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Abstract
This thesis sets out to prove that Hooker’s Preface to the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie is a rhetorical and textual unity, contrary to a consensus position which asserts that the eighth and ninth chapters were hastily added at the behest of George Cranmer to score polemical points against Hooker’s adversaries. However, chapters eight and nine are exactly the kind of rhetorical move that Hooker might have made as part of the way he organized his polemic in the Preface and, in fact, are rhetorically related to the rest of the Preface, functioning as a literary digressio and peroratio, respectively. This assertion will be argued both by describing how a digressio functions as part of the dispositio of any given text, with reference to the ancient rhetorical manuals, and suggesting that Cranmer’s letter is textually related the Dedicatory Epistle of Book V and is unrelated to chapter eight of the Preface.
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Chapter 1

*Status Quaestionis: A Consensus Opinion?*

A modern scholarly consensus exists which asserts that the eighth and ninth chapters of Richard Hooker's Preface to the *Lawes* were hastily appended by Hooker at the behest of George Cranmer, who wished him to strengthen his argument against his Puritan adversaries both in substance and in force. Scholars such as Hardin Craig, W. Speed Hill, and William Haugaard have each advanced a version of this thesis, which suggests that Hooker's original Preface is constituted by chapters one through seven only, which are written in a significantly more irenic tone, in contrast to the rather inflammatory tone of chapter eight in particular. In addition, it is suggested that chapter seven seems to form a natural end to the piece, and the shift in the tone, rhetoric, and substance signal that Hooker has revisited the Preface, and in a rather hasty way, has appended the final two chapters.

It is the contention of this thesis that this consensus seriously misreads the Preface and fails to take into account its rhetorical coherence. Furthermore, this thesis will argue that Cranmer's letter, to which the consensus view believes Hooker is responding in the final two chapters of the Preface, has nothing to do with the Preface at all, but rather is linked to the Dedicatory Epistle to Whitgift which prefixes book V of the *Lawes*. This thesis will argue for the rhetorical coherence and unity of the Preface based both on internal evidence which points to the consistency of Hooker's argumentation, and on the rhetorical strategy employed by Hooker in the composition of the Preface. Part of this argument will entail the assertion that chapter eight of the Preface ought to be understood as a rhetorical *digressio* (digression) and holds a crucial role in Hooker's overall rhetorical strategy.
The Formation of a Modern Consensus

In 1642, a publication appeared under the title, *Concerning the New Church Discipline: An Excellent Letter written by Mr. George Cranmer to Mr. R.H.* (1642). While its provenance remains a mystery, it appears to consist of editorial advice offered by Hooker's friend George Cranmer to Hooker related to the composition of some part of the *Lawes*. In an important 1941 article, Hardin Craig made the brief assertion concerning the Preface that "the eighth chapter has clearly been added with the advice given in George Cranmer's letter." As Craig correctly notes, the letter alludes to various movements, people and books, amongst which are included the *Admonition*, Martin Marprelate, the Barrowists, Penry, Hackett and others. Importantly, Craig notes that Cranmer directs Hooker to read Dr. [Richard] Bancroft's book, typically presumed to have been *Dangerous Positions*, yet that book had not appeared until 1593 and it is unlikely that either Cranmer or Hooker could have read it if *Lawes I-IV* came into print in 1593—a fact now generally settled. Craig suggests that the book in question must have been Bancroft's earlier *Brief Discovery* (1588). Craig notes that the subject of Hooker's Preface is the dangers of the Puritan movement, and Cranmer's letter enumerates five degrees of outrage.

---


that have appeared in that movement, thus concluding that Cranmer’s letter is the impetus for the appended eighth chapter of the Preface to the Lawes.  

In 1972, W. Speed Hill built upon Craig’s thesis in considerable detail, utilising the conclusions regarding the relationship of Cranmer’s letter to the Preface as a lynchpin in his argument that Hooker rushed the Preface and first four books into press for the parliamentary session (and the restraining legislation) of 1593. Cranmer was pushing a reluctant Hooker to draw out the seditious nature of the Puritan polity by linking the more moderate Puritans with the radicals. Hill concedes that while Hooker has done this in the eighth chapter of the Preface, he has not done so to the extent that Cranmer would have wished. Hill also argued that the appearance of chapters eight and nine as a separate publication in 1642 also suggests that those chapters were composed separately.

William Haugaard, in the commentary volume on the Preface and Books I-IV, summarizes the conclusions of Craig and Hill and further suggests that the concerns in Cranmer’s letter match the contents of chapter eight, whereas little in the early chapters does.

---

4 Craig, First Form, 101. It should also be noted that Craig thought that chapter nine was likely part of the original text and that chapter eight was the questionable literary embolism.


6 Hill, Evolution, 139.

7 Hill, Evolution, 144-5.

He further notes, “in none of these seven chapters does Hooker directly suggest that the implementation of the disciplinary program might disrupt or destroy beneficent structures of English society, and that the title of chapter eight, ‘How just cause there is to fear the manifold dangerous events likely to ensue upon this intended reformation, if it did take place’ signals a change in tone. The important textual convergences noted between the two texts include Cranmer’s reflection on the opening line of the Preface ‘what posterity is likely to judge’ and the notation by Cranmer that Hooker handles the ‘cursed crew of Atheists’ in Book V, yet here again they may be touched, indicating that Hooker ought to address this issue ‘here’ in the Preface. Like Hill and Craig before him, Haugaard concludes that the use of Cranmer’s letter must explain the disjunction between the first seven chapters and the final two chapters of the Preface.

The problem, as this thesis will attempt to prove, is that chapter eight is exactly the kind of rhetorical move that Hooker might have been expected to make as part of the way he organized his polemic in the Preface. In fact, it is the assertion of this thesis that chapter eight is intimately related to the rest of the Preface in that it rhetorically parallels material in chapter two, and functions as a literary digressio, with the ninth chapter then functioning as the peroratio. This assertion will be argued both by describing how a digressio functions as part of the dispositio of any given text, with reference to the ancient rhetorical manuals, and by revisiting Roland Bayne’s suggestion that Cranmer’s letter is textually related generally to Book V, and

---

9 Haugaard, Preface, 48.

10 Haugaard, Preface, 45.

11 Haugaard, Preface, 48-51.
particularly the Dedicatory Epistle to Whitgift, and has nothing whatsoever to do with chapter eight of the Preface.

As we proceed to examine how Hooker uses scripture (chapter two of this thesis), we shall find that the theme of "order" is the pervasive hermeneutic lens that drives the polemic of the Preface. "Order" is the definitive lens through which Hooker views both Scripture and history (past, present and future), and the proper interpretation of both.

Of course, "order" is conceptually a multi-valent term. To this end, Hooker's use of "order" will need to be placed in the context of how that term was used and argued over in the polemic of the time, and special attention will be given to its use in the Admonition Controversy.

This thesis will consider this theme of "order" in the Preface in the context of the contemporary controversy over order and polity, comparing the Preface to establishment homiletic apologetic texts, and also make note of Hooker's clever use of sources (Theodore Beza and Guy de Brès), considered sympathetic to his adversaries, as allies in his own cause. Finally, a rhetorical structural review of the Preface will be offered based on this revised reading of the Preface.
Chapter 2
Hooker's Use of Scripture in the Preface to the Lawes

Introduction

In the Preface to the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie, Richard Hooker accuses his opponents of holding an interpretation of Scripture that predisposes a presbyterian ecclesiastical polity. By encouraging their own unique reading of Scripture, his opponents have subtly persuaded many to either question or abandon the polity established by law. This program has been so effective, Hooker asserts, that his opponents have sown the seeds of discord and disunity, and are upsetting the social order to such an extent that those who are so deeply persuaded by the Puritan case have "cast off the care of those verie affayres which doe most concerne theyr estate, and to thinke that then they are lyke unto Marie, commendable for making the choice of the better parte."

This analogy, of his opponents likening themselves to Mary "having chosen the better part," illustrates just how flawed and deluded his adversaries really are. The dangerous hermeneutic they adopt which seeks to establish a church order and ecclesiastical polity at odds with the one established by law leads to a disintegration of social cohesion, and indeed is seditious in its very nature. Thus, for Hooker, his opponents and their witless followers are most certainly not "lyke unto Marie," and they have not chosen the better part.

The question arises, though, if his adversaries are flawed in their reading of Scripture, how, indeed does Hooker read and interpret Scripture? How, precisely, does he make use of Scripture to make his case against his disciplinarian foes? If Hooker claims that they have not

---

12 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 3.12; 1.18.26-28. The reference is to the story in Luke 10:38-42 in which Martha was distracted by many tasks while Mary sat at the feet of Jesus, whereupon Jesus commended her for having chosen the better part. A second important reference is made to this story in Pref.8.13; 1.50.13.
chosen the better part, then surely he must know a better way. Thus, the question before us is what does Hooker take to be the better part? This chapter will examine closely several of the ways in which Hooker uses Scripture in the Preface to the *Lawes* in order to understand what he believes the better part to be.

**Scripture Directs Christians to the Use of Reason**

In chapter three of the Preface, Hooker takes up the problem of human discernment, whereby nature teacheth men to judge good from evill as well in lawes as in other things, which he suggests is done by the force of their own discretion.” By what authority, his adversaries might plead, are we free to appeal to the force of our own discretion? Hooker provides a surprising answer, namely, by the authority of Scripture. He directs his readers to several examples. By appealing thrice to Paul and once to Luke, he attempts to demonstrate that Scripture itself tends Christians toward the use of reason. Take, for example, 1 Corinthians 10:15, speak as to them which have understanding, judge ye what I say. For Hooker this is a clear admonition in Scripture to employ human understanding to make critical judgements. In short order he also offers 1 Corinthians 11:13, Judge in yourselves, is it comely that a woman pray uncovered? another appeal to reason outside Scripture. From Romans 14:5 he cites a further example, Let every man in his own mind by fully persuaded. He directs the reader also to Luke 12:56-57 in which Jesus reprimands the Jews for interpreting the appearance of

---

13 Hooker, *Lawes*, Pref. 3.1; 1.12.24-25.

earth and sky but not being able to interpret the present time. Their minds are closed from right and wrong and they cannot judge for themselves what is right.\textsuperscript{15} All four of these passages are heaped together in the opening paragraph of chapter three of the Preface. Hooker draws these texts together, with a cumulative force, offering no deep probing of their meaning, presenting them simply according to their \textit{plain sense},\textsuperscript{16} to make the case clearly and simply that there are instances in which Scripture directs the Christian to the use of reason. As William Haugaard has noted

Hooker\textsuperscript{16}'s biblical quotations established common ground with his adversaries and lent impeccable authority to his arguments. When he declared that \textit{the force of \textsc{one}'s own discretion} provides the natural human means for distinguishing good from evil, the New Testament provided a catena of four passages confirming that both Paul and Jesus expected their readers and listeners to exercise their God-given power of judgement.

It appears as though Hooker is operating on the same level as his opponents. But is he simply searching the Scriptures as his opponents do in their quest to justify their polity, or is he operating on a deeper and more nuanced level in his selection of texts?

Egil Grislis has noted that for Hooker, \textit{The faithful exegete must be a judicious theologian and not merely a proof-text hunter.}\textsuperscript{17} What is Hooker up to in his selection of texts? With respect to at least one of his selections, 1 Corinthians 11:13, Hooker has chosen a passage that deals with a problem of church order, whether or not a woman should have a head covering.

\textsuperscript{15} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 3.1; 1.12.27-28


when she prays. It is a disciplinarian question, exactly the sort of thing that should be of interest to Hooker’s adversaries. But what, according to Hooker, does Paul tell us to do in such matters of controversy? He says, to “judge in oneself.” It is a matter of the discernment of inherent reason. Thus, for Hooker, not only does Scripture generally direct us to the use of reason, but it does so specifically with respect to matters of church order and things indifferent. The answer to questions of church order are not to be found by looking for scriptural precedent alone, but in Scripture’s admonition to judge such precedents according to reason.

Maintaining that Scripture commends the use of reason, especially with respect to matters of church order, it should come as no surprise that Hooker suggests that there are ceremonies ordered in Scripture that no longer require assent or adherence. One might expect at this juncture that he would provide an example from the ceremonial Law of Moses, thus appealing to the principle in Article VII that the ceremonial law is no longer in effect. Instead, he boldly offers an example from the apostolic community, namely the oscula sancta (the holy kiss, or kiss of peace), to which he provides no fewer than four references, Romans 16:16, 2 Corinthians 13:12, 1 Thessalonians 5:26, 1 Peter 5:14. If precedent from Scripture alone were enough to argue for the continuance of a piece of church order prescribed in Scripture, then this example would provide ample evidence. While Hooker concedes that “the auncienter, the better ceremonies of religion are, he asserts that “howbeit, not absolutely true and without exception, but true only so farre forth as those different ages do agree in the state of those things for which at first those rites, orders, and ceremonies, were instituted.”

---

18 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 4.4; 1.24.6.

19 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 4.4; 1.24.1-5.
attested in the New Testament does not have universal application if the purpose for which it was instituted is no longer a concern, or indeed, if a ceremony originally harmless, such as the *oscula sancta* were to be found scandalous to present-day sensibilities. Even the cumulative force of scriptural attestation is not enough to render a ceremony presently valid, necessary, or universal. The judgment of reason can allow the overriding of custom with apostolic approbation and the abandonment even of ceremony with Scriptural evidence.

Having demonstrated that such disciplines can be abandoned should reason dictate their omission, Hooker expresses his amazement that the disciplinarians see prescribed in Scripture disciplines that are plainly not there. At the outset of chapter four, Hooker notes that these disciplinarian fantasies are "collected onlie by poore and marvelous slight conjectures," and sarcastically opines, "A verie strange thing sure it were that such a discipline should be taught by Christ and his Apostles in the word of God, and no Church ever have found it out, nor receyved it till this present time." The implication is clear: if what the disciplinarians see in Scripture is in fact correct, then reason should have led other men to find it. What is of deeper import, though, especially given that "what was used in the Apostles times, the Scripture fully declareth not, so that making their times the rule and canon of Church Politie, ye (the disciplinarians) make a rule which being not possible to be fully known, is as impossible to be kept.

There are situations, however, where an appeal to reason may not be possible, either through ignorance or through the difficult nature of the problem as set forth in Scripture.

---

20 Hooker, *Lawes*, Pref. 4.1; 1.20.20-21.


Scripture is in some things plaine, as in the principles of Christian doctrine; in some things, as in these matters of discipline, more dark and doubtfull.\(^\text{23}\) Sometimes, an appeal to Scripture alone is simply not enough. Thus, while matters of doctrine are most plainly set forth in Scripture, in matters indifferent,\(^\text{23}\) such as problems of church order, we must supplement our own reading with the assistance of wiser counsel.\(^\text{24}\) It is to these cases that we now turn.

In Cases of Exegetical Difficulties, Seek the Advice of Experts ï Part I (The Fathers)

In two instances in chapter three of the Preface, Hooker skillfully appeals to Scripture through the exegesis of two Church Fathers, namely, St. Gregory of Nazianzus and St. Augustine of Hippo. The thrust of chapter three is a critique of \(^\text{25}\) namely a presbyterian polity allegedly prescribed by Scripture. Hooker argues that there is first a natural faculty within man to judge between good and evil,\(^\text{26}\) to which Paul lends support (1 Corinthians 10:15, 11:13, Romans 14:5), to which St. Augustine attests that such things are plainly set downe in Scripture.\(^\text{27}\) However, there are also

\(^{23}\) Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 3.10; 1.18.1-2.

\(^{24}\) As John Luoma has observed with respect to Hooker’s method, \(^\text{24}\) What is true of doctrine is not true of discipline. The establishment of a form of discipline is a matter of reason and decided by consensus. The chief principles of reason are evident; but the positive laws of society, necessitated by the fall, require the consensus of the wise.\(^\text{24}\) John K. Luoma, \(^\text{24}\) Who Owns the Fathers? Hooker and Cartwright on the Authority of the Primitive Church, \(^\text{24}\) Sixteenth Century Journal 8, no. 3 (Oct 1977): 54.

\(^{25}\) Hooker, Lawes, Pref. Title 3.1; 1.12.22-23.

\(^{26}\) Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 3.1; 1.12.24.

\(^{27}\) Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 3.2; 1.13.10.
things belonging (though in lower degree of importance) unto the offices of Christian men, because they are more obscure, more intricate and hard to be judged of that require the attention of learned authorities, to the end that in these more doubtfull cases their understanding might be light to direct others. For Hooker, the most important truths are self-evident through reason and revelation (Scripture), but matters of indifference are the purview of learned men. Thus, in matters of Church polity, Hooker has here made the claim that he may appeal to learned authorities to establish his position, and amongst these authorities will certainly rank the Church Fathers.

And so it is that following an appeal to a classical authority (Galen) and to Scripture itself (Malachi) Hooker turns to a passage from Gregory of Nazianzus in order to speak directly to the error of opponents:

Presume not yee that are sheepe to make yourselves guides of them that should guide you, neither seeke ye to overskip the folde which they about you have pitched. It sufficeth for your part, if ye can well frame your selves to be ordered. Take not upon you to judge your judges, nor to make them subject to your lawes who should be a law to you. For God is not a God of sedition and confusion but of order and peace.

Because something is a matter of indifference, one is not absolved from seeking the guidance of proper authority in ruling on such matters; rather, the impetus to seek guidance is greater. Hooker’s adversaries are guilty of upsetting the natural order of things by setting themselves up as such interpretive authorities. Several inversions are implied in the quotation from Gregory:

28 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 3.2; 1.13.12-18.

29 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 3.2; 1.14.1-7, quoting Greg. Naz orat. qua se excusat, in turn quoting 1 Cor. 14:33.
sheep mistake themselves for the shepherd, those subject to the law mistake themselves for arbiters of the law, and more poignantly, as ones who make the law. All in all, it is a situation of great social confusion, to which Paul is then marshalled (1 Corinthians 14:33) in support, as God is not a God of sedition and confusion, but of order and peace.

Again, matters indifferent are not matters that are unimportant, but indeed of grave importance, especially with respect to the character of the divinely ordered society. But what is crucial in all of this is how Hooker makes this argument. Ultimately, it is an appeal to Scripture for social order and cohesion as established in the polity of the Elizabethan Settlement. Clearly, Scripture does not define a specific order, but requires order in principle. To make this point, Hooker could have simply quoted 1 Corinthians 14:33. Indeed, he does quote it or allude to it twice more in the preface, demonstrating how important this Scripture was in his defense of the Establishment polity. Instead, what Hooker does is to quote it through the exegesis of Gregory. As Hooker presents it, Gregory’s interpretation of 1 Corinthians 14:33 is precisely the same interpretation as Hooker’s. Hooker marshals Gregory not simply to meet his polemical goal of arguing that his opponents are fundamentally dissentious if not seditious, but to further demonstrate just how Scripture is to be read, and that is as part of the tradition. He has just explained that where a matter is not clear, it is incumbent upon the sheep to seek out a shepherd, and so he has done this. Hooker has, in fact, modeled what is required of his opponents. His appeal is not simply an appeal to Scripture for support, but an appeal to Scripture through the wisdom of Gregory, a learned doctor. This, for Hooker, is the proper use of tradition, not to

30 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 6.3; 1.31.32; and 6.6; 1.34.9-10.
trump what is plainly explicated in Scripture but rather to elucidate Scripture especially with respect to matters indifferent when contemporary interpreters find themselves at loggerheads.

