

The Individualised Eschatology of Richard Hooker (1554-1600)

EGIL GRISLIS

The University of Manitoba

1.

The concern with eternity reverberates throughout Hooker's writings. Yet his concern with death and afterlife was mostly existential and hence individual. Although Hooker did make references to biblical texts that dealt with the Day of Judgment on a world-wide scale,¹ these were not developed into a comprehensive and all-inclusive doctrine. Moored in Scriptures and tradition as well as steadfastly reliant on right reason, Hooker was not carried away by apocalyptic speculations. His central concern remained the death of the individuals and God's judgment on them in afterlife.²

Hooker lived and wrote during the reign of Queen Elizabeth I when notable political and religious coherence and order had been achieved. There were, however both past and present events, that were deeply troublesome. Most notably, there was the excommunication of Elizabeth I by Pope Pius V on February 25, 1572 that carried with it the claim that her subjects had been freed from loyalty to her. In 1581 the British Parliament issued a decree: the attempt to convert anyone to Catholicism would be an act of high treason and in punishment the guilty would be "hung, drawn, and quartered", that is, hung until barely conscious, then cut down from the gallows, after that the genitals cut off, then disemboweled, and finally cut in four parts with an axe. These gruesome details are interpreted in some detail by Peter Lake.³ As the Jesuit missionaries continued to arrive, Elizabeth I regarded them as traitors and executed them accordingly. Among them was the saintly Father Edmund Campion (1540-1581), the most renown martyr. There were also attempts on the life of Elizabeth I, most notably the Babington Plot of 1586 as well as variegated and continuous Puritan challenges. The Great Spanish Armada left Spain on July 12, 1588 but was annihilated by the British navy and several vicious storms. While Hooker did not decide which of these challenges was the very worst, he pointed to their common denominator – the attempt to destroy the present order of the Elizabethan society and the Anglican faith. Hence Hooker began his great work *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Polity* with a courageous confession:

Though for no other cause, yet for this; that posteritie may know we have not loosely through silence permitted things to passe away as in a dreame, there shall be for mens information extant thus much concerning the present state of the Church of God established amongst us, and their carefull endeavour which woulde have upheld the same.⁴

2.

In this complex setting Hooker celebrated the central role of the Christian faith. This meant that as a believer, Hooker took seriously the inevitable death of each individual followed by the subsequent judgment of God. In his own pastoral ministry Hooker had become well acquainted with the complex dimensions of the reality of death. He can also be expected to have preached numerous funeral sermons. Of those only one has survived, entitled *A Remedie Against Sorrow and Feare*, delivered in a funeral Sermon, John 14:27.⁵ It is a very thoughtful statement, with almost every word finding its rightful place as it elaborated key theological and pastoral insights.

One, the sermon was intensively existential. It addressed the state of mind of the grieved through carefully chosen quotations from the New Testament. These, however, were not merely recited texts, but a passionate portrayal of the great love of Jesus for His people. Through these quotations, Jesus speaks to the grieving. Initially the sermon begins as a deeply intense address to the disciples. These are “chosen sentences of sweet encouragement”.⁶ Almost immediately the sermon in a most intensive way turns to the grieving listeners, “Let not your hearts be troubled, nor feare”.⁷ Such are also the following words of Jesus, “My deare, it is for your own sakes that I leave the world”. As Hooker continued to quote the words of Jesus, he briefly interpreted them. It was a remarkably intense weaving of divine love and human affection:

I know the affections of your hearts are tender but if your love were directed with that advised and staide judgement which should be in you, my speech of leaving the world and going unto my father would not a little augment your joie. Desolate and comfortlesse I will not leave you, in spirit I am with you to the worlds end, whether I bee present or absent nothing shall ever take you out of these hands [...] where I am, you shalbe. In the meane while My peace give, not as the world giveth, give I unto you, Let not your hearts be troubled, nor feare.⁸

Two, besides being a sensitive pastor, Hooker was also a superb theologian. He well understood that the mere proclamation of the Gospel did not automatically dispel all grief. This is only natural: “Our nature coveteth preservation from things hurtfull”.⁹ But where such hurt is present, the human heart is heavy and begins to fear. Jesus seeks to assuage both, and speaks to His disciples, “Let not your hearts be troubled” and “feare not”.¹⁰

