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“The study of the covenants and their role in Reformed theology has, at least since the nineteenth-century work of Heppe, commanded a large swath of scholarly writing. Academics have weighed in on such varied arguments as the significance of the number of the covenants, the active participants in biblical covenants, and the centrality of those covenants in any given system. Rarely does such a lengthy conversation find a new, helpful partner, but Robert Wainwright has proved to be that rare exception. His masterly examination of the discussions of covenant in the primary sources and in their historical context not only clarifies the development of this theological trajectory, but also sheds light on the broader project of English Reform. Wainwright’s work must now take its rightful place in the canon of English Reformation studies.”

—Jonathan W. Arnold, Associate Professor of Church History and Historical Theology, Director of Research Doctoral Studies, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

“The clarity of its analysis and the richness of its evidence make Robert Wainwright’s book an excellent guide to the early English Reformers’ encounter with the theology of Zurich and Basel, Strasbourg and Geneva.”

—Steven Gunn, Professor of Early Modern History, Merton College, University of Oxford

“Focusing on the concept of covenant as a marker of Swiss influence on English theology during the early Reformation period, Robert Wainwright offers a timely, scholarly, and persuasive reassertion of the Reformed character of the English Reformation. His study not only provides welcome discussion of several significant but neglected voices within early English Protestantism, but also explores the distinctive character of early Reformed covenant theology more widely. Early Reformation Covenant Theology will consequently be very welcome to anyone interested in the development of Reformed Protestantism, whether in England or elsewhere.”

—Stephen Hampton, Dean and Senior Tutor, Peterhouse, University of Cambridge
“Rob Wainwright has written a path-breaking study of covenant theology in early Tudor England. He shows how vital Swiss influence was in the construction of evangelical identities, and argues powerfully that the Reformed theologians of Zurich and Strasbourg have been underestimated, that of Luther overstressed. The book will be essential reading for all those engaged in the study of the early Reformation.”

—Felicity M. Heal, FBA, Emeritus Fellow and Lecturer in History, Jesus College, University of Oxford

“Robert Wainwright’s monograph Early Reformation Covenant Theology rides the crest of a wave of an innovative reinterpretation of the English Reformation. More than likely to set the cat among the pigeons, Wainwright challenges the widely held assumption of the ‘exceptional’ or ‘peculiar’ character of England’s Reformation that has long constituted an axiom of English Reformation historiography, both traditional and revisionist. Yet as Wainwright persuasively shows, this narrative of English exceptionalism has obscured the profound influence of Swiss Reformed theology on English Protestant thought dating from the 1520s and flowering during the reign of Edward VI. The reception of Continental Reformed divinity, especially of Huldrych Zwingli, Heinrich Bullinger, John Calvin, and Peter Martyr Vermigli, exerted a decisive influence on the shape of the Elizabethan Settlement. Wainwright cogently demonstrates that the ‘Zurich Connection’in particular played a key role in defining the course of the Reformation in England.”

—Torrance Kirby, FRHistS, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Graduate Programme Director, McGill University

“Robert Wainwright’s meticulous study of covenantal thinking in the early English Reformation is a model for how the history of theology and the history of religious movements can be fruitfully integrated. It should also be required reading for anyone who still thinks that the Reformation in England had little to do with the currents of reform elsewhere in sixteenth-century Europe.”

—Peter Marshall, FBA, Department of History, University of Warwick
“Reformation Covenant Theology is well researched and well composed. In particular, Wainwright’s work shines a light on a previously murky question—namely, the extent to which Continental Reformed work was influencing the English church in that first generation of the Reformation. I think this book will pave the way for future, very fruitful studies, capitalizing on the author’s efforts. Highly recommended.”

—Benjamin R. Merkle, President, New Saint Andrews College

“In this important contribution to Reformation scholarship, Robert Wainwright explores the influence of the Swiss Reformation—particularly as it took shape in Zurich—on the early English Reformers, specifically William Tyndale, Miles Coverdale, John Hooper, and John Bradford. Examining covenant theology and the theology of the sacraments, Wainwright argues for the significance of the European dimension of the English Reformation and particularly for the early influence of the emerging Reformed tradition. Wainwright’s careful reading of the writings of the Continental Reformers (Huldrych Zwingli, Heinrich Bullinger, and Jean Calvin) alongside those of the English Reformers (Tyndale, Coverdale, Hooper, and Bradford) shows similarities and lines of influence in a way that has not been done before. Wainwright argues convincingly for a strong and direct influence of Reformed theology on the theology of the early English Reformation. Although Wainwright’s is not a new argument, the evidence that he adduces here makes possible a deeper understanding of the English Reformation’s indebtedness to the Reformed strand of the Continental Reformation.”

—Charlotte Methuen, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, University of Glasgow
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Series Introduction

P&R Publishing has a long and distinguished history of publishing carefully selected, high-value theological books in the Reformed tradition. Many theological books begin as dissertations, but many dissertations are worthy of publication in their own right. Realizing this, P&R has launched the Reformed Academic Dissertation (RAD) program to publish top-tier dissertations (Ph.D., Th.D., D.Min., and Th.M.) that advance biblical and theological scholarship by making distinctive contributions in the areas of theology, ethics, biblical studies, apologetics, and counseling.

Dissertations in the RAD series are curated, which means that they are carefully selected, on the basis of strong recommendations by the authors’ supervisors and examiners and by our internal readers, to be part of our collection. Each selected dissertation will provide clear, fresh, and engaging insights about significant theological issues.

A number of theological institutions have partnered with us to recommend dissertations that they believe worthy of publication in the RAD series. Not only does this provide increased visibility for participating institutions, it also makes outstanding dissertations available to a broad range of readers while helping to introduce promising authors to the publishing world.

We look forward to seeing the RAD program grow into a large collection of curated dissertations that will help to advance Reformed scholarship and learning.

John J. Hughes
Series Editor
Foreword

The insularity of the English, so evident in national events of the last three years, takes at least some of its force from the insular history of the English Reformation created by one historical tradition in the Church of England. On this view, the theology and devotional practice of the English Reformation owed nothing of importance to unfortunate events over the English Channel from 1517, which merely signified that it was time for Anglicanism to present a more native form of Western Christianity, without interference from the Bishop of Rome. Happily, such distortion of reality has largely disappeared from the thinking of those who actually study the course of events in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; we now see how the English Reformation represented the outer waves of events in mainland Europe, and in particular how it reflected the struggles of English Reformation theologians to work out what a Protestant Reformation meant. They made choices out of what was on offer in the various different aisles of the Reformation supermarket, and they did so from early days with an informed eye and with distinctive long-term results. Even though here as elsewhere, Martin Luther’s stance against the Pope mightily impressed those drawn to Reformation, England was destined like its neighbour Scotland to move away from what turned into a specific Protestant identity called ‘Lutheranism,’ towards the theologians of central Europe who became convinced that Luther had seen only part of the truth.

