009.

HUDSON, ANNE, *The Premature Reformation: Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford: OUP, 1988).

HUDSON, WINTHROP, *The Cambridge Connection and the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1980).

HUGHES, CELIA, 'Coverdale's Alter Ego', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 65/1 (1982), 100-124.

---, 'Two Sixteenth-Century Northern Protestants: John Bradford and William Turner', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 66/1 (1983), 104-138.

HUME, ANTHEA, 'William Roye's "Brefe Dialogue" (1527): An English Version of a Strassburg Catechism', *HTR*, 60 (1967), 307-321.

---, 'English Protestant Books Printed Abroad, 1525-35: An Annotated Bibliography', in L. Schuster, et al. (eds.), *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More* (8; New Haven & London: YUP, 1973), 1063-1091.

HUNT, E.W., *The Life and Times of John Hooper (c.1500-1555) Bishop of Gloucester* (Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992).

IVES, ERIC, *Anne Boleyn* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986).

---, *Lady Jane Grey: a Tudor mystery* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009).

JAMES, SUSAN, *Kateryn Parr: The Making of a Queen* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999).

JEANES, GORDON, *Signs of God's Promise: Thomas Cranmer's Sacramental Theology and the Book of Common Prayer* (London: T&T Clark, 2008).

JONES, WILLIAM, 'Uses of Foreigners in the Church of Edward VI', *Numen*, 6 (1959), 142-153.

JORDAN, W.K., *Edward VI: the Young King* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1968).

KARPMAN, DAHLIA, 'William Tyndale's Response to the Hebraic Tradition', *Studies in the Renaissance*, 14 (1967), 110-130.

KENDALL, R.T., *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (Oxford: OUP, 1979).

KING, JOHN, *English Reformation Literature: The Tudor Origins of the Protestant Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982).

---, 'Thomas More, William Tyndale, and the Printing of Religious Propaganda', in M. Pincombe and C. Shrank (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature, 1485-1603* (Oxford: OUP, 2009), 105-120.

KIPLING, GORDON, 'Belmaine, Jean (*fl.*1546-1559)', *ODNB* (OUP: 2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2041> accessed 12 December 2006.

KIRBY, TORRANCE, 'Wholesale or retail? Antoine de Marcourt's *The Boke of Marchauntes* and Tudor political theology', *Renaissance and Reformation*, 28/2 (2004), 37-60.

---, *The Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2007).

KNAPPEN, MARSHALL, 'William Tyndale – First English Puritan', *CH*, 5 (1936), 201-215.

---, *Tudor Puritanism: a chapter in the history of idealism* (Gloucester, MA.: Peter Smith, 1963).

KNOX, D.B., *The Doctrine of Faith in the reign of Henry VIII* (London: James Clarke & Co., 1961).

KOLB, ROBERT, *Luther's Heirs Define His Legacy: Studies on Lutheran Confessionalisation* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1996).

KRISTELLER, PAUL O., *Renaissance Thought and its Sources* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979).

DE KROON, MARIJN, *The Honour of God and Human Salvation: a contribution to an understanding of Calvin's theology according to his Institutes*, trans. L. Bierma and J. Vriend (Edinburgh & New York: T&T Clark, 2001).

KÜMIN, BEAT, *The Shaping of a Community: the Rise and Reformation of the English Parish c.1400-1560* (Aldershot: Scolar, 1996).

LEEDHAM-GREEN, ELIZABETH, *Books in Cambridge Inventories: book lists from Vice-Chancellor's Court probate inventories in the Tudor and Stuart periods*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: CUP, 1986).

LETHAM, ROBERT, 'The Foedus Operum: some factors accounting for its development', *SCJ*, 14/4 (1983), 457-467.

LEWIS, C.S., *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century excluding drama* (Oxford: OUP, 1954).

LILLBACK, PETER, *The Binding of God: Calvin's Role in the Development of Covenant Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001).

LITZENBERGER, CAROLINE, *The English Reformation and the laity: Gloucestershire, 1540-1580* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997).

LLOYD JONES, G., *The Discovery of Hebrew in Tudor England: a third language* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1983).

LOACH, JENNIFER, 'Reformation Controversies', in J. McConica (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford* (3; Oxford: OUP, 1986), 363-396.

---, *Edward VI* (New Haven & London: YUP, 1999).

LOADES, DAVID, *The Reign of King Edward VI* (Bangor: Headstart History, 1994).