But is this realistic? In so far as grief was “naturall and therefore simple not reprobable”,¹¹ Hooker suggested that this depended on the situation, that is, on the cause and the extent of the grief. Thus Christ did not reprove the “naturall compassion”¹² of the women who lamented that He was brought to execution – but their error, was that they should have lamented about their own sins.¹³ In addition, we err in protesting about the prosperity of the wicked. Hooker knew that the wicked were not wise and therefore could not be happy despite appearances to the contrary.¹⁴ “They are oftner plagued then we are aware of”.¹⁵ Moreover, the judgment of God awaits them. Of course, “the judgements of God doe not alwaies follow crimes as Thunder doth Lightning, but sometimes the space of many ages comming between”.¹⁶ The believers also do not know just what future will bring. Hence both the repentant believers and the self-secure unbelievers should fear God’s punishment. And what uncertainties there remain during life time there is no uncertainty at the Final Judgment. As shall be noted on several further occasions as well, Hooker did not elaborate on the Final Judgment. Yet he believed in it and regarded as necessary to give it a short but very powerful account even on the occasions of a funeral. Speaking especially of the evil doers, Hooker made the situation dreadfully clear:

And when their punishment doth come let them make their account in the greatnesse of their sufferings to pay the interest of that respect which hath been given them. Or if they chance to escape cleerly in this world which they seldome do, in the day when the heavens shall shrivell as a scrole and the mountaines move as frighted men out of their places, what Cave shall receive them? what mountaine or rocke shall they get by intreatie to fall upon them? What covert to hide them from that wrath which they shalbe neither able to abide nor to avoid?¹⁷

Apparently there is no doubt in Hooker’s mind that the just judgment will be fierce indeed. Yet he offered no detailed account of the pain of these dreadful events. Hell is not often mentioned by name. On one level it may be appropriate to note that the Elizabethan age had seen on numerous occasions how the traitors, as the Jesuit missionaries were designated, had been “hung, drawn, and quartered”.¹⁸ It knew what fier punishment be all about. Hooker never even hinted that he was aware of the public acts of such gruesome torture and execution. But Hooker could assume that everyone present at the funeral might very well imagine how horrific a divine punishment would be. Indeed, it may be noted that the power of Hooker’s rhetoric lay precisely in not describing the very details of the punishment, as human imagination is far more powerful than any detailed and verbal description could offer. However, there is another level to be taken in account. C. John Sommerville has suggested that in the sixteenth century England secularisation was not merely “an erosion of religious belief.” While seeing secularisation, initially, as a loss of religion’s social functions, we can also see it as a “refinement or spiritualisation of faith”.¹⁹ Without subscribing to Sommerville’s thesis’ first part, perhaps the

“spiritualisation” in Hooker’s situation may be understood on the one hand as his thorough and detailed adherence to classical Christian sources, and on the other hand as drawing on right reason in their interpretation. The primary emphasis on the most intensive love of Christ coupled with right reason, guided Hooker to acknowledge God’s judgment, but to bypass the potentially cruel or even sadistic aspects of an all too human description of the Final Judgment.

Three, Hooker regarded as the most dangerous the spiritual responses to one’s own suffering. Hooker asked: “The grieffe which our owne sufferings doe bring, what temptations have not risen from it?”²⁰ Here Hooker warned that Satan was well aware of our weakness in suffering and will seek to exploit it for his own benefit. Here Hooker pointed to two distinctive situations, namely “godly grieffe” and those with a “conscience of sinne”.²¹ Hooker counseled to seek consolation in the awareness that Jesus Himself was “consecrated by affliction”. When following Him, there will not be a laid out a red carpet before us but sharp “thornes”.²² How to survive in the midst of such tribulations, Hooker pointed to patience. A visible virtue, the call to patience suggested a practical, active response, avoiding extremes: “patience I name that virtue which onely hath power to stay our soules from being over extensively troubled”.²³ In this rather concrete vein, Hooker appealed to the example of angels and saints, drawing the observation that the hope of being remembered well by posterity will offer a measure of consolation.²⁴ Then a brief eulogy followed, consisting of an account of devotion to God and gracious dealing with other people²⁵. While this section may be viewed as fully appropriate as it reflects on the life-style of the departed and her high status in community, this is the more traditional part of an Elizabethan funeral sermon. Again, a specially vivid attention to Judgment and Hell fire is absent.