In the same chapter, Hooker makes the same interpretive move again, except in this instance the matter involves both the question of authority and the interpretation of Scripture. Following an explanation as to how his opponents have won so many to their understanding of ecclesiastical polity, which is the heart of the problem of the chapter, Hooker chides them for usurping the authority of the lawful magistrate in their claim. They make the claim that they are martyrs, to which Hooker responds with a true definition of martyrdom as found in Augustine: Martyrs rightly so named are they not which suffer for their disorder, and for the ungodly breach they have made of Christian unitie, but which for righteousness sake are persecuted. 32

Once again, Hooker has made an appeal to Scripture, namely Matt 5.10, Blessed are those who are persecuted for righteousness sake, through the exegesis of one of the Fathers, namely St. Augustine. Hooker unseats their interpretation of martyrdom and recasts it in terms of the well-ordered Establishment settlement. One is certainly not righteous, nor a martyr, who seditiously upsets the magistrate's good order. The theme of unity and order, as established in Scripture, is once again supported through an appeal to the authority of a Doctor of the Church. Hooker once again models how an appeal to exegetical authority is to be made in matters of indifference. To be sure, the authority of Scripture is to be sought, but in matters of great dispute, surely the best way is to seek the counsel of Scripture through the counsel of a learned father or teacher.

31 Based on 1 Cor. 1:27 that God has chosen the simple (Pref. 3.14; 1.19.31).

32 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 3.15; 1.20.10-13.
It should be added that in this very same reference to Augustine, Hooker is not content simply to allow the quotation end with only the reference to the Beatitude, but also allows himself to continue a lengthy quotation from Augustine in which Augustine explains the suffering of Agar (Hagar) not as holy martyrdom, but as suffering at the hands of the righteous one, Sara, who in fact, prefigures the Church. Likewise, it is noted from the Gospels, that Jesus suffered between two thieves. Hagar and the thieves serve as examples that not all who suffer are martyrs. Thus, it follows that although Hooker’s adversaries consider themselves persecuted they are erroneous in counting themselves as among the martyrs.

It would be very tempting to see in this strategy a slight against the so-called doctors of presbyterian polity as Hooker appeals to the ‘real’ doctors of the church, namely the Church Fathers. While this may be assuming too much, it is surely not too much to assert that Hooker was not averse to making an appeal to the exegetical tradition of the Fathers to make his case on matters of indifference, and indeed commended this practice as normative. What is most important in this, though, is that it is an appeal to exegetical tradition, and hence ultimately to the authority of Scripture, albeit interpreted through a particular lens.

In Cases of Exegetical Difficulties, Seek the Advice of Experts, Part II: The Magistrate

Scripture also directs the wise to settle disputes through a proper appeal to ecclesiastical authority. For the Puritan, of course, this would entail an investigation into the scriptural norms

33 Further evidence of this can be seen in the eighth chapter of Book V of the Lawes, in which Hooker explains this as a rule, and subsequently demonstrates it through a quotation from Ecclesiastes, buttressed by further proof from St. Basil and several other ancient authorities.
for settling disputes. However, in the case of the Elizabethan Establishment, this would entail an appeal to the magistrate or the magistrate’s ecclesiastical designates. In this matter Hooker concedes that an appeal to Scripture needs be made, but he concludes, contrary to his opponents, that nature, Scripture and experience all agree in one respect, namely to seek for the ending of contentions by submitting its selfe unto some judiciall and definitive sentence, wereunto neither part that contendeth may under any pretense or coulor refuse to stand.\(^{34}\) Hooker suggests that there are two ways to settle disputes, namely, an appeal to an internally appointed authority or an appeal to a universal authority, the former of which two waies God himself in the law prescribeth; and his Spirit it was which direct the verie first Christian Churches in the world to use the later.\(^{35}\) By this, of course, Hooker means the Apostolic Council of Acts 15. In this latter case, the Holy Spirit led the early Christians to submit to a greater authority when an argument arose over a matter of Scriptural interpretation (namely circumcision and adherence to the mosaic law, with reference to Deuteronomy 17:8). In effect, Hooker challenges his opponents, whom he casts in the role of the Judaizers to submit, along with him (based on this appeal to Acts 15) to a higher authority to settle their disputes concerning ecclesiastical polity.

Once again, Hooker clearly and cleverly demonstrates how he can use an appeal to a Scripture concerning Church order (Acts 15) to drive home his point that Scripture in itself is insufficient to settle matters of ceremony, discipline and church order, but rather that God will work through human law (governed by reason) to settle such exegetical and hermeneutic disputes. Ultimately, this appeal can be made because God will not allow confusion to abound,

---

\(^{34}\) Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 6.1; 1.29.25-28.

\(^{35}\) Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 6.2; 1.30.8-10.
because, as stated repeatedly in the Preface that "God is not the God of confusion," but rather provides the means through the law of reason to arbitrate disputes of such manner. After all, Scripture and reason (and hence the human laws divined by true reason) all find their origin the Second Law Eternal. Thus, Hooker can contend for conflict resolution through appropriate human authorities. Yet, once again he makes this argument through an appeal to Scripture, that God is the author of peace and not confusion (1 Corinthians 14:33) demonstrates (through Acts 15) how the Apostles recognized this and submitted to proper authority, and thus proves that God "must needs be author of those mens peaceable resolutions."36 If God is the author of peace and not confusion, God will use the means at his disposal to see the conflict settled, including but not limited to Scripture.

The Appeal to Scriptural Analogy

Finally, Hooker repeatedly uses Scriptural analogies to elucidate the contemporary situation. This use of analogy should not be confused with either an allegorizing of the Scriptural text, nor should we read Hooker as suggesting that the modern analogies are fulfilments of prophecies. Rather, he adopts these analogies as a kind of polemic of moral high ground. We have already made reference in the introduction to this chapter to the comparison of those who have blindly followed Presbyterian polity through flawed exegesis, as thinking they are "lyke unto Mary" believing they have chosen the better part. Hooker corrects his opponents by appealing to the same analogy when he reaches his rhetorical climax in chapter 8 of the preface, repeating the analogy of Mary and Martha which he first set forth in 3.12, "That things doubtfull

---

36 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 6.6; 1.34.10-11.
are to be constered [construed] in the better part, is a principle not safe to be followed in matters concerning the publique state of a common weale.Ô Indeed, Hooker seems to be following in a tradition which appeals to this particular passage as the first Edwardian homily on the reading of Scripture makes draws a similar analogy to Mary and the faithful reader of Scripture as Œchoosing the better part.Ô This repeated application of this analogy in chapter eight is a hint that we are dealing with a text that has a rhetorical unity.

In another analogy, further elucidating the seditious nature of the disciplinarian teaching, an example that might seem difficult for modern ears, Hooker illustrates the manner in which the disciplinariansÔfollowers fail to properly understand the use of Scripture. If Scripture is to be properly interpreted by reason, and indeed directs men to the use of reason, the followers of HookerÔs disciplinarian adversaries are like the weak women of the Pastoral Epistles who, by virtue of the weakness of their sex have and incomplete access to human reason. As such they fail to interpret Scripture accordingly and spread unedifying superstitions with respect to the faith

And although not women loded with sinnes, as the Apostle S. Paul speaketh, but (as verily esteeme of them for the most part) women propense and inclinable to holiness be otherwise edified in good things, rather than be carried away as captive into any kind of sinne and evill by such as enter into their house, with purpose to plant there a zeale and love towards this kind of discipline.Ô

---

37 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 8.13; 1.50.12-14.

38 ÔIt [Scripture] is a more excellent jewel or treasure then any golde or precious stone; it is more sweeter then hony or hony combe; it is called the beste parte which Marie did chose, for it hath in it everlastynge comforte,Ô from ÔA Fruitfull Exhortation to the Readying and Knowledge of Holy Scripture,Ô in Ronald Bond, ed., Certain Sermons or Homilies (1547) and a Homily Against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion (1570), (Toronto, U of T Press: 1987), 62.

39 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 3.13; 1.19.2-7.
The problem with Hooker’s opponents is that they have decided in advance what they wish to hear from Scripture, rather than using their human faculties to allow the Spirit to direct them to the truth found in Scripture, a truth that is consonant with human reason. Hooker complains that they zealously proclaim their doctrines to the extent that others come to believe them as a preconceit, and as such begin to search the Scriptures with the preconceit in mind, thus finding in Scripture evidence that contradicts both the plain sense of Scripture and reason.

In a further example he draws on Romans 3:17 to characterize his opponents as similar to certain ancient problem-makers, in which he suggests “The way of peace they have not known.”40 This of course dovetails with the polemic of the entire preface which is rooted in the recurring references to 1 Corinthians 14:33.

A final example of analogy, with an obvious moralizing tone comes from very end of the Preface in which Hooker expresses his trust that God will bring them to the day in which he and his opponents will be reconciled, and “shewe ourselves each towards other the same which Joseph and the brethren of Joseph were at the time of their enterview in Aegypt.”41 The breach that drove Joseph and his brothers apart was great, in the same way that Hooker and his brethren are now at odds, but for the ever irenic Hooker, there is no breach too great for God to heal, and as he closes out the Preface, Hooker ends on a word of hope that as God restored Joseph and his brothers, so too will Hooker and his brethren be restored to perfect peace and unity. As we shall

40 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 6.1; 1.30.4.

41 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 9.4; 1.53.9-11.
see, peace, order, and unity, as knit together by several appeals to the "God of peace" (1 Cor. 14)
signal a rhetorical unity of the Preface, and is the case we wish to unfold.

Conclusion

The foregoing has been anything but a thorough review of the ways in which Hooker uses Scripture in the Preface to the Lawes. What I hope I have accomplished, though, is to set forth the general ways in which Hooker uses Scripture in the Preface with reference to very specific examples. I have argued, particularly following David Neelands, that first and foremost Hooker contends that a true reading of Scripture will tend to the use of reason. In the Preface Hooker makes a concerted effort to demonstrate through simple references, particularly to Paul, that this is in fact the case. I have also argued that with respect to matters indifferent, and in particular with respect to Church order, where Scripture seems inconclusive, the counsel of the exegetical tradition of the Fathers is to be consulted. Furthermore, in cases in which disputes continue unsettled with respect to Church order, Scripture itself directs the Church toward an appeal to external authority as local custom deems appropriate, which in the case of the Elizabethan Church means the magistrate or the magistrate's ecclesiastical designates. Scripture does not prescribe a particular order, but commands a seemly order. His continual appeal to 1 Corinthians 14.33 both on its own and through the exegetical tradition makes adherence to seemly order primary. Finally, I have also suggested that Hooker is fond of drawing analogies from Scripture as a rhetorical feature of his polemic. His vehemence that his adversaries and their followers were not like Mary (as they apparently claimed), who chose the better part,

42 Neelands, "Hooker on Scripture, Reason, and Tradition."
demonstrates that Hooker could rally Scripture to his support not only for purposes of establishing his own understanding of ecclesiastical polity or directing Christians to the use of reason, but also to advance his position rhetorically and persuasively. Given his highly variegated approach to Scripture, it should come as no surprise to his readers that he clearly believed that he, and those who conformed to the polity of the Established Church, had surely chosen the better part.
Chapter 3
1 Corinthians 14:26-40 in the Theological Rhetoric of the Admonition Controversy

As has been hinted, *order* is a key concept in understanding Hooker’s Preface, and a hermeneutic lens through which he reads scripture. It will be important now to place his understanding of order in the context of the polemical world in which he was situated. *Order* was a watchword of the Admonition controversy. In the first instance, for the Puritans and advocates of presbyterian polity, it was first and foremost about the adoption of a godly order of worship that was faithful to Scripture. For the Conformist, on the other hand, it was primarily about following the legally prescribed rites of the English Church. Yet, for each side of the debate, there were deeper levels of meaning, and to some extent, shared meaning. For the Puritans, adherence to the godly order was a thing of beauty in itself and reflective of God’s ordering (and reordering!) of the world. Adherence to godly order in worship, as laid out in Holy Scripture, was a sign of God cutting through the morass of disorder and chaos that was *Romish superstition*. Adherence to godly order led to peace. The Conformists, equally suspicious of *Romish superstition* and Puritan innovation, defended the liturgy of the Elizabethan Settlement, namely Cranmer’s second Prayer Book slightly revised, out of a desire to maintain order both in Church and society. They, too, felt that order was reflective of God’s peace, but to them that order was of a more expansive magnitude. Of course, this underscores the very different and conflicting concepts of *Church* and what that term encompassed for each party. For the Puritans and presbyterians, Church and civil society were not the same thing. For the Conformists there was little distinction; Christian society was the Church. This led to the charge that the Puritans were nothing more than seditious separatists, seeking to upset the order of the
Christian commonwealth. The Puritans charged the Conformists with an unwillingness to fully embrace Reformation principles and as continuing to embrace forms, rituals, and governance that were clearly anti-Christian. Both strove fervently for an order of service that was reflective of God’s peace, and both were convinced that peace was the evidence of God’s favour upon both their forms of service and their ecclesiastical polity.

Central to this controversy was how Scripture, and in particular the concept of “order” enumerated by St. Paul in 1 Corinthians 14:26-40, was rhetorically marshalled in the competing polemic to defend each position. It is of particular interest that both sides took recourse and found support in the same words of the Apostle. It is the purpose of this chapter to investigate how 1 Corinthians 14:26-40 (and in particular verse 33, “for God is not a God of confusion but of peace,” and verse 40, “but all things should be done decently and in order”) functions rhetorically in the religious polemic of each side of the Admonition Controversy (of which it is possible to conceive of Hooker’s Lawes as the culmination). As each side looked to Calvin for support, I will examine briefly how Calvin employed these texts with respect to his own context, which, to my mind, is what in part establishes them as part of the rhetorical “tool kit” that subsequent controversialists access. We then turn to the Admonition Controversy itself and examine the use of 1 Corinthians 14:26-40 in The Admonition to the Parliament, subsequently examining Whitgift and Cartwright’s responses in turn. Finally, we turn to Richard Hooker, with a special focus on the Preface to the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie and briefly examine more closely how he engages with this locus of Scriptural material. The result will be to underscore how both sides approach this material with a common hermeneutical purpose which yet plays out in opposing readings that are employed against each other rhetorically within the polemic of the debate.
Calvin’s Use of 1 Corinthians 14:26-40

1 Corinthians 14:26-40 was a text that was crucial for Calvin in his interpretation of order. It is impossible in the scope of this chapter to conduct a thorough review of Calvin’s reading and application of this text, so our own review is limited to three observations.

The first observation is derived from the Prefatory Address to Francis I in the Institutes of Christian Religion, in which Calvin seeks to distance himself from the sedition of more radical reformers, with which he is accused of being aligned, instead asserting himself and his own theological program as being of a peaceable order:

But I return to you, O King. May you be not at all moved by those vain accusations with which our adversaries are trying to inspire terror in you: that by this new gospel (for so they call it) men strive and seek only after the opportunity for seditions and impunity for all crimes. For our god is not the author of division but of peace. And we are unjustly charged, too, with intentions of such sort that we have never given the least suspicion of them. We are, I suppose, contriving to overthrow the kingdoms we, from whom not one seditious word was ever heard; we whose life when we lived under you was always acknowledged to be quiet and simple; we who do not cease to pray for the full prosperity of yourself and your kingdom, although we are now fugitives from home.43

In this instance, Calvin has appealed to 1 Corinthians 14:33 to counter a charge that his theology is seditious. This is in sharp distinction to the immediate context of the biblical text itself, which is primarily concerned about order in worship. Of course, for Paul, the decorum of worship is not unrelated to the peaceful ordering of the Church, and Calvin, ever the careful exegete would have been working with this contextual reading of the Pauline text. The important thing to note is

the use of this text in defending Calvin’s peaceable citizenship. This is an interpretation of the text that will recur as we explore the responses to the Admonition.

The second observation may be gleaned as from IV.10 of the Institutes in which Calvin links church order with civil order:

We see that some form of organization is necessary in all human society to foster the common peace and maintain concord. We further see that in human transactions some procedure is always in effect, which is to be respected in the interests of public decency, and even of humanity itself. This ought especially to be observed in churches, which are best sustained when all things are under a well-ordered constitution, and which without concord become no churches at all. Therefore, if we wish to provide for the safety of the church, we must attend with all diligence to Paul’s command that all things be done decently and in order. [1 Cor. 14:40]  

This makes clear the connection that Calvin was getting at in the Prefatory Address between ecclesiastical order and public order, once again appealing to the particular Pauline text that speaks to order in worship, clearly underscoring an essential cohesion in Calvin’s understanding of the concept of order. In this instance, though, he is not generally addressing his theological program, but is more specifically addressing matters of polity.

The third observation has to do with the specifics of ordered worship. To be sure, Calvin is adamant that there are things laid down in Scripture that ought positively to be followed and which have been previously ignored or usurped:

But there is danger here lest, on the one hand, false bishops seize from this the pretext to excuse their impious and tyrannous laws, and on the other, lest some be overscrupulous and, warned of the above evils, leave no place whatever for holy laws. Consequently, it behooves me to declare that I approve only those human constitutions which are founded upon God’s authority drawn from Scripture, and, therefore, wholly divine.  

---

44 Calvin, *Inst.* IV.X.27.

Calvin finally addresses the specific issue of ordered worship and clearly elucidates the principle of the decorum when he states:

> let us take, for example, kneeling when solemn prayers are being said. The question is whether it is a human tradition, which any man may lawfully repudiate or neglect. I say that it is human, as it is also divine. It is of God in so far as it is part of that decorum whose care and observance the apostle has commended to us [1 Cor. 14:40]. But it is of men in so far as it specifically designates what had in general been suggested rather than explicitly stated.  

Ceremonies not positively taught in Scripture are permissible as long as they do not stand in a conflicted relationship with those positively taught. Furthermore, if such human traditions cohere with the Pauline decorum that Òall things be done decently and in order,Ó they may indeed be counted as Òof God.Ó The decorum is a general principle that may be applied particularly in light of other positive and negative pronouncements in Scripture. This is nuanced reading of the decorum of 1 Corinthians 14:40 which was not always followed so generously by later advanced reformers.

**Of Ceremonies: why some be abolished and some retained**

The note ÒOf Ceremonies: why some be abolished, and some retained,Ó which prefaced the 1549 Prayer Book (and all subsequent editions), set forth the principles for liturgical reform that would undergird the Conformist defense of the Prayer Book throughout the latter part of the sixteenth century. It argued that ceremonies which have their beginnings in human institution, even with Godly intent, can be turned to vain and superstitious purposes and be abused. Even such godly

---

46 Calvin, *Inst. IV.X.30.*
ceremonies, once profaned, are better set aside than retained. This is possible, because unlike the ceremonial of the Old Testament,

Christâ€™s Gospell is not a Ceremoniall lawe (as much as Moses lawe was) but it is a relygion to serue God, not in bondage of the figure or shadowe: but in the freedome of spirite, beeinge contente onely wyth those ceremonyes which do serue to a decent ordre and godlye discipline, and such as bee apte to stirre up the dulle mynde of manne, to the remembraunce of his duetie to God, by some notable and speciall significacion, whereby he myght bee edified.47

Thus, the criterion for inclusion of a ceremony is that it must serve a „decent order and godly discipline,“ and furthermore, that it must be edifying and „apt to stirre up the dull mynde of man,“ encouraging him in his Christian duty. This is the standard by which all ceremonies are to be judged, and thus if they miss the mark in this way, they ought to be dispensed with. There is a clear congruency here with the third observation we made with respect to Calvin and the decorum. Similarly, ceremonies devised with such an end in mind ought to be acceptable. In contrast to those who seek the abolition of all ceremonies, this treatise goes on to state,

„Wythoute some Ceremonies it is not possible to kepe anye ordre or quyete dyscypleyne in the churche“48 But why is order and quiet discipline such a concern? Precisely because it is a biblical injunction: „Let all thynges bee done emong you (sayeth Sainte Paule) in a semely and due ordre,“ states the treatise, quoting 1 Corinthians 14.40.49 As we saw in Calvinâ€™s decorum, the same principle rings true here: what Scripture demands is not so much a particular order, but the


48 Æ†Of Ceremonies, Æ† 287.

