

The editorial work on the Folger Library edition of Hooker is enlightened, rigorous, and sane, making intelligent choices and clarifying the dimensions of the task. The volumes are handsome, generous in type size, and aesthetically designed. They are appropriately illustrated with frontispieces or sample pages of the manuscript copy: Volume 2, for example, containing Book V, offers several pages from the manuscript of Hooker’s amanuensis, Benjamin Pullen, showing the printing-house marks for casting off copy, This edition is a scholarly, old-spelling one, not a reader’s edition, and the introductory essays focus on textual matters. At the end of each volume we find useful textual commentary along with appendices detailing, in the case of Volume 2, Hooker’s nonsubstantive corrections to the manuscript, the errors in Pullen’s manuscript corrected by the 1597 edition, manuscript defects supplied from the 1597 edition owing to physical damage to the manuscript or omissions from it, nonsubstantive variants and errors introduced in the 1597 edition, and a correction of miscitations in the Pullen manuscript and in the 1597 edition. Volume 3 contains similar appendices on nonsubstantive variants, press variants, and (for Book VIII) additional manuscript variants, along with lengthy supplements on Hooker’s autograph notes and on Archbishop Ussher’s transcription of those notes, made necessary by the unfinished state of Hooker’s work. The textual problems of Volume I are considerably simpler; here the most substantial appendix is devoted to the composition, printing, and proofing of the 1593 Folio. Although the amount of textual apparatus is at times large, the editors have succeeded in excluding such peripheral data as historical collation of the texts in seventeenth-century reprints; all that they present is relevant to the matter of preparing a critical, old-spelling text. Commentary on Hooker’s writings is to appear in later volumes; everything we have been given thus far concentrates on accurate establishment of the text.

The problems of establishing an accurate text, as has already been suggested, vary widely from volume to volume. Books I to IV were printed in 1593, with unusual expedition but evidently from a legible, accurate, and evenly-spaced copy prepared by Hooker’s scribe, Pullen. Hooker may not actually have been in the shop reading proofs during the run in 1593, but he was able to read sheets in time to prepare a list of errata. Two extant presentation copies of this edition, containing corrections in a contemporary hand that might be Hooker’s or Pullen’s but in either case appearing to reflect the wishes of the author, provide such reliable copy-text that Georges EdeIen has wisely found it necessary to make few emendations. Book V, first printed in 1597, offers the modern editor an extraordinary opportunity, since we have not only a carefully printed and proofread edition but the printer’s manuscript corrected in Hooker’s own hand. This printer’s copy is, as Speed Hill observes, “one of a handful
of Elizabethan manuscripts to have gone through the printing house and survived, and it is certainly the most extensive." Paradoxically, the editorial difficulties posed by this *embarras de richesse* are considerable; they will be discussed in some detail below, in view of the intriguing ramifications they offer for textual scholarship.

Books VI, VII, and VIII present difficulties in quite an opposite direction, for none of Hooker's great work after Book V was printed during his lifetime. At his death in 1600 he left Book VII in a state of near readiness for publication, though it did not surface until the Restoration; an extensive manuscript of Book VI has been lost, apparently before 1600, leaving us with only a portion of it; and Book VIII survives in pieces, from which it is possible to reconstruct most of what Hooker wrote. Allegations by Isaak Walton and others that "perfected" copies of Books VII and VIII were suppressed, stolen, or "embezzled" have fortunately been laid to rest by the discovery of Hooker's autograph notes written between 1593 and 1599, but reconstruction of these last books remains an exercise in approximation.

Each of the last three books offers special difficulties to the modern editor. The books do not even form a group sharing common textual problems. Books VI and VII were first published in 1648 under Archbishop Ussher's supervision, but with a version of Book VI that is "an almost total departure from the work [George] Cranmer and [Edwin] Sandys read, what Hooker's notes anticipate, and what Cranmer and Sandys recommended as revision." Attempts have been made to reconstruct the missing draft on the basis of Hooker's sources used throughout the *Ecclesiastical Policy*, but the relation of printed text to lost version remains problematic. A Trinity College MS 121 (D4), with Ussher's careful corrections, is "as close as we are likely ever to get to Hooker's drafts of Book VI, except for what we can infer from the notes by Cranmer and Sandys or the first notes by Hooker." P.G. Stanwood bases his edition closely on this copy text. Book VII was first printed in 1662 by John Gauden, with careless press-work but seemingly from an autograph manuscript that Gauden had not edited at all; it thus poses fewer problems that do Books VI or VIII, especially since the manuscript of Book VII was closer to completion than those of the other two books. For Book VIII there are ten manuscript versions, if we count Hooker's notes and drafts in Trinity College, Dublin. Stanwood wisely decides to accept the primacy of the Trinity MS and cautiously emend it in light of the other manuscripts. As Stanwood observes, "no Renaissance English prose text poses a comparable problem." The editor's handling of this complex situation is commendably clear and logical, and the result is a text that differs notably from that of Raymond Houk or John Keble.