Robert Wainwright’s study of this process is a forensic demonstration not merely of ‘the strange death of Lutheran England,’ but of the positive English turn towards what in the course of the sixteenth
century gained an identity as Reformed Protestantism. He explores the theme of reciprocal covenant pioneered by Huldrych Zwingli and much further expounded by his successor Heinrich Bullinger; he shows how early this theme entered English discussion, as William Tyndale brooded on its implications for understanding the Christian message, and influenced Miles Coverdale to follow suit in their enterprises of biblical translation and exposition. Might such theologians have supposed that the arch-opponent of justification by faith and chief enemy of Luther, King Henry VIII, could be drawn to this moralist theme and thence to an understanding of Protestantism? If so, their hopes were to be disappointed, as King Henry chose to cast a hostile eye on Swiss eucharistic theology instead. Yet the long-term implications of covenant in English theological construction effortlessly outlived the much-married monarch. A sure-footed and expert guide, Robert Wainwright gives us the resources to set out on that English Reformed Protestant journey.

Diarmaid MacCulloch
Professor of the History of the Church
University of Oxford
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Introduction

The entire sum of piety consists in these very brief main points of the covenant. Indeed, it is evident that nothing else was handed down to the saints of all ages, throughout the entire Scripture, other than what is included in these main points of the covenant.

—Heinrich Bullinger (1534)

In 1534 Heinrich Bullinger (1504–75) identified the divine covenant as the summary principle of the Christian faith. Bullinger was the Antistes—overseer or bishop—of Zürich where the concept of covenant had been a current of theological inquiry for over a decade. It had been deployed there in local controversy, yet its significance extended to the reforms sweeping through the Swiss Confederation and Europe more generally. In the Bible God’s arrangement with the patriarch Abraham and his descendants defined the mechanics of salvation according to a divine promise; theologians had been reflecting on that covenant agreement for centuries. During the Reformation, however, covenant theology

received a distinct formulation from the reformers of Zürich and Geneva which made it a signature of Swiss Reformed influence further afield. For them the covenant was the key to the interpretation of Holy Scripture and essential to a right understanding of salvation and the sacraments. It became a particular mark of Swiss influence on English reformers during the reigns of King Henry VIII and King Edward VI. This examination of Reformation covenant theology focuses our attention on the core intellectual tenet of Reformed theology and identity in the period.

Covenant theology was conceptualised in different ways during the Reformation. Scholars have advanced a number of interpretations of the positions taken by continental reformers and, in turn, the reception of continental theology in England has generated extensive historiographical debate. This means that an approach to English reception of the Swiss concept of covenant needs to be established for the period from the 1520s to the 1550s. Although the formal process of confessionalisation did not begin until the 1560s, it is not anachronistic to think in terms of confessional trajectories in preceding decades. Several distinct flavours of Reformation theology were being articulated and disseminated from the 1520s onwards. The leading centre of Reformed theology during the 1520s was the city of Zürich under the spiritual oversight of Huldrych Zwingli (1484–1531), who was succeeded by Bullinger in 1531. Strassburg was another important locus from 1523 until Martin Bucer (1491–1551) was forced to flee to England in the wake of the Augsburg Interim (1548). Only from the late 1540s

2 For convenience the adjective ‘Swiss’ will be used here to include Geneva even though the Republic of Geneva was not a member of the Swiss Confederation.

did Geneva begin to assume pre-eminence, although John Calvin (1509–64) had been gaining influence since the 1530s.

The Reformed trajectory can be distinguished from other patterns of Reformation by its ‘eminently ethical’ understanding of redemption. Those who adopted this approach understood ‘reformation’ as rejuvenation of the divine order by way of personal and communal renewal. For this reason Heiko Oberman argued that the medieval and Reformed traditions are together distinguished from the thought of Martin Luther (1483–1546) for whom ‘reformation’ involved a rejection of humanity’s very attempt to renew itself. The Reformed trajectory was, nonetheless, united with other patterns of Reformation in the ‘normative centring’ of the power for, and object of, moral rectitude around the sola formulae: sola gratia, sola fide, solus Christus.

At the source of the Lutheran and Reformed trajectories lie two interpretations of the biblical use of the concept of covenant. The relationship established by God with Abraham and his descendants is described in Genesis 15 and 17 by the Hebrew word berît, which was translated diathēkē in the Greek Septuagint (c.275–c.100

---


The Latin Vulgate (a.d. c.380–c.405) rendered the term as *pactum* (pact) or *foedus* (league or covenant). These terms could denote a unilateral promise of salvation made by God to Abraham which was passively received. Alternatively, they might refer to a bilateral or reciprocal agreement between God and Abraham in which both parties undertook certain obligations pertaining to salvation. The continuance of the agreement might be subject to the fulfilment of conditions by one or both parties, and sanctions might be imposed if either party defaulted on their obligations. By the early sixteenth century the systematic use of this terminology had been conflated by biblical exegetes such that *pactum* and *foedus* could be used in the sense of a ‘last will and testament.’ While *testamentum* usually connoted the unilateral concept as God’s unconditional promise or bequest, the bilateral (or mutual) and conditional concept of covenant was still a possible reading.

The covenant concept was significant at an early stage in Luther’s theology. He increasingly defined it in terms of a testator’s

---


unilateral bequest to his heirs: God had promised Abraham and his descendants that they would inherit righteousness. In 1519 he drew a distinction between a covenant and a testament: ‘He who stays alive makes a covenant; he who is about to die makes a testament.’

In 1520 he discussed the testament in the context of the Eucharist, leaving no room for mutual participation or for conditions to be imposed on humanity. Christ, in his humanity, had made a last will and testament. Human beings were entirely passive in receiving the inheritance of salvation unilaterally bequeathed by Christ’s death.

Meanwhile early Swiss Reformed theologians were interpreting the covenant in reciprocal terms.

Covenant and the Reformed Tradition

Modern scholarly reflection on Reformation covenant theology has suffered from its attachment to the study of post-Reformation federal theology. In 1939 Perry Miller downplayed its significance by asserting that the concept of covenant had ‘not been known, or at least not emphasised’ until New England Puritans introduced


it during the first half of the seventeenth century. In his view the Puritans saw the covenant as a ‘legitimate extension’ of Reformed theology establishing ‘the submerged grounds for moral obedience and for an assurance of salvation.’ Miller’s assertion of the late appearance of the conditional covenant—and only in New England at that—provoked a hunt for continental European precedents. The self-conscious excavation of ‘the origins of Puritanism’ which ensued insinuated an anachronistic agenda into the interpretation of the Reformation concept of covenant. The assumption that the conditional elements of federal theology were inconsistent with Calvin’s legacy encouraged the identification of alternative Reformed well-springs. In 1951 Leonard Trinterud published a seminal article on the origins of Puritanism claiming that the unconditional ‘testament’ attributed to Geneva was only one version of the concept. He suggested that a conditional ‘law-covenant’ was the ‘organising principle of the entire Rhineland reformation movement,’ by which he meant principally Zürich, Basle, and Strassburg.

Trinterud’s bifurcation of the Reformed tradition was maintained by a number of scholars including Jens Møller in 1963, Richard Greaves in 1968, Michael McGiffert in 1982, and Robert Letham in 1983. In 1980 Trinterud’s thesis was definitively restated

and expanded in a monograph by Wayne Baker entitled *Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenant: The Other Reformed Tradition*. Baker claimed that Bullinger represented the alternative bilateral approach to Calvin’s predestinarian unilateral testament. In 1990 David Weir tried to refine Baker’s conclusions by arguing that post-Reformation federal theology was designed to ‘bridge both worlds: that of the unilateral covenant and that of the bilateral covenant.’ However in 1991 Baker, together with Charles McCoy, argued that Bullinger had initiated a Federalist Reformed tradition which ought to be distinguished from the Calvinist Reformed tradition.