Four, with some repetition, Hooker turned his attention to fear, at times caused by sin, yet in life encountered in several settings. With the insight that “feare in it selfe is a thing not sinful”,²⁶ Hooker pointed to God as the creator of nature. In fact, natural fears contribute to human survival, assisting in the avoidance of danger but also awakening from spiritual smugness. Here fear also awakens to seek the presence of God and to fulfill His demands for righteousness.

Five, while insightful, his last several observations nevertheless lacked a real existential fervor. Here we were confronted by the thoughtful scholar rather than by the fiery, arousing pastor. That Hooker was capable of the latter approach, is seen in the moving conclusion of the sermon. In reading it, it is needful to keep in mind that according to Hooker, it is the blossoming of the love of God rather than the explosion of the wrath of God that is central in Christian existence:

It is nature which teacheth a wise man, in feare to hide himselfe, but grace and faith doth teach him where. Fools care not, where they hide their heads. But where shal a wise man hide himself when he feareth a plague comming? Where should the frighted child hide his head, but in the bosome of his loving father?

Where a Christian, but under the shadow of the wings of Christ his Saviour? Come my people, saith God, in the Prophet Enter into thy Chamber, hide thy selfe, etcetera Esay. 26. But because wee are in danger like chased birds, like Doves that seeke and cannot see the resting holes, that are right before them, therefore our Savior giveth his Disciples these encouragements before hand, that feare might never so amaze them, but that alwaies they might remember, that whatsoever evils at any time did beset them, to him they should still repaire, for comfort, councill, and succour. For their assurance whereof his Peace hee gave them, his peace he left unto them, not such peace as the world offereth, by whom his name is never so much pretended as when deepest treachery is meant, but Peace which passeth all understanding, peace that bringeth with it all happiness, peace that continueth for ever and ever with them that have it. This Peace God the Father grant, for his sonnes sake, unto whom with the holy Ghost, three persons, one eternall, and everliving God be all honor, glorie, and praise, now, and for ever; Amen.²⁷

3.

A very powerful sermon on death and salvation, with a specific attention to soteriological issues, *Remedie* was further supported with several key statements throughout Hooker's writings. These range from discussions of major issues to merely a few marginal comments. Beginning with the latter, we may note that in the *Lawes* Hooker spoke of *life after death* rather briefly, "Our good or evell estate after death dependeth most upon the qualitie of our lives".²⁸ The qualification "most" is suggestive. While generally Hooker viewed the inheritance of afterlife as the result of the gift of divine grace, accepted by the free choice of the human will, Hooker may not have wanted to exclude God's freedom in ultimate judgment. In other words, in his reflections on predestination Hooker had thought to balance the gift of grace, human freedom in accepting it, and God's final judgment.

Ultimately, Hooker was aware of the impossibility to measure the reality of divine patience. Yet his continuous emphasis on the love of God allowed to hope in faith and in a way discouraged to place rigid moralism as our main standard.²⁹

While Hooker acknowledged the reality of *divine judgment and condemnation*, he did not undertake a detailed discussion of it. Hooker also did not describe hell in any specific detail; he was no Dante savoring the detailed tortures of purgatory and hell. That he did not deny the existence of hell emerged only as an afterthought in Hooker's references to God's final, eschatological Judgment. At the same time, several of Hooker's specific concerns throughout his writings were above all with the power of God's love. The reality of judgment and the possibility of condemnation, always carefully acknowledged, nevertheless placed them in some subordination to the love of God.