49 Æ†Of Ceremonies, Æ† 286.
principle of order. Judging what is orderly and seemly is a matter for the national church. Here, the principle of conveniency is also to be applied, "For we thinke it conueniente that euery countreye should use such ceremonies, as thei shal thynke beste to the settyng furth of goddes honor, and glorye: and to the reducyng of the people to a moste perfecte and Godly liuing, without errour or supersticion."

For the purposes of the 1549 Prayer Book, this principle was applied simply to the reform of church ceremonial. Not surprisingly, being a treatise appended to a liturgical book rather than to a treatise on church order questions of polity are absent. It is concerned only for the outward and public manifestation of the Church's worship. Nothing is said, for example, of the retention of an episcopal polity in contrast to a presbyterian polity. It seems that it is the admonitioners who actually move the question forward as to whether the principles in this preface actually apply equally to matters of Church polity (as they appear to have for Calvin). Frere suggests that it is precisely the Puritan failure to make headway with their objections to the minor matters of clerical vesture that leads them to their two-pronged attack on the hierarchy and polity of the Church. Henceforward the Prayerbook and the episcopal government of the Church are the central points of the puritan attack: the Genevan Service book and the Presbyterian organization are pushed everywhere forward in direct rivalry to them. As we shall see, the Puritans draw a

50 “Of Ceremonies,” 288. On the term ‘conveniency,’ see Scott N. Kindred-Barnes, Richard Hooker’s Use of History in His “Defense” of Public Worship: His Anglican Critique of Calvin, Barrow, and the Puritans (Lewiston NY: Mellen, 2011). Kindred-Barnes succinctly defines the concept (as understood by Richard Hooker) thus: "Hooker’s use is tied to the Latin term convenientia which was used in the sixteenth century to describe conformity, harmony or going together." 6-7, fn. 9.

link between both ceremony and polity, as Calvin does, and the Conformists readily take up their
defense in a similar vein.

The Admonition to the Parliament

If the treatise “Of Ceremonies” had clearly set forth the principle that the Church had the
authority to revise its ceremonies according to the Pauline *decorum* of order and decency in
worship, then the admonitioners attacked the lack of order and decency (as they saw it) in the
Prayer Book:

> In all their order of service there is no edification according to the rule of the Apostle, but
> confusion, they tosse the Psalms in most places like tennice balls. The people some
> standing, some walking, some talking, some reading, some praying by themselves, attend
> not the minister.\(^52\)

They refused to submit to Prayer Book usage because they considered it a flawed book, as
illustrated by that now immortal description “culled & picked out of that popishe dunghill, the
Masse booke full of all abominations.”\(^53\) For the admonitioners, though, ordered worship could
only be attained through strict adherence to Scriptural norms and not through extra-biblical
judgement. The ceremonial and polity they attack in the Admonition (especially in the section
“A view of Popishe Abuses”) are seen as contrary to the express commandments of Scripture,
and thus the admonitioners understood themselves as standing in the tradition of Calvin, that is,

---


\(^{53}\) Admonition, 21.
qualifying the *decorum*. They were scandalized that the liturgy of the Church of England contained many things that are not found in Scripture.

The admonitioners were not opposed to using a book, though. It was not the use of a prayer book, per se, that they objected to. They were quite willing to submit to a single, approved usage, as long as it followed a minimalist godly order which in turn followed Scriptural norms and added nothing non-Scriptural thereto, “we have at all times borne with that, which we could not amend in this booke, and have used the same in oure ministerie, so farre forth as we might.”

While the Admonition recognized that the church purported to use ceremonies of good order under the apostolic *decorum*, in practice what occurred was something far short of the ideal. In particular, the use of vestments like the cope and surplice were particularly scandalous:

> And as for the apparell, though we have ben long borne in hande, and yet are, that is for order and decencie commanded, yet we know and have proved that there is neither order, nor cumliness, nor obedience in using it. There is no order in it but confuson: No cumliness, but deformitie: No obedience, but disobedience, both against God and the prince.

“No order but confusion” is surely an allusion to 1 Corinthians 14:33, “God is not author of confusion but of peace.” What the Conformists see as decent order is manifestly indecent and deformed according to the admonitioners’ standards. They cannot fathom how something can be decently commanded when it is not found in, or indeed, contradicts Scripture. There is no decency in such an order and to embrace such things is a mark of disobedience to God, and interestingly enough, against the prince as well. Here we see a hint that disordered worship is

---

54 Admonition, 21.

55 Admonition, 35.
seditious, but the principle is only hinted at and not fully explicated at this point, as we shall later find in Hooker.

The Admonition and the treatise Of ceremonies are of one mind that the Pauline prescription for order is the central liturgical test of faithfulness. Where they differ is in what constitutes order, and where the authority rests in determining order. For the Conformist, order flows from properly constituted civil and ecclesiastical authority, which has the wisdom to determine what is liturgically relevant and edifying in the context of the present national Church. The admonitioners recognize that something has gone completely askew and that the authority of Scripture is being subverted, noting Therefore can no authoritie by the word of God, with any pretence of order and obedience command them, nor make them in any wyse tolerable, but by circumstances, they are wicked, & against the word of God. For the admonitioners (and other advanced English protestants that we might conveniently name Puritans) Scripture was the supreme authority under which all were subject. For this reason, they refused to sign the Articles or submit to earthly authority, even if such authority was considered divinely appointed. The admonitioners desired one simple thing—a godly order of worship. In their estimation, the Prayer Book failed to meet Calvin’s qualification of the Pauline decorum, as in places they perceived it to be distinctly non-Scriptural. The Genevan order was an alternative considered much more faithful on all counts.

While a fundamental agreement existed in the importance of the Pauline imperative of 1 Corinthians 14:26-40, a major disagreement ensued over what that actually meant and where the interpretive authority rested. This is where the chasm widens between the competing readings of

---

56 Admonition, 36.
the Pauline text and where the distance in interpretive authority leads to the question of order in a broader sense. Disorder in worship is but a sign of disorder on a much more significant stage, the stage of the commonwealth. As we have seen, the connection between these two understandings of order was drawn by Calvin and in the English context it does not take long for disorder in worship to become the perceived catalyst for both a disordered ecclesiastical polity and a disordered society. While it is true that the Admonition attacks the established polity, its archbishops, bishops, chancellors, &c., and its confusion of orders (the deacon and the priest), the Admonition itself does not marshal 1 Corinthians 14:26-40 to its attack on a disordered polity; rather, that text is reserved at this point at least, for its attack on disordered worship, and thus functions in the same limited interpretive landscape as Of Ceremonies, even if the hermeneutic conclusions of each are entirely at odds. What is important for our purposes is that in the rhetoric of the debate over those larger issues of polity, it is precisely the same Pauline locus that becomes the Scriptural evidence that is marshalled by both sides in defense and opposition to each other. It is to the ensuing defense and responses to the Admonition and how they make the common appeal to Paul that we now turn.

Whitgift's Answere

The Admonition was barely off the press when John Whitgift wrote his substantial An Answere to a certen Libel intituled, An Admonition to the Parliament.57 Indeed, even as the Admonition had been supressed, Whitgift essentially reprinted its entirety in his own text in order to respond

point-by-point to the Admonition’s complaints, thus making the Admonition available to an even wider audience! The opening lines of Whitgift’s *Answere* not only set the tone for rest of the debate, but also make an important interpretive shift with respect to 1 Corinthians 14:26-40.

Whitgift begins with the rhetorical position that he was almost dissuaded from the task of writing this response, but felt pressed into it nonetheless. He opines that he hates contention (one who simply peruses his voluminous response might be forgiven for thinking otherwise) and makes this assertion on appeal to 1 Corinthians 14:33, noting that “God is not the author of contention or confusion but of peace.” The importance of this assertion cannot be overstated. The rhetorical piety is obvious, but there is claim happening as well, namely, a political claim rooted in the text of Scripture. Contention and confusion are contrary to God’s will, and while the discussion will turn to ordered worship in due course, this is about disorder in our common life—the commonwealth. Whitgift, like Calvin, appeals to a text about worship to make a political statement. By writing to the Parliament, the admonitioners had placed the whole matter in the political sphere. Rhetorically, Whitgift claims that he only rises to the task of combatting the admonitioners because the cause of peace is so important and so sacrosanct that it must be defended. It is a Scriptural imperative.

Whitgift argues strenuously against the notion that simply because something is not prescribed by Scripture that it cannot be included as an edifying part of the Church’s ceremonial. In particular, on the question of where services may be held, of standing, sitting or kneeling to receive communion, of baptizing in a font or in a river, Whitgift reasserts the principle from *On Ceremonies* that not only are such thing not prescribed but that “no man (as I suppose) is so

---

58 Whitgift, *Answere*, ſþ/o his loving nurseé (first unnumbered page)
simple to thinke that the Church hathe no authoritie to take order in these matters.\footnote{Whitgift, \textit{Answere}, 32.} Whitgift had already made the crucial appeal to 1 Cor 14:40, \textit{"lethe all things be doone decently and in order\footnote{Whitgift, \textit{Answere}, 22.}} and asks, \textit{"Dothe he not there giue unto them authoritie to make orders in the Churche, so that all thynges be done in order and decently?\footnote{Whitgift, \textit{Answere}, 25-28.} So, not only do we hear in Whitgift an echo of \textit{On Ceremonies}, we also hear echoes of Calvin\textit{\textit{\&} decorum}. And indeed, as the \textit{Answere} progresses we find that Calvin is very much on Whitgift\textit{\&} mind. In response The Admonition\textit{\&} criticism of liturgical custom and tradition that is maintained in the Church, Whitgift offers a lengthy quotation from the \textit{Institutes}\footnote{Whitgift, \textit{Answere}, 28.} and makes the following conclusion:

That in Ceremonies and externall discipline, hee that not in Scripture particularly determined any thyng, but lefte the same to hys Churche, to make or abrogate, to alter or continue, to adde or take awaye, as shall be thoughte from tyme to tyme moste convenient for the present state of the Church, so that nothing be done againste that general rule of Saincte Paule 1 Cor 14 Let all things be doone decently and in order.\footnote{Whitgift, \textit{Answere}, 28.}

In this clear reiteration and restatement of the assertion found in \textit{Of Ceremonies}, with strong support from the preceding lengthy quotation from Calvin\textit{\&} Institutes, Whitgift asserts that not only is the fight over order a contention about correctly interpreting Scripture, but a contention over correctly interpreting Calvin. We shall see this time and again, with a culminuation in the second chapter of the Preface to Hooker\textit{\&} \textit{Lawes}. There is one detail, though, that distinguishes Whitgift\textit{\&} restatement of the principle from \textit{On Ceremonies}, namely, the addition of \textit{\&} externall discipline\textit{\&} to what the Church has authority to regulate. Of course, this is a principle
that is further defined in Article XX of the Articles of Religion. Not only ceremonies, but also "externals" are subject to the wisdom of the Church under the exigencies of local circumstance. Thus, conveniency emerges as a major hermeneutic lens for the Conformist case. Whitgift had previously asserted (following both Calvin and the Articles of Religion) that Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation,63 but he now makes clear what does not fall under that category, namely ceremony and externals. "Externals" is a broad category and Whitgift eventually goes on to state what was quickly becoming the conformist norm, "For in suche matters touching ceremonies, discipline, and gouernement, the Churche hath authurite from tyme to tyme to appoynte that which is moste conuenient for the present state as I have before declared.64 Significantly, "externals" are now defined as "ceremonies, disciplines and gouernement," thus elaborating clearly and distinctly what falls under the rubric of what should be done decently and in good order by the Church under the Pauline decorum of 1 Corinthians 14:26-40. The not-so-subtle hermeneutic play here is that the Pauline decorum now applies both to ceremony and to other externals, an advance beyond the earlier "Of Ceremonies" but one that appears justified by analogy, through the consolidation of what pertains to salvation in the Articles of Religion and through direct appeal to the Pauline decorum as articulated by Calvin. Whitgift seeks to establish that his adversaries go beyond Calvin and he himself claims Calvin as his own authority.

It is clear that both sides appeal to the Pauline decorum, and as outlined earlier, the question is where does the authority for such order come from? For Whitgift, in true Conformist fashion, it is in the hands of the magistrate.65 To rail against such authority is contrary to the

63 Whitgift, Answere, 28.
64 Whitgift, Answere, 44.
65 Whitgift, Answere, 45.
Elizabethan principle of an ordered commonwealth, which is consequently contrary to will of
God. Confusion, Whitgift asserts, is the seede of contention and brawling. In his estimation,
if his adversaries carefully considered the writings of Calvin, they would see how wrong-headed
their assertions have been, These things (among others) I thought good to note out of master
Caluines words, which if they were diligently considered such contentions might soone be
ended. Ultimately, he concludes that anarchy and Anabaptism are the results of the new
discipline. The rhetorical appeal here is to address the admonitioners as if they had been led
astray by radicals. He writes confidently that since he has now addressed their concerns and
unmasked the errors of their reasoning, exegesis, and arguments, they will now fully
understand. He then appeals to them noting that schism and disorder will break loose if the
discipline is adopted and then sets up a series result clauses: if you like and hate / then you
will not ; if you do not want these things / then do not embrace the new discipline; if you like
learning / then despise . If his adversaries are not fully persuaded, then the rhetoric is surely
directed toward the sympathetic but perhaps fickle reader who might be tempted to the
admonitioners position without Whitgift's own careful guidance to the contrary. Most
importantly, though, a full-blown understanding of the Pauline principle of order and decency
must, in Whitgift's mind, expansively include both ceremonial order and other externals such as
polity, discipline and civic order.

66 Whitgift, Answere, 29.
67 Whitgift, Answere, 29.
68 Whitgift, Answere, 86-88.
69 Whitgift, Answere, 87-88.
But what makes Whitgift’s reading of 1 Corinthians 14:26-40 any more viable than that of his adversaries? We seem to be at an impasse in which two parties use the same text to arrive at vastly different understandings of what ‘order’ looks like. The answer lies in Whitgift’s wholesale condemnation of admonitioners’ use of Scripture. He regularly accuses his adversaries of not knowing how to competently use Scripture to argue a case. He rails at them for loading the margins of their tract with references to Scripture that have little or nothing to do with the point they are arguing. In contrast, Whitgift claims that he stands confidently in a tradition of interpretation that is consistent and coherent. Whitgift has a great mastery of Patristic sources and regularly appeals to them to assist him in interpretation. Furthermore, he regularly appeals to the Puritans’ own great ally, Calvin, especially in the case of interpreting 1 Corinthians 14:26-40.

Cartwright’s Reply and Whitgift’s Defense

Following Whitgift’s Answere, Thomas Cartwright took up the defense of the Admonition by responding to Whitgift’s Answere with A Replye to an Answere Made of M. Doctor Whitegifte Againste the Admonition to the Parliament commonly known as the ‘First Reply.’ In response to Whitgift’s assertion with respect to the Admonition that ‘no ceremony, order, discipline, or kind of government may be in the church, except the same be expressed in the word of God, is a great absurdity, and breedeth many incoveniences,’ Cartwright rejoined with ŦI say that the

---

70 See for example Whitgift, 1572: 32, and finally in exasperation 1572:77 ŦSurelie you that thought that no man wold ever have taken pains to examine your margent.Ô

71 All references to Cartwright’s ‘First Reply’ and Whitgift’s Defense are from John Ayre, ed. The Works of John Whitgift, D. D. vol. 1, Parker Society. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1851. Henceforth, Ayre, WW.

72 Ayre, WW, 190.
word of God containeth the direction of all things pertaining to the church, yea, of whatsoever things can fall into any part of a man's life. Cartwright argues this position from several texts, including Proverbs 2:9, 1 Corinthians 10:31, 1 Timothy 4:5, but especially from Romans 14:23: "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin; but faith is not faith but in respect of the word of God; therefore whatsoever is not done by the word of God is sin." As Whitgift had rejected this exclusivist approach in the Admonition, he likewise rejects Cartwright's formulation. In asserting that Scripture contains "all things necessary to Salvation" he does not deny that Scripture also contains generally a direction for ordering the Church and people's lives, but he refuses to accept the Puritan position that "the Scriptures do express particularly everything that is to be done in the church, and as is his usual custom, he attacks Cartwright's conclusions through an attack on his exegesis, demonstrating that the Puritan cause is based on a sloppy and indiscriminate reading of their cited texts.

Cartwright, though, does not see his appeal to Scripture as sloppy or indiscriminate. In fact, he attempts to make a systematic argument by offering what Horton Davies has called the "four infallible Pauline tests." In appealing to four key Pauline texts, Cartwright attempts to make an argument for the Puritan version of order using texts that on face value speak to the Conformist version of order. By this, it is meant that the texts in question are general, rather than

73 Ayre, WW, 190.

74 Ayre, WW, 190.

75 Ayre, WW, 191.

particular. This should come as no surprise, for as we have seen, they would be texts from which Calvin also argued the *decorum*, which is an argument from the "general" rather than the "particular." Cartwright's four principles are as follows.\(^{77}\)

1) 1 Cor. 10:32: The first, that they offend, not any, especially the Church of God.
2) 1 Cor. 14:40: The second is (that which you cite also out of Paul), that all be done in order and comeliness.
3) 1 Cor. 14:26: The third, that all be done to edifying.
4) Rom. 14:6,7: The last, that they be done to the glory of God.

In principle, Cartwright is in agreement with the Conformist case, underscoring to my mind at least, a fundamental shared theological Calvinist framework. But Cartwright goes on to attack Whitgift for his defense of matters of order that seem contrary to matters clearly ordered by Scripture, for example, the creation of non-Scriptural offices such as that of Archbishop, or the abrogation of the role of the elder, the confusion of the role of the deacon, and the appointing of shepherds without flocks.\(^{78}\)

It seems, therefore, that both the Puritans and the Conformists shared a "baseline" understanding of the principle of order from generality. What was in question was just how much flexibility was allowed in the particularities; which things were truly "matters indifferent"? Whitgift had a much more liberal understanding of the principle of "general order" that allowed the English Church much more flexibility in ordering its life, whereas Cartwright saw the general principle as one that was to be very conservatively applied, only in the cases in which there was no clear, positive Scriptural prescription. In many cases the Puritans saw "clear Scriptural prescriptions" where such prescriptions might have appeared much more ambiguous to the

\(^{77}\) Ayre, *WW*, 195.

\(^{78}\) Ayre, *WW*, 196.
Conformist. This is the sort of thing that Whitgift was attacking when the Puritan scriptural citations seemed only vaguely to apply (if at all!) to the matter being argued. Indeed, Whitgift goes on to attack Cartwright’s rules.\(^79\) With respect the first rule, he accuses Cartwright of sleight of hand by inserting the word “especially” into the text, thus twisting the text to make it meet his own preconceived program. With respect to the second rule, Whitgift wholeheartedly concurs with Cartwright, but begs the question of who is to judge what is well-ordered, those in proper authority or the private man? (More on this problem, below) With respect to the third rule, Whitgift attacks Cartwright’s the use of 1 Corinthians 14:26 by extrapolating a general principle from a particular example. Whitgift reminds Cartwright that Paul is not speaking in this case about all ceremonies, but in this context a particular set of disruptions to worship in the Corinthian church, and that it is wrong to create a general principle out of this sort of particularity. The fourth rule we shall pass over as it does not concern our argument. In all of this, Whitgift proves himself the more careful exegete. Even though Whitgift might easily find himself in agreement with the concept of general principles shaping the decorum, he objects to Cartwright’s sloppy exegesis in arriving at the principle.