This dichotomisation of bilateral and conditional versus unilateral and unconditional covenants tended to involve a subjective judgment on conditionality. For Miller conditionality was a positive comfort and moralistic counterweight to absolute predestinarianism whereas later accounts accused the reciprocal concept of upholding legalism at the expense of grace and election. According to those who subscribed to the view that conditionality entailed legalism the radical predestinarianism of Calvinist orthodoxy ‘paralysed’ the conditional covenant idea in federal theology.

Since the 1980s there have been several notable critiques of Trinterud’s dual-tradition thesis. In 1983 Lyle Bierma argued that all early Reformed expressions of the concept of covenant should be considered together. He demonstrated in 1990 that the conditional

---

457–67. McGiffert accepts the dichotomy with the qualification that it went unacknowledged in the early Reformation.


concept was not necessarily opposed to double predestinarism, thereby undermining a basic assumption of the unilateral-bilateral dichotomy. In 2001 Peter Lillback suggested close associations between Calvin’s understanding of covenant and those of other Swiss theologians. In 2002 Cornelis Venema queried Baker’s view of Bullinger as the founder of a second Reformed tradition, arguing that Bullinger’s and Calvin’s doctrines of predestination were not responsible for two different concepts of covenant. Then in 2012 Andrew Woolsey inverted the dual-tradition thesis by presenting Reformed covenant thought as a continuous and unified movement from the early Reformation to the seventeenth century.

These critiques form part of a more fundamental assault led by Richard Muller on the thesis of discontinuity between Reformation and post-Reformation Reformed theology. In two volumes published in 2000 and 2003 discussing the foundation and development of the Reformed tradition Muller rejected the view that unilateral and bilateral conceptions were ‘mutually exclusive and held by different thinkers, to the point that the unilateral definition belongs to a more “predestinarian” approach and the bilateral definition to an approach that verges on synergism in its emphasis on human responsibility.’
Bullinger’s bilateral conception did not preclude a Reformed predestinarianism, nor did Calvin’s predestinarianism prevent him from developing themes of mutuality in his commentaries and sermons. Reformed writers utilised both definitions of covenant and all of them upheld the monergistic soteriology of their confession. Predestination and covenant were neither in opposition nor in tension: in 2016 Muller helpfully clarified that ‘covenant is a doctrine that primarily explicates the personal and corporate dimensions of salvation in the historical economy of salvation—predestination is a doctrine that defines the purpose from a different perspective, being primarily concerned with divine intentions and ends and with the issues of eternity and time, decree and execution.’

The essential lesson of recent research is that theological diversity amongst Reformed theologians should not be misconstrued as indicative of multiple Reformed traditions. Muller has argued for the recognition of ‘a single but variegated Reformed tradition, bounded by a series of fairly uniform confessional concerns but quite diverse in patterns of formulation.’ This implies the unity of the Reformed identity, not only between Reformation and post-Reformation Reformed theologians, but also between contemporaries like Bullinger and Calvin who nonetheless placed different theological emphases. Whilst the severance of any necessary link

---

*Muller, Unaccommodated Calvin, 183.*

*Muller, “Reformed Theology between 1600 and 1800,” 175–76. See also Muller, After Calvin, 12–13, 99; Dewey Wallace, Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525–1695 (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 10.*

*Muller, After Calvin, 7–9.*

between predestinarianism and a unilateral concept of covenant exposes an untenable model, this does not imply that all Reformed theologians expounded mutuality between God and humanity to the same degree. The unilateral concept of covenant was assumed in one form or another by everyone but only some took the further step of formulating reciprocal features, and these were not necessarily detrimental to the priority of divine grace. Trinterud and Baker were mistaken in their belief that covenant theology divided the theologians of Zürich and Geneva.

Woolsey’s emphasis on the coherence and unity of the early Swiss concept of covenant strongly encourages study of its reception by early English evangelicals. His valuable analysis of Johannes Oecolampadius of Basle (1482–1531), Zwingli and Bullinger improves on all previous work and he complements Lillback with his own extensive account of Calvin’s covenant theology. Although his study, like many others, approaches the Reformation from the direction of Puritanism and the Westminster Assembly, and while the historiographical survey prepares the reader to think again in these terms, he rightly looks to medieval covenant thought as the immediate context of the early Reformed concept. Only occasionally does his interest in the origins of federal theology obtrude into his otherwise compelling analysis of the early Swiss reformers. Their influence on early English Reformed theology is arguably the more promising place to explore the impact of their covenant thought than in the new directions it took later in the century.

Seeing that the early Swiss reformers formulated reciprocal concepts of covenant that constituted a unifying characteristic of Swiss Reformed theology, the line of Reformed theological diversity

33 Woolsey, *Unity and Continuity*. For example he asks the question of Calvin’s concept, ‘What more is needed to constitute a covenant of works arrangement?’ Ibid., 282. The emphasis on the unity between Reformation and post-Reformation Reformed theology is a helpful corrective providing that early Reformed covenant theology is not assimilated into post-Reformation categories.
ought now to be drawn between the Swiss on the one hand and the Germans on the other. The theologians of Strassburg are to be considered alongside the Lutherans. Martin Bucer developed a concept of covenant without significant mutual or conditional elements, which is important insofar as he was in a position to exert major influence in England especially in his final years at Cambridge.

Bucer’s concept of covenant came close to Luther’s position albeit with idiosyncratic ambiguity. Although Nicholas Thompson suggests that ‘Bucer treated testamentum as a synonym for foedus’ and, to a greater extent than Luther, ‘emphasised the human side of the covenant,’ his bilateral themes should not be unduly emphasised; they are concentrated in his early work and have primary reference to the sacraments rather than to salvation. In *Grund und Ursach* ([Basic Principles]) (1524) he wrote that ‘Christians renew their spiritual and everlasting covenant and testament in the Lord with holy food and drink,’ but Thompson explains that, for Bucer, the Christian offers ‘nothing other than the obedience of faith’ in the sense of patristic eucharistic sacrifice. In *Epistola Apologetica* ([Apologetical Letter]) (1529) the sacraments are called ‘a symbol and token of the covenant which God has made with us [by which] we are reminded of those things which it befits God to do for us and us, in turn, to do for God.’ While Luther placed sacrament and sacrifice in opposition, Bucer preserved the sacrificial element of ‘grateful response’ from humanity. This was ‘the Godward and human dimension of any “ceremony” appointed to seal God’s covenant,’ rather than a

37 Ibid.
38 Quoted in Ibid., 118.
39 Ibid., 120.
40 Ibid., 285.
developed reciprocal feature of the covenant itself. Kenneth Hagen has noted that in another of Bucer’s early works, Ennarationes in evangelia [Explanations of the Gospels] (1527), the verum et aeternum Dei foedus is defined as God’s promise, requiring nothing of believers. The unilateral sense is clearly pronounced in Bucer’s mature writings. In De Regno Christi [Of Christ’s Reign] (1551) foedus is understood as unilateral adoption: ‘sollenique foederis divini, id est adoptionis in filios pactione, et sanctione’ (and a solemn pact and sanction of divine treaty, that is, of adoption as sons). Peter Stephens’ study of Bucer finds an overwhelming tendency towards understanding the covenant as God’s promise of forgiveness. Hence Luther’s and Bucer’s formulations must both be distinguished from those of the reformers of Zürich and Geneva.

