THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

CONSTRUCTING A GODLY SOCIETY: THE TEMPLATE FOR A REFORMED
COMMUNITY IN THE WRITINGS OF JOHN HOOPER (C.1500-1555)

Brent James Brodie

Doctor of Philosophy
The University of Edinburgh
2016

SIGNED DECLARATION

I, Brent James Brodie, hereby declare that this thesis represents my own composition and work. This work has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.

_____   _____

Brent James Brodie   Date

Abstract

Ever since John Hooper (c.1500-1555), the future Bishop of Gloucester and Worcester, made his famous stand against wearing vestments that placed him in opposition to the leading English clergy, he has been branded in the history of the English Reformation by many as a renegade and a radical. However, this thesis presents Hooper as one who saw himself as a conformist who sought to create the reformed community he desired within the established political and religious customs of his day. To explore this idea, this thesis examines how Hooper imagined a Protestant community for the kingdom of England or elsewhere. It identifies what Hooper considered to be the sources of God's authority in the community; how that authority was exercised through officials within the community and through godly laws, strong clerical preaching and a universal commitment to vocation. It examines how the people should respond to leaders who brought the successful introduction of Protestantism to their community. Hooper's vision was advanced in a series of tracts and letters written in Zurich and shortly after his return to England (1547-1551). They were composed at a time when Hooper enjoyed the greatest freedom to articulate his ideas in the company of his mentor, Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575), and refined through his tenure as a bishop in the Church of England. The reformed community that Hooper envisioned was one that was dependent upon a strong magistrate but also required the acceptance and participation of its members in fully embracing their own vocation and reform. Hooper strongly affirmed that leaders – both ecclesiastical and civil – had a duty to model their reformation in accordance with God's Law, the Ten Commandments. He assumed that the people would abide by the authority of the Decalogue and practice the Protestant faith together. He also believed that living in such a community would usher in a period of peace and prosperity. Hooper's zeal for reform was demonstrated by his belief that the Reformation required wholehearted embrace by everyone, but he was willing to operate within established English traditions, in order to see his Protestant beliefs realised within the community.

Lay Summary

John Hooper (c.1500-1555), one-time Protestant Bishop of Gloucester and Worcester, famously denounced clergymen who wore the priestly vestments that had been used by Catholic clergy. His public denunciation was ill received by other leading Protestant English clergy and ever since he has been branded by many in the history of the English Reformation as a renegade and a radical. However, this thesis presents Hooper as one who saw himself as a conformist who sought to create the reformed community he desired within the established political and religious customs of his day. To explore this idea, this thesis assesses how Hooper imagined a Protestant community for the kingdom of England or elsewhere. It identifies what Hooper considered to be the sources of God's authority in the community; how that authority was exercised through officials within the community and through godly laws, strong clerical preaching and a universal commitment to their profession. It examines how the people should respond to leaders who brought the successful introduction of Protestantism to their community. Hooper's vision was largely advanced in a series of tracts and letters written whilst he was in Zurich (1547-1549) and in the period after his return to England (1549-1552). Many of his ideas were composed at the time when Hooper enjoyed the greatest freedom to articulate his ideas in the company of his mentor, Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575), and later refined during his tenure as a bishop in the Church of England. The reformed community that Hooper envisioned was one that was dependent upon a strong magistrate but also required the acceptance and participation of its members in fully embracing their own profession and reform. Hooper strongly affirmed that leaders – both church and civil – had a duty to model their reformation in accordance with God's Law, the Ten Commandments. He assumed that the people would abide by the authority of the Ten Commandments and practice the Protestant faith together. He also believed that living in such a community would usher in a period of peace and prosperity. Hooper's zeal for reform was demonstrated by his belief that the Reformation required wholehearted embrace by everyone, but he was willing to operate within established English traditions, in order to see his Protestant beliefs realised within the community.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my greatest thanks to my principal supervisor Professor Jane Dawson. Her leadership and commitment to my improvement have brought immense personal and professional benefits to me and she has helped me to see this project through to what I wanted it be. I also thank her for her patience and direction as I worked through the various stages of understanding Hooper. I would also like to thank my examiners, Professor Charlotte Methuen and Dr Sara Parvis, for their helpful suggestions and critiques.

The New College Library and Special Research Collects staff have been most helpful to me in acquiring the necessary primary material and for helping me track down documents from Zurich. I am very grateful to them for their engagement. I am indebted to Dr Darren C. Marks who first introduced me to the theology of Heinrich Bullinger which eventually led me to John Hooper, and to the Rev. Dr R. Dale Dawson for encouraging me to pursue Church History.

I would also like to thank Amy, Thomas and Robert for their assistance in proof-reading my chapters at various stages. A special thank you as well to my wife Rachel for her proof-reading, but also for her constant love, support and encouragement when I needed it most; without her I would not have been able to complete this thesis. Thank you as well to my parents James and Barbara for your encouragement as I followed my dream of pursuing a PhD.

List of Abbreviations

AM	Foxe, John. *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe: With a Life of the Martyrologist, and Vindication of the Work*, edited by George Townsend. 8 vols. London: Seeley, Burnside and Seeley, 1843-1849.
APC	Dasent, John Roche, ed. *Acts of the Privy Council, New Series*, vols. 2-4: *1547-1554*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1890-1892.
BGAS	Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucester Archaeological Society
Cal. Pat. Rolls	Brodie, R.H and H.C. Maxwell Lyte. *Calendar of the patent rolls preserved in the Public Record Office. Prepared under the superintendence of the deputy keeper of the records for the reign of Edward VI 1547-1553*. 5 vols. London: HMSO, 1924-1926.
CSP Dom.	Knighton, C.S. ed. *Calendar of State Papers Domestic Series of the reign of Edward VI 1547-1553*. Revised edition. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1992.
CSP Sp.	Hume, Martin A.S. and Royall Tyler, eds. *Calendar of Letters, Despatches, and State Papers, Relating to the Negotiations between England and Spain, Preserved in the Archives at Vienna, Simancas, and elsewhere*, vols. 9-11: *Edward VI, 1547-1553*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1912-1916.
Ecc. Mems	Strype, John *Ecclesiastical Memorials of the Church of England: Relating Chiefly to Religion and its Reformation of it, under the reigns of King Henry VIII. King Edward VI. And Queen Mary the First*. 7 vols. London: Samuel Bagster, 1816.

EW	John Hooper, *Earlier Writings of Bishop Hooper: Together with His Letters and Other Pieces*. translated by Rev. Charles Nevison. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1853.
LW	*Later Writings of Bishop Hooper: Together with His Letters and Other Pieces*, translated by Rev. Charles Nevison. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1852.
ODNB	*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H.C.G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edition, edited by David Cannadine, April 2016.
OL	*Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation Written During the Reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Mary: chiefly from the archives of Zurich*, edited by Hastings Robinson. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for the Parker Society, 1846; 1847.
The First (-Fifth) Decade	Bullinger, Heinrich. *Bullinger's Decades in Four Volumes*, translated by H.I, edited by Thomas Harding. 4 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1848-1852.

With the exception of the titles listed above, full bibliographical details are given on first mention with short titles employed thereafter. The dates and spelling of places and names have been modernised for the sake of clarity. Reformation has been capitalised when referring to the European or national programme. In all other uses the word in lower case appears. The thesis has maintained the pagination of Hooper's writings as they appear in the two Parker Society volumes indication *Early Writings* [EW] or *Later Writings* [LW]. In the first reference, the original publication date is also given.

Contents

Introduction

In the year 1547, John Hooper (c.1500-1555), an English religious exile from the West Country, and future Bishop of Gloucester and Worcester made his way with his wife Anna and infant daughter Rachel, to Zurich. For the better part of two years, he would become immersed in the doctrines, customs and style of Zurich Protestantism under its leader and personal friend, Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575). These experiences helped him to create a series of writings reflecting all that he had witnessed and believed a Protestant community could achieve. There, he also became acquainted with other like-minded thinkers who would prove valuable assets to his future reforming efforts in England with the Strangers' Churches and as a bishop. When the winds of fate blew towards a favourable view of English Protestantism Hooper returned to England in 1549 and brought with him these ideas about how England might be reformed. In January 1547, the nine-year-old boy-king Edward VI (reigned 1547-1553) had succeeded his father Henry VIII (reigned 1509-1547) who had broken away with the Roman Catholic Church but retained many Catholic practices. Until October 1549 England was in reality governed by Edward's maternal uncle, the Duke of Somerset, and his Protestant-leaning council, and the path of English Protestantism had not yet been laid out when Hooper returned to England in May 1549. Hooper's Zurich experiences and writings to which he would frequently return in his public preaching and sermons enabled him to present a vision for how a nation could become truly Protestant.

While this thesis focuses upon Hooper's vision of a reformed community, that vision formed part of a widespread network of reformed ideas developed during the mid-sixteenth century. The present study began with an investigation into how the Reformation in Zurich, and especially the ideas of Heinrich Bullinger, were introduced within the Protestant kingdom of King Edward VI. These ideas were championed by a group of Continental refugees and their supporters who had had previous contact with Bullinger and shared his hope of spreading a Zurich-style

Reformation throughout Europe.[1] Men such as John a Lasco, John ab Ulmis, Martin Micron and John Knox found fertile ground in England to demonstrate their brand of Protestant ideas and became influential in the drive for ecclesiastical reform in Edward's kingdom. As a friend of Bullinger and these exiles, Hooper became one of the main conduits for the group's ideas, sharing them with those responsible for implementing reform in England. After his appointment as Bishop of Gloucester Hooper was also the highest ranking and most influential figure within the Church of England, and able to implement its vision of a reformed community in practice.

This thesis investigates how, in Hooper's understanding, community functioned, beginning with the idea that God had given humanity the Ten Commandments as a model for living faithfully in a community according to God's Law. This community included civil and ecclesiastical leaders, as well as the people. The vision of every person obeying God's Law, led by the example and authority of their civil and ecclesiastical superiors operating under the direction of God, was the organising principle for Hooper's society and the framework for his godly community. This thesis will examine his vision and consider how Hooper sought to implement and sustain the Reformation. While he was not a political strategist, his ideas for the building up of the community were based on a double vision of leadership by the civil magistrates and the clergy, which spearheaded its reformation, and response by members of the community, who reacted to the godly model by recognising and fulfilling their own vocations.

This study aligns itself with previous research on Hooper's theology rather than with biographical studies of Hooper. However, while writers exploring Hooper's theological positions have sought to clarify and understand the consequences of what Hooper wrote, this thesis will address a different question. It will investigate how Hooper sought to ensure that his ideas for reform could be implemented and protected, as well as the mechanisms he included within the

---

[1] Euler and Cross have both examined the networks and correspondence between England and Zurich from the Henrician period onwards. See Carrie Euler, *Couriers of the Gospel* Zurich: *England and Zurich, 1531-1558* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag Zurich, 2006); Claire Cross, "Continental Students and the Protestant Reformation in England in the Sixteenth Century," in *Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent c.1500-1750*, edited by Derek Baker and C.W. Dugmore (Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1979).

structures of the community to ensure that government authorities, the church and the people of the community brought those reforms to fruition. Therefore, this thesis examines how Hooper put his ideas forward and gives a more complete picture of what living in a reformed community meant. It does not consider how compatible Hooper's ideas were with the English context nor whether they were practical. That would require an examination of how authority actually functioned in Edward VI's England and how Hooper's ideas fitted into the social fabric of English life and politics.

Outline of Chapters

The first two chapters introduce John Hooper through his writings and his underlying theological principles and show the background ideas that influenced his ideas about a godly community. In the first chapter, the emphasis is on the historical events experienced by Hooper around the time he constructed his ideas for a community. This is not a biography of Hooper and omits most of his earlier life. It begins with his conversion to Protestantism because his earlier life has little direct significance for his Protestant writings and template for a godly community, and because Hooper had the greatest freedom to write during the period between 1547 and 1551. His tenure as bishop will also be considered, in order to demonstrate how Hooper attempted to put his ideas into practice in the context of his ministry as a bishop in the Edwardian church.

The second chapter departs from Hooper's biography to consider the relevant theological priorities that governed his opinions when devising the template for his community. Hooper was not a systematic thinker, as was his mentor Bullinger; nevertheless, when considering his understanding of how humanity, as people tainted by sin, lived in response to God, a pattern of understanding develops in Hooper's writings. While the chapter considers the process of how individuals come to understand their relationship with God, the chapter highlights how individuals should learn to reject sin and embrace godly living within the community. Another key idea is the way in which Christ modelled authority over the church and government. Hooper outlined how the leaders of the community – the magistrate and church leaders – assume attributes of Christ's office as priest, prophet and king. His more

general aim, however, was to show the theological rationale for the need to respond faithfully to God's calling. In doing so, his purpose in creating a godly community becomes apparent: humanity once possessed the knowledge to live in perfect obedience to God; however, tainted by sin, humanity had to follow the Law of God to reclaim that lost knowledge, and established authority made this possible.

Chapters three, four and five address the figureheads of authority in Hooper's template for the community. The third chapter considers the magistrate and the powers associated with his office.[2] The magistrate was the spearhead of the reformed community and Hooper granted the office holder considerable control to guide the community through its reformation and ensure that the Reformation was protected from those who might disrupt the pattern Hooper envisioned for the community. Hooper argued that the magistrate held a divine office, believing that God had given power to the magistrate so that he might act in God's place.[3] The magistrate was therefore to be recognised as acting according to divine will. Hooper based his model on Moses and the kings of the Old Testament, holding that the magistrate's purpose was to ensure that the people followed the Ten Commandments, God's template for godly living. The laws that the magistrate was to create protected the Reformation and the free preaching of the gospel because they were based upon the Ten Commandments. Finally, the chapter considers the ability of the magistrate to protect the Reformation. Hooper gave the magistrate the power to punish those who broke the laws as God had punished in the Old Testament. He assumed that punishment would serve as a deterrent to those breaking the law and would encourage obedience. Hooper also examined the magistrate's relationship to the clergy and his authority to call ecclesiastical councils and enforce godly doctrine; however, the magistrate was not permitted to interpret doctrine, because this was a power given to the church.

The fourth chapter establishes the models for reform considered by Hooper and serves as a preface to the discussion, in the fifth chapter, of how the clergy were to be reformed. It shows the extent to which Hooper's reform for the church was governed by a desire to emulate the early Church, understood in terms of its

---

[2] The question of the authority of a female monarch did not arise for Hooper as it would in different ways for different theologians under Mary I and Elizabeth I.
[3] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, (London: 1550), *EW*, 495.

simplicity and its commitment to the true preaching of the gospel and the proper administration of the sacraments. Such an alignment with the early Church in the present would ensure that the church would remain part of the true church. For Hooper, the church in Zurich best reflected the practice of the early Church. Driven by a biblical image, applicable historical evidence from the Church Fathers and a church that best identified this practice in sixteenth-century life, Hooper had acquired the means to criticise contemporary ecclesiastical models and present his platform to those in England, with whom he was most familiar. The chapter concludes with an example of how Hooper envisioned the reformation of church buildings as displaying these reforms. Drawing upon his *Injunctions*, Hooper demanded that in addition to incorporating official policy, the church was to reflect that of Zurich in the appearance of its buildings and in the manner in which it administered the sacraments.

The fifth chapter considers the powers of the church in the community and how God had given the church powers that were independent of the magistrate. In Hooper's community, the church was obedient to the magistrate but had absolute authority over its own jurisdiction, provided nothing contradicted the Bible. Hooper gave the church this authority to direct the church towards apostolic simplicity. To achieve such a state of simplicity, Hooper argued that the church's ministers were to cultivate simplicity by preaching from the Bible and practicing the Lord's Supper in order to create an atmosphere that would bring the parishioners into line with the early Church. The atmosphere would be enhanced by establishing a closer bond between the minister and his parishioners. Where ministers failed to create an atmosphere similar to the early Church, Hooper considered how the bishop could maintain effective oversight over his clergy and ensured that they performed their duties properly. This included ecclesiastical discipline for both the clergy and the laity and maintaining administrative control over doctrine to ensure conformity throughout the community. Hooper's plan for the church in society is also considered. He did not comment on charitable infrastructure, instead advocating an organic charitable model whereby parishioners would respond to the godly message preached to them.

Chapters six and seven turn from discussing those in authority to assessing the lives of citizens within the community. Chapter six considers the assumption that the average citizen of the community would be most influenced by their clergyman. As the person responsible for preaching about leading a godly life, ministers and their families should model godly behaviour so that behaviour could be copied by the members of the community. This chapter considers Hooper's ideas that if ministers lived according to the Ten Commandments, they would be properly following God and modelling that behaviour for the people. Since following the Ten Commandments was the template for perfect obedience to God, the chapter explores potential impediments that Hooper identified when a person was trying to follow God's Law. Also included is a more practical analysis of how the clergy demonstrated proper social relationships in sixteenth-century life, through godly marriage and raising children.

The final chapter moves beyond household relationships and considers how citizens should behave as members of the community. Whereas the first six chapters explore how authority was exercised and modelled, this chapter considers how those without authority contributed to the success of the community. Dealing with the general population was a distant third place in Hooper's writings about his community, behind the magistrate and the clergy, but he firmly believed that each person had a significant part to play in the success of the community. The chapter examines how Christ was the model for contributing to the success of the community as a citizen and how he interacted with those in authority and most importantly, demonstrated his vocation. The chapter considers vocation as the principal, independent, role that each person undertakes as a member of the community. While secular in nature, such a vocation was also a spiritual calling, and failure to complete one's vocation, as in the example of Jonah, might bring the downfall of the community. Citizens should behave dutifully by honouring both the magistrate and clergy through faithfully executing their civil and ecclesiastical responsibilities. The final section analyses the interaction between citizens in the community by examining how lawful divorce might be obtained, how individuals were to work cooperatively with others in their daily life and how their kindness and charity should reflect their inner spiritual convictions.

A Historiographical Survey of Hooper Studies within the Scholarship of the English Reformation

Hooper was rarely the sole focus of study in the years following his martyrdom. In consequence, Hooper, even though he was one of the more prolific Protestant writers in the brief reign of Edward VI, has often been seen as a marginal figure, referred to only sparingly by scholars of the Reformation in England. When Hooper has been mentioned, it has almost exclusively has been to interpret his involvement in the vestment controversy. This survey of historiography will introduce key writings about Hooper, from his contemporaries onwards, highlighting the historical context in which these scholars were working. In doing so, it will identify how Hooper has been received amongst scholars since the Reformation, in the context of a shifting historiographical tradition, and demonstrate how Hooper scholarship has come to recognise Hooper's ideas as important in their own right.

This review does not seek to cover all the literature related to Hooper and number of secondary sources have been omitted because they only mention Hooper or his view of the community in passing. Relevant material from these studies has been considered elsewhere in the thesis. Instead, this review examines the significant studies of Hooper, with a particular emphasis on mapping how scholars have come to recognise Hooper's programme for reform. This development underlies the exploration in this thesis of Hooper's ideas on how a community should embrace reform.

Early Reception of John Hooper 1555 – Eighteenth Century

The earliest reception of Hooper was made by his contemporaries. After the death of Edward VI in 1553, and in the face of Mary I's subsequent persecution and burning of many Edwardian clergy, the future of Protestantism in England was very much in doubt. To bolster their cause, Protestant writers created a narrative about martyrs, identifying them as advocates for the gospel. The most prominent account of these martyrs was by Foxe, a contemporary of Hooper, who wrote of having met Hooper in Worcester.[4] Foxe's glowing account of Hooper's life saw him as a friend of the

---

[4] Foxe, *AM*, 6:640.

Reformation, but he struggled to account for what he saw as Hooper's severe demeanour.[5] Foxe here reflected the views of others amongst Hooper's contemporaries: even Micron, Hooper's most ardent sympathiser in the Strangers' Church, had written to Bullinger, imploring him to advise Hooper to exercise some gentleness in his temperance.[6] Nevertheless, early reception of Hooper, no doubt enhanced by the fact that he was martyred by Queen Mary I, was firmly categorised as a hero of the Protestant faith, and an important player within Edward VI's reformation.

In the seventeenth century, scholarship of the English Reformation was reflective of the turbulent events that enveloped the country throughout the century.[7] England was engulfed in civil war, leading to the execution of King Charles I, a period of commonwealth under Oliver Cromwell, and restoration of monarchy under Charles II. Such turbulence led to heightened sensitivities surrounding the Reformation and the question of how reformers dealt with issues surrounding authority.[8] For Hooper scholarship, Hooper's rejection of official policy in the vestment controversy became a prominent lens through which Hooper was interpreted. In this period, some consideration was given to Hooper as an independent thinker, and Hooper became seen as a leader within a longer tradition of puritan and non-conforming factions within the Church of England.[9]

The harshest of Hooper's seventeenth-century critics aligned with more high church sympathies of the Church of England. Thus Heylyn, chaplain successively to kings Charles I and Charles II, condemned Reformed theology due to its adoption by puritan factions within the Church. For him, Hooper was a problematic figure who "also signifies unto the Brethren his dislike of these Vestments, and thereby strengthened and confirmed them in their former obstinacy: And finally, left no stone

---

[5] Foxe, *AM*, 6:640.
[6] Robinson, *OL*, 2:576.
[7] Anthony Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-century England: The Career and Writings of Peter* Heylyn (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), 2-3.
[8] See Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic*, 225-226.
[9] Thomas Fuller, *Church History of Britain From the Time of Jesus Christ to the Century MDCXLVIII*, 3 vols., (London: Thomas Tess and Son, 1837), 2:330.

unmoved… purified to the very last."[10] For Heylyn, reform was needed, but Hooper was far too extreme in his efforts: indeed, his influence was lamentable in the history of the English Reformation. For these high-churchmen, Hooper became a useful villain in the effort to discredit puritans.[11] Fuller, who rose to prominence within the Restoration period echoes Heylyn's sentiment: he "seemed to some to have brought Switzerland back with him, in his harsh, rough, and unpleasant behaviour, being grave into rigour, and severe into surliness."[12] Moreover, Hooper's close relationship with Bullinger, a Swiss reformer, was ample grounds to suspect Hooper of serving foreign interests over English reform.[13] Fuller's history of the English church sees Hooper as one of leaders of its puritan wing and questions whether Hooper was truly part of the Anglican tradition.[14]

Opponents to this high church wing of Anglicanism were sympathetic to Calvinist doctrine and practice within the Church of England, and kinder to Hooper. Even for them, however, contemporary events probably tarnished Hooper's image. While Hooper had been a promoter of the gospel and friend of the Reformation, his challenge to authority prevented a whole-hearted embrace of his legacy. Bishop Gilbert Burnet, who had fled England during the Restoration period, and supported the Protestant William of Orange, saw Hooper as a positive influence on English reform, writing in the 1680's that even Ridley "was very earnest to have Hooper made a bishop".[15] However, when considering Hooper's opposition to wearing clerical vestments, Burnet was less willing to paint Hooper in such a positive light: "his standing out so long, and yielding in the end, lost him much of the popularity,

---

[10] Peter Heylyn, *Aerius Revidius or the History of the Presbyterians* (Oxford: Printed for Jo. Cosley, 1670), 20.

[11] There is little consensus on what constitutes inclusion as a proto-puritan. However, the term puritan or non-conformist, when used to describe Hooper, has usually referred to the belief that he wanted to see the church purged of all remnants of Catholicism. This has led Lorimer, for instance, to distinguish Edwardian forms of puritanism by referring to Hooper as an Episcopal puritan and John Knox as a Presbyterian puritan. Peter Lorimer, *John Knox and the Church of England: His Work in Her Pulpit and His Influence Upon Her Liturgy, Articles, and Parties* (London: Henry S. King and Co., 1875), *34.*

[12] Fuller, *Church History of Britain From the Time of Jesus Christ to the Century MDCXLVIII*, 330.

[13] See Heylyn, *Aerius Revidius*, 20-21.

[14] Fuller, *Church History of Britain*, 330-331.

[15] Gilbert Burnet, *The History of the Reformation in England*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1841), 3:303.

that, to speak freely, he seemed to be too fond of."[16] Indeed, writing at the close of the seventeenth-century, Strype maintained the view that the vestment controversy was generally lamentable for Protestantism as a whole and throughout Europe.[17] Nonetheless, Restoration scholarship held that, for better or for worse, Hooper was to be included within the English Reformation, and seen as a force for change in the Church.

Tractarianism and the Defence of Hooper in Nineteenth Century Thought

Beginning in the mid-nineteenth century, calls for a reinterpretation of the scope of the English Reformation were articulated by a group of scholarly clergy at Oxford. The Tractarians, as they were later identified, drew their name from a series of essays entitled *Tracts for the Times*, written between 1831 and 1844.[18] The movement's principal leaders, Newman, Pusey and Keble, were concerned that the English Reformation had, from the seventeenth century onwards, become too closely associated with puritanism.[19] The Tractarians saw evidence of puritanism within the English Church through the blandness of its church ornamentation and what they viewed as the highly legalistic nature of its doctrine.[20] Newman, who subsequently converted to Roman Catholicism, and his friends saw considerable commonalities with worship and doctrine with the Roman Catholic Church, which had itself undergone considerable reform since the sixteenth century, more indeed than with the puritan factions of the English Church.[21] Scholarship about Hooper was significantly shaped by reactions to the Oxford Movement, as evidenced through discussions of his refusal to wear ecclesiastical vestments for his consecration as bishop.[22] Hooper's defiance was largely interpreted in two ways: as a defender of the Protestant English Church, or, as an advocate of the development of puritanism, to varying degrees, within the English Church.

---

[16] Burnet, *History of the Church*, 3:306.
[17] John Strype, *Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Cranmer, Sometime Lord Archbishop of Canterbury* (London: George Routledge & Co., 1853), 1:312.
[18] John Henry Newman, *et al., Tracts for the Times*, vol. 1: *Tracts 1-46*, (London: Printed for J.G.F and J. Rivington, 1870).
[19] Peter Benedict Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 4; See Newman et al., *Tract 36*.
[20] Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, 4; See Newman et al., *Tract 6*.
[21] Newman et al., *Tract 38*.
[22] See below, 45-46.

Those who saw Hooper as a defender of a Reformed English Church were largely evangelicals and generally, low church Anglicans. Scholars such as Burt and Gough, saw Hooper as a champion of anti-papal sentiment in the English Reformation.[23] For low church Anglicans, Hooper's seemingly relentless pursuit of reforms and his stark opposition to any remnant of Roman Catholicism in Protestant worship, were powerful evidence for their cause.[24] The publications of Henrician, Edwardian, and Elizabethan tracts by the Parker Society are illustrative of the interests of this group. The Parker Society published two volumes of Hooper's surviving writings together with his extant letters.[25] By publishing Hooper's writings, alongside other leading Protestants of Edward's reign, readers were to be reminded of what these Edwardian Reformers accomplished, and reject those who sought to allow (or still worse, welcome) Roman Catholic influence back to English shores.[26] Similarly, Burt presented Hooper's reforms as a model for what other reformers wanted to achieve,[27] arguing that even in their objections to Hooper's defiance, Cranmer and Ridley wanted to be rid of ecclesiastical ceremony.[28]

Dixon, in contrast, who was firmly within the high church tradition, categorised Hooper as a father of non-conformity.[29] Despite this categorisation, Dixon rejected the notion that Hooper's obstinacy at defying the Privy Council was a break within the English Church: "The first authors of Nonconformity, Hooper and his fellows, were so far from disliking uniformity as a general system, that many of them were licensed preachers, that is, they belonged to a band of men who undertook the special duty of recommending Uniformity to the nation."[30] Here, Dixon presented Hooper as one challenging policy but favoured the unity of the English church,

---

[23] Henry Gough, *A General Index to the Publications of the Parker Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1855), iii-iv; Diarmaid MacCulloch, "The Myth of the English Reformation," *Journal of British Studies* 20, no. 1 (1991): 3.
[24] See MacCulloch, "The Myth of the English Reformation," 3-4.
[25] See Hooper, *EW*, and *LW*, and Robinson, *OL*, 33-106.
[26] As Wilson rightly contends, there were considerable political factors involved with this movement. Roman Catholicism was viewed as a foreign influence which threatened the sovereignty of Great Britain. See Wilson, "John Hooper and the English Reformation under Edward VI 1547-1553," (PhD diss., Queen's University, Kingston 1994), 10.
[27] Robert K. Burt, *The First Protest, or the Father of Non-Conformity* (Paternoster Row, London: W. Kent and Co., 1862), 5.
[28] Burt, *The First Protest*, 15.
[29] Richard Watson Dixon, *History of the Church from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction*, vol. 3: *Edward VI. A.D. 1549-1553*, (London: George Routledge and sons, 1885), 184.
[30] Dixon, *History of the Church*, 3:185.

rather than as a dissenter. Importantly, Dixon re-established the idea that Hooper's vision of reform was complex, and could not be easily categorised by anachronistic titles such as puritan and non-conformist. Price, writing a half century later in 1938, also highlighted Hooper's "puritan outlook" through his episcopal administration.[31] While predominately interested in cataloguing Hooper's activities as a bishop, Price's study, along with those by Gairdner, Baskerville, and Hockaday in the early decades of the twentieth century, produced evidence of Hooper's diocesan visitations and the failure of many clergy to reach Hooper's standards.[32] Price did however afford Hooper some lenience in his study, arguing that Hooper's exercise of justice was merciful and geared towards reconciling the penitent to the church and to God. [33]

Hooper and the Via Media in the Twentieth Century

By the mid-twentieth century, discussion of the English via media had changed. In this interpretation, the English Reformation was unique. It was firmly Protestant, but it was a broad umbrella of both reformist and traditionalist components, which consistently battled against the extremes of both Catholicism and hard-line reformers who attempted to commandeer the English church for their own ends. Scholars such as Dickens[34] and Elton[35] stressed the reforming efforts of Thomas Cromwell and Thomas Cranmer. The latter was seen as the great ecclesiastical leader who navigated this middle course. There remains within this view disagreement as to whether or not the entire Edwardian reign was an aberration of the via media due to the "foreign" Protestant influences of Bucer, Martyr, and a Lasco.[36]

Consequently, in this period Hooper was often described as either the hard-line reformer, or as one who pandered to foreign reform ideas and was wholly oblivious of the uniqueness of English reform. Once again, Hooper's refusal to wear

---

[31] F.D Price, "Gloucester Diocese Under Bishop Hooper, 1551-3," *BGAS* 60 (1938): 59.

[32] James Gairdner, "Bishop Hooper's Visitation of Gloucester," *The English Historical Review* 19, no. 73 (1904): 98-121. See also G. Baskerville, "Elections to Convocation in the Diocese of Gloucester Under Bishop Hooper," *The English Historical Review* 44, no. 173 (1929): 1-32; F.S. Hockaday, "The Consistory Court in the Diocese of Gloucester," *BGAS* 46 (1924): 195-287.

[33] Price, "Gloucester Diocese Under Bishop Hooper, 1551-3," 89.

[34] A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation*, 2nd edition (London: BT Batsford, 1989).

[35], G.R. Elton, *Reform and Reformation, 1509-1558*, (London: Arnold, 1977).

[36] M.L. Bush, *Government Policy of Protector Somerset* (London: Edward Arnold, 1975), 104. Cited in Wilson, "John Hooper and the English Reformation under Edward VI," 19.

vestments, because of its challenge to authority, was seen as the seminal event in Hooper's career. Because Hooper was often involved in disputes with Archbishop Cranmer and because he was a proponent of Zwinglian doctrine, he was largely condemned as obstinate, or even dismissed outright. Thus Elton characterised Hooper as an obstinate man with tremendous, if not obnoxious, religious fervour which ran into conflict with more politically astute minds, and smacked of puritanism: "He had all [its] hallmarks: blazing sincerity, intolerable obstinacy, devotion to small points, bad manners, and utter confidence in his own judgement and conscience."[37] However, as has been observed by Wilson, these views were presented in studies focused on protecting the image of Cranmer and *via-media* of the English Reformation.[38] More substantive studies of Hooper's legacy and of the vestment controversy have profound implications for our understanding of his template for a godly society.

Others scholars, writing with less interest in protecting an image of those within the English Reformation, saw puritanism as a key link, strengthening foreign influences between England and the Continent. West's mid-twentieth century thesis on Bullinger's impact on Hooper's puritanism argued that Hooper, the Zwinglian prophet, brought a Zurich-style puritanism to England that would be adapted by later Genevan interpreters.[39] West's intention was to prove that through Bullinger and Zwingli, English Puritanism had its origins in Zurich rather than Calvin's Geneva.[40] This focus required West to understand Hooper through the lens of commonalities between Zurich theology and later Elizabethan trends. West was effective at capturing Hooper's affinity for Zurich and his desire for reform of the English church along the lines he found in Zurich. However, an important omission in West's research was any recognition that Hooper's affinity with Zurich arose from his belief that the city effectively reflected what he read in the Bible, something this investigation will consider.

---

[37] G.R. Elton, *England under the Tudors* (London: Methuen, 1974), 211.
[38] Wilson, "John Hooper and the English Reformation Under Edward VI," 12-18.
[39] W.M.S. West, "A Study of John Hooper with Special Reference to His Contact with Henry Bullinger," (PhD diss., University of Zurich, 1953), 1.
[40] West, "A Study of John Hooper with Special Reference to His Contact with Henry Bullinger,'' 1.

Another group of studies sought to place Hooper in the context of "parties" within the English church. In his study, *Tudor Puritanism*, Knappen argued that Hooper's opposition to vestments was evidence that he desired a whole-scale abandonment of all traces of Catholicism.[41] Knappen suggested that in this respect Hooper was in stark opposition to the "Anglican Party" through his opposition to the bishops, who Hooper saw as corrupting Edward VI's Council.[42] Jordan presented Hooper as part of a larger evangelical party,[43] which he saw, not as a formal fraternity, but as a group of individuals with common ideas. It was led by Hugh Latimer and included reformers such as Thomas Becon, Thomas Lever and John Bale in addition to Hooper, all of whom rejected religious pluralism and, with the exception of Latimer, held to a theological Zwinglian allegiance.[44] Jordan argued for the strength of Hooper's commitment to spiritual reform through social causes, commending his Lenten Sermons for their chastisement of those in power, and commenting elsewhere that the sermons were direct in their ability to address individuals. Jordan also described the rural clergy as, "intellectually and spiritually inert," suggesting that by improving the state of living and the competence of the clergy through education and rigorous discipline, the people might then embrace Protestantism.[45]

In his doctoral thesis in 1970, Diebler argued that Hooper was the face of English puritan piety during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries,[46] attempting to downplay continuities between Hooper's earlier life as a Cistercian monk and his time as a bishop, to make Hooper the link between Zwingli and later English puritans. Diebler was here following West, but was more explicit in identifying

---

[41] Marshall M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism* (Gloucester, Massachusetts: Peter Smith, 1963), 84.

[42] Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, 87.

[43] W.K. Jordan, *Edward VI: The Threshold of Power. The Dominance of the Duke of Northumberland* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1970), 307.

[44] There is little written evidence that links Hooper directly with any of these individuals. Of the three, Thomas Becon was a chaplain to Somerset at the same time as Hooper. The strongest link between these men seems to be their affections for Bullinger. John Bale lived in Zurich until 1547 and Thomas Becon was certainly aware of Bullinger's writings. See Theodor Vetter, *Relations Between England and Zurich during the Reformation* (London: Eliot Stock, 1904), 24.

[45] Jordan, *Edward VI*, 304.

[46] Edwin Clyde Deibler Jr., "Bishop John Hooper, a Link Connecting the Reformation Thought of Ulrich Zwingli and the Zurich Tradition with the Early English Pietistic Puritanism," (PhD diss., Temple University, 1970), 562.

particular Elizabethan puritans. For Diebler, Hooper's puritanism was the product of his commitment to the Bible, biblical authority and the complete eradication of Catholic practice, and his abhorrence of ritual had been discovered in Zurich and brought back to England. [47] Diebler's insistence on Hooper's simplicity as a form of puritanism was useful as it allowed him to focus upon piety; however, in doing so, Diebler, in line with the Elizabethan puritans with whom he began his study of Hooper, dismissed many of the subtleties of Hooper's position. Moreover, the thinking of those later puritans bears little resemblance to Hooper's template for the community. Diebler argued that puritanism had changed by Elizabeth's reign, but nonetheless argued for a common link between Hooper and later puritans in their belief in biblical purity and morality. This link may be plausible; however, Hooper's commitment to a magistrate-led reformation would have found him few admirers amongst these later camps. Unfortunately, therefore, when applied to other facets of Hooper's vision for the community, Diebler's conclusions do not fit very well.

By contrast, Ross stressed the exclusivity of Hooper's opinions.[48] He rejected the view of Hooper as a puritan and highlighted the differences between Hooper and various individuals to whom Hooper has been linked. Ross observed the gulf between the reformation programme offered by Cranmer and the one put forward by Hooper, but also argued that there was a potential rift in the relationship between Bullinger and Hooper, noting the break in their correspondence and pointing out that some of the language had changed. He therefore contended that relations soured between the two men following the vestment controversy.[49] However, Ross neglected to take into account of the fact that during the vestment controversy, Hooper was ordered to be silent. Moreover, once he took up his position as bishop, his opportunities to write were reduced. Ross's argument for a rift between Hooper and Bullinger also failed to allow for the possibility that some letters during this period of silence may not have survived. Given this lack of corroboration, Ross's argument is difficult to sustain. Nonetheless, although Bullinger will always remain

---

[47] Deibler, "Bishop John Hooper," 562.

[48] Donald S Ross, "The role of John Hooper in the religious controversies of the reign of Edward VI in England," (PhD diss., Michigan State University, 1979), 63-64

[49] Donald S Ross, "The role of John Hooper in the religious controversies of the reign of Edward VI in England," 63-64.

as a highly significant influence on Hooper's theological positions, Ross offers an important reminder that it is important not to overstate Hooper's reliance upon Bullinger. Hooper was capable of constructing theological ideas of his own, and he drew upon a variety of influences, as this thesis will argue when analysing Hooper's vision for the community.

Opie, in a 1968 article, provided a different interpretation,[50] arguing that a classification of Hooper as a father of non-conformity is problematic, as he conformed to official policy.[51] Instead, Opie argued that Hooper is best considered as an archetype of conformity and the need to maintain it.[52] Opie regarded Hooper as one who, after the vestment controversy, worked within the existing structures of the Edwardian Church to reform it.[53] Opie was thus able to reconcile Hooper's initial obstinacy with his later work as a bishop in the Church of England who enjoyed prominence at Court while not wavering from his goals to reform his diocese. In this way, Opie could also account for the way in which Hooper moved on from the vestment controversy and began to implement his goals for reform in his diocese. Clement too, argued that Hooper's opposition to non-conformity and Lollard movements in the South of England suggest that Hooper's stance against religious dissension was more aligned with Ridley and Cranmer than has often been thought.[54] Indeed, in Clement's reading, Hooper disdained the freedom that the Anabaptists sought from ecclesiastical and civil authority.[55]

Primus's study of the Edwardian and Elizabethan vestment controversies offered an effective alternative to discussions of non-conformity and puritanism by examining the causes of Hooper's objections, and he warned against jumping to conclusions about their political consequences.[56] Primus first noted that Hooper

---

[50] [50] John Opie, "The Anglicizing of John Hooper," *Archive for Reformation History* 59 (1968): 175.
[51] John Opie, "The Anglicizing of John Hooper," 175.
[52] Opie, "The Anglicizing of John Hooper," 175.
[53] Opie, ''The Anglicizing of John Hooper,'' 175.
[54] C.J. Clement, *Religious Radicalism in England 1535-1565* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1997), 54.
[55] Clement, *Religious Radicalism in England*, 54.
[56] See John Henry Primus, *The Vestments Controversy: An Historical Study of the Earliest Tensions within the Church of England in the Reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth* (N.V. Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1960), 17.

never condemned the concept of *adiaphora*.[57] Primus argued that Hooper's contention regarding vestments was that anything used in the church had to have a clear mandate in the Bible, and that the use of vestments had been rejected in the New Testament.[58] If matters were considered truly *adiaphora*, they should be left to individual conscience and not enforced by church authority. As Primus observed, this had unintended consequences by creating a significant controversy in the kingdom, but it also demonstrated that Hooper's concerns about vestments were not intended to challenge Edward VI's authority; rather, this was a theological debate that went horribly wrong.[59] Primus also noted that Hooper disapproved of the distance that vestments placed between the clergy and the people.[60] This suggests that Hooper's concern was to increase interaction between the clergy and parishioners; moreover, he believed that the clergy should be identified by proper behaviour rather than by their clerical attire.

Hooper Scholarship from 1980s to Present

Arguably, the breakthrough for studies of focussing on Hooper's vision for reform came about as a result of challenges of a grand theory of a single Reformation in England. Twentieth century scholars as diverse as Guy,[61] MacCulloch,[62] and Duffy,[63] have assented that the diversity of opinions across the realm makes a single narrative of the Reformation in England untenable. These scholars have appreciated that while the Reformation in England was progressed by Parliament and the leaders of the English Church, opinions and reactions were varied amongst the English population, who reacted both favourably and unfavourably. This view takes seriously the idea that some reformers were persuaded by Lutheranism, Zwinglianism, Calvinism, Anabaptism, or a mix of some or all of these camps, or indeed none at all. By extension, increasing agency has been attributed to Hooper in how he reacted,

---

[57] John Henry Primus, *The Vestments Controversy*, 17. Strype had earlier touched upon this idea, suggesting similar conclusions, but with less precision. See Strype, *Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer*, 1:309-310.
[58] Primus, *The Vestments Controversy*, 19-20.
[59] See Primus, *The Vestments Controversy*, 29-30.
[60] Primus, *The Vestments Controversy*, 27.
[61] John Guy, *Tudor England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 119.
[62] Diarmaid MacCulloch, "The Myth of the English Reformation," 1-19.
[63] Eamon Duffy, Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, c.1400-c.1580*, 2nd edition (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 332-338.

advocated and condemned aspects of English reform. Hooper's writings have taken their place alongside those of other Edwardian leaders such as Cranmer, Nicholas Ridley and John a Lasco, all of whom are understood as interpreters of and visionaries for English reform. [64]

Hunt's biography of Hooper attempted to weave a narrative of a religious opposition to English reform through a search for religious authenticity.[65] In this reading, Hooper's search inevitably drew him to Zurich because it demonstrated the characteristics he desired. However, such views seem, at best, speculative, because scant evidence of Hooper's early life exists, and it is impossible to make such a firm judgement with any certainty. Hunt stressed that Hooper's personal commitment to moral excellence and piety was a governing idea for his reforms and on the basis argued that puritanism was an apt (and in his view honourable) categorisation for Hooper's approach to reform. Hunt regarded Hooper as Pauline in his understanding of authority, but he struggled to understand Hooper's lack of consistency: "In one place he orders men to obey the divinely appointed ruler: in other places he states that it is not the business of the State to enact laws governing the conscience of its subjects where religion is concerned".[66] As will be argued below, this confusion can to some extent be overcome by considering how Hooper understood Moses as having created laws that interpreted God's commandments for godly living.[67]

Newcombe's study was authoritative in its denunciation of the proto-puritan label; instead, he presented Hooper as "a theologian for the working day who did not aspire to innovation or originality."[68] While Newcombe commented briefly on the role of the king in Hooper's writings, he was principally concerned to explore how Hooper strove to reform the church. By arguing that Hooper was essentially pastoral in his theology, Newcombe explained that Hooper's preference for a simplified

---

[64] There was an attempt to link Hooper with Knox through their affinity of Bullinger, Puritanism, covenantal theology and the First Helvetic Confession. Hooper certainly knew of Knox but no such evidence exists that Hooper influenced Knox during Edward's reign. See Andries Raath and Shaun de Freitas, "From Heinrich Bullinger to Puritanism: John Hooper's Theology and the Office of the Magistracy," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 56, no. 2 (2003): 208.

[65] See E.W. Hunt, *The Life and Times of John Hooper (c.1500-1555) Bishop of Gloucester* (Lewington: The Edwin Mellon Press, 1992), 14-20.

[66] Hunt, *The Life and Times of John Hooper*, 314.

[67] See below, 87.

[68] D.G. Newcombe, *John Hooper: Tudor Bishop and Martyr (c.1495-1555)* (Oxford: The Davenant Press, 2009), xvi.

church was based on his desire to re-establish the Church in England along similar lines to those which he had experienced in Zurich.[69] Newcombe's discussion emphasised the use of the church for English society. He observes that on the one hand, Hooper was concerned with what was preached and practised in the church, but on the other, he knew that the church relied upon those who governed the people. However, Newcombe did not develop this idea. This study will argue that rather than presenting a limited view that leaves the church and the government as two separate spheres, Hooper in fact viewed the two spheres working as a cohesive unit to create faithful citizens. While Newcombe's analysis is very helpful, it does little to explain how the church was to exist within Hooper's community, something this thesis will investigate.

Wilson considered how Hooper influenced the English Reformation in the reign of Edward VI.[70] His assessment of Hooper's life and writings argued that Hooper was a learned and innovative reformer in his own right.[71] Wilson contended that Hooper's learning and commitment to reform showed him to be an ardent proponent of the Edwardian Reformation, and noted many similarities with contemporaries, especially with Cranmer in the Lord's Supper.[72] Wilson's approach is helpful because he sought to evaluate Hooper on the basis of his writings and episcopal activities, in order to assess his attributes as a reformer. His study centred on Hooper's episcopal ministry, and particularly on how he managed to implement, and indeed lead, various facets of reform. While Wilson's main focus was on Hooper's ability to influence the Edwardian Reformation, especially the church, Wilson rejected later labels for Hooper, instead emphasising Hooper's independent contribution to the Edwardian Reformation. Wilson's positive approach to Hooper will be taken as a guide when Hooper's writings are examined in the following chapters.

Elsewhere, scholars have examined Hooper's reforms through his connections with continental reformers. By the time Hooper left Zurich, his contacts

---

[69] See Newcombe, *John Hooper*, 123.
[70] Wilson, "John Hooper and the English Reformation under Edward VI," 1.
[71] Wilson, "John Hooper and the English Reformation under Edward VI," 303.
[72] Wilson, "John Hooper and the English Reformation under Edward VI," 361.

within continental Protestantism were extensive. Regrettably, many of the letters which would have revealed the full extent of his networks have been lost, and these have to be reconstructed from Hooper's mentions of personal relationships in some of his later letters. In an effort to unearth the network which Hooper had, Dalton's thesis applied the principles of network theory.[73] Dalton argues that Hooper set about reforming the Church of England, and did so, using a wide range of support to enact the changes he wanted.[74] Hooper was not a "lone voice" seeking change but used networks; whether political or clerical; noble or lay; domestic or foreign.[75] Thus, according to Dalton, Hooper benefitted from others and contributed positively to Protestantism within Edward VI's kingdom.[76]

Pettegree, in his examination of the Strangers' Churches, has shown how Hooper played a role in their inception. Pettegree placed Hooper in the camp of John a Lasco, and detailed how a Lasco and Hooper desired to create a Continental church in England similar in style to the church in Zurich.[77] Hooper joined with a Lasco in hoping that the Strangers' Church in London would serve as a model that the Church of England could follow, in the desire that it would ultimately adopt this more advanced style of Protestant worship. Pettegree also noted Hooper's involvement in mentoring the ministers who lived with him and explored how effective he was in utilising his popularity at court to advance the concerns of the church.[78] This insight is most helpful in showing how Hooper could use his popularity and influence to achieve his ends. The practices of the Strangers' Churches appealed to many of Hooper's theological preferences, but it is difficult to know how much direct influence Hooper had in the theological formation of the Strangers' Churches. While his friendships with a Lasco and the clergy in London, together with the smaller group in Glastonbury would continue throughout Edward's reign, Hooper's disastrous actions during the vestment controversy severely hampered his direct

---

[73] I am grateful to Alison Dalton for allowing me access to her thesis. Alison Dalton "John Hooper and his networks: A study of change in reformation England," (DPhil diss., University of Oxford, 2008).
[74] Dalton, "John Hooper and his Networks," 2-3.
[75] Dalton, "John Hooper and his Networks," 2.
[76] Dalton, "John Hooper and his Networks," 234.
[77] Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 35.
[78] Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities*, 49.

involvement at the time when the Strangers' Churches were established. Following the end of the controversy, Hooper almost immediately left for Gloucester, distancing him still further from the developments of the Strangers' Churches. Nevertheless, Pettegree has shown that, through his contacts, Hooper contributed to this ecclesiastical vision of reform.

Research into Hooper's ministry as bishop has helped to broaden the scope of this study, as it takes seriously the fact that Hooper's understanding of the godly community integrated the theology and practice of the English church and the structuring of society.[79] Davies, in her study *A Religion of the Word*, regarded Edwardian England as a kingdom in the crux of an identity crisis. She argued that the early Edwardian church had to define its position between its stances on anti-popery and schism.[80] Those who tried to establish a cautious policy of reform faced a strong push from the more evangelical side, of which Hooper was part. Davies also noticed a change in the trends in religious language from those who were becoming opposed to official religious policy as Edward's reign progressed, arguing that this growing distance – between those who were adherents of the official reform policy and those who pressed for further reforms – was the product of national identity and religious fervour,[81] and that those who pressed for further reforms became more hostile to official policy because they feared a resurgence of Roman Catholicism brought by impartial reform measures.[82] However, Davies's placing of Hooper under the umbrella of English nationalism created a problem because she explicitly downplayed Bullinger's involvement with Hooper, [83] although her model works much better when examining others in the Edwardian commonwealth group such as Crowley and Gilby. In addition, Davies examined Hooper's concept of the office of bishop as a ministry of service and catechesis: "[the] bishop's office was not to legislate or spend time on ceremonies, but to educate the people".[84] She observed that, in the community, Hooper wanted officials to be appointed on the basis of their

---

[79] Chapter seven considers this idea by examining the life of the people in the community. See below, 192.
[80] Catherine Davies, *A Religion of the Word: The Defence of the Reformation in the Reign of Edward VI* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 21.
[81] Davies, *A Religion of the Word*, 21.
[82] Davies, *A Religion of the Word*, 47.
[83] Davies, *A Religion of the Word*, 231.
[84] Davies, *A Religion of the Word*, 104.

commitment to virtue rather than their lineage.[85] She suggested that Hooper's writings demonstrate that he had visions for reform of society as well as the church, lending credibility to the idea that Hooper's programme for reform involved (or required) the faithful living of the entire community.

Another group of studies, such as that by Litzenberger, have examined Gloucester specifically for evidence of Hooper's reforming efforts.[86] Litzenberger concludes that the Gloucestershire that Hooper had inherited was not so much hostile to the Reformation as indifferent, and that Gloucester had not experienced the religious turmoil found in its neighbouring counties,[87] not least because Hooper's predecessor, Bishop Wakeman had capitulated to official policy but turned a blind eye to the continuance of traditionalist practice.[88] Her account of Hooper showed him to be the person who was awakening the diocese to a new Protestantism. For this reason, Hooper focused on educating his clergy in the faith and having the clergy model these new tenets of the Protestantism that he embraced. This accounted for Hooper's commitment to and involvement in ecclesiastical courts.[89] Litzenberger's study demonstrates that, although his power was limited, Hooper attempted vigorous religious reform by targeting the clergy as the essential building blocks of reform. It was essential to create Protestant clergy quickly if the Reformation was to be adapted and followed by the community. This is a key insight for the analysis of Hooper's understanding of community.

Lowe paints a different picture by suggesting that Protestantism in Gloucester, on the eve of Hooper's appointment as its bishop, was an attractive option for the wealthy, as it gave them greater access to revenues that had been held by the church. Lowe avoided seeking to identify Hooper with any particular group, characterising him instead as an individual who responded to the challenges that were placed before him: "We need to see Hooper's life more in these terms of an integrative and communitarian ethos, characterized by a commonwealth ideology

---

[85] Davies, *A Religion of the Word*, 149.
[86] Caroline Litzenberger, *The English Reformation and the Laity: Gloucestershire, 1540-1580* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
[87] Litzenberger, *The English Reformation and the Laity*, 66.
[88] Litzenberger, *The English Reformation and the Laity*, 65.
[89] Litzenberger, *The English Reformation and the Laity*, 73.

that would have connected personal behaviour inextricably to a social conscience, taken from a particular understanding of the Gospel."[90] Lowe can be criticised for falling into the commonwealth trap, in that he has assessed a cause rather than the root of the issue: Hooper cared for the poor – that much is certain – but his writings about poverty suggest that he remained fearful of rebellious activity, both theologically and politically, because rebellious activity might lead to the destruction of the reformed community he so desired to create. Nonetheless, by arguing on the basis of historical circumstance rather than theological labelling, Lowe has made it possible for Hooper's actions to be considered with a fresh focus by examining how the Bishop sought to solidify his ideas around the existing community structures of Gloucester, while criticising the excesses of the Gloucester elite who supported his ideas. In this way, Lowe offers an opportunity to assess Hooper's work independently of labels, an opportunity which this thesis also embraces.

While theological studies of Hooper have recently been neglected in favour of considerations of his ministry as a bishop, Trueman has contributed an interesting discussion of Hooper's dependency on Lutheran soteriology. He believes that, through his contacts with Melanchthon, Hooper maintained an arguably Lutheran position.[91] Since Hooper has generally been heralded as a mouthpiece for Bullinger in England, this view is highly controversial. It also runs against comments from both Hooper and Bullinger expressing their deep suspicion of Luther. However, Bullinger and Melanchthon did correspond with each other,[92] and Trueman observes that although their relationship bore the baggage of their mentors' feuds, they shared some common ground, particularly on soteriology.[93] Trueman argues that Hooper's position requires further examination because similarities between Melanchthon and Bullinger have not yet been adequately explored, but he also takes the view that Hooper was not merely Bullinger's mouthpiece. Rather, as this thesis will argue,

---

[90] Benjamin Lowe, *Commonwealth in the English Reformation: Protestantism and the Politics of Religious Change in the Gloucester Vale, 1483-1560* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2010), 217.
[91] Carl R. Trueman, *Luther's Legacy: Salvation and English Reformers 1525-1556* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 223.
[92] See for instance, Charles Cornelius Gorham, ed., *Gleanings of a Few Scattered Ears during the Period of the Reformation in England and of the Times Immediately Succeeding A.D. 1533-A.D.1588*, (London: Bell and Daldy, 1857), 35.
[93] Trueman does mention that there were some theological similarities between Bullinger and Melanchthon. See Trueman, *Luther's Legacy*, 206, 207.

Hooper was quite capable of developing ideas apart from Bullinger to create the template for his vision of a reformed society.

It is apparent that scholarship about John Hooper has considered aspects of his life, experiences and theology, but that much of this has concentrated upon his later life, from his return to England beginning with the vestment controversy and continuing until his martyrdom. The gap this thesis seeks to fill is an examination of Hooper's earlier writings which set out his vision for a reformed community and which are free from the burden of hindsight contained in his later writings.[94]

Methodology

As this survey of previous scholarship has shown, there has been a tendency to associate Hooper's ideas with anachronistic historical debates by labelling him with later puritan movements. To avoid any confusion and to demonstrate the intention to view Hooper's writings in Hooper's own experiences and reference, the term puritan or any variant of that movement to classify Hooper or any notion of non-conformity have been omitted. The term "commonwealth" has also been avoided, even though Hooper used it to describe his Protestant society, to minimise confusion because it has been associated with movements of which Hooper was not necessarily a member. In its place, the term "community" has been employed to describe Hooper's vision. The term "community" was not used by Hooper but has been introduced to free Hooper's ideas from specific historical debates and allows the understanding of Hooper's ideas free from external connotations.

Writing about Hooper's ideas requires an investigation into the circumstances in which he wrote. These circumstances can be divided into periods separated by time, location and responsibility. Chapter one highlights the importance of Hooper's earlier writings from Zurich between 1547and1549. These emerge from a period of Hooper's life when Hooper was not under any ecclesiastical obligation, and during which he had freedom to write down ideas. Works which date to this period include his tract on the *Ten Commandments*, which provides the strongest indication of Hooper's theories for a reformed community.[95] A second series of Hooper's writings

---

[94] See for instance an letter written by Hooper from prison to his wife in Hooper, *LW*, 578-579
[95] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 435-558.

emerges during the early period of his return to England, between1549 and 1551. They reflect thoughts that maintained a degree of independence from official reform programmes, such as his *Sermons upon Jonah* which were predicated on previous ideas and represented a challenge of English policy.[96]

To capture Hooper's original vision for reform, this study considers Hooper's submission to the Church of England despite his objections to wearing clerical vestments. In the Hooper literature, this is often viewed as a watershed for Hooper's categorisation as either a non-conformist or as a conformist. This thesis challenges this stark distinction by considering Hooper as both a conformist and non-conformist, or simply, a "non-conforming conformist". This approach permits Hooper's writings to be understood as being in broad agreement with Church of England's authority, whilst also appreciating the fact that his writings were wholly devoted to changing the path of reform for the English Church. His writings from his position as bishop bear the hallmark of one who, within the system, actively sought to change English Protestantism towards a reformation programme he desired. His writings have not been analysed to offer an assessment of the success or failure of his models or any weaknesses he found when incorporating these reforms. This thesis has concentrated instead on what Hooper said about reforming his community.

The structure of the thesis reflects the hierarchical ordering found within Hooper's template for society. He gave a rough outline of that order in his tract *An Answer To the Bishop of Winchester's Book*: "Therefore in the most noble and famous commonwealth that ever was, the commonwealth of the Israelites, was this order appointed, Num. ix: first God, then his word… in the fourth place of this commonwealth was Moses appointed, as supreme head and prince next unto God; in the fifth place was appointed the priests… then the people".[97] The fact that Hooper was a clergyman had a profound impact upon his reforms for the community and the thesis reflects this bias, as Hooper's writings contain a considerable preference for religious solutions to political problems. As a preacher, Hooper's worldview was centred upon God's providence and how individuals were to respond faithfully to God. This meant that when constructing his template Hooper's point-of-initiation

---

[96] Hooper, *Ten Commandments* (London: 1548), *EW*, 249-430.
[97] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book* (Zurich: 1547), *EW*, 140-141.

was always the response to God, and all problems within the community were to be dealt with as a matter of faith. Such a theological perspective was inevitable given that Hooper regarded the ills of society as a result of sin. The separation from God created by this sin manifested itself in observable political or social catastrophe. As a result, there is a considerable political void in Hooper's writings. He did not incorporate much political philosophy and when he did, it was to reinforce biblical precedent. The same approach was applied to his view of history and current events. There has been no attempt to remove Hooper's theological reasoning from his template for the community, nor to insert any political theory for the sake of clarity. Instead, the thesis has sought to highlight Hooper's arguments and present Hooper's template for what he believed was a faithful community. To do otherwise would detract from the biblical answers that Hooper sought for the community.

One underlying assumption has been that Hooper's template for the community was not specific to the Reformation in England. Granted, Hooper's published works were dedicated to English leaders, but the contents of the letters could be applied elsewhere. England remained the object of Hooper's personal affection and attention, but his writings prior to 1551 were not solely directed towards his homeland. The evidence for this claim lies in the specific terms employed in Hooper's writings. He preferred the generic term "magistrate" instead of king when referring to concepts of power, and he declined to favour a particular system of government. He would on occasion use the specific titles of prince or king, but made no distinction in their usage. Hooper's reforms depended upon a strong magistrate and this was evident in the role the King would play during Edward VI's reign, but he did not specify that an English system was the preferred model for his reforms. The fact that in his earlier writings Hooper did not specifically mention England as the target for his reforms fits well with Bullinger's agenda for disseminating a Zurich-style reform programme throughout Europe. In the mid-1540s, Bullinger attempted to unify the Protestant regions to counter Catholic resurgence. Bullinger was deliberate in avoiding commenting on structures of government so as to not anger Protestant rulers across Europe, as he argued that the Reformation could occur in any political setting with the church respecting the existing laws of its territory. Therefore the political generalities that appear in

Hooper's writings were consistent with Bullinger's designs for a Reformed programme across Europe.

Sources and Editions

The thesis examines in detail a selection of tracts written by Hooper between the years 1547-1551. As the first chapter will explore, only works that contributed to Hooper's reform of the community have been directly included. Evidence has also been drawn from a series of letters written to Bullinger by Hooper and some of his closest friends, Martin Micron, Jan Utenhove, John ab Ulmis and John a Lasco. These letters offer a valuable resource because they provide often first-hand accounts of Hooper's efforts to reform. Micron and Utenhove had at one time been houseguests of the Hooper family and were also part of the ministerial team at the Strangers' Churches in London, in which Hooper was from 1549 directly involved. A second set of letters comes from mutual friends of Bullinger and Hooper connected through their trading links between England, Strasbourg and Zurich. Richard Hilles and John Burcher were both Protestant merchants who conveyed information to Bullinger about events in England; they received knowledge of Hooper's reforms from informants well placed to give an account of how his reforming efforts were being received in England; and they validate some of the claims of Hooper's close friends.

The writings of Heinrich Bullinger and his *Decades* have provided an important source for the thesis since he was composing his *Decades* during the period of Hooper's early writings. Hooper was present in Zurich while Bullinger was composing his *Decades*. When Hooper returned to England, he was instrumental in securing their English dedications. These writings represent Bullinger's theological position in the mid-sixteenth century and are the views that Hooper encountered in Zurich. The *Decades* were a compendium of Bullinger's theological thoughts which were accessible to lay audiences in which the author provided his positions on the magistrate, church and actions of the people. These provide helpful comparisons when investigating Hooper's positions.[98]

---

[98] Hooper mentions to Bullinger in a letter dated 27 October 1551 that he had a manuscript copy of Bullinger's *Decades*. Robinson, *OL*, 1:96.

The standard Parker Society editions of Hooper's writings have been consulted. This two-volume collection, carefully collated by its nineteenth century editors Carr and Nevison, contains all the extant works published by Hooper.[99] During the publication process, he included summaries and dedicatory addresses to particular patrons for whom the work was written and these dedications and summaries indicated the style and content that Hooper wanted others to read. Given that his ideas for the community required participation of the existing leadership of the community, these editions of Hooper's works best convey his ideas for reforming the community. The Parker Society also collected a majority of Hooper's surviving letters and has published them as part of two volumes of correspondence between Reformers in England and Bullinger.[100]

In summary, this thesis will examine Hooper's template for a godly community. His ideas are assessed primarily on the basis of those writings which were the product of his experiences in Zurich, where Hooper saw what he believed was the early Church modelled in sixteenth-century life. To re-create that experience, Hooper's template for the community envisaged the magistrate as the spearhead of the Reformation who would create godly laws based on the Ten Commandments and protect the reform programme from those who would seek to harm it. The church was to preach only from the Bible and administer the sacraments according to biblical precedent. Its clergy should lead moral and godly lives so that their parishioners might emulate them. Finally, the parishioners should dutifully worship God, obey the magistrate, and serve the community by faithfully and dutifully fulfilling their vocation. Hooper believed God had provided the guidance for living in a godly community, and that following this template for the community would indeed allow the community to avoid the wrath of God.