---, 'Books and the English Reformation prior to 1558', in J. Gilmont (ed.), *The Reformation and the Book* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), 264-291.

---, 'Hilles, Richard (c.1514–1587)', *ODNB* (OUP: 2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/47402> accessed 21 July 2010.

LOANE, MARCUS, *Pioneers of the Reformation in England* (London: The Church Book Room Press, 1964).

---, *Masters of the English Reformation* (2nd edn.; Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 2005).

LOCHER, GOTTFRIED, *Zwingli's Thought: New Perspectives* (Leiden: Brill, 1981).

LOHSE, BERNHARD, *Martin Luther's Theology: Its Historical and Systematic Development*, trans. R. Harrisville (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999).

MACCULLOCH, DIARMAID, 'The Myth of the English Reformation', *JBS*, 30/1 (1991), 1-19.

---, 'The Religion of Henry VIII', in David Starkey (ed.), *Henry VIII: A European Court in England* (London: Collins & Brown, 1991), 160-162.

--- (ed.), *The Reign of Henry VIII: Politics, Policy and Piety* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1995).

---, 'Archbishop Cranmer: concord and tolerance in a changing Church', in O. Grell and B. Scribner (eds.), *Tolerance and intolerance in the European Reformation* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996), 199-215.

---, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven & London: YUP, 1996).

---, *Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (London: Allen Lane, 1999).

---, *Reformation: Europe's House Divided 1490-1700* (London: Penguin, 2004).

---, 'Putting the English Reformation on the Map', *TRHS*, 15 (2005), 75-95.

---, 'Calvin: Fifth Latin Doctor of the Church?', unpublished lecture delivered at the University of Geneva: *Calvin et son influence 1509-2009* Conference (2009).

MAITLAND, S.R., *Essays on Subjects connected with the Reformation in England* (London: Francis & John Rivington, 1849).

MARSH, CHRISTOPHER, *Popular religion in sixteenth-century England: holding their peace* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998).

MARSHALL, PETER, 'Papist as heretic: the burning of John Forest, 1538', *HJ*, 41/2 (1998), 351-374.

---, 'Mumpsimus and Sumpsimus: The Intellectual Origins of a Henrician *Bon Mot*', *JEH*, 52/3 (2001), 512-520.

---, 'Is the Pope a Catholic? Henry VIII and the semantics of schism', in E. Shagan (ed.), *Catholics and the 'Protestant nation': religious politics and identity in early modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), 22-48.

---, *Religious Identities in Henry VIII's England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).

---, 'Religious Exiles and the Tudor State', in K. Cooper and J. Gregory (eds.), *Discipline and Diversity* (Ecclesiastical History Society; Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007), 263-284.

---, '(Re)defining the English Reformation', *JBS*, 48/3 (2009), 564-586.

MARSHALL, PETER and RYRIE, ALEC (eds.), *The Beginnings of English Protestantism* (Cambridge: CUP, 2002).

MARTIN, J.W., 'English Protestant Separatism at its Beginnings: Henry Hart and the Free-Will Men', *SCJ*, 7/2 (1976), 55-74.

MAYHEW, G.J., 'The progress of the Reformation in East Sussex, 1530-1559: the evidence from wills', *Southern History*, 5 (1983), 38-67.

MAYNARD SMITH, H., *Henry VIII and the Reformation* (London: Macmillan & Co, 1948).

MCCONICA, JAMES, *English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI* (Oxford: OUP, 1965).

MCDIARMID, JOHN, 'John Cheke's Preface to *De Superstione*', *JEH*, 48/1 (1997), 100-120.

MCENTEGART, RORY, *Henry VIII, the League of Schmalkalden and the English Reformation* (Woodbridge: Royal Historical Society, 2002).

MCGIFFERT, MICHAEL, 'William Tyndale's Conception of Covenant', *JEH*, 32 (1981), 167-184.

---, 'Grace and works: the rise and division of covenant divinity in Elizabethan Puritanism', *HTR*, 75/4 (1982), 463-502.

---, 'From Moses to Adam: The Making of the Covenant of Works', *SCJ*, 19/2 (1988), 131-155.

MCGRATH, ALISTER, 'Humanist Elements in the Early Reformed Doctrine of Justification', *ARG*, 73 (1982), 5-20.

---, '*Homo Assumptus*? A Study in the Christology of the *Via Moderna* with Particular Reference to William of Ockham', *ETL*, 60 (1984), 283-297.