Covenant and Late Medieval Scholasticism

Reformation covenant theology is more logically approached by way of late medieval thought than by working backwards from post-Reformation developments. The early reformers were products of their medieval intellectual heritage and they are best understood in that context. Late medieval scholastic theology is remarkable for

41 Hagen, “Testament to Covenant,” 22–23. This also appears to be the sense of Bucer’s Apology concerning Christ’s Supper (1526) in Commonplaces of Martin Bucer, ed. D. F. Wright (Abingdon: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1972), 323.
42 Quoted in Møller, “Beginnings,” 54. My translation. See also the different applications of testamentum and foedus in Martin Bucer, Confession on the Eucharist (1550), in Wright, ed., Commonplaces, 397.
its presuppositional and doctrinal diversity generated in large part by the philosophical controversy between the realist and non-realist epistemologies of the via antiqua and the via moderna.

In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries a broad consensus developed that salvation necessitated an ontological change in humanity. Theologians of what came to be known as the via antiqua, such as Thomas Aquinas (1225–74) and Peter Aureole (c.1280–1322), held that the formal cause of justification was a created or infused habit of grace or charity. This consensus began to collapse when Franciscan theologians like Duns Scotus (c.1266–1308), in seeking to uphold God’s freedom as well as his reliability, suggested that the created order was determined not by the very nature of reality but was contingent on the ordained will of God (potentia Dei ordinata). The only constraints on God are self-imposed but he is faithful to his own sovereign decisions. For William of Ockham (1285–1347) one of the soteriological implications of this was that created habits, rather than being absolutely necessary ex natura rei, were only de facto necessary in that God had ordained to accept them as the immediate cause of justification.45

The heterogeneous movement initiated by Ockham known as the via moderna sought to negate the philosophical turn of the early thirteenth century.46 It had in common a rejection of meta-categories in theology and an emphasis on scriptural revelation over against

---


46 I am grateful to Lydia Schumacher for discussion of the early Franciscans, the *Summa Halensis* (1236–45), and ‘grey areas’ in scholastic theology before the thirteenth century.
natural theology. This undermined the ontological foundations for habitual grace. While early medieval theologians had spoken of God as having an obligation (obligatio or debitum) to bestow grace on humans who do what is in them (facit quod in se est), the moderni drew on emerging economic and political ideas about covenants or contracts to posit a divine covenant (pactio divina) that guaranteed the reliability of God’s ordained will, not least with regard to salvation. God would not deny grace to the humiles (humble or meek) and promises to justify those who do their best. Grace was now conceived as a dimension of God’s disposition towards humanity and emphasis fell on the personal nature of the relationship. The efficacy of the sacraments depended on the covenant which guaranteed that God would bestow grace whenever a sacrament was received.

Humanity’s reciprocal action in procuring grace was defined in terms of love for God. The Tübingen theologian Gabriel Biel (c.1420/25–95) explained the condition of quod in se est as being ‘declinare…a malo et facere bonum’ (to decline from evil and to do good). The medieval conception of the Church as the ‘guardian of morality’ encouraged such a legal emphasis. Biel referred to Christ as legislator, more than salvator, noster and taught that humans have the innate power to love God for God’s own sake. This allowed the condition for justification to be understood as being the same under both the Old and the New Testament but, as McGrath has emphasised, to be discussed without necessary reference to Christ.

---

50 Gabriel Biel, quoted in McGrath, Intellectual Origins, 79.
52 Oberman, Harvest, 117.
53 Alister McGrath, “Homo Assumptus? A study in the Christology of the Via
Following Ockham, theologians of the *via moderna* considered the meritorious value of human love to be worth whatever God accepted it to be. While it might be of little intrinsic value it could still merit justification. The wisdom governing divine *iusticia*, both as Decalogue and as Gospel, was beyond human comprehension—and for that reason it might appear arbitrary—yet it was utterly reliable and consistent in accordance with the *pactum Dei*. The fulfilment of its conditions elicited saving grace.

Indications of Luther’s impending break from medieval covenant theology can be observed in his *Dictata super Psalterium* (1513–15) where the exegetical tendency to conflate *pactum* and *testamentum* placed him at odds with the *moderni*. He distinguished a ‘new rule of Christ’ unknown under the old covenant, the difference being that the new covenant cannot be cancelled by human sin. God still promises grace to the *humiles* but it is applied only when they acknowledge their extreme humiliation before God as the place where grace operates. He rejected Biel’s interpretation of ‘seek and you shall find’ (Luke 11:9) in terms of *facere quod in se est*, ‘as if those words meant that it is in our power to seek and to convert ourselves, when it says in Psalm 13 [14.2] that no-one understands or seeks God!’ Instead he fundamentally altered the terms of the discussion:


58 Luther’s marginalia to Gabriel Biel’s *Collectorium in quattuor libros sententiarum* and *Sacri canonis missae expositio*, quoted in Oberman, *The Reformation*, 107.
human action consisted not in meeting any minimal requirement but in confessing that salvation can only be found extra nos.

The humility with which believers respond to the covenant is not, for Luther, a saving virtue but the necessary result of faith, a recognition of their total poverty and wretchedness. In his Romans lectures of 1515–16 faith became the sole condition for justification, no longer a human act but a divine gift. The condition is fulfilled entirely by God, making the covenant unconditional on humanity’s part. Consequently the legal nature of the testamentum became not a means of regulating Christian conduct but a requirement upon God to deliver that which he has graciously promised. His transition from a bilateral to a unilateral concept of covenant becomes apparent after 1516 in his increasing emphasis on sola fide as opposed to sola gratia as pactum recedes behind promissio and evangelium in his thought.59

Although Luther believed that the covenant theology of the via moderna was repeating the error of Pelagius, Biel was part of what Berndt Hamm describes as ‘the late-medieval endeavour to transfer the weight of salvation from the side of the spiritual quality and activity of mankind to the side of God’s gracious, saving mercy.’60 Divine concursus in humanity’s ‘natural’ ability to do anything was assumed in the teaching that sinners are able to prepare themselves for the reception of justifying grace by loving God for his own sake above all else. Biel laid stress on the inadequacy of human merit and the need for divine assistance.61 Facere quod in se est was not conceived as a means of earning salvation through personal effort but an insistence on a minimal level of penitence in response to God’s initiative, which was a standard feature of the Western Christian tradition. Oberman explains that ‘to desire God’s help is doing one’s very best.’62

60 Hamm, Reformation of Faith, 119.
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62 Ibid., 133.
insists McGrath, and *by his own definition of Pelagianism*, Biel’s doctrine of justification is not only not Pelagian, but is actually strongly anti-Pelagian.63