---

[99] See Hooper, *EW*, v-vii
[100] See Robinson, *OL*, 33-106.

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Writings and Life of John Hooper

Introduction

The life of John Hooper has become well known thanks to the studies by Newcombe[1] and Hunt.[2] Since this thesis is concerned with Hooper's writings and how he imagined Protestant society it does not seek to add to these biographies. It focuses primarily on information that Hooper revealed about himself and his writings, leaving aside grander theories about Hooper's life .[3] This chapter will concentrate upon the details of Hooper's life after his conversion to Protestantism, which supports an understanding of those writings that were significant for his ideas of a Protestant society. In order to examine Hooper and the context in which he wrote, his life has been divided into periods based upon his location and the time of writing. Introducing Hooper in this way makes visible the circumstances which caused him to choose the style and content he employed. The years from 1547 to 1551 were crucial for formulating his ideas of a Protestant community. He spent most of the period from 1547 and 1549 in Zurich and then returned to England. Between 1547 and 1551, Hooper was able to write freely and in safety and without the episcopal responsibilities he shouldered from 1551 until 1553.

Protestant Conversion (c.1545)

Although we know Hooper was born between 1495 and 1500 in the West Country, John Hooper said very little about his early life.[4] That fact alone revealed much about

---

[1] D.G. Newcombe, *John Hooper, Tudor Martyr and Bishop* (Oxford: The Davenant Press, 2009).

[2] E.W. Hunt, *The Life and Times of John Hooper (c.1500-1555): Bishop of Gloucester* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellon Press, 1992).

[3] Both Hunt and Newcombe argue that Hooper was always drawn towards a life of simplicity in religion. This affinity with the simple supposedly began in his time as a Carthusian monk. However, this conclusion remains speculative and is not relevant to this thesis. See Newcombe, *John Hooper*, 2-19; Hunt, *The Life and Times of John Hooper*, 1-31.

[4] An attempt to trace Hooper's earliest days began with the martyrologist John Foxe. Foxe had numerous sources at his disposal whilst an exile during Mary's reign and his account of Hooper contained both Foxe's own interactions with Hooper as well as information and writings that he had collected from those close to Bullinger. Some of the information may have come from Bullinger directly but no definitive evidence survives that this was the case. Bullinger was at least aware of Foxe's project to catalogue Hooper's life, works and death. See, Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas S. Freeman, *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: the making of John Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 90-91. Cf. Edmund Grindal, *The Remains of Edmund Grindal, Successively Bishop of London and Archbishop of York and Canterbury* ed.

his priorities and the way in which he wanted to be known.[5] Following his conversion he set about forging a new Protestant identity. After reading Zwingli and converting to the Protestant cause, Hooper entirely repudiated his former religious convictions. Extreme reactions such as this would become characteristic of Hooper's zeal. His outlook and opinions were almost always expressed as stark polarities: black or white; godly or sinful. Though Hooper did not specify which of Zwingli's works he had consulted which ultimately led him to his Protestant conversion, it was likely that *On True and False Religion* was one of them.[6] Aston has shown that there had been a copy of this work in London since 1531,[7] and when at Court in the service of Arundel in London, Hooper would have had access to it. Aston has concluded about works such as Zwingli's *On True and False Religion*: "For the architects of reformed polity, it was of supreme importance that the people should become positive participants as soon as possible in the great change they were inaugurating. To witness the disgrace and punishing of holy statutes, to see them exposed as tools and dolls of fraudulent priests, was expected to produce disillusion with the past."[8] This described the type of Protestant conviction that Hooper was to espouse for the rest of his life.

Hooper did provide a few details about himself in a letter of introduction that he wrote to Bullinger in 1546 from Strasbourg in which he revealed he that he came from a relatively wealthy family and had enjoyed a degree of luxury as a courtier.[9] Since this was a letter of introduction, Hooper's intention was to present himself as a

---

William Nicholson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1843), 223. It was generally agreed that Hooper came from the West Country. The fact that Hooper later mentioned a familial connection the cloth trade supports this theory. See for instance, Robinson, *OL*, 1:53, 62-63. Hooper used his trade connections with the merchants as an exile which led him first to Strasbourg and would eventually to the footsteps of Bullinger in Zurich. Bullinger and Hooper had mutual acquaintances in Richard Hilles and John Burcher. Hilles was a writing partner of Bullinger based primarily in Strasbourg and Burcher was for a time living in Zurich. Charles M. Clode, *The Early History of the Guild of Merchant Taylors of the Fraternity of St John the Baptist London with Notices of the Lives of some of its Eminent Members* (London: Harrison and Sons, 1888), 2:86.

[5] The Greyfriars Chronicle recorded Hooper as being a "whyth monk". The white habit was worn by the Carthusians. John Gough Nichols, ed., *The Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London* (London: Camden Society, 1852), 63. See also C.H. Smythe, *Cranmer and the Reformation Under Edward VI* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1970), 95.

[6] Hooper recorded to Bullinger that he had also consulted some of Bullinger's writings on Paul. Robinson, *OL*, 1:33-34.

[7] Margaret Aston, *Faith and Fire: Popular and Unpopular Religion*, *1350-1600* (London: Hambledon Press, 1993), 291- 292.

[8] Aston, *Faith and Fire*, 306.

[9] Robinson, *OL,* 1:33-34.

worthy candidate for Bullinger's hospitality.[10] Hooper described himself as one who had abandoned his Catholicism and had been brought to his Protestant faith through the works of Zwingli and Bullinger.[11] Wanting to prove that his commitment to a Zurich style of Protestantism was genuine, he described his previous state to Bullinger: "I had had begun to blaspheme God by impious worship and all manner of idolatry".[12] Since he was trying to impress the Swiss Reformer, Hooper did not provide details of any religious conversion prior to accepting the Zwinglian position. He simply ran the two together by explaining that he had been: "at length delivered by the goodness of God, for which I am solely indebted to him and to yourselves".[13] He then proved that he held similar opinions to Bullinger. Hooper also mentioned an unfavourable encounter with traditionalist bishops in England and in a second letter gave a general description of a short-yet-dangerous visit to England. Hooper also wrote that he had suffered imprisonment on two separate occasions in England.[14] He apparently only mentioned this to add context to a previous question to Bullinger, in a letter that has not survived, about taking the Mass without believing it.[15] At this stage Hooper was expressing his theological preference for that which was practised in Zurich. He was not yet at a point where his writings could fully explore what a Protestant society entailed. This would only come after his arrival to Zurich.

The few letters that have survived from Hooper's life prior to his journey to Zurich in 1547 do not mention his vision of godly community. Instead, his writings were focused on ascertaining Bullinger's opinions on theological matters whilst at the same time providing him with English intelligence about developments of the church and government. In them, Hooper demonstrated his burgeoning belief in the

---

[10] See Newcombe, *John Hooper*, 11-16. Newcombe also writes about Hooper's omissions of his early life as a means to appeal to Bullinger. Newcombe stresses Hooper's news of English intelligence as more profitable to Bullinger so he tried to impress Bullinger through those channels. A fact that Newcombe might not have fully explored was that Hooper was likely in contact with Burcher who was already serving Bullinger as a correspondent for English affairs. As a merchant, Burcher's sources information would be more regular readily available than any existing letters from court for Hooper.
[11] Robinson, *OL*, 1:33-34.
[12] Robinson, *OL*, 1:34.
[13] Robinson, *OL*, 1:34.
[14] Robinson, *OL*, 1:41.
[15] Robinson, *OL*, 1:40.

supremacy of God and the consequences of sinful human actions to provoke the wrath of God. In an undated letter,[16] he wrote to Bullinger,

> But alas! gracious Lord, we are sleeping in the greatest security, while in the greatest danger; and it is therefore no wonder if we terribly experience the wrath of God, and the heavy consequences of our ungodliness. Let us amend therefore, lest he inflict upon us yet greater severities, namely, to become after this life the everlasting enemies of God: let us patiently bear, as the time requires, the chastisement that our sins have deserved; for he punishes the children of men for their iniquities.[17]

In this letter, Hooper indicated his belief that a person's actions in society merited divine satisfaction or retribution, both individually and as a community. There was nothing provocative or original in this statement, as it was a widely held conviction that God punished sin. The significance for Hooper's notion of the community was that it stressed the idea that if the community did not follow a path of godly living, the actions of that society would bring about its ruin.

Zurich (1547-1549)

In 1547, Hooper and his wife Anna[18] arrived in Zurich, where they were houseguests of Bullinger.[19] During this time, Anna gave birth to a daughter, Rachel, who was baptised in 1548 at the Grossmunster; Bullinger and the wife of Theodore Bibliander

---

[16] The editor of the Parker Society has attributed to this letter a date after 12 December 1546, when the Dukes of Norfolk and Surrey were arrested. Hooper mentions these arrests in the letter. Robinson, *OL*, 1:42n1.

[17] Robinson, *OL*, 1:41.

[18] Details surrounding the life of Anna de Tserclas (also known as Anne) remain relatively scarce. It has been generally assumed that she came from the Low Countries and fled to Strasbourg as a result of religious persecution. Hunt has argued that Anna and her elder sister were women of noble birth who nursed Hooper during his illness there, though this argument is by no means conclusive. According to Francis Dryander, a Spanish Reformer at Basel, Anna and John were married in Basel before 26 March 1547. See Hunt, *The Life and Times of John Hooper*, 45-46. Newcombe writes that Anna had belonged to the household of Jacques de Bourgogne who was a one-time schoolmate of Charles V and had fled religious persecution. Newcombe does not dismiss the possibility that Anna had been married previously, but thought that she probably did not have children. He also suggests that there is likely to have been a considerable age difference between Hooper and Anna as she bore him two children in Edward's reign. Newcombe, *John Hooper: Tudor Bishop and Martyr*, 27-28. See also, Rachel Basch, "Hooper, Anne [*née* de Tscerlas] (*d.* 1555), *protestant exile,*" ODNB.

[19] West's PhD research studied the activities of Hooper while he was in Zurich. West has been able to produce some indication through local sources that Hooper stayed only a short while with Bullinger. Hooper and his family then moved to Zwingli's old house which was in close proximity to Bullinger's house and the *Grossmunster*. West noted that this was geographically significant as it gave Hooper considerable access to Bullinger, his household and the leading reformers at Zurich. W.M.S. West, "A Study of John Hooper with Special Reference to his Contact with Henry Bullinger" (PhD diss., University of Zurich, 1953), 33.

served as her godparents,[20] which indicated a close relationship between Hooper and the leading reformers in Zurich. Hooper was in regular contact with Bullinger and possibly assisted him by translating letters written to Bullinger in English into Latin and Bullinger's responses from Latin into English.[21] Burcher, an English merchant in Zurich probably helped with translation as well, but Hooper's knowledge of theology would have been an asset to Bullinger in getting his ideas written into English.[22] As was typical of Hooper, he provided very little detail of his time in Zurich,[23] although his letters after his return were filled with admiration for the time he had spent there and the benefit of being able to interact daily with those with whom he sympathised theologically. Hooper would have become familiar with the *Prophezei* and learned much from Bullinger, Bibliander and other Zurich theologians.[24] However, there is no evidence that Hooper served in any official capacity in Zurich. His freedom from official commitments meant that he had considerable opportunities to develop his ideas and write. He also had access to two prominent Protestant printers in Zurich, Christoph Froschauer and Augustin Fries; his friendship with Bullinger would have

---

[20] West, "A Study of John Hooper with Special Reference to his Contact with Henry Bullinger," 6. Theodore Bibliander was the professor of Old Testament at Zurich and was a noted linguist.

[21] Newcombe notes that the two other prominent Englishmen in Zurich, Richard Hilles and John Butler both indicated that their Latin was not as proficient as Hooper's. Newcombe, *John Hooper, 32n190*. Hilles' relationship to Zurich and his language limitations are also recorded in Clode, *The Early History of the Guild of Merchant Tailors of the Fraternity of St. John the Baptist London,* 2:59-87.

[22] Clode notes that Burcher knew some Latin, but not enough to be of service to Bullinger in translating his English letters into Latin. Clode, *The Early History of the Guild of Merchant Taylors of the Fraternity of St John the Baptist London*, 2:61.

[23] West mentioned that the Hooper and his family lived with the Zink (or Zinchia) family. Newcombe also relied on West's research. See West, "A Study of John Hooper with Special Reference to his Contact with Henry Bullinger," 6; Robinson, *OL*, 1:55; Newcombe *John Hooper*, 31.

[24] The *Prophezei* was an ecclesiastical practice establish by Zwingli in 1523 and publicly practised from 1525. Diethelm describes the *Prophezei*: it was a theological educational programme for the church and government through which they would study the Bible in its original language to interpret its meanings for the peace and edification of Zurich and translate the texts into the vernacular. See Roland Diethelm, "Bullinger and Worship: "Thereby Does One Plant and Sow the True Faith," in *Architect of Reformation: An Introduction to Heinrich Bullinger, 1504-1575*, ed. Bruce Gordon and Emidio Campi, (Grand Rapids: Michigan: Baker Academic Press, 2004), 137-140. Gordon argued that Zwingli based the practice on an interpretation of 1 Cor 14:26 as a call for those trained in the Bible to "control prophetic inspiration" towards a peaceful existence. Gordon, *The Swiss Reformation* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 232; 1 Cor 14:26. When Bullinger succeeded Zwingli as Antistes, Gordon comments that Bullinger was by the mid 1540's altering the *Prophezei* to a *lectorium* which served as an institution for higher learning. Bruce Gordon, "Introduction" in *Architect of Reformation: An Introduction to Heinrich Bullinger 1504-1575*, eds. Bruce Gordon and Emidio Campi (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic Press, 2004), 22. Gordon notes that no matriculation records exist prior to 1559. Therefore, it was likely that Hooper would have witnessed the *Prophezei* in a period of transition. See Gordon, *The Swiss Reformation*, 235-236.

given him access to their printing presses. [25] While the Councils of Zurich upheld strict censorship laws, Hooper's publications in English did not fall foul of them.[26]

Between 1547 and 1549 Hooper published three works. His earliest tract was a response to a treatise written by Stephen Gardiner on the Sacraments. His second was theological treatise on Christ and the Christological models that were pertinent in society. His third was a theology of the Ten Commandments. Hooper had liberty in Zurich to write freely on the causes that were most important to him, and for that reason, it is important to consider Hooper's book dedications during this period because they identify the purpose and key teaching points for the audience for whom he wrote. The dedication was addressed to a particular person (usually of high political standing), and provided the best chance for the recipient to be exposed to the book's main arguments. This can be witnessed in the dedication of a volume of Bullinger's *Decades* to Henry Grey, Marquis of Dorset.[27] Hooper was one of the main instigators of this dedication and he also helped ensure that the English noble received the work.[28] Hooper had suggested the dedication because of Dorset's high standing and sympathy with the Protestant cause. In response, the Marquis wrote to Bullinger acknowledging the work and its dedication, while also informing Bullinger of his busy schedule.[29] This suggested that Dorset might not have read the entire volume though he was familiar with Bullinger's outline in his dedication. Understanding these conventions, Hooper too normally summarised his main teaching points in the dedication.[30] This practice makes it easier to understand what Hooper was trying to convey in his tracts and, more importantly, underlines the

---

[25] Hooper's works in Zurich were printed in English. As Froschauer and Fries spoke no English, the texts incorporated some grammatical and typographical errors. English printers would later correct these errors but the theology of the text remained consistent with the editions from Zurich. See for instance, Hooper, *EW*, iv.

[26] There was a censorship committee in Zurich at this time but Hooper did not mention any problems with publishing his works. For Bullinger's interaction with the censorship committee see Euler, *Couriers of the Gospel, 1531-1558* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag Zurich, 2006), 96.

[27] In a separate dedication of a volume of Bullinger's *Decades*, Hooper described the process of giving a theological work to Edward. As any work had to go through the Council before it reached the eyes of the King. Thus, in order for the work to even reach Edward, the dedication would have to be succinct and amicable to prospective censorship. See Robinson, *OL*, 1:82.

[28] Robinson, *OL*, 1:82.

[29] Robinson, *OL*, 1:3.

[30] One exception to this was Hooper's response to Stephen Gardiner, *Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*. There was no guarantee that Gardiner would actually read the entirety of Hooper's work, but Gardiner published a response to Hooper's work in 1550. See Knighton, *CSP Dom*, 190.

essential principles he wanted his audience to adopt. These dedicatory summaries, while insufficient in and of themselves, crystallise Hooper's intention and purpose and provide a key to understanding his ideas.

Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book

The first lengthy treatise coming from Zurich was Hooper's 1547 response to Gardiner's 1546 treatise on the preservation of the Mass.[31] Emboldened by the protection he enjoyed in Zurich, Hooper freely attacked the bishop of Winchester, who may have been responsible for Hooper's flight from England.[32] Hooper's intention was simple: he wanted to respond to Gardiner's arguments, and, more importantly, he wanted to offer England an alternative to Gardiner's traditionalism. Hooper believed ardently that if he were to make a case for his Protestant convictions, the power of the gospel would convince those under the control of traditionalists to join his Protestant cause. Hooper wrote to Gardiner:

> I have likewise dedicated the same [i.e. the *Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*] unto your Lordship, to declare that it is against your cause and opinion that I write, and not against you, to whom I wish the same grace and favour of God that I would unto myself, and the love that Paul wished unto his countrymen the Jews, of whose salvation he was most desirous, though their obstinacy and blindness so merited the punishment and severity of God's ire, that he was compelled to write the indictment and condemnation of their infidelity, as it appeareth by his most loving and affectionate heart...[33]

Hooper's work was not intended solely as a personal debate with Gardiner; Hooper sought to preach to a broader audience against the theological rationale for the use of the Mass. The dedication to Gardiner was more a matter of convenience as it gave Hooper a platform to critique the Mass.[34] Hooper's central idea was that the Mass was an invention of the papacy and did not reflect the practice of the early Church. He argued that the Mass had been invented by Lanfranc, the eleventh century

---

[31] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, EW, 101-247.
[32] Robinson, OL, 1:35; Foxe, *AM*, 6:637.
[33] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, EW, 102.
[34] Hooper was not the first reformer to critique Gardiner's work. Anthony Gilby published the first response in January 1547 and Hooper's followed in September. There does not appear to be any acknowledgement by Hooper of Gilby's tract. Cranmer would also write a response in 1551. See the Editor's note in Hooper, *EW*, 100.

Archbishop of Canterbury, and had been growing steadily further from the practice of the Apostles.[35] While critiquing the Mass was Hooper's primary objective, he also incorporated some notable statements concerning his vision for society. His comments on sin and godly living are of particular importance. Concerning sin, Hooper argued that if individuals strayed from the Law of God and relied upon their own intuition, they would fall victim to sin and bring down upon them the wrath of God.[36] To prevent such a descent into sin, Hooper stressed that individuals and communities who followed the Law of God would enjoy God's favour and protection bringing peaceful living.[37] Hooper argued that God's promises could only be experienced through faith.[38] This enabled him to move immediately to affirm the spiritual presence of the Eucharist, as well as providing a mandate by which people must live according to the promises of God. Such blessings were only available through living and worshiping faithfully.

A Declaration of Christ and His Office

Hooper's second work, *A Declaration of Christ and His Office* (hereafter *Christ and His Office*), also published in Zurich in 1547, was a discussion on Christ and his relevance for society.[39] It was a tract against the theological and political threats of Anabaptism in Zurich. In it Hooper sought to demonstrate that Anabaptist Christology was not orthodox Christian teaching. The work was dedicated to the Duke of Somerset. The dedication praised Somerset's victory at the Battle of Pinkie Cleugh over the Scots and was particularly relevant to the content, as Hooper believed this was a victory for Protestantism over the Catholic Scottish army. He used this context to stress the lordship and example of Christ for the Church. He wrote to Somerset:

> And as this victory and triumph is to be rejoiced at, so the end
> why God gave it is most diligently to be considered… I have
> written this little book, containing what Christ is, and what his
> Office is, that every godly man may put to his helping hand to
> restore him again unto his kingdom; and dedicate the same unto

---

[35] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 117.
[36] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 109-110.
[37] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 110.
[38] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, *135*.
[39] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, (Zurich: 1547), *EW*, 1.

your noble grace, unto whom God hath not only committed the defence of a politic and civil realm, but also the defence of his dear Son's right, Jesus Christ in the church...[40]

Hooper's intent was clear: the victory was a reminder to the English of their responsibility to obey God and to follow the example Christ in all aspects of their communal life.

The work examined Christ as a model for leadership for the various power structures in society.[41] Hooper's models favoured Christ's spiritual leadership as the prophet and priest, but recognised that there was a precedent for Christ to serve as a model for kingship as well. His overall aim was to create a true church and to model the whole of society on Christ's example.[42] He commented that "Christ [is] to be the King, Emperor, and Protector of the church, and that by the office and property of a king, that defendeth his subjects, not only by his godly laws, but also by force and civil resistance, as the enemies of his commonwealth shall minster occasion."[43] To underline this obedience Hooper used the example of Christ before Pilate to highlight Christ's adherence to the laws of the community: "Christ doth not deny to be the King of the world before Pilate, but that he meant not to reign worldly, to the hindrance and defacing of the emperor's dignity and title, as the Jews falsely accused him."[44] Hooper believed that the key to faithful living was to properly recognise the authority of the community by allowing its leaders, whom God had chosen, to create laws that protected the Reformation and prosperity of the people. Hooper argued that these leaders were tasked with enforcing the law and punishing those who would break it.[45] Therefore, Hooper defined the authority of civil governments and argued that they were to follow the model of Christ's authority.[46] For him, kingship was to be considered within a spiritual context and the government was to serve alongside the church. For both the government and the church should base their operation on the life and model of Christ.

---

[40] Hooper, *EW*, xiii.
[41] See below, 85.
[42] See below, 121-122.
[43] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 78.
[44] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 79.
[45] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 80-82.
[46] See Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 78.

A Declaration of the Ten Holy Commandments of Almighty God

Hooper's work on the Ten Commandments went through three editions, in 1548, 1549 and 1550, and was arguably one of his most significant works. *A Declaration of the Ten Holy Commandments of God* (hereafter *Ten Commandments)* (1548) represented Hooper's most robust comments on his imagined community.[47] Hooper's premise for writing the *Ten Commandments* was to assure his readers that God was merciful and to encourage the people of God to live according to God's commandments. He sought to demonstrate how to live peaceably with God.[48] As Wilson has noted, this was the closest that Hooper came to espousing the notion of covenant that was prominent in Bullinger's writings.[49] Though covenant ideas are present in Hooper's writings, he sought to highlight God's mercy rather than stress the action of the covenant. Hooper agreed that God had made a pact with humanity, but he was more concerned about how humanity would respond to this pact that God had made with them. For Hooper the Ten Commandments were the necessary template of a life lived in peace with Christ. The Ten Commandments gave guidance on proper and faithful actions as members of the community: "Wherefore it behoveth every man of God to know as perfectly these commandments as he knoweth his own name; that all his works, words, and thoughts, may be governed according unto the mind and pleasure of this law… [The Ten Commandments] teach what God requireth in the heart, and what in external conversation, both to God and man."[50]

Hooper argued that the Ten Commandments had two functions: first to enable each person to live according to God's Law; and second to create a communal culture that embedded God's Law into the social fabric. Living in a godly manner required conscious adherence to the commandments that God had given to humanity and Hooper stressed the importance of the human response, "Therefore look not only upon the promise of God, but also, what diligence and obedience he requireth of

---

[47] See for instance, R Paul Wilson, "John Hooper and the English Reformation under Edward VI 1547-1553" (PhD diss., Queen's University, Kingston 1994), 46-47.
[48] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 255.
[49] Wilson, "John Hooper and the English Reformation under Edward VI," 106-107. Primus has argued that the role of the covenant played a much more central role in Hooper's theology; however, Primus was attempting to create Hooper as a Proto-Puritan which put too great a stress on later sixteenth-century Calvinistic ideas. See J.H. Primus "The Role of the Covenant Doctrine in the Puritanism of John Hooper," *Dutch Review of Church History*, New Series 48, no. 2 (1968): 182-96.
[50] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 272.

thee, lest thou exclude thyself from the promise."[51] The Commandments were God's clear mandate for how communities were to interact with each other and to worship and honour God. Such a clear expression of God's requirements meant that within the construct of Hooper's community, the Ten Commandments must be incorporated into the governance of the community to ensure faithful Protestant living.

London (1549-1551)

House of Somerset

Hooper left Zurich in March 1549 to begin his voyage back to England. Foxe recorded that Hooper departed Zurich uttering a prophecy to Bullinger that he would not return and would probably be burned for his beliefs.[52] Whether or not this was the assertion of later Protestant propagandists, it spoke to the belief that Hooper's return to England was not to be one of compliance with the status quo of the English Reformation. On route, Hooper wrote numerous letters to Bullinger providing him updates on his travel along with intelligence of religious and political events.[53] Towards the end of May, after what Hooper described as a very arduous journey, Hooper, his wife and daughter, together with John Stumphius, a Swiss student, arrived in London, and soon took residence with Protector Somerset.[54] In a letter dated 31 May, Hooper informed Bullinger that he had sent Stumphius to Oxford. He had also met with Bartholomew Traheron, and mentioned handing a letter to Thomas Cranmer from Bullinger.[55] It seems likely that Hooper had quickly made his way to Court.

A month later, Hooper sent another letter to Bullinger from London in which he mentioned preaching at Paul's Cross.[56] By 1 August, Hooper was writing to Stumphius, "I am obliged to remain here in London and in the family of the lord

---

[51] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 267.

[52] Foxe, *AM*, 6:638.

[53] Euler has created a map of the most common travel paths between England and Zurich. See Carrie Euler, *Couriers of the Gospel*, XI.

[54] Susan Brigden, *The Reformation in London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 459.

[55] Hooper noted that the letter had received rather unenthused response from Cranmer. In the same letter, Hooper also promised to deliver Bullinger's letter to a Lasco. Robinson, *OL*, 1:64.

[56] Robinson, *OL*, 1:65. The Chronicler of the Wriothesley Chronicle records Hooper as preaching at Paul's Cross on Mondays during Whitsuntide in 1550. Charles Wriothesley, *A Chronicle of England During the Reigns of the Tudors from 1485-1559*, ed. William Douglas Hamilton, 2 vols. (Westminster: J.B. Nichols and Sons, 1875), 1:40.

protector, till things become more settled".[57] In November, when Somerset was sent to prison, Hooper referred to him as his patron.[58] Between May and November, to say that Hooper had a meteoric rise within the ranks of the English Court would run the risk of understatement. It is likely that Hooper's network of contacts within the English Court accounts for this.[59] That he was the bearer of letters from Bullinger and arrived at Court with a reputation as one of Bullinger's friends probably also helped Hooper to establish the contacts he needed, all the way to the Protector himself.[60] But perhaps the most likely basis for his success lies not in his personal connections to the Protector, but instead in the broader atmosphere of theology. Hooper proved an enthusiastic adherent to those favourable to the Protestant cause at Court.[61] These included both Cranmer and the Protector Somerset. As a houseguest of Somerset, Hooper was in the company of the notable reformers Thomas Becon and William Turner.[62] Somerset's house included his vocally Protestant wife, Anne Stanhope, who would rely on Hooper's pastoral support during her imprisonment in the Tower of London in 1551.[63]

In August 1549, a unique opportunity afforded itself to Hooper to rid England of one of the stalwarts of traditional religion, the Bishop of London, Edmund Bonner. The conservative chronicler of the Grey Friars recorded that Hooper was present at Bonner's sermon where Bonner defied a preaching order from the Privy Council which required Bonner to publicly denounce the Mass.[64] Hooper, along with William Latimer, having heard Bonner's sermon, eagerly reported to the Privy Council Bonner's defiance. Hooper's information led to his eventual removal from his bishopric.

---

[57] Robinson, *OL*, 1:68.
[58] Robinson, *OL*, 1:69.
[59] His friendship with Hilles, Burcher, and Butler would prove helpful. See for instance, Newcombe, *John Hooper*, 20-22. Dalton has examined these relationships in considerably more detail. See Alison Dalton, "John Hooper and His Networks: A Study of Change in Reformation England" (PhD diss., University of Oxford, 2008), 51-83.
[60] Hooper had also dedicated his 1547 work on *Christ and His Office* from Zurich to Somerset. Hooper, *EW*, xi.
[61] Dalton, "John Hooper and His Networks," 58-61.
[62] See M.L. Bush, *The Government Policy of Protector Somerset* (London: Edward Arnold Publishers, 1975), 67-68.
[63] Retha M. Warnicke "Seymour, Anne, duchess of Somerset (*c.*1510–1587)," *ODNB*.
[64] Nichols, *The Chronicle of the Grey Friars*, 63.

Also in late 1549, Hooper began to preach publicly at Paul's Cross in London. This was a task that Hooper enjoyed. The chronicler of the Grey Friars wrote that Cranmer used Hooper's enthusiasm for preaching at Paul's Cross to forward the Protestant cause.[65] Hooper would write that his sermons there were tremendously popular with the people,[66] and Loades observes that Hooper's sermons were generally simple and accessible to the people whilst balancing a firm polemic against those whom he was entrusted to speak out.[67] As Shagan has argued, "the language of evangelical Protestantism became the political *lingua franca* between government and people."[68] During this period of Hooper's life, as part of the Somerset household he, along with Turner and Becon, enjoyed considerable freedom to write and preach, under the patronage of the Lord Protector.

Chaplain to Northumberland

After Somerset's fall, Hooper rather quickly came into the household of Warwick, later the Duke of Northumberland, and successor to Somerset. Just how Hooper was able to escape virtually unscathed from the Somerset affair is as remarkable as it is unclear. However, in his study of the Duke of Northumberland, Loades has perhaps solved this mystery. Loades argues that Hooper represented an alternative vision for the Reformation in England. Hooper's vision was one that saw the clergy relinquish their secular responsibilities in order to focus on their spiritual tasks. As Loades observed, it was this attitude that made Hooper a highly attractive

---

[65] Nichols, *The Chronicle of the Grey Friars*, 63. MacLure argued that the Paul's Cross sermons were largely an early form of propaganda used by the government. Preaching could be restricted to those whose messages were sympathetic with what it was Council was trying to enact. As a preacher at Paul's Cross, Hooper would have been properly vetted and entrusted to deliver the message that the government wanted. Based on Hooper's letters to Bullinger, he became a regular preacher at Paul's Cross. This fact indicates that he was trusted by those in the Council to relay their messages. MacLure, *The Paul's Cross Sermons 1534-1642* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958), 20-22. For a general overview about the social and cultural impact of the sermons delivered in the Tudor period at Paul's Cross see W.J. Torrance Kirby, *Persuasion and Conversion: Essays on Religion, Politics the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 76-80; John N. King, "Paul's Cross and the Implementation of Protestant Reforms Under Edward VI" in *Paul's Cross and the Persuasion of England, 1520-1640*, eds. W.J. Torrance Kirby and P.G. Stanwood (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 141-160.

[66] Robinson, *OL*, 1:69-70; James Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation in England: An Historical Survey*, 4 vols. (London: MacMillan and Co., Limited, 1908), 3:264; Foxe, *AM*, 6:639.

[67] Hooper was also commissioned to preach against Anabaptist uprisings in the South of England by the Council. Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation*, 3:264-265.

[68] Ethan H. Shagan, "Protector Somerset and the 1549 Rebellions: New Sources and New Perspectives," *English Historical Review* 114, No. 455 (1999): 42.

ally and made it possible for him to rally his own religious policy against the likes of Cranmer and Ridley.[69] Moreover, Hooper was popular and his preaching at Court seemed to hold sway with the King's maturing Protestant faith. Foxe would later describe Hooper's sermons: "The people in great flocks and companies daily came to hear his voice, as the most melodious sound and tune of Orpheus's harp, as the proverb saith; insomuch that oftentimes when he was preaching, the church would be so full, that none could enter further than the doors thereof."[70] It was for his preaching that Hooper gained further acclaim at Court and become an agent for a more forward-thinking reforming agenda. This was demonstrated in Hooper's Lenten Sermons on Jonah in which he launched a vicious attack on religious officials who in his view were not taking the Reformation far enough. The *Sermons upon Jonah* were a shift from his earlier writings in that his tone became more of a critique of official policy than a template for progressive change. While Hooper under Northumberland would have a more prominent voice in England, it was this period which brought about the inevitable end of Hooper's autonomous writings for an envisioned political community. Increasingly, Hooper's attention would shift towards a reactive response to the leadership of the Church and the Council.

Strangers' Church at London

Away from Court, Hooper was also involved with the London community of Continental exiles, who were largely Protestant refugees. Hooper served as an advocate for John a Lasco and helped found a church for the Strangers at the Austin Friary. By the time the church had been granted a Royal Charter, Hooper had also become acquainted with many of those who would form a Lasco's pastoral team. Hooper would host Jan Utenhove and Martin Micron in his home while Hooper's relationship with a Lasco was probably mediated through Bullinger with whom a Lasco was also corresponding.[71] Martin Micron was one of the elders of the Dutch church and was a one-time houseguest of Hooper; he would serve as an invaluable

---

[69] Loades, *John Dudley Duke of Northumberland, 1504-1553* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 175-176.

[70] Foxe, *AM*, 6:639.

[71] Hooper mentioned a Lasco in a letter in which he introduced Jan Utenhove to Bullinger. Hooper's letter suggested a familiarity with a Lasco's character and his Protestant sympathies. See Robinson, *OL*, 1:56; Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 34.

source of information about Hooper's activities once he became immersed in his diocesan duties as bishop.[72] Though he would retain an interest in the Strangers' Church for the remainder of Edward's reign, Hooper's direct involvement with it lasted only until his appointment to the bishopric of Gloucester.[73] Importantly, the Strangers' Church at the Austin Friary was, as Pettegree has argued, viewed as a significant model of Continental Protestantism for England.[74] The church, having been granted autonomy from the Church of England in its governance and worship, provided the Zurich-sympathising leaders of the congregation a chance to explore a theological programme that was tailored to the Zurich model. The hope for Hooper was that a Zurich theology on English soil would make inroads within the Church of England itself. In reality however, this turned out not to be the case. As MacCulloch has suggested, the church that a Lasco and Hooper envisioned did not enjoy the trailblazing effect that they had hoped, largely due to Edward's death.[75]

An Oversight and Deliberation Upon the Holy Prophet Jonas

The *Sermons upon Jonah* (1550) was Hooper's most prominent set of sermons, delivered directly to Edward VI and his Court. Hooper conveyed this verdict to Bullinger in a letter in which he commented that his sermons before the King would have to be even greater than his Paul's Cross sermons, which were popular with his audiences, and asked for support:[76] "Do you, my reverent friend, write back as soon as possible, and diligently instruct me as to what you think may conveniently be said in so crowded an auditory. It must necessarily be great when before the king; for even in the city there is such a concourse of people at my lectures, that very often the

---

[72] See for instance Robinson, *OL*, 2:566.

[73] The leaders at the Strangers' Church kept Bullinger informed about Hooper's progress as a Bishop. See for instance, Gorham, *Gleanings of a Few Scattered Ears during the Period of the Reformation in England and of the Times Immediately Succeeding A.D. 1533-A.D.1588* (London: Bell and Daldy, 1857), 266.

[74] See Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities*, 34-35.

[75] Writing on the legacy of a Lasco, MacCulloch has argued that a Lasco the man enjoyed a greater legacy in Edward's reign and beyond, than did his church. The rise of Mary saw see the Strangers' Church disbanded. When Elizabeth took the throne, the Strangers' Church was re-established in 1560. Its autonomy however was severely curtailed, and the Bishop of London had considerable control over its general practice. A posthumous victory for Ridley indeed! See Diarmaid MacCulloch, "The Importance of Jan Laski in the English Reformation," in *Johannes a Lasco (1499-1560): Polnischer Baron, Humanist und europäischer Reformator*, ed. Christoph Strohm (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 344-345.

[76] Robinson, *OL*, 1:75.

church will not hold them."[77] Hooper understood that this was a significant platform for him. It was an opportunity to preach directly to the leading officials of England. In it, he could outline his true desires for reform. This was possible because Hooper was in favour with Northumberland and Edward.[78] Hooper was afforded a relative degree of liberty to choose the subject of his sermon series. The one constraint that Hooper faced was that Lent was traditionally a period of preaching on sin and repentance in preparation for Easter.[79] His preaching choice, therefore, is indeed significant, as it was Hooper's prerogative to stress the message that he felt most applicable. In the same letter to Bullinger, Hooper wrote "I shall make choice, I think, of a very suitable subject, namely, the prophet Jonas; which will enable me freely to touch upon the duties of individuals."[80] Within that statement, Hooper's direction was firmly established. Jonah would become the archetype by which Hooper could elucidate and critique England and her leaders.[81]

The name Jonah bore somewhat of a negative overtone throughout the duration of the sermons.[82] Hooper was concerned with the commonality of "Jonases" throughout England.[83] This meant that people were neglecting their duties – both secular and sacred – as Jonah had neglected his duty as a prophet of God. In condemning this dereliction of duty, Hooper was arguing that idleness must be eradicated from his society as it was the root of this sin. To eradicate idleness, Hooper looked squarely to Edward. Most important was his treatment of the king as a figure of authority.[84] Hooper argued that his faith was to become the model to which his subjects would aspire. This was most apparent in his opening address to Edward in the Lenten Sermons, "Among all other most noble and famous deeds of kings and princes, none is more godly, commendable, nor profitable to the

---

[77] Robinson, *OL*, 1:75.

[78] Northumberland allowed Hooper to preach while others had been banned from doing so. See John Opie, "The Anglicizing of John Hooper," *Archive for Reformation History* 59 (1968): 160.

[79] Lenten Sermons in the Court of Edward VI more or less maintained the traditional preaching style of sin and repentance. It was a platform like none-other where the clergy could be brutally critical on the sins of state. In 1549, Hugh Latimer preached a series of seven sermons which identified these themes. See, Hugh Latimer, *The Sermons by Hugh Latimer, Sometime Bishop of Worcester, Martyr, 1555*, ed. George Elwes Corrie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844), 85-281.

[80] Robinson, *OL*, 1:75.

[81] See Micron's summary of the reception of Hooper's sermons. Robinson, *OL*, 2:559.

[82] See for instance Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 468.

[83] See for instance, Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 502.

[84] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 435.

commonwealth, than to promote and set forth unto their subjects the pure and sincere religion of the eternal God, King of all kings, and Lord of all lords. Then shall justice, peace, and concord reign."[85]

While Hooper's primary aim was to consider the role of individuals, he was also advocating significant consequences for the whole of society.[86] The underlying principle of Hooper's social policies as presented in the Jonah sermons was authority. Hooper believed that society operated best where people recognised their superiors and in turn, those in authority should act benevolently to those who abided by the law. For the success of the community, each was given a vocational duty by God in addition to their Christian responsibilities. It was the purpose of the sermons to exhort Edward and his Privy Council to fulfil their responsibilities as Protestant leaders and encourage them to be a model of godly and diligent living for their subjects. Further, Hooper used the *Sermons upon Jonah* to warn them of the consequences of failing in their duties. Failing would lead to catastrophic ruin caused by the ire of God. Thus, for Hooper's community, it was imperative that authority was properly recognised within the community and that the individual vocation of each citizen was stressed.

Vestment Controversy and Bishop of Gloucester (1551-1553)

Vestment Controversy and Prison

After Hooper delivered his Lenten Sermons he was offered the bishopric of Gloucester, where the diocese had been without its bishop since the death of John Wakeman in 1549.[87] Edward VI marked the occasion in his *Chronicle*, writing, "Hooper was made Bishop of Gloucester."[88] During this period, Hooper was at the height of his popularity in England. He was enjoying considerable success at Court as a popular preacher, reflected in Cranmer's granting him a preaching licence and

---

[85] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 435.
[86] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 456.
[87] Litzenberger's study on the Reformation in Gloucester has provided a fresh light to Wakeman as bishop. The traditionally held view suggested that the traditionalist strongholds in Gloucester were a result of Wakeman's traditionalist sympathies. To an extent, this may be the case, however as Litzenberger has shown, Wakeman fully conformed to official policy. Caroline Litzenberger, *The English Reformation and the Laity: Gloucestershire, 1540-1580* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 59-60.
[88] Jordan, W.K., ed. *The Chronicle and Political Papers of King Edward VI* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1966), 40.

giving him the opportunity to preach to the King. However, this election was by no means a smooth process for Hooper and it led to considerable frustration for the leaders of the Church of England. Micron, who was living with Hooper at the time, wrote to Bullinger describing the events of Hooper's election to the office of bishop,[89] and reporting that Hooper had himself been ordered to maintain a degree of discretion about the matter.[90]

According to Micron, Hooper had two objections to the installation process. The first was the Episcopal Oath.[91] Hooper did not object to swearing the oath per se, but objected to the saints being called to witness.[92] Micron commented on Hooper's first objection: "Here then a question immediately arises as to the form of the oath, which the bishops have ordered to be taken in the name of God, the saints, and the gospels; which impious oath Hooper positively refused to take."[93] Hooper brought his objections to Edward, who, convinced by Hooper's reasoning, removed the clause referring to the saints.[94] John ab Ulmis, an ardent supporter of Bullinger, described Hooper's protest to the King: "His majesty became much excited, and said, 'What wickedness is here, Hooper? Are these offices ordained in the name of the saints, or of God?' As soon as Hooper had declared his opinion, the King immediately erased with his own hand the error of the bishops."[95] After Hooper had taken the Oath in the new form, Micron informed Bullinger of Hooper's opposition to the episcopal vestments. He explained that Hooper had on 30 July presented his arguments to Council and that he was to be consecrated without vestments.[96]

---

[89] Robinson, *OL*, 2:566. No letters to Bullinger from Hooper survive between 29 June 1550 and 1 August 1551.Therefore readers must look to Hooper's friends to describe the second part of Hooper's protest. See Robinson, *OL*, 1:78-91.

[90] Robinson, *OL*, 2:676. Hooper would write to Martyr and Bucer for their opinions concerning the indifference of the sacraments. Hooper also wrote a personal confession (see below, 47). It appears that Hooper refrained from any other correspondence. Dasent, *APC*, 4:191, 200.

[91] Samuel Leuenberger, *Archbishop Cranmer's Immortal Bequest: The Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England: An Evangelistic Liturgy* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1990), 60.

[92] Leuenberger, *Archbishop Cranmer's Immortal Bequest*, 60.

[93] Robinson, *OL*, 2:566.

[94] While the record of what Hooper presented to the king has been lost, Hopf has discovered a manuscript with a few details recorded on Hooper's appeal to write his protestations which the Council permitted. See Constantin Hopf, "Bishop Hooper's 'Notes to the King's Council' 3 October 1550," *Journal of Theological Studies* 44, no. 175-176 (1944): 194-199.

[95] Ab Ulmis was not present at Court but named Martyr as his source of information. Robinson, *OL*, 2:416. A similar account was also recorded by Micron. Robinson, *OL*, 2:566.

[96] Robinson, *OL*, 2:567.

However, an objection by Cranmer and Ridley swayed the Council to reject Hooper's objection.[97] Hooper persisted in his objections and his subsequent refusals alienated the support that he had previous enjoyed with the Council.[98] Micron's colleague at the Strangers' Church, Jan Utenhove, described to Bullinger this episode, which concluded with Hooper spending a fortnight in the Fleet prison.[99] Finally, Hooper capitulated to official policy and was consecrated according the established form.[100]

Confession

As the bitter disputes between Hooper and the Council intensified, Hooper was forbidden to publish and was effectively gagged until Hooper capitulated to be consecrated in the established form.[101] Peter Martyr, writing to Bullinger after Hooper had conformed, reported that Hooper had been silenced and initially unable to take his bishopric, much to the detriment to the Reformation cause.[102] Nevertheless, Hooper in rare defiance to the civil authority published a confession.[103] The *Godly Confession and Protestation of the Christian Faith* (hereafter *Confession)* (1550) was written to clarify his position and silence his critics. His dedication of this work to Edward and the Privy Council left no uncertainties to whom and why Hooper addressed his confession. Hooper highlighted his intention: "If a man see his neighbour's ass fall under his burden, or his ox to go astray, his neighbour is bound to help them both, the ass from burden, and the ox from straying."[104]

---

[97] For an extensive analysis on Hooper's views against the principle of *adiaphora* concerning the vestments and the various responses both for and against Hooper, see Primus, *The Vestments Controversy*, 17-59.

[98] Robinson, *OL*, 2:675.

[99] Utenhove concluded his letter to Bullinger with the request that Hooper was not to be told how Bullinger had heard about this information. It seemed Hooper wanted to keep Bullinger ignorant of the affair which was no doubt a source of considerable embarrassment for him. Robinson, *OL*, 584-586.

[100] See Gorham, *Gleanings*, 233-235.

[101] See above, 46n95.

[102] Robinson, *OL*, 2:487.

[103] The Parker Society included two confessions in Hooper's *Later Works*: *A Brief and Clear Confession of the Christian Faith* and *A Godly Confession and Protestation of the Christian Faith*. Ross, drawing upon some earlier theological concerns raised by West, has argued that the first of these, *A Brief and Clear Confession*, was not written by Hooper. Ross argued that the mistake may have been made by Christopher Barker, who reprinted the work in the 1580s believing it to be a work of Hooper. See Donald S. Ross, "Hooper's Alleged Authorship of 'A Brief and Clear Confession of the Christian Faith'," *Church History* 39 (1970): 18-29.

[104] Hooper, *Confession*, (London, 1550), *LW*, 67; Ex 23:4-5.

The general theme of Hooper's *Confession* was injustice. Hooper felt that the Council had committed an error by favouring Ridley's arguments, and this would form the basis for his rebuttal. "Even so I would desire my christian countrymen to use me (for I have built no altars of idolatry), if they be in doubt of me in any thing, and not to kill by hearsay, neither before they have heard me speak."[105] Here, Hooper argued that his theological positions had remained consistent. Moreover, Hooper affirmed that the laws of the Patriarchs were necessary to godly living.[106] He also reaffirmed the legitimacy of the magistrate and the need for the magistrate to create godly laws for the community and for the community to follow those laws as God's representative in government.[107] Concerning ministers, Hooper criticised bishops when they became too concerned with "civil policy".[108] Hooper argued that a call to the episcopacy should be based on God's calling and the candidate's abilities rather than their familial or political ties.[109] This was not a particularly radical work: nevertheless, because Hooper had been ordered to maintain silence while the debate continued, publishing this work this was probably what put Hooper into prison, thereby ending his period of writing about a reformed society.

Both Utenhove and Hooper's wife Anna reported to Bullinger that Hooper quickly travelled to Gloucester after his consecration and immersed himself in reforming his diocese.[110] Hooper complained bitterly about the hostility to the Reformation throughout the diocese. Much has already been written on Hooper's diocesan administration, and it will not be necessary here to cover in detail Hooper's work as a bishop.[111] Hooper set himself first to bring about administrative changes, which would see him play a leading role in his ecclesiastical courts.[112] Hooper also

---

[105] Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 69.

[106] Hooper argued that laws of the Patriarchs concerning their ability to know God and live a godly life began with Abraham and has remained unchanged ever since. See Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 71.

[107] Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 76-82, 91-92.

[108] Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 90.

[109] See Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 90. See below, 155.

[110] Robinson, *OL*, 2:586; Robinson, *OL*, 1:107.

[111] See for instance Caroline Litzenburger, *The Reformation and the Laity*, 59-82; Benjamin Lowe, *Commonwealth and the English* Reformation: *Protestantism and the Politics of Religious Change in the Gloucester Vale, 1483-1560* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2010), 115-218; FD Price "Gloucester Diocese under Bishop Hooper, 1551-3," *BGAS* 60 (1938): 55-151.

[112] Hooper's work and judgments in his ecclesiastical courts have been well documented by FS Hockaday and FD Price. See Price, "Gloucester Diocese under Bishop Hooper," 51-151, and Hockaday, F.S. "The Consistory Court of the Diocese of Gloucester,*"* *BGAS* 46 (1924):195-287.

quickly conducted a rigorous visitation of his diocese.[113] For the visitations, he produced injunction articles for both the clergy and the laity, though for the latter these were considerably more lenient.[114] There are indications that Hooper's success endeavours met some success; for instance he fostered a group of clergy which would reappear in the reign of Elizabeth.[115] In 1552, Hooper was also appointed bishop to the diocese of Worcester, and Gloucester became an archdeaconry under Hooper's jurisdiction.[116] In Worcester, Hooper again faced conservative resistance, but sought to tackle it as he had in Gloucester. To combat traditionalism, Hooper planned to spend six months in Worcester and six in Gloucester each year.[117]

Hooper's civil politics were always secondary to his ecclesiastical reforms but in 1552, he gained considerable political notoriety.[118] He also gained a key political ally in his reformation efforts in the Duke of Northumberland, who observed Edward's growing sympathy for Hooper.[119] It appeared that Hooper was convinced by Northumberland's desire to reform England. This amicable relationship continued as late as February 1553, by which time most others had begun to question Northumberland's sincerity for reform, when Hooper requested that Bullinger dedicate one of his *Decades* to Northumberland.[120] Northumberland desired less

---

[113] Litzenberger, *The English Reformation and the Laity*, 68. The Swiss student Josua Maler who was travelling to meet Hooper with letters from Bullinger also accounted Hooper's visitations. W.D. Robson-Scott, "Josua Maler's Visit to England in 1551," *The Modern Language Review* 45, no. 3 (1950): 349.

[114] Lowe, *Commonwealth and the English Reformation*, 183.

[115] A document sent by Hooper to Edward's Council provides the names of these notable Protestant clergy: they were signatories against the testament of Thomas Penn, an Anabaptist of the region. Included in the names were John Jewel and John Parkhurst. Their connection with Hooper probably helped to gain them access to Bullinger during their exile under Mary. Knighton, *CSP Dom*, 197.

[116] Strype, *Ecc. Mems*, 3:170-171.

[117] D.G. Newcombe, "Hooper, John (1495x1500–1555)," *ODNB*; Brodie and Lyte, *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 4:231.

[118] See Robinson, *OL*, 1:445.

[119] Newcombe traces Edward's growing support for Hooper beginning prior to the Vestment controversyVestment controversy. Newcombe, *John Hooper*, 151.

[120] Robinson, *OL*, 1:99. Hooper was one of Northumberland's last ecclesiastical sympathisers but it was probably Northumberland's blocking of the Canon Law Reforms, which Hooper played some role, and his prevention of the appointment of Robert Horne to the see of Durham which brought about serious doubts as to Northumberland's intentions. Loades, *John Dudley Duke of Northumberland*, 196.

political interference from the bishops and a particular decision by Hooper may have provided him with the basis for supporting Hooper as a model for this hope.[121]

When Hooper gained Worcester, he ceded considerable revenue and church lands under his administration over to the government.[122] Evidence for why Hooper did this, or whether this decision was entirely voluntary, is unclear, but either way, his aversion to involving himself in secular affairs is significant. Hooper was critical of the size of the expansive territory that he was responsible for and believed that the maintenance of church lands and the responsibility for the people inhabited it was best administered by the government, which would allow him to focus on his preaching and clerical supervision. In doing so, Hooper hoped that the government would serve the interests of the poor and execute justice across the land and provide for the clergy.[123] For that reason, Northumberland probably wanted Hooper to take a more central role in Edward's church. [124] Having Hooper in London would have set a considerable example to the rest of the country by supporting Hooper's brand of Protestantism.[125]

Political scheming aside, as a bishop, Hooper had the additional responsibility of serving as a Lord Spiritual in the House of Lords.[126] Given Hooper's aversion to the secular responsibilities of the clergy, serving in the House was probably not a position he relished. Nevertheless, as it was part of his duty, Hooper served diligently, and had an impeccable attendance record.[127] While the House of Lords sat, Hooper used this opportunity to support further Protestant

---

[121] Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England: 1547-1603* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990), 15.
[122] Edward waived Hooper's obligation to pay his first-fruits. See below, 54n144.
[123] Hooper would himself complain about the lack of revenues available to him to properly execute his duty. Brodie and Lyte, *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 4:231.
[124] This was reported by the Imperial Ambassador Jehan Scheyfve. Hume and Tyler, *CSP Sp*, 10:591.
[125] See below, 144-147.
[126] Graves has written on the Upper House in the reigns of Edward VI and Mary I, and observes that the members of the Lords Spiritual were drawn from very learned stock. See Michael AR Graves, *The House of Lords in the Parliaments of Edward VI and Mary I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 33. For a description of the responsibilities and make-up of the House of Lords see Michael AR Graves, *The House of Lords in the Parliaments of Edward VI and Mary I*, 1-10.
[127] Hooper's attendance is recorded in the Journal of the House of Lords. See *Journals of the House of Lords: Beginning Anno Primo Henrici Octavi 1513-1577*, vol .1 of *Journals of the House of Lords* (London: Parliamentary Archives, 1773).

legislation and better business practices.[128] Unfortunately, not much is known about Hooper's involvement in specific legislation, but it is clear that he fulfilled this duty diligently despite his opposition to secular involvement. This demonstrates that Hooper had used his position to influence the Reformation in England from within, using the powers he had been given to enact the outcomes that he desired.

Sermons, Visitations and Injunctions

Unsurprisingly, as Hooper immersed himself in the duties required of him as bishop, his literary output decreased. Moreover, as a bishop, his literary intentions changed. Hooper was using his position to implement his ideas as best he could. To do this he travelled regularly to monitor the clergy and people of his diocese.[129] This meant that Hooper became further immersed in official responsibilities. He had opportunity to criticise official religious and social policy within England and in his dioceses of Gloucester and Worcester in particular. While his diocesan administration would dominant most of his time, Hooper was able to lecture on books of the Bible.[130] Notably, he produced a commentary, *Annotations on Romans XIII* (hereafter *Romans 13*), in 1551.[131] Hooper dedicated this work to the cathedral clergy at Gloucester, though the intended audience included all ministers in his diocese. This was significant as the commentary was intended to be used by his clergy in their sermons. Hooper was concerned that his clergy were lackadaisical in their preaching and feared that a failure to preach would bring about the ruin of the church. He wrote: "Our office… is to be diligent and circumspect for the people of God; and now, the hand of God being stretched forth, to admonish the flock committed unto our charges in time, lest they die, and their blood required at our hands."[132] In particular, he asserted that sins committed against those called by God to govern would have significant consequences.[133]

---

[128] Graves, *The House of Lords in the Parliaments of Edward VI and Mary I*, 62. See *Journals of the House of Lords*, vol. 1: *Beginning Anno Primo Henrici Octavi 1513-1577*, 1:418, 420, 444, 480. The record reports that Hooper was commissioned to examine a bill concerning the cloth trade. Hooper's ties to the trade would have made him a suitable candidate in this task. See above, 29-30n4.
[129] Hooper, *Visitations* (Worcester: 1552), *LW*, 117.
[130] Robinson, *OL*, 1:75.
[131] Hooper, *Romans 13* (Worcester: 1551), *LW*, 93.
[132] Hooper, *Romans 13*, *LW*, 95.
[133] Hooper, *Romans 13*, *LW*, 98.

Additionally, Hooper argued that clerical malpractice and obstinacy towards Protestantism would bring about the ire of the king. Hooper was concerned that failures of the clergy to promote Protestantism would cause the people to rebel against the king. Hooper wanted the clergy to encourage grievances to be channelled appropriately, and also wanted them to care properly for the needy. The *Romans 13* commentary thus served to emphasise the power of the magistrate as an instrument of God and to highlight the sinful practice of rebellion. Hooper wrote: "For there is no traitor nor seditious man can be saved; but obedient and quiet men shall inherit the kingdom of heaven, and such as suffer wrong, and not such as do wrong, or intend to revenge by strength their own wrongs."[134] Hooper instructed that his clergy preach this message weekly.[135]

Two documents have survived which add greater detail to Hooper's diocesan administration and highlight his priorities for reforming the clergy in his *Visitation* articles and *Injunctions*. These have been adequately explored by Baskerville and Gairdner in their studies of Hooper's diocesan administration.[136] The *Visitations* and *Injunctions* themselves were not an original idea. It was customary for a new bishop to conduct a visitation of his diocese. This can be demonstrated through a series of injunctions from Ridley which have survived, allowing some comparisons to be made, and further insight can be gleaned from the dialogue with the Council in having the injunctions posted. Both injunctions called for the removal of all remaining ornamentation and required their ministers to adhere to the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*.[137] As Baskerville noted, it was the vigour which Hooper employed in his injunctions which was significant. Hooper used his power as bishop as a way to change behaviour. His concerns were primarily religious, but he understood that religious action carried political consequences. In addressing the clergy and laity, the most significant concept he employed was vocation.[138] Hooper entrusted everyone

---

[134] Hooper, *Romans 13*, *LW*, 98.
[135] Hooper, *Romans 13*, *LW*, 98.
[136] See G. Baskerville, "Elections to Convocation in the Diocese of Gloucester under Bishop Hooper," *The English Historical Review* 44, no. 173, (1929): 1-32 and James Gairdner, "Bishop Hooper's Visitation of Gloucester," *The English Historical Review* 19, no. 73 (1904): 98-121.
[137] See Nicholas Ridley, *The Works of Nicholas Ridley Sometime Bishop of London*, ed. Henry Christmas (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1843), 319-321. Hunt, *The Life and Times of Bishop Hooper*, 144-145.
[138] See below, 195.

with responsibilities and argued that success in parishes, and, to a greater extent, in the kingdom, depended on each person playing their role. Thus, the interconnected nature of Hooper's ideal society was of prime importance. This will be explored in chapter seven on the responsibilities of citizens of the community.[139]

Imprisonment and Execution (1553-1555)

As Edward lay dying in 1553, Hooper knew that any hope for continuing his religious reform as a bishop was in serious jeopardy. When he got word of Edward's death in July, Hooper was probably in his diocese.[140] There is nothing to suggest that Hooper had any knowledge of the plot to alter the succession, and he did not endorse it. Instead, Hooper was one of the first of the clergy to lend support to Mary's claims for the throne. This fact has puzzled many. Hooper sided with an ardent Catholic, against whom Hooper had preached, to take the English throne. This would appear puzzling because Jane Grey appears to be the better candidate for Hooper's ideal magistrate. Jane possessed strong, Protestant convictions, was attentive to living a life of faith through the pursuit of theological knowledge and was also in correspondence with Bullinger.[141] Nevertheless, Hooper rejected Jane's claim due to his belief that Mary was the rightful and legitimate heir to the throne. This may reflect a sense of failure on Hooper's part, arising from his distrust of the Council's leadership,[142] but it may also point a genuine, if misguided, hope that he could preach to Mary and convert her to his Protestant cause.[143] Certainly Hooper did not simply resign himself to the inevitability of the arrival of a Catholic monarch; rather he

---

[139] See below, 192.

[140] Hooper's name does not appear in any official capacity at this point either in the House of Lords or at Court. Newcombe writes that Hooper was away from the London at the time and was not part of Northumberland's scheming. Newcombe, *John Hooper*, 207.

[141] Hooper and those who knew him intimately played a role in establishing Bullinger's network with the Grey family. John ab Ulmis was instrumental in having the fifth volume of Bullinger's *Decade Sermons* dedicated to Lord Henry Grey, Marquis of Dorset, Jane Grey's father. The Parker Society Collections have preserved three letters from Jane Grey to Bullinger ranging from 1551-1553. These letters indicate that Jane had sought Bullinger's theological advice and by proxy, Bullinger gave her some religious instruction. Jane's letters also suggest a shared interest in theology as Jane consulted Bullinger on various theological topics. Though Bullinger's responses to Jane's letters do not survive, it appears that Bullinger took an interest in her personal and spiritual development. See Robinson, *OL*, 1:4-11.

[142] See above, 49n120.

[143] Hooper wrote a letter to Mary's Council distancing himself from slanderous reports that he had allegedly condemned Queen Mary's right to reign. In the letter, Hooper attempted to persuade Mary from embracing Catholicism. See Hooper, *An Apology* (England: 1554; reprinted in 1562), *LW*, 554-567.

actually provided horses for Mary to travel to London. Nonetheless, Hooper became one of the earliest victims of the arrests of Protestant clergy by the Marian regime when he was sent to the Fleet Prison on 1 September 1553 on charges of debt.[144]

It appears from Hooper's prison letters that his time in prison was tough and his freedom to write varied, but he maintained a significant correspondence when the opportunity afforded.[145] Most of the letters that remain were addressed to friends whom he sought to encourage as they faced Mary's systematic dismantling of Edwardian Protestantism. Hooper's comments on his political theology largely focused on how England had abused the chance to establish a true Protestant kingdom under Edward. Otherwise, Hooper complained bitterly about his mistreatment. He was also the victim of rumours that he had converted to Catholicism which added considerably to his turmoil.[146] Hooper was one of the first victims of the Marian purge of Protestant heretics; he was martyred in Gloucester on 9 February 1555, before the doors of his own cathedral.[147] The execution, according to Foxe, was particularly brutal.[148] Within months, his wife Anna and daughter Rachel would also be dead, victims of the plague that ravaged Strasbourg, whence they had fled.[149] Hooper's letters from prison were largely reflective as he accepted that England under Mary was returning to Catholicism. They are not concerned with how Hooper wanted to establish a Protestant community, and are therefore of marginal importance to this study.

Conclusion

Hooper's Protestant writings highlight his desire to formulate ideas about a Protestant community. These ideas can be found in Hooper's earliest letters to

---

[144] As Newcombe notes, the debt charge concerned Hooper's unpaid first-fruits; however, Edward had excused Hooper from paying them. This represented an easy avenue for Mary to rid herself of a most cantankerous Protestant bishop. Newcombe, "John Hooper", *ODNB*; Dasent, *APC*, 4:61.