As Speed Hill reminds us in his impressive textual introduction to his edition of Book V, editors and bibliographers since R.B. McKerrow have cherished the aim of recovering Elizabethan authors' original texts as conceived by them before their texts were submitted to the transformations and sophistications of print. In almost every case, of necessity, this attempted reconstruction is theoretical; the editor has to rely on one or more printed texts and the evidence they suggest as to editorial tampering with the author's original. Contrastingly, the materials available for the editing of Book V of *Ecclesiastical Policy* would seem a paradise for the modern editor. Here we have not only Hooker's own manuscript copy for Book V, as transcribed from Hooker's autograph for the press by his own amanuensis, Benjamin Pullen, and corrected in Hooker's own hand, but the printed edition of 1597 as seen through the press by the
author, proofread by him, and supplied with a modest list of six misprints and two additional changes. What more could we desire? Surely the manuscript provides us with "the text as originally conceived by its author," and should serve as the basis for a modern critical edition as it has served for no previous edition; John Keble’s text, as revised in 1888 by Francis Paget, Bishop of Oxford, assembles a schedule of some major differences between the manuscript and the 1597 edition, but this schedule is incomplete as a collation and has had little effect on the revised text of 1888. For many reasons, then, Book V as edited by Speed Hill offers us a unique opportunity to study a major work as it passed through the Elizabethan printing house, and holds before us the prospect of some real finality in our pursuit of that ideal image, the "definitive" edition.

In several significant ways, this richness of material does indeed reward us with remarkable information, under Hill’s astute examination. Because the manuscript is marked throughout for the casting off of copy, we are able to see in exact detail how the process of casting off affected the printed product. Hill argues effectively that, in this case at least, it produced almost no substantive variants, merely some nine changes in all are attributable to casting off copy, such as expanding "Church" in the manuscript to "Church of God" in the printed text. Nine such alterations in a book of some 182,000 words is not very significant, and Hooker caught one of these in proof in any case. Instead, the effect of casting off for copy was to produce very crowded or loosely composed pages, unsightly at times but doing no harm to the text. Again, we learn much about the work of the compositors from comparing manuscript and finished text. The second workman, B, makes more errors when he picks up the work at sig. Q-2A, and is lax in hyphenation at line-ends, yet is more faithful to the pointing and to some extent the spelling of his copy. We learn from the manuscript the extent of Hooker’s laboring over Pullen’s copy; in addition to authorially provided marginal notes and extensive interlineation, there are some 2,650 instances in which the pointing has been augmented or adjusted. Such careful attention to the manuscript by the author bolsters the case for regarding it as closest to Hooker’s intention.

Hill is surely correct in choosing the Pullen manuscript as his copy text, but, as his own intellectual candor makes clear, problems by no means disappear with the availability of so much original material. There is even at first a problem about choice of copy text, for one might assume that an Elizabethan author would have expected and even desired the compositor to normalize punctuation and orthography in accordance with printing-house practice, and Hooker’s proofreading of the result did not lead him to request many changes. Is the choice of the Pullen manuscript "a retrograde step?" Hill argues effectively that it is not, since the evidence suggests that Hooker read and corrected the manuscript more carefully than the proofs, and since compositors A and B differed from one another in the kind of overlay they applied in matters of punctuation and orthography. Substantive variants between the manuscript and the 1597 edition, both authoritative texts, must of course be carefully weighed as to individual merits, and Hill has done this with great care, but for the ambiguous or indifferent variants he logically favors regarding them as compositorial errors missed in proofreading by Hooker or not considered by him to be worth correcting.

As to accidentals, the problem is as usual most acute and underscores the ultimate futility of the search for definitive solutions. Even if editing the original manuscript tends to restore Hooker’s light pointing, the author’s spelling is often concealed by
that of Pullen in the manuscript and is left uncorrected by the author; the compositors, on the other hand, rarely let stand certain uncharacteristic spelling forms preferred by Pullen, so that "The orthography of the printed text is thus occasionally closer to Hooker’s own than is Pullen’s" (pp. xlv–xlvi), even though it is also inconsistent in itself. The greatest problem occurs with capitalization. Hooker evidently regarded the matter with some indifference, and made no attempt to clarify, for example, the inscribing of the letter C in the manuscript, one form of which is perfectly ambiguous; although capital in form, it is indifferently capital or lower-case in intent. This initial letter affects the capitalization of no less a word than Church, among others. The compositors did not know what to make of their copy, and waffled. The modern editor must confront the uncomfortable realization that "To no small degree, then, an old-spelling text confers on the accidentals of the adopted copy text a spurious authority" (p. xlviii). Hill, bemused by this riddle, wisely cuts the Gordian knot and arbitrarily prints upper-case for all instances of the ambiguous C in Christ, Christian, Church, Creed, and Ceremony.