Questions of both adiaphora and conveniency assert themselves into the foreground. Ironically enough, the rules that Cartwright articulates are precisely the tools by which the conveniency of an order, change, or retention of order or custom are to be evaluated as a matter of first course for a Conformist. And yet, in spite of putting these rules forward, for Cartwright, like the admonitioners, it works the other way around. If, and only if, there is no prescription in Scripture, then, and only then, should the four rules apply. Conveniency is not of first importance.

\(^{79}\) Ayre, \(WW\), 197.
for the Puritan, as it is for the Conformist. Cartwright desires to see all things tested against the
four rules, regardless of conveniency.\textsuperscript{80} The difference is subtle, but significant. Whitgift can
accuse Cartwright of not differing from him because they agree on the rules. Yet, where they
disagree it is with respect to their application. For Cartwright, 1 Corinthians 14, in particular, is
prescriptive against making changes to church order as outlined in Scripture. For Whitgift, the
decorum is permissive.

Ultimately, Whitgift brings the argument around to the issue of authority, where it must
ultimately always find its insurmountable summit. Whitgift makes the case that it is those who
have the care of the Church who have the authority to define what is comeliness and order;\textsuperscript{81} it is
not given over to private opinions. The matter of determining conveniency is in the hands of
those lawfully appointed. Whitgift argues, for example, that Scripture sets out no appointed
hours for worship, and yet, it is in the purview of the authority of Church, not of private
individuals, to set out such a rule.\textsuperscript{82} Whitgift finally suggests that the point of their disagreement
is in whether or not the English Church has lawfully used her authority.\textsuperscript{83} This gets to the heart
of the conflict. Where does authority rest? Whitgift assumes that such authority is found in the
lawful structures of the Church \textit{in commonwealth}, which if not divinely appointed are divinely
approved. \textit{Private opinion} is to be eschewed at all costs. But is the Puritan position simply
\textit{private opinion} or an emerging consensus of interpretation? These questions are beyond the

\textsuperscript{80} Ayre, \textit{WW}, 195.

\textsuperscript{81} Ayre, \textit{WW}, 197.

\textsuperscript{82} Ayre, \textit{WW}, 199.

\textsuperscript{83} Ayre, \textit{WW}, 200.
scope of this chapter, but the appeal to text such as 1 Corinthians 14:26-40 as part of the ongoing rhetoric and polemic serves to underline the widening chasm between Conformist and Puritan interpretations and use of Scripture.

**Cartwright’s Second Reply**

Cartwright chose not to let the matter rest and responded with his *The Second Replie of Thomas Cartwright: against Mister Doctor Whitgiftes Second Answer touching the Church Discipline*, 1575 (published in two parts), a work so voluminous that it has never received a complete modern edition. With respect to the polemical and rhetorical use of 1 Corinthians 14 (and the other texts that began to be marshalled in the controversy over Church order), Cartwright attacked Whitgift’s defense point-by-point. We shall not deal with Cartwright’s response to all of Whitgift’s critique of the four rules, but only with the ones that pertain to 1 Corinthians 14:26-40. As will be recalled, Whitgift argued that the issue in 1 Corinthians 14:26 was not a general rule about Church order, but rather, a particular response of the Apostle to the particular issue of disordered worship (tongues, prophecies, etc.). Whitgift castigated Cartwright for using Paul to argue a general rule from a particular example. We took that as a case of Whitgift unmasking a piece of unskilled and sloppy exegesis. However, Cartwright shows that he has a deeper understanding of Pauline rhetoric and argumentation than Whitgift would allow. In the Second Reply Cartwright suggests that it is in the nature of Pauline argumentation to draw general examples from particular cases:

To the thirde rule/ that all shoulde be doone unto edifying: he saithe that yt can not be applied to all things generally vsed in the churche, but to praiers, tounges, &c. specified in that chapter, as if it were not the ordinary of the Apostell/ to proue the particulars/ by the general/ and so to conclude/ that the exercises off praing/ singing &c. shoulde be doone to edifying because all things muste be doone.\textsuperscript{85}

Therefore, in Cartwright\textsuperscript{a} estimation, it is perfectly legitimate to argue the general from the particular, contra Whitgift, for it is the method adopted by the Apostle, himself. Because this is the case, the particular case of the Corinthians\textsuperscript{a} problems must, per force, serve as the basis upon which a general rule is articulated.

Whitgift had also argued that Cartwright had consistently confused the concepts of the public and the private. Cartwright, in responding to Whitgift\textsuperscript{a} critique of his first rule (1 Cor. 10), argued that a general rule must apply both publically and privately, as it made no sense that \textit{the Lorde were so carefull in private offences/ and careles in publike}.\textsuperscript{86} With respect to the third rule (1 Cor. 14.26), when Cartwright establishes the Pauline principle of proving the general from the particular, he extends that to argue for the public from the private as well, \textit{yt is manifeste t/ that the Apostell/ carrying yt also unto thinges indifferent/ will haue this to be the rule/ off our priuate actions/ myche more off suche publike actions/ as I haue before declared.}\textsuperscript{87} Thus, we encounter another fundamental exegetical difference that allows the text to be marshalled rhetorically for diametrically opposed polemical ends. From Cartwright\textsuperscript{a} vantage point, if Whitgift would only look more closely, he would see that the rule is self-evident and

\textsuperscript{85} Cartwright, \textit{SR}, LXIII.30-37.

\textsuperscript{86} Cartwright, \textit{SR}, LXII.2-3.

\textsuperscript{87} Cartwright, \textit{SR}, LXIII.1-4.
given by the Apostle. Returning to the problem of authority once more, Cartwright’s authority is not private, but rooted in the text of Scripture; nor is his exegetical method a private one, but rooted in the method of Scripture, itself. For Cartwright (and for the Puritans as a whole) Scripture provides the tools for its interpretation. If one wishes to understand what Paul would think, then one must examine Paul’s general method and extrapolate the conclusion from the particular Pauline problem to a general Christian rule. 1 Corinthians 14 (along with other several key texts, especially Romans 14) become the rhetorical ground on which this theological assertion is made.

Given the page count of the controversy so far, we might be grateful that Whitgift made no further reply. Given what we know of his method, should he have chosen to respond, it is likely he would have done so by countering Cartwright with several examples of how Cartwright’s method might be taken to absurd extremes, and demonstrated this by examples in which Pauline particulars ought not be taken to their logical general conclusions. He might have also further explored the private-public convergence in Cartwright by demonstrating the dangers to the commonwealth of taking such convergences to their natural conclusion. These are mere speculations, and it can be doubtful that a further response from Whitgift would have offered anything edifying or persuasive in terms of bringing the argument to a conclusion. Further response was left to others. One such response was to come from Richard Hooker.

Richard Hooker ï Preface to The Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie

It might be said that the Admonition Controversy never really came to an end, rather it just fizzled out. After the Whitgift-Cartwright exchange came to a close, more radical streams of
Protestantism reared their heads in the Marprelate controversy, the threats of the writings of Henry Barrow, and in the Hackett incident. In each of these cases, threats to ecclesiastical peace were deemed threats to the commonwealth and seditious in nature. It might be said that the memory of Peasants' revolt and other forms of radical continental Protestantism never faded. They remained just as vivid a memory in late sixteenth-century England as when Calvin wrote in the Prefatory Address to Francis I in the *Institutes*. In time, such memories seem to have formed the substructure of a narrative of never-ending fear of advanced forms of Protestantism. It should be said that this fear was equally buttressed on the other extreme by fears of papistical plots to reclaim England for Rome. Looking back on what we perceive as the monolithic achievement of the Elizabethan Establishment, it can be difficult to truly understand the uneasiness of the late-Elizabethan Conformist, who feared the advanced Protestant on the one hand, and the Papist on the other. This is the world in which Richard Hooker wrote, and of the Establishment he defended.

Whether or not Hooker really believed the Establishment to be under such an ominous threat, as at the precipice of its demise and as something only to be remembered for posterity, as the opening lines of *The Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie* suggest or whether that is simply his rhetorical positioning as he opens his treatise is a matter of dispute. What is certain is that there must have been a convergence between that reality and his rhetorical grandiloquence that made it such an engaging opening to his work. To this end, the Preface to the *Lawes* is both a tightly ordered and emotionally charged thesis statement of the problem before the English Church. For Hooker, the Church is at a crossroads: It can yield to the advances of the presbyterian movement, and thus open the door to those who desire a more radical and advanced Protestantism or it can hold fast to the Establishment that is faithful to the principles of the Reformation while at the
same time exerts a continuity with the best of the Ancient, Patristic, and Medieval Church. In the midst of it all, though, Hooker regards the issue as one of a problem of authority and order. To this extent, he is in continuity with the controversy that has unfolded since the middle of the century.

For Hooker, what is at stake is the problem of order. If the Lawes is about anything, it is about the problem of order. Questions of how the Church might order itself are central to its thesis and purpose. Where does the authority to order the Church come from? To whom is such authority designated? And what does such order look like? And of course, which matters are indifferent? These are the problems over which the controversy had raged for nearly half a century, and Hooker addresses them head on by articulating forcefully and clearly that peace is what God desires:

"But our hope is that the God of peace shall (notwithstanding mans nature too impatient of contumelious malediction) able us quietlie and even gladly to suffer all things, for that worke sake which we covet to performe."

The reference to "the God of peace" immediately leads us to suspect a reference to 1 Corinthians 14:33 given the contrast between our human predilection for "contumelious malediction" and Hooker's goal of quiet suffering, reminding us of the opening of Whitgift's Answer in which he claims himself a lover of peace under the rubric of 1 Corinthians 14:33, that "God is not the author of confusion but peace."

In chapter three of the Preface, Hooker now explicitly evokes that text as he accuses his adversaries of leading people astray into their way of thinking. But he does so through a quotation from Gregory of Nazianzus which paraphrases the text: "For God is not a God of
sedition and confusion, but of order and peace. This expansion of the text serves Hooker's purpose to broaden the parallel construction from confusion/peace, to include the additional parallel of sedition/order and equate confusion with sedition, and order with peace. This rhetorical strengthening heightens the polemic against those who would seek to usurp the present established order. This creates an equivalence between civic order and divine peace; and conversely between sedition against the civil authorities with theological confusion. Of course, this is entirely consonant with Hooker's approach to law as outlined in Book I. If all laws emanate from the Second Law Eternal, then the flouting of a civil law is the same as the flouting of a divine law. This is why God is the author of both order and peace, even if it is extrapolated from, and indeed is an interpolation of, the biblical text.

To some extent, this is nothing new. As we have seen, this formal equivalence between confusion and sedition can be found in Calvin, even if he has not used so boldly a manipulated version of the text of Scripture as Hooker has. We have also seen traces of this kind of thought in Whitgift, but here in Hooker the formal equivalence is stated more clearly than ever: sedition is contrary to the law of God.

Hooker further appeals to 1 Corinthians 14:33 in chapter six of the Preface (this time in its purer form) when he argues that in matters of contention, a definitive sentence of the magistrate should be sought (on analogy to the Apostolic council of Acts 15) when he writes:

Yet in this case God did not allowe them [the Jews] to doe that which in their private judgement it seemed, yea and perhaps truly seemed that the lawe did disallow. For God is not the author of confusion but of peace, then can he not be the author of our refusal, but of our contentment, to stand under some definitive sentence, without which almost impossible it is that eyther we should avoid confusion, or ever hope to attaine peace. To

89 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 3.2; 1.14.6-7. Note that both the Bishop Bible and the Geneva Bible read, For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace.
small purpose had the Councell of Jerusalem bene assembled, if once their determination being set downe, men might afterwards have defende their former opinions.\textsuperscript{90}

And what is peace and how is it attained? Hooker here addresses that old problem of private opinion/public sentence. Where Cartwright would have noted that God did not have two separate rules for the public and private, Hooker recognizes, in the tradition of Whitgift, that the two are often at odds. The only way that contentious matters can be settled is by following the example of the apostles and appeal to authority. This closes the argument, eliminates private opinion and attains to peace. Those who continue to put forward their private interpretations not only fail to understand what Scripture teaches but themselves become a threat to the thing Scripture commends the Christian to aspire to, namely order and peace.

Whether or not the eighth chapter of the Preface ought to be considered hastily added or part of Hooker’s original plan, its understanding of order is consistent with the earlier part of the Peace. The eighth chapter is a litany of the potential apocalyptic destruction of all that is held near and dear in the commonwealth. Private opinion becomes the thing that drives the “foe of order” or like a thorn in the flesh, except this is not the thorn that moved Paul to mission, but rather an unholy, seditious thorn:

For my purpose herein is to show that when the minds of men are once erroneously persuaded that it is the will of God to have those things done which they phancie, their opinions are as thornes in their sides never suffering them to take rest till they have brought their speculations into practise.\textsuperscript{91}

Hooker concludes the Preface, though, with a plea for peace, order, and unity, that he might be joined by his adversaries in bands of indissoluble love and amitie, to live as if our persons being

\textsuperscript{90} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 6:3;1.31.30-1.32.4.

\textsuperscript{91} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 8.12; 1.49.2-6.
mane our souls were but one, rather then in such dismembered sorte. Ὁ Rhetorically, the fear of disorder through sedition is answered by the restoration of order and peace. He hopes that his moderate adversaries will choose peace over the destructive path of radical Protestantism. He evokes the reunification of Joseph and his brothers as the ideal outcome and finally makes an appeal (as he began the Preface) to the God of Peace.

For Richard Hooker, private opinion was of no account, and was indeed dangerous. The common good was the good above all other to be aspired to and attained, for this good was reflective of the very nature and character of God. A polity which left each person to advance their own ecclesiological fancies could only lead to the destruction of an ordered society, and an ordered society was reflective of God's order. 1 Corinthians 14:33 served the purpose (even if Hooker had to appeal to Gregory's glossed version of it) of distinctly linking God's peace with civic order and theological confusion with sedition. 1 Corinthians 14:33 became the rhetorical hammer to be used to beat back his opponents once and for all, to unmask them and identify them for the destructive agents they were, and yet also invite them back into the holiness of a godly peace, if only they would turn from their wickedness and live.

To summarize, 1 Corinthians 14:26-40 was a "go to" text for both sides of the Admonition Controversy. An early appeal to the Pauline decorum in this text was logically made in the treatise Of Ceremonies in which exigency and conveniency are principles that govern its application. Not surprisingly, the Admonitioners objected to the hermeneutic principle put into

\(^92\) Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 9.3; 1.52.14-16.

\(^93\) Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 9.4; 1.53.9-11.

\(^94\) Hooker, Lawes, Pref.9.4; 1.53.14.
play by Of Ceremonies (and further canonized in the Articles of Religion), whereas the Conformists ran with it. As the controversy unfolded the concept of order and the application of the decorum stretched to include both ceremony and polity, by both the Puritans and the Conformists. Calvin had already established that this text might apply in both circumstances. In the context of the Admonition Controversy we see the Admonitioners and Cartwright placing emphasis on the prohibitive nature of the decorum and arguing for ceremony and polity as only prescribed by Scripture, whereas Whitgift and Hooker place the emphasis on the permissive nature of the decorum. In both cases, each side claimed, with justification, to be following Calvin's interpretation.

It is important to add that in each case, the appeal to Scripture was primary. What varied was how the text was to be interpreted, and where the interpretative authority rested. 1 Corinthians 14:26-40 was a crucial text, marshalled to advance the rhetorical polemic of two conflicting theological and ecclesiological worldviews. The polemic only became more entrenched as the rhetorical appropriation of 1 Corinthians 14:26-40 was advanced by either side.
Chapter 4
Critiquing the Consensus:
Part One – The Role of Cranmer’s Letter

Having established the importance of “order” as the hermeneutic lens through which Hooker reads scripture and understanding it in the context of the polemical landscape of which he was a part, we now return to the consensus position that chapters eight and nine of the Preface were hastily added at the last minute. The consensus case fails to convince on several levels. In the first instance, it is not clear to me that the matter of the dating of Cranmer’s letter to c. 1593 is really a closed question. Craig’s introduction of a 1593 date for Cranmer’s letter does not seem to be in accord with the prima facie evidence of the text itself. According to Keble, Strype (apparently following Fulman) had dated the letter to 1598 (a year after the publication of Book V of the Lawes). Yet, in 1902 Roland Bayne pointed out the obvious fact that Cranmer’s letter makes suggestions concerning the composition of Book V, which would be nonsensical if Book V had already seen publication. Bayne sensibly noted, based on internal evidence, that the letter must pre-date the publication of Book V and proposed the very reasonable date of sometime immediately preceding the 1597 publication of Book V. Bayne also noted, albeit somewhat in passing, that several correlations exist between Cranmer’s letter and the Dedicatory Epistle to Archbishop Whitgift which prefixes the fifth book of the Lawes. The notion that Cranmer's


96 Roland Bayne (ed.), Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity: the Fifth Book (London: Macmillan, 1902), xxxiii (see also 578, n. 3).

97 e.g., with Ded. 2,5,6, &7; Bayne Fifth Book, 578, n. 5; 578, n. 12; 580, n. 10; respectively.
letter might have something to do with Preface is nowhere in sight and it is obvious to Bayne that Cranmer’s letter is connected instead to the publication of Book V, and especially the Dedicatory Epistle. In order to test Bayne’s conclusions, I conducted my own comparison of the two texts and have discovered the following textual parallels which leads me to the conclusion that Cranmer wrote his letter not to advise a revision of the Preface, but rather to make suggestions with respect to the composition of Book V (or revision) of Book V, and in particular with respect to the composition of the Dedicatory Epistle.