[145] Newcombe, *John Hooper*, 216-217.

[146] Foxe, *AM*, 6:650.

[147] Newcombe, *John Hooper*, 228.

[148] Foxe, *AM*, 6:658.

[149] It has been suggested that Hooper's young son Daniel had remained behind in England initially. Newcombe notes that there was no mention of Daniel's arrival in Frankfurt, but after Anna's death in 1555, he lived with Edmund Oldsworth, who was the son of one of Hooper's Gloucester preachers. There is no further record of his whereabouts. This has led to speculation that Daniel did not survive long. Newcombe, *John Hooper*, 211. Daniel's young age is supported by a letter from Hooper to Bullinger in 1551, where he told Bullinger that there had not been any new additions to his family since he left Zurich. Robinson, *OL*, 1:92.

Bullinger after his conversion. His most prolific writings and most significant contributions to his understanding of a Protestant community came during his Zurich period. Having benefitted from Bullinger's theological instruction and witnessed the reformation of both the church and government in Zurich, Hooper drew on the Protestant ideals which had shaped Zurich to influence his own vision. He favoured the simplicity of worship and the belief that God demanded godly living from both individuals and the community. Hooper brought these ideas with him to England, and attempted to implement them as he grew more influential in the Reformation in England. After submitting to official policy, Hooper became immersed in his diocesan administration and sought to mould clergy who were suited to implement the reforms he had described in his earlier writings. However, progress was often slow, or non-existent, due not only to obstinate clergy and parishioners, but also to his duties in the House of Lords. When searching Hooper's writings for his ideas for a Protestant community, the writings from Zurich demonstrate Hooper's most robust writings on the community. However, they are completed by his reforming efforts, undertaken as a bishop of the Church of England, to enact the changes he desired.

Chapter 2: The Theological Foundations of John Hooper's Political Theology

Introduction

Hooper's theological outlook needs to be considered when understanding the reformed society that John Hooper wanted to establish. To the modern reader, Hooper's distinction between what is theological and what is purely political is not clearly demarcated. Hooper's theological convictions were the basis on which he could assess the problems of his day and develop responses to perceived societal ills.[1] This chapter will consider in detail the central nature of Hooper's theological position, which sought to understand God's decrees and how a sinful people should obey those decrees. Hooper wrote in his work on *Romans 13* that "the office and duty of a christian man is contained in two parts: the first, that he use himself aright and reverently with God; the second, that he use him comely and honestly with men."[2] Living in total obedience to God's Law was the only way in which humanity could satisfy God's demands. In so doing, Hooper believed that his society would enjoy a peaceful and faithful era of prosperity. Every decision made, therefore, was the result of Hooper dealing with that very question.

Rather than an exhaustive account of Hooper's theological thinking, this chapter considers those positions that have a direct bearing on how Hooper chose to organise and order the community. Thus, the presentation of theological arguments is considered in such a way as to highlight Hooper's pattern for understanding God and the world in which he lived. This chapter does not present a rigorous theological system because Hooper was not a systematic thinker. However, this study has arranged theological topics in such a way that models an individual's path for following the Law of God. This was a practical journey that focused on the awareness of human inability to achieve salvation and grew into a system that embraced obedience to God's Law for the individual and the society of which each

---

[1] Newcome has devoted a chapter to the theology of Hooper. The similarities between Newcombe's study and the present study are noted, but the intention of this chapter is to evaluate theological topics for their relevance in understanding Hooper's designs for a reformed community, which differs from Newcombe. See D.G. Newcombe *John Hooper: Tudor Bishop and Martyr* (Oxford: The Davenant Press, 2009), 36-87.

[2] Hooper, *Romans 13*, *LW*, 99.

individual was part. The steps along the path were shown in Hooper's work *Christ and His Office*. By considering Hooper's theology, the political framework that Hooper made to create his godly community can be properly understood.

Theological Foundations and Preoccupations

An examination of Hooper's theological foundations would be incomplete without considering two influences which dominated Hooper's theological outlook. These two influences were his Zurich roots, and his fear of Anabaptism. Both influences would have a considerable effect on Hooper's approach to theology and how he organised his understanding of God's Law. While Hooper's close, personal relationship with Bullinger has been considered, Hooper also espoused many of Bullinger's (and Zurich's) theological positions. Hooper had two avenues into the Zurich tradition. The first, whilst he was still in England, was through the writings of Zwingli; and the second, during his stay in Zurich, was through Bullinger's adaptation of Zwingli's message.[3] However, it is not correct to assume that Hooper was a mere ideological puppet of the Zurich tradition or of Zwingli or Bullinger. This chapter will therefore clarify areas of doctrinal similarity but will also identify areas where there was a difference between Hooper's writings and those of Zwingli or Bullinger. It should be noted that Bullinger, while loyal to his predecessor, had also adapted some of Zwingli's doctrines.

A second important influence was Hooper's fear of the Anabaptists. Hooper was afraid that the Anabaptists and their doctrines were a significant destabilising force throughout Europe.[4] While the worst stories of Anabaptism were probably heard in Zurich, Hooper feared similar problems in England.[5] Hooper called Anabaptist doctrine "very pernicious and damnable"[6] and mentions Anabaptist ideas

---

[3] See above, 30-31.

[4] Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 76. Hooper's preaching tour also suggested such fears. See J.W. Martin, *Religious Radicals in Tudor England* (London: Hambledon Press, 1989), 23.

[5] Estep argues that Bullinger's treatment of the Anabaptists was particularly prejudicial. William R. Estep, *The Anabaptist Story: An Introduction to Sixteenth-Century Anabaptism*, 3rd edition (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1996), 30. Robinson, *OL*, 1:65. Micron echoes these fears to Bullinger. See Robinson, *OL*, 2:560. Clement noted some unorthodox theological opinions around London amongst the Anabaptists. C.J. Clement, *Religious Radicalism in England 1535-1565* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1997), 220-223. See also John P. Davis, *Heresy and Reformation in the South-East of England, 1520-1599* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1983), 104.

[6] Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 121.

and those who espoused them in the same breath as the heretical giants Marcion and Manichaeus.[7] In terms of Hooper's theology, his writings suggested two responses to Anabaptism. On the one hand, Hooper was writing against Anabaptist theology, but on the other he also faced charges that he himself had espoused Anabaptist ideas.[8] The effect that Anabaptism had on Hooper's writings was most noticeable in Hooper's theology of sin and the Trinity as these were two areas where Hooper profoundly disagreed with them. However, Anabaptist beliefs also affected the structuring of Hooper's path for following God's Law. In contrast to Anabaptist belief, Hooper highlighted the depravity of man and the need for the Reformation to utilise the instruments both of the church and the government to ensure success. Both Zurich and the Anabaptists are therefore significant for fully understanding Hooper's theology, particularly as it pertained to how the individual learned to follow God's Law and the reformation of the community.

Sin and the Human Condition

Hooper's Use of Medieval Ideas

As Newcombe has rightly concluded, Zurich theology formed the basis of Hooper's theological outlook.[9] This also included how Hooper understood and appropriated certain late-medieval ideas. This is apparent in his understanding of sin and his ideas about how sin might be managed within the community, which is a key focus of this thesis.[10] The Zurich tradition, which formed the basis of Hooper's theological outlook, was heavily influenced by Erasmus' humanism.[11] Zwingli was an avid reader of Erasmus and according to Potter, while Zwingli was a Catholic Parish priest at Glarus, he met Erasmus in 1515, having already become enamoured of Erasmus' writings.[12] Zwingli favoured the Erasmian understanding that sin was a disease, as he expressed it: "For what could be said more briefly and plainly that sin

---

[7] Hooper's inclusion of Manicheanism is perhaps unfair as that strand of thought is not traditionally associated with Christian history and thought despite Augustine's dabbling with the ideas prior to his conversion. Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 78.
[8] See below, 66n49.
[9] Newcombe, *John Hooper*, 40.
[10] See below, 61-62.
[11] McGrath, *Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 154.
[12] G.R. Potter, *Zwingli* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 36; Ulrich Gabler, *Huldrych Zwingli: His Life and Work,* trans. Ruth C.L. Gritsch (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), 39.

is not sin but disease."[13] The significance of this belief was that a person whom God had saved could have their sinful disease remedied through a commitment to right moral actions. As Denlinger has established, the consequence of original sin was in this thinking not a complete separation from God, but a sickness that severely impacted one's capacity to understand the will of God.[14] For the Zurich tradition, works were significant and had an impact upon Christian life.[15] Human actions could bring about God's pleasure or displeasure. The Ten Commandments were the measure of God's desire for moral living, and breaking those laws brought with it personal and social ruin.[16] Importantly, however, this did not affect how Zwingli and his follower Hooper viewed the separation between God and humanity as the result of humanity's sin.

Despite his positive view that God could assess human actions as either favourable or unfavourable, Hooper must be considered broadly Augustinian, in line with most of his fellow Reformers. The Zurich tradition, due to its Erasmian roots, often faced criticism, especially from Luther, for venturing too close to the position of the fifth-century British monk Pelagius and his late-medieval interpreters such as the German scholar Gabriel Biel.[17] Pelagius, whom Augustine had rebuked for his understanding of sin, had asserted that the actions of a redeemed person bore salvific consequences.[18] Some of Hooper's arguments superficially appear to be in sympathy with Pelagius. Although Hooper placed a considerable emphasis upon moral living, he did not equate these moral actions with salvation. Instead, he rejected the Pelagian position: "It is not a christian man's part to attribute his salvation to his own free will, with the Pelagians, and extenuate original sin; nor make God the author of ill

---

[13] Ulrich Zwingli, *On Providence and Other Essays*, Ulrich Zwingli reprint 1983. ed. Samuel Macauley Jackson and William John Hinke (Durham: Labyrinth Press, 1922, 1983), 3.

[14] Aaron C. Denlinger, *Omnes in Adam ex pacto Dei: Ambrogio Catarino's Doctrine of Covenantal Solidarity and its Influence on Post-Reformation Reformed Theologians* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 186.

[15] See Euan Cameron, *The European Reformation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 113; See J. Wayne Baker, *Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenant: The Other Reformed Tradition* (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1980), 31-33; Ulrich Zwingli, *On Providence and Other Essays*, 4-7; Changkyu Kim, *Balthasar Hubmaier's Doctrine of Salvation in Dynamic and Relational Perspective* (Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick, 2013), 134-135.

[16] See Euan Cameron, *The European Reformation*, 116-117.

[17] Arnaud Vissers, *Reading Augustine in the Reformation: The Flexibility of Intellectual Authority in Europe 1500-1620* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 30.

[18] Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), 123.

and our damnation, with the Manichee; nor yet say, God hath written fatal laws, as the Stoic, and with necessity of destiny violently pulled one by hair into heaven, and thrusteth the other headlong into hell."[19] By rejecting a Pelagian understanding, Hooper should be read as an Augustinian in his theology of sin. Hooper believed that only through Christ could one gain salvation. While the actions of Christian living were important and gained God's favour or wrath and so affected the community that Hooper envisioned, they crucially did not affect an individual's salvation, because that was known only to God.[20]

Through his exposure to the Zurich tradition and its dependence upon Augustine, Erasmian humanism and rejection of the Pelagian school of thought, Hooper's acceptance or rejection of certain late-medieval ideas found within his writings can be better understood. For instance, Hooper retained the use of penance within his reform of the community. Penance, as Hooper conceived of it, was useful to demonstrate contrition.[21] Actions were important and God's favour was conditional upon a person's right belief and action. This also helps to explain Hooper's rejection of auricular confession because he stressed that contrition, in both thought and deed, was necessary on behalf of the individual seeking forgiveness.[22] His rejection of certain other late-medieval practices affirms this trend. Hooper categorically rejected the notion of Purgatory as this challenged his belief in the providence of God.[23] Absolution through baptism and the Mass was also an idea that Hooper rejected. He was critical of the idea that any sacrament could absolve a person of their sins.[24] It was God alone who could absolve sin. Human action, while profitable for God's favour and disfavour within the community, was insignificant to a person's salvation.

---

[19] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 263.
[20] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 263.
[21] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 549. See below, 160.
[22] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, 536; Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 50.
[23] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 197.
[24] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 208.

Depravity of Humanity

Hooper argued that in order to comprehend and follow God's Law, one needed to understand sin and the sinful nature that separated humanity from God. Hooper wrote:

> First, St Paul perceiveth that the grace and promises of God cannot be known of man, until such time as he be brought to acknowledge and displeasure of his sins. The physician and physic be unprofitable unto such as know not that they be sick… Therefore we must know the wound of our souls and the sickness of sin, before we can get any profit by the grace of God.[25]

To understand the human sinful condition and to teach people of God's displeasure of sin, it was necessary to highlight the need to follow God's Law. Hooper attested that the human condition was tainted with sin. This sin had severed humanity from God and required the death of Christ to atone for humanity's sin.[26] Hooper's understanding of sin was composed of two related ideas about sin and how it continued to affect humanity's relationship with God: original sin and a sinful disposition. Original sin was inherited as it was passed from Adam and resulted in a "natural corruption".[27] This corruption of nature implied that all were born into sin and were in need of salvation.[28] Hooper saw this relationship as a sin of genealogical consequence, a corrupted nature that existed from the time of Adam. He explained the origins and consequences of the sin of Adam from the account of Genesis: "For as we were in Adam before his fall, and should, if he had not sinned, been of the same innocency and perfection that he was created in; so were we in his loins, when he sinned, and participant of his sin."[29] Further, it meant that, as a result of sin, people were unable without grace to be saved. Hooper continued, in his introduction to the *Ten Commandments*, that because of Adam's sin: "so were we in [Adam] when God made him a promise of grace, and partakers of the same grace, not as the children of Adam, but as the children of the promise. As the sins of Adam without

---

[25] Hooper, *Romans 13*, *LW*, 99.
[26] Hooper rejected any other form of atonement for sin. See Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 49-50.
[27] Gen 3:13-24; Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 304. See also, Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 152.
[28] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 129; Hooper, *Confession, LW*, 73.
[29] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 258.

privilege or exception extended and appertained unto all Adam's and every of Adam's posterity".[30]

Hooper's strongest opinions on the subject were provoked by an interpretation of original sin that was circulating around London. In a letter to Bullinger in 1549, Hooper wrote with concern that the Anabaptists "contend that a man who is reconciled to God [immediately upon conversion] is without sin, and free from all stains of concupiscence, and that nothing of the old Adam remains in his nature".[31] Hooper's objections to this Anabaptist theology were of profound political significance. Everyone, whether Christian or not, still sinned, thus adversely affecting the health of the community. Despite the prevalence of sin, the institutions of the community were to work concurrently with the church to mitigate the capacity to commit sins because they were detrimental to the health of the community.[32] The second category of sin, the sinful disposition, assumed that every person remained prone to committing sin. Hooper again stated his objections to an Anabaptist position which rejected the prevalence of sin in a baptised Christian within the community. Before considering the intuitions of the government, Hooper first had to demonstrate how humanity might overcome the depravity of sin.

The Pursuit of Re-learning Godly Knowledge

Despite the prevalence of sin within an individual, Hooper believed that a Christian person had the ability to re-learn the godly knowledge that had been lost because of sin.[33] There is nothing to suggest that anyone had actually achieved this state of godliness, and Hooper was doubtful whether a person could ever achieve this state,

---

[30] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 258-259.

[31] Robinson *OL*, 1:65; Hooper referred to the Augustinian idea that Original Sin was transmitted through the sin of concupiscence. Through conception, the child's sin would be inherited via the lust of the parents. See Augustine, *The City of God against the Pagans: Book I-XIII* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 534-544. See above, 61.

[32] See below, 80-81.

[33] Newcombe has considered these ideas in his writing on Hooper's theology of humanity. Generally, Newcombe has reached similar conclusions, however Hooper's thought here seems much more aligned with Bullinger than Newcombe credits. See Newcombe, *John Hooper,* 68-74. See for instance, Luca Baschera, "Total Depravity? The Consequences of Original Sin in John Calvin and Later Reformed Theology," in *Calvinus Clarissimus Theologus: Papers of the Tenth International Congress on Calvin Research,* ed. H.J. Selderhius (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2012), 48.

but the important point remains that at least in theory, this was indeed a possibility.[34] Hooper argued that right actions were important for the prosperity of the community and he believed that when Christians satisfied God's Law, the community would be faithful and at peace.[35] However, such actions could never overcome the chasm created between God and humanity because of sin. Hooper made this distinction very apparent in his work on the *Ten Commandments*. He denied the power of works to merit salvation, arguing: "For although grace prevent the doing of good, and follow it never so much; yet is the work unperfect, and satisfieth not the perfection of the law: only it is Christ's merits that we are saved by."[36] Hooper believed that the human capacity to consider any good action was due to the understanding that God had bestowed righteousness upon humanity. Pursuing righteousness as an expression of faith was applicable to individuals as well as society.

To demonstrate this idea of righteousness within the community, Hooper's work, *Christ and His Office* provides an account on how people and the community in which they lived, were to strive to live virtuously as a process of relearning lost knowledge.[37] In it, Hooper explained the original condition in which Adam was created with the knowledge and power over creation,[38] suggesting that Adam was given the ability to know the Law of God and live according to that Law with his power over creation. When Adam sinned, however, this knowledge was lost. Hooper wrote, "Forasmuch as Almighty God, of his infinite mercy and goodness, prepared a means whereby Adam and his posterity might be restored again unto their original justice and perfection".[39] Thus, he was tasked with understanding how individuals and the community of which they were part, could live as God had initially designed for them.

---

[34] See above, 61.

[35] For an investigation into how works benefitted Christian life at Zurich see: John Fesko, *Beyond Calvin: Union with Christ and Justification in Early Modern Reformed Theology (1517-1700)* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 185.

[36] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 411.

[37] Hooper wrote that no descendent of Adam could ever know and follow the Law perfectly. Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 51.

[38] See Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 15.

[39] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 15.

The Devil and the Persistence of Evil

Despite humanity's best efforts to live faithfully, Hooper believed humans had failed to achieve their potential. He explained by showing that humanity was often tempted by the devil, whom Hooper called "our mortal enemy".[40] Hooper's understanding of the devil was one who tempted humanity away from the truth. Hooper explained this temptation by examining how the devil tried to dissuade Christ from fulfilling his mission: "thus was the malice of the devil always great against our Saviour. Before he came into the flesh, he made many believe he was come, before the time appointed by the prophets was expired. When he was come in deed, then went he about to persuade he was not come, nor was not the Saviour of the world, and never left till he had killed him".[41] From Hooper's description on how the devil tempted Christ, he believed in the singularity of a devil figure calling him Satan.[42] However, he did not suggest that the Devil was solely responsible for the persistence of sin in the world. Rather, he argued that evil existed in many forms. Writing in *Christ and His Office*, Hooper made the comment, "The devil never slept, but always by his ministers attempted to destroy the verity of Christ's religion, and clean to put out the light of truth, which was perfect in Christ's time and in the time of the apostles."[43] Hooper reconciled the idea of a singular devil and the general presence of evil through the idea of a sinful disposition. While Adam had first been tempted by the devil, humanity since Adam had continually chosen as Adam had, which was to serve themselves and deviate from the Law of God.[44] Therefore, while the threat of the devil was real, it was the temptation of deviating from God's Law which was the fundamental problem for Hooper's community. Understanding how to avoid this temptation became central to godly living.

---

[40] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 532.
[41] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 532.
[42] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 532.
[43] Hooper, *Christ and His Office, EW, 26.*
[44] See Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 108. Newcombe might be slightly overstating the power of humanity to overcome this entrapment as individuals, though his conclusions are certainly plausible. Newcombe was correct in arguing that humanity at one point had the necessary knowledge of God's Law but was "beguiled" by the devil, and required the mercy of God to avoid temptation; however, Hooper also suggested that a godly society needed a significant godly infrastructure to help people avoid the temptations of sinning and adhering to Godly laws. This was applicable for both individuals and societies. See Newcombe, *John Hooper*, 68-69.

Rehabilitation

Having asserted that, on account of humanity's sin, independent human effort to achieve salvation was incapable of overcoming the chasm between God and humanity, Hooper next considered how society might be put on the path towards achieving and experiencing that which God had designed for creation. He referred to this theologically as righteousness. This occurred simultaneously with justification, though the reconditioning of the mind towards God was a gradual process that required a life-long commitment. Hooper believed that, from the point of salvation, the Holy Spirit enabled the mind to re-learn that which had been lost due to sin as it had been in the Garden of Eden.[45]

> Hooper referred to this process of re-learning as sanctification:
>
> This sanctification is none other but a true knowledge of God in Christ by the gospel, that teacheth us how unclean we are by the sin of Adam, and how that we are cleansed by Christ; for whose sake the Father of heaven doth not only remit the sins wrought willingly against the word of God, but also the imperfection and natural concupiscence which remaineth in every man, as long as the nature of man is mortal.[46]

According to Hooper's definition, sanctification was the gradual relearning of the nature that had been lost during the Fall. Such learning brought an awareness of sin and actions contrary to the Law of God. Hooper maintained that, despite Christ's cleansing of original sin, humanity was still prone to causing offence to God. On account of this fact, he was resigned to the fact that offences would continue throughout his community, the best chance to minimise the capacity or opportunity to sin was to preach the Bible. The Bible provided the template for God's commandments for godly living and the model set by Christ – one whose perfection Hooper stressed as the ultimate example of how to live a life in faithful obedience to God. To do that, Hooper's theology of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit is essential to understanding how humanity could respond faithfully to godly life.

---

[45] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 267.
[46] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 71-72.

Hooper's Theology of the Trinity

Hooper, like most of his mainline Protestant brethren, was neither adventurous nor innovative in his understanding of the Trinity. Hooper's Trinitarian theology essentially reaffirmed the classical Latin position that stressed the equality of the Father, Son and Spirit.[47] He used the conventional terms of essence and persons to refer to the equal-yet-distinct attributes of the Trinity.[48] While his positions on the Trinity were orthodox, he wrote adamantly in defence of the doctrine. Hooper's defence was two-fold. Firstly, he refuted the heterodox positions of the Anabaptists and, in doing so, distanced himself from charges of Anabaptism.[49] Hooper provided a glimpse into how he tried to protect his reputation as a Trinitarian orthodox thinker when he wrote that "this is the faith of God's Spirit in my conscience, which I have learned in his word, and have faithfully and religiously preached and taught the same in all my sermons, as I will be judged by mine auditory."[50] In Hooper's *Confession* he used the opportunity to define his platform. His sixteenth article rejects all interpretations outside of the accepted Nicaean convention.[51] Hooper's position on the Trinity was never questioned during the vestment controversy, nor in his trials under Mary, so it would appear that Hooper was successful in his defence. Hooper's position on the doctrine of the Trinity had little consequence for his social vision. However, the independent actions of the divine persons with the Godhead were significant.

---

[47] Hooper demonstrated this by affirming the "three former Creeds": the Apostles, Nicean and Athanasian. Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 71-72.

[48] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 322.

[49] The charge of Anabaptism was used against Hooper and his radical positions by his traditionalist and Catholic adversaries. Given Hooper's strong condemnation of the movement, this would have certainly enraged him. Jehan Scheyfve, the Imperial Ambassador to England from mid-1550, mentioned Hooper to the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V in 1550 during the Vestment Controversies. He referred to him as an Anabaptist and sent a work of Hooper's to Charles. Scheyfve was not particularly interested in the religious developments in Edward's reign, so it is difficult to tell how he came to the Anabaptist classification when referring to Hooper. Based on Scheyfve's usual methods of securing information, he either heard others at court refer to Hooper as an Anabaptist or he knew very little about Hooper and used the term very generally to categorise his opposition to official religious policy. Scheyfve repeated the charge of Anabaptism in 1552 when there was word of Hooper being translated to the Diocese of London. Hooper appears in only one other entry where Scheyfve records that Hooper and John Ponet had preached using the name of the Emperor. Scheyfve had complained in his correspondence that he wanted them punished. Hume and Tyler, *CSP Sp*, 10:140, 254, 591.

[50] Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 74.

[51] Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 73,75.

Hooper's Theology of God

Hooper dealt with the Father, Son and Holy Spirit as separate entities, in terms of their significance for understanding his social vision. The following sections consider in which ways each person of the Trinity, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, influenced his community. Hooper's theology of God shared the same concerns about the nature of God as his medieval forebears. However, Hooper was not concerned about unearthing the metaphysical mysteries of the nature of God; rather, his investigation into the nature of God was to be approached through the human lens. Such a relationship can be rather succinctly summarised as Hooper's *modus operandi* as he believed it his responsibility to preach that which God had already revealed to humanity in the Bible. With that rationale to understand God, it was unnecessary for Hooper to look beyond that which was identified in the Christian scriptures. This was the way in which God had chosen to reveal himself, which to Hooper was the best possible way to understand God.

Within a biblical framework, Hooper understood God the Father as a merciful deity. Hooper created this image in his *Sermons upon Jonah*, beginning with the position that God, as Holy and without sin, was concerned with the sin of Nineveh and had commanded Jonah to preach and convert them. Hooper wrote,

> The *third* doctrine out of this place is a description of God's nature, and long-sufferance towards kingdoms, realms, public and private persons: for whereas he might most justly punish and take vengeance upon us for sin, he is yet so merciful that he premonisheth and forewarneth of his scourge to come, by his prophets, apostles and preachers, and willeth the world to amend."[52]

Here, Hooper saw God as one who was justified in taking vengeance against the people of Nineveh, though God demonstrated mercy by sending Jonah to bring warning of the people's sins to correct their behaviour. Hooper gleaned from the text that God was therefore slow to anger and provided an avenue by which his wrath could be avoided. Hooper believed that, should humanity turn from their wickedness,

---

[52] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 449.

they would be spared from the wrath of God.[53] Elsewhere in the *Sermons upon Jonah*, he drew a parallel with the biblical account of Elijah and Ahab,[54] concluding that it was the sin of "contempt of God's word"[55] which had brought about the ruin of Ahab and his kingdom, because the king refused to reform after Elijah's warnings. This has profound implications which focused on the avoidance of the wrath of God for Hooper's political vision. God would be patient, but it was essential that people heeded the warnings of the prophets.

As Hooper preached the mercy of God, the vengeance of God was never far removed from the discussion. Without wavering in his belief that God was merciful and slow to anger, Hooper's writings were filled with the fear that God could not let sin continue unabated. Certainly, Hooper's account of the story of Jonah was provoked by the fear that God's wrath was imminent.[56] In the same set of sermons, Hooper argued that God's wrath was directly correlated with the sins of the people. According to Hooper, these sins recorded in the scriptures, had continually angered God and brought the kingdoms of the Old Testament to ruin. In speaking of wrath, Hooper sought to maintain that God's anger, while severe and something to be feared, was justified.[57] He illustrated this point by discussing the action of fire in the sacrifice. The fire was destructive but also an act of mercy. It would consume the offering and allow the relationship to be restored. Hooper wrote, "He opened up his mercy unto Adam not only by word, but also by the fire that descended upon his sacrifices and his sons".[58] The image of fire was to represent the complete destruction of the sacrifice. It meant, insofar as Hooper's analogy suggested, that, like the burnt sacrifice, God's wrath could be utterly destructive and therefore to be feared. This led Hooper into a discussion of God's justice.

For Hooper, the concepts of punishment and justice were intrinsically linked and cannot be properly understood in isolation. Punishment without justice would lead Hooper down a path of a tyrannical God; conversely justice without the risk of

---

[53] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 449.
[54] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 464.
[55] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 464.
[56] See for instance, Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 449.
[57] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 448-449.
[58] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 48.

punishment left faith vulnerable to abuse. To address how justice correlated with punishment, Hooper proposed two inner workings of justice, which he called *correctivam* and *retributivam*.[59] The first act of justice, *correctivam*, is that God willed that all people were to be saved.[60] Hooper elaborated on his statement by arguing, "To obtain the first end of his justice, as many as be not utterly wicked, and may be holpen, partly with threatenings, partly with promises he allureth, and provoketh them unto amendment of life."[61] This first justice, as Hooper would explain, was a form of just action because it gave the opportunity to reform life. To this, he looked to Christ as the embodiment of this form of justice, which emanated from God's promise to be merciful, as it was Christ's sacrifice which gave people a chance to reform their lives.

The second form of justice is a direct extension of the first. As God had given people the means to reform their life, this form of justice was reactive, based on both human and societal actions.[62] Hooper issued a stark and clear warning, arguing, "Therefore look not only upon the promise of God, but also, what diligence and obedience he requireth of thee, lest thou exclude thyself from the promise."[63] This justice required people to live accordingly to God's commandments.[64] Hooper used the story of the Israelites in the desert to illustrate this point. He argued that the Israelites had failed to live under the commandments and were barred from their Promised Land because of their sin.[65] Had they lived faithfully, the Israelites would not have had to endure forty years of wandering in the desert and instead could have

---

[59] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 267.
[60] Hooper, *Ten Commandments, EW*, 266-267. This has led some to question whether Hooper advocated universal salvation. This was not a unique charge against those with sympathies to Bullinger. See McCoy and Baker, *Fountainhead of Federalism: Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenantal Tradition* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991), 30-34. However, Hooper never affirmed these principles nor was he attacked by his adversaries about holding such a notion. In that respect, it is probably better to read Hooper's position as a statement of desire than concrete position on the nature of salvation.
[61] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 266-267.
[62] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 266-267.
[63] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 267.
[64] Hooper does not appear to be referring to salvation as it would contradict his theology of providence and the assuredness of it. Though, admittedly, the division between the assuredness of salvation and human action in response to salvation is not always defined. Nevertheless, Hooper was likely referring to the consequences of one's temporal life rather than the actual status of one's salvation.
[65] Hooper reiterates the same position concerning Jonah with the Ninevites. Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 267.

entered the land God had promised upon their exit from Egypt. This fact represented the loss of livelihood and of the promise of God's temporal blessings when the people disobeyed. In terms of Hooper's political vision, it is the second form of justice which featured most prominently.[66] He clearly endeavoured to encourage his readers to embrace God's justice to prevent the impending wrath of God. As it was with the Ninevites, God would spare those who conformed to his will.[67] Hooper himself played the role of prophet as he argued that England too was held to God's will as were the people of Israel. God, as the creator of society, had demanded complete worship and adherence to the teachings of the Law.

Hooper's Christology

Hooper's Christology was integral to understanding his ideal social vision. Much of Hooper's work on Christ is contained in his work *Christ and His Office*. In the work, his Christology was consistent with the established reception of Christ in the Nicaean Creed.[68] Having established his orthodoxy, Hooper focused on how Christ's life could be modelled for individuals and the community. Christ provided the perfect model because Hooper believed that Christ lived, in his divinity and humanity, in perfect obedience to God.[69] Therefore Christ's perfect legacy represented the ideal of living according to God's Law and formed the basis for emulation by his community. Hooper did not believe that Christ's example could ever be repeated, but was content to encourage his readers to strive towards that example as much as they could. Hooper illustrated the mastery of Christ in the following manner, "He that before was most vile and contemptible in the sight of the world, now by right and just title acclaimeth the dominion and empire of all the world. How mighty a prince he is, the creation of the world and the preservation thereof declareth." [70] Hooper commented further: "This is the style of the God omnipotent, our Saviour Jesus Christ, in whose name all powers bow their knees in heaven, in earth, and in hell."[71]

---

[66] See below, 80-81.
[67] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 267.
[68] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 16.
[69] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 17-18.
[70] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 18.
[71] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 18-19.

Hooper mentioned others who were admirable in their faith, but was quick to reaffirm the folly of humanity.[72] In one sweeping statement, Hooper tempered any form of saintly devotion to anyone in either the Old or New Testaments as he wrote, "How merciful towards them that repent, we know by daily experience in ourselves, and by the example of other, Adam, David, Manasse, and Peter. How cruel and rigorous for sin, the punishment that we suffer and the calamities of this world declareth, specially the death of his most innocent body."[73] Taking this idea, Hooper divided the examples of Christ into practical models of leadership for the society that he would envision. This theme will be explored in further detail in Hooper's models for ministers within the church and government, but there are notable theological foundations which will clarify later discussion.[74]

As Christ was the perfect model, Hooper stressed that it was Christ's obedience to the will of God which most clearly identified Christ's vocation. He argued that Christ was most obedient in his willingness to die for the sins of the world. This was one of the world's greatest injustices as Hooper explained: "The greatness of this ire, sorrow, confusion, ignominy, and contempt, neither angel nor man can express: his pains were so intolerable, and his passion so dolorous, his death so obedient with the Father's will, that it was not only a sacrifice, but also a just recompense to satisfy for all the world solely and only".[75] Christ's death in the form of a sacrifice was the ultimate act of obedience as Christ was blameless and undeserving of the punishments for sin. Hooper believed that individuals would be inspired by Christ's faithfulness and would try to follow that obedience themselves. Hooper also argued that in addition to serving as a model, Christ's death was also a

---

[72] Hooper's position here is indicative of his later writings condemning the worship of saints as he did in his refusal to swear the oath that would make him a bishop. Hooper saw Christ's example as the most prominent and authentic model in every manner of godly living. Invoking the saints would be to swear to a lesser example, prone to sin and idolatrous to Christ. However, he did not abandon the practice of referring to greats of the faith both biblically and throughout the history of the church. Hooper instead referred to them for specific references to illustrate a point. When referring to theology, theologians would be cited in the same manner. In both cases, Hooper valued the Bible above any other source. The best any theological principle or historical example could do was to witness to what the Bible had revealed. See for instance, Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 231.

[73] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 18.

[74] See below, 108.

[75] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 48.

sign of God's faithfulness to creation and would add another avenue by which individuals would follow the Law of God.

He argued that when humans fell from their created perfection, Christ was promised to Adam as a means to salvation. Hooper saw Christ as the embodiment of the promise made initially with Adam and here, Hooper came closest to affirming a theology of covenant.[76] Nevertheless, the basis of Christ's salvation for humanity began with Hooper's belief that God was merciful. It was the mercy of God which allowed for a continued relationship with humanity through the gift of Christ. Humanity remained an unworthy benefactor, wholly dependent on the grace of God in order to remain the people of God.[77] Hooper argued that God demonstrated his mercy by promising to send Christ to humanity as a response of their sin.[78] Though the name of Christ was not known, Hooper believed that the promise of Christ was evident in the Old Testament through the belief that humanity would one day be reunited with God.[79] This faith among those contained in the Old Testament reaffirmed the promise of God's provision through the Law.[80] Simultaneously, the example of those who rebelled against God in the Old Testament and experienced God's wrath and ensuing destruction served as a reminder that sin was an ever-present reality. The gospels reinforced this promise through the life and sacrifice of Christ, as did the letters of Paul. Humanity was therefore to live with the knowledge and assurance of the resurrected Christ who was promised to Adam.

---

[76] Leuenberger has relied upon the West thesis which vis-à-vis Bullinger, privileged Hooper's strong bilateral covenant as a central organising principle. Both Leuenberger and West are correct in observing the existence of a degree of covenantal thought in Hooper's writings. However, Hooper did not devote much thought in his writings to develop the idea, nor does it form the basis for organising society. Samuel Leuenberger, *Archbishop Cranmer's Immortal Bequest: The Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England: An Evangelistic Liturgy* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1990), 49; W.M.S. West, "John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism," *The Baptist Quarterly* 18, no. 1 (1955): 357. Hooper's earlier work on a covenant give only biblical references of covenant as a sign of God's faithfulness. See Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 135, 190, 194. This is not to suggest that Hooper was opposed to Bullinger's covenant, as he likely agreed with it in principle, however it was not central to the organisation of Hooper's template for a godly community. See also Newcombe, *John Hooper*, 42-43.

[77] Hooper wrote that humanity was constantly and perpetually rebelling against the mercy of Christ. Humanity would always remain tempted by the devil. Christ saved people, but they were not yet free from sin. Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 21-22, 81.

[78] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 16.

[79] See Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 16-17

[80] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 18.

Hooper's theology of the Trinity has so far considered how the Father, the Son, and their respective attributes impacted the society which Hooper envisioned. Hooper argued that God the Father was merciful towards his creation. Through that mercy, God the Father provided a promise to his creation that if they were to live as God had commanded they would be able to live within God's favour. Should humanity fail, God's vengeance would ensue. God then gave the Son, through whom the promise was made flesh. As Christ embodied perfect holy living, Christ became the model which humanity was to strive to emulate. Hooper argued that the gospels confirmed his belief and that the revelation found within the gospels gave humanity the clearest way to live a life of obedience to God

Hooper's Theology of the Holy Spirit

Having established the significance of the Father and the Son, how Hooper understood the Holy Spirit requires an investigation. Between 1547and1549, Hooper was surrounded by reformers who arguably held the most robust concept of the Holy Spirit in all of Protestant Europe in Zurich.[81] As Timmerman suggests, these ideas, put forward by Bullinger, were rooted in the idea that the Holy Spirit works actively to rehabilitate the minds of fallen people.[82] To accomplish this, the Holy Spirit worked in the world and manifested itself throughout the history of Israel, as seen in the Old Testament, through the time of Christ, and into the age of the early Church, offering a moral guide for the people. Bullinger explained this relationship in the following manner:

> God indeed might by the secret illumination of his Spirit, without man's ministry (as his power is tied to no creature), regenerate the whole world, and govern the church itself: but as he despiseth not his creatures, nor destroyeth the work of his own hands, and doeth all things in order; even so from the first beginning he forthwith spake to the world by patriarchs, then by prophets, afterward by apostles; neither at this day ceaseth he to give unto the world doctors and pastors: so that it becometh us not to tempt God, that is, not to look for a secret inspiration with the heretics Enthusiastae; but to acknowledge a just order, and that God

---

[81] See for instance Bruce Gordon, *The Swiss Reformation*, 232.
[82] See Daniel Timmerman, *Heinrich Bullinger on Prophecy and the Prophetic Office (1523-1538)* (Gottingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprrecht, 2015), 85.

himself speaketh unto us by men, of whom he would have us to learn religion.[83]

Hooper held similar ideas, believing that the Holy Spirit was given to those whom God had called, as a means to lead them towards Christ. Unlike Bullinger, however, Hooper concentrated more on the work of the Holy Spirit for the Church. The Holy Spirit was to help clarify what it meant to live as Christ did, in perfect obedience to God's Law, and to guide or train individuals to live in this way:[84] "This wise useth he to nurture us, until such time as his holy Spirit work such a perfection in us, that we will obey him, though there were no pain nor joy mentionated of at all."[85] It is unlikely that Hooper envisioned a scenario in which perfect obedience might be achieved, but there was a correlation: the more a person studied and practised their faith, the better judge they could become of what it meant to live a godly life. This was possible because the more an individual rejected their sin and tried to live like Christ, the more they could be shaped by the spiritual guidance of the Holy Spirit to judge godly and ungodly action. This highlights the gravity of striving to live a godly life. This was true not only for themselves, but also the society in which they lived.

In addition to helping those in his community to live a godly life, Hooper also believed that the Holy Spirit was entrusted with protecting the message of God's mercy and Christ's salvation in the gospels. He had a conviction that God's truth would always prevail. This was reaffirmed through Christ as he prayed for the preservation of truth for his church: "Christ had prayed his Father to sanctify his church by his word, and by his holy Spirit, and desired him to preserve them from ill for his mercy's sake, he added the price, the merits, and just deserving of God's graces, and said, 'I sanctify myself for them, because they may be sanctified by the truth.'"[86] The Holy Spirit was to be the inspiration of Christ's works.[87] This belief was based upon the idea that God was merciful towards his creation and the Holy Spirit was evidence of this mercy. Hooper believed that God's mercy was

---

[83] Bullinger, *The Fifth Decade*, 94.
[84] Hooper relied on Jn 14 and argued that the Holy Spirit could teach nothing apart from what Christ had revealed. Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 139. See also Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 21.
[85] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 267.
[86] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 72; Jn 17:19.
[87] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 21.

demonstrated through the Spirit by serving as the voice to one's conscience, which reaffirmed God's truth to the faithful.[88]

The conscience remained the aspect of the human condition that maintained a sensitivity to God's truth which, if followed, would lead towards godly living. Hooper wrote, "Though we be born in servitude of sin, and blind unto all godliness, such a sparkle and dim light not withstanding remaineth in the soul, that our own conscience crieth out against us, when we utterly contemn the reverence and divine majesty of God."[89] In terms of living within the society that Hooper envisioned, the Holy Spirit guided the elect towards a proper godly living. When the elect acted against a godly command, the Holy Spirit would ensure that they were made aware of their sins. Hooper did not, however, suggest that a person would always adhere to the urgings of their conscience, initiated by the Holy Spirit. Rather, he suggested that most people were prone to dismiss it.[90] Nevertheless, the Holy Spirit would remain with the faithful in society so that God's Spirit could always be recognised. Hooper saw this as a recurring pattern throughout the Bible, which showed that faithful remnants would emerge, bringing God's message to societies where adherence to Godly living had waned.[91] This idea was connected to how Hooper saw the relation between God's providence in society and the human response to God's Law for godly living.

History and Human Action

Hooper's concept of history was theologically charged. History was about the story of God's revelation. As the author of history, God's pattern of revealing himself to his creation was solely his own initiative and prerogative. Hooper argued that because God had made his revelation clear, God was active in judging societies on their standards of godly living, suggesting that there was an implicit knowledge of godly living within all societies. This is the strongest theological rationale for

---

[88] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 21-22.
[89] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 294.
[90] This is illustrated in Hooper's Sermons on Jonah as he seemed resigned to the fact that many would reject the prodding of the Holy Spirit. When Hooper identified Edward as one who seemed sympathetic to his message, he preached that Edward should rule a society with the help of the Holy Spirit. See Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 435-442.
[91] In Hooper's Third Sermon on Jonah, he used the example of Elijah as he warned King Ahab to reform his and his kingdom's ways. See Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 463-465.

Hooper's use of the Greco-Roman philosophers when discussing questions of morality and human potential. Hooper could understand himself to be at one with these philosophers in adhering to the same notion of human betterment because they had an implicit knowledge of God's revelation. [92] Hooper indicated the possibility as he preached, "All men confess him to be the true God, that can and will help all diseases, the Jews, the Turks, the gentiles, the good, the bad."[93] He was quick to assert, however, that these groups, which were not necessarily within his narrowly defined scope of revelation, prayed to false gods.[94] Nevertheless, a notion of God and the power that God had over society was implicit in human thought.[95] In history, Hooper believed that Christians best understood the Law of God, because they had that knowledge, Hooper believed that God reserved the harshest of punishments for disobedient Christians.[96] Hooper found an example of this severity in the events of the fall of the Roman Empire in the fifth century, which had officially adopted Christianity. Hooper commented, "Thus when the Lord God would take from Rome for her sins the dominion of the world, he sent the Goths, Vandals, Huns, Arabies, and Turks, that wasted not only Italy, but also Egypt, Africa, and Asia, and so brought the empire of Rome to nought".[97]

For Hooper, history was a persistent struggle in which humanity sought to adhere to what God had designed for the community. However, he hoped that living in a godly community could end the struggle of disobedience.[98] It is at this point that Hooper used a popular conceptual image, through which others can get a glimpse into his conception of humanity's struggle to follow the Law of God. Throughout Hooper's *Sermons upon Jonah*, he employed the image of a ship, basing this metaphor on the boat on which Jonah was travelling. Hooper equated the story with God's displeasure at humanity straying from faithful living. In order for this to be

---

[92] For instance, see Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 352, 353, 390.
[93] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 457. In using the term "gentiles" Hooper was probably referring to Greek and Roman philosophers whom he mentions infrequently. See for instance Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 372.
[94] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 457.
[95] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 372.
[96] See Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 78.
[97] Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 78.
[98] See Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 78.

righted, every person needed to play their part in living a godly manner.[99] This ship metaphor[100] was even used to describe Edward VI's England as Hooper preached to the king and his court: "The ship of this commonwealth of England is tossed upside down, and the occasion thereof is imputed and laid unto Christ, and his holy word, though falsely; for Christ's nature is to appease and quiet all troubles and tempests with his presence, John vi."[101] Based on Hooper's metaphor of the ship of England, it had not just gone astray, but had capsized. This suggested that Hooper believed that England needed to right its course on the path to the kind of social living which God had intended.[102]

Hooper's reading of the Old Testament in particular stressed that, it was only after the Israelites had repented of their sins, that God would grant them the opportunity to be restored to their Promised Land. However, after they entered the Promised Land, the Israelites continually broke God's Law. The reasons for this were plain to Hooper who believed that people, once beyond the initial religious fervour after their restoration to God, became complacent. In this complacency, people found themselves enslaved to sin. Hooper considered this unfortunate pattern in his work on the *Ten Commandments*, arguing:

> When the Lord thy God shall bring thee into the land which he promised to thy fathers Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and shall give thee great cities and good, which thou never buildest, houses furnished with all necessaries, which thou replenishedst not, and water-pits that thou diggedst not, vines and olives that thou plantedst not, and thou eat and be satisfied; beware thou forget not the Lord that brought thee out of Egypt, from the house of servants.
> Here seest thou what danger and peril is annexed with abundance and prosperous fortune in the world… As Moses saith, Deut. xxxii., "The people replenished themselves with the gifts of God and rebelled, using prosperity and good fortune, forsook God."[103]

---

[99] See below, 78 and 202-205.
[100] See below, 202-205.
[101] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 464; Jn 6:16-24.
[102] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah, EW*, 464.
[103] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 301-302; Dt 7; Dt 32:15.

As Hooper understood the situation, complacency and idleness were the root social causes which incurred the future wrath of God. Hooper's Jonah sermons reiterated this theme. Referring to themes of idleness, Hooper wrote:

> How is it possible, where every sort offendeth in the commonwealth, but that the ire and vengeance of God should send unto our ship winds of adversity? I know that Jonas was never better known to be the occasion of this tempest in the sea, than I know these… sorts of people to be the trouble, and will be the destruction, of this commonwealth, if they be not found out by lot and wisdom betime.[104]

Hooper set out through his writings to ensure that the reformed society he envisioned was diligent in its aim to limit the chance of falling into complacency. For Hooper, in order for society to end this cycle of rebellion, it must always strive to live according to God's Law through godly living. The result, therefore, would be a kingdom of perpetual peace with God.

Salvation

Hooper's belief in salvation was intrinsically linked with his belief in the Providence of God. In his response to Bishop Gardiner, written from Zurich, Hooper reiterated a simple idea: that through the mercy of Christ told in the gospels, one could attain the salvation that was offered.[105] Salvation, as a concept, was to bring comfort to those who were unsure of their own standing with God.[106] His method for reassuring the anxious was to preach the simplicity of the salvation message, a position he felt had been undermined by Gardiner.[107] For Hooper, the nature of salvation was an act of mercy from God alone. There was nothing that humanity could do on their own accord without God, and he argued his position by examining the life of Nicodemus, as someone who publicly professed his Jewish faith whilst secretly following Jesus'

---

[104] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, EW, 461.

[105] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, EW, 111.

[106] See Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, EW, 111.

[107] As the editor of the Hooper's Writings in the Parker society has noted, Anthony Gilby also wrote a response to the book as did Cranmer in his 1551 tract on the Sacraments. Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, EW, 97. See also Thomas Cranmer, *Miscellaneous Writings of Letters of Thomas Cranmer Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. John Edmund Cox. 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844), 1:1-367.

teachings.[108] Hooper used this as evidence of the futility of works, asserting it was the belief that Nicodemus had in Christ that saved him.[109] He did not approve of the approach of Nicodemus, but Nicodemus' belief had been sufficient.[110]

For Hooper, how salvation worked was never in question. He pointed to the teachings of Christ, in which Christ had revealed all that was necessary for salvation:

> He taught the will of his Father unto the world, and how they might be saved from death infernal… so that they repented and believed the gospel… left nothing untaught, but, as a good doctor, manifested unto his audience all things necessary for the health of man… He preached not only himself, but sent his apostles and disciples to manifest unto the world, that the acceptable time of grace was come, and the sacrifice for sin born into the world… And after his resurrection he gave them commandment to preach, and likewise what they should preach…[111]

The gospels provided clarity as to how one was saved. Hooper believed that the early Church had continued in the teachings of Christ on the matter. The main task was to reaffirm this message and preach it, though of greater importance was the response of those who experienced that salvation.

In the *Ten Commandments*, he wrote that, after hearing the salvation message, the onus rested upon the person to live according to that response. This meant that one was to learn what salvation meant for the individual and how that individual was to live in response to that message of salvation. Hooper provided an indication as to how one was to pursue a life of understanding the implications of salvation:

---

[108] Wilson has considered the implications of Hooper's arguments with Gardiner in proving that his own opinion was more consistent with the church Fathers of Augustine and Irenaeus that was Gardiners. See R. Paul Wilson, John Hooper and the English Reformation under Edward VI 1547-1553" (PhD diss., Queen's University, 1994), 77. The example of Nicodemus led to the term 'Nicodemite' or calling one a 'Nicodemus'. It was a phrase popularised by Calvin and was often referred to in English Protestant history as derogatory term which identified one who publicly conformed to the official religion but secretly professed another. Nicodemus was a Pharisee who, in secret met Jesus and secretly followed Jesus' teachings. Hooper's usage does not appear to be pejorative but used only as a means of devaluing good works that would contributes to one's salvation. Jn 3:1-10. For an example of Calvin's use of the term see, T.H.L. Parker, *John Calvin: A Biography* (London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1975), 30.
[109] Hooper, *Christ and His Office, EW*, 55.
[110] See Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, EW, 52-53.
[111] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, EW, 20.

> It is the office of every true Christian, before all other studies, travails, and pains, that he shall sustain for the time of this brief and miserable life, to apply himself with all diligent force and labour, to know perfectly this means, ordained by God for our salvation; and, the thing once known, diligently with heart, soul, and mind, to follow the means, until such time as the effect and end be obtained, wherefore the means was appointed.[112]

Hooper's theology of salvation was therefore tied to his belief in the simplicity of the message. God, in an act of mercy, had promised salvation throughout the ages. This was fulfilled by Christ's sacrifice. However, the simplicity of the message did not permit a person to abuse it. As Hooper wrote, while a person may be assured of salvation, the rest of their life must be spent seeking to understand the consequences of salvation.[113] This was a way to keep people committed to Hooper's version of a Christian life, which was an essential attribute of Hooper's vision for society. In terms of creating the link between his understanding of salvation and its implication for the community on the whole, Hooper sought to reinforce that assurance through the church. Ministers were to stress the message to ensure that it was heard.[114] The government was to assist primarily in ensuring people heard the gospel preached.[115] A consequence of Hooper's use of the civil infrastructure for religious ends was to treat everyone as if they were a Christian. For this, it is necessary to turn to the final section of understanding Hooper's theology: the Christian society.

Christian Society

Hooper's conception of the society of which he believed himself part and that which dominated his writings was a product of his theology. It would be inconceivable to consider Hooper's society without dealing with the subject of sin, salvation and rehabilitation, election, providential history and certainly his belief in human potential. For Hooper, his community was a mixed economy. This meant that contained within his society were those who were true Christians and those who were not, but the society that he envisioned was to be governed by magistrates who had

---

[112] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 15.
[113] See for instance, Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 53.
[114] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 323.
[115] See for instance, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 78.

embraced Protestantism.[116] His Protestant society was one that was both equal and unequal. Both terms require an examination, as one pertains to the spiritual status of the person and the other to one's secular standing within the community:

> As in a commonwealth all men cannot be princes and governors, nor all men learned; yet, forasmuch as the commonwealth is the society and conjunction of the prince with all his subjects, be they of noble parentage or of base lineage, learned or unlearned, it is necessary that as well the lowest as the highest, the unlearned as the learned, know how to live like a true subject…[117]

Hooper's opinions on the unequal society require some clarification reflecting the time and era in which he wrote. Politically, Hooper believed that societies had to operate with order.[118] This order required that some people would have higher status than others.[119] In this respect, Hooper affirmed the belief that God had called some, but not everyone, to lead. This was likely due to Hooper's exposure to the Zurich Anabaptists. Hooper completely rejected the Anabaptist position that goods were to be held in common and that civil governance was no longer required.[120] For him, equality existed only in the spiritual realm and he believed strongly that God had called people to fulfil secular roles within society.[121] Despite the assumption that inequality was innate within society, Hooper argued that those who did not hold a position of power were still important to the community: "There is not the poorest in any realm, nor most weak person, but may profit the commonwealth where he dwelleth very much, and help to bring it to the end and perfection that the commonwealth was and is ordained for."[122] Thus, everyone, no matter their station within society, was part of the community and contributed to the successful operation of the commonwealth.

---

[116] Based on the context in which he wrote his social vision, it was not translatable to contemporary non-Christian societies. Hooper mentioned these societies on occasion, but they are clearly outside his frame of reference. The closest that Hooper came to engaging with non-Christian communities, was when he referred to the 'Turk', meaning the Ottoman Empire. The term was occasionally used to illustrate a point on Christian practice, usually concerning sacraments and images. When Hooper mentioned that Muslims or Turks rejected idols, he did so in an attempt to highlight the futility of his opponent's arguments. See, Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 296.

[117] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 215.

[118] See Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 215.

[119] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 215.

[120] Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 121.

[121] See below, 195.

[122] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 184-185.

Conclusion

In summary, Hooper's theology, as it pertained to his vision for society, was based on the need for people to live in accordance with a standard of godly living. This process began with the acknowledgement that an individual's actions could not save themselves and that only through following God could one achieve salvation. This initial step brought the person to an understanding of God's revelation of his mercy. As a person began the process of learning about God's mercy, they would discover that God had, from the promise made with Adam, a set of standards by which people could faithfully live. These actions, by themselves, were not enough to save a person, but would suffice to avert the wrath of God caused by humanity's sin. To learn how to live in a godly manner, Hooper believed that one needed only to turn to the Bible. The Old Testament provided stark examples of societies that had risen and fallen based on their adherence to God's commandments. In the New Testament, Hooper saw in Christ the perfect model for godly living. Christ was, in his humanity, fully obedient to the will of God. This, for Hooper, was what one should strive to emulate. To help an individual in their attempt to learn to live like Christ in perfect obedience to God, Hooper argued that the Holy Spirit assisted in the re-learning process. Acting as a conscience, the Holy Spirit would show a person whether or not an action was godly. It was Hooper's hope that in time it would be possible to rehabilitate the ability to follow God and the directions of the Holy Spirit would be in agreement with one's conscience. Although this was, at best, an ideal, it was something to which Hooper felt society should strive.

Hooper argued that those in the community were expected collectively to adhere to the will of God. He argued in his *Sermons upon Jonah* and *Ten Commandments* that society was publicly to strive towards godly living. This was an important task, as Hooper feared that, people would become complacent unless a rigorous policy of godly living was enforced. Relying on his readings about Israel in the Old Testament, Hooper believed that a diligent examination of faith should become routine. He thought that without such strict examinations people would forget the wrath of God that was always close at hand. When people turned from God, Hooper feared that, as had happened throughout the Old Testament, God would

destroy the community. For him, the only assurance was that, if society strove to act in a godly manner, God would bless them and allow them to live in peace. In order to achieve and maintain this peace, Hooper looked to the institutions of the community, to which this study will now turn.

Chapter 3: The Magistrate as the Leader of the Reformed Community

Introduction

Hooper's magistrate held the most powerful position in the community and was the office upon which Hooper saw the success or failure of the Reformation. This chapter acknowledges Hooper's debt to Bullinger's concept of a strong central magistrate and considers the power that Hooper was prepared to give the magistrate in leading the Reformation in the community. It first considers how the magistrate's power was rooted in a divine office. As the magistrate acted on behalf of God for the community, it will show how Hooper wanted to ensure that the Reformation was followed through the magistrate's laws. Basing these laws on the Ten Commandments, Hooper argued that the magistrate should create laws suitable for their community that would encourage their citizens to live a godly life. Hooper also explained what should happen when individuals broke godly laws and how the magistrate was to punish those who disobeyed. This raised the issue of how the magistrate was to punish properly, as well as the risks Hooper feared when the magistrate did not. Hooper's belief in the relationship between the magistrate's powerful office and the church, and specifically how the magistrate was to ensure that the gospel was properly preached, is also considered. Finally, the chapter assesses the relationship between the magistrate and the people and how the magistrate was to become a model for godly living and fair and equal justice. In doing so, the point will be made that Hooper envisioned the magistrate as a godly person who, by practising his or her faith and creating laws reflecting that faith, would inspire citizens to follow in the magistrate's godly footsteps in the path to creating a godly community. However, this chapter is not primarily concerned with Edward VI of England, though it is undeniable that Hooper's understanding of the power of the magistrate were applicable to England. Where possible, Edward is discussed as a means to illustrate or clarify a point that Hooper was making about the godly magistrate. Hooper believed that Edward held the keys to the successful continuation of the Reformation in England, but the chapter concentrates upon general concepts rather than specific historical instances. Hooper's godly magistrate

could be universally applied as a template for creating a godly society, and this reflects a more accurate treatment of Hooper's writing on the subject.

The Heavenly Kingdom as a Model for an Earthly Kingdom

For Hooper, the magistrate held a divine office rooted in the nature of Christ. In an investigation into the sources of authority, Hooper argued that Christ's attributes included those of king, emperor and protector, in addition to his other spiritual attributes.[1] Hooper based this idea of Christ as king on the biblical account of Christ professing his kingship over his church to Pontius Pilate.[2] Hooper acknowledged that Christ was here referring to his spiritual kingdom, but argued that the notion of Christ's spiritual kingdom had particular implications for how the magistrate was to conduct affairs in the world.[3] He seemed most interested in providing examples of how Christ properly defended his congregation of the faithful, which suggests that Hooper envisioned a magistrate as a defender of the Reformation. In Hooper's version of Christ's spiritual kingdom, he argued that Christ as king modelled two attributes of successful governance: protection and justice. Hooper argued that, in his kingship, Christ petitioned the Father for the forgiveness of the sins of the people and prayed for them.[4] This was an important model of kingship because it signified that Christ was intimately involved in the wellbeing of his subjects and ensured that their sins were to be forgiven. Finally, Christ gave his subjects the Word of God and the Holy Spirit.[5] Hooper argued that the Word of God served as a sword to protect his church from erroneous doctrine, while the Holy Spirit functioned as a weapon against the devil. The Holy Spirit was an active force that would defend the church from attacks from the devil and would not allow the church to break.[6] From Hooper's model of Christ acting as the magistrate of the church, Hooper observed that, within the realm of Christ's church, the magistrate must be attuned to the wellbeing of the church, in order to protect it from threats that would otherwise destroy it.

---

[1] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 78.
[2] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 79.
[3] Hooper argued that Christ was not referring to the temporal world as Christ did not want to offend the Emperor's dignity. This was, Hooper argued, a fictitious charge brought against Christ at his trial. Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 79.
[4] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 79.
[5] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 79.
[6] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 79.

To link the attributes of Christ's kingship to those of the temporal magistrate, Hooper wanted to look for evidence of a demonstration of these attributes in the world so that he could make an appropriate correlation to his own day. The evidence for this lay not with Christ and his perfect model of kingship over his church, but with God's governance in the Old Testament. Hooper found a strong example of this demonstration of God's magisterial powers in the narrative of the Israelites in exile in Egypt. This example was powerful because it took place before the Israelites had the capacity to form their own society. This was important for Hooper as he was trying to create a programme for a godly magistrate that God had modelled, not one built upon human tradition. This drew Hooper to his first example of Moses leading the Israelites from exile. Hooper wrote, "Pharaoh, that would this church of God and commonwealth of the Israelites to be destroyed, was lost and all his army in the sea. The idolaters, that would make the commonwealth of Christ's church one with the commonwealth of Egypt, were destroyed."[7] Hooper was thus able to use this association as an example for building a fresh model of the magistrate. From the story, the parallels with Christ's kingship in the heavenly church are clear: Pharaoh was attacking the subjects of God and God had protected them from an external threat thereby maintaining the continuance of the Israelites as faithful worshippers of God.

Hooper then observed how God demonstrated his justice by punishing disobedience. He argued that God's punishment was always in response to disobedient behaviour.[8] For this example, he considered why God had punished Adam in the Garden of Eden for breaking God's commandment.[9] He concluded: "It pleaseth so the Lord to punish the thing that allureth man's frail nature to sin, because the sin of man should the better be known".[10] In the preface to his *Ten Commandments,* he outlined three reasons why God punished: to correct sin, to lead a person to proper penance, and to reinforce that person's dependency on God by

---

[7] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 78.
[8] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 304-305.
[9] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 543; Gen 3:1-24.
[10] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 543.

making them aware of their sin.[11] Importantly, Hooper maintained that God punished because of his love for humanity and a desire to see improvement, rather than out of vengeance.

Thus far, Hooper's magistrate had focused on how God demonstrated the appropriate actions of the magistrate. However, all that could be definitively said was that God was present in the lives of his subjects and that he protected them. There was not yet an integral link between God's powers and those of a magistrate. To make this connection Hooper looked to the early Israelite community in Deuteronomy 17:14-20 for the first instance of a magistrate for the people of God.[12] From this passage, Hooper argued that God had responded to a request from the Israelites by granting them a king.[13] He believed that the king was to become a father figure to the Israelites to protect godly living and punish disobedience as God had done in the times of the Patriarchs.[14] Because of this, the magistrate became a representative of God, and should act according to the Law of God:[15]

> all kings and commonwealths of Christianity were instituted,
> specially to preserve the ministry of the church, and the estimation
> of God's word, that people might know and live accordingly to it,
> and as it teacheth; to decline all unjust wars and battles, to defend
> themselves, their realms, and all other that be persecuted for
> justice...[16]

Therefore, the magistrate was a divine office grown out of Israel's desire for such an authority figure. God had granted the request and appointed a magistrate to protect the church and the people under their care. This formed the foundational basis for Hooper's belief that the office of the magistrate was a divine office appointed by God to govern on God's behalf for the preservation of a jurisdiction, in the same way

---

[11] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 304-305. Hooper did consider that there were other reasons why God punished, but avoided mentioning any. It is possible that these other reasons that Hooper identified may have been referring to reasons why an individual was punished by God. Nevertheless, for the purposes of what Hooper felt was necessary to understand punishment within the framework of the Ten Commandments, he believed that these three reasons why God punished would suffice.

[12] Dt 17:14-20. Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 360.

[13] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 360.

[14] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 360, 364.

[15] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 362.

[16] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 364.

that Christ governs his church. Hooper's next task was to examine how the inheritors of this charge had acted, in order to construct a model for his community.