At the turn of the sixteenth century devotional writers were stressing God’s readiness to exercise compassion in the face of human inability. If there was a christological lacuna in the schools partial compensation was offered in the pulpits. Luther’s mentor Johannes von Staupitz (c.1460–1524) based the Christian life on the *sola misericordia* and *sola gratia* of God and the *solus Christus* of the Passion. It was only conjoined with Christ’s sufferings that any human merit was possible.64 In Nuremberg Stephan Fridolin (1430–98) preached Christ’s Passion as being ‘the middle point, the centre, the most central town in the region of our hope.’65 The Strassburg cathedral preacher Johannes Geiler von Kayserberg (1445–1510) settled on *facere quod in se est* to express a self-doubting reliance upon the mediation of Christ, Mary and the saints. Love for God was most meritorious when it discounted its own merit.66 In the decades preceding the Reformation the twelfth-century emphasis on a severe *Christus iudex* had shifted strongly towards a humble figure suffering on the Cross in order to effect salvation, if only sinners would accept his help and demonstrate corresponding repentance by living in imitation of him.67

*Facere quod in se est* was understood to be a flexible condition gratuitously measured to the ability of the individual sinner. Oberman makes the important point that ‘Biel’s concern is to provide

---
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a way to justification within reach of the average Christian. For Johannes von Paltz (1445–1511), Luther’s colleague at Erfurt, even attrition—doleo quod non doleo (I grieve that I do not grieve)—was sufficient: ‘offer to the one who was offered for you, because he so willed it, as much as you have: at least a good will (bonam saltem voluntatem) and, by virtue of his sacrifice, have confidence that you will be saved!’ The range of opinion as to whether this minimal offering elicited grace or responded to it was what disturbed Luther. Jared Wicks notes that in Staupitz’s treatment of the thief on the cross (Luke 23:39–43) ‘the thief makes no self-disposing good effort of searching and doing what he could, but instead confesses his own sin and acknowledges Jesus as righteous.’ By contrast, Paltz adduced the thief as evidence that conversion could begin with natural human effort to which God’s responds with grace. As Hamm remarks, ‘two preachers within the same order, who shared the same tradition, could also share intentions and an emphasis on mercy while articulating them in two very different ways.’ Perhaps even worse in Luther’s mind was never being sure that one had really done quod in se est and, consequently, whether one merited justification. The imitatio Christi, as the standard of love at which he was expected to aim, did not offer enough certainty about his own salvation.

Not everyone shared Luther’s misgivings. The major pastoral problem in Geiler’s long experience as a preacher, far from any lack of assurance, was presumption:

God has made a covenant [pactum] with us. Come then, the devil says, sin bravely, for however great your sins may be,
God’s mercy is still greater. [...] The whole world in our time is so corrupt that it is quite dangerous to preach about God’s mercy. For where there is one who despairs there are one hundred, nay one thousand, and ten times one hundred thousand overconfident people; and yet they are all mistaken.73

Geiler is undoubtedly liable to the charge that Christ’s Passion is a necessary but not sufficient condition for salvation, but in his mind he was able to offer complete assurance to those who despaired of their ability to do quod in se est: ‘for God’s mercy is so great that he would never condemn a person laid with all the sins of the world who felt the pain that he had, in committing them, arrogantly offended so good a lord, his God, and firmly resolved to refrain [from such sins] in the future.’74 The promise of grace within the context of covenant relationship was what invigorated spiritual and social renewal. Far from being contradictory, most people experienced the dual focus on justice and mercy as being positively complementary. They could look for signs of grace in their own lives, like the subjective experience of peace and joy or the desire to receive the sacraments, and thereby make reasonable conjectures about their standing before God.75 The parallels with post-Reformation Puritanism should not surprise us: the same intellectual and cultural currents flowed from late-medieval covenant theology through the Reformation.

Early Reformed theologians recast the principle that God does not ask anything from humans beyond their capability within a radically gracious economy which excluded human merit altogether.76

73 Johannes Geiler von Kayserberg, quoted in Hamm, Reformation of Faith, 74.
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This fundamental break between late-medieval and Reformation theology did not exclude logical development and continuity of thought. There had already been a significant body of pastoral theology expounding minimal requirements for salvation (sola misericordia, sola crux, sola caritas, sola humilitas, sola spes, sola contritio, etc.) and these were further concentrated on ‘the singular and one-sided efficacy of God’s role in man’s salvation’ (solus Christus, sola gratia, sola scriptura, etc.). Hamm maintains that the Late Middle Ages and the Reformation were ‘bound together by complex combinations of theological, pastoral, social and political trends which produced both a culture of mercy and release and a culture of regulation and discipline.’77 Reformed theologians were able to hold together salvation sola gratia and the requirement for godliness without resorting to Luther’s radical solifidianism to maintain the distinction.78 They were as comfortable as their predecessors had been with seamless conceptual links between righteousness, faith, and sanctification under the auspices of covenant relationship according to the law of love.79

**Exception and Reception**

Serious attempts to study the English Reformation against the patterns of the Reformation on the continent have been made only since the end of the twentieth century. The venture incites debate even before specific theological concepts can be invoked and some clarity must be established before we may proceed to measure the intellectual currents which flowed across the Channel. A review of historiographical interpretations of the period from the 1520s to the 1550s reveals an almost unswerving assessment of England as an exception from continental patterns of Reformation, being characterised by political rather than theological change.

78 Ibid., 150–51.
In 1825 Samuel Maitland questioned the trustworthiness of histories bequeathed by members and admirers of the ‘puritan sect,’ amongst whom he counted the likes of John Foxe (1516/17–87), Thomas Fuller (1593–1667), Gilbert Burnet (1643–1715) and John Strype (1643–1737). In reacting against their allegedly unreliable accounts of the Reformation, nineteenth-century historians distanced the English experience from the populist doctrinal upheaval on the continent, stressing instead the reluctance of the English people to embrace reform, the avarice of the rulers who imposed it, and the apparently minimal effect reform had upon doctrine.

Charles Smyth, writing in 1926, explained the Henrician Reformation as a diplomatic necessity, while ‘the Edwardine Reformation was a dangerous and an unpopular experiment’ whose ‘alien influences [. . .] left the whole country seething with [. . .] heretics and sectaries of every description.’ In the end,’ wrote Smyth patriotically, ‘it was not Protestantism that converted England from Catholicism, but the Spanish Match.’ The story told by Norman Sykes in 1938 of a thoroughly constitutional Reformation of the Ecclesia Anglicana reached its apogée during the Second World War with Maurice Powicke’s epithetical ‘act of state’. Thomas Cranmer (1489–1556), maintained Powicke, ‘was always the primate, the English theologian [. . .] seeking a settlement suited to English needs.’