![Fig 1. A Comparison of Cranmer’s “Excellent Letter” with Hooker’s Dedicatory Epistle of Book V of the Lawes](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cranmer ‘Excellent Letter’</th>
<th>Hooker ‘Ded’, Book V, Lawes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One man [Whitgift] alone there was, to speake of, (whom let no suspition of flattery deprive of his deserved commendation;) Who, in the diffidence of the one part, and courage of the other, stood in the gap, and gave others respite to prepare themselves to the defence; which by the sudden eagernesse and violence of their adversaries had otherwise been prevented. Wherein God hath made good unto him his own empresse, <em>Vincit qui patitur</em>, for what contumelious indignities he hath at their hands sustained, the world is witnesse; and what reward and honour above his adversaries God hath bestowed upon him, themselves (though nothing glad thereof) we must needs confesse. FLE 442.1</td>
<td>The errors which we seeke to reforme in this kind of men are such <em>as both received at your owne [Whitgift’s] hands their first wound</em>, and from that time to this present have bene proceeded in with that moderation which useth by patience to supprese boldness and to <em>make them conquer that suffer</em>. Ded. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first degree was only some small difference about the Cap and Surplesse, but not such as either bred division in the Church, or tended to the ruine of the government then established. This was peaceable; the next degree more stirring. Admonitions were directed to the Parliament in peremptory sort against our whole forme of Regiment: In defence of themé FLE 443.2</td>
<td>So that these which have lastly sproong up for complements, rites and ceremonies of Church actions are in truth for the greatest part such silly things, that very easiness doth make them hard to be disputed of in serious manner. Ded.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It being perceived that the plot of Discipline did not only bend it selfe to reforme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another sort of man there is, which have been content to run on with the reformers for a time, and to make them poor instruments of their own designes. These are a sort of godlesse politickes, who perceiving the plot for Discipline to consist of these to parts, the over throw of Episcopal, and erection of Presbyteral Authority, and that this later can take no place till the former be removed, are content to joyn with them in the **destructive part of Discipline, bearing them in hand**, that in the other also they shall find them ready. But when the time shall come, it may be they would be as loath to be yoaked with that kind of regiment as now they are willing to be released from this. FLE 445.5

Towards this **destructive parte** they have found many helping handes, divers although peradventure not willing to bee yoked with Elderships, yet contended (for what intent God doth know) to uphold opposition against bishops not without greater hurt to the course of their whole proceedings in the businesse of God and her Majesties service then otherwise much more weightie adversaries had beene able by their owne power have brought to pass. Ded. 8

Behold, at length it brake forth into open outrage, first in the writing of **Martin**: in whose kind of dealing these things may be observed. FLE 443.2

Yet is not their grossnes so intolerable as on the contrarie sidethe scurrilous and more then Satyricall immodestie of **Martinisme**. Ded. 7

Thus were those poore seduced creatures **Hacquet** and his **two other adherents** whom I can neither speak nor think of but with much commiseration and pitie, thus wer they trained by faire wais first accomplting their own **extraordinarie love to this Discipline** a token of God more than ordinarie love towards them. Ded. 6
These mens ends in all their actions is τὸ ἱδίον, their pretence and colour, Reformation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>These mens ends in all their actions is τὸ ἱδίον, their pretence and colour, Reformation.</th>
<th>Our wisdome in this case must be such as doth not propose to it selfe τὸ ἱδίον our own particular the partiall and immoderate desire whereof poisoneth wheresoever it taketh place but the scope and marke which we are to aime at is τὸ κοινὸν, the publique and common good of all for the easier procurement whereof our diligence must searche out all helpsé Ded. 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

As we begin to inspect the parallels above, we see that textual relationships abound. The first set of comparisons provides, in the first instance, the very general indication that Cranmer’s letter is offered in the context of Hooker preparing the Dedicatory Epistle to Whitgift. Cranmer speaks of the one man who ᾧ stood in the gap ᾧ battling the Discipline, while others were being prepared for the task. That this man is Whitgift is evident from the reference to his motto vincit qui patitur [the one who endures or suffers, conquers].

In the second instance, and more particularly, Cranmer cautions Hooker against flattering Whitgift too highly, lest his commendation appear suspect either perhaps in the eyes of Whitgift, or even their shared adversaries. This caution surely seems more appropriate in the context of text explicitly dedicated to Whitgift (Book V) than to the Preface of the entire work. This relationship is underscored when Hooker, himself, praises Whitgift, heightening the praise from Cranmer’s “standing in the gap ᾧ to ᾧ striking the first blow. ᾧ Apparently Hooker was not worried about praising Whitgift too highly. Hooker also makes reference to Whitgift’s motto, but in translation, aligning his patience with Whitgift’s strength, joining him as one who ᾧ conquers in suffering. ᾧ

The second set of parallels underscores a fundamental agreement between Cranmer and Hooker about the matter being addressed in the Lawes generally and in book V particularly. For

---
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Cranmer, the problem begins with small things, namely the cap and surplice—things not worthy of ecclesiastical division or dispute. Yet, through *the Admonition*, these things have led to larger things, namely, the suggestion of the radical reform of ecclesiastical regiment or even civil order. Hooker follows this line very closely, first in Ded. 3, in which he refers to the former as "silently things unworthy of contention, and latterly in Ded. 8, in which the reform of the liturgy quickly gives way to introduction of presbyterian polity. In fact, Hooker had previously asserted "If a sparke of error have thus farre prevailed even where the wood was green, and farthest of to al mens thinking from any inclination unto furious attempts, must not he peril thereof be greater in men whose minds are themselves as dry fewell, apt beforehand unto tumults and seditions and broyles?" For Cranmer and Hooker the point is entirely consonant, small things that seem innocuous easily lead to larger things that may even be seditious.

In the third set of parallels Cranmer suggests that the those who wish to replace episcopal polity with presbyterian polity do so by forming clandestine partnerships with dubious allies such as atheists, and possibly even papists, who also desire the overthrowing of the current regiment, but for different reasons. Yet, Cranmer asserts, the time will come when they wish that they had never made such pacts. Hooker makes the similar point, noting even more strongly the damage that would ensue both for religion and the commonwealth. Importantly, several verbal parallels are to be noted, suggesting that Hooker had Cranmer in mind on this point:

---

With respect to the fourth set of parallels, several key points may be observed, both related to the activity of radicals. The first is the passing congruence with respect to Martin Marprelate. On the one hand, we must be wary of making too much of this simple parallel. Cranmer simply notes the outrage that first brake forth in the writings of Martin, while Hooker simply mentions Martinisme. On the other hand, what is worthy of note is the absence of any explicit mention of Martin in the Preface, which is written in much closer proximity to the events of the Marprelate controversy, whereas the later Dedicatory Epistle does make this explicit reference, apparently responding to Cranmer’s letter.

The second, and more persuasive point on the fourth set of parallels is the reference to William Hackett and his co-conspirators. While Hackett is not named by Cranmer, the reference to preaching from the Pease-cart and the need to speak with commiseration about his two pitiable co-conspirators (the unnamed Edmund Coppinger and Henry Arthington) surely points to this failed messiah. Hooker actually names Hackett also speaking of his two other adherents about which he feels compelled to speak about with commiseration and pitie, indicating a clear textual relationship with Cranmer’s letter. Cranmer goes on to write also of the

---

100 There is, however, one possible quotation from Martin in Pref. 8; 1.50-2-5.

stirring affection the Discipline is likely to inspire, while Hooker speaks of the extraordinarie love to this Discipline.

Finally, in perhaps what is the most striking parallel, Cranmer makes the assertion that outcome of all the disciplinarians' actions is from their own private concern or τὸ ἵππεν. This is an overarching concern in the Lawes, namely that divergence from the common mind and common decision-making processes. Hooker picks up on this point also employing the term τὸ ἵππεν, and intensifies Cranmer's intent by providing the contrasting Greek term τὸ κοινὸν, [the common good] to illustrate how his own goal is to be contrasted with Puritan private concern. This striking verbal agreement and intensification surely indicates a textual relationship between these two texts.

It is my contention that the weight of these five parallels provides conclusive evidence that Cranmer's Excellent Letter was written to provide advice as Hooker wrote the Dedicatory Epistle to Whitgift which prefixes Book V of the Lawes and that there is no similar consonance with the Preface. This allows us dismiss the consensus view and begin read the Preface on its own merits without the distraction of the compositional problem that has been presented by the presence of Cranmer's letter lurking in the background.
Chapter 5
Critiquing the Consensus:
Part Two – Chapter Eight as digressio

Even having made the argument that Cranmer’s letter has nothing whatsoever to do with the Preface, we must still deal with the apparent break between chapters seven and eight, the problem that Cranmer’s letter has been previously marshalled to solve. To any modern reader there does seem to be an issue of a very striking break at the end of chapter seven of the Preface, as Hooker seems summarizes the case, lists the contents of the Lawes, and seems to come to a conclusion. What follows in chapter eight is an emotionally charged rant that at first glance seems wildly out of place. What are we to make of this supposed shift? Upon investigation, it appears very likely that chapter eight of the Preface constitutes a rhetorical digressio. This constitutes my second major departure from the consensus view and will be argued in what follows.

One must remain suspicious of conclusions argued from changes in tone and what feels right or awkward about at text. What might feel awkward to us, may not have been a problem either for the ancients or early moderns, especially given their formal training in rhetoric and exposure to carefully rhetorically crafted texts and orations. When I first encountered the problem of the shift in tone between chapters seven and eight of the Preface, it reminded me of a similar problem in biblical studies, the problem of whether 2 Corinthians is a composite letter.

---

102 I am grateful to Professor Rudy Almasy who suggested this line of investigation to me at the 2012 Sixteenth Century Society Conference in Fort Worth, Texas.
If I may be allowed a personal digression, I recall that over twenty years ago in my very first New Testament course we were taught that because of the emotional change in tone in 2 Corinthians 10-13 that this section of the letter probably comprised the earlier ëletter of tearsî or ëangry letterî that was apparently lost. Could Paul have conceivably ëturned upî the emotional volume in chapters 10-13 after previously making an appeal for money in chapters 8 and 9? I recall our New Testament professor asking us ëwhich one of us might put money in the plate after being so chastisedî? But herein lies the problem: we were being asked to apply our modern sensibilities to an ancient text. Could the shift in tone in 2 Corinthians actually have made sense to the church in Corinth? Could the original hearers have heard the ëtoneî differently than we do? It seems to me that textual partitioning theories can run wild when we rely on arguments of tone and how we, as modern readers, respond in our context to changes in tone in a text from another age. This is not to say that the matter with respect to 2 Corinthians 10-13 has been settled, but persuasive rhetorical readings have been put forth to argue that 2 Corinthians (and other Pauline letters typically seen as composites) can be read with a rhetorical unity.\(^{103}\) I wondered if this might be what we are struggling with, with respect to the eighth chapter of the Preface to the Lawes. I think it behooves us therefore, to at least investigate one of the possible forms that might explain this tonal dissonance that we find so offensive and ask the question as to whether or not the tonal shift might have very well made sense rhetorically. A brief look at the problem of 2 Corinthians 10-13 offers some important insights for our discussion of chapter eight of the Lawes.

\(^{103}\) Craig Keener, 1 & 2 Corinthians, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 146, notes the following (amongst others) who have recently challenged the partitioning theory of 2 Corinthians: Ben Witherington III, Paul Barnett, David E. Garland, Jan Lambrecht, and Bruce Matera.
Ben Witherington, in his 1995 commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians, states the problem succinctly in almost identical terms to what we hear from those who speak against the rhetorical unity of Hooker's Preface. There seems to be significant break between chapters 9 and 10 of 2 Corinthians and a shift in tone in which Paul goes on the offensive in chapter 10. The argument is not, of course that Paul did not write 2 Corinthians 10-13, but rather that it is another letter (perhaps the earlier "letter of tears" or "angry letter" spoken of elsewhere in the epistle) by Paul. The partitioning argument is driven by a need to explain the sudden break. Witherington notes, "certainly something is required to explain the shift in tone, and to some degree in focus, from ch. 9 to ch. 10." Craig Keener suggests, however, that shifting gears suddenly and "going on the offensive was a standard part of defense speeches, pervasive in forensic rhetoric." To this Ben Witherington adds:

Part of the reason for the existence of these theories [of partition] is that most treatments of 2 Corinthians have not taken into account Paul's use of ancient rhetorical conventions. Recent works have begun to remedy this problem, but attention has been focused on chs. 10-13, which is something of a rhetorical masterpiece, or chs. 8-9, not on 2 Corinthians as a whole. This sort of approach fails to identify the digressions in Paul's arguments in 2 Corinthians as such.

The observation is astute and worth exploring, however, one must seek the evidence of threads of continuity between the sections of the letter to argue a continuity and coherence. Keener suggests that there are several clues to a rhetorical coherence of the letter in the development of parallel themes, concept and language in both the earlier and latter sections of the epistle (i.e.,

---

104 Ben Witherington, III, Conflict & Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 331.

105 Keener, 1 & 2 Corinthians, 216.

106 Witherington, Conflict & Community in Corinth, 329.
crafty/craftiness in 2:7 & 12:19; deceive/deceit in 4:12 & 12:6; exhort/beg in 5:20 & 10:1-2; note also the pervasive language, of boasting, joy and commendation throughout, and the theme of power and weakness that occurs in both sections). As we shall see shortly, a similar case can be made of Hooker’s Preface. If Keener is correct, though, that a tonal shift to an offensive stance is not uncommon, why might this shift come later in the letter, rather than the beginning? To this Keener notes, rhetorically, it makes sense to establish common ground earlier in a speech or letter and to reserve the most controversial elements for the final part of the speech. This is exactly what Paul does, and as we shall see, this is exactly what Hooker does in the Preface.

Moving from the particular example of 2 Corinthians and its digression we now turn to the more general problem of what a digression is and how it functions in the context of the larger rhetorical arrangement of any given composition. Quintilian offers a concise bit of instruction: it is the custom of most speakers, when the order of facts is set forth, to make a digression to some pleasing and attractive moral topic, so as to secure as much favourable attention as possible from the audience. From Quintilian, we learn that it is a common form and that in many cases it is used, as is all rhetoric, to persuade the audience. It is especially useful for moral topics and can be meant to please the audience. While chapter eight of the Preface certainly constitutes a moral digression, one might have hard time seeing it as pleasing or attractive.

---

107 Keener, 1 & 2 Corinthians, 149.

108 Keener, 1 & 2 Corinthians, 149.

*Oratore*, opens the door a bit more fully for us, suggesting that a digression ought to rouse the emotions where rational arguments may not as yet have won day. For Cicero, the digression is not limited to "pleasing and attractive moral topics," but rather may be about "exciting the passions."

In those parts of the speech which, though they do not convince by argument, yet by solicitation and excitement produce great effect, though their proper place is chiefly in the exordium and the peroration, still, to make a digression from what you have proposed and are discussing, for the sake of exciting the passions, is often advantageous.\textsuperscript{110}

In both chapters eight and nine of the Preface we encounter Hooker "exciting the passions" to great effect. In chapter eight he arouses great fear, while in the peroration of chapter nine he returns to comfort and hope. These chapters serve to confirm emotionally what he has argued for rationally, in precisely the way Cicero suggests.

A digression can occur anywhere in a composition but when dealing with forensic rhetoric the handbooks suggest two locations that work to great effect: following the exordium and before the peroration, after the conclusion of the argument. And while Cicero, cited above, suggests that emotional appeals are properly the realm of the exordium and the peroration, in *De Inventione* he suggests (following Hermagoras) that an effective placement is prior to the ultimate conclusion which can "contain some praise of the speaker himself, or some vituperation of the adversary, or else may lead to some other topic from which he may derive some confirmation or reprehension, not by arguing, but by expanding the subject by some amplification or other."

\textsuperscript{111} To which we can add from Quintilian, "There will therefore


\textsuperscript{111} Cicero, *Treatise on Rhetorical Invention* [De Inventione], The Orations of Marcus Tullius, Cicero, vol 4., C. D. Yonge, trans. (London: George Bell & Sons, 1888), 1.51.
sometimes be room for it; for instance, if our statement, towards the conclusion, contains something very heinous, we may enlarge upon it, as if our indignation, like our breath, must necessarily have vent. Quintilian had previously stated that a digression is often effective after the opening ordering of facts. Indeed, Quintilian is concerned that it not been seen as a fixed part of speech, but rather a fluid sort of tool that can be drawn on and used where a heightening of emotional intensity will service the overall rhetorical programming. When speaking in relation to the Greek term for digressio, ἀπεκβάσις he notes:

As to the definition of the ἀπεκβάσις it is, in my opinion, a dissertation on any subject relating to the interest of the cause, digressing from the order of facts. I do not see, therefore, why they assign it to that part of a speech, above all others, which immediately follows the statement of the case, any more why they think that name belongs to a digression only when something is to be stated in it, as a speech may swerve from the right path in so many ways. For whatever goes beyond those five parts of a speech which we have specified, is a digression, whether it be an expression of indignation, pity, detestation, reproach, apology, conciliation, or reply to invective.

So while a digressio may appear anywhere, it seems that following the exordium and preceding the peroration are two highly effective orderings.

It seems to me that Hooker’s change in tone in chapter eight, in which he draws out the calamitous, even apocalyptic outcome of embracing the Discipline is precisely of this nature. It is a digression that has a particular effect as it digresses from the formal argument and ratiocination to make an emotional appeal which then leads into yet another sort of emotional appeal which is found in the peroration of chapter nine. This is precisely the sort of thing that

112 Quintilian, Institutes, IV.III.5.

113 For example, he suggests that it might serve as second exordium if the speaker is defending a distasteful law, see Quintilian, Institutes, IV.III.9.

114 Quintilian, Institutes, IV.III.14-15.
Ben Witherington identifies as happening in 2 Corinthians 10. He notes, ōI would suggest that the shift in tone is there not because we have arrived at the peroration but because Paul now chooses to go on the counter attack by means of a rhetorical synkrisis, and this will include pathos, an appeal to the stronger emotions.ō¹¹⁵ What I hope is clear in all of this is first, that ancient and early modern readers might not have been as confounded by a sudden shift in tone and style as we are, and indeed they may have very well expected and anticipated such shifts. And secondly, that the rhetorical form of digressio is one means of explaining and classifying such literary shifts.

Even with all I have argued, I am sure that there will be those who still see Hookerō enumeration of the contents of the Lawes in chapter seven the natural stopping place and original ending of the Preface, and thus continue to place the burden of proof on the few of us who opt for non-partitioned Preface. I can only appeal again to the ancients and make the following observation. Cicero states:

Since, after the statement of the case has been made, an opportunity often presents itself of making a digression to rouse the feelings of the audience; or this may be properly done after the confirmation of our own arguments, or the refutation of those on the other side, or in either place, or in all, if the cause has sufficient copiousness and importance.¹¹⁶

Hooker begins the eighth chapter, after the seeming conclusion in chapter seven with the following words, ōThe case so standing therefore my brethren as it doth the wisdom of the governors ye must not blameō ō[emphasis added] As Hooker embarks on his digression, he offers a tip to the reader that he is shifting gears, and they should know what to expect, namely that he is about to embark on a digression. The important observation though, is that Hooker sees

¹¹⁵ Witherington, Conflict & Community in Corinth, 338.

¹¹⁶ Cicero, De Oratore, 2.76.
chapter seven as the culmination of the *statement of his case*. We must not forget that the Preface is not a work unto itself, but is indeed a *preface* to a massive eight-volume polemical work. What precedes this digression is Hooker’s statement of the case. Thus, he is perfectly in line with rhetorical convention to make a digression to rouse the feelings of his audience, as Cicero states. Quintilian concurs when he notes, ‘There will be therefore sometimes be room for it; for instance, if our statement, towards the conclusion, contains something very heinous, we may enlarge upon it, as if our indignation, like our breath, must necessarily have vent.’ For Hooker, there is something very heinous afoot indeed, and he gives vent to his passions in chapter eight. Therefore, with these observations in hand, I feel that there is no obstacle before us in proceeding to make the case that chapters eight and nine are integral to the rhetorical program of Hooker’s Preface to the *Lawes*, and in particular form the actual, original, and intended *digressio* and *peroration* of the work.

---

Chapter 6
The Relationship of Chapters Eight and Nine of Hooker's Preface to the Lawes to Establishment Homiletic Literature

Having previously argued that chapters eight and nine of Hooker's Preface to the Lawes are integral to the Preface (and the Lawes as a whole) and are not an appendix hastily added to the Preface at the behest of George Cranmer,\footnote{See also, Daniel F. Graves, “The Rhetorical Coherence of Hooker’s Preface to the Lawes,” Reformation and Renaissance Review 16, no. 1 (April 2014): 9-23.} I would like to make an additional observation about chapters eight and nine, namely that the themes, literary devices and tropes employed by Hooker in those chapters make those chapters sound very much like sixteenth century homiletical literature of the English establishment that was meant to quell sedition and discourage rebellion. In particular, one can find striking similarities with Peter Martyr Vermigli’s 1549 sermon (erroneously attributed to Thomas Cranmer), *A Sermon Concernynge the tyme of rebellion*, and the Elizabethan *Homelie Against Disobedience and Wylfull Rebellion*.