---, *Luther's Theology of the Cross: Martin Luther's Theological Breakthrough* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1985).

---, *The Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987).

---, 'Justification and the Reformation: The Significance of the Doctrine of Justification by Faith to Sixteenth Century Urban Communities', *ARG*, 81 (1990), 5-19.

---, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification* (3rd edn.; Cambridge: CUP, 2005).

MCNAIR, PHILIP, 'Peter Martyr in England', in J.C. McLelland (ed.), *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Italian Reform* (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1980), 85-106.

METHUEN, CHARLOTTE, *Kepler's Tübingen: Stimulus to a Theological Mathematics* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998).

---, 'Oxford: Reading Scripture in the University', in T. Kirby, E. Campi, and F. James (eds.), *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2009), 71-93.

MILLER, GREGORY, 'Huldrych Zwingli', in C. Lindberg (ed.), *The Reformation Theologians: an introduction to theology in the Early Modern period* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 157-169.

MILLER, PERRY, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (2nd ed.; New York & London: Macmillan, 1954).

---, *Errand into the Wilderness* (London & Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956).

MØLLER, JENS, 'The Beginnings of Puritan Covenant Theology', *JEH*, 14 (1963), 46-67.

MOZLEY, J.F., *William Tyndale* (London: SPCK, 1937).

---, *Coverdale and His Bibles* (London: Lutterworth, 1953).

MULLER, RICHARD, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988).

---, 'Review of "Fountainhead of Federalism"', *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 63 (1994), 89-91.

---, *The Unaccommodated Calvin: Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition* (Oxford: OUP, 2000).

---, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (Oxford: OUP, 2003).

MURDOCK, GRAEME, 'The Importance of Being Josiah: An Image of Calvinist Identity', *SCJ*, 29/4 (1998), 1043-1059.

NEWCOMBE, D.G., 'Hooper, John (1495x1500-1555)', *ODNB* (OUP: 2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13706> accessed 8 May 2009.

---, *John Hooper: Tudor Bishop and Martyr* (Oxford: Davenant Press, 2009).

NICHOLSON, ERNEST, *God and His People: Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament* (Oxford: OUP, 1986).

O'DONOVAN, JOAN, *Theology of Law and Authority in the English Reformation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004).

OBERMAN, HEIKO, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism* (Cambridge, MA.: HUP, 1963).

---, *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966).

--- (ed.), *Itinerarium Italicum: The Profile of the Italian Renaissance in the Mirror of its European Transformations* (Leiden: Brill, 1975).

---, *Masters of the Reformation: the emergence of a new intellectual climate in Europe*, trans. D. Martin (Cambridge: CUP, 1981).

---, *The Dawn of the Reformation: Essays in Late Medieval and Early Reformation Thought* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986).

---, *Luther: Man between God and the Devil* (New Haven & London: YUP, 1989).

---, *The Reformation: Roots and Ramifications*, trans. A. Gow (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994).

OLOFSSON, STAFFAN, *The LXX Version: a guide to the translation technique of the Septuagint* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990).

OPIE, JOHN, 'The Anglicising of John Hooper', *ARG*, 59/2 (1968), 150-177.

OPITZ, PETER, 'The Exegetical and Hermeneutical Work of John Oecolampadius, Huldrych Zwingli and John Calvin', in M. Sæbo (ed.), *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, 3 vols. (2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 407-451.

---, 'Bullinger and Paul', in R. Holder (ed.), *A Companion to Paul in the Reformation* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2009), 243-265.

OVERELL, ANNE, *Italian Reform and English Reformations, c.1535-c.1585* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008).

OVERFIELD, JAMES, 'Scholastic Opposition to Humanism in Pre-Reformation Germany', *Viator*, 7 (1976), 391-420.

PARKER, T.H.L., *John Calvin: a biography* (London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1975).

PARKER, T.M., *The English Reformation to 1558* (London: OUP, 1950).

PEARSE, M.T., *Between Known Men and Visible Saints: a study in sixteenth-century English dissent* (London & Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1994).

PELIKAN, JAROSLAV, *Reformation of Church and Dogma (1300-1700)* (The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine, 4; Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1984).

PENNY, D.A., *Freewill or Predestination: the battle over saving grace in mid-Tudor England* (Woodbridge: Royal Historical Society, 1990).

PETTEGREE, ANDREW, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London* (Oxford: OUP, 1986).