Hooper looked to the Bible for tangible demonstrations of the attributes of a good magistrate. Biblical examples gave clues as to proper and improper magisterial actions, as well as allowing consequences to be gleaned from these actions. Hooper's first example was Moses who became the first point of reference for Hooper in understanding the role of the magistrate. Moses' example was influential because it provided one of the earliest instances of established government for the Jewish people. In the chronology of the Old Testament, governance had been a patriarchal political structure prior to Moses; but after their captivity in Egypt, the Jewish people, led by Moses, took the first step towards nationhood. As the Exodus account recorded, Moses' power was given to him by God.[17] This was important to Hooper because, in the absence of an existing structure, Moses' leadership was wholly reliant upon God for guidance. The Israelites, as they became known, had not yet had a model of kingship for their own people. Moses was the leader responsible for delivering the Law of God to the people and ensuring that it was followed in daily life.[18] Moses was tasked with protecting the community: he was to punish those who had transgressed the Law in the hopes of inheriting the Promised Land.[19] Hooper looked at the power given to Moses for inspiration as to how the magistrate should be incorporated into his programme and, equally important, about what limits God had placed upon Moses' powers as leader. Hooper also drew upon the examples of monarchs in the Old Testament,[20] whom he found to be helpful models which reaffirmed the traditional leadership model that Moses had demonstrated.

When examining the biblical examples of the office of the magistrate, Hooper preferred not to rely upon a single narrative of a magistrate, but instead to consult a multitude of examples, both favourable and unfavourable. His rationale was that no individual could perfectly fulfil their duty, so exploring several examples would

---

[17] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 140-141.
[18] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 413.
[19] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 255-257, 288-289.
[20] Hooper provided a list of noble magistrates, though it was not exhaustive. See Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 458.

allow him better to observe how the magistrate was to act in different situations.[21] For instance, Hooper criticised King David: "[Saul's] successor David was likewise so entangled in the snares of the devil, that with much pain he could quit himself from the witched coup that the devil had once brought him good luck of."[22] These later kings of Israel and Judah provided positive and negative leadership models and the institutions of the government and church became more complex within the confines of a more established kingdom.[23] Moses therefore provided a clearer example of the magistrate.

Selection of the Magistrate

Hooper did not speculate on an ideal form of government. It seems that he was prepared to allow the political structures of an area to dictate its governance. However, he was not without criticism of contemporary leaders.[24] Writing against certain unnamed members of the nobility Hooper wrote,

> In time past men were accounted noble for virtue and justice; such as had done some noble act, either in peace, in governing the commonwealth, or in war for the defence of his country, and the heads thereof. They were born no gentlemen, but made gentlemen for their noble and virtuous acts. The nobility now-a-days is degenerate. It applieth no study to follow the wisdom, learning, and virtues of their predecessors, but think it enough to have the name, without effect. Their wisdom and learning once ruled other; now they contemn learning, and scarce can understand a learned man when he talketh of wisdom and learning.[25]

From this criticism, it is apparent that Hooper was not critical of existing structures; rather, it was the actions of those who held the office which Hooper was concerned with reforming. Writing from the safety of Zurich, this could have been an opportune

---

[21] Hooper argued that the more devoted to Christ a magistrate was, the more the magistrate would be tempted by the devil. See Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 80.

[22] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 81.

[23] For Hooper's assessment of other Old Testament kings see below, 93-94.

[24] Hooper was not unique in this regard. See for instance, Thomas Becon, *The Catechism of Thomas Becon S.T.P. chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer, prebendary of Canterbury: with other pieces written by him in the reign of Edward the Sixth*, ed. John Ayre (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844), 559-660; Hugh Latimer, *The Sermons by Hugh Latimer, Sometime Bishop of Worcester, Martyr 1555* ed. George Elwes Corrie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844), 178.

[25] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 363.

time to call for changes to structures of governance; however, Hooper refrained, and instead focused on reforming the actions of those who would wield power in the realm. This suggests that Hooper took governing structures as a given within the society from which they arose. Hooper might have come to this position while at Zurich, as Gordon suggests: "The Swiss Reformed churches were born in compromise; in order to take root they had had to embrace established political, social, and economic structures."[26] The Swiss certainly had a tradition in their reformation of respecting established authority, and Hooper echoed this sentiment by attacking the personal piety of political leaders rather than a person's position or nomination to an important office. As someone with the experience of living in a Swiss city-state and a monarchy, Hooper would have had first-hand experience of how these different communities selected or inherited their leaders. He did not comment on these, but instead, Hooper made only general comments on how the magistrate should govern.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, Hooper turned for his analysis of how the Israelites were to live in community to the laws of Moses, which identified only two criteria for nominating a magistrate.[27] Hooper argued from Deuteronomy that any magistrate must be from the community.[28] While Hooper was repeating what he found in scripture, he believed that a person native to the land had a vested interest in its success. Hooper invoked an image of paternalism to illustrate his idea: "In these words is declared, that whosoever will govern a commonwealth aright, must love it and the members thereof as the father his children".[29] Hooper was convinced that the command by God to appoint a magistrate from amongst the community who shared the same customs as the people they governed, and recognised God's authority. This convention underpinned the magistrate's ability to create laws, and, as will be discussed below, Hooper argued that magistrates had to follow the laws that they created.[30] More importantly, it established a general sense of accountability. Through sharing national kinship with the people, the magistrate would be bound to see the

---

[26] Bruce Gordon, *The Swiss Reformation* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 228.
[27] Dt 17:14-16.
[28] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 360-361.
[29] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 360-361.
[30] See below, 99.

Reformation flourish in their territory by modelling godly rule and seeing the people honour their godly magistrate by respecting their laws. The end result would be, Hooper argued, a faithful reformation programme.

Bullinger's Influence on Hooper's Preference for a Strong and Central Magistrate

One of the strongest political positions imparted to Hooper by Bullinger was the strength of the magistrate as the leader of the Reformation. Bullinger saw strength in a strong and central power that, if executed properly, would wield considerable power in introducing and developing the Reformation over its territory. In writing to Edward VI, Bullinger praised monarchical governance: "Now touching the excellency of these forms or kinds of government, it maketh not greatly to my purpose to dispute which ought to be preferred before other. Many have preferred the monarchy before the rest: but therewithal they added, 'If he which holdeth the monarchy be a good and upright prince.' Which, nevertheless, is rare to be found." [31] Bullinger made his position known: that a strong and centralised power could wield immense power over its territory and, more importantly, that a magistrate such as Edward VI could use his power to institute a state-endorsed Protestant agenda.[32] Bullinger suggested this in his dedication of his *Third Decade* to Edward as the officeholder of a divine office.[33] The dedication reaffirmed an earlier position on the magistrate that Bullinger had presented in his *Second Decade*,[34] where he defined the office:

---

[31] Bullinger, *The First and Second Decade*, 311.

[32] The suggestion Bullinger's support for Edward and his monarchical government was the result of frustrations with his own efforts at reform cannot be discounted entirely. See Carrie Euler, *Couriers of the Gospel: England and Zurich, 1531-1558* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag Zurich, 2006), 91-92. For an example of Bullinger's difficulty with the council concerning religious affairs, see Bruce Gordon, "Introduction," in *Architect of Reformation: An Introduction to Heinrich Bullinger, 1504-1575*, ed. Bruce Gordon and Emidio Campi (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic Press, 2004), 23-24. However, Biel notes that there were instances where Bullinger and the Council worked effectively together. One such case was the treatment of poor relief. Biel notes that there were many problems with jurisdiction over poor relief, but Bullinger and the council compromised and worked out a social programme through which the council would assist in funding parishes that found themselves in financial difficulties when it came to caring for the poor. See Pamela Biel, *Doorkeepers at the House of Righteousness: Heinrich Bullinger and the Clergy 1535-1575* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1991), 142-145. See also Robinson, *OL*, 1:73, 76.

[33] Bullinger, *The First and Second* Decade, 309. Bullinger, *The Third Decade*, 3-16.

[34] Bullinger, *The First and Second Decade*, 307-324.

> The whole office of a magistrate seemeth to consist in these three
> points; to order, to judge, and to punish… The ordinance of the
> magistrate is a decree made by him for maintaining of religion,
> honesty, justice, and public peace: and it consisteth on two points;
> in ordering rightly matters of religion, and making good laws for
> the preservation of honesty, justice, and common peace.[35]

Bullinger saw in Edward VI the possibility of a king's fulfilling this mandate. However, it was Edward's potential for strengthening the Reformation in England that most attracted Bullinger's attention. For Bullinger, this was the most important aspect of Edward's role because the godly laws that Bullinger demanded of the magistrate would guide the realm through proper reform. Bullinger's dedication consisted of a direct appeal to Edward, and in it he outlined a model for how a magistrate could come to exemplify this Protestant vision, affirmed the office of the magistrate as of divine origin. In occupying a divine office, Bullinger argued, the magistrate could only succeed as a monarch by following the Law of God.[36] Furthermore, it was imperative for Edward to surround himself with councillors who shared the same respect for scripture and desire to seeing the Reformation succeed in England.[37] Neither Bullinger nor Hooper detailed specific laws that the magistrate should enact, although they both stated explicitly that the magistrate had a judicial mandate to ensure that the community abided by the Ten Commandments.[38]

Rather than defining specific laws, Bullinger believed that the magistrate was to act quasi-prophetically, as the "living law".[39] As Kirby has claimed, this was central to Bullinger's understanding as he believed that magistrates had the power to interpret the Ten Commandments for their subjects in terms both of relevance and practical application.[40] This meant that the magistrate had considerable freedom to create laws that were most appropriate to their realm. Bullinger looked to Moses for

---

[35] Bullinger, *The First and Second Decade*, 323.
[36] Bullinger, *The Third Decade,* 4. Bullinger also looked to the Kings of Israel to justify his position that the successful monarchs of Israel heeded the Law of God and the unsuccessful did not. See Bullinger, *The Third Decade*, 6-13.
[37] Bullinger, *The Third Decade*, 4.
[38] Bullinger, *The Third Decade*, 220.
[39] Bullinger, *The Third Decade*, 221.
[40] See W.J. Torrance Kirby, *The Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 27.

the example of this process of creating applicable laws.[41] However, there was a limit to the power that Bullinger was prepared to grant the magistrate in creating laws, and he did not permit the magistrate to contravene the spirit of the law as it was intended.[42] As an accountability check, Bullinger also argued that the magistrate was to abide by the laws that they created.[43] The magistrate was to lead by example and punish those who transgressed these laws.[44] In this construction, the magistrate sustained the Reformation by their laws, which protected the Reformation by allowing ministers to preach their Protestant message freely; this in turn led to the successful operation of the community.

It is undeniable that Hooper's concept of the magistrate was inspired by Bullinger; however, the way he saw the magistrate as leader of the Reformation requires further exploration. Like Bullinger, Hooper saw Edward as an asset who could be a potential model for his reformation vision. On account of the king's youth and impressionability, it was necessary to proceed slowly, but Hooper believed that proper instruction would allow Edward to be the magistrate that the Reformation would need in order to function properly. Moreover, Hooper did not believe that Edward's age was as barrier to seeing this vision realised and he believed that Edward was responsible for the faith of England. This view was certainly contentious because in England, traditionalists such as Stephen Gardiner argued that Edward's minority prevented any development or change to the state of religion from the position Henry VIII had left.[45] Hooper, however, challenged this position:

> And this is specially to be noted in St Paul, that he saith simple
> and plainly, we should obey "the higher powers," to confute,
> argue, and reprehend those that cloke and excuse their
> disobedience, either for the age of the rulers… And that age
> dischargeth no man for inobedience, the word of God declareth
> how that he was present to help young kings, and to defend them
> in their under age; as it is to be seen by king Josias. Also, God

---

[41] See Bullinger, *The Third Decade*, 221.
[42] Kirby, *The Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology*, 27.
[43] Bullinger, *The Third Decade*, 223.
[44] Bullinger allowed for the possibility that judges might perform this task. See Bullinger, *The Third Decade*, 220, 232.
[45] Gardiner's opposition to religious change during Edward's minority was frequently mentioned in his letters to Protector Somerset. In particular, see, *The Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, ed. James Arthur Muller (1933; repr. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press Publishers, 1970), 265-267, 290-291.

> punisheth young kings as often as they walk not after his word; as
> it is to be seen by Jehoiakim… for the sins he committed.[46]

Importantly, Hooper demonstrated that the magistrate's office was appointed by God. Age could not be a factor in discrediting Edward from acting as the magistrate that God had called him to be. This confirmed, for Hooper, that the magistrate's power came from God, because God had chosen Edward as king. To deny Edward the chance to reform the kingdom, Hooper effectively argued, would mean that the magistrate was only conditionally chosen by God. Conversely, this meant that Edward was responsible for England's government and would not be spared from God's wrath on account of his age, should he fail to reform the kingdom, even at a young age like King Josiah of Judah.

The Magistrate as God's Temporal Minister

It has already been established that Hooper rooted the authority of the magistrate in the Old Testament and saw it modelled by Christ as protector of his church. The magistrate assumed the mantle of God's representative. Such authority gave the magistrate legitimacy against anyone who challenged their right to govern, since such a challenge was an attack against God's choice of the magistrate and thus against God. When Hooper described this power as something tangible, he did so by making a comparison to an ecclesiastical model. This seems an odd choice, given Hooper's aversion to the clergy's involvement in temporal affairs.[47] However, he was probably appealing to a popular convention to illustrate his point by describing the idea that the clergy had sole authority to perform their spiritual duties.[48] For instance, the clergy's right to administer the sacraments would be unquestioned by parishioners as the fulfilling of a divine ordinance. The following serves as an example of the implications of what Hooper was trying to suggest: as a minister in the Church of England, he was granted the power to administer the Eucharist. The Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552 both affirm the priest's sole responsibility for

---

[46] Hooper, *Romans 13*, *LW*, 101-102.
[47] This will be discussed in the next chapter: see below, 148.
[48] Concerns about the behaviour of specific clergy are not relevant to the discussion as this merely suggests that the clergy's authority over their spiritual affairs was not questioned. See for instance, Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 177.

celebrating the Eucharist from the beginning of the service to its administration.[49] This fact would be uncontested – even dangerous to contest – for all within the Church of England and would have been understood as a divine mandate given to the priest. This had become reinforced by a collective understanding in the social consciousness and it was probably the manner that Hooper wanted the magistrate to be understood and would grant the magistrate the assurance of their divine office. Hooper drew this example from the Apostle Paul: "In this, that Saint Paul calleth him the minister of God, he putteth the subject in mind again, that whosoever contemn or disobey the higher power, contemneth and disobeyth God."[50]

The magistrate, as a minister of God, was bound by the same conditions as the ministers of the church. In this way, Hooper argued that the magistrate had a divine right to hold their office: "yet is his office and place the ordinance and appointment of God, and therefore to be obeyed".[51] Hooper avoided any confusion that the magistrate might supersede or contradict the Law of God by considering how the magistrate used the sword in a Christian manner and how the sword might be misused. Hooper made two assertions about the magistrate's ability to wield the sword faithfully. First, "that under the pretext and cloak of the law, he serve not his affection or gain, nor punish the innocent."[52] Secondly: "Let the magistrate take heed he absolve not him that God condemneth, and commandeth to be punished, for gain, affection, good intention, or else for any foolish and preposterous pity: for doing so, Saul lost his kingdom."[53] This is the point at which Hooper came closest to constructing a theological mandate for the magistrate. As a representative of God's power on Earth, Hooper observed that the magistrate operated under the Law of God, which reinforces the Pauline relationship that conformity to the magistrate's godly laws was a religious obligation. Hooper argued, "Also the magistrate there is warned to take heed he do nothing but as the minister of God, to rule and govern after his

---

[49] Editions of the Edwardian Books of Common Prayer are found in Church of England and Joseph Ketley, ed., *The Two Liturgies, A.D. 1549 and A.D. 1552: With Other Documents Set Forth by Authority in the Reign of King Edward VI* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844), 76, 265.
[50] Hooper, *Romans 13*, *LW*, 107; Rom 13:1-7.
[51] Hooper, *Romans 13*, *LW*, 104.
[52] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 474-5.
[53] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 475.

word. For this God requireth of him, that he be a faithful minister."[54] This limited the magistrate from ruling tyrannically, as Hooper did not allow the magistrate to transcend God's Law. Doing so would jeopardise the success of the kingdom.[55] Thus, the magistrate was bound to follow and enact God's Law to ensure prosperity. This challenged the papal image of Christ's temporal vicar who acts proactively to define God's Law; rather the magistrate is submissive to the will of God on his own accord.

Magistrates' Laws

For Hooper, the magistrates' power and measure of effective governance was understood through their ability to create and enforce in the civic sphere godly law based upon the Ten Commandments. The use of the Ten Commandments as a basis for law was tied to their divine origin.[56] The Law was given directly to Moses from God and expressed clearly God's expectations of individuals and the community. Hooper explained this the following way, "They teach abundantly and sufficiently in few words, how to know God, to follow virtue, and to come to eternal life."[57] All subsequent laws for godly living, even those given by Christ, were based on what God had outlined with Moses. Consequently, for Hooper, any law had to be rooted in the spirit of the Ten Commandments if it were to honour God.[58] The Ten Commandments themselves were authoritative, not only for the particular time that they were given, but for all subsequent communities as well, for they contained God's template for peace. Hooper believed that God had, through scripture, revealed for successive societies a general template for godly living.

Hooper made a distinction between two sets of laws: those of humanity and those of God.[59] Hooper argued that human laws required only external obedience, but the Law of God required internal and external obedience.[60] This provided Hooper with a forum to discuss disobedience to ungodly laws; but, for the purposes of

---

[54] Hooper, *Romans 13*, *LW*, 107.
[55] See Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 18.
[56] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 255-256.
[57] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 272.
[58] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 366.
[59] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 273-274.
[60] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 274.

creating his godly society, he quickly discarded talk of human laws to focus on why the Law of God and the laws of a godly magistrate were one and the same.[61] This meant that obedience to civic laws became a spiritual matter. This did not mean that the church was to assume responsibility; in fact, Hooper argued that quite the opposite was true. One's attitude towards the law was a testament of one's rejection or commitment to God's designs for the community, expressed through the Ten Commandments: "no man should decline from this law… no man should add anything from it, but simply to observe it."[62] There was little room for grey areas in Hooper's understanding of the law. Due to the clarity of the law, any attempt to thwart it would be deliberate. Therefore, Hooper could not conceive of any law that did not reflect what the Ten Commandments decreed.[63]

Against the background of Hooper's clarity about the law and its pertinence and relevance to society, his conception of the magistrate as an interpreter of the commandments requires further consideration. Hooper did not comment on particular laws within any realm as godly or ungodly, and he provided the magistrate with some freedom to interpret the Ten Commandments as they pertained to specific periods and territories, so long as the resulting laws reflected the spirit of the Ten Commandments.[64] The ability to interpret laws suggested that not all laws were permanent. While the Ten Commandments were true for all humanity, specific laws might be enacted for particular situations and circumstances. Hooper forbade magistrates to create laws on religion that were not found in the Bible, but granted them the option of creating civil laws as the need arose for the preservation of their territory.[65] For instance, Hooper would have observed magistrates – in the form of the city council – passing godly laws in Bullinger's Zurich, while he would have also observed England's parliament creating godly laws more suited to its monarchical structure. Hooper recognised these distinctions: "And as many divers commonwealths there be, so many divers laws there be. Howbeit all christened kings and kingdoms, with other magistrates, should reign by one law, and govern their

---

[61] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 274.
[62] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 274.
[63] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 273-275.
[64] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 273.
[65] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 280.

churches of their realms solely by the word of God".[66] In recognising the particularities of the regional nuances of laws, Hooper focused on understanding the innate principles of the Law as a template from God to understand society.

In defining the magistrate as the executor of God's Law, Hooper made a rather simple statement that had considerable ramifications. Referring to Ephesians 6 Hooper wrote, "So commandeth Paul… for they are appointed unto that place of governance to be God's vicars, to execute his law, his will, his pleasure, to bring men to God, and not to carry men from God."[67] Hooper thus suggested that all laws existed to bring people to God. Taken literally, all laws are an extension of an act of God. This was an idea which he had inherited from Zurich, but which also suggested a certain categorisation of laws as either for God or against him.[68] Because Hooper was dealing primarily with hypothetical situations in his early writing, he did not pay much attention to laws that contravened the Law of God, implicitly or explicitly.[69] Rather, he saw laws as a means to develop spiritual and social improvement within the community:

> So that the law is a certain rule, a directory, shewing what is good, and what is ill; what is virtue, and what is vice; what profitable, and what disprofitable; what to be done, and what to be left undone. This declaration of the law general appertaineth unto all the kinds, members, and particular laws, made either for the body, either for the soul.[70]

Hooper stressed that laws should always demonstrate the faithfulness, justice and goodness of God, as was found in the Ten Commandments. Writing against Stephen Gardiner in his *Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, Hooper argued that every person in the community should have knowledge of God's Law: "As the common laws of every city must be known of every man that will be a good citizen, so must the common laws of Christ's church be known of every one that will be a

---

[66] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 280.
[67] Eph 6:1; Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 359.
[68] See Robert C Walton, *Zwingli's Theocracy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967), 120-122, 166-167.
[69] When Hooper wrote of laws that contravened the Law of God, Hooper focused on how individuals were to passively resist those laws, whilst respecting the office of the magistrate. See for instance, Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 358-359.
[70] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 273.

good Christian."[71] The onus for the magistrate was therefore to create laws that would be in accordance with God's demands for godly living.

The All-Encompassing Nature of the Law

For Hooper, the force of the magistrate was felt most in society by the ways, or indeed severity, by which magistrates ensured that their godly laws were adhered to in society. Hooper believed that, while godly laws were integral to his envisioned society, enforcing these laws in a godly fashion would bring about the reformation of the community: "The magistrate is but a minister of the law, and is bound for the law's sake to suffer him to live, that transgresseth not the law: so is he bound to put him to death, that hath offended the law."[72] To do this, Hooper suggested that the magistrate was a servant to the godly laws that were created for society. One of the strongest ways in which Hooper demonstrated the magistrate as a servant of the law (apart from actually enforcing the laws) was to abide by the godly laws that they had passed. Hooper summarised this position in the following way, "The princes are called *reges a regendo*; that is to say, they are called kings, which name cometh of a verb that signifieth to govern. They must lead the people and themselves by the law, and not against the law; to be ministers of the law, and not masters over the law."[73] Abiding by and enforcing their laws helped to persuade the magistrate's subjects that the Reformation was a worthy campaign.

For Hooper, then, as he made clear, the magistrate should be an exemplary Christian: "If the king, prince, magistrate or rulers of the commonwealth, nor know God's laws, nor follow justice, equity, temperancy, nor sobriety; what honesty or virtue can they look to have in their subjects? They must give example of all virtue."[74] In the same tract, Hooper offered the examples of the Israelite kings Saul and David who, on account of their virtue, were godly kings and enjoyed prosperity when they followed their godly laws. When they ceased to abide by these godly laws, they suffered personal ruin and in the case of Saul, the loss of his kingdom.[75]

---

[71] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 214.
[72] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 369.
[73] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 362-363.
[74] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 415.
[75] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 358.

As one subject to godly laws, Hooper believed that by abiding by the laws they enacted, the magistrate would appear more justified in handing out punishments as offences affected the entire community which the magistrate was visibly part.

Because the magistrate was both subject to the law and enforced it, Hooper next sought to prove how everyone was held accountable to the law, irrespective of political or ecclesiastical station. Hooper argued, "It is ill done, therefore, of princes and magistrates, to give charters and privileges to such as by the law should die; and a shrewd example for other, that think, when need is, I shall have friends likewise to beg me my pardon."[76] Hooper looked to Moses for inspiration in the need to make the law equally applicable for all, but he also highlighted the example of Miriam,[77] the sister of Moses, who was struck with leprosy and cast out of the camp in accordance with the law.[78] For Hooper, making exceptions for those from privileged circles was a gross misuse of judgement. As civic laws were based on the Law of God, any alteration of the law was also a breaking of God's Law and, in so doing, ran the risk of disrupting the Reformation in the kingdom. The magistrate was charged by God to execute godly laws, and deviating was a failure of godly duty. Equality under the law meant that everyone, irrespective of their social standing or influence in the community, was bound by the laws of the magistrate and of God. For Hooper, there could be no exceptions because no one, not even the magistrate, was above the law precisely because it was based upon the Law of God.

The Magistrate as God's Instrument to Punish

Hooper also argued that the magistrate had a divine duty to punish those who broke the law. To do this, Hooper looked at how God punished, to show the transformation of punishment, and what forms it should take. However, he needed first to explain the relationship between disobedience and punishment. When Hooper highlighted examples of God's punishment of the people of Israel, he observed that it was always

---

[76] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 369.
[77] Hooper referred to her by her Latinised name Mary.
[78] Nm 12:14-15. Hooper also used the example of Jehu, a king of Israel, who purged the kingdom of idolatry and removed, but did not follow God's Law personally. See 2 Kgs 9:1-10:36; Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 436.

to punish disobedient behaviour.[79] He needed to demonstrate that God's punishment of disobedience correlated with the form of justice that the magistrate would administer when the laws of the community were broken, and he found this correlation in the nature of the laws. As discussed in the previous section, Hooper intended that, in his godly community, the laws that the magistrate created would be based upon the Laws of God. Given such parameters, the magistrate's laws were godly, and to break those laws would indeed be considered disobedient to God's commands.[80] Therefore, the magistrate was punishing in the same manner that God had done in the Old Testament and was, as a consequence, justified in punishing transgressions as God had done.[81]

Having established this link between the disobedience that God punished and the punishment that Hooper expected the magistrate to dispense, he then considered how God had enacted punishment. To validate his position that the magistrate had a divine prerogative to punish disobedient behaviour, Hooper looked to Paul's Epistle to the Romans, chapter 5: "God, for sin being angry, punisheth the miserable nature of man, being spoiled of his original and first perfection, with many calamities."[82] Through his use of Paul, Hooper suggested that God punished when offences were committed. One of the best examples for Hooper's reading of Paul was the account of the Israelites wandering the desert. Hooper wrote, "Therefore Moses saith, that 'God led them in the wilderness to punish their sin,' which is the principal cause of all calamities."[83] In Hooper's *Sermons upon Jonah*, he identified several more instances where God had punished, including the example of God's punishment of Israel under King Ahab. By punishing their disobedient king, God had punished the Israelites until they obeyed.[84] From these and other examples of God's punishment, Hooper concluded that God did not tolerate disobedient behaviour, and that God required the use of punishment when disobedient acts had been committed. Hooper was able to prove that God had been active in punishment, which provided him with

---

[79] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 436.
[80] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 436.
[81] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 304.
[82] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 304; Rm 5:12-15.
[83] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 304.
[84] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 472. See above, 68.

the basis for his claim that the magistrate received the responsibility to punish from God for use in the community.

Having observed that God had regularly punished disobedient people and communities when they had broken his Law,[85] Hooper concluded that as God's representative, the magistrate was commanded to punish: "Wherefore God commandeth the magistrates and superior powers of the earth to punish the transgressors of the law made for the preservation of every commonwealth".[86] Acting on God's commandments and as his minister, the magistrate was fulfilling a divine office by punishing as God had done. Appealing to Romans chapter 13, Hooper summarised his own position: "[St Paul] declare[s] that it is not enough for the magistrate to bear a sword, but to use and execute the sword, as the sins of the people require, to punish and kill them, if the law so find them guilty."[87] Hooper's reference to Paul here indicated the extent of the authority which he was prepared to give the magistrate – including the power of life and death. . For example, Hooper wrote in his reply to Gardiner, concerning a traitor: "The king, of equity, is bound to kill the body of this traitor; and God can do no less of his justice than kill both body and soul of this idolater, if he repent not."[88] As God's representative, the magistrate had all of the necessary powers within the Law of God to punish transgressors and ensure that the Law of God was adhered to by the community.

It would be a mistake, however, to conclude that the authority of the magistrate's office to punish meant that God no longer punished disobedience. In his *Sermons upon Jonah*, Hooper specifically cautioned the leadership of the Reformation in England that God's punishment was close at hand, implying that if the magistrate failed to punish, God would.[89] Hooper used the instance in the Book of Jonah where the sea became rough as Jonah attempted to escape his call to Nineveh to prophesy, to warn that God's punishment was still active:[90]

---

[85] See Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 182.
[86] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 282.
[87] Hooper, *Romans 13*, *LW*, 108.
[88] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 215.
[89] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 215.
[90] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 484.

> When the magistrate by negligence or preposterous pity will not
> punish for sin, then God striketh; as ye may see by the universal
> flood, by the fire in Sodom and Gomorre. Give heed, therefore,
> most gracious lords, to punish these Jonases, and to put better into
> their place; or else God will punish either with an evil beast,
> either with sword, either with famine, either with pestilence, as it
> is written, Ezekiel xiv. But in case ye will do it, the sea will cease,
> as I pray God it may.[91]

From Hooper's address to the nobility of England, he was certain that God would intervene when the magistrate failed to punish for disobeying godly laws. Hooper suggested, therefore, that the magistrate, having been given the power from God to punish, was tasked with ensuring that the citizens behaved, punishing those who did not.[92] Failure to do so would mean that God would enact his own form of punishment, which Hooper believed would be catastrophic not only for the magistrate, but the entire community as well. Therefore, Hooper believed that punishing the magistrate might delay the wrath of God and allow a peaceable community.

God's Punishments

To examine how God punished, Hooper turned to the examples of David and Manasses (Manasseh) to describe the first two attributes of God's rationale for punishment.[93] In this instance, Hooper did not mention what the sins were, but elsewhere in his writings he hinted at what he might mean. Concerning King David specifically, Hooper wrote, that David "felt the pains of his adultery, the death of his child, the conspiracy of Absalom, the vitiating of his wives, exile and banishment, and other such calamities".[94] He was punished by God because he had broken the Ten Commandments by committing adultery and murder. Turning to an examination of Manasseh in his *Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, Hooper examined how in this case God's punishment also brought about penance. Manasseh, Hooper

---

[91] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 484.
[92] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 484.
[93] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 90; Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 201-202. Hooper also mentioned Osias (probably King Uzziah who was stricken with leprosy for entering the Temple to burn incense) but did not elaborate. Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 305; 2 Chr 26:19-21.
[94] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 90.

observed, had originally sinned against the Law of God:[95] "Manasses, for the time of many years, conspired nothing but the abolition and destruction of God's word, killed the prophets of God, and many other godly persons."[96] God had punished Manasseh by allowing the Assyrian army to capture him and lead him to captivity in Babylon, but Manasseh then repented, and was restored to power. He then followed the Law of God, and also ensured that his people followed it. For Hooper, this was evidence that God had used punishment to bring about a penitent change in behaviour. Manasseh, after the humiliation of his capture, was brought to repentance and it was for this reason that his remaining years as king were in accordance with the Law of God. Hooper was therefore able to conclude that a function of God's punishment was to bring about a penitent spirit that would conform to the Law of God.

The third mention of punishment concerned God's punishment of individuals and communities as a means to ensure that people would realise their dependence on God. Hooper described this idea through reflection upon Deuteronomy with its account of manna falling from heaven.[97] When the Israelites had undergone a scarcity of food in the wilderness, God had provided food from heaven. Hooper agreed with the writer of Deuteronomy, arguing that the manna was a metaphor showing how humanity must rely on God for spiritual sustenance. Hooper wrote, "God's punishment therefore taught the Israelites this doctrine, that God giveth not only meat, but also virtue thereunto to nourish him that eateth."[98] Hooper argued that God could teach individuals by having them suffer before providing a way in which their immediate concerns were remedied but also in such a way that individuals might be reminded of God's sovereignty. The expectation therefore, was that individuals would then live in proper accordance with God's Law. It is doubtful that Hooper saw this form of punishment as an applicable model for the civic magistrate; nevertheless, it was significant for the magistrate insofar as it reinforced the need to punish disobedience to avoid such hardships and deepened relationships with God, as the Israelites had experienced in the wilderness.

---

[95] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 202; 2 Chr 33:1-18.
[96] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 201.
[97] Dt 8:3.
[98] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 306.

In each of these three forms of punishment, Hooper argued that God's punishments were enacted because individuals and communities had broken the Law of God. However, in punishing sinful actions Hooper argued that it was ultimately God's desire to see individuals and their community correct their wrongs and return to godly living.

How the Magistrate is to Punish

Hooper employed the use of a metaphor to explain how the magistrate was to punish. This metaphor was one of a devoted father and his relationship with his children whom he would punish for their betterment:[99]

> The father's office is, to teach and bring up their children in the knowledge and discipline of God, to know him aright, and keep them from wantonness and ungodly life… not to provoke them to ire, but gently win them to virtue and love, without severity and rigour, if fair means can avail; if not, to use rod and the punishment, as he seeth the cause require; and not to be remiss and negligent in correcting his child's fault, neither to wink at his ill doings.[100]

In the same way that the father punished disobedient children, the magistrate was obliged to punish to correct improper behaviour because of his love for those he punished. In this light, punishment must follow the law, and the magistrate must act as one delivering God's justice. Thus, the magistrate, by acting through godly laws, would execute fair justice and give the offender the best opportunity to conform to the Protestant society that the magistrate demanded. Hooper stressed that the magistrate's execution of justice must be fair and impartial, and loyal only to the law. Hooper wrote, "In the ministration whereof the magistrate or prince should always observe justice, as well against one man as the other, without respect of persons".[101] He was critical of any magistrate who punished because of a personal vendetta or used laws for personal gain.[102]

---

[99] Hooper quoted Xenophon (the Athenian soldier, historian and writer c.430-354 CE), who wrote that, "a good prince differeth nothing from a good father." Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 361. McConica observed that the magistrate as a father figure was popular image for the king and his relationship with the state. James McConica, *English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), 30.
[100] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 360.
[101] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 369.
[102] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 474-475.

Because Hooper believed that the laws of the realm existed for the betterment of its citizens and the peace of the community, and because he encouraged the magistrate to punish crimes as they merited under the law, he also cautioned against ruling too harshly.[103] It was important that the punishment did not lose sight of its objective. As a general principle, however, he was fearful of magistrates who were lax in their discipline or refused to punish wrongdoing. Hooper argued that the magistrate must remain steadfast in executing discipline, offering numerous stark warnings about the impending destruction of the community if discipline were abandoned or not rigorously enforced.[104] Preaching to the leaders of England, Hooper argued that, "This man of God [Jonah] noted and knew the displeasure of God against sin: but our Jonases sleep quietly in both ears, and feeleth not the pain of sin; and this security and insensibleness under the wrath of God cometh by the ignorancy that the whole world is lapped in almost, as touching the danger of their vocations."[105] Moreover, Hooper suggested that, if the magistrate failed to discipline, they would also be implicated in the crime in the eyes of God and worthy of the punishment that the guilty party deserved.[106] Hooper was afraid that, if disobedience were left unpunished, citizens would not respect the laws the magistrate was trying to create for the reformation of the community, and he provided a biblical example of what happened when obedience to the Law of God was repeatedly ignored:

> Whiles it is a committing, the prick and danger thereof is not felt, but it delighteth rather man: so without fear ate Adam and Eve the apple... And because God out of hand punisheth not our sin, the devil bewitcheth our minds and wits, and beareth us in hand that he will never punish, and that God seeth not our sin, nor is not so greviously offended with our sins.[107]

Therefore, Hooper believed that the only solution to avoid breaking of the magistrate's laws was to punish those who broke the laws. This would remind

---

[103] This idea corresponds with Price's evaluation of Hooper's judicial verdicts for ecclesiastical cases in Gloucester. Price wrote that Hooper's verdicts had a particular "sternness" to them. See Price, "Gloucester Diocese Under Bishop Hooper, 1551-3," *BGAS* 60 (1938): 86.
[104] See Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 494-498.
[105] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 494.
[106] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 369.
[107] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 454.

transgressors of their dutiful obedience to God's representative and the godly laws that they made.

Sedition: Failings of Punishment

The risk that a society would collapse because of continued sinful activity was a constant fear for Hooper.[108] In particular, he feared that sin left unpunished would lead to sedition.[109] Sedition, born of humanity's corrupted nature, would threaten the Reformation if left unchecked. While sedition was an offence against the magistrate committed by the people, the topic is best considered in the context of Hooper's views of the magistrate rather than his vision for the people, because Hooper generally viewed seditious and rebellious activity as resulting from the magistrates' failure to govern properly.[110] Thus, Hooper argued that sedition was probably provoked by the magistrate, either because they failed to punish disobedience, or because they treated their subjects tyrannically and unfairly. Hooper exhorted: "The common sort of people, let them learn to know and obey both God and man, and not trust to the pardon and remission of their ignorancy, and disobedient treason and sedition, at the parson's or vicar's hand; but they must know and fear both God and God's magistrate themselves."[111] If they did not, Hooper feared divine retribution for:

> the poor man, partly provoked by necessity and need, and partly of unchristian hatred and disdain he hath at his neighbour's wealth and prosperity, conspireth, worketh, provoketh, and desireth by all means to oppress and rob his richer neighbour; and will by force, strength, treason, sedition, commotion, assemblance, and gathering together of such as he is himself, against God's laws, God's ordinances, magistrates and superior powers, take away and usurp every man's goods, he careth not how; not remembering the judgement and terrible damnation of God for his so doing…[112]

---

[108] See Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 491-492.
[109] See Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 461.
[110] See below, 212.
[111] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 504.
[112] Hooper, *Romans 13*, *LW*, 97.

For Hooper, then, destruction of the community was the only possible outcome of a failure to discipline.[113] In Hooper's godly community, it was hoped that, through the proper actions of the magistrate, sedition would never surface. Nevertheless, he provided examples of how sedition rose in society, to help the magistrate avoid it.

In summary, however much the magistrate created godly laws and lived by the laws that they created, Hooper believed that there would be those who would transgress those laws. The way to ensure that laws would be properly observed was to punish transgressors, in the hope that through punishment, the transgressor would stop disobeying godly laws and would amend their behaviour and live a godly lifestyle. Punishment was the way in which Hooper hoped that godly order would be achieved. For Hooper, punishment of those who broke the law was strictly the jurisdiction of the magistrate; however, before considering how the magistrate might punish, Hooper sought to understand the role of punishment in society. For Hooper, talk of punishment was also used as a means to bringing restoration to both the person and society. Hooper wrote that, "[it is] for no for hatred that he punisheth, but for love; and that he findeth always in man just matter worthy punishment."[114] Because of this, Hooper considered punishment an act of love as well as justice for the community.

The Magistrate as Protector of the Church

For Hooper, the magistrate's relationship with the clergy was of major importance for the success of the community's reformation. At stake was the cohesion necessary for a harmonious and unified front, which would ensure that the Reformation was maintained in society. To ensure this harmony, Hooper needed to define the magistrate's relationship with the church. It needed to have enough strength to allow the magistrate to push forward civil laws that would guarantee Protestant reform, but not to be so strong as to intrude into the clergy's jurisdiction. The clergy's task was to deliver preaching, no more and no less.[115] Hooper articulated this balance in the following manner,

---

[113] See Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 510.
[114] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 304.
[115] See Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 82.

> If the prince rule the body, the bishop to sit in the quire and rule the soul; as indeed there is more bishops' decrees, laws, and statutes in the church for the soul, than civil laws in any realm for the body. Whereas every commonwealth ought to have but two governors, God and the prince, the one to make a law for the soul, the other for the body: all the king's officers to be ministers of the law made to the conservation of the commonwealth, and the bishops to be ministers in the church, of the law that is prescribed by God… so must the bishops, priests, and all other preachers, be ministers of Christ, and govern the people in their vocation according unto the law prescribed by God… There is no more required of the bishop, but that he be diligent and faithful in the execution of God's word."[116]

For a model on how the magistrate was to act with the officials of the church, Hooper again looked to the Old Testament. Specifically, he was interested in how kings and prophets/priests had interacted in the Old Testament and looked to Moses and Aaron as the first to demonstrate this relationship.[117] Moses and Aaron had distinct roles. When God commanded Moses to go to Pharaoh, Moses asked for a prophet who would speak the will of God to Pharaoh, therefore God appointed Aaron to perform the task. On this basis, Hooper observed that two roles were required to lead the community.

As the Israelites left Egypt, according to Hooper's reading of the Exodus account, the roles became more distinctly defined: Aaron assumed a priestly function and Moses led the nation as its magistrate, serving as a judge, legislator, and military leader. Moses was to deal with legislating proper religion, while Aaron was to ensure that the priests conformed to God's commandments and led the nation in proper worship.[118] Hooper argued that Aaron, who was called upon as Moses' spokesperson, was never authorised to create doctrine,[119] and he criticised instances where the division between the responsibility of the magistrate and the church had been blurred: "Doubtless the princes of the earth, unto whom God committeth the civil governance of the people, shall sustain the ire of God for their negligent endeavour in this behalf, because they suffer such preachers and bishops to rule over

---

[116] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 142.
[117] Ex 6:28- Ex 7:1.
[118] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 141.
[119] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 141.

the conscience of their subjects, where only the Law of God should have place."[120]

For Hooper, the important point was not that God had called Moses first or that God recognised Moses' request for help by creating a prophetic order, but that these were two distinct offices ordained by God to work in tandem to achieve God's will for his chosen people. Thus, for Hooper, there was a divine mandate for the offices of the church and state to work together. Failure to do so or subversion of one or the other was to defy fundamental arrangement created by God.

An additional responsibility with which Hooper had entrusted the magistrate was to purge the community of idolatrous worship and to remain vigilant in ensuring that no challenges to the legitimacy of the Protestant church arose. Hooper echoed a similar idea in his *Sermons upon Jonah*: "So did Nabuchadnezer [*sic*], Darius, and Cyrus, kings of most notable fame: therefore Christ calleth the princes the nurses of the church."[121] Hooper argued that it was the magistrate who would ultimately rid the church of idolatry, set it on the path to reform, and allow the ministers of the church to preach the gospel freely.[122] In Hooper's own experience, he was able to observe and commend Edward VI's father, Henry VIII, for removing the Church of England from the control of the Roman Catholic Church. Hooper described what had transpired in a brutally honest response to Gardiner:

> Yet God many times doth resuscitate of his great mercy divers
> princes and godly-minded kings, for the defence of the church, as
> he did Cyrus and Constantinus, with many other. And in my days
> it pleased God to move the heart of the most noble victorious
> prince Henry VIII., of a blessed memory, to deliver his subjects
> from the tyranny of the wicked antichrist, the bishop of Rome,
> with many other godly and divine acts, which brought the light of
> God's word into many hearts…[123]

Hooper's main archetype for this style of leadership was the Judean King Josiah. Josiah spearheaded reform by ridding the realm of idolatry. Josiah was a popular example for reformers in the reign of Edward VI because, like Edward, Josiah was a

---

[120] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 140.
[121] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 542.
[122] See Catherine Davies, *A Religion of the Word: The Defence of the Reformation in the Reign of Edward VI* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 156.
[123] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 201.

child-king.[124] By referring to Josiah, Hooper was able to comment on the magistrate's role in ridding the church of barriers to reform; but this also served to prove that, even as a child, Edward was still able to reform the English Church. Hooper observed of Josiah that "he removed all false doctrine and idolatry out of the church, and restored the book of the law into the temple, bound himself and all his subjects to honour and obey God only, as that book taught."[125] Importantly for Hooper, the Josiah example emphasised that only the magistrate had the power to create the laws necessary to ensure conformity to religion and authority to punish those who broke the laws. It was these powers which Hooper believed would enable the church to preach the gospel freely and protect the church from opposition.

Calling Ecclesiastical Councils and Adjudicating Doctrinal Debate

Although the magistrate was prevented from forming doctrine, Hooper argued there were occasions when differences of opinions arose and deliberation was required to solve the nature of the theological problem and laws made to enforce the resolution. Despite his belief in the clarity of the Bible, Hooper understood that disputes needed to be resolved quickly and definitively, where the verdict would therefore be respected and enforced by the magistrate.[126] He was critical of the medieval Ecclesiastical Councils of the Roman Church, and especially of the medieval popes who summoned ecclesiastical councils. He argued that the power to call an ecclesiastical council lay with the magistrate.[127] He looked to scripture first, but his position was also enhanced by considering the successful councils of the Patristic Age, which he argued, had been called by magistrates and had produced the Church's ecumenical Creeds. With these precedents, Hooper considered how an ecclesiastical council was to be called and concluded that councils were generally

---

[124] For Josiah as a model of Edward's kingship see Diarmaid MacCulloch *Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (London: Allen Lane, 1999), 62-63; Felicity Heal, *Reformation in Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 157-158; Stephen Alford, *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 52; Graeme Murdock, The Importance of Being Josiah: An Image of Calvinist Identity," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 29, no. 1 (1984): 1048.

[125] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 201.

[126] See below, 112.

[127] Hooper supported his position by providing examples of poor doctrine which arose from any ecclesiastical councils where the magistrate had not first called it. Conversely, he praised the doctrine of councils called by magistrates. See for instance, Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 118; Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 376; Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 524.

called in response to a problem that required the magistrate's supervision and legal adjudication. Hooper explained the scenario:

> Though that Aaron and his sons, with the rest of the priests, had the ministry of the church committed unto them; yet were they never so bold to make any law for the people concerning conscience, or to bring any ceremony into the church, without the judgement and knowledge of God's word, and Moses the prince… This cause of religion was not brought unto the bishop and priests to be defined, but unto Moses, who counselled the Lord, and thereupon advised his subjects what was to be done in such a case. Read the place. This declareth that no general council, no provincial assembly, no bishops of any realm or province, may charge the subjects thereof with any law or ceremony, otherwise than the prince of the land by the word of God can give account to be good and godly.[128]

On his journey back to England from Zurich in 1549, Hooper stayed for a short time at Antwerp where he spoke with the English Ambassador. Hooper recorded the ambassador's news for Bullinger because through him, Hooper had learned of plans to reconvene the Council at Trent.[129] For Hooper this proved his contention that the magistrate must have the authority to call a council. He told Bullinger,

> This however I know for certain, that there is not a friendly feeling between the pope and the emperor, neither between the king of France and the emperor. Both of them are greatly afraid of him, and he, in his turn, is in the greatest fear of the fulminations of the pope. It is now seriously disputed between them, whether the general council shall be at Trent or Bologna.[130] The pope urges, bids, entreats, commands the emperor to consent to Bologna. He resists, refuses, opposes in every possible way, and says that he would rather break off all alliance with the pope, than allow of that locality, namely, Bologna. It is easy to conjecture what mischief lies hid in this proposal on the part of the pope. He is in great apprehension for his kingdom...[131]

---

[128] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 141.

[129] The Council of Trent had been suspended indefinitely in September 1549 by Pope Paul III. It was formally reopened in 1551 by Pope Julius III. In the interim, the Council of Bologna had convened from 1547 to 1549 to tackle some of the concerns of Protestantism. This Council was not widely attended, due in part to disagreements between the pope and Charles V. See John W. O'Malley, Trent: *What Happened at the Council* (London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University 2013), 125-128.

[130] Bologna was a city-state under the jurisdiction of the Papal States, whereas Trent fell under Habsburg rule.

[131] Robinson, *OL*, 1:58-59.

From the account that Hooper provided, the quarrels between the Holy Roman Emperor and the pope around the time of Nicaea were indicative of the problem Hooper had with the leader of the church calling for a council. At issue for Hooper was the division caused by the dispute as to where this council would be held. For him, the pope had clearly overstepped his bounds into a temporal dispute, which might have led to war. Despite Hooper's hatred of the pope, this served to confirm the model that he was trying to portray. The pope, by trying to dictate the terms of the general council, had sacrificed the chance of speedily calling a council and risked losing the opportunity to debate essential matters of doctrine due to temporal concerns. Further, the pope risked losing the important ally of the Holy Roman Emperor and the chance to enforce any doctrinal legislation passed in the council. The Holy Roman Empire covered much of Western Europe and a break between the Church and the Empire would have put Catholic conformity in serious jeopardy. This feud therefore was the proof that Hooper needed to affirm that councils should be called by the magistrate alone. The clergy, by contrast, were to focus on reforming doctrine.

Magistrate and Society

Just as the magistrates were to have a relationship with the clergy, Hooper also saw a positive role for the magistrates and their interaction with society. Hooper, however, believed that this relationship would exist through the laws that the magistrates created.[132] The magistrates were also accountable to the people whom they governed. Hooper stopped short of outlining or establishing a model for such interactions between the magistrate and the people, but there are references in his writings which might identify his expectations.[133]

The theological basis of the magistrate's relationship with society differed little from what has been established, in terms of the magistrate's duty with the church and through the implementing and executing of the laws. Hooper argued, "There is no more to be taken heed of in laws and civil policies, but to see the law

---

[132] See above, 90-91.
[133] For examples of Hooper's expectations, see below, 203-204; Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 365-366.

repugn not the law of God".[134] Provided that God's Law was faithfully executed throughout the community, the magistrate would enjoy a positive relationship with society. This positive relationship would prevent insurrection arising from grievances based on injustice and inequality. If the magistrate did not act according to the Law of God and ruled unjustly and tyrannically, there was a risk that feelings of injustice from the people might lead to social unrest, which Hooper feared might destroy the community. He described this in more practical terms,

> I see and know by experience much trouble and danger to arise
> among the unlearned and ungodly people by ignorance: for when
> they see such deformities and confusions rise and chance, as we
> see many times to happen in kingdoms, courts, judicials, laws,
> governors that more fancy private profit and singularity than the
> profit of the whole commonwealth, and indifferency of all men
> and all causes indifferently; they suppose verily (for lack of
> knowledge in God's word) that all orders, policies, kingdoms, and
> dominions be no other thing than cruel tyranny and oppression of
> the poor...[135]

Hooper was concerned about equality and justice for the common people. As God's representative for godly living on earth, the magistrate needed to appear as a vassal of God's justice for all, irrespective of social standing and he was critical of magistrates who paid no attention to the poor. He deplored their abuse of those less fortunate and argued that everyone, irrespective of duty, must be treated with equality. Hooper argued that caring for the poor was rooted in the example of Christ, as Christ had often defended the poor. Therefore, the magistrate, as a member of the community, was to replicate that generosity with their goods in caring for the poor.[136]

Hooper understood that the magistrate's actions would serve as one of the main indicators to the people of how Protestantism would be perceived throughout the realm, so it was imperative that the magistrate learn how to govern justly through scripture. Relying on the Old Testament account of Jehoshaphat, in his dedication to Edward VI, Hooper urged Edward to act like this king who followed the Law and appointed godly magistrates and priests, which brought about obedient and loving

---

[134] Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 77.
[135] Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 78.
[136] See Hooper, *Romans 13*, *LW*, 111.

subjects.[137] Further, Hooper argued that the magistrate must also be seen as one who was charitable and understanding of the concerns of the people.[138] Foxe wrote that this was an attribute that Hooper himself displayed as he cared neither for the stature nor the wealth of those in his care.[139] Foxe even records a personal visit to Hooper: "Twice I was, as I remember, in his house in Worcester, where, in his common hall, I saw a table spread with good store of meat and beset full of beggars and poor folk".[140] By setting an example, in this way Hooper would have certainly expected the magistrates to act in similar fashion.

Hooper's Politics in Context

Before concluding the chapter, it is necessary to look for evidence of how Hooper's ideas about the magistrate and his framework for political theology measured against what scholars have been able to determine from his contemporaries. This will make it possible to place Hooper in the context of the Edwardian Reformation and to explore the extent to which his ideas were similar to, or dissimilar from those of his English Protestant contemporaries. This chapter has highlighted themes of Hooper's political theology which stressed the godly magistrate who directed the course of religion within their jurisdiction, and has identified a shift in focus to valuing individual contribution and obedience to the community. As contemporary research has unearthed, Hooper's opinions actually differed very little from those of other proponents of Edwardian political theology.

Alford, in his study on kingship in Edward's reign has concluded that popular Protestant opinion had favoured the image of Edward as godly magistrate.[141] What had begun as a rejection of papal authority within England and the king was seen to have taken the pope's place, exercising supremacy within his own jurisdiction, both

---

[137] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 441; 2 Chr 20:1-30.

[138] See Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 497.

[139] Foxe, *AM*, 6:644.

[140] Foxe, *AM*, 6:644. Foxe went on to record that it was customary for Hooper to require those with whom he dined to recite the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments. Foxe does not elaborate on this, but it is unlikely that there was any attempt at segregating those of religious differences. Rather, Hooper likely, as it seems more akin to his other ministerial pursuits, used this as a forum to ensure that his parishioners, irrespective other their station were given the chance to learn and recite the tenets of the Protestant faith.

[141] Alford, *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI*, 104.

civil and ecclesiastical.[142] Kirby too has observed this trend of an increasingly supreme king through the advent of the Royal Supremacy. The Royal Supremacy afforded Edwardian political theology the view that Edward was an interpreter of ecclesiastical law to ensure the success of the Reformation, while the church obeyed what the magistrate legislated.[143]

Chavura's study has clarified the trend towards individual accountability in Edward's reign for its citizens. His argument suggests that Reformed theology, of which Hooper was a major proponent, had begun to change the concept of the ordering of society from a distant cosmological outlook, to one that saw God's providence as the most important.[144] The significance of Chavuras's observation was that this change in the belief of how society functioned brought the individual closer to God's plan for godly living. For the Edwardian reformers, this meant that one's actions became increasingly important to a God who was deeply concerned with the individual and how they acted and worshipped.[145] Alford also focused on the change in the expectation of one's actions through the efforts of William Cecil (1520-1598), arguing that Cecil modelled expectation of a just and accountable noble to inhabitants of his lands. Moreover, Alford observes that Cecil, in his efforts to remain accountable, regularly executed fair justice on his lands.[146]

Finally, Hooper's commitment to obedience and fear of insurrection within the realm was a common theme. As Kirby has observed, the rebellions in 1549 had severely weakened the unity of the kingdom. To unify the people and condemn the radicals, Kirby notes that Cranmer took a leading charge against seditious activity.[147] The language of the sermons preached by Cranmer bear similarities with Hooper in that Cranmer also warned that insurrection and rebellious activity could lead to the destruction of the community.[148] However, just action on the part of those in power would help to prevent rebellions occurring at all. Chavura came to a similar

---

[142] Alford, *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI*, 111, 114.
[143] Kirby, *The Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology*, 27-28.
[144] Stephen A Chavura, *Tudor Protestant Political Thought, 1547-1603* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 40.
[145] Chavura, *Tudor Protestant Poltical Thought*, 40,79.
[146] Alford, *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI*, 146-147.
[147] Kirby, *The Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology*, 123.
[148] See Kirby, *The Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology*, 125.

conclusion, emphasising how the Council had attempted to make obedience normative within Edwardian society. Chavura also found that the Council issued more preaching licenses with the expectation that they preached about loyalty to Edward and the Reformation.[149] In summary, what these recent studies have shown is that Hooper's political theology exhibits many similarities in theme and substance to the ideas that were circulating around Edward VI's England. This suggests that Hooper was keenly aware of political and theological opinions in England and he used many ideas that would have been well known and used by his contemporaries in England to convey similar themes.

Conclusion

In summary, the success of Hooper's vision for the reformation of the community was dependent upon the magistrates and their ability to execute their duties faithfully. Hooper first granted considerable legitimacy to the magistrates by sourcing their authority in God's office. Acting as God's representative in temporal matters gave the magistrates the same spiritual standing as the clergy had in their own duties. The magistrates governed and created laws with God's authority. Conformity to those laws was, therefore, compulsory and failure to obey was the same as disobeying God. Hooper also argued that in making laws, the magistrate had the power to interpret God's Law provided that the resulting laws reflected the spirit or intention of the Law and that these laws were both relevant and appropriate for the society which the magistrate governed. Here, Hooper gave considerable freedom to the magistrate in terms of interpretation but held firm to the belief that, if the magistrate followed God's Law, rebellion and sedition in the realm would cease. Provided that the magistrate implemented godly laws, Hooper permitted them to punish those who were disobedient. With few exceptions, Hooper generally did not provide examples of how the magistrate was to punish but argued that the magistrate had control over the punishment, and this included the right to execute when necessary. He also believed that, if the magistrates failed to punish transgressors, they would be failing in their duty.

---

[149] Chavura, *Tudor Protestant Political Thought*, 30.

Hooper called for a strong and necessary bond between the magistrates and the church. Mindful of past disputes between the church and the civil authorities over their respective authority, Hooper gave complete and divine authorisation to both the church and the civil authorities, with no opportunity for either to encroach on the other's responsibilities. At the same time, he did not view the two spheres as completely separate, as both were instrumental in implementing and maintaining the Reformation within realm. He argued that the magistrate was not to seek to define doctrine but was responsible for ensuring that the church followed true doctrine. Hooper also believed that there might come a time when a doctrinal consensus needed to be established by means of an ecclesiastical council, which he thought should be called by a magistrate who must then enforce its verdicts. This would ensure that the outcomes were legally binding and that the church would remain unified.

Finally, Hooper commented generally on how the magistrate was to act towards the people under their jurisdiction, stressing that the people were to obey their magistrate. By doing so, the people were also honouring God who had placed the magistrate in that position. At the same time, however, Hooper argued that in their actions the magistrate needed to reflect godly behaviour. He preferred to speak about general principles for magistrates because different circumstances required different actions. He stressed that the magistrate was to act as a devoted father to their children, and that their use of the powers given to them should reflect generosity, kindness and patience, as well as commitment to justice and order. For Hooper, it was unthinkable that the Reformation to be successful in the community without a strong magistrate to oversee progress. The reformation programme as defined by Hooper was strongly magisterial and the Reformation could only exist in so far as the magistrate implemented it.

Chapter 4: Models for Reforming the Church

Introduction

This chapter will consider how models of the early Church and the church at Zurich influenced Hooper's ideas for reform and will assess some of the criticisms that he had of contemporary practice in England. Establishing these models for Hooper's reformation will clarify his proposed reforms for the clergy in the next chapter. Hooper's vision for his reformed church can be summarised in a single concept: simplicity. This idea has been previously considered by several Hooper scholars, but often as a way to understand his opposition to wearing vestments or to stress any potential proto-puritan tendencies.[1] This chapter will argue from a different perspective, omitting the vestment controversy and any assessment of Hooper's legacy, in order to focus on understanding what Hooper believed was the purest form of Christian worship, which served as the model for his reformation of the church. For Hooper, such talk of simplicity meant something wholly discontinuous with both the Roman Catholic Church and the moderately Protestant Church of early Edwardian England. Simplicity meant a reversal of medieval ecclesiastical invention to a bygone age of the Apostles. Hooper stated very clearly what the reforms of the church should resemble: "the Lord be magnified in all the godly and learned bishops and others of this realm, that have and do put to their helps and studies to bring the church of Christ to her old and reverend perfection again".[2] As well as identifying the simplicity for which Hooper strove and examining the churches which he felt best modelled his desires for reform, the chapter will consider how Hooper critiqued

---

[1] See for instance: John Henry Primus, *The Vestments Controversy: An Historical Study of the Earliest Tensions within the Church of England in the Reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth* (Kampen: J.H. Kok N.V., 1960), 4-5; R. Paul Wilson, "John Hooper and the English Reformation under Edward VI 1547-1553," (PhD diss., Queen's University, 1994), 201; W. Morris. S. West, "John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism," *The Baptist Quarterly* 18, no. 1 (1955): 355; Edwin Clyde Diebler Jr, "Bishop John Hooper, A Link Connecting the Reformation Thought of Ulrich Zwingli and the Zurich Tradition with the Earliest English Pietistic Puritans" (PhD diss., Temple University, 1970), 293; See E.W. Hunt, *The Life and Times of John Hooper (c.1500-1555) Bishop of Gloucester* (Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2002), 226.

[2] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 438. Hooper was attacking the denigration of the church from the bishops and the magistrate. His reference to the "church of Christ" presumably means the early Church of the Apostles. Hooper wrote elsewhere that the doctrine of the early Church was pure and followed God's Law properly. By following these doctrines, the magistrates and bishops would not allow the church to deviate from God's Law. See Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 549.

existing church models in England and how he sought to reinforce his opinions through the use of the Church Fathers. The chapter concludes with how Hooper sought to bring forward this idea for simplicity in his suggestions for reforming church buildings.

The Simplicity of the Early Church

Hooper's concept of the early Church is difficult to comprehend by modern standards. As Newcombe has observed, Hooper's definition suffered from imprecision. Hooper's use of the term was broad in scope and drew on different eras of church history. At times Hooper seemed to see the early Church as the church at the time of the Apostles, but in other instances, he understood it to include all church history up to the conclusion of the age of the patristic fathers (c.750 AD).[3] Hooper was certainly not the only one of his contemporaries to refer to the early Church in rather vague terms. Wright concluded that Knox was also imprecise in his use of the term.[4] To appreciate how he used the term, it is important to realise that by the early Church Hooper did not mean a purely historical entity. This is not to suggest that Hooper's was oblivious to the origins of Christian worship or the writings of the patristic fathers, but to emphasise that the early Church to which Hooper referred represented an ideal of how he believed early Christians had worshipped and lived in community.

Hooper's 'early Church' represented the right ordering of what the church should be. For him, the early Church clearly demonstrated worship governed by scripture, following the example of the Apostles. The accuracy of his projection was not as important as what he believed to be true. For instance, it would be difficult for Hooper to find literal support in scripture for his contention that churches must have bare walls. The earliest Christians worshipped in synagogues, and there is no explicit evidence for bare walls in scripture. Hooper's second use of early Church also

---

[3] D.G. Newcombe, *John Hooper: Tudor Bishop and Martyr* (Oxford: The Davenant Press, 2009), 37. Newcombe makes one such observation where Hooper claimed that the teachings of the church began to stray from the death of Polycarp the Bishop of Smyrna (69-155 CE), but was critical of other early Church fathers. Elsewhere, Hooper wrote, "I had rather follow the shadow of Christ, than the body of all general councils or doctors since the death of Christ." Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 26.
[4] See David F. Wright, "John Knox and the Early Church Fathers," in *John Knox and the British Reformations*, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), 99-116.

becomes apparent when he considers the need for churches to have bare walls: using the label 'early Church' allowed him to criticise contemporary practices with which he disagreed. On the basis of his assumption that the early church buildings had bare walls, Hooper could argue that the early Church did not have holy images and he could therefore also criticise idolatry. Rather than seeking to establish a strictly historical model, Hooper's use of the early Church allowed him both to critique and to project. Hooper's idea of the early church represented what he believed God intended the church to be as expressed in the Bible.