In what follows, I will outline the following six parallel themes and their respective tropes found both in chapters and eight and nine of Preface and the above texts that demonstrate this thesis:

1. Rulers need to take a firm hand against rebellion
2. Pretended reform and counterfeit service of the gospel
3. The upturning of social order as the consequence of religious dissent
4. The inability of the righteous man to hold his peace
5. Obedience as a cardinal religious virtue
6. Repentance as remedy

It is my contention that the evident similarities will serve to demonstrate that Hooker understood himself as working as part of a continuum of defending the established religion of the
English church. As such, I believe that he expected his audience to be generally familiar with the themes, devices and tropes employed in chapters eight and nine and that it was his intent to be understood as part of that continuum of establishment defence. Consequently, I do not believe that Hooker’s reader would have been as shocked by the tonal shift in chapter eight as we are. Rather, what we have in chapter eight is exactly what one would have expected to find as the culmination of his argument in the Preface concerning the upholding of order and peace.

Finally, I will make the tentative suggestion that the separate publication in the Seventeenth Century of chapters eight and nine do not, as Speed Hill has argued, provide evidence for an early stage of composition of those chapters, but rather confirms the case that these chapters fit perfectly into the milieu of Establishment homiletic literature and that they were perceived as such to the extent that someone thought they might be employed in the fashion.

**Theme 1: Rulers need to take a firm hand against rebellion**

In 1549, Thomas Cranmer preached a sermon in St. Paul’s cathedral in response to the recent uprisings that had taken place as the result of the introduction of the Book of Common Prayer. The text of this sermon survives as "A sermon concernynge the tyme of rebellion," and Torrance Kirby has persuasively argued that is a product of the pen of Peter Martyr Vermigli.\(^{119}\) From

\(^{119}\) Torrance Kirby, *The Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology*, (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 121-148. See also, Wriothesly, A Chronical of England During the Reigns of the Tudors, from AD 1485 to 1559, vol. 2 (Camden Society, 1876), 18, notes that after the Communion was completed, Cranmer’s chaplain went to Poules Crosse and made a sermon of the gospell of this Soundai, brieflie and shortlie declaring in the same sermon part of my lordes exhortation to the people, because all herde him not before É Ó See also, Millar Maclure, *The Paul’s Cross*
Vermigli’s text, Cranmer proclaimed that there were "higher and lower" causes for the late rebellion as pertaining both "to the governours as to the common people". He then outlines the "remissness of correction in the governours" as primary cause:

The Gouvornors and rulers be ordeyned of god, (as Sainte Paule declarith in his epistell to the Romanes) for the intent and purpose, that they should be goddes officers and ministers here in erthe, to end of the age and avaunce them that be good and to punysh and converte them that be evill. And for this cause god gyves them the sworde that they shulde avenge goddes quarell, by ponyshhing the transgressors of his lawes and commaundements. But (O good Lorde) be mercifull unto us, for wee have been to slacke [remise] in punysshing offenders, and many thinges we have wynked at.

He then enumerates several grievous sins that have been "wynked at", or passed over, such as perjury, blasphemy, adultery, slander, lying, gluttony, and drunkennes, just to name a few, that have been either lightly punished, pardoned or ignored and then draws the following conclusion:

And whilst wee lacked this right iudgement of goddes wrathe againste synne, loo, sodenly cometh upon us this scourge of seditio, the rodde of goddes wrathe, to teach us how sore god hateth all wickedness [and is displeased with his minsters that wynke thereat].

And finally,

But we have dissimuled the mater, we have been colde in goddes cause, and have rather wynked at then ponnyshed contempte bothof god and his lawes, therefore, now wourthily we suffer all that we suffre.

---

Sermons: 1534-1642 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958), 193, who notes that according to Wriothesley, on the same day "[John] Joseph, chaplain to Cranmer, after communion celebrated in the cathedral, according to the 'King' book." He rehearsed Cranmer’s sermon on the evils of sedition showed by the present commotion in the kingdom, i.e., the risings in Devon and Norfolk.

120 Peter Martyr Vermigli "A sermon concerynge the tyme of rebellion", in Kirby Zurich Connection, 151.


122 Vermigli, "Tyme of rebellion", 152.

Two important observations ought to be made: First, rebellion has been the outcome of immoral behaviour. We will return to the relationship between moral sin and sedition shortly, but it is sufficient at this point to note the connection. Secondly, and importantly for our purposes, that it is incumbent upon rulers to intervene in such sinful behaviour, to maintain moral order lest the social order be threatened. In fact, this is a divine responsibility, rooted in the instruction of the Apostle, and when rulers are remiss, when they "wynk at sin", then God's wrath will be kindled against them in the form of sedition and rebellion. Thus, the sermon makes the case for a strong response both to sin and its offspring, sedition.

Richard Hooker begins chapter eight of his Preface to the Lawes with the assertion that one ought not to be surprised when rulers act to quell what appears to be leading toward sedition:

The case so standing therefore my brethren as it doth, the wisdom of governors ye must not blame, in that they further also forecasting the manifold strange and dangerous innovations which are more then likely to follow if your discipline should take place, have for that cause thought it hitherto a part of their dutie to withstand your endevors that way. The rather, for that they have seene already some small beginnings of the fruities therof, in them who concurring with you and your judgement about the necessitie of that discipline, have adventured without more ado, to separate themselves from the rest of the Church, and to put your speculations in execution.\(^\text{124}\)

Having made his arguments for order, and how disputes ought to be settled, earlier in the Preface, Hooker is now bringing to light the greater problem of what happens when a moderate group, led astray by the innovative teaching of a more radical brand, begins to separate themselves from the church. A separation from the church is also a separation from the rest of the body politic. The governors of both the church and the commonwealth ought to be concerned

\(^\text{124}\) Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 8.1; 1.36.18-26.
and seek remedy for such a situation, for such division will have disastrous effects which are already coming to light. It would not be appropriate to "wynk" or lightly dismiss such developments, as the Vermigli/Cranmer sermon claimed as the flaw of its day, but rather such errors must be brought to light by those in authority. Hooker underscores the wisdom of the leadership of his day who are trying to "nip things in the bud." Indeed, Hooker provides in no less an example than Martin Luther, illustrating the problem of leniency toward rebellion:

Luther made request unto Frederick Duke of Saxony, that within his dominion they might be favourably dealt with and spared, for that (their error excepted) they seemed otherwise right good men. By means of mercifull toleration they gathered strength, much more then was safe for the state of the common welth wherein they lived. They had secret corner-meetings and assemblies in the night, the people flocke unto them by thousandes. The meanes whereby they both allured and retayned so great multitudes were most effectuall; first a woonderful show of zeale towards God ... [and then they] fill[ed] the eares of people with invectives against their authorised guides, as well spirituall as civill.\(^\text{125}\)

For Hooker, it would be a flagrant neglect of duty on the part of the governors of church and state to let things play out and take a "wait and see approach." The rest of the eighth chapter of the Preface makes the case against such an approach by outlining the litany of ills that will proceed and the turning upside down of all social and ecclesiastical order. Both texts clearly put the responsibility to reprimand sin and sedition on the civil and ecclesiastical authorities.

\(^\text{125}\) Hooker, *Lawes*, Pref. 8.9; 1.46.31-1.47.12.
Theme 2: Pretended Reform and the Counterfeit Service of the Gospel

A predominant theme in the struggle for reform was what constituted authentic reform in accordance with the gospel? As the Elizabethan Settlement was consolidated, the struggle over what constituted true reform intensified, dividing over matters as varied as clerical vesture, presbyterian or episcopal polity, and liturgical praxis. For the more advanced reformers, those so-called Puritans who advocated a presbyterian polity, and abandonment of the vestigial marks of the Roman Church such as vestments and the Prayer Book liturgies, the Reformation had stalled. From the point of view of the defenders of the Establishment, such Reformers were radical and dangerous and often depicted as "pretend reformers" who espoused a "counterfeit gospel." The adherence to a counterfeit form of the gospel, or even more charitably, an adherence to a misunderstanding or pretended knowledge of the gospel invariably was deemed to lead to seditious behaviour.

In the Vermigli-Cranmer sermon, the instigators of rebellion are clearly not pretended reformers, but rather conservatives who have not accepted the Edwardian reforms, both ecclesiastical and political. Furthermore, those of low estate have foolishly followed those who have fomented Rebellion. The cause of rebellion is ostensibly given as the adherence to the gospel, but this is a smoke-screen for sedition:

And yet it is reported that many among those unlawfull assemblies that pretende knouleadge of the gospell, and will needs be called gospellers, as though the gospell were the cause of disobedience, sedition and carnall liberality, and the destruction of those policies, kyngdomes and common weales wheare it is receyved. But if they will be true gospellers, let them then be obediente, meeke pacient in adversitie, and long suffering and in nowise rebell againste the lawes and magistrates. These lessons are taughte in the
gospelle both by evident scriptures, and also by the examples of Christ, and his apostilles.\textsuperscript{126}

The concept of the ordered commonwealth is the governing hermeneutic lens through which Scripture is to be interpreted, according to Vermigli and Cranmer. This remains a consistent hermeneutic principle throughout the rest of the Tudor period for establishment apologists.\textsuperscript{127}

Obedience is a major theme in the official Establishment homilies, and the *Homelie against Rebellion* [1570] reiterates the same principle, namely, that rebellion under the banner of godly service, is still rebellion, and by definition must be counterfeit religion because it is disordered in nature:

> Though they woulde pretende sundrie causes, as the redresse of the common wealth (whiche rebellion of all other mischiefes doth most destroy), or reformation of religion (whereas rebellion is most agaynst all true religion), though they have made a great shewe of holye meaning by beginning their rebellions with a counterfeit service of God (as dyd wicked Absolon begin his rebellion with sacrificing unto God), though they display and bear about ensignes and banners, which are acceptable unto the rude ignorant common people, great multitudes of whom by such false pretence and shewes they do deceive...\textsuperscript{128}

The point is made clearly that rebellion is contrary to God's divine order. To incite rebellion, even for apparently just cause such as redressing injustice in the commonwealth, or advancing reformation in religion, can never be justified for by definition it is anti-religious. While the fears of rebellion at the period were still directed at those who adhered to Rome and were instigating rebellion against the Queen and her established order, the net is cast widely over all those who

\textsuperscript{126} Vermigli, "Tyme of rebellion", 164.


\textsuperscript{128} "An Homelie Against Disobedience and Wylfull Rebellion[1570], in Ronald Bond, , ed., *Certain Sermons or Homilies (1547) and a Homily Against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion (1570)* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987), 232.
would advance rebellion. The biblical example of Absalom offering sacrifice before his rebellion serves as a caution to all those who think that they are undertaking a holy task when they rise up against their divinely appointed earthly masters.

By the time of the *Lawes*, the problem is most decidedly those advanced disciplinarians who seek to advance the reformation through violence. Hooker's concern is that the moderate presbyterians who are still able to find a home in the established church, although with much discomfort, might be led astray by the persuasive efforts of those more radical reformers, and more poignantly, that even moderate reforms are the seedbed for greater sedition. Thus, Hooker's "Barrowist fragment" serves as the foil by which he seeks to persuade the more moderate types of the dangers of going down the puritan road:

Thus the foolish Barrowist deriveth his schisme by way of conclusion, as to him it seemeth, directly and plainly out of your principles. Him therefore we leave to be sastisfied by you from whom he hath sprong. And if such by your owne acknowledgement be daungerous, although as yet the alterations which they have made are of small and tender groath; the changes likely to insue throughout all states and vocations within this land, in case your desire should take place, must be thought upon.\(^{129}\)

The bulk of chapter eight is taken up by examples of how the world will be "clean turned upside down" by this pretended reformation in an attempt to persuade the moderates from embracing a reform that can only result in seditious outcomes. In language that clearly echoes the other establishment homiletic literature that we have examined, Hooker cautions that their reformation is a pretended reformation, whose true goal is to overturn the authorized magistracy. In citing the example of Anabaptist radicalism (heavily borrowed from Guy de Brès), Hooker reminds his adversaries

The pretended end of their civill reformation was that Christ might have dominion over all, that all crowns and scepters might be throwne down at his feete, that no other might

raign over Christian men but he, no regiment keepe them in aw but his disciplin, amongst them no sword at all be carried, besides his, the sword of spirituall excommunication. For this cause they laboured with all their might in overturning the seates of Magistracy, because Christ hath said, King of Nations; in abolishing the execution of justice, because Christ hath said, Resist not evill; in forbidding oathes the necessary meanes of judicial tryall, because Christ that sayd, Swere not at all; finally in bringing in community of goods, because Christ by his Apostles hat given the world such an example...  

The point of all this is to demonstrate that flawed exegesis leads to a counterfeit reformation, and ultimately to sedition, which is contrary to God's order. But Hooker is deeply suspicious even of their religious motives. The leaders of rebellion are in fact wily and manipulative, and use the piety of others to advance their cause. Hooker says that in "a cunning slight ... [they] smooth up the mindes of their followers, as well by appropriating unto them all the favourable titles, the good wordes, and the gracious promises of Scripture..." The people see them as "verily the men of God ... his true and sincere prophets." Their reformation is "pretended" and through the pretence of reformation, many well-intentioned moderates will find themselves drawn into sinful sedition. Indeed, the point of chapter eight of the Preface seems to be a caution that moderate presbyterianism and Puritan principles might actually be the tinder from which the fire of radicalism and sedition is kindled. Hooker's rhetoric is remarkably close to other Establishment homiletic literature on this point: there is a pretended reformation that sways the unwitting with a counterfeit gospel. The veracity of the true gospel is defined through a hermeneutic lens of order, which, as a lens trumps the biblical imagery and evidence marshalled and advocated in favour of advanced reformation by rebellion.

130 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 8.8; 1.46.14-25.
131 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 8.10; 1.47.21-3.
132 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 8.10; 1.47.26-7.
Theme 3: The Upturning of the Social Order as the Consequence of Religious Dissent

If order is perceived as a primary religious and Scriptural value, and in turn functions as an hermeneutic lens through which Scripture is to be interpreted, and ultimately serves as a rule by which true and lawful reformation in religion can be measured, then disorder is surely a signpost pointing to ungodly religion, a flawed reading of Scripture, and unlawful reformation and its inevitable offspring, rebellion. The spectre that looms large in all these discussions, as we have witnessed, is the spectre of Anabaptist violence. The German Peasants’ Revolt of 1525 is never far out of the field of vision, even as late as the end of the century. The argument of chapter eight of the Preface to the Lawes is to suggest that well-intentioned moderates are being led astray by more radical (and insidious) reforms disguised as scripturally mandated reforms. Hooker makes the case that these reforms will result in social chaos. For Hooker, if God is the God of order and not of confusion, how can these reforms be Godly? The minds of men have been erroneously persuadged that it is the will of God to have those things which they phancie and these are in fact dangerous opinions quite and cleane contrarie to their first pretended meanings. They are errors masked under the cloke of divine authority and things doubtfull are to be constered the better part. Hooker takes his adversaries to be theologically confused, stirred by a desire to implement a program of reform for selfish, not godly reasons. Hooker attacks their flawed exegesis, we ought to search what things are consonant to Gods will, not which be most for our owne ease; and therefore that your discipline being (for such is your errour) the absolute commaundment of almighty God, it must be received although the world by receiving it should
be cleane turned upside downe. Much of chapter eight enumerates what a world cleane turned upside downe would look like. It is a world of Anabaptist radicalism and sedition in which, amongst other things, the rule of law is overturned, books will be burned, the magistracy overturned, and polygamy embraced.

The reactionary character of the picture painted by Hooker of a world cleane turned upside downe seems somewhat at odds with the irenic Hooker with which we are otherwise acquainted. We are often led to believe that Hooker was reluctant to resort to rhetorical techniques that moved the passions. Brian Vickers' statement, commenting on a section of Book V of the Lawes, is often taken as axiomatic of Hooker's method, "Nowhere does Hooker invoke movere or actio as essential resources for the preacher." Although this assertion is narrowly made with respect to how Hooker understood the rhetoric of preaching, a broader application is further assumed. Vickers continues, "In both the sermons and the Lawes Hooker is in basic agreement concerning the importance of these interrelated processes of teaching and comprehending. But he seems, in addition too have had a distinct distrust of emotional appeal." This is typically taken as evidence that Hooker was pushed into this using this extreme emotional approach in the Preface by Cranmer's letter. However, its seems to me that within the context of Hooker's overall program of arguing order as the hermeneutic lens or guiding concept for discerning the will of God, this rhetorical move is the only one he can make.

---

133 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 8.5; 1.41.31-1.42.4.


He must see the argument through to its necessary conclusion, and that conclusion is one in which the passions are indeed forcibly moved. This move is entirely in concert with the rhetorical style of establishment anti-rebellion homiletical polemic.

As far back as Vermigli’s *Tyme of Rebellion* we can see this rhetorical move coming into play. In fact, Vermigli’s sermon begins with just such an appeal. He states that until the present time, the English realm has been envied for its wealth and feared for its force, but “is now so troubled, so vexed, so tossed, and deformed, and that sedition among our selfes, of such members of the same, that nothing is left unattempted to the utter ruyn and subversion thereof.” This does not appear all that different from what Hooker is saying in chapter eight of the *Lawes*. Vermigli proceeds to make the argument that Scripture explains the causes of the tumults and sedition, namely remissness of the governors to correct (the primary cause), and avarice (the secondary cause). We have already dealt with the concept of pretended reformation. Although the circumstances are different, Vermigli and Hooker agree that sinful motives masquerade as godly opposition to authority and lead others astray. Interestingly, Vermigli uses language very similar to Hooker in describing a world led astray by such pretended reformation: “that for the same they wold either do iniurye to their neighbours or cofounde all thinges upsy downe with sediciouse uprores and unquietness.” [emphasis added]

A world turned upside down by rebellion is not confined to Vermigli and Hooker’s texts alone. The third part of the 1570 *Homilie against Disobedience and Wylful Rebellion* understands rebellion as all sin heaped together into one:

---


For he that nameth rebellion, nameth not a singular, or one only sinne, as is theft, robberie, murther and such like, but he nameth the whole poodle and sinke of all sinnes against God and man, against his prince, his country, his countrymen, his parents, his children, his kinsfolkes, his freendes, and agains al men universally: al sinnes, I say, against God and all men heaped together he that nameth rebellion. \textsuperscript{138}

The sermon then goes on to enumerate several examples such as rebels profaning the Sabbath, in addition to dishonouring the prince, abrogating all the laws of the second table of the Decalogue, including dishonouring parents, murdering, and stealing. \textsuperscript{139} The fruit of rebellion sounds very much like the world Hooker describes in chapter eight of the Preface. The homily takes it one step further than Hooker takes it and describes plagues, pestilences and maladies as the handmaidens of rebellion. \textsuperscript{140} All of this is to underscore the contrariness of rebellion and sedition to God’s order. And it is to be recognized that Hooker is completely within the tradition of this sort of polemical literature to appeal to this rhetorical tactic to assert the conclusion that pretended reformation is seditious, contrary to God’s law, and that its fruit is a world cleane turned upside downe.

**Theme 4: The Inability of the Righteous Man to Hold his Peace**

Perhaps one of the most highly recognized quotations from Hooker comes from the opening line of the Preface to the *Lawes*, \textit{...though for no other cause, yet for this; that posteritie may know...} 

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{138} Homelie against Rebellion, 225.
\item \textsuperscript{139} Homelie against Rebellion, 225.
\item \textsuperscript{140} Homelie against Rebellion, 227.
\end{itemize}
we have not loosely through silence permitted things to passe away as in a dreameé

Posterity has long been identified with one of Hooker’s imagined audiences. But of course, Hooker in no way intends Posterity to read his work and assess his efforts as a failure. Hooker is actually saying, ñI cannot keep silent in the face of what is stirring before us, and therefore I must speak in order to do my part to stem its tide.ø The Preface to the Lawes is an illustration of what might happen if Hooker were to fail in his efforts, but, as we shall also see, it is also a hopeful vision of what will happen if he succeeds. The point being, he cannot hold his peace.