The rehabilitation of the religious character of the English Reformation began after the Second World War. In 1947 Gordon Rupp ventured the suggestion that ‘the English Reformation is not

---

wholly to be explained in terms of that conspiracy by which a lustful monarch and predatory gentry combined to plunder the Church and rend the unity of Christendom. It had, after all, something to do with the beliefs of Christian men."84 Rupp also countenanced recognition of some continental influence:

We shall be wise if we refuse to imitate those historians who loved to glorify some imaginary and splendid isolation of the English Church, as though there was something inherently disreputable in borrowing from abroad [. . .]. Nevertheless, facts are facts, and it will be our business to note that even where our Reformers set their faces most steadfastly towards Wittenberg, Strasbourg or Zürich, their caps were tilted after an English fashion.85

In 1948 Maynard Smith seemed to have heeded Rupp’s pleas in dividing his attention equally between ‘The Political Reformation’ and ‘The Religious Reformation,’ but he retained English insularity. ‘The great majority of quiet respectable folk had no desire for change,’ he wrote, and the small minority whose humanism Luther did catalyse ‘cared very little for Lutheran teaching.’86 In 1950 T. M. Parker observed that the resemblances between England and the continent were ‘closer than are sometimes admitted’ but this concession does not appear to have inspired deeper examination of continental influence.87

Between the 1950s and the 1970s interpretations were divided on the nature of the English Reformation yet its insularity continued

85 Ibid., 47–48.
to be generally affirmed. Historians with very different perspectives, such as Clifford Dugmore, Owen Chadwick and Geoffrey Elton, maintained the uniquely political nature of the English Reformation. Meanwhile research in local archives encouraged others to emphasise popular enthusiasm for reform originating, not on the continent, but in continuity and exchange with native, medieval traditions of dissent, specifically Lollardy. This approach was adopted not only by Geoffrey Dickens, but also by the medieval historian Margaret Aston. In 1964 Dickens acknowledged that continental doctrines had exacerbated existing native conflicts but this was lost beneath the fact that, ‘if the English clergy were perturbed in 1536 by any doctrines save those of neo-Lollardy, they made extremely little of the fact.’ In the 1980s a number of different scholars, including

88 Although Harry Porter noted numerous continental connections, he made no concerted attempt to integrate the English experience into continental patterns: H. C. Porter, Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge (Cambridge: CUP, 1958).
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Aston, Dickens, Susan Brigden, John Davis and Anne Hudson, came to similar conclusions about popular support for Reformation and its continuities with Lollardy. In 1989 however the second edition of Dickens’ *The English Reformation* anticipated a new awareness of ‘the powerful European forces’ exerted on Henrician England.

From the mid-1970s revisionist historians began to reinvigorate the old interpretation of Reformation as slow and politically-driven. Nevertheless, the exceptional nature of the English experience persisted in revisionist arguments, whatever the extent of their scepticism as to the popularity of reform. In 1984 Jack Scarisbrick argued that ‘the peculiar character of the English Reformation’ was that its initiation, in the form of the Royal Supremacy and monastic dissolutions, ‘officially owed nothing and in practice little to Protestantism.’ In 1992 Eamon Duffy’s elegiac account

---
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of England’s religious world before ‘the stripping of the altars’ proceeded without attempting any substantial engagement with the Reformation on the continent at all. In 1993 Christopher Haigh scorned the assumption that ‘what happened in England was simply a local manifestation of the wider European movement,’ stating that ‘English Reformations’ ‘did not follow any general Continental pattern.’ Although he recognised that there was borrowing from and coincidence with the continental Reformation, he insisted that ‘English Reformations’ were ‘different’. In 2005 George Bernard demonstrated no more concern for the continent in his account of reform driven by the Crown than Duffy had thirteen years earlier.

Students of continental history have shown a greater willingness to see England as one scene on the European stage. In 1991 Euan Cameron stated that ‘Europe’s offshore islands [. . . ] were as readily exposed to the ideas of the Reformation as anywhere on the Continent.’ In 2002 Philip Benedict specifically censured early Tudor revisionists for displaying ‘a much more limited awareness of the larger world of European Reformation scholarship and its implications for their topic.’ Benedict’s criticism broaches one explanation for English exceptionalism: the relatively short supply of Anglophone scholarship of the European Reformation until the latter half of the twentieth century.

Luther in English were pioneered by Roland Bainton in 1950 and Rupp in 1953. The non-Lutheran Reformations trailed behind. Calvin studies were aided by the translation of François Wendel’s French-language study in 1963 and the publication of T. H. L. Parker’s English-language biography in 1975. The first satisfactory study of Zwingli in English was by George Potter in 1976 and only in 2002 was a complete history of the Swiss Reformation published in English by Bruce Gordon. Gordon’s contribution, followed in 2009 by an impressive biography of Calvin, is the product of a growing awareness of the importance of continental influence on England.

Most historians, as this survey suggests, have concentrated on political and devotional change. Felicity Heal, who in 2003 produced an integrated account of the Reformation across Britain and Ireland, suggests that this concentration encourages national studies. ‘Historians of doctrine and ideas have found it easiest to transcend fixed boundaries,’ she writes. ‘But when the reception of these ideas and their assimilation into the political mainstream is at issue, national historians have a tendency to revert to claims of local exceptionalism.’

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

Students of England’s debt to continental reform have often worked with intellectual history or historical theology. In 1992 Diarmuid MacCulloch claimed that ‘to chronicle the theological story of the English Reformation is largely to chronicle the shifting influences from the Continent, and English assimilation of them or reaction against them.’ Since then more scholars have begun

---


to discuss continental influence so that, by 2007, Peter Marshall could claim ‘that the Reformation in these islands possesses not just a “European context” in which it can be helpfully viewed, but a European dimension from which it cannot meaningfully be separated.’ Interest in this European ‘dimension’ led to a British Academy symposium held in 2007 being devoted to the subject of British reception of the continental Reformation. Numerous papers were concerned with the reception of ideas.

A survey of these studies is suggestive of the progress that has been made. In 1994 Carl Trueman demonstrated that the radicalisation of the early English reformers was ‘Luther’s legacy’ in spite of their modifications to Luther’s theology. In 1999 Richard Rex surveyed the early impact of continental theology at Cambridge. Rory McEntegart argued in 2002 for the sincerity of English interest in the theological aspects of negotiations with the Lutheran princes during the 1530s. Alec Ryrie’s important study of Henrician reformers in 2003 suggested identifications with Lutheranism, and in 2009 a symposium was convened in Berlin to examine the relationship between the ‘Sister Reformations’ in England and the

---


Holy Roman Empire, particularly, that is, in Wittenberg.116 These have all been valuable correctives to English exceptionalism but it is apparent that most of them have concentrated upon specifically German Lutheran influence. This in spite of MacCulloch’s assessment that the ‘nearest relative’ of the English Reformation was ‘a string of Reformations which stretched from Martin Bucer’s Strassburg to Heinrich Bullinger’s Zürich.’117

Loss of institutional unity in western Christendom contributed to a crisis of identity which, besides its social and political expressions, was fundamentally religious. Marshall’s proposal that ‘we should see the English Reformation primarily as a crucible of religious identity formation’ begins to deal with the sense of dislocation that ensued after the collapse of the late-medieval Church.118 The crisis was not only religious, but theological; it demanded reassessment, not only of the individual’s relationship to the Church and to the state, but also of the way in which he related to God. It is impossible to understand religious identities properly without appreciating the context of theological discourse in which they operated.119

