John E. Booty, editor. *Richard Hooker, "Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity": Attack and Response*. The Folger Library Edition of The Works of Richard Hooker, volume IV. W. Speed Hill, general editor. Cambridge, Mass., and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1982, Pp. li, 274. \$45.00.

Earlier volumes in the Folger Library edition of the works of Richard Hooker have provided us a solid critical edition of *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, including a discussion of the extraordinary textual problems and opportunities that are afforded us by Book V when we compare the carefully printed and proofread edition of 1597 with the printer's manuscript in Hooker's own hand. This present volume offers us material no less unusual and challenging, though of a different sort. It provides a contemporary commentary on the *Laws* in the form of a polemical attack and Hooker's preparations for a rejoinder to that attack. As the editor, John Booty, remarks, rarely do we find autograph notes of this sort in the controversial literature of the sixteenth century, and rarely is such controversy based on a central document of such magnitude.

Much of the present volume is taken up with *A Christian Letter of Certain English Protestants* (1599), written against Hooker by an individual clergyman or a group of Calvinist, anti-Arminian, reform-minded Anglican clerics moved by the necessity of refuting Hooker's purported errors in basic Christian doctrine. Interspersed in the text of *A Christian Letter* itself are Hooker's marginal observations, written in preparation for a more formal answer that was cut off by Hooker's death in November of 1600. The letter and its marginalia are followed in this volume by Hooker's autograph notes toward a fragment on predestination (Trinity College, Dublin, MS 364, f. 80), and three longer sections in draft form also from Dublin (MS 121) on grace and free will, the sacraments, and predestination. Together these materials make up the only recorded refutation of Hooker's *Laws*, and the basis upon which he intended to reply. William Covell did publish in 1603, evidently with the authority and encouragement of Bishop Whitgift, *A Just and Temperate Defence of the Five Books of Ecclesiastical Policie* (STC 5881), though without access to Hooker's notes and fragments and relying heavily on Hooker's own words in the first five books of the *Laws* then in print. The materials in this present volume go far beyond Covell, for they provide the outline of Hooker's own answer to his critics.

What troubles these critics especially are Hooker's non-Calvinist views on grace and predestination and his seeming tolerance of Catholic doctrine. To the author or authors of *A Christian Letter*, the two points are of course connected, for Hooker's insistence that in God's plan "all mankind should be saved, that did live answerable to that degree of grace which he had offered, or afforded them" (xxvi) suggests to Hooker's critics the Pelagian heresy of assuming that human will is itself capable of good. Hooker's doctrine thereby (in the reformers' view) encourages a Catholic emphasis on works. Hooker is of course no Pelagian, for he accepts the doctrine of original sin (as does the Catholic Church), but his allowance for some operation of human acceptance or non-

acceptance goes too far for the Calvinist or Calvinists who undertake to refute him.

These reforming divines are not extremists. John Booty ably shows the nonconformist nature of their positions, and tentatively identifies one of them as Andrew Willet, a loyal Anglican who was Calvinist in theology, anti-Roman Catholic, a protester against the Act of Uniformity, and a questioner of the soundness of Hooker's doctrines. The author or authors, whether or not Willet was one of them, base their attacks against Hooker on the Thirty-Nine Articles, together with relevant passages of Scripture and the Fathers of the early Church. They admire the style and simplicity of the early Fathers and of Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Jewel, and others, as opposed to the ornate formality of Hooker's style and his reliance on Schoolmen such as Aquinas. Their greatest fear is that Hooker's erroneous doctrines signal a malaise in the very heart of the establishment upon which the spiritual health of the Protestant world must depend.