--- (ed.), *The Early Reformation in Europe* (Cambridge: CUP, 1992).

---, *Marian Protestantism: Six Studies* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996).

--- (ed.), *The Reformation World* (London & New York: Routledge, 2000).

PETTEGREE, ANDREW ET AL. (eds.), *Calvinism in Europe, 1540-1620* (Cambridge: CUP, 1994).

PINEAS, RAINER, *Thomas More and Tudor Polemics* (London & Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1968).

PORTER, H.C., *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Cambridge: CUP, 1958).

POTTER, G.R., *Ulrich Zwingli 1484-1531* (Cambridge: CUP, 1976).

POWICKE, F.M., *The Reformation in England* (London: OUP, 1941).

QUESTIER, MICHAEL, *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580-1625* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996).

RAATH, ANDRIES and DE FREITAS, SHAUN, 'From Heinrich Bullinger to puritanism: John Hooper's theology and the office of magistracy', *SJT*, 56/2 (2003), 208-230.

RACAUT, LUC and RYRIE, ALEC (eds.), *Moderate Voices in the European Reformation* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005).

REX, RICHARD, 'The English Campaign against Luther in the 1520s', *TRHS*, 5th series/39 (1989), 85-106.

---, *The Theology of John Fisher* (Cambridge: CUP, 1991).

---, 'The New Learning', *JEH*, 44/1 (1993), 26-44.

---, 'The crisis of obedience: God's word and Henry's reformation', *HJ*, 39/4 (1996), 863-894.

---, 'The Early Impact of Reformation Theology at Cambridge University, 1521-1547', *RRR*, 2 (1999), 38-71.

---, *The Lollards* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002).

---, 'New Light on Tyndale and Lollardy', *Reformation*, 8 (2003), 143-171.

---, *Henry VIII and the English Reformation* (2nd edn.; Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

ROREM, PAUL, *Calvin and Bullinger on the Lord's Supper* (Alcuin Club; Nottingham: Grove Books Ltd, 1989).

ROSS, D.S., 'Hooper's alleged authorship of *A Brief and Clear Confession of the Christian Faith*', *CH*, 39/1 (1970), 18-29.

ROSS, J.B., 'Gasparo Contarini and His Friends', *Studies in the Renaissance*, 17 (1970), 192-232.

RUMMEL, ERIKA, *The Confessionalisation of Humanism in Reformation Germany* (Oxford: OUP, 2000).

RUPP, E.G., *Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition (Mainly in the Reign of Henry VIII)* (Cambridge: CUP, 1949).

---, *The Righteousness of God: Luther Studies* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1953).

---, *Six Makers of English Religion 1500-1700* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1957).

---, 'John Bradford, Martyr. ob. 1 July, 1555', *The London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, 6th series/32 (1963), 50-55.

---, *Patterns of Reformation* (London: Epworth Press, 1969).

---, 'The Battle of the Books', in P.N. Brooks (ed.), *Reformation in Principle and Practice: Essays in Honour of A.G. Dickens* (London: Scolar Press, 1980), 1-19.

RYRIE, ALEC, 'Divine kingship and royal theology in Henry VIII's Reformation', *Reformation*, 7 (2002), 49-77.

---, 'The Strange Death of Lutheran England', *JEH*, 53/1 (2002), 64-92.

---, *The Gospel and Henry VIII: Evangelicals in the Early English Reformation* (Cambridge: CUP, 2003).

---, 'Gough, John (*d.*1543/4)', *ODNB* (OUP: 2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11136> accessed 8 January 2010.

---, 'Paths not taken in the British Reformations', *HJ*, 52/1 (2009), 1-22.

SANDERS, E.P., 'The Covenant as a Soteriological Category in the Nature of Salvation in Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism', in R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs (eds.), *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Culture in Late Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 11-44.

SCARISBRICK, J.J., *The Reformation and the English People* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984).

---, *Henry VIII* (2nd edn.; New Haven & London: YUP, 1997).

SCHNEIDER-LUDORFF, GURY, 'Philipp of Hesse as an example of princely Reformation: a contribution to Reformation studies', *RRR*, 8/3 (2006), 301-319.

SCHOFIELD, JOHN, *Philip Melanchthon and the English Reformation* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).

SEEBOHM, FREDERIC, *The Oxford Reformers: John Colet, Erasmus, and Thomas More* (3rd edn.; London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1911).