Luther may have led the vanguard of the revolt against papal authority but his self-identification with bona fide Christianity did

not win universal recognition from those who abandoned Rome. One such sceptic was the bishop of Winchester, Stephen Gardiner (1483–1555), who complained in 1541, ‘You have not abolished the authority of Rome throughout the world, but you have appropriated it to yourselves, and transferred it to Wittenberg.’ Gardiner was addressing Lutherans, yet for some time—certainly since the late 1520s—Luther had been one among several leading reformers, and the cities of Zürich and Strassburg had emerged as alternative models to Wittenberg of what was authentic and evangelical Christianity. The radical reformer Melchior Hoffman even predicted that in 1533 Strassburg would be instated as the New Jerusalem. Cameron has described Luther as ‘a leader who did not provide all the answers; an icon who commanded immense respect but could not be followed word for word.’ The enormous market for Luther’s publications did not necessarily represent informed or uncritical support. His belief in justification by faith alone and his concomitant attack on the meritorious value of human works for salvation were touchstones of Reformation theology, but they were assimilated by some who retained greater emphasis on morality and obedience. Although ethical priorities might arise for a number of different reasons, in some cases it was the reciprocal concept of covenant that contributed powerfully to their formation. Conversely, the reciprocal covenant might be developed as a response to accusations of antinomianism against evangelical doctrine.

The Henrician Reformation saw dalliances with continental Lutheranism but doctrinally it is better to speak of an Anglo-Lutheran


moment’ rather than a ‘movement.’ It is difficult to name individual English theologians who were authentically Lutheran. Even Robert Barnes (1495–1540), a friend and student of Luther’s at Wittenberg, can be seen to have exhibited ‘important areas of difference’ on the Law amongst other doctrines. It is highly significant that the vast majority of Luther’s works which were translated into English during the early Reformation did not concern his doctrine of justification. Those reformers who embraced salvation sola gratia were not necessarily committed to Luther’s assessment of the human condition in terms of forensic guilt. Many of them, including Cranmer, framed it in terms of moral disease. The effect was detrimental to the progress of radical solifidianism in English evangelicalism.

The scholarly focus on Lutheran influence in the early English Reformation can be unhelpful in encouraging us to think of the theology of the period in terms of a mild, proto-Anglican via media. More radical individuals are necessarily cast as proto-Puritans. Inadequate attention to continental influences other than Lutheranism during Henry VIII’s reign needs to be redressed. This was when
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the ‘Zürich connection’ first began: the term was used by Torrance Kirby in 2007 to describe the profound influence that operated after Bullinger and Peter Martyr Vermigli (1499–1562) became the ‘chief architects’ of Edward VI’s Church.129 Carrie Euler’s monograph of 2006 is by far the most detailed discussion of the reception of the Zürich tradition in Henrician England. She begins in 1531 and analyses the process of transmission with special attention to the history of the book, pastoral theology, and to polemic aimed at Catholic material piety and Anabaptism, footnoting the debate about covenant theology.130 Ryan Reeves’ work in 2014 reveals the connection between Swiss Reformed political thought and English evangelical attitudes to civil authority.131 Further scrutiny and deeper theological analysis will be required for some time yet, but there is good reason to believe that Reformed theology made a contribution to the English Reformation from its earliest years.

The Edwardian links deserve further exploration as well, for they anticipate the influence on Elizabethan religion exerted by Bullinger and Vermigli through networks established during the Marian Exile and via their publications.132 After his return to England from exile in 1559, John Jewel wrote wistfully, ‘O Zurich! O Zurich! how much oftener do I now think of thee than ever I thought of England when I was at Zurich!’133 The prevalence of continentally-inspired Reformed theology in the Elizabethan Church of England was so
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great that Kirby has called it a ‘flowering’ of Zürich theology. Zürich certainly excelled Geneva as the point of reference.

This contribution towards understanding Swiss Reformed influence on English theology from the 1520s to the 1550s focuses on the soteriology and sacramental theology associated with the covenant concept. Quentin Skinner stipulates that some very demanding conditions should be met before ‘influence’ can be ascribed: he requires (1) that there should be ‘genuine similarity between the doctrines of A and B,’ (2) ‘that B could not have found the relevant doctrine in any writer other than A,’ (3) ‘that the probability of the similarity being random should be very low.’ Here ‘influence’ will be used less stringently as a form of reception. It is ‘a question of tendencies, in part unconscious,’ as Gottfried Locher makes clear: ‘We should not expect an exact copy of the Zurich reformation. But when one or more of the aforementioned characteristics is seen to strive to take effect in programmatic form, then we may think in terms of relationship, repetition, or influence.’

Covenant and the English Reformers

The seventeenth century has acted as a scholarly base camp for explorations of sixteenth-century Reformation covenant theology. Research has been preoccupied with its significance for post-Reformation federal theology and the presenting task has been to grapple with continental formulations of the covenant within the Reformed tradition. Little interest has hitherto been shown in the development of the concept in England, but research into continental concepts of covenant has now progressed sufficiently to warrant extension of the investigation to the English Reformation. In addition, the recent historiography of the English Reformation

encourages exploration of English concepts of covenant as part of a process of religious identity formation in the context of continental influences. The reciprocal concept of covenant can be used to illustrate the influence of Swiss Reformed theology on certain English reformers.

The lack of any concentrated analysis of the concept of covenant in early English Reformation theology has permitted the assumption that it became significant only in the late sixteenth century. The most detailed account to date appeared in 2004 as a preliminary chapter to Theodore Bozeman’s study of post-Reformation Puritanism. The chapter is valuable because it avoids the anachronisms of Trinterud and his followers. Bozeman claims that the majority of early English reformers ‘either expressed no special interest in the covenant idea or expounded it, with [John] Bradford [1510–55], in noncontractual or unilateral terms.’ Cranmer was typical in this respect; his writings exhibit no special appreciation of the covenant even à propos his reading of Swiss sacramental theology. Bozeman does, nevertheless, identify several early reformers as exponents of the reciprocal concept: Miles Coverdale (1488–1569), George Joye (1490/95–1553), WilliamTyndale (c.1491–1536), John Bale (1495–1563), John Hooper (1495/1500–1555), Thomas Becon (1512/13–67) and Edmund Allen (1510s–59).136

The covenant was a significant feature of English Reformed theology. The concepts articulated by Zwingli, Bullinger and Calvin provide a basis for a systematic investigation of the concepts belonging to Tyndale, Coverdale and Hooper as three of those reformers rightly identified by Bozeman as espousing reciprocal themes. Bradford’s concept of covenant will also be examined here for the sake of comparison and in order to determine the reasons for variety within the English Reformed tradition. These four reformers were fairly representative of educated English reformism between the 1520s and 1550s: Tyndale and Hooper were Oxford men while Coverdale

and Bradford studied at Cambridge; Tyndale and Coverdale were Bible translators; Tyndale, Coverdale and Hooper experienced exile, Bradford did not; Coverdale and Hooper became bishops; Tyndale, Hooper and Bradford were martyred, Coverdale died an old man.