Once again, we see that Hooker is not unusual in the context of establishment polemical literature. Near the beginning of Vermigli’s sermon, the same rhetorical play is used. One can perhaps imagine Cranmer pronouncing these words of Vermigli from the pulpit: ñThese reasons perchaunce might move some men to be quyitt and holde their peace, but me they doo not somuch move, whiche know right well that our commen sorrowe and lamentable state can not be remedied with silence, no good counsel can be geven withholding my peace.ø The similarity with Hooker is striking and essentially the same rhetorical move. To be sure, such a move is not confined to the literature under examination but is another indication that Hooker is intentionally working within an established tradition of argumentation.

---

141 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 1.1; 1.1.1-2.


143 Vermigli, ñTyme of Rebellionø 150-1.
Theme 5: Obedience as a Cardinal Religious Virtue

Little need be said of this issue as it has been touched on elsewhere, except to reiterate that in all of this literature, as in much of the literature of the Elizabethan establishment, \"order\" is the virtue of all virtues and serves as the hermeneutic lens through which Scripture is rightly interpreted and right reformation properly discerned. The Edwardian homilies ðAn Exhortacion conceryning Good Ordre and Obedience to the Rulers and Magistrates and ðAn Homelie against Contencion and Braullynge both underscore order as a hallmark of God's creation and perfect obedience to God's order, as expressed in obedience to the rulers and magistrates as a primary virtue.

Theme 6: Repentance as Remedy to the Sin of Rebellion

This brings us to our final theme cataloguing the similarities between Hooker and establishment homiletic literature, ðRepentance as Remedy to the Sin of Rebellion. It is a mark of Hooker's rhetorical prowess that having moved the passions of his reader in chapter eight by what I have previously argued is a rhetorical digressio that he returns to assume an irenic stance in the ninth chapter that is both hopeful and pastoral. For Hooker, although his opponents are well down the road headed to an upturned order, there is the possibility to turn back, and that is through repentance. The ninth chapter begins:

The best and safest waie for you therefore my deere brethren is, to call your deedes past to a new reckoning, to re-examine the cause yee have taken in hand, and to trie it even point by point, argument by argument, with all the diligent exactness yee can; to lay aside

---

144 Both sermons are found in, Bond, Certain Sermons.
the gall of that bitternes wherein your minds have hitherto overabounded, and with meekness to search the truth.\textsuperscript{145}

The re-examination, point by point, is what Hooker is prepared to assist with throughout the eight books of the \textit{Lawes}. The tide can be stemmed through stepping back and looking reasonably upon each argument. Hooker continues, noting that it is only pride that prevents one from turning again: ÒThinke ye are men, deeme it not impossible for you to erre: sift unpartiallie youre owne hearts, whether it be force of reason or vehemencie of affection, which hath bred, and still doth feede these opinions in you.Ó\textsuperscript{146} He then explains that is commendable to acknowledge oneÓs errors, giving the illustration of St. AugustineÓs \textit{Confessions} as an honourable example of one who happily repents of previous error and shares his transformation with the whole world.\textsuperscript{147} Hooker ultimately seeks restoration and reconciliation, and his final image of the reconciliation of Joseph reunited with the brothers who had previously tried to kill him serves as the model for what might be, should his opponents repent of their errors.\textsuperscript{148} This conclusion is an emotionally satisfying dénouement, which grounds the way of peace in repentance and reconciliation. God is finally, and once again, invoked as Òthe God of peaceÓ\textsuperscript{149} indicating that restored order comes through abandoning seditious thinking and seeking reconciliation through repentance.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{145} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 9.1; 1.51.24-29.
\item \textsuperscript{146} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 9.1; 1.51.29-31.
\item \textsuperscript{147} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 9.2; 1:52.1-6.
\item \textsuperscript{148} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 9.4; 1.53.5-15.
\item \textsuperscript{149} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 9.4; 1.53.14.
\end{itemize}
Repentance is also a key theme in Vermigli’s *Tyme of Rebellion*. In response to the possible criticism that repentance ought to be constrained to those in authority who failed to justly punish offenders, Vermigli asserts:

> Let every man serche his own conscience and (like as Danyell did) let every man confesse, and bewayle aswell his owne synnes, as the synnes of the heddes and rulers. And let every man for his owne part converte and amende hym self, forasmuche as he knowith that our offences be the causes not only of private but of publick and common calamities.  

While the argument as to responsibility is somewhat different, the message that repentance is the spiritual medicine that heals sedition and rebellion is consistent. As Hooker used the biblical example of Joseph to buttress his argument, so Vermigli appeals to Daniel 9:1-19.

Vermigli revisits this admonition in the latter part of the sermon, having perhaps just reminded his hearers of the calamitous German Peasants’ Revolt of 1525:

> Thies thinges before rehersed have I for this intent and purpose spoken, that wee shulde acknowledge and repute all this seditions and troubls which wee now suffer, to be the veray plage of god, for the reiecting or ungodly abusing of his moost hollye wourde, and so provoke and enlist every man to true and frutefull repentaunce and to receave the gospel (which now by godly mercy and the good zeale of the kings maiesty and his counsaill is every wheare set abrode)  

It is of note the troubles are visited by God upon the commonwealth for the rejection and abuse of God’s word. The heart of the trouble is always flawed exegesis, and thus an implicit reminder that the lens of divine order is the primary lens through which Scripture is to be read and correctly interpreted. Vermigli continues with a litany of biblical examples, including the *children of Israill in the deserte [who] did often tymes seditiously set themelfes against*

---


Moses, 

and illustrates how calamity always follows sedition. Upon offering a prayer for God's mercy, he brings the homily to its conclusion by offering another litany of scriptural examples of how penitence is the only remedy for plague and sedition. It is a "heavenly medicine" which God promises will that "if our synnes were redde as scarlet they shall be made as white as snowe." The outcome is precisely what Hooker would later suggest, in his example of St. Augustine.

A final observation on the 1642 separate publication of Chapters 8 and 9 of Preface to the Lawes as "The Dangers of the New Discipline"

This final observation is perhaps not profound, but offers us the opportunity to understand the separate 1642 publication of chapters eight and nine in a slightly new light. We know that the final two chapters of the Preface were separately published in 1642, not under Hooker's name, but as an individual treatise to discourage rebellion. The circumstances with respect to the publication of the fragment are cloudy, but the observation I wish to make is this: someone clearly saw this text as persuasive piece of rhetoric on its own, and perhaps as part of a species of


154 Speed Hill, "Hooker's Preface, chapters viii and ix", Notes and Queries, n.s. 16 (1969): 457-9, has suggested that the 1642 publication represents an earlier version of chapters 8 and 9 and that several textual variants demonstrate the more primitive character of the text. He suggests that its very existence as a distinct manuscript confirms Houk's suggestion that the final two chapters of the Preface were added by Hooker after he had completed the first seven (458). However, George Edelen (FLE 1.xxxiv) notes that some of the variants, however, clearly derive from the folio editions and provides several examples as evidence. Thus, it seems clear that chapters seven and eight have been excised and reissued to defend the loyalist cause in 1642.
establishment polemic that echoed and reinforced the establishment polemic that it often mimics in style, rhetoric and purpose. If I have suggested that Hooker was self-consciously writing in this manner, I am now suggesting that he was also received as part of that tradition and the evidence of the text’s usage as a part of that tradition underscores this assertion.
Chapter 7

Sympathetic Sources: Hooker's use of Beza and De Brès in the Preface to the Lawes

Amongst the several sources upon which Hooker draws in the Preface to the *Lawes* are two significant continental divines, Theodore Beza and Guy de Brès. What makes these two sources noteworthy in the Preface is that Hooker draws on them favourably, and at considerable length, at two points in which he is most strenuously making the cases against presbyterian polity. What is more curious is that both Beza and de Brès are advocates for just the sort of polity against which Hooker was arguing. Why would Hooker use sources that are ostensibly hostile to the polity he was advocating to try to turn the hearts and minds of his opponents? It is the contention of this paper that Hooker, surprisingly, uses these sources not only as a way of finding common ground with his disciplinarian adversaries but also as an attempt to redraw the lines of kinship, seeking to turn his adversaries away from false brethren and toward reconciliation with their brethren in the Established Church.

As chapters two and eight are the two longest chapters of the Preface, and given that they both specifically deal with problems of ecclesiastical order, and given that they both draw on the work of two Reformed thinkers who would be understood as sympathetic to his adversaries, it is not untoward to argue that chapters two and eight might understood as a having a parallel relationship and function, perhaps not classically chiastic, but at least structurally intentional. I have argued that chapter eight is something of a rhetorical digression in which Hooker reflects on the seriousness of what might happen if the disciplinarians get their way. It is a road fraught with calamity and radicalism. In chapter eight, Hooker makes an historical appeal, drawing considerably on an account of the rise of Anabaptism and its relation to radicalism penned by the
Continental reformer, Guy de Brès. Similarly, chapter two of the Preface, drawing largely Beza's *Life of Calvin*, recounts Calvin's attempts to bring order to the chaos of a Geneva left without a workable ecclesiastical polity. In the same way that chapter eight forms a lengthy digression on a theme, so too, does chapter two. Both chapters make an appeal to history. In chapter two Calvin is treated as having made the best of a bad situation, and that the polity he imposed was out of exigency and the need for order. To Hooker's mind this does not make it the order that ought to be universally adopted, though. In chapter eight, Hooker argues that imposition of such an order on England would be calamitous, and would in fact breed the kind of disorder Calvin was actually trying to overcome. This is Hooker's argument and how he structurally presents it, but once again, why use the sources he does in these pivotal places?

**Theodore Beza's *Life of Calvin***

Let us first consider Hooker's use of Theodore Beza's *Life of Calvin*. There are two ways the source is utilized as an ally. The first is the use of a text *by Beza* as an ally, and the second is Hooker's choice to appeal to Beza's protagonist, Calvin, as an ally in his cause. It would be wrong-headed to assume that simply because Hooker (and the English Church) did not share a common polity with that of the continental reformers, that they ought not to be seen as theological allies. Indeed, David Neelands has argued with respect to John Calvin, that he shared much common ground theologically with Hooker, in spite of the fact that they disagreed on polity (and public worship), ſCalvin's account of renewal or sanctification in the redeemed person, and his account of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist in terms of instrumentalism, were generally absorbed within the Church of England, without much support from the officially
approved doctrinal statements.\textsuperscript{155} We also need not go over the ground covered in the last generation that establishes Hooker's credentials as a Reformed thinker.\textsuperscript{156} The question therefore is not why would Hooker appeal to Beza, Calvin (or de Brès for that matter) but rather, why would he appeal to them as allies when making arguments around precisely the points upon which they disagreed?

With respect to Beza, we know that he was an especially revered figure amongst those who sought a more advanced reform of polity in the English Church. Indeed, the early editions of the \textit{Admonition} circulated with a letter from Beza to Grindal which, while not advocating for Presbyterian polity, did argue against the maintenance of ceremonies associated with popish superstition.\textsuperscript{157} This was a widely circulated text which established Beza in the public mind as an ally to the cause of the advanced English reformers, and yet, as one reads through the letter, we might be surprised to see Beza arguing that new ceremonies might be added, and even that apostolic ceremonies might be dropped if comeliness required it.\textsuperscript{158} Practically, Beza is not that far from Hooker on this account. This, of course, is the principle espoused and established in the prayer book preface, \textit{Of Ceremonies, why some be abolished and others retained}.

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{155} David Neelands, \textit{The Use and Abuse of John Calvin in Richard Hooker's Defence of the English Church}, \textit{Perichoresis} 10, no. 1 (2012): 4.  \\
\textsuperscript{156} See for example, W.J. Torrance Kirby, \textit{Richard Hooker as an Apologist of the Magisterial Reformation}, in McGrade (ed), \textit{Richard Hooker and the Construction}, 219-233.  \\
\textsuperscript{158} As for my part, I am out of doubt, that the Doctrine of the Apostles was most perfect in all poyntes, and that it is not lawfull for any man to take any thing from it, or putte any thing to it. But as for theyr Ceremonies. I iudge a little other wise of them. In Frere, \textit{Puritan Manifestoes}, 45-6.
\end{footnotesize}
even say that Hooker and Beza are working from the same playbook on this account. What separates them is the fact that Beza believes much more corruption has seeped into the retained ceremonies and that a more thoroughgoing reform ought to ensue not because the ceremonies are wrong, in and of themselves, but because of their association with superstition and idolatry.\footnote{Frere, *Puritan Manifestoes*, 45.}

Hooker, of course, would argue differently. The point being, they shared the same methodological starting place but would come to different conclusions. Hooker could appeal to an authority such as Beza without any reluctance because his appeal was not based on shared conclusions but on shared underlying fundamental methodological agreement. I think this is what is happening in his use of Beza's *Life of Calvin*.

As Hooker reads the text, it is primarily a tale about order and disorder, which is Hooker's highest value in the Preface. Indeed, he repeatedly appeals to 1 Corinthians 14:33, "God is not God of confusion but of peace\footnote{Hooker cites this passage three times in the Preface: *Lawes* Pref. 3.2; 1.14.6-7; Pref. 6.3; 1.31.32; and Pref. 6.6; 1.34.9-10.}" glossing the text to read "For God is not a God of sedition and confusion but of order and of peace." Thus, for Hooker, Beza's text provides the perfect opportunity to demonstrate this fundamental underlying principle, that order and peace are of such divine value that even the imposition of a presbyterian polity might be appropriate if disorder reigned. As such, Hooker interprets Beza's text as struggle between order and disorder, and even goes so far as to suggest that the presbyterian polity implemented by Calvin is appropriate given the circumstance. The opposition to Calvin by the Genevans came from a love of disorder. While Hooker sees presbyterian polity as generally problematic, it is not that he viewed it as entirely illegitimate. As Brown Patterson has rightly observed, "though Hooker..."
strenuously opposed any efforts to further the Genevan polity in England, he clearly accepted the church in Geneva as legitimate, as he also did the Reformed churches of Scotland and France.\textsuperscript{161} Thus, while it seems at first surprising that Hooker might appeal to Beza's *Life of Calvin* to make his case against Presbyterianism in England, it in fact explains how he can acknowledge the legitimacy of the Genevan church in the context of the larger value of the maintenance of order and peace. However, it is to be granted that the move is a bold one, which he makes in only the second chapter of the work. Hooker does not delay his appeal to Beza (and Calvin), but immediately seeks to use both the source (Beza) and the man (Calvin) as his unlikely allies. Rather than drawing a deep line in the sand at the outset, Hooker is seeking the common ground by which he might begin the work of persuasion. Brown Patterson has also reminded us that "one thing that is striking about the *Lawes* in contrast to the more overtly polemical theology of the Elizabethan period is that Hooker not infrequently sought to reason with his opponents, suggesting that he recognized that there was considerable common ground in theology between them."\textsuperscript{162} Near the very beginning of his text, this is the play Hooker is making, by suggesting that an ally of his adversaries is his ally, too.

This is also much the case in his appeal to Calvin as a character in Beza's narrative. I would follow others such as Kirby, Grislis, Patterson and Neelands who understand his description of Calvin as sympathetic, if not uncritical. To put Hooker's reading of the situation succinctly, Calvin had to work with what he had, and did the best under challenging circumstances, but the problem with Calvin, according to Hooker, is that he mistook the polity he


\textsuperscript{162} Patterson, *Perkins*, 34.
implemented as one of divine institution. Hooker does not object to Calvin's actions so much as his defense of his polity.

This view of Hooker's presentation of Calvin as irenic and sympathetic has recently been challenged by A.J. Joyce, who sees Hooker's comment on Calvin as "incomparably the wisest man that the French Church did enjoy, since the hour it enjoyed him" as witty and ironic. Joyce understands Hooker's irenicism as a constructed literary persona, and that in his introduction of Calvin, he "damns with faint praise." Joyce hangs a lot on the phrase "since the hour it enjoyed him," which can possibly read as ironic and sarcastic and possibly not. Ultimately, Joyce sees Hooker as one who was in fact prepared to put at risk the logical coherence of his argument in order to score points at his opponents' expense. I would suggest that Hooker was far from putting at risk his coherence at all. What Hooker objects to, once again, is not the polity, per se, but its elevation by Calvin as divinely ordained, as the result of Calvin's "love of his own counsels." Hooker goes to great lengths to see Calvin in a positive light, but must deal with the reality that Calvin claimed divine ordinance for his polity. The criticism of Hooker's treatment of Calvin in *A Christian Letter* only serves to underscore that the subtly of Hooker's argument was not readily accepted, at least by one reader. Hooker was accused

---


167 "Nature worketh in us all a love of our own counsels." Hooker, Pref. 2.7; 1.10.10.
attacking Calvin, to which Hooker assertively made his marginal response, “Two things there are which trouble greatly these later times, one that the Church of Rome cannot, another that Geneva will not erre,” and “Safer to discuss all the saints in heaven then M. Calvin.” I do not take this as evidence that Hooker was trying to undermine Calvin as Joyce does, but rather that his critique of Calvin overshadowed the rhetorical move he was trying to make, which was to demonstrate a kinship with Calvin in the pursuit of order and peace. Indeed, Hooker noted that Beza himself criticized Calvin, and that as different as Calvin and Beza were in terms of disposition they shared in “amity and concord.” Indeed, Hooker makes a note to himself that he ought to remember to make this comparison and observe yet how they were linked. This seems a clear demonstration of Hooker’s purpose, that kinship can be found even when such difference prevails. If Hooker was angry in his marginal notes to A Christian Letter, it was precisely because his reader had not been persuaded by his attempt to make an ally out of Calvin and claim some common ground with his own adversaries. Perhaps this makes chapter two a noble failure.

**Guy de Brès** *La racine, source et fondement des Anabaptistes … de nostre temps*

Guy de Brès is perhaps best remembered today as the author of the *Confession de foy* [1561] popularly known as the *Belgic Confession*. De Brès converted to Reformed Christianity in 1547

---

168 FLE 4.55.4-6.

169 FLE 4.57.30.

170 FLE 4.49.9-10.

171 FLE 4.55.15-17.
and was ordained a pastor in Geneva. He spent time abroad in England during the time of Edward VI. He was martyred in 1567. The work on which Hooker draws extensively in the eighth chapter of the Preface is de Brès’s lengthy, *La racine, source, et fondement des Anabaptistes ... de nostre Temps* which heavily underscores the seditious nature of Anabaptism.