To support his position, Hooper looked to historical Christians for demonstrations of the ideals he found evident in scripture, and he was therefore selective in his use of specific historical opinions.[5] The same can be said for historical developments within the history of the church. A particular action, if it supported his interpretation of what the early Church had done as recorded in scripture, became sufficient evidence for affirming that practice. For instance, Hooper praised the Emperor Constantine V (718-775 CE): "who assembled all the learned men of Asia and Grecia, and condemned the use of images."[6] He also praised Constantine the Great (227-337 CE) for calling ecclesiastical councils and adopting the Christian religion, while condemning him and the Emperor Julian (c.332- 363 CE) for engaging in activities forbidden by scripture.[7] Therefore, Hooper could assess actions by earlier Christians as either favourable or unfavourable, judged according to what, in his estimation, scripture outlined as proper worship and organisation for the early Church.

In the image of the early Church that Hooper presented, the Bible would bring proper faith to those who would hear its contents and improve the obedience and proper worship of the community.[8] When the simplicity of the Bible was recognised, the church would worship according to God's plan and model, and would therefore become what Hooper identified as a true church of God. Through proper worshipping and understanding, God's peace would also be granted to the

---

[5] See below, 130.
[6] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 47.
[7] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 278, 329; Dt 18:9-10.
[8] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 26.

community, as the Apostles lived in the manner that God had designed for humanity. Therefore, for Hooper, every aspect of ecclesiastical reform should support this image of simplicity. If anything within the church's structure detracted from this image, it was to be removed without exception. Simplicity was not a philosophy that could be pursued haphazardly; in order to achieve biblical simplicity, all hindrances must be removed: "Help ye therefore, O ye bishops and priests, the king's majesty's and his noble council's proceedings, that all things may be brought to a perfect and apostolical reformation."[9]

The 'Apostolic' Church at Zurich

As Hooper sought to recreate early Church experience for his own day, he found the closest approximation of these ideals practised at Zurich. Hooper believed that replicating the Apostolic church in sixteenth-century life yielded the best chance to become a true church, making faithful Christian citizens and by extension a faithful community. This is not to suggest that Hooper wanted to replant Zurich in England; rather the motivations for the Zurich reforms captivated him as he believed that the Zurich Church was closest to the Apostolic Church. Gordon identifies a possible draw for Hooper to the Church at Zurich:

> Through ransacking scripture, the Fathers, and even the medieval scholastics, Zwingli sought to create a church faithful to the apostolic witness… In contrast to Luther, Zwingli had set before his countrymen a picture of what God's kingdom on Earth would look like, and he encouraged them to believe that they would be its subjects.[10]

Specifically, Hooper's writings suggest that he was particularly drawn towards Zurich's practices of preaching and the administering of the Lord's Supper.[11] Hooper stressed these two ecclesiastical practices because he, like Bullinger, recognised two marks of the church, as first stated in the Augsburg Confession in 1530: "The Church is the congregation of saints, in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the

---

[9] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 439.

[10] Bruce Gordon, *The Swiss Reformation* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 143.

[11] Hooper used the term Lord's Supper to refer to the practice of taking the bread and wine which commemorated the last supper (hereafter Last Supper) that Christ and his disciples shared before Christ's execution. See Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 60-61; Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 175; Lk 22:7-23.

Sacraments are rightly administered."[12] These marks, preaching and proper administration of the sacraments, were established by God and provided a means by which God's people could properly understand and follow the teachings of Christ, the head of the church. Hooper mentioned discipline as important, but did not include discipline as a third mark, as did others in the Reformed camp.[13] Therefore, Hooper believed that the proper practise of both preaching and the sacraments were key to living and worshipping God.

Euler has recognised that in Bullinger's Zurich preaching was integral to the church's identity and to the spiritual development of its parishioners.[14] Evidence for Euler's claim is demonstrated in Bullinger's *Decades*, where he emphasised that preaching was imperative as it was directly mandated by Jesus to his disciples.[15] Preaching also connected the church at Zurich to the early Church of the New Testament, which, Bullinger believed, had relied upon preaching exclusively biblical sermons from the Bible, to understand the will of God.[16] Therefore, Bullinger was adamant that preaching in the church at Zurich was to follow what he believed to be the early Church's example in not going beyond what was contained in the Bible.[17] As Bullinger wrote:

> Paul himself avouches, that he preached the gospel of Christ; and in
> that preaching delivered nothing beyond that which the law and the
> prophets had taught. But who can deny but [that] the writings of
> Moses and the Prophets are fully perfit [sic]? Therefore the

---

[12] Leif Grane, ed. *Augsburg Confession: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing, 1987), 89; Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 87; Bullinger, *The Fifth Decade*, 21.

[13] Discipline would feature prominently in his reforms as a bishop and was integral to his reformation of the church and clergy. Nevertheless, Hooper did not waver from the two marks of the church. For a discussion of Hooper's use of discipline in the church, see below, 147. Conversely, Vallerandus Poullain, Hooper's wife's relative, leader of the French Church at Glastonbury also supported proper discipline as a third mark of the church in his 1551 Confession. See Vallerandus Poullain, "Confessions of the Glastonbury Congregation (1551)," in *Reformed Confessions of the 16th and 17th Centuries in English Translation*, vol. 1: *1523-1552*, comp. with intro. James T. Dennison (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2008), 658.

[14] Carrie Euler, *Couriers of the Gospel: England and Zurich, 1531-1558* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag Zurich, 2006), 47.

[15] Bullinger, *The Fifth Decade*, 147.

[16] Rodney Petersen, *Preaching in the Last Days: The Theme of "Two Witnesses" in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 120.

[17] Bullinger, *The Fifth Decade*, 534.

canonical scriptures [which are the New Testament and the old] are enough for us.[18]

For the Church at Zurich, preaching clearly from the Word of God meant that they were making aware the knowledge of God and the desire for humanity to live faithfully by God's Law.[19] The desired result from preaching was to make more faithful Christians in Zurich. Bullinger held a strong belief that God had given individuals the template by which they could live faithfully to what God had desired,[20] and this was later echoed by Hooper in his own treatment of the Decalogue.[21] Both espoused the belief that the Holy Spirit would convict the conscience of the listener to conform to the will of God.[22]

The preaching of the Word of God, according to Gordon, was the hallmark of the service in Zurich.[23] Bullinger had inherited the primacy of the sermon from his predecessor Zwingli but adapted its function.[24] For Zwingli, as Tuininga observed, the minister was a prophet of God and his use of the Bible could lead sermons into a prophetic political commentary.[25] As a messenger of God, the minister had the power to criticise government policy on the basis of the prophet's biblical interpretation. However, as Gordon described, after the Zurich defeat at Kappel, a humiliated and weary Zurich desired an amendment to Zwingli's politically charged preaching style.[26] This was the atmosphere when Bullinger assumed Zwingli's former post. Bullinger maintained the position that the minister was a prophet. However, the prophetic function was confined to improving morality by preaching the Word of God.[27] As Gordon noted, this allowed Bullinger to focus on using preaching for the "cultivation of piety and godly living, and these, he believed, only took root in an

---

[18] Bullinger, *The Fifth Decade*, 534.

[19] Bullinger, *The Third Decade*, 404.

[20] See Pamela Biel, *Doorkeepers at the House of Righteousness: Heinrich Bullinger and the Zurich Clergy 1535-1575* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1991), 84- 85.

[21] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 255-256.

[22] Bullinger, *The Fifth Decade*, 331. See Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 111-112.

[23] See Gordon, *The Swiss Reformation*, 139.

[24] Andrew Pettegree, *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 20-22.

[25] Matthew Tuininga, *Calvin's Political Theology and the Public Engagement of the Church: Christ's Two Kingdoms* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 42.

[26] See Gordon, *The Swiss Reformation*, 139-140; G.R. Potter, *Zwingli* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 403.

[27] Biel, *Doorkeepers at the House of Righteousness*, 72-73.

ordered society."[28] Whether or not this was a condition that was forced upon Bullinger when he took Zwingli's preaching post is debatable, but it was a practice that Bullinger would maintain and which Hooper would have observed during his time in Zurich. Bullinger's adaptation of the preaching ministry would directly influence Hooper's use and understanding of preaching for the society that he envisioned, and it was Bullinger's ideals of the preached word at Zurich that Hooper would use to form his own style. Hooper never possessed the political zeal or interest of Zwingli; however, he did see preaching as a means to correct ungodly behaviour. Moreover, like Bullinger, he interpreted the role of prophet as a means to understand the will of God and encourage the preaching of the Law to encourage godly living.

The other major theme that featured prominently in Hooper's writings from his time in Zurich was the practice of the Lord's Supper.[29] Hooper's affinity towards the practice of the Lord's Supper at Zurich was governed by the same principles as preaching, in that Hooper believed the Zurich practice was closest to how the early Church celebrated the Lord's Supper. His letters to Bullinger indicated Hooper's high praise for the practice at Zurich. Hooper wanted Bullinger to teach his friend Utenhove about the Lord's Supper at Zurich, "He is coming to you on my recommendation, that he may hear your godly sermons and theological lectures, and observe the mode of administering the Lord's Supper, which as it most simple among you, so is it most pure."[30] By Hooper's own admission, Zurich had the preferred practice on account of its simplicity.[31] While it is not the purpose to provide a theological explanation for the Lord's Supper in Zurich, the essence of the Supper, as Rorem has argued, was an opportunity to reflect on the life and sacrifice of Christ and to improve themselves by modelling Christ's life.[32] This modelling of Christ and his disciples captivated Hooper as he believed that it would inspire godly

---

[28] Gordon, *The Swiss Reformation,* 141.

[29] See below, 199-202.

[30] Robinson, *OL*, 1:56. See also Robinson, *OL*, 1:76.

[31] For example, Hooper advocated that the Lord's Supper be administered sitting, rather than kneeling, and receiving both the bread and the wine as Christ's disciples had done. See for instance, Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 536-537.

[32] Rorem has considered Bullinger's modifications of Zwingli's Lord's Supper at the time of the *Consensus Tigurinis*. This thesis recognises that Bullinger had broadly adapted Zwingli's memorial positions. See Paul Rorem, "Calvin and Bullinger on the Lord's Supper", *Grove Liturgical Studies* 60 (Nottingham: Alcuin/ Grove, 1989): 15-20.

living. Communicants were brought into the historical setting to be one with the Apostles to focus on the sacrifice of Christ. Bullinger's expectation was that, through remembering the sacrifice of Christ, an individual would grow closer to God in their faith and devotion:

> Now in the Lord's supper bread and wine represent the very body and blood of Christ. The reason hereof is this. As bread nourisheth and strengtheneth man, and giveth him ability to labour; so the body of Christ, eaten by faith, feedeth and satisfieth the soul of man, and furnisheth the whole man to all duties of godliness. As wine is drink to the thirsty, and maketh merry the hearts of men; so the blood of our Lord Jesus, drunken by faith, doth quench the thirst of the burning conscience, and filleth the hearts of the faithful with unspeakable joy.[33]

By growing closer to God and to their neighbours, individuals would live a more godly life and become better Christians. This was certainly Hooper's vision in his adaptation of the Zurich style for England.

Hooper's description of how the Lord's Supper was to be prepared and practiced is remarkably similar to the format later found in the 1552 Book of Common Prayer, particularly in its inclusion of the Ten Commandments in the Communion rite. According to MacCulloch, this is reason enough to suggest that Hooper, or one who shared his beliefs, possibly a Lasco, was responsible for the change.[34] Hooper was a vocal critic of the 1549 Book of Common Prayer and from its inception he had advocated changing contentious aspects of the Prayer Book, including the Eucharist.[35] MacCulloch suspects that it was due to the support for Hooper and his ideas from the King and much of the Council that the 1552 edition reflected practices which were largely in line with those proposed in Hooper's earlier writings.[36]

As Hall has identified, the 1549 edition of the Prayer Book posited a spiritual presence within the meal which relied upon the inner mysteries of the sacrament to

---

[33] Bullinger, *The Fifth Decade*, 329.
[34] Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (London: Yale University Press, 1996), 243.
[35] MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, 506.
[36] See MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, 506-507.

benefit the faith of the communicant through the receiving of the bread and wine.[37] This was probably due to the influence of Bucer, as neither a Lasco nor Hooper accepted this position.[38] At this point, the Ten Commandments did not feature in the eucharistic liturgy. The inclusion of the Ten Commandments in the eucharistic liturgy of the 1552 edition, therefore, is notable. As Leuenberger suggests, reciting the Ten Commandments in preparation for the Lord's Supper indicates a desire to repeat the principles of holy living instead of relying simply upon the sacred mysteries of the sacrament to transform the moral actions of the communicant.[39]

Hooper believed that the Ten Commandments contained the necessary blueprint for living in faith; therefore, the inclusion of the Ten Commandments in the revised, 1552 edition of the Book of Common Prayer suggests that they were used as a means to remind congregants of their duty to follow Christ. Having recalled the Ten Commandments, the communicant was then prepared to partake in the Lord's Supper, fully aware of the need to obey the commandments of Christ and to live as a godly Christian, and of their need for God's help to do so.[40] This is not to suggest that penitence before the Lord's Supper was a new departure, but that the use of the Ten Commandments as a means to prepare for the Lord's Supper marked a significant change from the 1549 Book of Common Prayer. This change is consistent not only with Hooper's understanding of the central importance of the Ten Commandments, but also with a Lasco's belief that receiving communion was a reminder of what Christ had done for the individual; by partaking, the lives of the communicants would be amended in response to God's Commandments.[41] Only a simple service that resembled that of the original Last Supper would unite the present Church with the disciples and bring about the transformation in godly lifestyle that Hooper found integral to his vision for the reformation of church and community. It

[37] Basil Hall, "Cranmer, the Eucharist and the Foreign Divines in the Reign of Edward VI" in *Thomas Cranmer, Churchman and Scholar*, edited by Paul Ayris and David Selwyn (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1993): 218-258, 238.

[38] Hall, "Cranmer, the Eucharist and the Foreign Divines in the Reign of Edward VI," 217, 243,

[39] Leuenberger, *Archbishop Cranmer's Immortal Bequest: The Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England: An Evangelistic Liturgy* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1990), 68.

[40] Church of England and Joseph Ketley, ed., *The Two Liturgies with Other Documents Set Forth by Authority in the Reign of King Edward the Sixth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for the Parker Society, 1844), 266-267.

[41] Hall, "Cranmer, the Eucharist and the Foreign Divines in the Reign of Edward VI," 243.

is therefore quite plausible that the inclusion of the Ten Commandments in the 1552 liturgy of the Lord's Supper was influenced by the ideas of Hooper and a Lasco.

In addition to its theology and liturgy, Hooper also had an affinity for the kind of reformation, or reordering, of church buildings that he had witnessed in Zurich. As a student and one-time house guest of Bullinger, Hooper would have witnessed Bullinger's own church, the *Grossmunster*, reformed from its medieval past. To appreciate the change that Hooper would have witnessed, a brief history of the changes the *Grossmunster* experienced is helpful. In 1519, before Zwingli began his reforms, the *Grossmunster* would have been adorned with colour. Upon entering, a parishioner would be reminded of the might of God and his Church and of its patron saints Felix and Regula.[42] The high altar was the optical and theological focal point of the Church. The Mass would be read in Latin and psalms and canticles chanted from the choir.

By the time of Bullinger's appointment as *Antistes* in 1531, however, the building had undergone considerable change.[43] The medieval ornamentation was gone and iconoclasm had been responsible for destroying any images depicting saints. The relics and icons had been plundered or destroyed and the murals of the church whitewashed over. The high altar had been removed and a table put in its place. Further, music had been forbidden and the organ removed (though, as Gordon notes, Zurich's prohibition on music and singing was not a widely held position amongst the other Swiss churches).[44] The plain walls and absence of imagery meant that the Bible, proclaimed and preached, would have to serve in capturing the congregation's imagination, piety and devotion. This was how the church would have looked when Hooper lived in Zurich, and it served as the model by which he would construct his own theories about the appearance of properly reformed church buildings.

---

[42] Siblings Felix and Regula were two third-century martyrs who were said to have been beheaded at Zurich. The legend recounted that the two were seen to pick up their heads and walk to their grave. It was there that the *Grossmunster* was built by emperor Charlemagne. *Original Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1st ed., s.v. "Zurich."

[43] See Gordon, *The Swiss Reformation*, 65-67.

[44] Gordon, *The Swiss Reformation*, 246.

The severity with which Hooper would later view traditionalist remnants can be measured by the sheer number of his episcopal injunctions which focused on ensuring that traditionalist practices were not used. Of Hooper's *Visitations* to Gloucester, no fewer than thirty-one of the fifty articles dealt, directly or indirectly, with the prohibition of traditionalist practice and theological suppositions.[45] Hooper's vision for a new ecclesiastical structure therefore directly affected the community's experience and perception of their faith. The newly ordered church buildings were intended to reinforce Hooper's attempt to bring the community together. Without the images of the saints and other ornamentation to connect them with the history of Christian tradition, the congregants were drawn together around the Bible and the preached word, as Hooper believed the Apostles had been. This continuity with the Apostles was reinforced by the Lord's Supper where all gathered around the table to memorialise the Last Supper of Christ. As the people participated, they played the part of the disciples who were called to witness and receive the first sacrament, but they were also marked as the thoroughly Protestant people of God.

Reinforcing and Establishing Biblical Authority through the Church Fathers

Hooper desired to reform the church towards a simpler church that resembled that of the Apostles, but he also needed a means to validate the reforms that he sought. While Hooper approved of the concept of an ecclesiastical council and diocesan synods, he did not develop any mechanism by which such a church council would rigorously assess claims for truth.[46] However, Hooper's lack of a body to oversee truth claims about the Bible was not mere oversight, because Hooper believed that the truth of the Bible would become self-evident if give the freedom to pervade the community.[47]. He believed that God's template for godly living was clearly stated in

---

[45] Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 120-129.

[46] Hooper was particularly hostile to contemporary ecclesiastical councils because they had evolved from the times of the Church Fathers. He viewed councils in their contemporary form as avenues by which the church confused the biblical message for its own purposes. For an example of such hostility see Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 117-118. He did not however question the magistrate's right to call a council and believed that if properly called a council could be beneficial for the church. See below, 155-156.

[47] Hooper did not mention the practice of the *Prophezei* that he witnessed in Zurich. It is not clear if Hooper had a plan for such an institution either formally or informally for his community. However, the use of it in the Strangers' Churches might indicate his approval. See Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 63; Peter Iver Kaufman, "Prophesying Again," *Church History* 68, no. 2 (1999): 337, 339-340. Kaufman's treatment

the Bible and that its use was therefore universally applicable. While Hooper believed in the universal application of the Bible, he sought the authority of the Church Fathers to support his position. Hooper's use of the Church Fathers to support the beliefs that he drew from scripture was probably his attempt to avoid the charge of inventing doctrine. By enlisting the support of the Church Fathers, Hooper could prove his positions were not novel.[48] Indeed, innovation was the charge that Hooper used in his attempt to discredit his Anabaptist adversaries.[49] Thus, Hooper utilised the opinions of the Church Fathers to verify his positions for reform.

Hooper employed a selective use of the Church Fathers.[50] To defend his views, Hooper used the opinions of the Church Fathers where they concurred with his own position. He was equally critical of them where their views did not support what for Hooper was the proper biblical teaching. Hooper illustrated this appeal to authority when writing this article for understanding the sacraments. Here, Hooper praised Cyprian's belief in the wine as a representation of Christ's blood.[51] Despite praising Cyprian's figurative understanding of the Lord's Supper, Hooper was prepared to distance himself from him where there was a difference in biblical interpretation. In his *Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, Hooper wanted to distance himself from Cyprian on rebaptism. Hooper wrote, "In the time of Cyprian, it was used to give the bread of the supper unto the children. If it were given them as a sacrament, it was ill; but I cannot believe it. Grant it were, I will not follow Cyprian, but the institution of Christ. I know that he was but a man, and had his faults, as ye may see by his opinion, where he would such as were christened of heretics to be rebaptized."[52] Thus, the Church Fathers, when it suited Hooper, were used as a means to strengthen Hooper's arguments. Hooper was clear that the Fathers

---

of Hooper is problematic, because despite any sympathies he might have had, Hooper did not advocate the use of formal prophesyings in his diocese.

[48] Hooper was not the only reformer to draw upon the authority of the Church Fathers in this way. Lane argues that Calvin too implored similar techniques. See Anthony N.S. Lane, *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), 1-3.

[49] Similar charges were also directed towards Protestants by Catholics. This suggests that charging one with innovation was a popular Reformation criticism to discredit one's interpretation of the Bible and teachings of the Church Fathers. See for instance the charge against Luther in Michael A. Mullett, *Martin Luther*, (London: Routledge, 2004), 256.

[50] Newcombe, *John Hooper*, 50-51.

[51] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, EW, 232.

[52] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, EW, 172-173.

could err and when they did, Hooper was clear in his attempt to distance himself from what he believed was erroneous belief.

Hooper's Grievances about the Church of England and his Desires for Church Reform

Considering the Reformation in England is a helpful avenue to explore Hooper's criticisms of ecclesiastical reform. It shows how Hooper's desire for reform had to be implemented in the context of a national church in which reforms were incremental and often difficult. Hooper's concerns are best understood through the tensions that arose between Hooper and the official reform programme of the English Church. Hooper's direct involvement in the reform of the Edwardian Church began in mid-1549. This is not to suggest that he was unaware of the ecclesiastical developments for the first year and a half of Edward's reign, but that his influence and direct comments only seriously began in 1549.[53] When Edward VI took the throne, Parliament repealed the laws that had condemned Protestants to burn under Henry VIII and which had convinced Hooper to flee to the Continent.[54] Nevertheless, he was critical because these reforms were slow and incremental.[55] The greatest of Hooper's condemnations, however, was reserved for the *Book of Common Prayer* in 1549, which was the first genuinely 'Protestant' publication from the church and council.

The *Book of Common Prayer* of 1549 set the tone for the ecclesiastical climate that Hooper observed on his return to England. While moving beyond Henry's traditional positions, the authors of the *Book of Common Prayer* unsuccessfully tried to sponsor a Protestant reform that would not alienate traditionalists through a series of ambiguous word choices that allowed for multiple

---

[53] Hooper's letters indicate a suspicion that Edward Seymour, the future Protector Somerset, and the new regime might be favourable towards reform. He based this on the events in late 1546 of the arrest of the Duke of Norfolk, a major proponent of traditional religion at court. Robinson, *OL*, 1:42. Hooper's next letter to Bullinger detailed the battle of Pinkie Cleugh. The level of detail concerning events and people involved suggested that Hooper knew the major players in England. It seemed likely that he would also have had knowledge of Protestant sympathies as well. Robinson, *OL*, 1:43-44.

[54] Specifically, the implementation of the Act of the Six Articles.

[55] Robinson, *OL*, 1:72. Spalding has drawn attention to some of the political difficulties in seeing certain reform legislations passed. See James C. Spalding, ed., *The Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Laws of England, 1552* (Kirksville, Missouri: Northeast Missouri State University, 1992), 34-35.

interpretations.[56] The Preface of the Prayer Book captured some of this sentiment by making clear that there was to be a break from Catholicism, but still maintained a strong association with aspects of church tradition that were not necessarily to be rejected:

> Yet because there is no remedy [with respect to certain ecclesiastical customs], but that of necessity there must be some rules: therefore certain rules are here set forth, which as they be few in number, so they be plain and easy to be understanded. So that here you have an order for prayer (as touching the reading of holy scripture) much agreeable to the mind and purpose of the old fathers, and a great deal more profitable and commodious, than that which of late was used… It is so more commodious, both for the shortness thereof, and for the plainness of the order, and for that the rules be few and easy.[57]

These ambiguities and means of varied interpretation would serve to cement Hooper's general suspicion about the official Reformation in England. Hooper saw a grave error in incremental change to bring about godly living. Such increments were a sign of fear and lack of trust in God's template for society. Hooper wanted the church reformed quickly, which meant drastic action to rid the church of its medieval past.[58] He saw at Zurich what the English Church could be in terms of a body that was truly reformed, thus the uncertainty that plagued England's leaders did not apply to his project for reform. He was convinced that, through his Protestant teaching and evangelisation in London, and particularly through his preaching at Court and at Paul's Cross, he could win the leaders of England over to his side, and in many respects he was successful in this. He enjoyed considerable patronage from both Somerset and Northumberland, though he did not have the same success in building allies with England's leading Protestant clergy. Nonetheless, Hooper saw that

---

[56] One such instance was the right for bishops to interpret disputes on the Prayer Book arising in their diocese. For instance, The Prayer Book stipulated concerning resolving disputes "but doubts may rise in the use and practicing of the same: To appease all such diversity (if any arise), and for the resolution of all doubts concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute the things contained in this book; the parties that so doubt, or diversly [sic] take any thing, shall alway [sic] resort to the Bishop of the Diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same: so that the same order be not contrary to any thing contained in this book." Church of England and Joseph Ketley, *The Two Liturgies*, 195. For a discussion on how issues arose with bishops interpreting the *Book of Common Prayer*, see MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, 486-487.
[57] Church of England and Ketley, *The Two Liturgies,* 18-19.
[58] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 202.

England had the possibility to become a fertile ground for the reformation that he wanted.

Hooper likened the English situation to the tribe of Israel in the desert under the guidance of Moses. The people of Israel shared similar characteristics with the church of Hooper's day insofar as they were chosen by God and had the responsibility of fulfilling their obligations to God as a community. The comments on Moses have very clear implications for the state of religion in England. The subject of Hooper's analysis was Exodus 20, which dealt with the topic of developing a model of understanding for how to act as a faithful community who had been delivered from their oppressors.[59] Like the Israelites who had been freed from Egypt, England had been freed from Rome, but they were in the wilderness and had not yet reached the Promised Land.[60] Hooper's interpretation explained that England's wilderness experience required the church to successfully remove those who would seek to hinder or hamper the process of reform, in order to reach their promised land. Such an interpretation, however, did not seem to suit his vision that England was truly reformed and ready to enter their promised land. Hooper channels some of this mentality when describing how Moses could bring people to prosperity. Hooper wrote, "Moses therefore sheweth, like a good prince and faithful preacher, what is to be done in both these states and conditions of life, in prosperity and adversity. So that, if this counsel be followed, there is neither prosperity, neither adversity, can withdraw man from the will and pleasure of God."[61]

Reforming the Ungodly Church

To justify his reforms for the church, Hooper relied on Bullinger's interpretation of the two-church theory.[62] Both argued that there was a difference between the church as it existed in their present day and a notion of a holier institution that had been given by Christ and sustained by the Spirit, as it was recorded in the gospels.[63] The two men were united in the idea that a discrepancy between the church as it existed,

---

[59] "I am the Lord God that brought thee out of Egypt, from the house of servitude: thou shalt have no strange gods before me." As quoted in, Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 293; Ex 20:3.
[60] See Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 201.
[61] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 301.
[62] See below, 134n65.
[63] See below, 134-136.

and the church as it was intended to be, allowed them to account for errors and failings within the church and to protect the divine nature of Christ from those who they felt were abusing proper worship.[64] As Campi has identified, Bullinger expressed this idea rather succinctly by arguing that there were in fact two congregations, one triumphant and one militant.[65] The eternal church could not err and was comprised only of those chosen by God; whereas the church militant was a mixed economy of elect and non-elect people and often erred. Hooper's development of this idea, however, was not as pronounced as Bullinger's. According to Hooper, there was a church that was guided by the Holy Spirit and was free from all errors. Hooper wrote:

> I believe in the Holy Ghost, equally God with the Father and the Son, and proceeding from them both: by whose virtue, strength, and operation the catholic church is preserved from all errors and false doctrines, and teacheth the communion of saints in all truth and verity: the which Holy Spirit shall never forsake the holy church, which is Christ his mystical body.[66]

However, for Hooper there was no separation of earthly and temporal congregations as there was with Bullinger. Instead, Hooper argued that it was the actions of a church that determined whether it was a true church of God.[67] Hooper argued that a church of God was called so by its ability to preach the Bible properly and to

---

[64] See Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, EW, 82-84.

[65] See Emidio Campi, *Shifting Patterns of Reformed Tradition* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014), 63-65. *Bullinger*, *The First and Second Decade*, 161-162, Bullinger, *The Fifth Decade*, 17. Other Reformed thinkers also considered a theory of two churches because it reconciled the problem with disobedience in the church and God's providence; however, their terminology often differs. For Bucer's understanding of the two churches see, Ian Hazlett, "Bucer," in *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology,* eds. David Bagchi and David C Steinmetz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 110. Given Hooper's exposure to Strasbourg and Martin Bucer, more research needs to be done into the question of how much Bucer's theology of the church influenced Hooper. For Calvin, see Maarten Stolk, trans. Gerrit W. Sheeres, "Calvin and Rome," in *The Calvin Handbook*, ed. J.H. Selderhuis, trans. Henry J. Baron, Judith J. Guder, Randi H. Lundell and Gerrit, W. Sheeres (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company 2009), 104-105. For Zwingli see W.P. Stephens, *The Theology of Huldrych Zwingli* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 260-261. Jacques Courvoisier is critical of such terminology in Zwingli's writings as it leaves little room for a church undergoing reform. See Jacques Courvoisier, *Zwingli: A Reformed Theologian* (1963; repr., Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 2016), 56.

[66] Hooper, *Confession*, LW, 73.

[67] Newcombe, *John Hooper*, 190.

administer the sacraments according to what was required in the gospels. Any church that did not properly execute these tasks was not a true church of God.[68]

Using his criteria, he argued that Christ's church was protected from erroneous doctrine.[69] It also allowed him to make an effective appeal to the historical church for a model. Hooper argued that the early Church was a true church of God because it completed these tasks and subsequently referred to others that had exhibited similar practices. A weakness of Hooper's scheme was that it was highly subjective; indeed, any church that differed from his biblical expectations (and various instances within church history) of proper preaching and administration of the sacraments would fall victim to a charge of being an ungodly church. However, he would not have seen it this way. Hooper was responding to what he believed was a clear command from Christ to worship in this particular way. He would not accept the position that this view was subjective. Christ demonstrated proper worship, and to deviate from what Christ had outlined was to reject Christ.

For Hooper's own day, this allowed him to criticise his Catholic adversaries for erroneous doctrine and improper administration of the sacraments.[70] Hooper would argue that, in their errors, they were no longer a church of Christ: "For no church… can be absolutely perfect. But where doctrine is sound, and no idolatry defended, that church is of God, as far as mortal man can judge."[71] This suggested that being a part of the church of God was based on the actions of those running the church. Thus, Hooper could argue that Christ's Spirit was indeed faithful to the church and would always protect the church of God – just not necessarily individual churches if they no longer preached the gospel or administered the sacraments properly. Thus, the aim of Hooper's efforts was to ensure that there were structures in place to give the church in his community the best chance to become a godly church.

---

[68] Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 87. Hooper also suggested this idea when he declared in his *Visitation Book* "For the malice of the minister cannot derogate nor hurt the doctrine, verity, and majesty of God's word and his sacraments". Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 125.
[69] Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 87.
[70] Hooper's demonstrated this in his attack on Stephen Gardner's Book on the Sacraments written from Zurich. See Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 101-247.
[71] Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 87.

When Hooper arrived in England from Zurich, the English Church he observed was not yet, in his view, a true church of God like that of Zurich. While Hooper's earlier writings from Zurich were not entirely about reforming the English Church, his later writings resonated more closely with perceived issues in the English Church and provided a path for England to achieve its godly requirements. Hooper began with the idea that the church visible was the principal point of access where the community would engage with God.[72] Nevertheless, Hooper argued that the church visible would always struggle to remain a true church of God.[73] Despite the best of intentions (or otherwise), this body was susceptible to abuse and diversion from the template for godly living and worshipping that God had intended. As Hooper argued that the church would remain the central place where the gospel was preached and the sacraments administered, he wanted to see reforms both in structure and practice; these would ensure that the church would remain a true church of God. Equally important was his desire to see religious devotion expressed in everyday life. For him, reforms within the church visible would invariably take a large step towards creating a new, Protestant, religious experience of society. This meant that the liturgy and preaching of the church would remain the formal place where the Word of God was encountered, but, the community would also benefit, for the message heard through the church's ministry would be practised in – and have practical implications for – the community. In this way, Hooper believed that the Reformation would establish a godly community which enjoyed the peace of God.[74]

Hooper proposed an institutional church that was scaled back and considerably more streamlined in its mandate than its Catholic predecessor. Hooper argued that the church must become a strongly controlled body that was focused on its responsibilities to preach the gospel, administer the sacraments and model godly behaviour. This meant that the clergy were to retreat from their involvement in secular affairs. Hooper instead envisioned a relationship whereby the clergy would use their preaching from the pulpit to support the government's efforts to create

---

[72] Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 87.
[73] See Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 80.
[74] See Hooper's comparisons between the House of Lot in Sodom and Gomorrah and the household in Israel. Hooper believed that the Israelites could contain 'strangers' by having them abide by the law of the land. See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 340-341.

godly laws rather than, for instance, holding political office themselves. Hooper argued that this presented a unified commitment between the church and the government to enact true reform. He provided a glimpse into his vision of what the church at the basic level within the community ought to be when he stressed that the church was to emphasise only proper preaching and administration of sacraments.[75] The only exception that Hooper made to such a closely defined role for the clergy was that they care for the poor, not only by preaching to them, but also by encouraging charity amongst the congregation and assisting in social welfare.[76]

For Hooper, focusing on the essentials of the church would lend itself naturally to social policy as the community would become more sensitive to the will of God. He believed that a parishioner would have the Word of God preached to them, after which they would act in Christian manner to others in the community. Hooper saw evidence for such a correlation in a discussion on righteousness and love in his work on *Psalm 23*. He saw this relationship modelled by the early Church and wanted to recreate this mentality. When the church focused on a few core elements, it would become a positive force in the community by the actions of its members:

> If the virtue and nature of God's word by God's Spirit be sealed in the conscience (and this doth St Paul teach wonderfully), as well by faith, that cometh by hearing of God's word, as also of his precious supper, the sacrament of his body and blood and passion… And where this faith is so kindled in the heart, there can be none other but such a fruit following it.[77]

Hooper's ideal role for the clergy was one that emphasised a return to a simpler model, in the hopes that in this way, their message would be clear and would instil in the people values that would benefit the community on the whole.

---

[75] Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 87-88.

[76] In Hooper's *Sermons upon Jonah* he attacked the treatment of the poor by those in authority. He constructed a model of an army where the captains mistreated and overworked their soldiers, "And as these unjust and already damned captains, (except they repent,) with receivers, paymasters, victuallers, and other, destroy not only the law and majesty of arms, but also deceive the king, by pilling and polling the poor and needy soldiers; so decay and undo they the whole commonweal". Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 476.

[77] Hooper, *Psalms* (London: 1562), *LW*, 218. Rm 10:5-10.

The Church as a Protestant Building

Hooper's message of simplicity and apostolic recreation was also relevant to the physical structure of the church building. For Hooper, the church building was to be a place that would serve as a channel to highlight the preached word, free from distractions of images, icons and relics that he felt would challenge the supremacy of the Bible and the need to draw the congregation towards it. Hooper's *Ten Commandments* suggested that he was largely referring to the reform of the English Church, and therefore he privileged ideas that he felt were most applicable to England, though what Hooper wrote could be applied to other situations.[78] For example, when he made general statements about idolatry, Hooper's complaints seemed to coincide with reforms that were already happening with the church: "For my belief and hope is, that every man in England knoweth praying to saints and kneeling before images is idolatry."[79] The tone suggested that Hooper understood that changes were happening, but these changes were neither as extensive nor as rapidly implemented as he had hoped. In terms of what Hooper would have witnessed by 1549, the Council, building on measures already undertaken through the Henrician Injunctions, had issued proclamations to remove what they felt were the worst images, subject to abuse, had banned chantries and closed down chantry chapels, and were in the process of removing stone altars. However, support for these proclamations was hardly universal throughout England.[80] To examine official policy, observing Hooper's one-time adversary Nicholas Ridley is helpful. As the newly minted Bishop of London in 1550, he provided his London churches with official injunctions brought from the Privy Council requiring changes to the worship

---

[78] The purpose of this section is not to examine the history of the changes to the churches in England under Edward VI, but to observe official policy in Edward's reign as a means to measure the degree to which Hooper wanted to see the churches reformed in his community.

[79] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 321.

[80] Duffy has catalogued the changes that the Church of England experienced during the longer Reformation process in his study *The Stripping of the Altars*. Duffy was of the opinion that the vibrant religiosity of the Church was undermined by a few, influential Protestants bent on moving beyond Catholic liturgy and social control. See for instance, Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, c.1400-c.1580*, 2nd edition (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 471. MacCulloch presents an alternative interpretation, noting that while English Protestantism was enforced by influential policy makers in England, the embrace of firmly Protestant preaching suggested that the people were not necessarily obstinate towards English Protestantism. Preaching represented a new form of worship that could connect with the audience. See MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, 215.

space.[81] That year was arguably one of the more rigorous regarding changes to the appearance of the churches in England so Ridley's injunctions provide a helpful standard for comparison with what Hooper desired for a reformed church building.

For Hooper, recreating the Zurich model would require a heavy hand to abolish any traditional ornamentation in the church because Hooper believed that it had the potential to lead the people away from the Bible. Ridley also called for the removal of images. Included in his injunctions was a requirement to take down any remaining altars. Ridley charged his ministers and wardens:

> Whereas in divers places some use the Lord's board after the form of a table, and some of an altar, whereby dissention is perceived to arise among the unlearned; therefore wishing a godly unity to be observed in all our diocese, and for that the form of a table may more move and turn the simple from the old superstitious opinions of the popish mass…[82]

The difference between Ridley and Hooper was in the intentions behind the removal of the altars.

Hooper's *Injunctions* echoed Ridley's. Of altars, Hooper too wrote: "whereas in divers places some use the Lord's board after the form of a table, and some of an altar, whereby dissension is perceived to arise among the unlearned; therefore, wishing a godly unity to be observed in all our diocese".[83] The intentions of Ridley's injunctions were clear: the altars were to be removed and tables used in their place for conducting the Lord's Supper. However, Hooper, true to his Zurich preference, took a more rigorous position than his London counterpart. Hooper argued that merely removing the altar did not completely sever the ties with its Catholic usage. Hooper illustrated this charge to his ministers by adding an additional requirement that was absent in Ridley's: "And also that ye take away all the greis, ascenses, and

---

[81] The articles presented were not necessarily embraced by all as there were some, like Northumberland who was probably more disposed towards Hooper's rigid reforms. However, potential personal preferences must not replace the weight of official policy for accurate comparison. Litzenberger has also observed these similarities. See Caroline Litzenberger, *The English Reformation and the Laity: Gloucestershire, 1540-1580* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 69.
[82] Nicholas Ridley, *The Works of Nicholas Ridley Sometime Bishop of London, Martyr, 1555*, ed. Henry Christmas (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1841), 319-320.
[83] Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 128.

upgoings and heretofore went to any altar within your churches or chapels… whereat any mass hath been said, or any idol, image or relic used to be honoured: and so to make the church and house appointed to serve God".[84] For Hooper, all traces of Catholic practice needed to be removed in order to establish this new community.

Perhaps one of Hooper's most thorough reforms in England involved images in stained glass windows.[85] Unlike Thomas Cromwell during Henry VIII's reign, Hooper stopped short of calling for destruction of church property, but when the glass required repair or reconstruction, Hooper called for it to be replaced by plain windows; if decorations were insisted upon, only images that could be directly found in the Bible were acceptable, and Hooper expressed his preference for the use of biblical flowers or trees in such a case.[86] The church that Hooper envisioned should lead a parishioner towards the Bible, and Hooper's comments on the flowers emphasised this: any remaining decorations must serve to point the observer towards the Bible rather than the saints. For Hooper, this offered a direct connection with what he saw as the early Church's use of the Bible alone.

In summary, Hooper's reforms for church buildings were a product of his desire that the churches in his community to reflect what had seen in Zurich because he felt that the church in Zurich was the closest approximation to the worship space of the early Church. Though he did not mention Zurich specifically, his preference for the plainness throughout the church was certainly drawing on what he had witnessed there. His main concern was that even the most innocent image could distract parishioners from the Bible. The church building was to function as a gathering-place where parishioners would be instructed in God's biblical commandments, and the building where they worshipped was to lead them to the Bible. Therefore, objects of ecclesiastical significance in the Catholic Church could have no place in the template for Hooper's church as he sought to forge a church experience for his reformed community. Hooper envisioned a church that was similar in its theological and decorative style to that of Zurich which had strong focus on the

---

[84] Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 135.
[85] Hooper specifically called for the faces of Saints to be painted over. Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 138.
[86] Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 138.

Bible as the centre of liturgical imagination, creativity and imagery. Hooper argued that this was also the closest representation of the early Church.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Hooper's vision for the church was to replicate as best as he could the early Church. His rationale for believing so strongly in this church was found in his definitive argument that it was a true church of God. Hooper did not waver from his belief that God would never forsake his true church and that responsibility was left to the church to practise in faith in order to remain part of the true church. This would happen if they preached from the Bible and properly administered the sacraments of the Lord's Supper and baptism, as he believed were clearly demonstrated in the Bible. How these were to be practised was influenced heavily by what Hooper believed about the early Church in the New Testament and what he had seen during his time in Zurich. Hooper saw in that city the inheritors of godly worship because they were able to recreate what Hooper believed was worship that conformed to the practice of the Apostles. Even the church buildings in Zurich were symbolic of the style of worship of the early Church with its plain walls and architecture drawing the parishioners towards the sermon. But it was those who were entrusted with running the church who had to ensure that Hooper's model for reform would be followed. This was the responsibility of the clergy, to whom the next chapter will turn.

Chapter 5: Reforming the Clergy

Introduction

Not unexpectedly, achieving simplicity was not simple. In this aspect of the community, more than any other, Hooper was intimately involved with the steps being taken to achieve his vision in his diocese, and personally experienced the difficulties in realising that vision. Due to his involvement in the planning of the Strangers' Church, and his efforts in to reform his diocese as bishop, Hooper's writings reflect the struggle of achieving his reforms for the church. In this area, Hooper had neither the time nor opportunity to implement his reforms. Too often, Hooper became engaged with controversy or clerical administration that detracted from his reform of Gloucester and Worcester and often contributed little in the way of substantive measures to further his ideals of a church that based on biblical simplicity. However, dealing with Hooper's writings alone is not enough to account for the work that Hooper did as a bishop. Thus, this chapter discusses Hooper's drive towards simplicity, as identified in the previous chapter, but also considers the decisions he took in his attempts to put these ideas into practice. This chapter is not a comparison between the reforms of England and Hooper's reforms; rather, Hooper's actions in England will be used to illustrate the tools at his disposal to implement the reforms that he desired. The church at the time discussed in this chapter was very much transitional, and Hooper was in the process of laying the groundwork necessary to begin the actual reforming process. Therefore, rather than simply focusing on Hooper's writings about reforming the church, this chapter considers how some of his temporary measures could lead to further reforms. In this analysis, Hooper's ecclesiology is largely omitted in favour of assessing how the church was meant to function and ultimately to benefit and build up the community that Hooper envisioned. This chapter will consider the process of selecting ministers, and their clerical responsibilities to preach and administer the sacraments, once elected. It then examines the role of the bishop and his mechanisms for conflict resolution and discipline. The final section considers how the clergy encouraged parishioners to practise charity and poor relief in the community.

Voting and the Appointment of ministers

As seen above, Hooper believed that God's Law must be the basis of all proper reform.[1] The question was, how should those who preached these laws – that is, the clergy – be reformed and reforming clergy appointed. Hooper turned to Bullinger who advocated a policy according to which congregations participated in the appointment of their ministers. This was significant for Hooper as it was a marked shift away from the practice of the Church of England, where there were quite separate processes for ordination and appointment.[2] Instead, Hooper suggested a more streamlined approach similar to Zurich and the Strangers' Churches where the two processes were done in quick succession, and it took the power to appoint ministers from the hands of the bishops.[3] Further, it would also put an end to the system of patronage, according to which the incumbents of some posts were appointed by the nobility, or other patrons; this was for Hooper a particularly problematic aspect.[4]

In Zurich, Bullinger had clearly stated his preference for the people being involved in the appointment of ministers, drawing on the writings of Cyprian and the example established by Moses:[5]

> God commandeth the priest to be ordained before the whole
> congregation: that is, he teacheth and sheweth that the ordaining of
> priests ought not to be done without the knowledge of the people
> being present; that in their presence either the vices of the evil might
> be discovered, or the deserts of the good commended; and that that is

---

[1] See above, 96-99.
[2] Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (London: Yale University Press, 1996), 397.
[3] The proposed 1552 Ecclesiastical Laws maintained the bishop's authority to nominate and appoint ministers, "He should confer holy orders at the appropriate time. He should not lay hands on anyone either because of bribery nor rashly. He should appoint suitable ministers for ecclesiastical benefices". James C. Spalding, *The Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Laws of England, 1552* (Kirksville, Missouri: Northeast Missouri State University, 1992), 144; Bullinger, *The Fifth Decade*, 131-132; Michael S. Springer, *Restoring Christ's Church: John a Lasco and the Forma ac Ratio* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 123.
[4] See Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 481; Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 143. Hooper made mention of clergy who were appointed by patrons. Hooper wanted an amendment for this policy to have clergy appointed exclusively on merit.
[5] Bullinger, *The Fifth Decade*, 131-132.

a just and lawful ordaining, which shall be examined by the election and judgement of all.[6]

Bullinger did not here specify whether the witnesses from the church were to elect their own minister, but he nevertheless called for a public forum in which the people had a say, particularly in expressing any reason to reject the appointment of the new minister.[7] Hooper's tenure as bishop was not long enough to see the introduction of a mechanism where the public would have a say over ministerial appointments. Such a forum was always more of a long-term plan for Hooper because, in order for the elections to be effective, Hooper first needed the people to embrace Protestantism.[8] When Hooper took office as bishop of Gloucester in 1551, the diocese was not yet at a point where the people would have confirmed the appointments that that Hooper would have wanted.[9] As a result, Hooper did not initiate any further discussion on this subject; however, his desire to impose Protestant teaching amongst his clergy, suggests that he might later have done so.[10]

Although Hooper did not develop policies within his own diocese, he was familiar with the practice of confirming clerical appointments within the Strangers' Churches.[11] Because Hooper was involved with John a Lasco and the other leaders of the Strangers' Churches, the practice of the Strangers' Churches identify a system that Hooper might have wish to use, had he been able to do so. John a Lasco had enshrined in the Confessions of the Church the right for his congregation to elect its own minister.[12] The process of election was to engage the people and to create a

---

[6] Bullinger, *The Fifth Decade*, 132.

[7] Daniel Timmerman, *Heinrich Bullinger on Prophecy and the Prophetic Office (1523-1538)* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 162.

[8] Hooper's *Sermons upon Jonah* criticise lay people for failing to live godly lives. This suggests that Hooper wanted to see people embrace godly living before allowing them to approve ministerial appointments. See Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 481.

[9] Hooper's famous debate with two of his canons, Johnson and Joliffe, speak to this example. John Strype, *Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Cranmer, Sometime Lord Archbishop of Canterbury* (London: George Routledge & Co., 1853), 1:315.

[10] Hooper complained to William Cecil about the state of the clergy, and used his powers of his diocesan courts to ensure that clergy within his diocese learned the Protestant messages he wanted them to preach. See F.D. Price, "Gloucester Diocese Under Bishop Hooper, 1551-3," *BGAS* 60 (1938): 107-109.

[11] Pettegree has considered Hooper's leadership in the early stages of the Strangers' Churches; He argues that Hooper had considerable influence over the ministers through his ties to Bullinger and his friendship with a Lasco. See Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 34.

[12] Basil Hall, *Humanists and Protestants 1500-1900* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990), 192.

church that was governed by the participation of the laity rather than having church leadership forced upon it. Becker has observed that a Lasco reinforced this notion of community within the church by having the people involved in the church governing structure.[13] The result was an attempt by a Lasco to create a congregation which intentionally blurred the lines between church and community, by making citizens active participants in both.[14] There was an important caveat, however, in that the appointments had to be approved by Edward VI.[15] While it is difficult to conclude with certainty how aware Hooper was of a Lasco's writings, he certainly knew what was going on in London's Strangers' Church, and it can be concluded with reasonable certainty that Hooper and a Lasco both sought to create a community in which individuals were active participants in maintaining a godly community. For both reformers, the appointment of the minister was a means by which this communal participation could be solidified.

The election process that a Lasco created progressed in the following way: the call for nominations to the office of the minister began with a preparatory service after which a period of one week was given to the community to put names forward. After the week had passed, the parishioners were called to fast and pray. On the day of the elections, the officials of the church commenced proceedings at nine o'clock in the morning.[16] A minister described the nature of the office and elaborated the mandate of the minister's duties which included: proper preaching, the right administration of the sacraments, and an agreement to execute ecclesiastical discipline and submit to it themselves.[17] The session continued with prayer for

---

[13] Becker's study is here cited according to Jeffrey Jaynes, review of Judith Becker, *Gemeindeordnung und Kirchenzucht: Johannes a Lascos Kirchenordnung für London (1555) und die reformierte Konfessionsbildung*, *Renaissance Quarterly* 61, no. 4 (2008): 1312-1314.

[14] Becker's study is here cited according to Cornel Zwierlein, review of Judith Becker, *Gemeindeordnung und Kirchenzucht: Johannes a Lascos Kirchenordnung für London (1555) und die reformierte Konfessionsbildung*, *Church History* 90, no. 1 (2010):112-113.

[15] Dirk W. Rodgers, *John a Lasco in England* (New York: Peter Lang, 1994), 30; P Southwell, trans.,"Charter of King Edward VI, Granting the Church of the Augustine Friars, London to Foreign Protestant Refugees," in *Austin Friars: History of the Reformed Dutch Church in London 1550-1950*, ed. J. Lindeboom, trans. D. de Ionge, (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1950), 202.

[16] As described in Rodgers, *John a Lasco in England*, 59.

[17] This procedure was also repeated for other offices of church leadership including both the orders of the elders and the deacons. The office of the Deacon primarily performed a pastoral role in England. The proposed canon law for the roll of deacon emphasised care for the poor. Within the worship service, the deacon would read scripture and occasionally administer sacraments and preach with the

guidance and the singing of a Psalm. After a break, the election process commenced in the afternoon. First, the officials of the church presented their preferences and voted on the choice until a consensus was reached. When that voting was completed, the candidate would then be asked to accept. At this point, the process went back to the parishioners, who could veto the nomination.[18] Finally, assuming that this vote was successful and the veto not exercised, the elected minister would be installed after a further period of eight days during which the lay members of the congregation could express any grievances or concerns. If any were raised, they would be judged by the governing ecclesiastical officials on the merits of the argument.

How many of Hooper's reforms would or indeed could ultimately have been incorporated into his dioceses remains debatable. Nevertheless, given their mutual adoration for the Zurich style of ecclesiastical practice and a Lasco's freedom to institute reforms, the model of a Lasco's Strangers' Churches probably offers the closest approximation to Hooper's own plans for reform. There is also evidence that Hooper wanted to increase participation from the laity in overseeing the performance of their minister.[19] Hooper and a Lasco shared the expectation that more involved parishioners would bring about greater accountability from their ministers. This accountability was however, intended to be mutual: the minister was to be responsible to those who had supported, or allowed, his appointment to their church and who paid his stipend; at the same time the people were to be accountable to their minister for their response to the message being preached and were more likely to respond well to a cleric they had helped appoint.[20] The process of participating in the appointment of a minister was thus intended to generate an atmosphere in which the mutual interest vested by each party in the other would ensure that the gospel would be preached and heard by the people.

There was one notable exception to a Lasco's electoral programme, however. The office of the Superintendent, the position held by a Lasco, was the only authority figure which was not confirmed by public involvement. This provided a different

bishop's permission. Spalding, *The Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Laws of England*, 140. The office of elder is not listed.

[18] Rodgers, *John a Lasco in England*, 60.

[19] See Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 130-140.

[20] See Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 130.

twist to Hooper's own position as bishop as well. Rodgers has commented, based on a Lasco's *Forma ac Ratio*, on this anomaly:

> The office of superintendent was divinely ordained when Christ appointed Peter to strengthen his fellow disciples in the faith. This does not mean, however, that he gave to Peter superior power or authority ("as the Roman Pope dreams"). Rather, because all the apostles were equal, he wanted to establish in the Church "some definite order," whereby some would be responsible for others. Thus, while the Bible pictures all presbyters as equals, it is nonetheless necessary for each church's [governing body] to be ordered… by one individual.[21]

Regrettably, a Lasco was not in London long enough to develop a rigorous system for selecting a potential successor. He nonetheless saw the office of superintendent as governed by a strict mandate. There was not, however, any recorded recourse for removing a superintendent from office. On behalf of the King, the Charter for the Strangers' Churches states:

> We give also and grant to the said superintendent ministers and their successors faculty, authority and license, after the death or voidance of the superintendent, from time to time to elect, nominate and depute another learned and grave person in his place… and brought before us our heirs or successors, and by us, our heirs or successors instituted into the office of superintendent. [22]

It is clear from this that the appointment of a superintendent would require royal approval, but it is unclear whether a potential successor would be nominated from within the church, and if so, how. This may reflect a Lasco's belief that the superintendent, which, in reformed circles, was the preferred translation of *episcopos*, was an office that had been divinely appointed by Christ, a position that Springer has argued, formed the basis of a Lasco's understanding of how Christ gave oversight to the Apostle Peter.[23] While Hooper retained the use of the term bishop, Hooper's understanding of a supervisory role over the clergy was the same as a Lasco's, which will be discussed below.[24]

---

[21] Rodgers, *John a Lasco in England*, 59. Michael S. Springer, *Restoring Christ's Church*, 62.
[22] Southwell, "Charter of King Edward VI," 202.
[23] Springer, *Restoring Christ's* Church, 65-67.
[24] See below, 154.

It was unlikely that Hooper was doing so out of any sense of altruism for the laity. Rather, he was more interested in reshaping the image of the clergy within contemporary notions of anticlericalism that stemmed from absenteeism and immorality.[25] If Hooper desired elected ministers, an open selection enforced by an elected mandate would serve to give the laity and the minister a vested interest in each other. The existence of the vetting committee ensured that the rise of any popular interest could be carefully monitored by the leading church officials so that any minister nominated would be a strong proponent of the reformation programme that Hooper wanted to offer. Thus, the minister became intrinsically linked with the community, contributing to the image that the Reformation required the participation of all to create a strong and cohesive unit.

The Duties of Ministers

Once the minister was successfully appointed to the church, Hooper had a very clear set of expectations that his ministers needed to fulfil if they were to perform successfully. This section will consider the minister's official duties, while the following chapter will focus on the minister's behaviour as a model of godly living for their parishioners, which was to some extent distinct from their official duties to the church.[26] Hooper understood a ministers to be solely responsible for ensuring both that their congregation was a true church of God and that the two marks of the true church – preaching and sacramental administration – were properly practised in their congregations. These were the only two responsibilities which pertained to the operation of the church which he explicitly mentioned.

Hooper argued that the sermon was the principal avenue by which the will of God was made known to the people. A failure to preach, or poor preaching, ran the risk that the congregation would fail to hear and understand God's requirement for godly living and would thus also fail to worship God properly.[27] He believed that ignorance arising from poor preaching would not save the community from God's

---

[25] See Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 143.
[26] See below, 171.
[27] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 206; Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 344.

wrath, which was incited by not following the God's Law.[28] Hooper argued, "In this vocation of preaching the preacher should so use himself, as he might say always, 'My doctrine is not my doctrine, but his that hath sent me.' For it is God's word and his law, that turneth the hearts of people to repentance."[29] Hooper believed that preaching was a powerful tool and that a properly preached sermon would bring people to repentance.[30] He saw the tremendous power of preaching in the example of Jonah, and expounded it in his *Sermons upon Jonah*. Here he began by arguing that the Ninevites were ill-suited to hear the message that Jonah had to offer. On the basis of the antiquity of their religious beliefs and Jonah's irrelevance as a foreigner with little prestige, Jonah's message should have been rejected. However, when Jonah preached, the Ninevites defied expectation and believed the message that Jonah proclaimed.[31]

Hooper also observed that when the Ninevites heard the consequences of their actions, they amended their lives immediately. In contrast to the Ninevites' rapid acceptance and reformation, he criticised the delays and ecclesiastical bureaucracy of England, which he believed were preventing the English people from experiencing their own Nineveh conversion. The lesson he took from the example of Jonah was that a sermon that preached the Law of God and made people aware of the need to live according to that law would cause them to amend their lifestyles accordingly. The sooner this happened, the less chance that the people would turn to superstition. Hooper assumed that every minister was, like Jonah, a prophet; according to Hooper, a minister acted prophetically when he communicated God's word. Based on Jonah's example, he advocated that this preaching be practised as soon as possible, as it was the essential step for reform.

In addition to stressing the power of a godly sermon, Hooper also commented on the frequency and style of the preaching he expected. Writing in his *Confession*, Hooper expected regular preaching from his clergy and argued that a morning

---

[28] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 449, 496.
[29] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 509.
[30] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 558.
[31] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 512.

sermon and prayer should be offered every day of the week.[32] He did not view this as too onerous a task for his ministers, complaining that "Fifteen masses in a church daily were not too many for the priests of Baal; and should one sermon every day be too much for a godly bishop and evangelical preacher?"[33] What was to be said in these sermons, however, was less clear. Hooper did not dictate a formalised preaching style to his preachers,[34] although he did provide a homily on Romans 13 in 1551 that he expected his ministers to preach.[35] According to Null, this was not an innovative practice: Cranmer had been active in writing homilies for his clergy to preach, especially during periods of national crisis.[36] In his *Romans 13* tract Hooper ordered his ministers to read from Romans 13 on Saturdays and Sundays and to use his homily in place of the Saturday sermon.[37] His *Injunctions*, in contrast, only instructed that preaching was to happen.

Moving from what Hooper had demanded of his clergy, it is not difficult on the basis of Hooper's writings to hypothesise what he expected from his clergy's sermons. When discussing the necessity of the sermon, Hooper repeatedly stressed that this was the way in which God's Law was made known in the community. Moreover, Hooper also stressed that sermons should not stray from the Bible so as not to run the risk of confusing the audience.[38] This suggested that Hooper preferred sermons that were simple and easy to understand, which would correspond to his preferences for other forms of the worship service like the Lord's Supper.[39] Hooper preferred that the service highlight the Word of God and the sermon was also intended to do this. Old has commented concerning Hooper's *Sermons upon Jonah*: "We find here neither great oratory nor great exposition. We find nothing of the exciting exposition of the biblical text which was so typical of the Continental Reformers. It is, however, competent preaching on the part of a man who had a good

---

[32] Hooper, *Confession*, LW, 80.

[33] Hooper, *Confession*, LW, 80. Hooper made an exception for services on Sundays and holy days when, in accordance with the King's injunctions, a homily was to be read in place of a sermon. See Hooper, *Visitations*, LW, 128.

[34] See Hooper, *Romans 13*, LW, 96.

[35] Hooper, *Romans 13*, LW, 98.

[36] Ashley Null, *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of Repentance: Renewing the Power to Love*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 213-215.

[37] Hooper, *Romans 13*, LW, 98.

[38] See Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, EW, 279.

[39] See above, 125.

sense of what needed to be preached to his generation."[40] Old was here comparing Hooper's preaching to that of one of England's greatest preachers, Hugh Latimer.[41] Nevertheless, Hooper's sense that the simplicity of the sermon should clearly explain God's Law through scripture is undeniable.

It would be a mistake to assume that Hooper's preference for simplicity made him an ineffective preacher. Contemporary accounts suggest that his sermons were generally popular and successful.[42] Hooper was invited to preach at Paul's Cross and served as a personal chaplain to the Protector Somerset soon after he returned to England, and perhaps his greatest strength was the refreshing simplicity of his sermons.[43] By making his sermons accessible and biblically driven, Hooper may have been using a popular style that was easy to understand and thus providing sermons that could have provided model for clergy throughout the kingdom. Hooper was very critical of instances where the sermon was not clearly preached or alternatives to the sermon were used instead, singling out the canonical hours as a prime example:[44] "To abolish the preaching of the word, as those do that hath brought into the church massing and mumbling of canonical hours (as they call them), which neither they that say them, neither those that hear them, understandeth not".[45] Given his complaints about the state of preaching in Gloucester, modelling simple-yet-effective sermons understandable to all was a response to a perceived need to improve preaching as well as making God's Law accessible to the people.[46] This desire for simplicity agreed with his initial concerns about reforming the church. Wilson has argued that Hooper had a robust knowledge of Hebrew, Greek and Latin as well as the Latin philosophers and Patristic Fathers, and that he possessed the

---

[40] Hughes Oliphant Old, *The Reading and Preaching of the Scriptures in the Worship of the Christian Church*, vol. 4: *The Age of the Reformation* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2002), 146-147.

[41] Old, *The Reading and Preaching of the Scriptures in the Worship of the Christian Church*, 146.

[42] Robinson, *OL*, 1:65.

[43] See Robinson, *OL*, 1:69-70.

[44] Duffy noted that the Book of Hours remained popular in Edward's reign. They were adapted to comply with official religious policy by striking out contentious material. See Eamon Duffy, *Marking of the Hours: English People and Their Prayers 1240-1570*, 2nd edition (Newhaven: Yale University Press, 2005), 168.

[45] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 344-345.

[46] Hooper indicated this to a letter to William Cecil in a letter in April 1551. Knighton, *CSP Dom*, 193.

literary tools to adapt his sermons to the spiritual needs of the community.[47] What was most important about Hooper's sermons, however, was that he believed that they must be true to the Bible and reinforce God's demands that people live faithfully to God's Law, a model something he wanted all his ministers to follow.