The abridged edition prepared by A.S. McGrade and Brian Vickers serves quite a different purpose. It is designed to acquaint readers with the main achievement of Hooker’s great work, and so concentrates on what the editors regard as the quintessential historical, philosophical, and political arguments contained in the Preface, Book I, and Book VIII. Along with these sections, presented whole, we are given 23 of the 81 chapters in Book V, and certain other chapters (each complete in itself) from the rest. The selection is an intelligent one, and provides us with a useful alternative to the Everyman edition by R.A. Bayne, 1907, revised by C. Morris in 1954, which presents Books I–V but not the posthumous Books VI–VIII. The editors are especially happy to make available Book VIII, edited by R.A. Houk in 1931 but long out of print. A substantial introductory essay by McGrade on the whole work sets Hooker in the context of Renaissance intellectual history, and deftly makes the point that Hooker wrote as a controversialist at a time when the Anglican establishment seemed in danger particularly from the Puritan left. We should cast off the familiar image of Hooker as magisterial, calm, above the battle, McGrade urges, and see the problem with which Hooker was dealing. McGrade is especially good on the significance of the posthumous books, and on the essential place Hooker’s defense of royal supremacy occupies in the overarching argument.

Brian Vickers’ essay on Hooker’s prose style is nicely attuned to that of McGrade, for Vickers too argues that Hooker should be regarded as an eloquent controversialist whose most effective rhetorical strategies are designed for a deliberative language of praise and blame. Vickers regards his author as dignified, to be sure, but successfully undertakes to rescue him from the common charge of too great a loftiness, stateliness, and remote Latinate elocution. The introductory material offered by both editors provides much historical context, and invites the reader to savor Hooker as a vital, even visceral, thinker and stylist.

Considerations of space have eliminated some of Hooker’s footnotes as well as the Biblical references supplied in Keble’s edition, and the text is provided without commentary. The editors have devoted themselves less to textual matters than has Hill, of necessity, although McGrade is a member of the team producing the Folger Library edition of Hooker under Hill’s generalship. Through this connection, the editors of the abridged text have availed themselves of a number of Folger readings,
although the reader is presented with no way of determining how extensive or systematic this borrowing from the new Folger text may have been. Basically, McGrade and Vickers have contented themselves with Keble. If the Folger edition had been more complete, it could have served throughout as the basis for the abridged text.

The modern reader confronts a varied landscape in the editing of Hooker. The Folger project under Hill’s tutelage is bringing forth an excellent library edition in six volumes including commentary, rather expensively priced for most scholars, and in old spelling. Houk’s scholarly but outdated edition of Book VIII is available in most libraries. The Everyman edition gives us Books I–V in a modern spelling text based on Keble and without much editorial assistance, but is no longer in print. Now McGrade and Vickers have produced a modern-spelling selection, based essentially on Keble but reflecting some Folger advances, in a readable volume published at £12.50. You pays your money and you takes your choice.

DAVID BEVINGTON, The University of Chicago


The intention of this book is to make available the largely neglected political writings of Peter Martyr Vermigli in an annotated edition, elucidated by a comprehensive and thoughtful introduction and through some additional selections from his Latin works. The passages chosen were determined by their content, their representative quality and the attention paid to them by contemporaries. The introduction provides a brief but satisfying statement of Vermigli’s place in the tradition of the intervention into political questions by Reformed thinkers who were in education and profession really theologians. Vermigli’s sources are discussed as are his methodology and intentions. The Italian’s biography is only introduced when it helps explain the context of his work.

From this relatively short sample of Vermigli’s writings, it becomes clear why he has not previously attracted the attention of scholars of political theory. Little of what Vermigli wrote regarding the nature of the state, its proper functions and the legitimacy of any resistance to it is original. His ideas are derivative and not as forcefully argued as those, for example, of John Calvin. Still, Kingdon makes a strong case for further investigations into Vermigli’s role as a transitional thinker between the Lutheran position on the state and the Calvinist and as a source for subsequent generations of clergymen whose attitudes to political questions were very probably influenced by those of Vermigli.

This assertion is all the more interesting because Vermigli wrote no single work on politics; there is no systematic investigation of such matters at all in a corpus limited almost exclusively to theological subjects. Still, Vermigli often was confronted by the necessity to address political problems, given the role he played in England, Zurich and Strasbourg and given the intellectual environment of the Reformation. Vermigli’s political thought is most apparent in the collection of Loci communes prepared in part