A characteristic example was the doctrine of *infant baptism*. Following the *Thirty Nine Articles*³⁰ and the tradition of the Church of England, Hooker accepted infant baptism as a regenerative sacrament. Yet this did

not mean that Hooker was equally willing to accept the condemnation of unbaptized infants. As the Reformation had rejected purgatory and along with it the limbus for unbaptized infants (as a deposit of permanent happiness without, however, the vision of God in heaven), the status of unbaptized infants became confused. Condemnation of unbaptized infants emerged in several localities, at the same time as the salvation of unbaptized infants was also viewed as a real possibility. Increasingly the latter position became the accepted view.³¹ Hooker's positive position represented the actual situation. He had observed correctly that "the judgment of many hath gone hard against them".³² For his own view that unbaptized infants are saved, he supplied the following reflective theological insights, namely, that (1) "grace is not absolutely tyed unto the sacraments".³³ (2) "Such is the lenitie of God that unto thinges altogether impossible he bindeth no man",³⁴ God accepts the baptism by desire of others "in stead of the deed it selfe".³⁵ Hooker's subsequent almost celebrative emphasis on God's grace "whereby of his owne incomprehensible mercy he thought to save without baptisme", served him to deliver a scathing critique of the Church that through "superfluous scrupulosity" placed almost insurmountable demands in the way of infant baptism.³⁶

At the root of Hooker's Erasmian gentleness³⁷ lay the Augustinian distinction between the *visible and invisible Church*. Now the invisible Church, a "body mysticall", "one" in reality, is partially in heaven and partially on earth.³⁸ Although "a reall body" that consists of a "huge multitude", it is not discernable by human sense ad truly perceived by God alone. Its position in the eyes of God is unique: "Whatsoever we reade in scripture concerning the endlesse love and the saving mercy, which God sheweth towards his Church: the onely proper subject thereof is this Church".³⁹ Again, Hooker's boundless celebration of divine love emerges in its full splendor.

As far as the visible Church is concerned, according to Hooker, it is also "one, continued from the first beginning of the world to the last ende".⁴⁰ Membership in the visible church is gained by confessing Jesus Christ as Lord and accepting the faith that He had proclaimed. The actual entering takes place by baptism. Although it could be assumed that Hooker had in mind the traditional infant baptism of his Church, he actually pointed to the baptism of the Egyptian eunuch (Acts 8:38) and hence to evangelical believers' baptism.⁴¹ And the membership in the visible Church is proven by the traditional confession of "one Lord, one faith, one baptisme".⁴² Those who reject such belief are "aliens and strangers", namely "Saracens, Jewes, and Infidels".⁴³ Consequently, according to Hooker's conviction, to this visible Church there also belonged the *Roman Catholic Church*. This pleased neither most Protestants nor Catholics. To explain his position, Hooker referred to the Roman Catholic popular and apologetic question to Protestants, formulated with scorn and humor: "they aske us where our Church did lurke, in what cave of the earth it slept for so many hundreds of

yeeres together before the birth of Martin Luther?"⁴⁴ Hooker's response was that Luther had not established any new church, but reformed the one and only Church that over the centuries had gone through greater and lesser faithfulness to Jesus Christ.⁴⁵ Similar had been the situation in the Church of England.

Such a response indicates something of basic unwillingness to pronounce judgment even on segments of the visible Church. Some of Hooker's considerations were relativistic, such as "Jerusalem is a synfull polluted citye, but Jerusalem compared with Babilon is rightuous".⁴⁶ While elaborating several key errors of the Roman Catholic Church, he was not convinced that a mere enumeration of errors served as a sufficient proof for its perdition. Rather, Hooker looked for the condition of the very center and discovered that even "infidells and heathen" cry out for God's "mercy and desire in generall to have their synnes forgyven them".⁴⁷ In other words, not merely in comparison to people even less believing than they, Hooker saw in the quest for mercy and the forgiveness of sins an absolute standard. However small an accomplishment was registered by this standard, it was nevertheless better than the denial of the very "foundacion of faith", where salvation could not be hoped for.

Now in regard to the salvation of Roman Catholics, Hooker continued to make use of various creative arguments. While some of them can be noted, it is clear that Hooker's central hermeneutical presupposition, the guiding light that determined the direction of his argumentation, was his firm belief in the immense love of God. To God's love all things are possible – even a direct denial of the foundation of Christianity. After all, why cannot God's mercy "delyver their soules from hell!"⁴⁸

Indeed, "we are apte prone and redy to forsake god but is god as redy to forsake us?"⁴⁹ And, while "no man lyveth that synneth not", it is also true that "as pefecte as any do lyve maie syn".⁵⁰ Indeed, who among us may judge – except God, who thank God! – judges in mercy, and sometimes embraces us in mercy.