SELDERHUIS, HERMAN (ed.), *The Calvin Handbook* (Grand Rapids & Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2009).

SHAGAN, ETHAN, *Popular Politics and the English Reformation* (Cambridge: CUP, 2003).

SHARPE, KEVIN, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England* (New Haven & London: YUP, 2009).

SKINNER, QUENTIN, 'Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas', *History and Theory*, 8/1 (1969), 3-53.

SMEETON, DONALD, *Lollard themes in the Reformation theology of William Tyndale* (Kirksville, MO: SCJ Publishers, 1986).

SMITH, PRESERVED, 'Englishmen at Wittenberg in the Sixteenth Century', *EHR*, 36 (1921), 422-433.

SPAANS, JOKE, 'Reform in the Low Countries', in R. Po-chia Hsia (ed.), *A Companion to the Reformation World* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), 118-134.

SPEIGHT, HELEN, '"The Politics of Good Governance": Thomas Cromwell and the government of the south-west of England', *HJ*, 37/3 (1994), 623-638.

SPRUYT, B.J., 'Wessel Gansfort and Cornelis Hoen's *Epistola Christiana*: "The ring as a pledge of my love"', in F. Akkerman, G. Huisman, and A. Vanderjagt (eds.), *Wessel Gansfort (1419-1489) and Northern Humanism* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 122-141.

---, *Cornelius Henrici Hoen (Honius) and his Epistle on the Eucharist (1525)* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2006).

STAYER, J.M., 'Zwingli before Zurich: Humanist Reformer and Papal Partisan', *ARG*, 72 (1981), 55-67.

STEINMETZ, DAVID, *Calvin in Context* (Oxford & New York: OUP, 1995).

---, *Reformers in the Wings: From Geiler von Kayserberg to Theodore Beza* (2nd edn.; Oxford: OUP, 2001).

STEPHENS, W.P., *The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Martin Bucer* (Cambridge: CUP, 1970).

---, *The Theology of Huldrych Zwingli* (Oxford: OUP, 1986).

---, 'Huldrych Zwingli: The Swiss Reformer', *SJT*, 41/1 (1988), 27-47.

---, *Zwingli: An Introduction to His Thought* (Oxford: OUP, 1992).

---, 'Bullinger and the Anabaptists with reference to his *Von Dem Unverschamten Frevel* (1531) and to Zwingli's writings on the Anabaptists', *RRR*, 3 (2001), 96-107.

STREHLE, STEPHEN, '*Fides aut Foedus*: Wittenberg and Zurich in conflict over the Gospel', *SCJ*, 23/1 (1992), 3-20.

SYKES, NORMAN, *The Crisis of the Reformation* (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1938).

TEMPLE, WILLIAM, *Readings in St John's Gospel* (London: Macmillan, 1939).

THOMPSON, NICHOLAS, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and Patristic Tradition in the Theology of Martin Bucer, 1534-1546* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2005).

THOMSON, J.A.F., *The Later Lollards 1414-1520* (Oxford: OUP, 1965).

TJERNAGEL, N.S., *Henry VIII and the Lutherans: a study in Anglo-Lutheran relations from 1521 to 1547* (St Louis, MO: Concordia, 1965).

TOV, EMANUEL, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: collected essays on the Septuagint* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 1999).

TRACY, JAMES, 'Heresy Law and Centralisation under Mary of Hungary: conflict between the Council of Holland and the central government over the enforcement of Charles V's placards', *ARG*, 73 (1982), 284-307.

TRINKAUS, CHARLES, *The Scope of Renaissance Humanism* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1983).

TRINTERUD, LEONARD, 'The Origins of Puritanism', *CH*, 20/1 (1951), 37-57.

---, 'A Reappraisal of William Tyndale's Debt to Martin Luther', *CH*, 31 (1962), 24-45.

TRUEMAN, CARL, *Luther's Legacy: Salvation and English Reformers, 1525-1556* (Oxford: OUP, 1994).

TUDOR-CRAIG, PAMELA, 'Henry VIII and King David', *Early Tudor England: Proceedings of the 1987 Harlaxton Symposium* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1989), 183-205.

TYACKE, NICHOLAS, *Aspects of English Protestantism c.1530-1700* (Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 2001).

VAINIO, OLLI-PEKKA, *Justification and Participation in Christ: The Development of the Lutheran Doctrine of Justification from Luther to the Formula of Concord (1580)* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2008).