The second official duty of the minister for the church was to administer the two sacraments of the church: the Lord's Supper and baptism. Hooper's *Sermons upon Jonah* provide a detailed account of how the minister was to best perform the sacraments for the community.[48] Hooper wrote, "He doeth best his office, and is best instructed to minister the sacrament, if he in the ministration thereof go as near as is possible to the first institution of Christ and the apostles… it must needs follow, their doings and ministration to be most perfect, holy, and religious."[49] To achieve the perfection of the sacrament, Hooper ordered that prior to the service, ministers should undertake their own spiritual preparation and then lead their congregation in preparation. Concerning the Lord's Supper, Hooper instructed his clergy to perform the sacrament as close as possible to what was found in the gospels. For instance, concerning the distribution of the bread, Hooper argued that the bread was to be passed to the recipient and not placed into their mouth.[50] Further, the bread was to be broken, because Christ had had done so as a symbol for his broken body.[51] Hooper's rationale was that the minister was to model what Christ had done. Hooper envisioned the service and tried to replicate as best he could how Christ had celebrated the Last Supper. Hooper proposed that the sacrament should begin with a sermon on the sacrifice of Christ, then a prayer said for both the bread and the wine, and these would then be distributed. Following the meal, the congregation would

---

[47] See R. Paul Wilson, "John Hooper and the English Reformation under Edward VI 1547-1553" (PhD diss., Queen's University, 1994), 67-68. Beer suggests that Hooper probably learned Greek from Conrad Pellikan in Zurich. Barrett L Beer, "Episcopacy and Reform in Mid-Tudor England," *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 23, no. 2 (1991): 233.

[48] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 534-535.

[49] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 534.

[50] Hooper does not make any mention of the 1549 Book of Common Prayer which conducted the Eucharist in the manner he condemns. The 1548 order which appeared in the 1549 Book of Common Prayer is outlined in Church of England and Joseph Ketley, ed., *The Two Liturgies, A.D. 1549 and A.D. 1552: With Other Documents Set Forth by Authority in the Reign of King Edward VI* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844), 76-85.

[51] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 534-535. He does not mention what kind of bread was to be used, whether leavened (as would be required by the 1552 Book of Common Prayer) or unleavened (as still required in 1549).

depart.[52] Anything beyond that, Hooper argued, was contrary to Christ's example and should be rejected. It was not until Hooper's Visitation of Gloucester that he developed any more concrete proposals for the liturgical practise of the Lord's Supper.[53] Provided that his proposals were for practising the Lord's Supper were adhered, in accordance with his prescribed articles in his *Visitations*[54] ministers were to follow parliamentary law for all other parts of the service surrounding the Supper.[55] By conducting the sacrament in this manner, the minister was demonstrating obedience to both God and king.[56]

The second sacrament that the minister was to perform was baptism. Hooper witnessed Protestant baptism in Zurich when his young daughter was baptised. From his experience at Zurich, Hooper argued that only two actions were necessary for the minister to perform at baptism: word and element. Hooper argued that the minister must baptise in the name of the Trinity and use only water.[57] Hooper was critical of the use of any other substances, such as oil, in baptism which he saw as human inventions which "obscure the simplicity and perfectness of Christ our Saviour's institution."[58] He was also critical of the idea that baptism was essential for salvation.[59] Baptism's importance was its ability to unite the community through

---

[52] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, EW, 61.

[53] Hooper's model was contingent on the government creating agreeable legislation, which by 1551 Hooper believed that the Council was generally in agreement with him as they had commissioned a new Book of Common Prayer, which would, according to Hooper, correct the practice from its 1549 form. See Robinson, *OL*, 1:84; Hooper, *Romans 13*, LW, 126. Hooper argued that if the government did not create favourable legislation, they were to continue to observe the Lord's Supper in the way that Hooper described as God's Law trumped the civil law. Hooper looked to Bullinger for advice on the subject. See Robinson, *OL*, 1:40.

[54] Hooper's *Visitations* occurred after the Privy Council issued injunctions in 1550, which refined aspects of the celebrating the Lord's Supper. It is probable that Hooper here referred to these injunctions rather than the outline of service for the 1549 Book of Common Prayer. Ridley's commentary on the Privy Council's injunctions suggests a similar approach. See Nicholas Ridley, *The Works of Nicholas Ridley Sometime Bishop of London*, ed. Henry Christmas (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1843), 321-324. See above, 139.

[55] During this visitation, the law Hooper would have followed would have been the Act of Uniformity. This might account for Hooper's silence during Knox's kneeling controversy. Utenhove did not mention Hooper's involvement despite discussing Hooper earlier in the letter. See Robinson, *OL*, 2:591-592.

[56] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, EW, 81.

[57] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, EW, 533. For Hooper's description of the ceremony see Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, EW, 130.

[58] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, EW, 533.

[59] Hooper was referring to infants who had died before their baptism and challenged the notion that they were automatically damned. Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, EW, 129-130.

identifying members of the community as part of the body of Christ. Hooper argued that this principle operated in the same manner as circumcision in the Old Testament to make known who was a member of the Church of God.[60] It also served as a reminder of the mercy and justice of God.[61] Hooper paid particular attention to the weak state of infants who could not profess their own faith, arguing that in the act of baptism, God demonstrates his provision for humanity at its most helpless.[62] This too was a unifying idea: baptism served to heighten the community's dependence on God's provision for them and for the church, of which they were all part.

The Duties of the Ministers: Bishop

Hooper was not opposed to the office of a bishop as he found sufficient evidence from the Bible to maintain its use in a godly church.[63] However, he called for significant reforms to the office. In his understanding, the bishop's duties were exactly the same as those of the minister: to teach and administer the sacraments. As has been established above, the only difference was that the bishop was also to have a supervisory role over the ministers.[64] In order to become an effective supervisor, Hooper argued that the bishop must be confined to a manageable area of supervision, citing the example from the Book of Titus where Paul instructed that each city of the island of Crete was to have its own bishop.[65] On this basis, he admonished those responsible for organising the church: "in case there were such love in them now, as was then towards the people, they would say themselves, there were more to do for the best of them in one city than he could do."[66] In addition to reducing the area of supervision, he also wanted to curtail a bishop's extra-ecclesial duties. Writing in his *Sermons upon Jonah*, Hooper argued that the bishop should not play the part of the king, explaining that the bishops in the early Church:[67]

---

[60] It is probable that Hooper here followed Bullinger's teachings. See Bullinger, *The Fifth Decade*, 299. Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 89.
[61] See Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 88.
[62] See Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 89.
[63] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 396.
[64] See above, 145-146.
[65] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 396. See Catherine Davies, *A Religion of the Word: The Defence of the Reformation in the Reign of Edward VI* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 104.
[66] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 396.
[67] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 506- 507.

they applied all the wit they had unto the vocation and ministry of the church, whereunto they were called: our bishops hath so much wit, they can rule and serve, as they say, in both states; of the church, and also in the civil policy: when one of them is more than any man is able to satisfy, let him do always his best diligence. If he be so necessary for the court, that in civil causes and giving of good counsel he cannot be spared, let him use that vocation, and leave the other: for it is not possible he should do both well.[68]

Bishops in Hooper's church should focus only on their ecclesiastical mandate and not involve themselves in governmental affairs. Hooper was gravely concerned that otherwise preaching and teaching in the church would suffer, and with them the reformation of the church, which hinged on proper preaching and teaching. He demanded: "Let therefore all bishops and priests know, their office is to preach and pray. This I say… of no hatred, but of love; for I am afraid of God's threatenings and vengeance toward them, if they amend not; for God saith he will require the blood of the people at the bishop's hand."[69] An important aspect of the bishop's supervisory role was to ensure that the ministers were executing their mandate to preach the gospel truly and to administer the sacraments properly. Therefore, he set about detailing how the bishops could properly supervise their ministers and resolve the disputes that would inevitably arise.

For Hooper, ecclesiastical synods provided the basis for supervision. Hooper was probably drawn to the Zurich model because the locus for settling ecclesiastical disputes was usually the synod, with representation from both the church and government officials.[70] This coincided with Hooper's assumption that the reformation of the community required participation from the church and government. Wood provides clear summary of the format of the Zurich synod from 1532 onwards, which Hooper would have known:

Following a prayer of invocation and a roll call of expected attendees, newly elected clergy took their formal oaths of allegiance to the Zurich council. The magistrates present offered

---

[68] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 398.
[69] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 507.
[70] Gordon has written extensively on the synods in Zurich. See Bruce Gordon, *Clerical Discipline and the Rural Reformation: The Synod in Zurich 1532-1580* (New York: Peter Lang, 1992) and Gordon, *The Swiss Reformation* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 251-255.

advice and reproof in their role as political guardians of communal salvation. The lengthiest portion of synod sessions then came when each member of Zurich's clergy submitted to mutual, episcopal discipline (*censura*). The assembled clergy functioned as a collective bishop overseeing and, where necessary, correcting all ministers and teachers with respect to teaching and lifestyle (*doctrina et vita*).[71]

Undoubtedly, Hooper intended to establish similar meetings to ensure that his diocese was unified in its preaching, but it was not until Hooper was appointed bishop that he gave details on how the synod would actually operate. Writing to his clergy in his *Visitation Articles* he required:

that every parson, vicar, or curate, or other that serve cures within this diocese, four times in the year appear personally in their deanery before me, or my deputies, in such synods, councils and assemblies as I will appoint for the determination of such questions and doubtful matters in religion as may happen to stand and be in controversy between men learned and them…[72]

Hooper maintained the necessity of these meetings, though he also thought that synods were only legitimate if called by the magistrate.[73] He satisfied this requirement by calling these meetings by the authority of the king.[74] A noticeable difference from Bullinger, however, was the question of who had ultimate authority in the synod. In the model that Hooper proposed, the bishop exercised ultimate authority in the direction and decisions rendered during the synod, whereas in Zurich, as Wood suggests, authority was exercised collectively by the ministers. In his model, it appeared that Hooper himself had final authority. His desire to retain final authority ensured that when dealing with clergy who did not share his goals for

---

[71] Jon Delmas Wood, "Bullinger's Model for Collective Episcopacy: Transformation Ministry in a Society Facing Final Judgement" in *Following Zwingli: Applying the Past in Reformation* Zurich, ed. Luca Baschera, Bruce Gordon and Christian Moser (London: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2014), 83.

[72] Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 132. While Hooper conducted regular visits of his diocese, Hooper did not develop anything further on the matter. This suggested that once Hooper was able to appoint Protestant clergy, these visitations would formally give way to these quarterly visitations. It is unlikely that Hooper would discourage any bishop from regularly visiting congregations.

[73] See above, 111-113.

[74] Based on the language that Hooper used, Hooper would have been acting in accordance to the law and thereby satisfying his own requirements for a godly synod. It was likely, based on Hooper's modelling of Bullinger's synods, that a representative of the magistrate would have been present as well. See Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 132.

reform, he had the power to resolve disputes in the manner he felt best adhered to the Law of God and the king.[75]

The possibility that Hooper might have changed his position once the ministers were rightly reformed cannot be dismissed.[76] It is striking that, in the model that Hooper proposed, he wanted to keep the disputes confined to the synod where they could debate in private and seek a resolution. There is a certain irony in this, given the public disruption caused by Hooper's opposition to the wearing of vestments in the previous year, and this might indicate an increased awareness on Hooper' part of the potential damage of such disagreements. Moreover, Hooper remained convinced that he could best resolve conflict through his personal supervision as bishop. Having a strong voice in the context of a synod would entitle Hooper to provide a convincing, if not definitive, voice in ensuring that his ministers were unified in their preaching and sacramental administration, and to ensure that the churches under his supervision became and remained true churches of God.

Hooper was by no means the only reformer in Edward's reign who had sought to reinterpret the episcopacy and its powers. As Beer notes, Thomas Cromwell, one of the architects of the Henrician Reformation, had begun the process of removing political responsibilities from the bishops.[77] Heal has identified that this trend was maintained in the Edwardian regime under the administrations of Somerset and Northumberland by Councils pursuing an agenda of making the bishops subject to the authority of the king. She notes that one of the significant changes was to appoint the bishop at the king's pleasure.[78] This brought the bishop in theory, more in line with the wishes of the king, because the king had the power to appoint them.

---

[75] It should be noted that as a bishop, Hooper was granted the power in the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer* to interpret and adjudicate disputes within his diocese that concerned the interpretation of the *Book of Common Prayer* so long as he did not contradict anything within it. It is unclear if Hooper believed that this power extended to interpreting debates on scriptural interpretation. Church of England and Joseph Ketley, *The Two Liturgies*, 19.

[76] This might account for Hooper's silence concerning how theological ideas were adjudicated in the synod. Given his exposure to the Zurich synod and his involvement with the Strangers' Churches, later developments for collaboration amongst ministers might have been a long-term goal within Hooper's diocese. Nevertheless, the rules which Hooper identified in recognising biblical authority were unlikely to change. See above, 156.

[77] Barrett L Beer, "Episcopacy and Reform in Mid-Tudor England," 235.

[78] Heal, *Princes and Prelates*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 126.

This was an advantageous shift for Protestant supporters, as it allowed for the appointment of Protestant sympathising bishops.

Having the king appoint bishops favourable to the Protestant cause provided a means to improve the episcopal ministry of new appointees. Heal has identified three criteria of ministry, which required bishops to be educated, fiscally responsible and proponents of social welfare for the poor.[79] Based upon the actions of those in authority, it would appear that Hooper's aspirations for reform of bishops and clergy fell on fertile ground. He was not the initiator of these ideas in England, but his prominence at Court in 1550 added a powerful voice to the ranks of those who supported episcopal reform. Hooper had proposed a system whereby the bishop would effectively be a minister with the added responsibility of supervising the ministers within his diocese.[80] His voluntary transfer of lands in Worcester suggests that for him this was not just theory. However, when comparing Hooper's ideas with those circulating in England, the idea of a bishop serving as an arm of the government was well placed to conduct reform. For Hooper, such a prospect fitted well within his system, as long as the government remained committed to the Protestant cause. Moreover, as Hooper desired the swift implementation of church reform, when the government assumed power over episcopal appointments, the two ends coincided. His advocacy of government supervision of the appointment and removal of bishops therefore aligned with the principles of his community reform whereby magistrates used their authority to protect the church from those who would seek to harm it. At the same time, this system freed the bishops to focus on their preaching duties and to ensure that their clergy followed the model set by these new, godly bishops.

The Role of Discipline and Discipliner

The final duty of the minister was that of discipline, though Hooper did not include discipline as a true mark of the church. He did not believe that any church could ever deal with discipline perfectly, and therefore argued that a church could retain the title

---

[79] Heal, *Princes and Prelates*, 150; Kenneth Carleton, *Bishops and Reform in the English Church, 1520-1559* (Suffolk: Boydell and Brewer, 2012), 44- 47.
[80] Carleton, *Bishops and Reform in the English Church*, 89.

of a true church of God despite imperfect discipline.[81] However, though it was not a mark of the true church, Hooper did not believe that a church could function without discipline.[82] Hooper's understanding was that discipline should be exercised for the sake of the unity of the church and greater community, providing the space in which the community could seek God's forgiveness and could forgive each other.[83] Hooper was also careful to limit the scope of the church's right to discipline to ecclesiastical matters. Its purpose was to remind the guilty party of their obligation to follow the Law of God and to encourage the community not to repeat the transgression.[84] Price has described this relationship as one focused on "contrition… and intended as much to impress the witnesses as the performer."[85] Discipline was intended to encourage people to take personal responsibility for themselves and for the community that they had offended. Hooper also hoped that punishing the guilty party would lead to a change of behaviour; although he did acknowledge that only the Holy Spirit could bring about such a transformation. The goal of discipline therefore, was to apply punishment so as to make a person more willing to allow the Holy Spirit to do its work. Hooper summarised this relationship:

> But ye must understand, that this act and discipline of the church is but an act politic and civil to such as hath professed to live in the commonwealth of Christ's church, in an order, lest that the vicious life of the person should be a slander unto the word of God. This open penance appertaineth not unto the conscience or remission of sin before God, which is done only for the penance of Christ…[86]

An important exception was that Hooper did not permit the church to use physical punishment on an individual. Physical punishment was the responsibility of the magistrate as the keeper of the peace and the person authorised to protect the realm.[87] For this reason, transgressors who were deserving of physical punishment were to be handed over to the magistrate to be tried according to the laws of the

---

[81] Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 87.
[82] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 183. Hooper argued that without discipline, disobedience would flourish unchecked. See Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 90.
[83] Hooper conceded that this was not always possible. See Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 183-184.
[84] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 183.
[85] Price, "Gloucester Diocese Under Bishop Hooper, 1551-3," 89.
[86] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 183.
[87] See Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 183.

realm.[88] The church was only authorised to punish transgressions in ecclesiastical matters. That was not to say, however, that there could be no overlap between the church and the magistrate acting within their own disciplinary powers to bring about a change of behaviour. It is likely that Hooper's vision that the magistrates and the church were to cooperate to ensure that the Reformation flourished in the community extended to discipline as well, as his punishment of Anthony Kingston, a prominent Gloucestershire native and courtier, suggests.[89] Hooper appears to have envisaged a division along a body and spirit divide, with the magistrate punishing the body, and the church punishing the soul. John ab Ulmis, described Hooper's actions in this case to Bullinger:

> It happened some days after that Sir Anthony Kingston, a man of great influence, was accused of adultery before Hooper. Hooper cited him into his court, but the knight at first refused to make his appearance: induced however at length, as I suppose, by the hope of impunity, he waited on the bishop; and, being severely rebuked by him, gave him a blow on the cheek… Hooper laid the whole matter before the government… for [Kingston] was both mulcted in the penalty of five hundred pounds, and handed over to Hooper to be dealt with according to law and custom, to do penance, which kind of punishment is the most shameful and disgraceful of any.[90]

In this example, Hooper relied on the government to enact the punishment which was proper for the offence against the civil laws, and this included both a pecuniary and a physical aspect.[91] After the magistrate had punished Kingston, Hooper prescribed his own ecclesiastical discipline to deal with his soul, involving a public discipline that centred on Kingston's spiritual health to remind him of God's demands for holy living.

While Ab Ulmis did not record what sort of penance Hooper demanded of Kingston, details of other punishments that Hooper dispensed have survived. Hockaday's recordings of Hooper's punishments include that meted out to one John Trigge of Durrisleye in 1551:

---

[88] See Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 183.
[89] See Robinson, *OL*, 2:442.
[90] Robinson, *OL*, 2:442.
[91] Price notes that Hooper, unlike his predecessor Wakeman did not allow payments to excuse or mitigate penance. Price, "Gloucester Diocese under Bishop Hooper," 95.

Upon Sonneday next cummynge shall bee in his sherte onelye standing upon a fourme and there shall openly saye that I suffer this penaunc becawse I can not say oon [all] of the commaundements of allmightie god but I am more lyke an ethnick [sic] than a christen man.[92]

Here Hooper required a public display of repentance in Gloucester at the market cross and in Trigge's own parish church. Depending on the severity of the offence, this process could be repeated numerous times. [93]

When analysing Hooper's use of punishment, some points are worth noting. Hooper's *Visitations* required that everyone memorise the Ten Commandments, "whether they can say their commandments, creed, and pater-noster in English, and whether they presume to receive the communion before they can say it, or whether any of them neglect or disdain to learn them."[94] Therefore He was punishing Trigge for breaking his diocesan requirements. For Hooper, punishments were symbolic gestures.[95] While not stated explicitly in these trial records, Hooper's observations on Jonah in his *Sermons upon Jonah* suggested that punishments should bring the transgressor to an awareness of their sin and provide a reason for why this particular punishment was delivered. In the Jonah example, Hooper argued that God created a large storm and put Jonah's life and those of the mariners in considerable danger because Jonah believed that he could run away from God's demands and escape punishment.[96] By sending the storm, Jonah learned that God was sovereign and omnipotent across the Earth, so that to seek to escape from his vocation would be a futile endeavour.[97] For the case of Trigge, confessing his crimes in only a shirt and in the presence of the public at the market was Hooper's way of reminding everyone that their efforts would amount to nothing if they did not learn and follow the Law of

---

[92] As quoted in F.S. Hockaday, "The Consistory Court of the Diocese of Gloucester.*" BGAS* 46 (1924): 219.

[93] Price's notes that Hooper's penitential preference was to have the person on the Saturday at the high market cross, publicly repent their actions. The Saturday market was the high market day where the penitent's confession could be heard by largest audience. On the Sunday, a similar confession was again uttered in their parish church in front of the congregation. This process could be repeated numerous times. Price, "Gloucester Diocese under Bishop Hooper," 90.

[94] Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 140.

[95] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 543.

[96] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 452.

[97] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 452.

God.[98] Further, it reminded the transgressor of his calling to live a godly life according to the Law of God because without knowing the Law of God, he would not be living as a Christian person. Through this humiliation, it was hoped that the penitent would make amends and return to a godly lifestyle.

The strongest penalty that Hooper had at his disposal was excommunication.[99] This did not play a large factor in Hooper's writings, although he was clearly aware that it was available to the church as a last resort when an individual remained unrepentant.[100] Even after its use, there was a hope that an unrepentant transgressor might reform and re-enter the church. Hooper looked to the early Church to justify using excommunication and concluded:

> It is yet the custom of the old church to excommunicate such as
> were common adulterers, covetous persons… except they did
> open penitence, which was a commendable use and godly act,
> done to give other men fear, lest they should commit like offence.
> Also it was a good exploration of the transgressor's conscience,
> whether his penitence were true or feigned.[101]

Despite his affirmation of the practice, Hooper argued that excommunication needed to be reformed,[102] and to be aligned with Pauline practice. He argued that the Apostle Paul had made a precedent ensuring excommunication needed to be agreed by the whole church.[103] When issuing an excommunication, Hooper charged that the person be cut off from the church and forbidden from partaking in the sacraments.[104] They were cast-off from Hooper's godly community because they had abandoned the Law

---

[98] This was a medieval form of penance. Whether Hooper permitted this form of penance exclusively for its symbolism is not clear. See Price, "Gloucester Diocese under Bishop Hooper," 89.

[99] See Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 480. Hooper suggested that Jonah being thrown out of the boat was a metaphor for casting out those who were unrepentant.

[100] See Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 183-184.

[101] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 183. See also Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 425-425.

[102] See Hooper, *An Apology*, *LW*, 563. This reference is a comment from 1554, but it confirms Hooper's earlier comments that excommunication differed from contemporary Catholic practice. See Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 183. Bullinger, who had reservations about excommunication, argued very strongly that the practice of excommunication had been greatly abused in recent times. See Bullinger, *The Fifth Decade*, 41-43; Speelman notes that Bullinger's suspicion of the practice led him to the position that excommunication was best administered by the government. Herman Speelman, *Calvin and the Independence of the Church* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2014), 48.

[103] Hooper, *An Apology*, *LW*, 563; 1 Cor 5:1-12. Hooper observed that this practice originated in the time of Moses.

[104] Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 126-127.

of God. Importantly, even in this harshest punishment at the church's disposal, discipline was always done in the hope that it would bring the transgressor to an awareness of their sins and lead to a return to godly living.

Exercising Discipline in the Ecclesiastical Courts

Hooper's preface to his *Visitations* set a strong precedent for high moral standards for the clergy in his diocese:

> If the life and manners be unculpable, and cannot be justly
> blamed; which consisteth in this: if the minister be sober, modest,
> keeping hospitality, honest, religious, chaste, not dissolute, angry,
> nor given to much wine, no fighter, no covetous man, such as
> governeth well his own house, and giveth an example of virtue
> and honesty unto others. For as the godly life and conversation of
> the parson or doctor doth no less avail in the reformation of other
> than the doctrine itself…[105]

It was clear that clergy were expected to show themselves to be faithful ministers not only through preaching but through their convictions and behaviour.[106] In his subsequent address to his clergy in his *Visitations* Hooper wrote that clerical discipline was practised, "so that the dignity and majesty of the order of priests and pastors, being fallen in decay, may not only be restored again, but that, first and principally, the true and pure worship of God may be restored".[107] This highlights the central importance of the church to the implementation of the Reformation; as Litzenberger argues, "Hooper could force outward conformity, but he needed the help of the Gloucester clergy to achieve his ultimate goal".[108] As discussed above, Hooper wanted to allow the people, at least once they had become committed Protestants, to monitor their clergy. For instance, Hooper's *Injunctions* outlined the expectation that the laity would evaluate their minister, "whether they do dispute or reason among the unlearned people of any such doctrine as is not agreeable with God's word, nor approved by the king's majesty's authority."[109] Any breaches would then be reported to him, as the bishop, and he would assess the situation within the

---

[105] Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 118.
[106] See below, 172.
[107] Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 119.
[108] Caroline Litzenberger, *The English Reformation and the Laity: Gloucestershire, 1540-1580* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 74-75.
[109] Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 148.

ecclesiastical courts and give a verdict. Such measures would be used to contribute to his effort to realign his diocesan clergy along more Reformed lines.

Litzenberger suggests that Hooper's intention to monitor the lifestyles of the Gloucester clergy might have stemmed from Hooper's predecessor, Bishop Wakeman, who had not enforced moral or doctrinal conformity amongst the clergy.[110] When Hooper was appointed as Bishop of Gloucester, he therefore had to combat a perceived lack of discipline among the clergy that had previously gone unmonitored.[111] On the basis of the ecclesiastical court records, Baskerville also made this suggestion.[112] Four cases in particular serve to demonstrate the climate that Hooper had inherited, and in all of these cases Hooper sought the offending minister's deprivation: "Parson Knolles of Ashleworth was sentenced to be deprived for breaking a woman's head in an ale-house: Parson Dickinson of Eastington for brawling and obscene language: Parson Dombell of Driffield for simony: Parson Cox of Avening for pluralism."[113]

On account of his dissatisfaction with the current state of the clergy, Hooper quickly took on a consistent and active role in leading judicial proceedings in the ecclesiastical courts.[114] His involvement went well beyond what was considered normal for his station in the diocese of Gloucester.[115] One does not get the impression that these proceedings were something in which Hooper delighted, as

---

[110] Litzenberger notes that the Royal Visitors in 1547 were also critical of the state of the clergy. See Litzenberger, *The English Reformation and the Laity*, 65-66. Price commented on the lack of Protestant advancement in the rural regions of Gloucestershire. Price, "Gloucester Diocese under Bishop Hooper, 1551-3," 52; Baskerville, "Elections to the Convocation in the Diocese of Gloucester under Bishop Hooper," *English Historical Review* 44, no.173 (1929): 7. Others such as Lowe have been more charitable to Wakeman and have argued that he went as far as the law allowed. However, his lack of reforming zeal would have still been unpalatable to Hooper when he first came to Gloucester. See Benjamin Lowe, *Commonwealth and the English Reformation: Protestantism and the Politics of Religious Change in the Gloucester Vale, 1483-1560* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2010), 118-119.
[111] There were some notable exceptions to Hooper's criticism. For instance, Hooper praised the Protestant zeal of John Parkhurst, (who would become the Elizabethan Bishop of Norwich), whom Hooper viewed as particularly learned: "Mr. John Parkhurst, rector, is found *insigniter doctus*". In James Gairdner, "Bishop Hooper's Visitation of Gloucester," *The English Historical Review* 19, no. 73 (1904): 105.
[112] Baskerville, "Elections to the Convocation in the Diocese of Gloucester under Bishop Hooper," 7.
[113] Baskerville, "Elections to the Convocation in the Diocese of Gloucester under Bishop Hooper," 7.
[114] Hockaday has examined the Gloucester Ecclesiastical Court records and has catalogued the scope and breadth of cases heard around the time of the Reformation. See Hockaday, "The Consistory Court of the Diocese of Gloucester,"198-200.
[115] See Price "Gloucester Diocese under Bishop Hooper," 71.

they were a distraction from the requirements of godly preaching and sacramental administration necessary for the godly church. Nevertheless, Hooper deemed his involvement necessary to ensure that standards were maintained amongst the clergy. In Gloucester, Hooper presided over sixty-five out of eighty-eight sessions.[116] Of the twenty-three sessions over which Hooper did not preside, nine took place whilst he was absent in London in order to exercise his responsibilities in the House of Lords. His involvement in the sessions of the ecclesiastical court was a testament to the value Hooper placed on the moral lives of the clergy, and the importance of this in encouraging the people to accept the desired reform.

In executing punishment upon disobedient clergy, Hooper retained the use of penance. It was not difficult to see why Hooper omitted the saying of the Hail Mary, and the use of the rosary, given his doctrinal position; however, he retained the use of penitential shirts and also maintained the tradition of the penitent appearing without a head cover so as not to hide their shame.[117] Though he was not able to achieve this aim during his tenure as Bishop of Gloucester and Worcester, Hooper wanted to staff his churches with the clergy he thought could best run a godly church. As Price and Baskerville both observed, this proved easier said than done.[118] As Protestantism became more established and accepted, Hooper's commitments to the ecclesiastical court would have inevitably decreased. Clerical discipline was an avenue by which Hooper sought to ensure that his clergy conformed to their proper duties and provided effective pastoral care over their congregations.

Hooper maintained the same overarching themes for the laity as he did the clergy, though, he did not hold the laity to the same rigorous standards. That said, Hooper still expected much from the parishioners of his diocese. In his *Visitations*, he identified the scope and authority of discipline for the laity:

> that a Christian and brotherly admonition, correction, and
> punishment is lawful to be had by the Word of God, and also

---

[116] As Price notes, the records of Hooper's actions in Worcester have not survived. Price, "Gloucester Diocese under Bishop Hooper", 75n88.

[117] Price, "Gloucester Diocese under Bishop Hooper," 89.

[118] Hooper did not have the power to remove those who had received their office on account of noble patronage. See Baskerville, "Elections to the Convocation in the Diocese of Gloucester Under Bishop Hooper," 7n9.

> excommunication against rebels and obstinate persons, which are
> not to be admitted unto any communion of the sacraments or
> prayers, before that they have openly reconciled themselves unto
> the church with public and open penance.[119]

From 1551-1553, Hooper did not seek to change the disciplinary infrastructure that was available to him as a bishop in the reign of Edward VI; however, an argument could be made that Hooper did not have the time to properly implement a broader system of discipline for parishioners. He used the channels available to him to create a disciplinary precedent that could set a climate for expectations of proper conduct within the community. This process began by Hooper being involved in disciplinary proceedings from the outset and providing a model of proper behaviour.[120] Only after the establishment of this precedent could Hooper consider a change of infrastructure in order to implement ecclesiastical discipline amongst the laity. He was interested in creating an environment whereby the people of the parish would be accountable to others in their congregations. The purpose was not to subvert authority within the church; rather it was to create an environment of conformity where collective adherence to Hooper's vision of Protestantism would be the expectation in every parish.

Charity as Organic Structure

Surprisingly, Hooper did not write on the church's social presence in the community, nor did he develop any sort of any social programme that would indicate extra-ecclesiastical social infrastructure in the areas of poor relief and public works, which had traditionally been associated with the Church. Furthermore, there were no indications – whether in his *Visitations*, *Injunctions* or the dedication of his work on *Romans 13* – that Hooper encouraged ministers to create social programmes. Hooper's lack of interest in establishing a formal ecclesiastical structure for poor relief represents a difference between Hooper and Bullinger. Biel has argued that Bullinger, unlike Hooper, desired that the church should be the primary agents of poor relief in Zurich.[121] The differences in opinion over the question of poor relief is

---

[119] Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 126-127.
[120] See above, 158-163.
[121] See Pamela Biel, *Doorkeepers at the House of Righteousness: Heinrich Bullinger and the Clergy 1535-1575* (New York: Peter Lang, 1991), 139-144.

probably due to each reformer's belief in the capacity of the minister to complete his duty. Hooper preferred his ministers to focus on preaching as anything else would become a distraction to their preaching office. Conversely, Bullinger, because he was working within an established Protestant system in which preaching expectations had already been established, was able to diversify his ministers' duties.

Hooper's governing style was highly regulatory in terms of the actions and behaviour of the clergy; therefore, it would seem that if Hooper had envisioned a branch of the church that involved social programmes, he would have mandated its use in one of the three key documents in which he laid out his vision of the congregation, *Visitations*, *Injunctions* or *Romans 13*. Following the Book of Common Prayer, Hooper did mandate a poor-box to collect alms, but he offered no formal regulation concerning their distribution.[122] Considering Hooper's affinity towards the early Church, and indeed the centrality of almsgiving to the Book of Common Prayer, this is a puzzling omission, especially given the early Church's collective social responsibilities for the poor and infirm. However, Hooper's lack of formal planning and infrastructure should not be interpreted as a lack of interest or care for those in need in the community.[123] His silence can instead be attributed to a changing preconception of charity and social programming in the community. There were three factors which might explain Hooper's stance: the growing power of the government, Hooper's streamlined ecclesiology and individual charity. Hooper's underlying assumption was that, once internal belief was established, external actions, including the giving of alms to the poor, would flow from those beliefs.[124]

Hooper believed that an expanded role of the magistrates' powers would lead to the success of the Reformation and that the strength of the government would include caring for the poor. In his *Ten Commandments*, Hooper considered the

---

[122] Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 149. Shagan noted that poor-boxes had been in use since 1547. Ethan Shagan, *Popular Politics and the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 276-277. Lowe has noted that in Gloucester, the government had begun the process of taking over various community aspects like education and poor relief. Lowe observes that this was sometimes done out of necessity. Nevertheless, Hooper did not appear to have objected to this process. See Lowe, *Commonwealth and the English Reformation*, 206.

[123] Hooper wrote to Bullinger that he was upset by the tyrannical behaviour nobility towards the people in England. See Robinson, *OL*, 1:66. For Hooper's more general comments on the treatment of the poor see Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 392; Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 556.

[124] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 341-342.

biblical story of David transferring the building plans of the temple to his son Solomon.[125] Hooper suggested that a similar government-sponsored poor relief agenda would look after the needy: "and so for all other necessaries, that they may defend the orphalings [sic] and poor widows with all other oppressed wrongfully. For the palace of a prince, or a magistrate, should be the refuge and sanctuary of the poor, where as they might offer boldly, as before God, their griefs and oppressions."[126] He was particularly drawn to the idea that the king of Israel was to oversee the development of the temple and all the social welfare of the community. This was a charge given by God to the king. For Hooper, the delivery of social programmes based on the Solomon model were a governmental, rather than an ecclesiastical, responsibility.[127]

A second reason for Hooper's desire that the government should oversee social welfare was that he was actively trying to reduce the activities of the ministers of the church. He wanted ministers to focus exclusively on preaching and encouraging their parishioners to live according to the Law of God.[128] Hooper described the scope of the church in the following way, "The church of God must therefore be bound to none other authority than unto the voice of the gospel and unto the ministry thereof".[129] This emphasis certainly reflected Hooper's harsh judgments about the ability and capability of earlier English ministers, and he was critical of ministers managing multiple duties since he thought that this would often result in poor preaching.[130] By focusing on the gospel, the ministers would be more faithful to their calling and yet in their sermons show how the church remained linked to charity and social causes in the community.

By preaching about faithful living, Hooper wanted his ministers to instil godly and charitable living in their parishioners. He believed that once an individual

---

[125] See 1 Chr 28:1-29:30.

[126] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 366.

[127] This did not relive the church of its responsibilities to collect alms. Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 366.

[128] See Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 26.

[129] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 27.

[130] Letter from Hooper to William Cecil (17 April 1551) in John Bradford, *The Writings of John Bradford, M.A. Martyr, 1555: Containing Letters, Treaties, Remains*, ed. Aubrey Townsend (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1853), 395; D.G. Newcombe, *John Hooper: Tudor Bishop and Martyr* (Oxford: The Davenant Press, 2009), 172-173.

had heard the Word of God and the expectations required of them by God and the example of Christ in the gospels, they would respond to the preached word and act accordingly to care for the less fortunate in society.[131] Hooper demonstrated such behaviour himself by regularly inviting those less fortunate to eat with him.[132] His inspiration came from Augustine and Paulinus who, as bishops, used wealth from their own houses to provide for the poor.[133] Hooper argued for a transfer of the care for the poor from the church to the systems which he hoped would develop more organically within the community.[134] The government would run any official programmes, but Hooper's desire was that acts of charity and social welfare would spring from an individual's desire to act charitably in response to the call from God to do so.

Conclusion

Armed with a vision of what the church could be, Hooper set about creating his own ideas for a reformed church. By 1549, the target in his sights was the new government-backed Protestant church in England. Hooper believed that the key to implementing the necessary reforms to create a godly church began with the appointment of ministers who would properly preach the gospel and administer the sacraments. To ensure that the clergy were supported and properly supervised, Hooper believed that the office of the bishop should be confined to ecclesiastical affairs. He also proposed that the clergy should meet regularly in a synod to resolve doctrinal disputes and ensure they were dutifully executing their ministries. To achieve this, however, Hooper needed to demonstrate considerable control over the initial steps on the path to the Reformation. He believed that as bishop he needed to be the model reformer for the church, and use his powers to ensure conformity amongst his preachers. Hooper had to ensure that his reforms were implemented, and he relied heavily on church discipline to accomplish this. While Hooper did not believe that church discipline was a mark of the true church, he did consider discipline crucial to the life and health of the church. He worked with the magistrates

---

[131] See above, 166.
[132] See above, 115n140.
[133] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 397.
[134] See Hooper, *Romans 13*, *LW*, 111-112.

to punish transgressors but limited his disciplinary actions to church matters. Hooper's punishments were symbolic, intended to teach the clergy to abide by his injunctions. His hope was that, through discipline, he would gradually be able to develop the clergy that were needed to see the Reformation enacted and the true church of God restored.

It was Hooper's hope that eventually the Reformation would take hold. Once it did, Hooper had some grand visions about how the people, both laity and clergy alike, would interact. Hooper wanted the people to become more participatory in the selection of their ministers, following the model of a Lasco's Strangers' Church. He believed that, if the congregations played some part in the selection of their minister, the chance that the church would remain godly would be strengthened through mutual accountability. In his reformed church, Hooper also saw the church redefining its place in the community. For Hooper, the church was only to be a place of worship, though this did not mean it was oblivious to the needs of society and particularly the poor. Through the preaching of godly sermons, the congregation, and indeed the in certain instances the government, would assist those less fortunate of their own accord, without the need for formal ecclesiastical institutions. This would be a sign of Hooper's reformation message and one that should be adopted by everyone, irrespective of station. Nevertheless, this pattern of behaviour would have to be modelled by the clergy so that the people could learn it. It is the behaviour of the clergy that the next chapter considers.

Chapter 6: The Clergy – The Model for the People

Introduction

This chapter explores the way in which Hooper thought the clergy should act as role models of godly behaviour in the community. While Hooper expected the same of the magistrate, he knew that the clergy were more visible to the laity on a regular basis and therefore under scrutiny in matters of morality and godly living. The modelling of godly life was therefore best observed by the people in the church setting. This assumed that the church was the epicentre of daily life, and that life was entirely focused on faithful living to God in community. Thus, as the leader of the church, the local clergyman was to model behaviour that was both applicable and relevant to the rest of his congregation. This was dependent, however, on the assumption that the ministers were Protestants and working towards the same goal. Hooper's model did not take account of ministers who rejected Protestantism since he assumed that any who were hostile to his Protestant agenda would have been removed from office.[1] Therefore, Hooper's model was created in the belief that he was discussing solely the role of Protestant ministers.

Hooper made a key distinction between the minster as a member of the community and as the person who led the congregation to fulfil divine commandments. Ministers were to become models for their parishioners in two visible and public fields: in their personal character and in their family life. Within these categories, Hooper could stress that the ministers were to be exemplars of charity and piety, of devotion to God, and of family life, all of which would be applicable to their congregations. Hooper took seriously the notion that the community would judge the validity of his reformation programme by the actions of the clergy, and his own actions as bishop demonstrated this view. Certainly, Hooper's *Injunctions* placed considerable weight on the behaviour of the clergy, but similar rigour was consistently used throughout his writings. He feared that if the clergy failed to match their behaviour to what they preached, parishioners would

---

[1] Hooper hoped that the King's Injunctions would increase accountability See Hooper, *LW*, xviii-xix.

question the validity of their Protestant agenda.[2] Instead, by modelling godly behaviour in their duties and family life, the clergy gave the congregation a godly example to follow which Hooper believed would ultimately lead to peaceful and faithful living.

Clergy as Community Role Models

The clergy were amongst the most visible and influential authority figures in the daily life of parishioners.[3] Hooper had a profound commitment to the way in which the clergy might conduct themselves as ministers of Christ's church and serve as ambassadors of the new Protestant vision. When he first observed the state of the clergy in Gloucester as their bishop, he was particularly hostile to clerical immorality and the neglect of their preaching duties. Hooper's series of *Injunctions* and *Visitations* suggest that he was diligent in seeing the lives of the clergy improved. For instance, Hooper wanted to ensure that the clergy refrained from immoral activities. Seeking to ascertain "whether they use alehouses and taverns, dice or cards, hunting or hawking, bowls, tennis-play, or any such other unlawful games as be forbid by the law of this realm, and also by the word of God, when they be a hindrance to virtue, prayer, modesty, and study."[4] His insistence on a strict moral code suggested that he wanted his clergy to behave better than he had observed in his Gloucester diocese.[5] By amending their lifestyle, Hooper's clergy would prove that his ideas for a reformed community were legitimate. Hooper genuinely believed that the validity of his reform would rest upon the lifestyle of its leaders – the clergy. Clerical behaviour would provide the strongest indication to their congregations

---

[2] In a letter to Bullinger in 1549, Hooper criticised the leadership of the Church of England, and Thomas Cranmer in particular, for not enforcing more rigorous moral standards amongst the bishops. Hooper at this point was deeply concerned that Protestantism would not be embraced if there was no change in the behaviour of the bishops and by extension, the clergy, suggesting that the clergy had to become models for reform. See Robinson, *OL*, 1:71-72.

[3] Foxe recorded how ministers were to be model citizens. See Foxe, *AM*, 6:639.

[4] Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 144-145.

[5] Litzenberger's research challenges this position by arguing that the clergy's behaviour might not have been as bad as Hooper reported. There were instances of absenteeism and poor behaviour, but Litzenberger's findings suggest that Hooper's polemics might be only partly founded in reality. See Caroline Litzenberger, *The English Reformation and the Laity: Gloucestershire, 1540-1580* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 59-60.

concerning the substance of the reformation programme.[6] Hooper also argued that the faithful performance of their duties was important:

> We understand by the ministry and know it not by the name alone, but by the work and administration in it, to the edifying of the church and body of Christ by the faithful administration of God's word and sacraments, according unto the commandment of Christ; from the which if any minister cease, he leaveth to be a minister, and should not be taken for such one.[7]

Hooper here suggests that the legitimacy of a minister's office was dependent both on his carrying out his duties as well and on his adherence to a proper moral code.

Besides urging moral living and rejection of the temptations of sixteenth century life, Hooper also wanted his clergy to embody the personal piety that he believed to be necessary to keep society focused on obedience to the will of God.[8] This would be reflected in the clergy's personal lives. Hooper wrote in his *Visitations* that ministers "ought to be found blameless in all their lives and conversation, having good report and testimony of all men".[9] He assumed that the clergy could only be found blameless if they followed the Ten Commandments, which he regarded as the template for pious living. This went beyond mere avoidance of sin to a positive embracing of a lifestyle that diligently followed God. Just as the magistrate was to base laws around the Ten Commandments, the clergy were to abide by the moral guidelines that the Ten Commandments demanded and shape their lives in accordance with them. Properly following these guidelines, Hooper argued, would guarantee not only faithful living but also a prosperous community.[10]

By bringing the Ten Commandments to the forefront of ecclesiastical practice and its expectation for a godly life, Hooper created a visible and measurable set of standards by which this godly living could be judged. If the minister broke or failed to adhere to a Commandment, the congregation would be correct to rebuke the

---

[6] F.D. Price, "Gloucester Diocese Under Bishop Hooper, 1551-3," *TBGAS* 60 (1938): 100. Hooper complained in a letter to William Cecil in 1552 about the poor behaviour of the clergy. Hooper, *LW*, xviii. See also Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 134.
[7] Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 123.
[8] Hooper did not use the word piety however the personal responsibilities that Hooper advocated suggested that it was piety that he demanded.
[9] Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 125.
[10] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 272.

minister for impious living. Hooper wanted to create a level of accountability to ensure that the clergy did not stray from their vocation of preaching, administering sacraments and being models of sound Protestant living. Consequently, the clergy should maintain a separation from activities that induced members of the community to sin.[11] They could then present themselves as upstanding members of the community who could lead people towards godly living rather than enablers of activities which might lead to the failure of the community. Hooper's expectations were certainly rigorous, but if the reformation of the community was to resonate with the people he believed it to be essential that the clergy should function as godly leaders.

The expectations that Hooper had for his ministers, therefore, was that they were to preach the entirety of the Ten Commandments and live according to them, thereby becoming a model of proper godly living for their congregations.[12] The Commandments outlined a life that was pleasing to God though individual actions, as well as relationships within the community. Hooper wanted to ensure that the Ten Commandments were known to the congregation by regular preaching and memorisation, and that they were presented in such a way as to be easy for both the clergy and the laity to understand and to follow.[13] He was steadfast in his belief that the Commandments, if followed properly, would be the cornerstone of harmonious living within the community. Hooper's vision was that by copying the clergy, the people would learn to follow the will of God, submit to proper authority, and live in community with their fellow members of the community.

Impediments to Reform

Hooper believed that the template to godly living had been given by God and had been made clearly available in scripture, and he did not seek to prove why the Ten Commandments were the model. Because God had given humanity such a template, no further evidence was necessary. Hooper demonstrated his belief in the clarity and relevance of the Ten Commandments in his *Injunctions*: "that every parson, curate,

---

[11] See Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 130-131.
[12] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 272.
[13] See for instance, Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 271.

and minister teach the ten commandments of God out of the twentieth chapter of Exodus, as they stand there, and no otherwise, not taking one word, letter, or syllable from them, but in all things to follow in this case the book of God."[14] Thus, ministers needed only to preach and model what was contained in Exodus 20.[15] Since the Ten Commandments were readily available, Hooper focused on removing any barriers that might prevent an individual from following them. He dealt with these barriers in an addendum to his tract on the Ten Commandments, addressing what he called impediments, of which he identified six: time and place, personal exemption, presumption, curiosity, desperation and ignorance.[16] To describe these impediments Hooper interwove the story of the Israelites in their journey from Egypt to their Promised Land. The Israelites were the strongest example of a community learning the consequences of following or disobeying God's Law. He intended his audience on the one hand, to see their experiences as parallel to those of the Israelites as they participated in the journey to a Protestant kingdom. On the other hand, he used his narrative to criticise existing society, reminding his audience of the harsh conditions that the Israelites had experienced when they were given the Commandments. The Israelites had not yet known the Law and were the first to amend their lifestyle in accordance with God's commandments. By contrast, Hooper's audience had the benefit of hindsight and history to observe God's wrath when his people disobeyed as well as the peace they had enjoyed when they followed the Law.[17]

The first impediment identified by Hooper was the problem of "time and place".[18] Here Hooper identified two barriers. The first was that some were hostile to learning in a time of much religious uncertainty.[19] Writing from Zurich in 1548 Hooper was probably appealing to people in England, but he saw the implications as

---

[14] Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 133.

[15] Ex 20:1-17. Hooper's instructions to preach the Exodus 20 account suggest that he was here following the custom of the Reformed version of the Ten Commandments. It is uncertain, however, whether Hooper's inclusion of Exodus 20 was a deliberate instruction to avoid the Catholic and Lutheran version which bases the last two commandments on Deuteronomy 5:4-21.

[16] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 413-430.

[17] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 427.

[18] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 413.

[19] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 413. Hooper is suggesting that following the Ten Commandments might have been innovative for people. It is possible that Hooper might be speaking abstractly about churchgoers, but evidence from Price about Hooper's later episcopal ministry suggests that Hooper's concerns were based on his observations about England. See above, 165.

universally applicable. This first point called for a continued effort to reform, irrespective of circumstances. To add weight to this demand, Hooper reminded his audience of the context in which the Ten Commandments were received: whilst Moses and his people were wandering the desert.[20] Hooper equated Protestant England with the Israelites because both were embarking upon a new relationship with God.[21] Hooper's assurance was that if the people were living faithfully, even in a time of uncertainty, God would provide for them. The second aspect of Hooper's first impediment was that of place. Hooper suggested that some might claim that the Ten Commandments could not be studied or practiced within the context of the community and were best confined to a monastery or a place of higher learning. Here, Hooper emphasised his preference for having the Bible preached without restriction to the congregation. Hooper referred again to the reception of the Ten Commandments, drawing upon the fact that Moses had received them and brought them to the people. Therefore, Hooper saw no reason to argue that the Ten Commandments could only be observed apart from the community and excluding them. Rather, the ministers had a biblical injunction to preach the Ten Commandments to the community and to encourage the community to follow them, irrespective of religious or political circumstance or the intellectual attainment of those who would participate.

The second impediment that Hooper raised related to the people for whom the Ten Commandments were written, which Hooper called "Exception of Persons".[22] To clarify his position Hooper once again considered the person of Moses. Hooper observed that there would be some who would excuse themselves from adhering to the Ten Commandments on the assumption that adherence only applied to those of an ecclesiastical rank.[23] He condemned any such notion that the Ten Commandments were a moral code reserved for the clergy, asserting that this idea was one of the earliest forms of rebellion against the league God had made with Moses. Using violent imagery, he recounted the forms of divine retribution brought upon those who refused to live by what God had commanded, placing particular

---

[20] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 413-414.
[21] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 413.
[22] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 414.
[23] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 415.

emphasis on the choice given to the people not to follow God's Laws. Hooper recalled the Exodus account, "This wicked acceptation of persons Moses destroyeth, and most godly repeateth and numbereth the members of the church, the orders and degrees of the same… No manner of person is excluded from the league: whereby we know, as God's mercy is common for all men".[24] This, for Hooper, was the proof he required to argue that no-one was exempt from observing the Law or from the punishments reserved for those who disobeyed it. As he understood the Exodus account, God had given a stark warning to those who sought to remove themselves from the contract of the Commandments or regard it as a code solely for the ecclesiastical order: "when men put from themselves the obedience of the law unto other saying 'let the priests and monks keep the law, and learn it, [why] should a… gentleman be bound to learn and keep all the holy rules?'"[25] The charge for the ministers in Hooper's society was therefore to preach and practise the relevance of the Law in such a way as to remind everyone of their duty to live by these decrees; they were also to admonish those who failed to live according to these precepts. That is, the minister was to stress that the Ten Commandments were a charge to the entire community and avoid any suggestion they defined a mysterious order only for the monks.

Having established the relevance of the Ten Commandments for the entire community, Hooper shifted his emphasis to challenging some of the attitudes that undermined faithful living. This was the issue raised by the third impediment, "presumption".[26] Hooper argued that individuals were guilty of presumption when they took divine assurances as a reason to evade their responsibilities to follow the Ten Commandments, and that God's assurances were subject to abuse when people had no fear of breaking God's Law. Such presumption, he thought, was actually born of ignorance of the Law itself.[27] He referred again to the Israelites, this time to the new generation of exilic Israelites who were soon to enter their Promised Land. Hooper's choice of biblical example was significant because he saw many parallels between the people of England and the Israelites on the verge of entering the

---

[24] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 414.
[25] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 414.
[26] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 415.
[27] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 416.

Promised Land.[28] He expounded the story when the laws for their new city were outlined for the people.[29] In the Deuteronomy passage, reminders of the Israelites' past were given in order to correct their sinful behaviour. Hooper used this to remind Protestants – and specifically those in newly Protestant England – that God's Law was clear and that God demanded specific actions.[30] He also reaffirmed that any breaking of the Law could not be permitted, even on account of ignorance.[31]

Hooper believed that people were in the greatest peril when they permitted their hearts to sway them from God's Commandments. He characterised that danger: "he promiseth good to himself, saying in his heart, Yea, if I walk in the imagination of my heart, and take my pleasure, there is no danger."[32] In reality, Hooper clarified, "This diabolical presumption is the occasion that men not only fall into divers kind of abomination, but also persevere in the same ill."[33] Hooper was particularly exercised by some people's assumption that the saints would intercede on their behalf, which he thought created an atmosphere of "presumption".[34] Hooper turned the argument back to the fundamental basis of salvation, believing that when the foundation upon which Protestant society was built was weakened, people would be ignorant of what was required of them. If the ministers failed to educate the people properly, then he feared that God's Law would become shrouded in superstition.[35] The solution was simple: he specifically charged the ministers to educate their congregations about the contents of the Ten Commandments. If they were truly preached, as clearly as they were presented in Exodus, the people would not be ignorant of what the Law was saying. With this knowledge and understanding, false presumptions, which Hooper believed accompanied Roman Catholicism, would be removed. Thus, the minister was to preach that following God was the only way to salvation, and also the only means whereby one might live peaceably. The ministers

---

[28] See above, 133.
[29] Dt 29:19-24.
[30] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 416-417.
[31] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 416.
[32] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 415-416.
[33] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 415-416.
[34] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 416-417.
[35] Hooper developed his argument by criticising ancient myths where people looked to supernatural phenomena to explain unlikely events. Hooper argued that, by teaching the Law, the people would recognise God's supremacy and would fear God and live godly lives. See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 417.

were to preach and themselves teach the Ten Commandments and model a life free from presumption.

The fourth impediment identified by Hooper was that of "curiosity".[36] Hooper described curiosity as a process, "when men of an ill and licentious life return not to penance, as the scripture biddeth, but mounteth straightway into God's providence and predestination".[37] Two interpretations arose from Hooper's term of curiosity. An individual was curious when seeking out signs of their predestination.[38] Secondly, an individual might also succumb to curiosity by straying from God's Law under the impression that they were already saved by God.[39] This particular impediment seemed to be centred more on theological application than upon the practical examples the clergy could demonstrate to their congregation. Nevertheless, in Hooper's presentation of the underlying theology, there were some points about how the clergy might avoid distorting the Ten Commandments.

Hooper was fearful that curious minds would begin to speculate upon God's actions and punishments and stressed that the clergy must only preach what was revealed in scripture. The clergy were not to preach or discuss predestination apart from what was revealed in scripture. He argued that the human mind was unable to know the intentions behind God's decisions to punish or to abstain and reaffirmed that for Christians to seek to do so was a great risk to their soul.[40] Hooper went as far as condemning those who sought to speculate and charging them with subverting the authority of the Holy Spirit. This was so serious an offence that Hooper wanted people to avoid it at all costs. In terms of its practical implications for his vision for a Protestant society, Hooper wanted the Bible to be understood as the revealed Word

---

[36] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 419.
[37] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 419.
[38] This interpretation was one that Hooper would have inherited from Bullinger. Bullinger affirmed the doctrine of predestination, but argued that an individual should not look for evidence of their predestination. Such knowledge was known only to God. Instead, Bullinger argued that individuals should focus only on following the Law of God. See Bullinger, *The Fourth Decade*, 185-191. See also Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 419. Heal has argued that Hooper was concerned with aspects of Predestination as he was concerned that it risked making God the author of sin. Felicity Heal, *The Reformation in Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 331. Ab Ulmis wrote to Bullinger that Hooper engaged into heated debate with Bartholomew Traheron on the subject. Robinson, *OL*, 2:406.
[39] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 419.
[40] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 420.

of God and did not permit any deviation from that which was written. To speculate, therefore, ran the risk of misconceiving the will of God and might lead to the calamitous ruin of the society that God wanted to create. Hooper charged the ministers specifically to preach that the Ten Commandments were the template for a godly living. He wanted them to preach that God's justice was God's alone and that the best possible avenue by which they could stave off God's wrath was to live faithfully to the Commandments.[41]

The fifth and penultimate, impediment was that of "desperation".[42] Hooper argued that desperation referred to an individual's belief that they could not be saved.[43] Here, he took a decisively different tone from his treatment of "curiosity" which had been considered with utmost severity, offering a more pastoral approach. Hooper began his discussion of desperation by consoling those who felt that they were unable to benefit from, or were in some way excluded from salvation. When a person found they continued to sin, they developed a fear of God's judgement and would become disengaged with the mercy of God.[44] For ministers, this particular impediment was crucially important and they needed to provide a balanced view of how society was to live in faithfulness to God. There was no question that all sin should be identified and subsequently abandoned, but Hooper demanded that his ministers also teach and demonstrate the mercy that God had shown throughout the Bible. To illustrate this point, Hooper referred again to Moses and the Israelites in exile in the desert, this time describing Moses as the "good physician".[45] He argued that Moses was able to prescribe a spiritual remedy for the illness afflicting his people by directing them towards God. In the same way, ministers were to provide the way in which all people could find solace in the mercy of God through their godly living.

---

[41] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 420-421.
[42] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 423. In the sixteenth-century, 'desperation' was the term used to describe the levels of anguish that led to suicide (it was how Judas' state of mind was described as he hanged himself). Jane E.A. Dawson, *John Knox* (London: Yale University Press, 2015), 248.
[43] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 423.
[44] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 422.
[45] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 423.

To avoid individuals falling into a state of desperation, Hooper advocated a gradual introduction to the Word of God. To illustrate this, he used an analogy of an age-appropriate diet as a child progresses from infancy to adulthood and explained that a person's ability to understand the mercy of God began with very basic ideas about God:

> But unto this way of life (to Christ by faith) all men be not brought after one sort: for as man's life is not maintained with one kind of meats, but the child with pap, the full age with stronger meats, the health with common meats, the sickness with such as be of lighter digestion; so is it in bringing man to faith in Christ Jesu, our Saviour.[46]

Hooper allowed for different approaches to teaching God's mercy, suggesting that the obstinate and sinful should have only the Ten Commandments and consequences of sin preached to them. For others, Hooper gave the example of David who was in a more desperate situation and indicated that a reminder of the mercy of God might suffice.[47] For Hooper, the minister's task was to assess the approach necessary to lead people to living a godly life. For some, a reminder of sin and condemnation of their errors would be appropriate, but for others, a more gracious approach was preferable. He concluded his discussion of the fifth impediment with a summary of this position: "This is to preach in the church of God: not to fear the sorrowful conscience with the rigour of the law; neither to flatter those hypocrites… with the promise of faith, until such time as they amend, and the law done his office in him."[48]

The final impediment Hooper identified was that of ignorance, though, given the understanding he presented a better term would be apathy. Hooper had previously considered those who were obstinate and fearful; here he turned to those who were neither scared of nor opposed to the Commandments, but simply indifferent. Hooper correctly diagnosed that there would be some within any community who would reject religion because it was either too difficult to comprehend or they were uninterested in what God had to offer a faithful person. Hooper dealt with the two

---

[46] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 424.
[47] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 425.
[48] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 426.

forms separately. He laid the blame of confused apathy on the decrees of the bishops throughout the centuries.[49] He did not mention any particular decree, although he elsewhere suggested that the Mass and the rise of the worship of the Saints were two practices that had led to apathy.[50] These practices had become so distant from what was described in the Bible that they had created an atmosphere of apathy because people did not know what was actually written in the Bible.[51] As Hooper put it, writing the voice of a person suffering from such apathy, "The scripture hath so many mysteries in itself, and is too hard for our capacity. Sometime the letter, sometime the sprit, and sometime both must be understood."[52] In addition, "The doctors brawl and chide between themselves, and how should the unlearned understand it aright?"[53] To counter this attitude, Hooper stressed that the Bible should be freely preached as it contained sufficient guidance on how one might come to salvation. The minister's responsibility as a preacher and model of the Ten Commandments, was to preach clearly from the Bible and to incorporate only those episcopal decrees which served to clarify what was written.[54]

The second form of apathy which Hooper attacked was that of disinterest. Hooper once more referred to Moses when he gave the Commandments to the people writing that, "Moses answereth and saith, This law is sufficient, is simple, and plain, easy to be understood, a perfect doctrine, and required of all men."[55] He had little patience for those who dismissed the Ten Commandments due to a lack of interest. He assumed that the Laws were written by God to accommodate the plainness of human understanding and argued that the Ten Commandments were straightforward and simple so that they could be understood by the average Christian and that they did not contain any mysterious or mystical knowledge which needed to be hidden from any Christian.[56] He stressed that neither Abraham nor Moses needed any foreign knowledge by which they could understand the Law that had been given to

---

[49] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 426.
[50] See for instance, Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 310-312; Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 225-237.
[51] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 426.
[52] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 426.
[53] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 426.
[54] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 427.
[55] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 427.
[56] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 427.

them by God.[57] Hooper's reference here to Abraham, a patriarch who had lived before the Ten Commandments were given to the people of Israel, illustrates Hooper's belief that the Ten Commandments were greater than the physical tablets given to Moses. Hooper explained that Abraham knew the Ten Commandments because he followed God, and by following God, he naturally followed what was later written on the tablets. Hooper used this idea of the implicit law of God to discredit those who would plead apathy to the Law. Hooper also countered apathy through the example of the Apostle Paul who preached the Christian message to the gentiles.[58] Abraham's and Paul's audiences had quite different sets of cultural customs and experiences, but Hooper did not see this as a problem in either instance, since conscience alerted all human beings to their sinfulness, whatever the context:

> For the law of God to do well by, is written naturally in the heart
> of every man. He that will diligently search himself shall soon
> find the same; and in case man would behold his own image both
> in body and in soul, though there were no law written, nor
> heavens over our heads to testify the goodness and justice of God,
> and the equity of an honest life, man's conscience would tell him,
> when he doth well, and when evil.[59]

These examples enabled Hooper to discredit any who sought to discount the Ten Commandments because they were difficult to comprehend. God had given the Ten Commandments to all, and he had also given everyone a conscience to tell a right action right action from a wrong one. The minister's task was one of encouragement and empowerment. He was to make his congregation aware of the simplicity of the Ten Commandments and encourage them to engage directly with these most simple of guides, given by God for faithful and godly living.

In summary, Hooper saw the Ten Commandments as the sole way to attain a state of proper faithful living. They were designed by God and made plainly and

---

[57] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 427. See also Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 341-342. Hooper's thoughts appear to be influenced heavily by Bullinger's concept of natural law. Bullinger argued that God "with his finger writ them in their hearts," suggesting that God had given individuals a moral code to discern God's laws. Bullinger, *The First and Second Decade*, 211. The Ten Commandments were the codification of these innate laws. Bullinger, *The First and Second Decade*, 209-212. See also Stephen A. Chavura, *Tudor Protestant Political Thought, 1547-1603* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 107-111.
[58] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 427.
[59] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 427-428.

easily accessible for the people who formed Hooper's society. To persuade his audience Hooper countered the ways people might seek to avoid living by what God had demanded. He looked to his ministers to be model citizens living by the precepts of the Ten Commandments. Hooper believed that citizens should model themselves upon those in authority and they would be the strongest practical example of how to accomplish the peaceful living promised by God. In addition to living by the Ten Commandments, Hooper also wanted his clergy to preach against any misconceptions, giving the proper warnings about lax adherence to the Law and encouraging those who might be discouraged. Therefore, the clergy, by abiding by the Ten Commandments, were to act as models and teachers of the Law leading their congregants to faithful living.