Then there is also the consideration of ancestors – all of them had been Roman Catholics! How can one believe that all of them are now among the damned? Moreover, is it not a fact that "many were there amongst our fathers who being seduced by the common error of that church never knewe the meaninge of her heresies?"⁵¹ And so Hooker continued. It seems to me that Hooker's greatest ecumenical insight was the recognition that even the pope could be saved. If, generally speaking, the Puritans were regarded as the greatest enemies in the *Lawes*, in the *Tractates and Sermons*, Roman Catholics were the more dangerous opponents. In the *A Learned Discourse on Justification*, Hooker delivered a beautiful statement that for his time was remarkably love-filled. Hooker wrote, rather prophetically, that

The houre maye come when we shal thincke yt a blessed thinge to heare, that yf our synnes were as the synnes of Popes and Cardinalls, the bowells of the mercye

of God are larger. I do not propose unto you a Pope with the neck of an Emperor under his foote, a Cardinall riding his horse to the bridell in the blood of saintes: but a pope or a Cardinall, sorowfull penitent disrobed, stript not onlie of usuped power, but also delivered and recalled from error; antichrist converted and lying prostrate at the feete of Christe: And shall I think that Christ will spurne at him?⁵²

The Archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, has judiciously summed up that “Richard Hooker believed (injudiciously, in terms of his reputation and career) that Roman Catholics could go to heaven”.⁵³ The Archbishop, of course, has evaluated the situation realistically in political terms. But Hooker looked for truth and for him God’s saving love was the ultimate concern, regardless of the cost.

As for *idolaters*, Hooker was outspoken in critique of their errors, and relied on their evaluation in the Book of Leviticus and the example of Moses. In essence, idolatry was “the highest degree of treason against” the Almighty God. Of course, idolatrous reason was a total failure for them that practiced it – they received no “succor”, lost all “grace” and in afterlife received “confusion”.⁵⁴ Yet already in this life the idolaters found themselves under a “dreadful curse”.⁵⁵ Without a doubt, Hooker took the biblical statements very seriously and hence accepted the reality of the Last Judgment. But Hooker did not revel in this knowledge. Indeed, he knew that the Canaanites had not fared well. However, he understood that as an example, “a fearefull paterne” at that, of God’s just displeasure and wrath against all sinfull nations”. In other words, the deadly fate of the Caananites made clear that “God thought good to plague and to afflict” all idolaters. At the same time, what happened to the ancient Canaanites was a special event, an example, and “examples have not generallie the force of lawes which all men ought to keepe, but of counels onlie and persuasions”.⁵⁶ God had not legislated “in what forme and manner we ought to punish the synne of idolatrie in all others”.⁵⁷ And this, in Hooker’s opinion, was reasonable because potentially redemptive. Hooker spoke in love and therefore in hope: “idolators maie be converted and live”. Even pagan temples may be transformed into Christian sanctuaries for worship.⁵⁸

Now the *atheists* were something else. Their situation was virtually hopeless. As Hooker saw the situation, there were two types of people who failed to apprehend the reality of God. The first were so underdeveloped “that they hardlie and scarcely seeme to holde the place of humane beinge”. Consequently they have “utterlie no knowledge of God”.⁵⁹ The second have become atheits by personal initiative. In order to be able to forsake all morality, they have rejected all Christian insights. Hooker lamented, “Is it not woonderfull that base desires should so extinguish in men the sense of their owne excellence, as to make them willinge that their soules should be like to the soules of beastes, mortall and corruptible with their bodies”.⁶⁰ In Hooker’s experience, the conversion to faith of these atheists has been a very rare experience – “Till some admirable or unusuall accident happen (as it hath in some) to worke the beginninge of a bitter alteration in their

mindes, disputation about the knowledge of God with such kinde of persons commonly prevaileth little".⁶¹ In their perspective, the atheists saw religion as "a mere politique device".⁶² Notably among them was Niccolo Machiavelli, the "wise malignantes".⁶³ And here one could see the tragedy of their lives; "they loose them selves in the very maze of their owne discourses, as if reason did even purposelie forsake them, who of purpose forsake God the author thereof".⁶⁴ Ordinarily then, there is no hope for the atheists – they have closed their minds, the ordinary route to God. Thus they steadfastly and perversely reject every divine proffer of grace. Yet even here Hooker did not elaborate the dire punishment in eternity that will await these atheists. But he does not rejoice in their perdition either. As already noted, Richard Hooker was no Dante.