Of the early English reformers Tyndale has received by far the most scholarly attention after Cranmer himself. James Mozley’s landmark biography of 1937, complemented by Stanley Greenslade’s essay of 1938, had enduring value; they were succeeded in 1994 by David Daniell’s biography with a literary bent. The tenor of interpretation was set in 1948 when Maynard Smith called Tyndale ‘an austere Puritan.’ Trinterud added theological credence to this in 1951 and 1962 with his remarks on the legal nature of Tyndale’s conditional covenant motif. In 1961 Broughton Knox, echoed by Møller in 1963, accused Tyndale of ‘overthrowing the whole basis of the Reformation’ on the grounds that he attached God’s promises to the fulfilment of conditions. This interpretation was enshrined in 1964 in William Clebsch’s conclusion that, while Tyndale’s soteriology had been solifidian in the 1520s, in 1530 he adopted a ‘bifocal theology of gospel and law’ involving ‘a twin justification, by faith before God and by works before men.’ By 1532, wrote Clebsch, ‘Tyndale had revised his theology radically around the controlling notion of covenant, understood as a moralistic contract between God and man.’ This became the standard interpretation and was
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accepted in 1968 by Greaves who aligned Tyndale with Zwingli and Æcolampadius.\textsuperscript{143}

Clebsch’s thesis was broadly accepted by Charles Williams in 1969 and by McGiffert in his article of 1981 dealing with Tyndale’s concept of covenant. McGiffert addressed the specifically soteriological question of whether Tyndale saw works as efficacious and concluded that he was not really legalistic.\textsuperscript{144} He then assented to Trinterud’s thesis, reinforcing the view that Tyndale had little influence on later covenant theology.\textsuperscript{145} In 1994 Trueman reiterated McGiffert’s denial of the contractual soteriology of Tyndale’s concept. He claimed that it better resembled a familial relationship and that Tyndale had confined conditionality to an ethical imperative for Christians.\textsuperscript{146} Trueman’s more novel contribution was to argue that there had been no fundamental revision of Tyndale’s soteriology in 1530–32.\textsuperscript{147} However, although Trueman helpfully demonstrated Tyndale’s early ethical emphases, he was so concerned to exonerate Tyndale of legalism that he allowed conditionality to have no bearing whatsoever on justification.\textsuperscript{148} In 1996 Patrick Collinson judged that analysis of Tyndale had been ‘vitiated’ by the agenda seeking the origins of Puritanism.\textsuperscript{149} This appears to be true of all previous
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studies save Trueman’s. Another impediment has been the absence of any systematic survey of the concept of covenant throughout Tyndale’s works. Thus Arne Dembek could still suggest in 2010 that the concept had not emerged as Tyndale’s theological ‘Leitmotiv’ until as late as 1533. In 2014 Reeves demonstrated that Tyndale was accessing Swiss Reformed writings no later than 1527/28.

The scarcity of interest shown in Coverdale—as opposed to Coverdale’s translations—is surprising. Almost nothing has been written by historians since Maynard Smith in 1948 and Mozley in 1953, both of whom devoted more print to his Bible translations than to the man himself or to his theology. The only other


significant studies, both from 1982, were Esther Hildebrandt’s dissertation, which recounted Coverdale’s exile abroad, and Celia Hughes’ analysis of several episodes of his life. There have been no assessments of his concept of covenant aside from Trinterud’s comment that Coverdale’s Bible translations were, in his view, ‘indifferent’ to it.

Hooper has attracted rather more attention than Coverdale but usually for his participation in the Vestment Controversy rather than his theology. In 1951 Trinterud claimed Hooper as an exponent of the ‘covenant, or federal, school of thought.’ Morris West followed with three articles in 1954 and 1955 assessing Hooper’s contribution to Puritanism. The first of these suggested that the covenant provided a framework for Hooper’s theology, a view vociferously contradicted by Møller in 1963. In 1968 Greaves took a single sentence to note the significance of conditionality in Hooper’s understanding of the Decalogue, but J. H. Primus supported West in claiming that Hooper’s ‘concept of authority rooted in the covenant’ was the basis for most of his ‘Puritan traits’. A via media was ploughed in 1992 by E. W. Hunt: although West had probably claimed too much, the covenant was ‘by no means peripheral’ to Hooper’s thought. In 1994 Trueman acknowledged
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in passing that Hooper had articulated a ‘bilateral’ concept of ‘contract’ which took effect only after reconciliation to God.\textsuperscript{163} John Franke’s dissertation in 1996 recognised the foundational significance of a conditional ‘notion of a contract’ to Hooper’s theology but his analysis of it was limited in scope.\textsuperscript{164} In 2003 Andries Raath and Shaun de Freitas identified Hooper as the link between Bullinger’s federalism and Puritanism, implicitly fortifying Trinterud’s and Baker’s positions.\textsuperscript{165} Alison Dalton’s dissertation of 2008 explored influences on Hooper, placing him definitively in the Swiss camp, but she did not undertake extensive theological investigation.\textsuperscript{166} David Newcombe’s biography of 2009 took up Møller’s denial of the significance of Hooper’s concept but failed to provide supporting evidence from Hooper’s writings.\textsuperscript{167} A more satisfactory assessment is undoubtedly needed.

Historians often cite Bradford but without any extended analysis. His reforming career was brief and ended prematurely, yet the wealth of his writing deserves exploration. For Trinterud he was an emergent Puritan, apparently undeserving of further comment.\textsuperscript{168} For Møller he participated in the formation of what would become Puritan covenant theology.\textsuperscript{169} The most accomplished study remains Philip Johnston’s 1963 dissertation which excelled both biographically and
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theologically; his examiner Gordon Rupp delivered a commemorative sermon on Bradford that same year, and in 1964 Marcus Loane published a brief biography. In 1968 Greaves described Bradford as reflecting Calvin’s concept of covenant, thereby allocating him to the Calvinist, as opposed to Rhenish, tradition in Trinterud’s model. In 1975 Haigh’s study of Lancashire included mention of Bradford, who was a native of that county, and in 1983 Hughes contributed a useful overview of Bradford’s life and writings. Andrew Penny’s study in 1990 of the mid-Tudor predestinarian controversy concerned Bradford’s doctrine of election, a theme which Trueman treated at greater length in 1994. Subsequently Megan Wheeler in 2006 and Michael Graham and Gretchen Minton in 2013 treated Bradford as a prisoner under Mary Tudor and in 2015 Alastair Minnis published on his doctrine of the Resurrection. A clear evaluation of the covenant in Bradford’s thought has never been attempted before and the importance of Bucer to his theological development makes for illuminating comparison.
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INTRODUCTION

This investigation of the concept of covenant as a marker of Swiss influence on English Reformed theology begins in chapter two with a discussion of the complex question of religious and theological identity. Consideration is given to the problems which pertain to analysis of developing and competing theological opinions in England, and evidence for Reformed theology under Henry VIII and Edward VI is surveyed. Chapters three and four introduce the reciprocal covenant as a characteristic of the Reformed tradition and use it to indicate English reception of Swiss theology. The writings of each of the reformers selected are examined with attention given to attendant views on justification, sanctification and predestination when these elucidate distinctively Reformed characteristics. This reception model is developed further in chapters five and six through a similarly structured study of the concept’s impression upon sacramental theology. Sacramental controversy emerged at an early stage of the Reformation with acute relevance to covenant theology in both the Swiss and English discourses.