Marriage and the Clergy

As much as Hooper stressed an individual's faithful adherence to the Law, he recognised that his godly community included relationships and he needed his clergy to be able to model one of the strongest forms of relationships in the community: marriage. To initiate a proper discussion on marriage, he needed to affirm first the theological basis for married clergy. While Protestantism had warmed to the idea that a clergyman should live in a lawfully recognised marriage, Hooper was still faced throughout Edward's reign with defending this idea against English traditionalists.[60] This opposition allowed him to develop a more robust defence of the need for clerical marriage and the benefit that it brought to the community. Hooper argued that marriage had been abused, but maintained that the institution of marriage was indeed "honourable", and that there was no basis to ban clergy from godly marriage.[61] Hooper refuted the view that marriage could be profitable for some, but forbidden to others, using a medical metaphor: "It is like as if the physician should say to two men of one age, one disposition, and sick in one disease, that the medicine that healeth the one will kill the other."[62]

---

[60] Hooper's troubles with Joliffe and Johnson suggest such a problem. Newcombe, *John Hooper*, 202.
[61] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 375.
[62] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 376.

Marriage had not been universally practiced by the first and second generation of Continental Protestant Reformers although most leading Reformers, including Luther, Melanchthon, Zwingli, Bullinger, Bucer and Calvin, married. In England, although Thomas Cranmer had married before he was made Archbishop of Canterbury, clerical marriage remained outlawed under Henry VIII; when clerical marriage was permitted in 1549, however, Hugh Latimer and Nicholas Ridley remained celibate. Nonetheless, having married clergyman was quickly becoming a hallmark of Protestant identity.[63] Like many of those with similar Protestant convictions, Hooper had married whilst in Strasbourg: Peter Martyr married and subsequently remarried on the death of his first wife, and John a Lasco was married by 1540. Hooper considered married life to be acceptable, if not normative, for the clergy, and his image of family life for the clergy was one that contributed to his broader description of dutiful clergy who were diligent in preaching the gospel and who promoted godly living. Hooper was highly critical of the abuse of clerical celibacy and the immorality to which it gave raise, and saw clerical marriage as a means of tempering some of the worst abuses, producing a godly cleric and his family. The image of the holy cleric and his wife and family was one that Hooper drew solely from the Bible and the practice of the early Church. Hooper wrote that, "seeing that St Paul doth plainly say that the forbidding of marriage is the doctrine of devils, therefore it is not to be judged that the marriage of priests, bishops, or any other ministers of the church, should be unlawful, but that the same is both holy, and agreeable with God's word."[64] He then highlighted a discussion within the Council of Nicaea, "The council of Nice [Nicaea] condescended to the mind and sentence of Paphnutius, that said, faithful marriage was chastity."[65] Hooper sought to protect the married cleric and his wife from abusive parishioners and those who would argue against the legitimacy of clerical marriage. Within the dioceses of Gloucester and Worcester, Hooper condemned those who attacked the minister as a family man:

---

[63] The Convocation of the Clergy and the House of Commons approved clerical marriage in 1547, but it was not until 1549 that the House of Lords approved it. See Helen L. Parish, *Clerical Marriage and the English Reformation: Precedent, Policy and Practice* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), 180-181.

[64] Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 126.

[65] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 376. There has been some debate as to the accuracy and persuasiveness of the argument of Paphnutius (fl.c. 4th century CE). See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 376n1.

"whether there be any man that raileth, speaketh uncharitably, or calleth any minister's wife whore, or detest and abhor their companies… for lack of grace and knowledge they increase in sin, and decay all love."[66]

Marriage of the clergy became a clear sign of his overall Protestant vision. He exhorted his ministers to demonstrate how God had ordained marriage for the community. Hooper made few direct references as to how the clergy should behave in their roles as husbands and fathers; however, he offered a few general comments on marriage within the church which indicated the subtleties of the role specifically for the clergy. Hooper's description of marriage began with the premise that the clergy had two families: their congregation and their personal family. As a family man, the married clergyman was expected to be a model for those in their congregation. The fact that the clergy could share the experiences of many within his congregation was helpful in integrating the clergy into parochial life, since it meant that they could relate more closely to the daily struggles of their parishioners, and parishioners could look to the clergy for guidance on conducting their marriage and family life in a godly manner. Hooper seems not to have taken into consideration any negative pressures that might exist. He firmly believed that, if executed properly, his model would bring about peaceful living in the community. He argued, "Wherefore God putteth the sixth [commandment] that defendeth marriage, whereby is preserved this commonwealth, and as godly continue, as it began; the which law is not only necessary for the preservation of the commonwealth to come, but also to preserve the state present in peace and tranquillity."[67] Thus, marriage was seen as an avenue towards social peace and tranquillity, with ministers contributing to that peace within their own households.[68] Within the household, the minister would serve as the faithful teacher, ensuring that their household was equipped to lead godly lives.[69] Reflecting the attributes of godly living, the minister brought to the household an atmosphere of devotion and godliness that could be emulated by the laity.

---

[66] Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 141.
[67] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 354.
[68] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 381.
[69] See Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 32.

Hooper employed theological reasoning on the one hand, but he was also aware of the very real problems which he believed were causing considerable distress within the household. Commenting on the abuse of marriage he wrote, "For never was there greater occasion of discord and hate between commonwealth and commonwealth, prince and prince, private persons and private persons, than for the abuse and violating of marriage".[70] In particular, Hooper identified the problems of sexual promiscuity and child-neglect. To prevent these worrying trends, Hooper wanted to make public marriages the standard practice within the realm.[71] He sought to increase the public nature of marriage by emphasising the public reading of marriage banns, and marriage vows. Marriages were to be announced to and conducted before the church congregation to create a sense of public accountability.[72] Within marriage, Hooper maintained that public accountability could also help prevent issues which might arise. In this regard, the clergy were no exception as their marriage became part of the community like any other. As a mechanism to increase accountability, the clergy were forbidden from conducting marriage services for their parishioners in private.[73] The minister's own marriage, and those marriages that they performed, must be public and visible to the congregation.

Clerical marriage had the additional advantage of giving ministers a relative degree of safety from accusations of sexual indiscretion. As a married man, a minister's sexual appetites would be restrained within marriage and he would be able to "avoid fornication".[74] In summary, Hooper wanted to maintain that marriage for ministers was indeed an acceptable practice. By allowing clerical marriage, the happily married minister with a family was able to promote openness and accountability. Married clergy could satisfy their sexual desires and participate in family life like their parishioners. In addition, the marriage of clergy reflected an

---

[70] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 354.
[71] See below, 207.
[72] Hooper applied this openness for wills and testaments as well. By reading wills and testaments in public, Hooper believed that discrepancies about the wills would be minimised and potential arguments avoided. Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 138.
[73] Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 137-138.
[74] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 381.

ideal of familial living that was bound in faith and also promoted quietness. It had the potential to be replicated by each family within the minister's parish.

The Minister as a Family Man

Although a minister was to be devoted to his vocation and be an exemplar of morality and godly living, Hooper also described him as a member of a family. In this regard, Bullinger's legacy proved influential because Hooper had witnessed first-hand his mentor's family life in Zurich. Bullinger's home was renowned for its hospitality to passing students and religious exiles, in addition to his large family of eleven children. Bullinger's home was often portrayed in a very positive light in letters from both John and Anna Hooper. Anna wrote, "I justly lament your absence, who have stood forth as my most excellent friend, nay, rather I may say, my patron; and who have so obliged me by your favours, that were I even to pledge my life, much less my property, I should be unable to return your kindness."[75] For leaders like Bullinger, within the church and community, the vocal and visible nature of their office increased the significance of their actions which were subject to greater scrutiny from both parishioners and detractors of the concept of clerical marriage.

Establishing a model for family life required more practical examples that would be useful for their congregations. In his letters to Bullinger, Hooper's comments about his family provided a clear indication as to how the clergy were to model their family. Fortunately, Hooper wrote frequently about his family.[76] His family was also regularly mentioned by Hooper's close friend in England, Martin Micron.[77] These descriptions of his family were often expressed in most endearing terms with many updates on the state of his family and on how his daughter was adjusting to life in England. In a letter from Strasbourg Hooper described the difficulties of travelling as a family as they made the trip back to England from Zurich: "the fretfulness too of our little daughter Rachel in some measure prevents

---

[75] Robinson, *OL*, 1:109.

[76] Foxe made a particular mention of Hooper's virtuous household. Foxe, *AM*, 6: 644.

[77] Ab Ulmis and Micron regularly included updates to Bullinger on the health and status of Hooper's family. These updates were usually in response to enquiries from Bullinger. For instance, Micron reported in 1550: "Master Hooper… is in good health… Mistress Anna… has gone to the mansion of a certain noble lady in the neighbourhood of the city for a change of air." Robinson, *OL*, 562. Jan Utenhove also writes about meeting with Anna but does not provide any details of their encounter other than his promise to pass along a letter from her to Bullinger. Robinson, *OL*, 2:587.

our journey; for she is cutting her teeth, and exposure to the air aggravates the painfulness of incipient illness."[78] The family was, for Hooper, a model for chastity, a haven for stability and definably Protestant in its make-up. Importantly, his own family unit was a model for his parishioners.

From his letters Hooper appears to have been a diligent father with a sincere interest in his daughter's development. For example, in a letter from August 1551 Hooper wrote to Bullinger about Rachel, whom for Bullinger had stood sponsor at her Baptism:

> If the Lord will preserve my little daughter Rachel, so that she may embrace his Son Jesus Christ, and promote his cause, I shall think my desires abundantly accomplished in my old age, even though I should have no more family. She very frequently hears from her mother the great commendation of the country and place where she was born; and she is with great care and diligence instructed in the promises which she formally made to the church by means of your kindness... She now sends an entire piece of cloth as a token of her reverence and respect, one half to yourself, the other to the wife of master Bibliander [who had also served as a baptismal sponsor]; and she heartily thanks her heavenly Father, that by you as her sponsors she has been received into the society of his holy church.[79]

From the image that he created in his letter to Bullinger, Hooper presented himself as a diligent father who was concerned about the faith of his daughter. He also implied that securing Rachel's faith would be the ultimate reward for his life. Hooper as a father was deeply concerned about the spiritual wellbeing of his children.[80] Hooper also dealt implicitly with the topic of social behaviour with children explaining that he and his wife Anna were making Rachel aware of those who had supported her and instructed her to be thankful to her spiritual mentors.[81] The expectation was that Hooper's children would respect those in authority, both spiritually and within the family. Hooper, by instructing Rachel to respect those who had influenced her, was shaping her experiences for later life when as an adult she would show similar reverence for her sovereign, her family and her parish minister. Hooper was arguably

---

[78] Robinson, *OL*, 1:50.
[79] Robinson, *OL*, 1:92.
[80] Robinson, *OL*, 1:105.
[81] Robinson, *OL*, 1:92.

setting a parental model that his parishioners should follow: parents, whether clergy or lay, had a responsibility to teach their children, from an early age, the values of the Protestant message. Learning the fundamental building components for successful living within the community began in childhood and continued throughout the persons' life. Thus, the relationship between parent and child was foundational to bringing up children who would be upstanding members of society later in life. For the clergy in particular, there was an even greater spotlight shone on their parenting since their parishioners were expected to copy their good practices.

Conclusion

This chapter has considered how Hooper wanted his clergy to act as models of godly living. The specific template was found in the Ten Commandments where God had provided the keys to successful living. Attention was focused on ensuring that the Ten Commandments were visible in society with the clergy chosen as his models to show the rest of the community how to live by those commandments. Two specific reasons led to the choice of the clergy: the first, that they were called by God to preach godly living and secondly, that they held authority and had day-to-day interaction with the community. Concerning the first, Hooper argued that the clergy needed to embody that which they were trying to advocate. As men called by God, Hooper believed it was essential that they practise what they were preaching and he demanded that they strive to live in a godly fashion throughout their entire life. This would eliminate any conflict between what parishioners saw and what they heard preached. Having insisted upon the need for the clergy to model godly living, he then dealt with the barriers preventing the Ten Commandments being followed by the community. Listing six impediments which he wanted his clergy to explain Hooper felt that the clergy must be sensitive to the needs of their particular parishioners and at times use mercy, as well as preaching harshly when necessary. For Hooper, the only viable way for the community to live faithfully and enjoy God's peace was by following the Law of God as it was written in the Ten Commandments.

Hooper extended his discussion to include an account of family life. Following the introduction of clerical marriage in the first wave of Protestantism, Hooper saw it as advantageous for the clergy. He argued that it curbed sexual

licentiousness and encouraged a suitable family life. It was for his concept of a reformed community that married clergy demonstrated what family life should be like to the community. Married clergy should ensure their homes were places of spiritual learning for their own families and for guests. Those called by God to lead must be able to do so and provide for those in the community an example of what day-to-day life should resemble. Hooper might be accused of placing too great a responsibility on his clergy by demanding that they serve as role models for the rest of society; however, it was these high standards which unlocked the way to godly and indeed peaceful living and to diminish them would jeopardise that very peace with God which Hooper strove.

Chapter 7: The People of the Community

Introduction

This chapter explores those avenues by which Hooper sought to empower the community to contribute to the success of its reformation. It will consider how Hooper wove together both temporal and divine responsibilities to define how a citizen of the community could contribute the building up of a godly society, what actions they should avoid as members of the community, and what influence their commitment to the reformation programme would have over its success. Hooper was both unapologetic and unwavering in his belief that the reformation of their community was first implemented by those in power. The clergy were to introduce godly religion and lead the change of religious behaviour; the magistrate was to introduce godly laws and punish those who disobeyed them. With most of the effort towards reformation concentrated on ensuring that those involved in these two aspects of the community's leadership were properly equipped to conduct that reform, the position of citizens in general was often treated as an afterthought. Identifying their contribution would require going beyond Hooper's writings on religious devotion and proper behaviour, and this chapter focuses upon the evaluation the empowerment of the people who might make a positive contribution to the success of the reformation. Underpinning the discussion of how citizens could contribute is Hooper's belief that when the community worked diligently and obeyed the magistrate and their clergy, those in authority would recognise their hard work and treat their subjects with justice. Hooper believed that mutual respect and commitment would build a peaceful community.

Hooper looked to Christ as a model for living within the community. He employed the concept of vocation as a calling from God that enabled the community to function properly, and also examined interpersonal relationships, considering how people were to live together in a godly fashion. Within this framework of shared experience, Hooper turned to the question of how members of the community could contribute to existing structures of church and government. Hooper's arguments should be understood in the context of his aversion to Anabaptism, a movement

which he believed mitigated against his desire for homogeneous communal experience.[1] In the final section, Hooper's views on marriage and divorce are discussed, showing how he sought to redefine the rights of women in marriage and his advice for dealing with marriages that fail. In both instances, Hooper sought to minimise obstacles to godly living and ensure a peaceful community.

Christ as a Model Citizen

To explain his ideals for general behaviour within the community, Hooper looked to the life of Christ. Chapter Two has examined Christ's obedience to following the will of God, but it did not explore how Christ's example was to be emulated by the society that Hooper imagined.[2] Hooper saw Christ as representing the perfect citizen, and sought to show how that model could work to shape society.[3] It has already been seen that Hooper gave clear indications as to how the magistrate and clergy were to behave, and he also believed that even those within the community who held no power still had significant influence upon the success and faithfulness of their community. He insisted that everyone, irrespective of calling, was to be united in their efforts for the sake of Christ:

> It is the office of every true Christian, before all studies, travails,
> and pains, that he shall sustain for the time of this brief and
> miserable life, to apply himself with all diligent force and labour,
> to know perfectly this means, ordained by God for our salvation;
> and, the thing once known, diligently with heart, soul, and mind,
> to follow the means, until such time as the effect and end be
> obtained, wherefore the means was appointed.[4]

All citizens therefore were charged with the same goal of following Christ and using the Bible as a guide to follow the model which Christ had perfectly displayed in his life.

Hooper paid particular attention to Christ's obedience, arguing that Christ had displayed obedience in politics, religion and vocation. In his work on Romans 13, Hooper also suggested that Christ had demonstrated political obedience in his life as

---

[1] Hooper, *Confession*, *LW*, 76.
[2] See above, 71.
[3] See Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 16.
[4] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 15.

a Jewish citizen under Roman occupation. Relying on Paul's writings as evidence of Christ's obedience, he concluded that "Christ and his apostles paid tribute and other duties unto the higher powers of the earth."[5] Hooper also drew attention to the way in which Christ upheld the mandate of Pilate, reinforcing this argument by citing how the Apostle Paul submitted to the authority of Caligula and Nero as Emperors of Rome.[6] Hooper concluded that Christ was obedient to his superiors and he reminded his readers that Christ gave to Caesar that which was owed to Caesar as a magistrate. This gave Hooper the justification he needed for demanding that citizens obey their magistrates. In matters of faith, Hooper presented Christ as one entirely obedient to what he was called to do. Hooper's treatise *Christ and His Office* considered the nature of Christ's faithful obedience to God and he wrote that, "[the divine nature of Christ] obeyed the will of the Father."[7] This confirmed Hooper's arguments in his tract on the *Ten Commandments* where Hooper argued that Christ was the fulfilment of the Law.[8] Although Christ was the fulfilment of the Law, he had been obedient to the religious laws of his day.

In exploring vocation, Hooper looked more broadly to the purpose of Christ's mission on earth. He argued that after Adam had sinned, Christ's vocation had been to come to earth as a man and save humanity according to the will of God, and he gave himself over to this vocation: "Seeing he was sent into the world to suffer this most cruel death and passion, he would do nothing that should be contrary unto his vocation; but, with patience praying for his enemies, submitted himself unto the ignominy and contempt of the cross".[9] Through his death, Christ demonstrated complete obedience and fulfilled his vocation to serve as a sacrifice for the sins of the world. Just as Christ was obedient, humanity should respond by also following God's calling. In summary, Hooper considered the life of Christ to serve as a model of an ideal citizen because he perfectly fulfilled his vocation to the benefit of the community of which he was part. In all facets of his life, Christ had demonstrated the ideal form of living to everyone in the community.

---

[5] Hooper, *Romans 13*, *LW*, 101.
[6] Hooper, *Romans 13*, *LW*, 102.
[7] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 17.
[8] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 412.
[9] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 17-18.

Vocation

For Hooper, vocation defined the life of everyone in the community and their place in society.[10] This was a topic that Hooper continually brought to his audiences' attention. His ideas about vocation were consistent from the period of his three Zurich writings to the issuing of his *Visitations*.[11] Hooper believed that the success of the community rested on everyone fulfilling their vocation and that this responsibility was the same for everyone irrespective of social rank. Vocation thus marked a collective responsibility to contribute to the success of the community with the help of God.[12] The consequent interdependence of all members of society meant that the actions of each individual contributed to the success or failure of the community.[13]

Hooper's most substantial treatment of vocation was in his *Sermons upon Jonah*. As discussed above, Hooper used the story of Jonah above all, to stress the importance of successfully fulfilling one's vocation. He observed that Jonah was a prophet called by God to preach to the people of Nineveh, and thus chosen for leadership by God.[14] It would have been understood by his audience, particularly in the immediate context in which the sermons were delivered, that Nineveh was to be related to the reform of the Church of England. In the *Sermons upon Jonah*, Hooper underscored the necessity of responding to one's vocation, describing the calamities

---

[10] See Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 456, 504.

[11] The visitation articles deal predominantly with clerical vocation, but Hooper's views on clerical vocation are consistent with his presentation of the concept of vocation in his *Sermons upon Jonah*. As an example of Hooper's thoughts on vocation, he wrote, "Forasmuch as of all charges and vocations the charge of such as be appointed to the ministry and function of the church is the greatest, it is to be provided and foreseen that such as be called and appointed to such vocation and office be such as can satisfy the said office". Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 118.

[12] See Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 81.

[13] Litzenberger shows this by highlighting the role of the midwife. Hooper specifically forbade midwives to invoke the saints during a delivery. While this was a spiritual problem that Hooper was addressing, it indicated that Hooper took seriously the fact that the proper execution of one's vocation – for instance as midwife – contributed to the success of the community. See Caroline Litzenberger, *The English Reformation and the Laity: Gloucestershire, 1540-1580* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 69-70; Hooper, *Visitations*, *LW*, 141.

[14] Blench has considered that repentance and conversion remain paramount to the Jonah sermons. He is not mistaken in such an approach, but seeing the sermons as admonishment for past transgression and for the state of religion at the time does not afford Hooper any allowances to pursue vocation as a way to mitigate the sins which he spoke against. See J.W. Blench, *Preaching in England in the late Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries: A Study of English Sermons c.1450-1600* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964), 44-45. Davies has challenged this view by arguing that sermons could be an avenue for future change. Catherine Davies, *A Religion of the Word: The Defence of the Reformation in the Reign of Edward VI* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 89.

that Jonah had faced as he sought to avoid God's command to preach to the Ninevites. He summarised Jonah's failings as a series of six dangers which identified the ways in which disobeying the call from God not only impacted upon his own faith, but also endangered those in the boat on which he fled. Thus, the Jonah story demonstrated how one person's actions could affect others on the boat, or for Hooper's purposes, in the community. Jonah's failure to respond began in a small way, but with his continued disobedience, the situation became worse not only for Jonah but for the entire crew. Hooper was able to use the example of Jonah as a warning that small failings and coupled with a subsequent refusal to change increased the gravity of the sin and led eventually to destruction. Applying this more generally, Hooper cited Jonah to prove that disobedience, in the sense of not fulfilling one's vocation was calamitous for the community.

True to Hooper's belief in a top-down approach to reform, he maintained that it was particularly important that those in power should follow their vocation. Hooper believed that when those in authority acted according to God's Law, the people would follow their leaders.[15] The result, he anticipated, would be a community that followed God's Law. Hooper was explicit about this in the *Sermons upon Jonah*, seeking to ensure that King Edward understood the serious nature of the task that was expected of him. He wrote in the preface to the published version of his sermons, which he dedicated to Edward, that no deed "is more godly, commendable, nor profitable to the commonwealth, than to promote and set forth unto their subjects the pure and sincere religion of the eternal God".[16] Davies captures the importance of vocation by arguing that, for Hooper, fulfilling one's vocation could "transform an entire social order".[17] For the general audience, Jonah also served as a model for the common people of being called by God to fulfil a particular task.

Hooper's understanding of vocation allowed individuals to organise and measure their contribution to the community. He did not imply that one particular form of vocation was necessarily more vital than another to the successful operation

---

[15] See for instance, Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 435-437.
[16] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 435.
[17] Davies refers to the practice of preaching generally rather than Hooper's sermons on Jonah, specifically. Catherine Davies, *A Religion of the Word,* 89.

of the community. Though some vocations had more political power, like the magistrate, each person had a responsibility to fulfil his or her vocation and help the success of the community. The fulfilment of their duty was imperative, in part because it was the surest way of keeping people busy and focused on contributing to the community. For instance, bakers could be measured on their output of bread. When they filled a reasonable quota whereby their customers would not have to go without food, they had dutifully fulfilled their vocation. Although Hooper did not provide such a stark example, he hinted at this kind of correlation in his analogy with the mismanagement of a ship. He explained that, "upon every man that neglecteth his vocation, and doeth not as he is bid: as when he that should steer the rudder in a ship leaveth her to waves, he that should strike the sails, stretcheth them to more wind".[18] Likening vocation to poor handling of a ship revealed Hooper's belief that each member of the community, irrespective of social standing, had a different role and that a prosperous and reformed community was contingent upon the dutiful fulfilment of every vocation.

The naval image was certainly not a unique metaphor for either church or government. However, by making reference to both within the same ship showed how Hooper bound the concept of vocation as a religious calling to the success of the entire community. The image provided Hooper with a method of presenting a clear template to the King. If the ship were run properly, it would be successfully piloted; however, if the boat deviated from its intended course, the blame could be placed squarely on those who had not fulfilled their responsibilities and prevented the ship from sailing properly.[19] A more practical criticism was made when he laid out his views on the clergy of Edward VI's England:

> The bishops and priests unquiet the ship of this realm two manner ways [sic]; one by the neglecting of their true duty, the other by a defence of a false and damnable superstition. In the primitive and apostolical church, the office of a bishop and priest was to teach in the congregation of the faithfuls [sic] the doctrine of the prophets and apostles, according to the commandment of Christ… Now is

---

[18] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 460.
[19] Davies, *A Religion of the Word*, 155.

this integrity turned into false idolatry and devilish superstition –
to sing and say mass in the congregation of God.[20]

Thus, Hooper maintained the notion that everyone was responsible in his or her own way to ensure that the ship, representing the community, was on proper course.[21]

Hooper argued that each vocation was a calling from God. Even if a person's task was secular in nature, he argued that it was of equal importance to God's sacred calling to live faithfully. This led to the further point: not pursuing one's vocation was an offence not only against the community, but also against God. Hooper caricatured this attitude: "But a man might say, Tush! it is not so great a matter if a man walk not in his vocation, neither yet is God so much offended with disobedience."[22] He disagreed. The baker (for instance) must do his duty as a Christian not only by following the teachings of Christ but also by working diligently as a baker since both were required in order to maintain the community.[23] To reinforce the point, Hooper argued that those who did not fulfil their vocation would be subject to rebuke from the community. Hooper illustrated this by examining the actions of the mariners towards Jonah once they discovered he had fled God's call: "that these gentilish mariners rebuke Jonas of disobedience, it declareth the fault to be so great when any man leaveth his vocation, and specially the vocation of preaching, that it meriteth and is worthy to be rebuked of all men."[24] Hooper feared that not fulfilling one's vocation would also lead to strained relationships within the community and jeopardise the overall success of the Reformation. He summarised his argument in terms that condemned those in his audience who neglected their duty, whilst at the same time offering hope to those where were penitent:

> Of this in the whole we learn, that there is none so great danger,
> but that we may escape, if with penitence we return unto the Lord,
> and ask him mercy. As many Jonases therefore, as be in this
> realm, that hath and doth or falsely use or negligently contemn
> their vocation, let them acknowledge their offence, and beg

---

[20] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 460.
[21] See Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 461.
[22] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 452.
[23] For a similar example, see Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 452.
[24] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 470.

> pardon; or else doubtless, where penitent Jonas was cast a dry
> land, they shall remain for ever in the pains of hell, as Saul doth.[25]

In summary, only the faithful fulfilment of God's calling would save individuals and the community. As the people were engaged in their vocation for the success of the community, Hooper next considered how they contributed to the community's institutions, namely, the church and the government.

Church Responsibilities: Partaking of the Lord's Supper

For Hooper, the church continued to be the main channel through which people could encounter God: by partaking in the sacraments and by hearing the Word of God preached. In his *Confession*, he declared the benefit of participating in the Lord's Supper as a community: "This is the definition of the Lord's Supper. It is a ceremony instituted by Christ, to confirm and manifest our society and communion in his body and blood, until he come to judgement."[26] Hooper expressed his belief that by participating in the life of the church, the community would benefit from a collective similar religious experience. Proper styles of worship would offer a common link between members of the community and would contribute to peace. The end result was never in question for Hooper; the problem was how the parishioners were to achieve this collective experience, and here he turned his attention to the liturgical services in which the parishioners took part.[27]

---

[25] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 501-502.

[26] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 175.

[27] The intention here is not to offer a complete description of Hooper's view of the sacrament. Hooper's view on the Lord's Supper has been sufficiently explored by Newcombe who argued that Hooper's belief in the Lord's Supper was consistent with the Swiss tradition. See for instance, D.G. Newcombe, *John Hooper: Tudor Bishop and Martyr* (Oxford: The Davenant Press, 2009), 85-86. However, Ross has claimed that that Hooper may not have been in favour of the *Consensus Tigurinis* signed by Bullinger and Calvin. Donald Smith Ross, "The Role of John Hooper in the Religious Controversies of the Reign of Edward VI in England" (PhD diss., Michigan State University, 1979), 63-64. This view has been challenged by Wilson, who argues that Hooper held a favourable opinion of the *Consensus Tigurinis*. R. Paul Wilson, "John Hooper and the English Reformation under Edward VI 1547-1553," (PhD diss., Queen's University, 1994), 204-205, 222. However, both views are both partially correct and partially incorrect as can be explained by Gordon's analysis. In Gordon's reading, Bullinger himself had his own reservations about the document, but signed it for the sake of Reformed unity in Europe. Gordon, *The Swiss Reformation* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 175-176. Therefore, Hooper, if he held any reservation about the document, may have had the same misgivings as Bullinger, but endorsed it for the sake of unity. What is clear in this debate is that Hooper's position was effectively memorialist, but retained, as Bullinger had, a possibility that the partaker of the sacrament would be brought closer to God through their participation. See Newcombe, *John Hooper*, 86. Robinson, *OL*, 1:71-72.

Hooper detailed what the people gained from participating in the sacrament and to what extent their participation benefited the overall health and wellbeing of the community. In his *Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, Hooper considered the situation of Christ's disciples at the Last Supper, as recorded in the gospels.[28] His reason was clear: Hooper wanted to recreate the experiences of the disciples and highlight the effect the betrayal of Christ had on them and how they, as a community, responded to one another. Hooper breaks the event into two parts: the preparation and the administering.[29] Hooper interpreted the preparation as a general call for self-examination:

> And remember that when Christ said unto the apostles, that one of them should betray him, all were amazed at the words, and with sorrowful countenance the one beheld the other, with great fear who it should be. They heard a wonderful sin named: everyone examined his own conscience, whether it were capable of any such sin or not, and with fear demanded who it be.
>   This act of the apostles declares what every man's office is that cometh to the sermon, where by the word of God sin is accused, to examine his own conscience, and see that no such sin be in him that God condemneth by his word: if he be culpable, to repent from the bottom of his heart, and desire forgiveness.[30]

Hooper's description of the disciples' experience emphasised the horror of betraying Christ. As the disciples were unaware of who was the betrayer, each was called to examine his own conscience and to repent of any sins. Within Hooper's ideal society, such self-examination was to be repeated in each church. The sermon called the people to repentance as Christ had done to his disciples. Through their repentance, the people made amends with God and staved off the wrath of God by returning to godly living. [31] After having made personal amends with God and with one another for their sins, Hooper believed the health of the community might indeed be restored. He noted Christ's subsequent words at the Last Supper: "He exhorted them to patience, and to contemn the world; the one to love the other, and the one to bear

---

[28] Hooper referenced all accounts of the Last Supper in the gospels in Mt 26, Mk 1, and Lk 22. However, he stressed Luke's account as Hooper believed that it refuted any notion of Christ's physical presence in the Lord's Supper. See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 400-401.

[29] See Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 182-183.

[30] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 177.

[31] Hooper believed that the wrath of God was close at hand. Asking for forgiveness would satisfy God's anger of sin and spare the people from God's impending wrath. See Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 543-544.

charitably the infirmities of the other."[32] In the liturgical setting, a sermon was to parallel Christ's words, serving as a call to repentance that would re-establish charity among all. In Hooper's view the Lord's Supper unified the people by establishing a shared experience of God, Hooper believed that part of its power lay in the public confession of sin, in which parishioners asked God for forgiveness. By so doing, they were reminded together of their dependence upon God and their need, both as individuals and collectively, to live according to God's Law

Next, Hooper considered towards the administration of the meal. He examined how the disciples reacted during the breaking of the bread and to what extent this experience affected their small community. Hooper understood the breaking of the bread and the drinking of the cup to symbolise the sacrifice of Christ; they offered a reminder of the need for reliance on Christ for salvation and in godly living. Hooper wrote, "The ears of the Christian heareth that the body of Christ was given, and his blood shed, for his sins. These words, and the breaking of the bread between him and his christian brother, doth certify him that the ire of God was great against sin, that would not otherwise be satisfied than by the death of Christ, his only Son."[33] The community was again reminded of their sin and the necessity to rely fully upon Christ. The fact that Hooper made specific mention of 'brothers', showed the sacrament had a particular communal aspect in addition to its personal one.

His *Sermons upon Jonah* reflected his views on the sacrament, first echoing the opinions put forward in his *Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, but also adding some helpful clarification on how the community would benefit during the sacrament. Hooper argued that the people were to partake of the sacrament while seated.[34] Upon receiving the Lord's Supper, Hooper felt that there should be considerable thanksgiving amongst the people. Collectively, they were to be reminded of Christ's death for their sins and offer prayers for perseverance in their

---

[32] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, EW, 178.
[33] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, EW, 179.
[34] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, EW, 536. Wilson has noted that Hooper had publicly denounced kneeling at this point. However, this did not seem to preoccupy Hooper's later actions concerning Knox's objections. Hooper rejected kneeling as it implied worshiping the sacrament. He would tolerate standing, but preferred sitting. Wilson, "John Hooper and the English Reformation under Edward VI 1547-1553," 186, 201; See William Muss-Arnolt, "Puritan Efforts and Struggles, 1550-1603: A Bio-bibliographic Study," *American Journal of Theology* 23, no. 3 (1919): 346-349.

faith.[35] The community came together not only to repent of sin, but also to increase charity and fellowship. According to the model of the Last Supper, by participating in the Lord's Supper, the people would be reminded of the requirement that each individual to follow Christ through repentance. Individual repentance would develop into a shared collective participation in the church through which community problems would be mitigated by the increase in charity. Hooper thus expected parishioners to be highly participatory in the worship life of the church, specifically in the sacraments and public repentance when parishioners gathered, partook and confessed together. The church would thrive on the participation of its parishioners and serve as the fundamental pillar of societal and ecclesiastical conscience. All this was founded on the Bible, but expressed socially in the body of the church and its people.

Political Citizens

Having considered how the people could contribute to the success of the church, Hooper then turned to how the people might also support the magistrate in governing of the community. His definition of a citizen's political responsibilities in the community was deeply indebted to Bullinger. In Hooper's writings the same tone is found as in Bullinger's; in particular, they share a strong expectation that the people would obey those in office serving as God's political ministers.[36] The political activity of the people was therefore centred on obedience to the laws, but the question also arose of how they should react when the magistrate disobeyed the Law of God. Like Bullinger, Hooper employed biblical examples to support his call for obedience to magistrates as God's ministers, though he preferred to cite the Apostle Paul rather than Bullinger's references to Old Testament narratives of Moses and David. Nevertheless, the two reformers arrived at very similar conclusions. Hooper took from Paul's narrative that God had ordained certain people to hold power,

---

[35] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 537.
[36] See for instance, J.Wayne Baker, *Fountainhead of Federalism: Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenantal Tradition* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991), 9; Emidio Campi, *Shifting Patterns of Reformed Tradition* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014), 54-55.

stating emphatically that "it is the subjects' duty to obey them".[37] Paul's message reaffirmed what Christ had taught regarding giving the government its dues.

Hooper was particularly concerned with the response of the people when magistrates acted in ways or created laws that were contrary to the Law of God.[38] However, Hooper did not advocate the removal of an ungodly magistrate, arguing that even when magistrates differed from the word of God, "the subjects may not, nor, upon pain of eternal damnation, ought not, by force nor violence to resist the officer in his higher power".[39] Instead, they should fervently pray that God change the magistrate's behaviour.[40] Hooper's rationale for advocating prayer rather than resistance was that God had appointed magistrates, and only God could remove them from office. Hooper believed that God would ultimately provide for his faithful people and would, in time, liberate oppressed people from a magistrate who rejected divine laws.[41] He based this argument on the fate of Pharaoh in the book of Exodus, pointing out that because Pharaoh had tried to destroy the Israelites and their worshipping of God, God had destroyed Pharaoh's army.[42] God would similarly protect his people and overthrow any magistrates who defied him, so the people should continue to obey God's Law and pray for deliverance.

Hooper also directed that the citizens were to obey the magistrate by following the laws and decrees that they enacted. Once again he differed little from Bullinger, who had begun by referring to the divine nature of the magisterial office and emphasised that laws created by the magistrate should be obeyed in the same way as ecclesiastical ordinances.[43] As the magistrate and his laws were divine in their origin and provided the Law of God was not breached, the magistrate retained full authority over citizens for the protection and peace of the community.[44]

---

[37] Hooper, *Romans 13*, *LW*, 104; Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 196.
[38] See Robinson, *OL*, 1:66.
[39] Hooper, *Romans 13*, *LW*, 104; See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 358-359.
[40] Newcombe accounts Hooper's response to Queen Mary's accession which illustrated his commitment to Mary in spite of differences of religion. See Newcombe, *John* Hooper, 207-208. For a more general approach to ungodly magistrates who required subjects to break God's Law see Davies, *A Religion of the Word*, 160.
[41] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 78.
[42] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 78.
[43] Bullinger, *The First and Second Decade*, 390-391.
[44] Bullinger, *The First and Second Decade*, 391.

Bullinger also believed that, like the ministers of the church, the community should provide for public servants so they would not have to seek additional private employment. Bullinger firmly enshrined the view that service to the community would be funded by the people. This reflected a similar arrangement in the church. Funds would therefore be allotted to all public servants, garnered from tax and harvest. Thus, the community was to work collaboratively and the coordinating role of the government was established to provide for the needs of the public servants.

Hooper summarised his own position – though in less detail than Bullinger had done – in a brief comment upon obedience to the laws of the land in his tract on the *Ten Commandments*. He highlighted the authority of magistrates:

> Howbeit, in their realms, provinces, and jurisdictions, they may make what laws they will, and as many as they will; command them to be kept as long as it pleaseth them, and change them at their pleasure, as they shall see occasion for the wealth and commodity of their realms, as we see in all notable commonwealths among the Greeks and Romans, with other. Unto the which superior powers we owe all obedience, both of body and goods, and likewise our daily prayer for them unto Almighty God to preserve their honours in grace and quietness.[45]

He emphasised that for the people of the community, the laws imposed upon them were to be followed in all circumstances and citizens were not permitted to opt out of laws such as military service and taxation.[46] He also insisted that the people should pray regularly for the magistrates, asking for the preservation of the magistrate and that they should live godly lives. Through prayer, Hooper believed the people learned to trust God and his protection of the community, merging their collective identity with God's will. This sense of a collective identity would create a model of public accountability in which the people were to expect godly laws coming from those in power.[47] Thus, through this system of obedience and expectation, Hooper was creating a system where each would work together. If the laws were godly, obedience would be easily found throughout the commons and the same vice versa.

---

[45] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 280.
[46] See below, 205-207.
[47] In cases where the laws or behaviour of the magistrate or higher ranking official do not satisfy the expectations of the Word of God, Hooper still did not advocate resistance. See for instance, Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 359.

The people were to obey the commands of government insofar as they did not transgress the Law of God and the result would be harmony throughout the kingdom.

The Call to Arms

While Hooper's beliefs surrounding vocation and authority created normative instructions for daily life, the ever-present reality of war in his era necessitated instructions on how individuals were to behave during periods of conflict.[48] He quickly dismissed the idea that vengeance might be exacted personally.[49] Going to war was, without exception, under the guidance of the magistrate. The magistrate's right to go to war to protect the community has already been established and Hooper expected the people to respond faithfully to the magistrate's call to arms.[50] He argued that it was a citizen's duty to obey the command of the magistrate and fight for the protection of the community or to defend others from injustice.[51] The community was designed to protect itself, professional soldiers or militia following the magistrate into war was a sign not only of obedience but the love owed to one anointed by God. The obedience of the soldiers would determine the success or failure of the venture, a point illustrated by the interesting example of the Roman general Scipio Africanus.[52] Hooper argued that Scipio went to war with the mighty Hannibal because he enjoyed the deep devotion of his soldiers and he described their obedience, "For they were so obedient, that if he bade any of them fall from the top of a steeple into the water, they would not have disobeyed him."[53] Such a level of devotion was admirable in times of war because it underscored the divine office of the magistrate and ensured that the community succeeded. If the people followed their magistrate in a just war, they would be successful.[54]

---

[48] Hooper's letters to Bullinger make regular mention of wars or rumours about wars throughout Europe. See Robinson, *OL*, 1:36, 41, 52.

[49] Hooper used the example of Moses killing the Egyptian to prove that private or unilateral vigilantism was forbidden. See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 371.

[50] See above, 93.

[51] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 390-391.

[52] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 365.

[53] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 365.

[54] Hooper condemned magistrates who continued in unjust wars and argued that those who waged them would ultimately face the wrath of God. Hooper is less clear on what this meant for those who were called by the magistrate to fight it. Nevertheless, in his community, the Protestant magistrate would only engage in just wars, thus rendering a debate irrelevant. See Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 475-476.

Hooper was not unaware of the brutishness of war. Although he had never fought in a war, in his travels he would have met those who had fought or indeed led an army into battle.[55] He understood that soldiers would be required to kill their enemies in battle. However, despite the violent and gory nature of war on the battlefield, the solider was still a Christian citizen. Hooper argued that when a person was called to war, they were still expected to obey godly laws.[56] He rejected the idea that godly behaviour was suspended or inapplicable in times of war: "Contrary unto this devilish opinion, God required them to pass as true men, and not as thieves; as those that were obedient unto all honest and godly laws, and not as exempt and privileged persons from all virtues and godliness."[57] To understand Hooper's position, it is important to consider why a soldier was sent to war. A soldier was the protector of the realm and a defender of the oppressed and he must therefore demonstrate godly virtue as he restored order. This was contingent upon the magistrate instructing his soldiers to act in accordance with God's Law. If the magistrate followed godly law and commanded the same from his soldiers, they would escape divine punishment for their actions.[58]

War affected the entire community and those who were not fighting still had an important role to play in the overall success of the war effort. Hooper argued that it was imperative that those not engaged in fighting should pray, and he believed that it would make a difference: "Though he be not able to fight in the field against man, he may fight at home by prayer against the devil, that moveth war and sedition to destroy the commonwealth. Though his vocation be not to bear rule in the commonwealth, yet may he pray that God give grace to such as rule to rule well."[59] The example of Moses and during the Israelites' battle with the Amalekites provided

---

[55] As a chaplain to the Seymour family, Hooper undoubtedly would have been exposed to some second-hand experiences of war. Further, Hooper was able to relay battlefield information to Bullinger about the war in Scotland, suggesting that his contacts were exposed to war. See Robinson, *OL*, 1:43-44.

[56] Hooper argued that in just war, the act of killing was not considered murder. See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, 371. Fissell argued that in Edward's reign, the church maintained a significant player in warfare, thus lending credibility to Hooper's concerns about the morality of Christian soldiers on the battlefield. See Mark Charles Fissell, *English Warfare, 1511-1642* (London: Routledge, 2001), 58.

[57] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 290.

[58] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 365.

[59] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 184-185.

an apposite example.[60] "When he prayed, the church of Israel prevailed; when he ceased, it was put to the worst by her enemies."[61] Hooper believed that if the people prayed, God would answer their prayers. Within his grander narrative of his ideal community, when the people were engaged in prayer, they were following the Law of God and God would protect the community when they embarked upon a just cause.

In summary, Hooper believed that his community might sometimes need to engage in a just war.[62] Everyone had a part to play, whether this was to fight or to pray. The people were expected to obey the magistrate's command to go to war and fight for the preservation of their community and protect those who faced injustice.[63]

Marriage and Divorce within the Community

A more common question that also illustrates Hooper's concern for the smooth running of his godly society was the contentious topic of marriage and divorce and, specifically, the rights of women in divorce proceedings. Upon his return to England, Hooper was criticised for his views on marriage, and in particular his assertion of the right of women to divorce an unfaithful husband and remarry. Hooper told Bullinger that his views were not well received in England, complaining: "My opponents allow the husband to divorce his wife by reason of adultery, and to marry another; but they do not allow the same liberty to the wife."[64] Hooper's discussion of marriage did not deal with its definition in canon or civil law;[65] rather, he derived his views on marriage from the Bible and from his rejection of existing practices.[66] From Euler's

---

[60] Ex 17: 8-13.
[61] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 184. Hooper seemed to have interpreted the act of raising hands as an act of prayer. See Ex 17:11.
[62] See above, 91.
[63] See Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 184.
[64] Robinson, *OL*, 1:64.
[65] Hooper did however make a passing reference to Eusebius for evidence that a wife had the same right as her husband to remarry after he had proved to be unfaithful. See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 383.
[66] Bullinger had written a tract on marriage for the laity in 1540 called *Der Christlich Eestand*. Miles Coverdale translated the work into English in 1541. A second German edition was published in 1548. See Carrie Euler "Bullinger's "*Der Christlich Eestand*": Marriage and Covenant," in *Architect of Reformation: An Introduction to Heinrich Bullinger, 1504-1575*, eds. Bruce Gordon and Emidio Campi (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic Press, 2004), 256-259, 256 nn7, 10. Exactly how much influence Bullinger's views of marriage had over Hooper is debatable. There were some similarities, especially in the belief that marriage could lead to more obedient citizens. See Euler,

study of Bullinger's views on marriage, it is apparent that Hooper's understanding was not inconsistent with other Protestant views on marriage. He argued that it was a relationship between a man and a woman, marked in a publicly ceremony and existing in order to produce children and to reduce sexual promiscuity.[67] Hooper argued that such marriages were not occurring in England because individuals were entering into marriage for reasons other than those for which marriage was intended. In particular, he believed that people were entering into marriage for pure affection, without proper consent and without adhering to the proper virtuous causes Hooper described for entering into marriage.[68] Hooper also maintained a traditional view on marriage hierarchy. He affirmed the Pauline position that the man was the head of the household and had certain legal rights over his wife.[69] At the same time, he strongly advocated that women be given legal rights within the framework of the marriage.[70] He stressed that the consent of both parties was mandatory to lawfully enter into a marriage contract, and parental consent was also needed.[71] He was anxious that people should not be coerced into marriage.[72] Despite his mistrust of marriages entered into on the basis of affection, Hooper believed that marriage contracts based in consensual love would generally have better- that is to say, more

---

"Bullinger's *Der Christlich Eestand*," 261-262. The noticeable difference between the two was that Bullinger's theology of marriage, like his theology as a whole, was centred around the concept of covenant; nor does covenant theology seem to be for him an organising principle.

[67] See Euler, "Bullinger's *Der Christlich Eestand*," 269; Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 381.

[68] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 381.

[69] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 380.

[70] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 380.

[71] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 381. Hooper does not mention an age limit for consent. Bullinger had also advocated parental consent as part of the marriage. Euler, "Bullinger's *Der Christlich Eestand*," 269. Hooper also addressed the topic of interfaith marriage. Hooper argued that if the couple in the marriage refused to live together on account of their differing faith commitments, they would be permitted to divorce and remarry. Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 385. He considered this topic again in 1554 in a letter from prison addressed to a woman who encountered this issue. Based on the contents of the letter, it was apparent that this Protestant woman had married a man who now practised Catholicism. Hooper's remarks reaffirmed his earlier positions but further expanded on the subject to say that in the case that neither party would leave, they were not permitted a divorce. He furthered that the Christian person should not commit idolatry by attending the Mass and find safe refuge if they could not bear the spiritual or physical harm. See Hooper, *Letters*, 2:609-611. Consent was also required in canon law in order for the marriage to become a sacrament. It is not known if Hooper was criticising malpractice of this law or if his concerns were more generally applied. See Johanna Rickman, *Love, Lust, and License in Early Modern England: Illicit Sex and the Nobility* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 15-16; John Witte Jr., *From Sacrament to Contract: Marriage, Religion, and Law in the Western Tradition*, 2nd edition (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012), 140.

[72] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 381.

peaceful consequences - for the community than marriages forced upon one party, and in particular the woman.

Hooper also considered the topic of divorce, and which he defined very narrowly. In Hooper's view, "True divorcement is a separation and departing of man and wife from the bonds and law of matrimony, for the breaking of the faith and promise of matrimony, which made the man and the wife two in one flesh. I will not entreat of other causes of divorcements than fornication, because my book maketh no mention of any other."[73] His discussion of the process of divorce established a clear procedure for attaining a divorce and was framed in such a way that the community played a role in the proceedings with the final licence for divorce coming from the civil authorities.[74] The involvement of civil authorities in the divorce proceeding signalled Hooper's Zurich-inspired view that marriage was a matter for civil rather than ecclesiastical law.[75] In Zurich, Bullinger had argued that granting a divorce should be reserved for the magistrates.[76] Hooper followed this Zurich line.

Hooper viewed divorce as a last resort and identified several stages along the way, seeking reconciliation and prayer for God's forgiveness for the other individual.[77] First it must be established that adultery had taken place.[78] During this stage, Hooper hoped differences might be resolved in private between the husband and wife. If no reconciliation was possible, an accusation of adultery should be brought to the attention of "honest arbiters and godly friends",[79] that is, trusted individuals, such as deacons. At this stage, Hooper still hoped that the marriage might be saved through counselling and arbitration. If the differences still could not be resolved, as a final stage, the offended party was to bring the case before the

---

[73] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 382.
[74] For similarities with Zurich, see Pamela Biel, *Doorkeepers at the House of Righteousness: Heinrich Bullinger and the Clergy, 1535-1575* (New York: Peter Lang, 1991), 159-160.
[75] Hooper used the term "lawful" to describe entering into marriage. He did not use any terminology that would suggest that marriage was purely spiritual, though he did argue that God would bless a Christian marriage, and that the Bible provided a framework for healthy marriages. This was likely to distance himself from the traditionalist opinion that marriage was a sacrament. See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 380-381.
[76] Euler, "Bullinger's *Der Christlich Eestand,"* 274.
[77] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 384.
[78] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 384.
[79] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 384.

magistrates, and a proper marital court could proceed.[80] Court sessions were to be public so the people of the community might witness the proceedings and the magistrate would summon witnesses.[81] The description of these court proceedings reflect Hooper's desire that any sort of discipline should be brought in front of the community.[82] Since the community would bear witness, Hooper stressed that a public proceeding acted as a deterrent. At the conclusion of the hearing, the judge might rule to dissolve the marriage; if he did so, he would be affirming what God had already dissolved.[83]

For his time, Hooper's writings on marriage were radical because he proposed that women possessed the same rights as men to divorce their husbands when the man was guilty of adultery.[84] Nevertheless, his description of divorce proceedings highlighted the need to maintain order and public accountability in the community. By expecting couples to bring their grievances before public officials and with the court operating in the presence of citizens, there was a better chance that there would be mutual forgiveness, or that all would witness punishment being exercised against the guilty party.[85] Hooper's intention was that in cases of marital breakdown, the Law of God would be reaffirmed and the power of the magistrate recognised. This would offer the best chance of maintaining peace and order in the community during a divorce.

Living Together as a Community

Hooper also considered how people in his community might best live in harmony. Christ's example as a citizen gave Hooper the opportunity to discuss the role of the people in building society. He prefaced this by considering fair practices for agriculture and land ownership and criticising wealthy landowners for the unreasonable enclosure of land which made it very difficult for those working on that

---

[80] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, *384.*
[81] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 384.
[82] See above, 158-162.
[83] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 384.
[84] It was not until 1857 when divorce became a matter for the civil courts. Prior to this time, couples wanting to divorce had to attain a church annulment or an Act of Parliament to dissolve their marriage.
[85] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments, EW*, 384.

land to secure a living.[86] From this example, Hooper developed a model for proper neighbourly living, arguing that the way to remedy these specific injustices was to increase individual and collective engagement and participation in the community. Recognising that similar tensions might arise in any society or political system, Hooper stressed that godliness in the context of inter-personal relations was necessary for the success of the community.

His underlying assumption was that attitudes towards one's neighbour were the product of internal conviction and that these served as a test for the presence of true inner piety. Internal conviction could and should be correlated with external actions. Theologically, this gave Hooper the chance to retain good works without threatening his Protestant doctrine of justification by faith.[87] Importantly, it also allowed him to criticise those acting against his vision for society, notably those he identified as seeking to assert "a carnal liberty of the gospel".[88] For Hooper, such "carnal gospellers" were linked to Cain, the murderous brother of Abel. Commenting on God's rejection of Cain's sacrifice, Hooper wrote, "Caine, that thought God would be pleased with an external ceremony without an internal reconciliation, was openly declared to be an hypocrite, without faith or any godly motion."[89] The same condemnation, he thought, could also be applied to those who, despite their ecclesiastical or political station, caused suffering to the less fortunate. In Hooper's *Sermons upon Jonah*, he recalled the biblical story of King Ahab and Naboth's vineyard and the curse brought against Ahab by the prophet Elijah. "'Cursed be ye that join house to house, and field to field.' The experience of this curse had Ahab, that ungodly took from Naboth his vineyard."[90] Hooper drew out the modern parallel for his audience: "If these men that hath enough will not move the ship of your

---

[86] Hooper mentioned enclosures only generally in his *Ten Commandments* written in Zurich. Hooper appeared to reinforce charity and neighbourly living over critiquing any specific policy. Nevertheless, it is likely that based on Hooper's writings, he would have had a particular grievance against the enclosures crisis in Edward's reign. See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 390.
[87] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 324.
[88] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 349. Hooper was writing about why Abel's sacrifice was accepted by God and Caine was not. Hooper argued that Cain did not properly adhere to God's commandments for sacrifice. Gn 4:1-16.
[89] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 134.
[90] According to the biblical account, Ahab's wife Jezebel had plotted to kill Naboth for his vineyard which Ahab had coveted. This brought a strong condemnation from the prophet Elijah. Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 466; 1 Kgs 21:1-29.

highness's commonwealth, let them leave their ravening, and give God thanks for that they have, and to their ability help, and not rob the poor."[91] For all those in the community, regardless of their status, their conscience should generate positive actions towards others. Hooper believed that inter-personal relationships were determined by the fact that the community was homogeneous in faith and united by a common set of social principles which deemed public participation essential for the establishing of a godly society. In consequence, those who abstained from such a collective responsibility were to be excluded from the community. In particular, Hooper viewed the Anabaptists as outsiders who were not part of the community, and whose presence ran counter to its wellbeing.[92] While he opposed their doctrines, Hooper's primary concern with the Anabaptists was their rejection of the communal responsibilities necessary for a reformed community. His vision for daily interaction in the community can best be understood by examining his attacks on the Anabaptists.

Hooper feared an Anabaptist upsurge in England probably because he had witnessed Anabaptism in Zurich as late as 1549.[93] Though English Anabaptists had different origins to those in Zurich, Hooper remained concerned about a rise of Anabaptism in England, often describing English fringe groups with considerable severity, and probably exaggerating his fears.[94] Some of Hooper's harshest criticisms were expressed in 1549, in a letter written from London to Bullinger, through whom he probably first learned his aversion to the movement:

> How dangerously our England is afflicted by heresies of this kind,
> God only knows; I am unable indeed from sorrow of heart to
> express to your piety. There are some who deny that man is endued
> with a soul different from that of a beast, and subject to decay.
> Alas! not only are those heresies reviving among us which were
> formally dead and buried, but new ones are springing up every day.
> There are such libertines and wretches, who are daring enough in

---

[91] Hooper, *Sermons upon* Jonah, *EW*, 466.
[92] See above, 57-58.
[93] Robinson, *OL*, 1:65. MacCulloch has argued that Anabaptism in England was of a different variety to the Anabaptism Hooper would have known in Zurich. The Anabaptists in Essex and Kent were largely Dutch rather than German. MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (London: Yale University Press, 1996), 145-146. For a treatment on Joan Burcher see Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, 475-477.
[94] Robinson, *OL,* 1*:*66.

their conventicles not only to deny that Christ is the Messiah and Savior of the world, but also to call that blessed Seed a mischievous fellow and deceiver of the world. On the other hand, a great portion of the kingdom so adheres to the popish faction, as altogether to set at nought God and the lawful authority of the magistrates; so that I am greatly afraid of a rebellion and civil discord.[95]

Hooper believed that Anabaptists held heretical views about Christ. He followed Bullinger's belief in the perpetual virginity of Mary which underscored the divine nature of Christ's conception, and affirmed his divinity.[96] Such a fundamental disagreement on matters of doctrine led Hooper to assert that Anabaptist opinions, as he understood them, were not to be permitted in the community. Hooper considered Anabaptists to be neither Protestant nor capable of living according to the Law of God.

Hooper believed that Anabaptists would exclude themselves from the major spheres of authority in the community.[97] On account of their heretical beliefs, Hooper argued that the Anabaptists would not take communion with those in the Church of England, and were therefore separate from the Church.[98] Hooper wanted the community to develop a self-disciplining unity, and the existence of a clearly defined group separate from the church would jeopardise his entire project.[99] Hooper feared even more that heretical ideas might infiltrate the Church of England and prevent people living according to God's Law. The Anabaptists never gained the political backing of those in authority in England, they were nonetheless a dangerous alternative to Hooper's desire for a united religion and society.

Having argued that the Anabaptists should be expelled because they challenged his vision of a homogeneous community, Hooper gave a particularly defined and narrow view of good neighbourly living. In his *Sermons upon Jonah* he considered what good could be gained by interactions within the Christian body.

---

[95] Robinson, *OL*, 1:66.
[96] Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's* Book, *EW*, 161. Hooper criticised the opinion of Helvidius (c.380) who argued that Mary bore more than one child. This suggests that Hooper believed as Bullinger in Mary's perpetual virginity. See Bullinger, *The First and Second Decade*, 133. However, he likely inherited the idea from Zwingli. See W.P. Stephens, *The Theology of Huldrych Zwingli* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 62.
[97] See Robinson, *OL*, 1:66.
[98] See Hooper, *An Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 245-246.
[99] See above, 62.

Here he returned to his discussion of Christ in the Last Supper and how the disciples were brought to right order with God and each other.[100] By collectively participating, they were able to enter into a state of thanksgiving where those in the community would be drawn together by their mutual love for Christ. Through sharing the sacrament, Hooper argued that people were caught up in a natural expression of joy in Christ, in which they would pray and encourage one another to continue in their walk of faith and to provide for the poor.[101] That is, he believed that through the Lord's Supper a proper love of God would translate into the right sort of inter-personal actions and the people would be able to maintain their responsibility for godly living within the community.[102]

Hooper also developed a more rigorous schema to govern all actions which he summarised in his commentary on the tenth commandment. Godly society, he believed, was the opposite of covetousness:

> As much as is necessary for man to live an upright and godly life
> in this world, both towards God and man, is repeated in the nine
> commandments afore, if they be observed according to their
> institution, and mind of Almighty God, the giver of the same: as
> he desireth all the external acts of man to extend unto the glory of
> God, and utility of our neighbour...[103]

He suggested that envy was the cause of sins against one's neighbour and that an offence against one's neighbour, like bearing false witness against them, was also an offence against God.[104] In this way, internal faith was linked to external action. Internal convictions would naturally breed positive action towards the community. The connection between the internal and the external relationship was explained, "Therefore this is true, that the ordinance of God still remaineth in the justified man immutable, that he must obey the law, and serve in his vocation according to the scripture; that the exterior facts may bear testimony of the inward reconciliation."[105] External actions which benefitted the community would flow from internal faith. If

---

[100] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 536.
[101] Hooper, *Sermons upon Jonah*, *EW*, 537.
[102] See Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 339-340.
[103] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 409.
[104] Hooper, *Ten Commandments*, *EW*, 405.
[105] Hooper, *Christ and His Office*, *EW*, 95.

people were in the right spiritual state, this would naturally breed good inter-personal relationships.

Conclusion

The actions of the average citizen in the community were integral to the community's success, though they were not the primary focus for Hooper's reforms. This was because Hooper believed that those in power were to implement reform by law and action. Many of Hooper's writings merely left citizens obeying the demands made by those in superior offices. Once the Reformation was implemented, the people would fully embrace the change. It was only when the authorities' plans for full reform went awry that problems occurred. Even then, Hooper largely ignored the people. While unapologetically magisterial and hierarchical, Hooper understood that the nature of community meant that all members would have to participate in their own way to contribute to society. He looked to the life of Christ to provide an example that the people could follow in their duty to God, the community and to others. From the life of Christ, Hooper sought to explain how the people might prove useful members of society through their contributions to the health and success of the community.

Hooper believed that the people would be most beneficial to the godly society when they followed their true vocation. By fulfilling their true vocation, they would be less idle, resulting in less time by which they might partake in sinful activity. Hooper insisted that members of the community were not to rebel against their superiors and when the community was in peril from unjust and ungodly rulers it would be the people's prayers to God that would deliver them. Women were held to the same standards as men regarding their spiritual obligation to live a godly life. While women were still primarily restricted to the household for his age, Hooper was relatively progressive in his treatment of women. In summary, the people formed the backbone of the community. Hooper stressed that hard work, obedience and faith following the life of Christ would encourage their leaders to respond with the same justice and faith and would be fundamental to the success of the reformation of the community.

Conclusion

The Downfall of John Hooper

Unfortunately, Hooper's dreams could not be realised, as Edward's death signified the passing of any chance for Hooper's vision for a godly community to take hold in England. Hooper was one of the first to be arrested under the new regime of Mary I. He was not the first to perish during the Marian persecutions, but quickly became acquainted with the hardship of prison. He conveyed the sense of loss at the death of Edward VI as a sort of apocalyptic destruction, not only of his ideas, but of English Protestantism as well:

> These pretensed and pale hypocrites have stirred the
> earthquakes, that is to wit, the princes of the world, against
> Christ's church, and have also darkened the sun, and made the
> moon bloody, and have caused the stars to fall from heaven;
> that is to say, have darkened with mists, and daily do darken
> (as ye hear by their sermons) the clear sun of God's most pure
> word: the moon, which be God's true preachers, which fetch
> only light at the sun of God's word, are turned into blood,
> prisons, and chains, that their light cannot shine unto the world
> as they would…[1]

Hooper's words, written from the Fleet prison in 1554 as Mary and her advisors were pressing on with a return to Catholicism, suggest that he was resigned to the fact that it was increasingly unlikely that he would ever be able to institute the reforms on the scale that had inspired his earlier writings. Hooper had undergone humiliation and suffering at the hands of the new authorities, and he probably expected that his death was imminent. He was burned at the stake, in what Foxe described as a particularly long and drawn-out death, in Gloucester on 9 February 1555.[2] The ending of Hooper's life as one of the most high-profile martyrs of the Marian burnings had a profound impact on how he would be understood by subsequent generations.

---

[1] Hooper, *Letters*, 2:591; Rv 6:12.
[2] Foxe, *AM,* 6: 658; D.G. Newcombe, *John Hooper: Tudor Bishop and Martyr* (Oxford: The Davenant Press, 2009), 228.