Although we lack Hooker's polished response, the gist of his intended reply is fully apparent in his notes. In fact, they are so frank that they reveal to us a Hooker that the published version might have obscured. We see Hooker here as one openly contemptuous of Calvinist zealots who are never content with the authority of the Church Fathers until "they find out somewhat in Calvin to justify them selves" (3). Hooker is determined to maintain a compassionate and dignified tone no matter how much "this fellow" (1, 47) may goad him into anger. He bridles at "pettie quarrels" and at being asked to attend to "every particular mans humor" (xxix). "Ignorant asse!" he exclaims. "It is not I that scatter but you that gather more then ever was let fall" (22,24). "What bedlam would ask such a question?" (30). "You ly, sir" (41). "How this asse runneth kicking up his heeles as if a summerfly had stung him" (42). The pungent wit and asperity of Hooker's replies are prompted no doubt by the suggestion that he, "under the shewe of inveighing against Puritanes," broaches many "chiefest pointes of popish blasphemie" (7). One suspects that some of Hooker's satirical tone would have found its way into his published reply, since a reply of this sort is by its nature more directly controversial than the *Laws*, but we are still given insights by these marginal notes that are refreshingly candid.

As Booty observes, Hooker's "Notes toward a Fragment" are contained on one leaf of MS 264, Trinity College, Dublin, previously identified by P. G. Stanwood as Hooker's and transcribed in Volume III of the Folger Library edition. Their importance here is to show an intermediate process between the marginal notes to *A Christian Letter* and the drafts in the so-called Dublin Fragments. We have, in other words, Hooker's working notes at various stages of development and expansion. The Dublin Fragments are the closest we have to a completed answer, and in them the tone is more restrained. The longest of the three essays, on predestination, may actually have been drafted earlier, between 1595 and 1600, in response to Walter Travers (a leader of the disciplinary Puritans) rather than to *A Christian Letter*, though it serves its purpose here, redrafted for the present occasion, and is indeed the culmination of what Booty justly calls "the most detailed and sustained exposition of grace

and predestination in Hooker's works" (xxxvii). Together, the Fragments outline an important treatise on free will, grace, and predestination, the most vexed topics raised by *A Christian Letter*. This material is an expansion and clarification of Hooker's earlier work rather than a new departure, but it represents the cause to which Hooker fervently devoted his last energies. He clears himself especially of the charges of urging too great a freedom of the will, and of teaching the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. He shows a reverence for Calvin along with a profound distrust of Calvin's followers who, like many Roman Catholics, make of their church an institution that professes to be above human error.

Hooker's marginal notes, at times very difficult to read, are here scrupulously transcribed with the help of two seventeenth-century transcriptions, themselves not always reliable. The sole sixteenth-century quarto of *A Christian Letter* itself poses no special textual difficulties. The copy text for the Dublin Fragments is evidently a seventeenth-century transcription. Variants between copy text and adopted reading throughout this volume are nonsubstantive, such as the correcting of obvious misprints or changing italian font to roman. An appendix records all such departures from copy text. A learned and thorough commentary deals chiefly with Church authorities and clarification of doctrinal points. The editor is sympathetic toward Hooker but without scholarly bias. The volume is handsomely and generously illustrated with sample pages, chiefly showing Hooker's careful writing in the margins and his alteration of words as he proceeded. This is an attractively prepared volume, and a fitting commentary on those that have gone before.

DAVID BEVINGTON, *University of Chicago*

Collected Works of Erasmus, Volume 6, The Correspondence of Erasmus: Letters 842 to 992 (1518 to 1519). Translated by R.A.B. Mynors and D.F.S. Thomson, annotated by Peter G. Bietenholz. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1982. Pp. xxii, 448. \$75.00.

The glory of this volume is the quality of the translation, for which the Preface assigns specific responsibility to R.A.B. Mynors. Only a few of these letters have been translated into English previously, some by Francis M. Nichols (*The Epistles of Erasmus*, 3 [New York: Longmans, 1918]), by Marcus A. Haworth, S.J., (in *Erasmus and his Age: Selected Letters of Desiderius Erasmus*, ed. Hans J. Hillerbrand [New York: Harper and Row, 1970]) and by Barbara Flowers (appended to the English edition of Huizinga's *Erasmus of Rotterdam* [New York: Phaidon, 1952]). These earlier versions involve intelligent scholarship and writing. However, in comparison with them Professor Mynors' work clearly stands out as that of an exceptionally gifted English stylist, whose talent for English fluently transmits Erasmus' for Latin.

Mynors continually produces a vivacious English that corresponds to the stylistic regions through which these letters mainly range. Many sentences come fast, with syntax that (only) seems unstudied. Over four and a half centuries later, the reader feels the impulse of that "running hand which I use to keep pace with the