As William Haugaard has noted, ëDe Brès’s impeccable credentials as martyr and orthodox Calvinist made him an ideal authority for Hooker to cite in addressing England’s own advanced Protestants.ê As with his use of Beza, he both paraphrases and quotes verbatim from de Brès. For example, in Pref. 8.6, Hooker draws the following point more or less directly from de Brès:

ëFor they had always in their mouthes those greater things, charitie, faith, the true feare of God, the Crosse, the mortification of the fleshe ê
e

Hooker uses de Brès’s account of Anabaptism as a cautionary tale, to paint a dystopic vision of what might happen to England if the Presbyterian program is allowed to advance. As he made clear in the account of Calvin in Geneva, the issue was not so much Presbyterianism per se, but rather the taking of Presbyterianism to be divinely ordained. As a Reformed thinker who considered presbyterian polity as an essential mark of the church, de Brès seems a strange bed fellow, indeed. But what de Brès consistently underlines in his text, and this is what Hooker picks up repeatedly is that the problem with the Anabaptists, is that they became convinced of

---


173 Haugaard, FLE 70.

174 Hooker, *Lawes*, Pref. 8.6; 1.43.9-11; c.f. de Brès, ëFor they had always in their mouths, the love, faith, and the fear of God, the mortification of the flesh, and the cross...ê *The Rise, Spring, and Foundation of the Anabaptists, Or Rebaptized of our Time*, 1565 [Trans. Cambridge, 1668 by J.S.], 2. Emphasis original.
their own counsels as divinely inspired. Of Muntzer, de Brès writes, that he considered himself not only a preacher but also a senator and counsellor, considered his own interpretation of Scripture authoritative, and gave sentence upon all according to his will and fancy. This is the point Hooker forcefully makes in directly addressing his adversaries in 8.5 of the Preface:

But for as much as against all these and the like difficulties your answere is, that we ought to search what things are consonant to Gods will, not which be most for our owne ease; and therefore that your discipline being (for such is your errour) the absolute commandment of almighty God, it must be received although the world by receiving it should be cleane turned upside downe; herein lyeth the greatest daunger of all. For whereas the name of divine authoritie is used to countenance these things, which are not the commandements of Gode, but your owne erronious collections; on him ye must father whatsoever ye shall afterwards be led, either to doe in withstanding the adversaries of your Cause, or to thinke in maintenance of your doings.

The caution is that his adversaries, in their insistence on implementing a presbyterian polity as the *sine qua non* of full reformation, are in fact aligning themselves with the sorts of radicals the most prominent Reformed leaders have always stood against. There is an important nuance to his argument. While Hooker was certainly no advocate of presbyterian polity, and while he argued strenuously in defense of episcopal polity, he did not outright reject Presbyterianism as a legitimate form of Christianity. Indeed, as staunch an advocate as he was with respect to episcopal polity, although he demonstrated that he could make the *jure divino* argument in its favour, he resisted from fully embracing the episcopacy as irrevocably divinely ordained. The issue remains the insistence on implementation from a *jure divino* principle.

---


176 Hooker, *Lawes*, Pref. 8.5; 1.41.30-42.9.

But there is something else, as well. As we have seen, Hooker highly values "order" as a divine virtue and as the mark of divine approbation. He finds a strong ally in de Brès because de Brès effectively illustrates what happens when a mistaken sense of divine inspiration comes from the love of one's own counsels. The outcome is sedition and all its related consequences, and as Hooker reminds his readers (paraphrasing Paul), God is not the God of chaos and sedition but of order and peace. He employs de Brès to argue from history the possible future outcome if his adversaries continue to go down the road they are on. Toward the end of chapter eight he begs his adversaries not to be offended when the long-term outcomes of their actions are considered and not simply their best, well-meaning intentions.\textsuperscript{178} Hooker succinctly states his purpose elsewhere toward the end of eighth chapter:

\begin{quote}
For my purpose herein is to show that when the minds of men are once erroneously perswaded that it is the will of God to have those things done which they phancie, their opinions are as thornes in their sides never suffering them to take rest till they have brought their speculations into practise.\textsuperscript{179}
\end{quote}

Much of what is happening in chapter eight is Hooker playing with the concept of kin-relations. He opens the chapter with an almost dismissive description of a dysfunctional family, at war with itself:

\begin{quote}
\é your poor brethren. They on the contrary side more bitterly accuse you as their false brethren, and against you they plead saying: \éFrom your breasts it is that we have sucked those things which ye delivered unto us ye tearmed that heavenly, sincere, and wholesome milke of God\é worde, howsoever ye now abhorre as poison that which the virtue thereove hath wroght and brought forth in us \é ë \é Him therefore we leave to be satisfied by you from whom he hath sproong.\textsuperscript{180}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{178} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 8.13; 1.49.32.

\textsuperscript{179} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 8.13; 1.49.2-6.

\textsuperscript{180} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 8.1; 1.36.30-1.37.3; 1.39.4-5.
and ends the chapter more sympathetically with a hope that a stop might be put to the dysfunction. In a sense, the question put to his adversaries, is ἃ with whom do you wish to be aligned? ἢ or ἃ to whom do you belong? ἢ Again, toward the end of the eighth chapter he skillfully reminds his adversaries that they have not fully joined into the separatist program, and in noting this, he keeps the door open for them to have a change of mind and heart, ἃ Yea, even by you which have staied your selves from running headlong with the other sort, somewhat notwithstanding there hath been done without leave or liking of your lawful superiors, for the exercise of a part of your discipline amongst the clergy thereunto addicted. ἃ

It is my contention that this change of mind and heart is predicated on the adversaries making a conscious decision as to whom they are most closely related. Are they radicals like the Anabaptists? Or are they truly Reformed like Calvin, Beza, de Brès, and of course, Hooker, himself? Chapter nine drives the point home most eloquently in the image of the hope of reunification (on Hooker's terms, of course) with the appeal to the reuniting of Joseph and his brothers in Egypt.

In spite of the fact that Hooker paints a frightening picture of the threat presented by radical Anabaptism, as Stephen McGrade has observed, Hooker "shows compassion for the Anabaptists...[and] offers a psychological analysis of how good souls can go wrong." ἃ As with his use of Beza's Life of Calvin, his use of de Brès's account of the rise of Anabaptism is peppered with moments of sympathy. Whether or not this is a constructed irenic literary persona,
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181 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 8.13; 1.50.28-31.

182 McGrade, Ἄ introduction to Laws, xxxiv. Hooker here quotes Lactantius, de Jusitit. Iib. 5. cap. 19 "O quam honesta voluntate miserì errant? With how good a meaning these poore soules doe evill." Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 8.9; 1.46.30-2.
as asserted by Joyce, or reflective of how he truly felt, is not ultimately important. What matters is that here is an example of Hooker seeking common ground through not only the use of a source deemed sympathetic to his adversaries, but also through a sympathetic reading of the historical incidents.

The point of employing de Brès is the same reasoning Hooker used in employing Beza, to redraw the lines of kinship for his adversaries, to draw them away from radicalism, and back to the Establishment. Hooker does this by claiming kinship, himself, with such leading continental reform figures as Beza, Calvin, and de Brès. They are allies that he shares with his adversaries, and where his allies are to be critiqued, he does so, but as a sympathetic and irenic ally, reserving his fury for the radicals. The Preface is a text intended to persuade. One of Hooker's tools is the company he chooses to keep in his text. If he could marshal figures sympathetic to his adversaries as his own allies, perhaps he might be able to turn the minds and hearts of those who were heading down a foolish path.
Chapter 8
Conclusion: A Structural Review of the Preface

Having dismissed the consensus view that chapters eight and nine were hastily added to the preface by demonstrating the relationship of *Dedictory Preface* of Book V to the Cranmer's letter, and by suggesting that chapter eight forms a literary *digressio*, and having suggested that this *digressio* might be just the sort of thing his readers would have expected, I believe we can now make the conclusion that the Preface to the *Lawes* has a literary and rhetorical integrity. The task of this concluding chapter is to draw the threads of this argument together and briefly sketch out the nature of this integrity.

As we have seen, chapter eight is a lengthy digression on the pitfalls of embracing presbyterian polity. It is a caution against sedition and disorder. Likewise, chapter two (drawn chiefly from Beza's *Life of Calvin*), entitled "The first establishment of new discipline by M. Calvin's industry in the Church of Geneva, and the beginning of strive about it amongst our selves" deals with the establishment of presbyterian polity in Geneva as a response to the problem of disorder. I have argued that while Hooker begins by lauding Calvin as "the wisest man that ever the French Church did enjoy," a surprising move given Calvin's role in establishing a presbyterian polity diametrically opposed to episcopal polity, this alignment is about making an ally of an ally of his adversaries. Calvin and Hooker are both seekers after order. The orders they implement are appropriate for their respective ends, but not necessarily transferable. The issue at stake for Hooker in retelling the calamitous tale of Geneva is not so much the problem of presbyterian polity, but rather the issue of disorder. I have demonstrated that for Hooker order is one of his highest principles. According to Hooker, when Calvin arrived
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183 Hooker, *Lawes*, Pref. 2.1; 1.3.14.
in Geneva, there were no ecclesiastical laws, for the system of ecclesiastical government had collapsed when the bishops and priests had fled:

For spirituall government, they had no laws at all agreed upon, but did what the Pastors of their soules by persuasion could win them unto. Calvin being admitted one of their Preachers, and a divinitie reader amongst them, considered how dangerous it was that the whole estate of that Church should hang still on so slender a thred, as the liking of an ignorant multitude is, if it have power to change whatsoever it selfe listeth.\textsuperscript{184}

Calvin was the bringer of order, who asked the churches and people to covenant together through solemn oath and the implementation of a polity agreeable to all, and most importantly agreeable to the word of God.\textsuperscript{185} Yet, he was undermined, with battles ensuing as to whose discipline would be the most reformed according to scripture.\textsuperscript{186} What ensued was disorder and chaos, brought on by the private discernment of local leaders. I contend that this is the argumentative purpose of the second chapter. Hooker makes no attempt to attack the polity in question (although he clearly views it as an inferior polity); his aim, rather, is to make an ally of his adversaries\textsuperscript{\textdagger} hero, Calvin. When Calvin\textsuperscript{\textdagger} attempts at order in the form of a solemn covenant are undermined, he finds himself banished.\textsuperscript{187} What is crucial is that Hooker and Calvin are in agreement on the idea of order. When order is rejected, sedition, confusion, and the overturning of society and its institutions are the result. Calvin\textsuperscript{\textdagger} major contribution, it seems, is not so much a particular polity, but the tools and mechanisms to order a reformed society. For example, Calvin introduces ecclesiastical courts as means of settling disputes.\textsuperscript{188} Of what was Calvin

\begin{enumerate}
\item Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 2.1; 1.3.29-1.4.3.\textsuperscript{184}
\item Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 2.1; 1.4.4-10.\textsuperscript{185}
\item Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 2.2; 1.4.23-25.\textsuperscript{186}
\item Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 2.2; 1.5.10-14.\textsuperscript{187}
\item Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 2.4; 1.6.15-24.\textsuperscript{188}
\end{enumerate}
criticised in his attempts to impose order? He was accused of popish tyranny.\textsuperscript{189} In Hooker\textsuperscript{189} reading he and Calvin are fighting the same fight although they are doing so with respect to very different polities, yet this is not a problem for Hooker as his commitment to episcopal polity is not a \textit{jure divino} commitment.\textsuperscript{190} Likewise, Hooker challenges his adversaries to prove that Calvin ever claimed a universal commandment for the implementation of presbyterianism, or that Calvin ever claimed \textit{the singular necessity thereof}.\textsuperscript{191}

When we arrive at chapter eight of the Preface, we encounter Hooker prophesying a collapse of order opening the door to the Barrowist (or radical) agenda if presbyterianism is pushed forward. The chapter is entitled \textit{How just cause there is to feare the manifold dangerous events likely to ensue upon this intended reformation, if it did take place.}\textsuperscript{192} The full apocalyptic scenario need not be rehearsed here, but a select list includes: the constraining of supreme powers by certain powers;\textsuperscript{192} the loss of appeal to higher authority;\textsuperscript{193} the replacing of collegiate societies, namely the two universities, by schools such as the one in Geneva;\textsuperscript{194} the destruction of civil courts and thus \textit{the world turned clean upside down}\textsuperscript{195} (the greatest danger imaginable in

\textsuperscript{189} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 2.4; 1.7.13-14.
\textsuperscript{190} Graves, \textit{iure Divino?} 60.
\textsuperscript{191} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 2.7; 1.10.24-27.
\textsuperscript{192} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 8.2; 1.39.10-11.
\textsuperscript{193} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 8.2; 1.39.18.
\textsuperscript{194} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 8.3; 1.40.8ff.
\textsuperscript{195} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 8.5; 1.42.3-4.
Hooker’s world-view!); anti-social, carnal Anabaptism will become the order of the day;\textsuperscript{196} the days of the week will be renamed;\textsuperscript{197} things never before taught will be taught (innovation);\textsuperscript{198} scripture will be the only tool allowed in disputations; there will be book burnings;\textsuperscript{199} novelty of religion;\textsuperscript{200} and an upsetting of the sacramental order.\textsuperscript{201} These are only to name a few!

This heightening of emotion before the final emotional appeal of the peroration is entirely consistent, as we have seen with the rhetorical form of a \textit{digressio}. Hooker heightens the appeal even further at the beginning of the \textit{digressio} by presenting a fictitious Barrowist narrative that rants against the more moderate sorts of puritans, \textit{thus the foolish Barrowist deriveth his schism by way of conclusion, as to him it seemeth, directly and plainly out of your principles. Him therefore we leave to be satisfied by you from whom he hath sprong.}\textsuperscript{202} Hooker intends to evoke an emotional relational tension by using the metaphor of mother and child for the moderate puritans and their Barrowist offspring, thus connoting a closeness, but it is not a closeness to be delighted in. The Barrowists are like bastard children, and indeed unholy spawn. Thus, Hooker seeks to drive a wedge between them, asking them to gaze upon what they have given birth to with derision and even fear.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{196} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 8.6; 1.43.19-21.
\textsuperscript{197} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 8.6; 1.44.2-4.
\textsuperscript{198} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 8.6; 1.44.6-7.
\textsuperscript{199} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 8.7; 1.44.19.
\textsuperscript{200} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 8.7; 1.44.31.
\textsuperscript{201} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 8.6; 1.45.15ff.
\textsuperscript{202} Hooker, \textit{Lawes}, Pref. 8.1; 1.39.2-5.
\end{flushleft}
If one were to view chapters two and eight as parallel digressions, perhaps not quite a chiasm proper, but chiastic in principle, one notices the relational alignments and contrasts even more starkly. To this end, I have argued that Calvin and Hooker (and Beza and de Brès) are kin with respect to the implementation or upholding of order. I have further suggested that the unruly reformers of Geneva who opposed Calvin are kin with the Barrowist and other English radicals who oppose all order and create chaos and sedition. The moderate Puritans, Hooker’s adversaries, see themselves as kin with Calvin, but Hooker has actually exposed that they are kin with the radicals. In fact, the radicals are their offspring. From your breasts it is that we have sucked those things which when ye delivered unto us ye termed that heavenly, sincere, and wholesome milke of Gods worde, howsoever ye now abhorre as poison that which the virtue therof hath wrought and brought forth in us. 203 Hooker’s emotional appeal is one in which he attempts to shift the alignment of kinship. In chapter two, the shift is subtler, in that he attempts to retrieve Calvin from his adversaries and set himself and Calvin (and his source, Beza) against them. In chapter eight the shift is overt in that he attempts to align his adversaries with the more radical Protestants. Although the emotional rhetoric is very different, the goal is the same.

Hooker does not leave it on this frightening note, though, for he concludes the eighth chapter by illustrating that although his moderate adversaries have begun to go down a road that ought not to be taken, it is not too late. In the ninth chapter, Hooker seeks to restore the relational dissonances of kinship in the peroration with the image of the biblical Joseph and his brothers being reunited in Egypt. There is a hint that they are true kin, and yet there are separated by error. Hooker’s emotional appeal is to invite his adversaries to gaze in both directions and make

203 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 8.1; 1.36.30-1.37.3.
a choice of kinship: choose between the radical seditious Barrowist (the unholy spawn), or being reunited as Joseph and his brothers (the model of reconciliation).

In this sense, the ninth chapter has a parallel relation with the first chapter as well. The first chapter begins with that famous pessimistic plea, ëthat for no other cause, yet for this; that posteritie may know we have not loosely through silence permitt ed things to passe away as in a dreameê ñ Hooker has no intention of letting things pass away through silence. The whole eight books of the Lawes are a testament to that. Yet, chapter nine of the Preface is anything but pessimistic. Having unfolded the apocalyptic possibilities in chapter eight, Hooker speaks word of hope and of reconciliation. Even if these words are ultimately unrealistic, they form an integral part of the rhetorical program of the Preface.

Finally, I have argued that this rhetorical program is actually deeply informed by one important scriptural text, 1 Corinthians 14:33, ëfor God is not a God of confusion but of peaceê. This is the key underlying text which unites the Preface thematically and structurally. The concept of peace and order is one of the touchstones of the Preface. In chapter one, Hooker invokes the ëGod of peace,¿ almost as poet might invoke a muse, to ëenable us quietlie and even gladly to suffer all things, for that worke sake which we covet to performe.¿ Chapter two is all about Calvin struggling to order things in peace. In chapter three he cleverly quotes 1 Corinthians 14:33 through a paraphrase made by Gregory of Nazianzus which slightly glosses the text to read, ëFor God is not a God of sedition and confusion but of order and peace¿. The
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204 Hooker, Lawes, Pref.1.1; 1.1.9-10.

205 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 1.1; 1.1.19.

206 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 3.2; 1.14.6-7.
addition of "sedition," and "confusion" gives us a telling sense on how he believes the passage ought to be interpreted, and the issue at stake at the present. Chapters five and six are about the settling of contention through appeal to proper authority, and Hooker again quotes 1 Corinthians 14:33 in 6.3, and 6.6, highlighting its crucial importance in relation to his program. Chapter seven is his summary and statement of the case. Chapter eight is a lengthy digression all about sedition and confusion and the threat to order and peace. Finally, chapter nine, the peroration, concerns the potential restoration of order and peace through reconciliation. Indeed the final line of the Preface concludes invoking the "blessings of the God of peace" both in this world and in the world to come (ital. added), echoing and balancing the invocation of the "God of peace" from chapter one.

The Preface is a sustained reflection on order and peace, and the threat thereto by a moderate presbyterian polity that is in danger of breeding seditious radicalism. For Hooker, the threat to order is contrary to the scriptural affirmation that God is the God of order and peace. The Preface seeks to make this clear. The rhetorical strategy of the Preface is to address this issue from all sides and with all the possible tools that Hooker can muster. I can see nothing in chapters eight and nine that undermines this assertion, and in fact, as I believe I have demonstrated chapters eight and nine drive this point home.

In conclusion, I have argued that the consensus view with respect to the composition of the Preface to the Lawes is built on the questionable foundation that of Cranmer's "Excellent Letter" as the impetus for Hooker appending chapters eight and nine to a substantially completed Preface. I have suggested as a correction, based on an examination of the textual evidence that
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207 Hooker, Lawes, Pref. 9.4; 1.53.14.
Cranmer’s letter instead was the impetus and foundational text for the Dedicatory Epistle which prefixes book V of the Lawes. I have further argued that chapter eight of the Preface actually constitutes an example of the rhetorical form of *digressio* based on a description of the forms from ancient rhetorical handbooks which would have been known to Hooker. I have suggested further that this *digressio* could very well have been exactly the sort of thing a reader might have expected and have underscored this assertion by demonstrating its rhetorical similarly with establishment homiletic literature. Finally, I have argued from the consistency of the rhetoric that the structure, form, and content that the Preface constitutes a sustained reflection on the problem of order and peace against disorder and sedition, as based on 1 Corinthians 14:33, and a redrawing of the lines of kinship between those who stand for and against this principle. Understanding this, chapters eight and nine are not only consistent in thought with the remainder of the Preface but are integral to its rhetorical and polemical coherence. Thus, it is finally time to put to rest the image of weak-kneed, irenic Hooker unable to make an impassioned argument without the pressing of his friend Cranmer. Hooker had the tools at his disposal to do so and he executed his rhetorical program in the Preface with a coherent brilliance of his own making.
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