Hooper's Godly Community

Hooper's vision for a godly community appeared to fade after his martyrdom. However, this disappearance might be more apparent than real. During the troubles at Frankfurt am Main in 1555, one group, drawing on Hooper's theology, were less inclined to support the Calvinist position.[3] Reformers such as Edmund Grindal (c.1516-1583), John Jewel (1522-1571), and Richard Cox (c.1500-1581) warmed to Bullinger during their exile and brought a second generation of Bullinger's influence in England under Queen Elizabeth. This may have helped to preserve Hooper's ideas, mediated through Bullinger.[4] Personal antagonisms from Edward's reign may have become submerged by Hooper's posthumous reputation as a Marian martyr.

The realisation of Hooper's godly community was bound up with the office of the magistrate; however, in its conception, his community was geared towards following God and living a godly life by acting in accordance with the Ten Commandments. While Hooper believed that a person's salvation ultimately rested upon divine providence, the pursuit of a godly life could be achieved using the template for a godly community. He did not envisage the community as a means to save the soul; however the community could be used to decrease a person's propensity to sin. Thus, the community, bonded together by godly intentions, would produce godly citizens. The desire for the community was largely the product of how Hooper understood God's favour and disapproval of human actions. His notion of God was one whose righteousness created an inability to tolerate sin; but whose mercy provided the means to salvation through Christ and the path for godly living through the Ten Commandments. Thus, Hooper sought to create a society designed to avert God's wrath and the peace and security of a godly people supported.

---

[3] As Dawson has discovered, John Knox was interpreting Hooper's experience in the vestment controversy to suit his own agenda within months of Hooper's martyrdom. What makes Knox's reinterpretation of Hooper's experience all the more intriguing was that it is quite likely that Anna and Rachel Hooper were in attendance and listening to Knox, as they had fled to Strasbourg. Jane E.A. Dawson, *John Knox* (London: Yale University Press, 2015), 101. Recently discovered new material illuminates the roles of key players within the Frankfurt controversy and demonstrates the importance of Grindal, Jewel and Cox. Jane E.A. Dawson, "Letters from Exile: Documents of the Marian Exile," The University of Edinburgh, http://www.marianexile.div.ed.ac.uk/documents/documents.shtml (accessed 26 August 2016).
[4] For an assessment of the Edwardian legacy see Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (London: Allen Lane, 1999), 157-222.

The strength that Hooper found in his vision was its commitment to modelling what he read in the Bible and believed had been practised by the early Church. The Bible was the revealed word of God and had been made plainly available for humanity, so that they might come to understand God's expectations for human behaviour. The early Church had best understood the biblical message. Hooper found the quintessential expression of God's designs for human behaviour in the Ten Commandments. His preference for the Ten Commandments was simple: they had been given by God directly to his people and contained the actions necessary for a harmonious relationship with God and fellow citizens. Constructing a society that best exemplified the instructions of God as expressed through the Ten Commandments was therefore the foundation for Hooper's conception of godly living within a community.

Hooper's preference was for a strong godly magistrate, even one who did not share his values. In Hooper's view, the magistrate was called to the office by God and served as God's representative in the community's temporal affairs. This suggests that Hooper was not the radical that he has been labelled: he affirmed the need for a strong government intervention to accomplish his reforms. The magistrate was also the person responsible for making the Ten Commandments a reality in the society being governed. The link between the Ten Commandments and the magistrate lay in the laws that the magistrate enacted. Hooper never argued for one form of government over another because he respected that different areas preferred different political structures. Recognising the resulting differences in political climate, he believed that the magistrates had some leeway in creating laws that best suited their own political situation. Despite the freedom of interpretation that Hooper was prepared to give the magistrate, he did not waver from the position that laws must convey the spirit of the Ten Commandments. The Commandments and the laws that derived from them, in whatever form they were presented for the community, were to outline godly behaviour and existed to govern relationships that would honour God and satisfy God's expectations for godly living.

Since these laws were to govern behaviour and provide a framework for godly living, Hooper argued that they needed to be rigorously enforced. It was hoped

that living within a Christian community would inspire citizens to embrace godly living. However, it was recognised that some would break those godly laws; therefore, to maintain the integrity of the laws, Hooper affirmed that the magistrate had to punish transgressors. He suggested that such punishment was best copied from God's interactions with the Israelites from Moses onwards. God's punishments both punished the sin but, of equal importance, also brought remorse and a desire to return to living within the parameters of God's requirement for godly living. There were times when the person would not reform and needed to be removed by various means from the community, and, in such cases, Hooper argued that the magistrate, who acted as God's hand of justice over the body, might use capital punishment to restore the health of the community. Punishment, and the magistrate's right to punish, were therefore necessary to maintain order. Hooper had a tremendous fear that the inadequate use of punishment would create instances in which sins were not dealt with in the correct manner. The fear of sedition and rebellion was always present for Hooper, but the greater danger was that if the magistrate allowed sin to continue unchecked, God would intervene and bring about the destruction of the community.

Hooper linked punishment with a broader sense of responsibility: vocation. Everyone, irrespective of their social standing, had a God-given vocation. Vocation, as far as it was considered in the context of his envisioned community, was secular in practice, but was also a calling from God to ensure that society could function. Hooper put forward this idea most prominently in his *Sermons upon Jonah* to the leading officials at the English Court. He believed that if everyone worked hard at the task to which they were called, the community, which he compared to a ship, would sail on course. When individuals did not do their duty, the ship would be adrift. Underpinning the talk of communal success through completing one's vocation was Hooper's real fear about idleness. He was afraid that when people had too much leisure they would fall into the entrapments of sin. Therefore, by working diligently for both spiritual and communal prosperity, Hooper emphasised that the success of the community (apart from official governance) rested upon the hard work of its citizens. Such an awareness of their potential contribution no doubt helped encourage citizens to contribute positively to the success of the community.

Not lost on Hooper was the need for the community to create moral citizens, a task which, in his view, largely fell to the church. He believed that the church ministers, and also their families, should be the preeminent examples of proper social behaviour and action. This formed part of Hooper's general assumption that his church should resemble the early Church. He even extended this requirement to church buildings by proposing that buildings should reflect simplicity, a key value in his understanding of Protestantism, and that they should display the supremacy of the gospel. He argued that ministers should become exemplars of living, in accordance with the Ten Commandments and the magistrates' laws. Such a requirement demonstrated that Hooper intended all facets of life to contribute to the image of a godly community. Moreover, he wanted to create a series of expectations that were recognisable to fellow citizens and could be believed and lived out by them. In this way, a relationship of accountability would be established between citizens and their minister; this also ensured that the minister was active in the community. Hooper's hope was that, if the minister were to preach and live out godly reform, the people would follow suit. Importantly, the church would be the central location in which the gospel of Christ was preached and the sacraments received. If done properly, this ensured the church would remain a part of the true church of God. When this status was under threat, Hooper argued that the bishop should play a supervisory role in ensuring that correct doctrine was followed and dispensing ecclesiastical discipline where it was warranted. When issues arose amongst ministers regarding the understanding of the Bible, Hooper saw the relationship between the church and government as an asset. By having the magistrate settle ecclesiastical disputes, they could be resolved in a unified manner and enforced by the magistrate's laws. Appearing united would create the image of a truly comprehensive reformation in the community and would encourage people to live out their Protestant faith in obedience to their superiors, as well as in more proactive areas, such as caring for the poor.

Analysis of Hooper's Ideas

Queen Mary and her regime strove to abandon Protestantism by royal prerogative, and this indicates the weakness of Hooper's over-reliance on central authority. His

writings did warn that if the nation did not conform to godly living, God would bring about destruction, but these warnings seen to have been based on the assumption that England would not introduce reform. Hooper's reforms would enjoy success only as long as the ruler acted in accordance with his plans. When the magistrate did not, the limitations of Hooper's vision were dangerously exposed. The magistrate was able to determine the success or failure of the reformation community. Despite the ultimate failure of Hooper's ideas, his vision for a godly community offered an ambitious and idealistic glimpse into the hopes and aspirations of what a community, reformed by the leadership of God and magistrate, might offer. Furthermore, it resolved many of the social problems that Hooper believed were caused by a lack of godly living.

In the context of his views on centralised power, the way in which Hooper argued that power should be dispensed in society was significant. This was manifested in two ways: in the supremacy of God and in the offices of the magistrate and (to a lesser extent) the clergy. First, Hooper believed that God was ultimately and supremely in control over all humanity. As such, God had gradually allowed representative power to be assumed by the magistrate and the church. It is not clear how much power Hooper was prepared to allow the people; however, for the initiation of a Protestant community, Hooper believed that power was best centralised because achieving reformation was a difficult struggle with many averse to change and was unlikely to be popular. By centralising power, the principles of the reform might overcome this initial opposition. Hooper's community exercised centralised power through the offices of the magistrate and the church, and he saw cooperation between the two offices as essential to the success of the Reformation. The magistrates had the power to create laws and to punish those who sought to oppose them and similar authority was employed by the church. Through his power to oversee ministers and regulate their preaching, Hooper was able, as Bishop of Gloucester and later Worcester, to introduce reform and discipline those who diverged from the reformed programme that he had proposed. The magistrates would be bound by the laws they created and the clergy were expected to model the behaviour that they were trying to create. Hooper believed that behaving correctly was the evidence that the people would look for in their superiors to validate the reforms being advocated. In this way, the people would become obedient citizens.

The relationship between Hooper and Bullinger, and specifically how Bullinger influenced Hooper's development of his concept of a community is also significant for understanding Hooper's view of the godly community. Rather than including a systematic evaluation of Bullinger's theological influence upon Hooper, this thesis has restricted its comparison to the reforms that Hooper proposed. It has become apparent that Hooper adopted Bullinger's strong biblical narrative as his own template for reform and as the foundation the reformed community. Like Bullinger, Hooper believed that a strong magistrate must spearhead the reformation of the community; they also shared the view that the magistrate had the key role of translating the Ten Commandments into laws that were relevant to the community. Like Bullinger, Hooper also stressed that the magistrate must demonstrate godly behaviour to the community. In comparing the two reformers' ideas, it is clear they generally approached the shaping of the reformed community from the same perspective. There were however some difference between Hooper and Bullinger in their ecclesiastical reforms. Hooper has always been considered a Zurich sympathiser in his sacramental theology but he took a different approach to the duties of the clergy. Hooper was probably less clerically minded than Bullinger, as can be seen in their discussions of the tasks of the church and its ministers. While Hooper maintained most of what he had learned at Zurich, there were differences in execution that indicated that he had developed some independent ideas. This conclusion aligns itself with Newcombe's assessment that Hooper can neither be too removed from Bullinger's ideas nor can too much of Bullinger's ideas be relied upon to understand Hooper.[5]

Limitations of the Study

Underpinning any analysis of Hooper's writings and the implications of his ideas is the difficulty of the limited time during which he could develop and express them. Any chance for his ideas about the reformation of the community to take hold in England quickly vanished after Edward VI's death. Despite Hooper's seemingly inexhaustible work ethic, the destruction of the Protestant regime in England after the

---

[5] D.G. Newcombe, *John Hooper: Tudor Bishop and Martyr (c.1495-1555)* (Oxford: The Davenant Press, 2009), 123.

death of Edward VI left little chance for any of the reforms that he had manged to institute to produce a lasting effect. Therefore, it is difficult to measure the impact of Hooper's writings. For that reason, this study has concentrated upon Hooper's writings rather than seeking to assess the success of his ideas in England.

Hooper was a learned minister, rather than a sound political theorist, who looked for spiritual answers to political problems. In this, he was not unique: many of his fellow clergy were active commentators on the politics of the realm. Hooper believed that God had given humanity a template by which they could live in peace and proper obedience. He was less concerned about political pragmatism, for as long as the Bible was truly preached and godly laws enacted, the goals of his community would be achieved. This left many political questions to be answered; however, such political concerns were not part of Hooper's remit. He was a minister who looked to what he understood best for living a godly life and this was the crux of his vision for the Reformation.

Implications for Hooper Research

Recent Hooper scholarship has sought to rescue his reputation from the charges of radicalism and puritanism, arguing that there was more to Hooper than a man opposed to vestments, and considering Hooper's independent contribution to reform. Two categories of future study suggest themselves: theology and historical legacy. This thesis has uncovered a thought-through programme for a reformed community; as a result, a need to provide a complete systematic theological account has become apparent. Hooper's theological position needs to be assessed alongside others, including his mentor Heinrich Bullinger, to see how far his beliefs accorded with the broader trends of European theology. This thesis has highlighted some differences with Bullinger, but a more robust treatment of Hooper's theology might place Hooper's theological positions more precisely and furnish an alternative viewpoint when assessing his goals for reform.

Within a broader context, this thesis has considered how an influential reformer such as Hooper had a profound vision of the Reformation church and society. Modern scholarship has stressed the need to consider various voices in the

reformations in England, and one way to hear these voices is to examine how individual reformers conceived of a Protestant community. Like Hooper, a number of the leading English clergy accepted *The Book of Common Prayer* with varying degrees of enthusiasm. Though full agreement with the liturgy was not universal, its great strength, and the secret of its success, was that it provided a workable and unifying document for the Church of England. The uniformity of liturgical practice disguised the particular views held by individual clergymen, whether Lutheran, Calvinist, or Zwinglian, or lying outside the magisterial Reformation tradition like the Anabaptists. The investigation of such a variety and multiplicity of views in the reign of Edward VI and beyond might reveal more about how the architects of the Reformation in England envisioned their country as a Protestant nation. This would enhance the understanding of the richness of religious, social, and political ideas that existed in England and perhaps more significantly reveal on which issues these men were willing to compromise in the pursuit of their common goal. Such an understanding might also offer a model for contemporary ecclesiology and ecumenical pursuits.

In conclusion, this thesis adds yet another dimension to the complex figure that was John Hooper, one-time Bishop of Gloucester and Worcester, and friend of Heinrich Bullinger. That his vision for reform was never realised is less significant than the fact that Hooper had a vision of what a Protestant community might look like. He believed that it could be achieved through obedience and everyone's faithful execution of their vocation. He was sure that his template would give the community leadership and the necessary strengths to protect the Protestantism that he held dear. Moreover, it provided an effective model for the people to adopt the Protestant message and participate in a godly community. The stress upon participation was one of the strengths of Hooper's vision, because he sought to engage fully all groups within society. With his ambitious agenda he assumed everyone would be responsible for the success of the Reformation and of the entire community.

Had King Edward VI lived longer, it is possible that Hooper's ideas would have been further developed and might have received more serious consideration by his contemporaries. Exactly what that reformation might have looked like is difficult

to tell, but the King was a great admirer of Hooper and as an adult might have been prepared to implement his vision more fully. What this thesis can say with certainty was that Hooper's template for a godly community was intended to operate within existing social and political structures. This realisation raises serious questions as to whether Hooper intended to be the radical that he has been portrayed in the past. Hooper was the most significant voice amongst the group of English reformers who were convinced by the Reformation programme in Zurich and believed its vision could take hold in Tudor England. Hooper's template for a godly community expressed the hopes of a period during which reformers like Hooper believed that the success of the Reformation could thrive through cooperation with a godly civil power. However, as Hooper found under Queen Mary, this reliance upon magisterial authority also brought with it problems and dangers.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

a Lasco, John. "Large Emden Catechism of the Strangers' Church, London (1551)." In *Reformed Confessions of the 16th and 17th Centuries in English Translation*, vol.1: *1523-1552*, compiled with introductions by James T. Dennison, 584-642. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2008.

a Lasco, John. "London Confession of John a Lasco (1551)." In *Reformed Confessions of the 16th and 17th Centuries in English Translation*,vol.1: *1523-1552*, compiled with introductions by James T. Dennison, 552-583. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2008.

Augustinus, Aurelius, and R. W. Dyson. *The City of God against the Pagans: Book I-XIII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Becon, Thomas. *The Catechism of Thomas Becon S.T.P. chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer, prebendary of Canterbury: With Other Pieces Written by Him in the Reign of Edward the Sixth*, edited by John Ayre. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844.

Bettenson, Henry, ed. *Documents of the Christian Church*. Second edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Bradford, John. *The Writings of John Bradford, M.A. Martyr, 1555: Containing Letters, Treaties, Remains*, edited by Aubrey Townsend. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1853.

Bray, Gerald, ed. *Documents of the English Reformation*. Cambridge: James Clarke and Co., 1994.

Brodie, R.H and H.C. Maxwell Lyte. *Calendar of the patent rolls preserved in the Public Record Office. Prepared under the superintendence of the deputy keeper of the records for the reign of Edward VI 1547-1553*. 5 vols. London: HMSO, 1924-1926.

Bromiley, G.W., trans. and ed. *Zwingli and Bullinger*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953.

Brown, Rowdon, ed. *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts existing in the archives and collections of Venice and in other libraries of Northern Italy*, vol. 5: *1534-1554*. London: Longman and Co., 1873.

Bullinger, Heinrich. "A Brief Exposition of the One and Eternal Covenant of God." In *Fountainhead of Federalism*, translated and edited by J. Wayne Baker and Charles McCoy, 101-138. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991.

Bullinger, Heinrich. *Bullinger's Decades in Four Volumes*, translated by H.I, edited by Thomas Harding. 4 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1848-1852.

Bullinger, Heinrich. "The Old Faith, an Evident Probacion out of the Holy Scripture, that the Christen Faith (Which is the Right, True, Old and Undoubted Faith) Hath Endured Sens the Beginnyng of the Worlde)." In *Writings and Translations of Bishop Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter*, originally translated by Miles Coverdale; edited by George Pearson, 1-83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844.

Bullinger, Heinrich and John Calvin. "Agreement of the Ministers of the Church of Zurich and of John Calvin, Minister of the Church of Geneva, on the Subject of the Sacrament (*Consensus Tigurinis* 1549)." In *Reformed Confessions of the 16th and 17th Centuries in English Translation*, vol. 1: *1523-1552*, compiled with introductions by James T. Dennison, 538-545. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2008.

Church of England, and Joseph Ketley, eds. *The Two Liturgies, A.D. 1549 and A.D. 1552: With Other Documents Set Forth by Authority in the Reign of King Edward VI*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844.

Cranmer, Thomas. *Miscellaneous Writings of Letters of Thomas Cranmer Archbishop of Canterbury*, edited by John Edmund Cox. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844, 1846.

Dasent, John Roche, ed. *Acts of the Privy* Council, New Series, vols. 2-4: *1547-1554*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1890-1892.

Erasmus, Desiderius and R.A.B Mynors. *The Collected Works of Erasmus*. 10 vols. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.

Foxe, John. *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe: With a Life of the Martyrologist, and Vindication of the Work*, edited by George Townsend. 8 vols. London: Seeley, Burnside and Seeley, 1843-1849.

Frere, W.H. and W.P.M. Kennedy. *Visitation Articles and Injunctions*. London: Longmans, Green, 1910.

Gardiner, Stephen. *The Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, edited by James Arthur Muller. 1933; reprint, Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press Publishers. 1970.

Gorham, George Cornelius, ed. *Gleanings of a Few Scattered Ears during the Period of the Reformation in England and of the Times Immediately Succeeding A.D. 1533-A.D.1588.* London: Bell and Daldy, 1857.

Grane, Leif, ed. *Augsburg Confession: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publising, 1987.

Grindal, Edmund. *The Remains of Edmund Grindal, D.D.: Successively Bishop of London and Archbishop of York and Canterbury*, edited by Rev. William Nicholson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1843.

Hooper, John. *An Answer unto my lord of wynchesters booke intytyled a detection of the devyls Sophistrye wherewith he robbith the unlearnyd people of the trew byleef in the moost blessyd sacrament of the aulter made by Johann Hoper*. (Zurich, 1549). [*Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, *EW*, 97-247.]

Hooper, John. *A Declaration of Christe and of his offyce compylyd by Johan Hopper*. (Zurich, 1547). [*A Declaration of Christ and His Office*], *EW*, 1-96.Hooper, John. *A declaration of the ten holy com[m]aundementes of allmyghte God wroten Exo. 20. Deu. 5. Collectyd out of the scripture Canonicall, by Joanne Hopper*. (Zurich, 1549). [*A Declaration of the Ten Holy Commandments of Almighty* God, *EW*, 249-430.]

Hooper, John. *Earlier Writings of Bishop Hooper: Together With His Letters and Other Pieces*, Translated by Rev. Samuel Carr. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1853. [Cited *EW*].

Hooper, John. *An Exposition upon the 23. psalme of David full of frutefull and comfortable doctrin, written to the Citye of London by John Hooper, bushop of Gloceter and Worceter, and holy Martyr of God for the testimonye of hys truth*. (London: 1562). [*Expositions of Psalms XXIII., LXII., LXXIII., and LXXVII*, *LW*, 176-373.]

Hooper, John. *Godly and most necessary Annotations in y xiii Chapter too the Romaynes: Set furth by the right vigilant Pastor, Jho[n] Hoper, by gods calling, Busshop of Gloucestre*. (Worcester: 1551). [*Annotations on Romans XIII*, *LW*, 93-116.]

Hooper, John. *A godly Confession and protestacion of the Christian faith, made and set furth by Jhon Hooper, wherein is declared what a Christian manne is bound to beleve of God, hys King, his neibour, and hym-selfe*. (London: 1550). [*A Godly Confession and Protestation of the Christian Faith*, *LW*, 64-92.]

Hooper, John. *Later Writings of Bishop Hooper: Together With His Letters and Other Pieces*. Translated by Rev. Charles Nevison. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1852. [cited *LW*].

Hooper, John. *An Oversighte and deliberacion upon he holy prophet Jonas: made, and uttered before the kings maiesty, and his honourable councell, by Jhon Hoper in lent last past Comprehended in Seuen Sermons*. (London: 1550). [*An Oversight and Deliberation upon the Holy Prophet Jonas*, *EW*, *431*-560.]

Hooper, John. *A true Coppey of Bishop Hooper's Visitation Booke made by him in Anno Dom.1551,1552*. (Worcester: 1552). [*Copy of Visitation* Book, *LW*, 117-156.]

Hughs, Paul H. and James F Larkin, eds. *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, vol. 1*: The early Tudors*, *1485-1553*. London: Yale University Press, 1964.

Hume, Martin A.S. and Royall Tyler, eds. *Calendar of Letters, Despatches, and State Papers, Relating to the Negotiations between England and Spain, Preserved in the Archives at Vienna, Simancas, and elsewhere*, vols. 9-11: *Edward VI, 1547-1553*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1912-1916.

Jordan, W.K., ed. *The Chronicle and Political Papers of King Edward VI*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1966.

Journals of the House of Lords, vol. 1: *Beginning Anno Primo Henrici Octavi, 1513-1577*. London: Parliamentary Archives, 1773.

Knighton, C.S., ed. *Calendar of State Papers Domestic Series of the reign of Edward VI 1547-1553*. Revised edition. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1992.

Latimer, Hugh. *The Sermons by Hugh Latimer, Sometime Bishop of Worcester, Martyr, 1555*, edited by George Elwes Corrie. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844.

Latimer, Hugh. *The Sermons and Remains of Hugh Latimer*, edited by George Elwes Corrie. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1845.

Lever, Thomas. *Sermons 1550*, edited by Edward Arber. London: Bloomsbury, 1871.

Nichols, John Gough, ed. *Literary Remains of Edward VI Edited from his Autograph Manuscripts with Historical Notes, and a Biographical Memoir*. 2 vols. New York: Burt Franklin, 1857.

Nichols, John Gough, ed. *The Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London*. London: Camden Society, 1852.

Nichols, John Gough, ed. *The Chronicle of Queen Jane, and of Two Years of Queen Mary, and Especially of the Rebellion of Thomas Wyat*. London: Camden Society, 1850.

Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation Written During the Reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Mary: chiefly from the archives of Zurich, edited by Hastings Robinson. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for the Parker Society, 1846-1847.

Poullain, Vallerandus. "Confessions of the Glastonbury Congregation (1551)." In *Reformed Confessions of the 16th and 17th Centuries in English Translation*, vol. 1: *1523-1552*, compiled with introductions by James T. Dennison, 645-662. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2008.

Parker, Matthew. *Correspondence of Matthew Parker, D.D. Archbishop of Canturbury Comprising Letters Written Letters Written by and to Him, From A.D. 1535 to His Death, A.D. 1575*, edited by John Bruce and Thomas Thomason Perowne. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1853.

Philpot, John. *Examinations and Writings of Archdeacon Philpot*, B.C.L. Martyr, *1555*, edited by Robert Eden. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for the Parker Society, 1842.

Ridley, Nicholas. *The Works of Nicholas Ridley Sometime Bishop of London*, edited by Henry Christmas. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1843.

Robinson, Hastings, ed. *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation Written During the Reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Mary 1537-1558*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1846, 1847.

Robinson, Hastings, ed. *The Zurich Letters Comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and Queens with Some of the Helvetian Reformers During the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1842, 1845.

Rymer, Thomas, ed. *Foedera*, vol. 15:*1543-1586*. Burlington: TannerRitchie Publishing and the University of St. Andrews, 2007.

Schleitheim Confession, edited and translated by John H. Yoder. Scottdale, Pennsylvania: Herald Press, 1977.

Southwell, P. "Charter of King Edward VI, Granting the Church of the Augustine Friars, London to Foreign Protestant Refugees." In *Austin Friars: history of the Dutch Reformed Church in London 1550-1950*, edited by J. Lindeboom and translated by D. de Ionge, 198-203. The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1950.

Spalding, James C., ed. *The Reformation of the Ecclesiastical Laws of England, 1552*. Kirksville, Missouri: Northeast Missouri State University, 1992.

Tanner, J.R., ed. *Tudor Constitutional Documents A.D. 1585-1603: With an Historical Commentary*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930.

Turnbull, William B., ed. *Calendar of State Papers Foreign Series of the Reign of Edward VI: 1547-1553*. London: Longman, Green, Longman, & Roberts, 1861.

Wriothesley, Charles. *A Chronicle of England During the Reigns of the Tudors from 1485-1559*, edited by William Douglas Hamilton. 2 vols. Westminster: J.B. Nichols and Sons, 1875.

Zwingli, Ulrich, Samuel Macauley Jackson, and William John Hinke. *On Providence and Other Essays*. 1922; reprint, Durham, North Carolina: Labyrinth Press, 1983.

Zwingli, Ulrich, Samuel Macauley Jackson, and Clarence Nevin Heller. *Commentary on True and False Religion*. 1928; Reprint, Durham, North Carolina: The Labyrinth Press, 1981.

Secondary Literature

Alford, Stephen. *Edward VI (Penguin Monarchs): The Last Boy King*. London: Allen Lane, 2014.

Alford, Stephen. *Kingship and Politics in the Reign of Edward VI*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Anderson, Marvin Walter. *Peter Martyr, A Reformer in Exile (1542-1562): A Chronology of Biblical Writings in England and Europe*. Nieuwkoop: B. De Graaf, 1975.

Archilla, Aurelio A. Garcilla. *The Theology of History and Apologetic Historiography in Heinrich Bullinger*. San Francisco: Mellon University Press, 1992.

Aston, Margaret. *England's Iconoclasts*, vol. 1: *Laws Against Images*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Aston, Margaret. *Faith and Fire: Popular and Unpopular Religion 1350-1600*. London: Hambledon Press, 1993.

Avis, Paul D.L. *The Church in the Theology of the Reformers*. London: Marshall Morgan and Scott, 1981.

Bailey, Derrick Sherwin. *Thomas Becon and the Reformation of the Church in England*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1952.

Baker, Wayne J. and Charles McCoy. *Fountainhead of Federalism: Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenantal Tradition*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991.

Baker, Wayne J. *Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenant*. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1980.

Basch, Rachel. "Hooper, Anne [née de Tscerlas] (*d.* 1555)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H.C.G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edition, edited by David Cannadine. Oxford: Oxford University Press, April 2016. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/46906 (accessed August 22, 2016).

Baschera, Luca. "Total Depravity? The Consequences of Original Sin in John Calvin and Later Reformed Theology." In *Calvinus Clarissimus Theologus: Papers of the Tenth International Congress on Calvin Research*, edited by H.J. Selderhius, 35-57. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2012.

Baskerville, G. "Elections to Convocation in the Diocese of Gloucester Under Bishop Hooper." *The English Historical Review* 44, no. 173 (1929): 1-32.

Beer, Barrett L. "Episcopacy and Reform in Mid-Tudor England." *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 23, no. 2 (1991): 231-252.

Beer, Barrett L. "London Parish Clergy and the Protestant Reformation, 1547-1559." *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 18, no. 3 (1986): 375-393.

Beer, Barrett L. *Rebellion and Riot: Popular Disorder in England during the Reign of Edward VI*. Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1982.

Biel, Pamela. *Doorkeepers at the House of Righteousness: Heinrich Bullinger and the Clergy 1535-1575*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1991.

Blench, J.W. *Preaching in England in the late Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries: A Study of English Sermons c.1450-1600*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964.

Bolliger, Daniel. "Bullinger on Church Authority: The Transformation of the Prophetic Role in Christian Ministry." In *Architect of Reformation: An Introduction to Heinrich Bullinger 1504-1575*, edited by Bruce Gordon and Emidio Campi, 159-180. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic Press, 2004.

Booty, John E, David Siegenthaler and John N Wall, eds. *The Godly Kingdom of Tudor England: great books of the English Reformation*. Wilton, Connecticut: Morehouse-Barlow Company, Inc., 1981.

Bradshaw, Christopher. "David or Josiah? Old Testament Kings as Exemplars in Edwardian Religious Polemic." In *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth-Century Europe,* vol. 2: *The Later Reformation*, edited by Bruce Gordon, 77-90. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996.

Brady Jr., Thomas A. *Turning Swiss: Cities and Empire, 1450-1550*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Brigden, Susan. *London and the Reformation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Brigden, Susan. *New Worlds, Lost Worlds: The Rule of the Tudors 1485-1603*. London: Penguin, 2001.

Bryson, Alan. "Cheke, Sir John (1514–1557)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edition, edited by David Cannadine, October 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5211 (accessed August 25, 2016).

Burnet, Gilbert. *The History of the Reformation in England*. 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1829.

Burt, Robert K. "The First Protest, or, The Father of English Non-Conformity". *St. Bartholomew Bicentennial Papers*. Tract Series One. London: W. Kent, 1862.

Bush, M.L. *The Government Policy of Protector Somerset*. London: Edward Arnold, 1975.

Cameron, Euan. *The European Reformation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Campi, Emidio. *Shifting Patterns of Reformed Tradition*. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014.

Campi, Emidio, Frank A James III, and Peter Opitz, eds. *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Humanism, Republicansm, Reformation*. Geneva: Droz S.A, 2002.

Carleton, Kenneth. *Bishops and Reform in the English Church, 1520-1559*. Suffolk: Boydell and Brewer, 2012.

Chadwick, Owen. *The Reformation*. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1986.

Chadwick, Owen. *The Early Reformation on the Continent*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001.

Chavura, Stephen. *Tudor Protestant Political Thought, 1547-1603*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Christianson, Paul. *Reformers and Babylon: English Apocalyptic Visions from the Reformation to the Eve of the Civil War*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.

Clement, C.J. *Religious Radicalism in England 1535-1565*. Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1997.

Clode, Charles M. *The Early History of the Guild of Merchant Tailors of the Fraternity of St. John the Baptist London: With Notices of the Lives of some of its Eminent Members*. 2 vols. London: Harrison and Sons, 1888.

Collinson, Patrick. "Economic Problems of Provincial and Urban Clergy During the Reformation." In *The Reformation in English Towns, 1500-1640*, edited by Patrick Collinson and John Craig, 147-158. London: MacMillan Press, 1998.

Collinson, Patrick. "Grindal, Edmund (1516x20–1583)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edition, edited by David Cannadine, January 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11644 (accessed August 25, 2016).

Collinson, Patrick. *The Religion of the Protestants: The Church in Early English Society 1559-1626*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

Courvoisier, Jacques. *Zwingli: A Reformed Theologian*. 1963; reprint, Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 2016.

Craig, John. "Jewel, John (1522–1571)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edition, edited by David Cannadine, January 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14810 (accessed August 25, 2016).

Cross, Claire. "Continental Students and the Protestant Reformation in England in the Sixteenth Century." In *Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent c.1500-1750*, edited by Derek Baker and C.W. Dugmore, 35-57. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1979.

Cross, Claire. "Oxford in the Tudor State from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Mary." In *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. 3: *The Collegiate University*, edited by James McConica, 117-150. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Cunich, Peter. "The Dissolution of the Chantries." In *The Reformation in English Towns, 1500-1640*, edited by Patrick Collinson and John Craig, 159-174. London: MacMillan Press, 1998.

Dalton, Herman. *John a Lasco: His Earlier Life and Labours; a Contribution to the History of the Reformation in Poland, Germany and England*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1886.

Davies, Catherine and Jane Facey. "A Reformation Dilemma: John Foxe and the Problem of Discipline." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 39, no.1 (1988): 37-65.

Davies, Catherine. *A Religion of the Word: The Defence of the Reformation in the Reign of Edward VI*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Davies, Catherine. "'Poor Persecuted Little Flock' or 'Commonwealth of Christians': Edwardian Protestant Concepts of Church." In *Protestantism and the National Church in Sixteenth Century England*, edited by Peter Lake and Maria Dowling, 78-102. London: Croon Helm, 1987.

Davies, Horton. *Worship and Theology in England*: *From Cranmer to Hooker, 1534-1603*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.

Davis, John P. *Heresy and Reformation in the South-East of England, 1520-1599*. London: Royal Historical Society, 1983.

Dawley, Powell Mills, *John Whitgift and the English Reformation*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954.

Dawson, Jane E. A. *John Knox*. London: Yale University Press, 2015.

Dawson, Jane E. A. "Knox, John (*c*.1514–1572)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edition, edited by David Cannadine, January 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15781 (accessed August 25, 2016).

Denlinger, Aaron C. *Omnes in Adam ex pacto Dei: Ambrogio Catarino's Doctrine of Covenantal Solidarity and its Influence on Post-Reformation Reformed Theologians*. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.

Dickens, A.G. *The English Reformation*. Second Edition. London: BT Batsford, 1989.

Diethelm, Roland. "Thereby Does One Plant and Sow the True Faith." In *Architect of Reformation: An Introduction to Heinrich Bullinger, 1504-1575*, edited by

Bruce Gordon and Emidio Campi, Grand Rapids, 135-158. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic Press, 2004.

Dixon, Richard Watson. *History of the Church of England from the Abolition o the Roman Jurisdiction*, vol. 3: *Edward VI.-A.D. 1547-1553*. London: Routledge, 1885.

Dowey, Edward. "Bullinger as Theologian: Thematic, Comprehensive and Schematic." In *Architect of Reformation: An Introduction to Heinrich Bullinger 1504-1575*, edited by Bruce Gordon and Emidio Campi, 35-66. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic Press, 2004.

Duff, E. Gordon. *A Century of the English Book Trade*. London: The Bibliographical Society, 1948.

Duffy, Eamon. *Marking of the Hours: English People and their Prayers 1240-1570*. London: Yale University Press, 1240-1570. London: Yale University Press, 2006.

Duffy, Eamon. *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional English Religion in England 1400-1580*. Second edition. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.

Ella, George M. *Henry Bullinger: Shepherd of the Churches 1504-1575*. Durham: Go Publications, 2007.

Elton, G.R. "England and the Continent in the Sixteenth Century." In *Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent c.1500-1750*, edited by Derek Baker and C.W. Dugmore, 1-16. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1979.

Elton, G.R. *England under the Tudors*. London: Methuen, 1974.

Elton, G.R. "Reform and the 'commonwealth-men' of Edward VI's Reign." In *The English Commonwealth 1547-1640: Essays in Politics and Society Presented to Joel Hurtsfield*, edited by Peter Clark, Alan Gordon Rae Smith and Nicholas Tyacke, 22-38. Leicester: Leicester University of Press, 1979.

Elton, G.R. *Reform and Reformation, 1509-1558*. London: Arnold, 1977.

Enssle, Neal. "Patterns of Godly Life: the Ideal Parish Minister in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth -Century English Thought." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 28, no. 1 (1997): 3-28.

Estep, William R. *The Anabaptist Story: An Introduction to Sixteenth-Century Anabaptism*. Third edition. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1996.

Euler, Carrie. *Couriers of the Gospel: England and Zurich, 1531-1558*. Zurich: Theologischer Verlag Zurich, 2006.

Euler, Carrie. "Heinrich Bullinger, Marriage and the English Reformation: 'The Christen State of Matrimonye' in England, 1540-53." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 34, no. 2 (2003): 367-393.

Euler, Carrie. "Bullinger's *Der Christlich Eestand*: Marriage and Covenant." In *Architect of Reformation: An Introduction to Heinrich Bullinger, 1504-1575*, edited by Bruce Gordon and Emidio Campi, 255-275. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic Press, 2004.

Evenden, Elizabeth and Thomas S. Freeman. *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: the making of Foxe's "Book of Martyrs"*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Fesko, John. *Beyond Calvin: Union with Christ and Justification in Early Modern Reformed Theology (1517-1700)*. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.

Fissel, Mark Charles. *English Warfare, 1511-1642*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Foot, M.M. "Bookbinding 1400-1557." In *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, vol. 3: *1400-1557*, edited by Lotte Hellinga and J.B. Trapp, 109-127. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Fuller, Thomas. *Church History of Britain From the Time of Jesus Christ to the Century MDCXLVIII*. 3 vols. London: Thomas Tess and Son, 1837.

Gabler, Ulrich. *Huldrych Zwingli: His Life and Work*, translated by Ruth C.L. Gritsch. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

Gairdner, James. "Bishop Hooper's Visitation of Gloucester." *The English Historical Review* 19, no. 73 (1904): 98-121.

Gairdner, James. *Lollardy and the Reformation in England: An Historical Survey*. 4 vols. London: MacMillan and Co., 1908.

Gerrish, B.A. *The Old Protestantism and the New*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark Limited, 1982.

Gordon, Bruce. *Clerical Discipline and the Rural Reformation: The Zurich Synod 1532-1580*. Bern: Peter Lang, 1992.

Gordon, Bruce. "Heinrich Bullinger." In *The Reformation Theologians: An Introduction to Theology in the Early Modern Period*, edited by Carter Lindberg, 170-183. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2002.

Gordon, Bruce. "Introduction." In *Architect of Reformation: An Introduction to Heinrich Bullinger, 1504-1575*, edited by Bruce Gordon and Emidio Campi, 17-32. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic Press, 2004.

Gordon, Bruce. *The Swiss Reformation*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Gordon, Bruce. "The Swiss Reformation." In *Palgrave Advances in the European Reformations*, edited by Alec Ryrie, 57-79. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Gough, Henry. *A General Index to the Publications of the Parker Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1855.

Graves, Michael A.R. *Early Tudor Parliaments 1485-1558*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Graves, Michael A.R. *The House of Lords in the Parliaments of Edward VI and Mary I: An Institutional Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Greenside, S.L. "The Faculty of Theology." In *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. 3: *The Collegiate University*, edited by James McConica, 295-334. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Greschat, Martin. "The Relation Between Church and Civil Community in Bucer's Reforming Work." In *Martin Bucer: Reforming Church and Community*, edited by D.F. Wright, 17-31. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Gunther, Karl and Ethan Shagan. "Protestant Radicalism and Political Thought in the Reign of Henry VIII." *Past and Present* 194 (2007): 35-74.

Guy, John. *Tudor England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Haigh, Christopher. *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Haigh, Christopher. "The Success and Failure of the English Reformation." *Past and Present* 173 (2001): 28-49.

Hall, Basil. "Cranmer, the Eucharist and the Foreign Divines in the Reign of Edward VI." In *Thomas Cranmer, Churchman and Scholar,* edited by Paul Ayris and David Selwyn, 218-258 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1993).

Hall, Basil. *Humanists and Protestants 1500-1900*. Edinburgh: T. &T. Clark, 1990.

Hall, Basil. "Martin Bucer in England." In *Martin Bucer: Reforming Church and Community*, edited by David Wright, 114-160. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Hargrave, O.T. "Bloody Mary's Victims: The Iconography of John Foxe's Book of Martyrs". *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 50, no. 1 (1982): 7-21.

Hazlett, Ian. "Bucer." In *Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology*, edited by David Bagchi and David C. Steinmetz, 100-112. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Heal, Felicity. "Cox, Richard (*c*.1500–1581)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edition, edited by David Cannadine, January 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6526 (accessed August 25, 2016).

Heal, Felicity. *Of Princes and Prelates: A Study of the Economic and Local Position of the Tudor Episcopate*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Heal, Felicity. *Reformation in Britain and Ireland*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Hellinga, Lotte, "Printing." In *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, vol. 3: *1400-1557*, edited by Lotte Hellinga and J.B. Trapp, 65-108. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Heston, C.W. *The Last Tudor King: a study of Edward VI October 12th, 1537 - July 6th,* 1553. London: Readers Union, 1961.

Heylyn, Peter. *Aerius Redivivus, Or the History of the Presbyterians*. Oxford: Printed for Jo. Cosby,1670.

Hildebrandt, Esther. "Christopher Mont, Anglo-German Diplomat." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 15, no. 3 (1984): 281-292.

Hillerbrand, Hans J. *The Protestant Reformation*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1968.

Hoak, Dale. "Rehabilitating the Duke of Northumberland: Politics and Political Control, 1549-53." In *The Mid-Tudor Polity c.1540-1560*, edited by Jennifer Loach and Robert Tittler, 29-51. London: The Macmillan Press, 1980.

Hoak, D.E. *The King's Council in the Reign of Edward VI*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Hockaday, F.S. "The Consistory Court of the Diocese of Gloucester.*" Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* 46 (1924): 195-287.

Hopf, Constantin. "Bishop Hooper's 'Notes' to the King's Council, 3 October 1551." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 48, no. 175 (1943): 194-199.

Hopf, Constantin. *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946.

Houlbrooke, Ralph. "Parkhurst, John (1511?–1575)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edition, edited by David Cannadine, January 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21362 (accessed August 25, 2016).

Hudson, Winthrop S. *John Ponet (1516?-1556): Advocate of Limited Monarchy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942.

Hunt, E.W. *The Life and Times of John Hooper (c.1500-1555) Bishop of Gloucester*. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2002.

Jaynes, Jeffrey. Review of Judith Becker, *Gemeindeordnung und Kirchenzucht: Johannes a Lascos Kirchenordnung für London (1555) und die reformierte Konfessionsbildung*. *Renaissance Quarterly* 61, no. 4 (2008): 1312-1314.

Jensen, Kristian. "Text-books in the Universities: the Evidence from the Books." In *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Volume Three – 1400-1557*, edited by Lotte Hellinga and J.B. Trapp, 354-379. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Johnstone, Nathan. "The Protestant Devil: The Experience of Temptation in Early Modern England." *Journal of British Studies* 43, no. 2 (2004): 173-205.

Jones, William M. "Uses of Foreigners in the Church of Edward VI." *Numen* 6, Fasc. 2 (1959): 142-153.

Jordan, W.K. *Edward VI: The Young King*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Pres of Harvard University Press, 1971.

Jordan, W.K. *Edward VI: The Threshold of Power. The Dominance of the Duke of Northumberland*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1970.

Kaufman, Peter Iver. "Prophesying Again." *Church History* 68, no. 2 (1999): 337-358.

Kim, Changkyu. *Balthasar Hubmaier's Doctrine of Salvation in Dynamic and Relational Perspective*. Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick, 2013.

King, John. N. "John Day: Master Printer of the English Reformation." In *The Beginnings of English Protestantism*, edited by Peter Marshall and Alec Ryrie, 180-208. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

King, John N. "Paul's Cross and the Implementation of Protestant Reforms Under Edward VI." In *Paul's Cross and the Persuasion of England, 1520-1640*, edited by W.J. Torrance Kirby and P.G. Stanwood, 141-160. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

King, John N. "The Book Trade Under Edward VI and Mary." In *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, vol. 3: *1400-1557*, edited by Lotte Hellinga and J.B. Trapp, 164-178. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

King, John N. *Tudor Books and Readers: Materiality and the Construction of Meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Kirby, W.J. Torrance. "The Civil Magistrate and the *Cura Religionis*: Heinrich Bullinger's Prophetical Office and the English Reformation." *Animus* 9 (2004): 25-36.

Kirby, W.J. Torrance, Emidio Campi and Frank A James III, eds. *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Kirby, W.J. Torrance. *Persuasion and Conversion: Essays on Religion, Politics and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Kirby, W.J. Torrance. "Political Theology: The Godly Prince." In *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli,* edited by W.J. Torrance Kirby, Emidio Campi and Frank A James III, 401-422. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Kirby, W.J. Torrance. *The Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Knappen, Marshall M. *Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism*. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1963.

Lane, Anthony N.S. *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.

Leaver, Vincent Wayne. *Thomas and Ralph Leaver: Protestant Reformers During the Edwardian Reformation in Sixteenth Century England*. Miami, Florida: Vincent Wayne Leaver, 1986.

Leuenberger, Samuel. *Archbishop Cranmer's Immortal Bequest: The Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England: An Evangelistic Liturgy*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1990.

Lindberg, Carter. *The European Reformations*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2002.

Lindeboom, J. *Austin Friars: History of the Dutch Reformed Church in London 1550-1950*, translated by D. de Ionge. The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1950.

Litzenberger, Caroline. *The English Reformation and the Laity: Gloucestershire, 1540-1580*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Loach, Jennifer. "Conservatism and Consent in Parliament, 1547-49." In *The Mid-Tudor Polity c. 1540-1560*, edited by Jennifer Loach and Robert Tittler, 9-28. London: The MacMillan Press, 1980.

Loach, Jennifer. *Edward VI*. Edited by George Bernard and Penry Williams. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1999.

Loades, David. "Hilles, Richard (*c.*1514–1587)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H.C.G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edition, edited by David Cannadine. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/47402 (accessed August 25, 2016).

Loades, David M. *John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland, 1504-1553*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Loades, David. "Thomas Cranmer and John Dudley: an uneasy alliance". *Thomas Cranmer: Churchman and Scholar*, edited by Paul Avid and David Selwyn, 157-172. Bury St. Edmonds: The Boydell Press, 1993.

Loan, Marcus. *Masters of the English Reformation*. 1954; reprint, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1983.

Loan, Marcus. *Pioneers of the Reformation in England*. London: Church Room Book Press, 1964.

Locher, Gottfried W. *Zwingli's Thought: New Perspectives*. Leiden: Brill, 1981.

Lorimer, Peter. *John Knox and the Church of England: His Work in Her Pulpit and His Influence Upon Her Liturgy, Articles, and Parties*. London: Henry S. King and Co., 1875.

Lowe, Benjamin. *Commonwealth and the English Reformation: Protestantism and the Politics of Religious Change in the Gloucester Vale, 1483-1560*. Surrey: Ashgate, 2010.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *Reformation: Europe's House Divided 149-1700*. London: Penguin Books, 2004.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid. "Kett's Rebellion in Context: A Rejoinder." *Past and Present*, no. 93 (1981): 165-173.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid. "Protestantism in Mainland Europe: New Directions." *Renaissance Quarterly* 59, no. 3 (2006): 698-706.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid. "The Importance of Jan Laski in the English Reformation." In *Johannes a Lasco (1499-1560): Polnischer Baron, Humanist und europäischer Reformator*, edited by Christoph Strohm, 325-346. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *The Later Reformation in England: 1547-1603*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid. "The Myth of the English Reformation." *Journal of British Studies* 30, no.1 (1991): 1-19.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *Thomas Cranmer: A Life*. London: Yale University Press, 1996.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation*. London: Allen Lane, 1999.

MacLure, Millar. *The Paul's Cross Sermons 1534-1642*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958.

MacMahon, Luke. "Mont, Christopher (1496/7–1572)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edition, edited by David Cannadine, January 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18994 (accessed August 25, 2016).

Manning, Roger B. "The Spread of the Popular Reformation in England." *Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies* 1 (1970): 35-52.

Marshall, Peter. "Evangelical Conversion in the Reign of Henry VIII." In *The Beginnings of English Protestantism*, edited by Peter Marshall and Alec Ryrie, 14-37. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Martin, Jessica and Alec Ryrie. *Private and Domestic Devotion in Early Modern Britain*. Surrey: Ashgate, 2012.

Martin, J.W. *Religious Radicals in Tudor England*. London: Hambledon Press, 1989.

McConica, James. *English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

McConica, James. "The Rise of the Undergraduate College." In *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. 3: *The Collegiate University*, edited by James McConica, 1-68. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

McGrath, Alister E. *Intellectual Origins of the European Reformation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

McGrath, Alister E. *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, vol. 2: *From 1500 to the Present Day*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

McGrath, Alister E. *Luther's Theology of the Cross*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985.

McGrath, Alister E. *Reformation Thought: An Introduction*. Second edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1993.

Milton, Anthony. *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.

Moeller, Bernd. *Imperial Cities and the Reformation: Three Essays*, translated and edited by H.C. Erik Midelfort and Mark Edwards. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.

Mullett, Michael A. *Martin Luther*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Murdock, Graeme. "The Importance of Being Josiah: An Image of Calvinist Identity." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 29, no. 1 (1984): 87-104.

Muss-Arnolt, William. "Puritan Efforts and Struggles, 1550-1603: A Bio-bibliographic Study." *American Journal of Theology* 23, no. 3. (1919): 345-366.

Needham, Paul. "The Customs Rolls as Documents for the Printed Book-Trade in England." In *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, vol. 3: *1400-1557*, edited by Lotte Hellinga and J.B. Trapp, 148-163. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Newcombe, D.G. "Hooper, John (1495x1500–1555)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford:

Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edition, edited by David Cannadine, April 2016. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13706 (accessed August 25, 2016).

Newcombe, D.G. *John Hooper: Tudor Bishop and Martyr*. Oxford: Davenant Press, 2009.

Newman, John Henry, et al. *Tracts for the Times*, vol. 1: *Tracts 1-46*. London: Printed for J.G.F and J. Rivington, 1870.

Nockles, Peter Benedict. *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Null, Ashley. *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of Repentance: Renewing the Power to Love*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Oakley, Francis. "The Absolute and Ordained Power of God in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Theology." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 59, no. 3 (1998): 437-461.

Oberman, Heiko A. *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.

Oberman, Heiko A. *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1963.

O'Day, Rosemary and Felicity Heal. eds., *Princes and Paupers in the English Church 1500-1800*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1961.

Old, Hughes Oliphant. *The Reading and Preaching of the Scriptures in the Worship of the Christian Church*, vol. 4: *The Age of the Reformation*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2002.

O'Malley, John W. *Trent: What Happened at the Council*. London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2013.

Opie, John. "The Anglicizing of John Hooper." *Archive for Reformation History* 59 (1968): 150-175.

Opitz, Peter. "Bullinger's Decades: Instruction in Faith and Conduct." In *Architect of Reformation: An Introduction to Heinrich Bullinger1504-1575*, edited by Bruce Gordon and Emidio Campi, 101-116. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic Press, 2004.

Overall, M.A. "Peter Martyr in England 1547-1553: An Alternative View." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 15, no. 1 (1984): 87-104.

Ozment, Steven. *Protestants: The Birth of a Revolution*. London: Image Doubleday Publishing, 1993.

Ozment, Steven. *The Age of Reform 1250-1550: An Intellectual and Religious History of Late Medieval and Reformation Europe*. London: Yale University Press, 1980.

Ozment, Steven. *The Reformation in the Cities: The Appeal of Protestantism to Sixteenth Century Germany and Switzerland*. London: Yale University Press, 1975.

Parish, Helen L. *Clerical Marriage and the English Reformation: Precedent, Policy and Practice*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000.

Parker, T.H.L. *English Reformers*. London: SCM Press, 1967.

Parker, T.H.L. *John Calvin: A Biography*. London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1975.

Payne, John B. 'Erasmus on Romans 9:6-24." In *The Bible in the Sixteenth Century*, edited by David C. Steinmetz, 119-135. Durham: Duke University Press, 1990.

Petersen, Rodney Lawrence. *Preaching in the Last Days: The Theme of Two Witnesses' in the 16th and 17th Centuries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Pettegree, Andrew. "Day, John (1521/2–1584)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edition, edited by David Cannadine, January 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7367 (accessed August 25, 2016).

Pettegree, Andrew. *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Pettegree, Andrew. *Marian Protestantism: Six Studies*. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996.

Pettegree, Andrew. "Micron, Marten [Martin Micronius] (1523–1559)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edition, edited by David Cannadine. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/68324 (accessed August 25, 2016).

Pettegree, Andrew. "Printing and the Reformation: The English exception". In *The Beginnings of English Protestantism*, edited by Peter Marshall and Alec Ryrie, 157-179. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Pettegree, Andrew. *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Pettegree, Andrew. "Utenhove, Jan (1516–1566)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edition, edited by David Cannadine, January 2008. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28037 (accessed August 25, 2016).

Potter, G.R. *Zwingli*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Price, F.D. "Gloucester Diocese Under Bishop Hooper, 1551-3." *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* 60 (1938): 51-151.

Primus, John Henry. "The Role of the Covenant Doctrine in the Puritanism of John Hooper." *Dutch Review of Church History, New Series* 48, no.2 (1968): 182-196.

Primus, John Henry. *The Vestments Controversy: An Historical Study of the Earliest Tensions within the Church of England in the Reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth*. Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1960.

Raath, Andries and Shaun de Freitas. "From Heinrich Bullinger to Puritanism: John Hooper's Theology and the Office of the Magistracy." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 56, no. 2 (2003): 208-230.

Rickman, Johanna. *Love, Lust, and License in Early Modern England: Illicit Sex and the Nobility*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.

Riorden, Michael and Alec Ryrie. "Stephen Gardiner and the Making of a Protestant Villain." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 34, no. 4 (2003): 1039-1063.

Robson-Scott, W.D. "Josua Maler's Visit to England in 1551." *The Modern Language Review* 45, no. 3 (1950): 346-351.

Rodgers, Dirk W. "À Lasco [Laski], John (1499–1560)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edition, edited by David Cannadine. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16081 (accessed August 25, 2016).

Rodgers, Dirk W. *John a Lasco in England*. New York: Peter Lang, 1994.

Rorem, Paul. *Calvin and Bullinger on the Lord's Supper*. Nottingham: Grove Books, 1989.

Ross, Donald Smith. "Hooper's Alleged Authorship of 'A Brief and Clear Confession of the Christian Faith.'" *Church History* 39, no. 1 (1970): 18-29.

Ryle, J.C. *Five English Reformers*. London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1961.

Ryrie, Alec. *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Ryrie, Alec. "Counting Sheep, Counting Shepherds: The Problem of Allegiance in the English Reformation." In *The Beginnings of English Protestantism*, edited by Peter Marshall and Alec Ryrie, 84-110. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Ryrie, Alec. "Paths Not Taken in the British Reformations." *The Historical Journal* 52, no. 1 (2009): 1-22.

Ryrie, Alec. *The Gospel of Henry VIII: Evangelicals in the Early English Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Scribner, Bob. "Anticlericalism in the Cities." In *Anticlericalism in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, edited by Peter A. Dykma and Heiko A. Oberman, 147-166. New York: Brill, 1993.

Shagan, Ethan. *Popular Politics and the English Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Shagan, Ethan. "'Popularity' and the 1549 Rebellions Revisited." *English Historical Review* 115, no. 460 (2000): 121-133.

Shagan, Ethan H. "Protector Somerset and the 1549 Rebellions: New Sources and Perspectives." *English Historical Review* 114, no. 455 (1999): 34-63.

Shaw, Duncan. "John Willock." In *Reformation and Revolution: Essays Presented to the Very Reverend Principal Emeritus Hugh Watt, D.D., D. LITT., on the Sixtieth Anniversary of his Ordination*, edited by Duncan Shaw, 42-69. Edinburgh: St. Andrew Press, 1967.

Skidmore, Chris. *Edward VI: The Lost King of England*. London: Phoenix, 2007.

Smyth, C.H. *Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1970.

Speelman, Herman. *Calvin and the Independence of the Church*. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2014.

Spicer, Andrew. "Poullain, Valérand (*c*.1509–1557)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edition, edited by David Cannadine, April 2016. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/68327 (accessed August 25, 2016).

Springer, Michael S. *Restoring Christ's Church: John a Lasco and the Forma ac Ratio*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

Steinmetz, David C. *Luther in Context*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1986.

Steinmetz, David C. *Reformers in the Wings: From Geiler von Kayserberg to Theodore Beza*. Second edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Stephens, W.P. *The Theology of Huldrych Zwingli*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Stephens, W.P. "Zwingli on John 6:63: '*Spiritus est qui vivificat, caro nihil prodest*'." In *Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation: Essays Presented to David C. Steinmetz in Honor of His Sixtieth Birthday*, edited by Richard A. Muller and John L. Thompson, 156-185. Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1996.

Stjerna, Kirsi Irmeli. *Women and the Reformation*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 2009.

Stolk, Maarten. Trans. Sheeres, W. Garrit. "Calvin and Rome." In *The Calvin Handbook*, edited by J.H. Selderhuis, translated by Henry J. Baron, Judith J. Guder, Randi H. Lundell and Gerrit W. Sheeres, 104-112. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2009.

Stone, Lawrence. *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800*. Revised edition. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1979**.**

Strype, John. *Ecclesiastical Memorials of the Church of England: Relating Chiefly to Religion and its Reformation of it, under the reigns of King Henry VIII. King Edward VI. And Queen Mary the First*. 7 vols. London: Samuel Bagster, 1816.

Strype, John. *Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Cranmer*. 2 vols. London: George Routledge and Co., 1853.

Taplin, Mark. "Bullinger on the Trinity: *Religionis Nostrae Caput et Fundamentum*." In *Architect of Reformation: An Introduction to Heinrich Bullinger1504-1575*, edited by Bruce Gordon and Emidio Campi, 67-100. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic Press, 2004.

Taylor, Larissa. ed. *Preachers and People in the Reformations and Early Modern Period*. Boston: Brill, 2003.

Timmerman, Daniel. *Heinrich Bullinger on Prophecy and the Prophetic Office (1523-1538)*. Gottingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprrecht, 2015.

Trapp, J.B. "The Humanist Book." In *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, vol. 3: *1400-1557*, edited by Lotte Hellinga and J.B. Trapp, 283-315. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Trueman, Carl R. *Luther's Legacy: Salvation and English Reformers 1525-1556*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

Trueman, Carl R. "Traheron, Bartholomew (*c*.1510–1558?)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edition, edited by David Cannadine. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27658 (accessed August 25, 2016).

Tuininga, Matthew. *Calvin's Political Theology and the Public Engagement of the Church: Christ's Two Kingdoms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Tyacke, Nicholas. *Aspects of English Protestantism 1530-1700*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001.

Venema, Cornelis P. *Heinrich Bullinger and the Doctrine of Predestination: Author of the Other Reformed Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic Press, 2002.

Vetter, Theodor. *Relations Between England and Zurich During the Reformation*. London: Eliot Stock, 1904.

Vissers, Arnaud. *Reading Augustine in the Reformation: The Flexibility of Intellectual Authority in Europe, 1500-1620*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Wabuda, Susan. *Preaching During the English Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Walters, H.B. *London Churches at the Reformation with an Account of their Contents*. London: SPCK, 1939.

Walton, Robert C. *Zwingli's Theocracy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

Warnicke, Retha M. "Seymour, Anne, duchess of Somerset (*c*.1510–1587)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Online edition, edited by

David Cannadine. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/68053 (accessed August 22, 2016).

Weir, David A. *The Origins of Federal Theology in Sixteenth Century Reformation Thought*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

West, W. Morris. S. "John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism." *The Baptist Quarterly* 18, no. 1 (1955): 22-46.

White, Peter. *Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Witte Jr., John. *From Sacrament to Contract: Marriage, Religion, and Law in the Western Tradition*. Second edition. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012.

Witte Jr., John. *The Reformation of Rights*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Wright, David F. 'John Knox and the Early Church Fathers." In *John Knox and the British Reformations*, edited by Roger Mason, 99-116. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998.

Wood, Andy. *The 1549 Rebellions and the Making of Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Wood, John Delmas. "Bullinger's Model for Collective Episcopacy: Transformation Ministry in a Society Facing Final Judgement." In *Following Zwingli: Applying the Past in Reformation Zurich*, edited by Luca Baschera, Bruce Gordon and Christian Moser, 81-106. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2014.

Zwierlein, Cornel. Review of Judith Becker, *Gemeindeordnung und Kirchenzucht: Johannes a Lascos Kirchenordnung für London (1555) und die reformierte Konfessionsbildung*. *Church History* 90, no. 1 (2010):112-115.

Website

Dawson, Jane E.A. "Letters from Exile: Documents of the Marian Exile." University of Edinburgh. http://www.marianexile.div.ed.ac.uk/documents/documents.shtml. (accessed 26 August 2016).

Unpublished Dissertations

Abray, Lorna Jane. "The Long Reformation: Magistrates, Clergy, and People in Strasbourg 1520-1598." PhD diss., Yale University, 1978.

Dalton, Alison J. "John Hooper and His Networks: A Study of Change in Reformation England." DPhil. diss., University of Oxford, 2008.

Diebler Jr., Edwin Clyde. "Bishop John Hooper, A Link Connecting the Reformation Thought of Ulrich Zwingli and the Zurich Tradition with the Earliest English Pietistic Puritans." PhD diss., Temple University, 1970.

Huelin, Gordon. "Peter Martyr and the English Reformation." PhD diss., London University, 1954.

Ross, Donald Smith. "The Role of John Hooper in the Religious Controversies of the Reign of Edward VI in England." PhD diss., Michigan State University, 1979.

Vander Molen, Ronald Jay. "Richard Cox (1499-1581), Bishop of Ely: an intellectual biography of a renaissance and reformation administrator." PhD diss., Michigan State University, 1969.

West, W.M.S. "A Study of John Hooper with Special Reference to His Contact with Henry Bullinger." PhD diss., University of Zurich, 1953.

Wilson, R. Paul. "John Hooper and the English Reformation under Edward VI 1547-1553." PhD diss., Queen's University, 1994.

West, W.M.S. "A Study of John Hooper with Special Reference to His Contact with Henry Bullinger." PhD diss., University of Zurich, 1953.

Wilson, R. Paul. "John Hooper and the English Reformation under Edward VI 1547-1553." PhD diss., Queen's University, 1994.