VENEMA, CORNELIS, 'Heinrich Bullinger's Correspondence on Calvin's Doctrine of Predestination, 1551-1553', *SCJ*, 17/4 (1986), 435-450.

---, *Heinrich Bullinger and the doctrine of predestination: author of "the other reformed tradition"?* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2002).

---, *Accepted and Renewed in Christ: the "Twofold Grace of God" and the Interpretation of Calvin's Theology* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007).

VISSER, DERK, 'Covenant', in H.J. Hillerbrand (ed.), *OER* (1; New York & Oxford: OUP, 1996), 442-445.

WABUDA, SUSAN, 'Shunamites and Nurses of the English Reformation: the Activities of Mary Glover, niece of Hugh Latimer', in W. Sheils and D. Wood (eds.), *Women in the Church* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990), 335-344.

---, 'Henry Bull, Miles Coverdale, and the Making of Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*', in D. Wood (ed.), *Martyrs and Martyrologies* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), 245-258.

---, 'Equivocation and Recantation during the English Reformation: the "Subtle Shadows" of Dr Edward Crome', *JEH*, 44/2 (1993), 224-242.

WALLACE, DEWEY, *Puritans and Predestination: grace in English Protestant theology, 1525-1695* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1982).

WALLACE, RONALD, *Calvin's Doctrine of Word and Sacrament* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1953).

---, *Calvin, Geneva and the Reformation: a study of Calvin as social reformer, churchman, pastor and theologian* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1988).

WALSER, GEORG, *The Greek of the Ancient Synagogue: an investigation on the Greek of the Septuagint, Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2001).

WALTON, ROBERT, *Zwingli's Theocracy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967).

WANDEL, LEE, *Always Among Us: Images of the Poor in Zwingli's Zurich* (Cambridge: CUP, 1990).

---, *Voracious Idols and Violent Hands: Iconoclasm in Reformation Zurich, Strasbourg, and Basel* (Cambridge: CUP, 1995).

---, *The Eucharist in the Reformation: Incarnation and Liturgy* (Cambridge: CUP, 2006).

---, 'The Body of Christ at Marburg, 1529', in R. Falkenburg, W. Melion, and T. Richardson (eds.), *Image and Imagination of the Religious Self in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 195-213.

WEIR, DAVID, *The Origins of the Federal Theology in Sixteenth-Century Reformation Thought* (Oxford: OUP, 1990).

WENDEL, FRANÇOIS, *Calvin: the origins and development of his religious thought*, trans. P. Mairet (London: Collins, 1963).

WERRELL, RALPH, *The Theology of William Tyndale* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 2006).

WEST, W.M.S., 'John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism [1]', *BQ*, 15/8 (1954), 346-368.

---, 'John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism [2]', *BQ*, 16/1 (1955), 22-46.

---, 'John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism [3]', *BQ*, 16/2 (1955), 67-88.

WHITE, HAYDEN, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (London & Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1987).

WILLIAMS, C.H., *William Tyndale* (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1969).

WOODING, LUCY, *Rethinking Catholicism in Reformation England* (Oxford: OUP, 2000).

---, *Henry VIII* (London & New York: Routledge, 2009).

WRIGHT, DAVID, 'The Ethical Use of the Old Testament in Luther and Calvin: a comparison', *SJT*, 36 (1983), 463-483.

WRIGHT, JONATHAN, 'Marian Exiles and the Legitimacy of Flight from Persecution', *JEH*, 52/2 (2001), 220-243.

Unpublished Dissertations

DALTON, ALISON, 'John Hooper and his Networks: a Study of Change in Reformation England' (unpublished University of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 2008).

DUNNAN, STUART, 'The Preaching of Hugh Latimer: a reappraisal' (unpublished University of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1991).

HILDEBRANDT, ESTHER, 'A Study of the English Protestant Exiles in Northern Switzerland and Strasbourg 1539-47, and their role in the English Reformation' (unpublished University of Durham Ph.D. thesis, 1982).

JOHNSTON, P.F., 'The Life of John Bradford, the Manchester Martyr, c.1510-1555' (unpublished University of Oxford B.Litt. thesis, 1963).

WAINWRIGHT, R.J.D., 'Covenant, duty and obligation in the thought of William Tyndale and John Frith' (unpublished University of Oxford M.St. thesis, 2008).

WHEELER, MEGAN, 'Protestants, Prisoners and the Marian Persecution' (unpublished University of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 2006).