The *infidels* are also outside the visible Church as they "utterlie reject the very principles of Christianity, which heretikes embrace and erre onely by misconstruction".⁶⁵ Hooker always believed that in religion error was a grave mistake. At the same time he was convinced that damnation was only for unrepentant sinners who had thoroughly misused their free will and repeatedly rejected the proffer of saving grace. Hooker thought that this dreadful and punitive insight did not need any particular elaboration and defense – except in the case of needing to oppose the Calvinist view of double predestination that had significantly underestimates human free will.⁶⁶ In other words, even though often not heeded, in the Elizabethan Age the doctrine of eternal damnation was familiar and theoretically accepted. Hooker also did not question the reality of God's wrath and Final Judgment. Yet in every situation – except in regard to the atheists and the infidels – Hooker looked for the possibility of repentance, hence for hope and salvation. And this was not a platitudinous and irrational hope. With great care, Hooker continued to ask very serious questions, as his methodology was built not only upon reliance on the inspired Word of God, but also on the God-given reason, restored by grace (and often referred to as "right reason"). Scriptures and reason evaluated tradition continuously, sifted through both Christian and pagan sources – and reflected with care. As a thinking Anglican, Hooker put aside those traditional Catholic doctrines that in his view conflicted with Scriptures and right reason. At the same time Hooker was not a rationalist from the not as yet arrived Age of Enlightenment. Therefore in his reflections on death, the afterlife and the Final Judgment, Hooker carefully integrated Scripture, tradition, and right reason, not only as a superb theologian but also as a notable evangelist. In each instance, doctrines were to serve as proffers of grace and thus invitations to salvation.

4.

For Hooker such an approach also meant reconciliation between contenders, in his *Tractates and Sermons* with greater attention to the

Roman Catholic Church and in the *Lawes* the various Puritan movements. He concluded his Preface to the *Lawes* as follows:

But our trust in the almightie is, that with us contentions are now at their highest floate, and that the day will come (for what cause the despaire is there) when the passions of former enmitie being alliaied, we shal with ten times redoubled tokens of our unfainedlie reconciled love, shewe our selves each towards other the same with Joseph and the brethren of Joseph were at the time of their enterview in Aegypt. Our comfortable expectation and most thirstie desire whereof what man soever amongst you shall anie waie helpe to satisfie (as we trulie hope there is no one amongst you but some way or other will) the blessings of the God of peace both in this world and in the world to come, be upon him moe then the stares of the firmament in number.⁶⁷

But the expression of an ecumenical hope was, and remains, a meaningful hope only insofar as it is conjoined with repentance and forgiveness. Hooker thought that this needs to be applied to the doctrine of the Last Judgment as well: it is existentially salvific only in so far it is preceded by the personal repentance to seek mercy in God's Judgment.

In a way it can be regretted that beyond personal repentance and existential encounter with Christ here and with faithful hope for hereafter, Hooker did not spend more time on the Last Judgment. But then, Hooker did not have the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Nag Hammadi Gnostic texts. Therefore for his reading of the apocalyptic materials his resources were somewhat more limited than ours. Of course, Hooker acknowledged the reality of the Last Judgment. But when we compare him with the Luther and Calvin, we may note that while they while reflecting on the Book of Revelation, they did not write a full-length commentary on it. Apocalyptic reflections often became of greater interest for those who were even less able to handle them responsibly and academically. Luther called them the *Schwärmer*; without attention to its German root-meaning, the term has been often translated as "fanatics". Living in an atomic age with memories of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, one really does not need to be even a full fledged *Schwärmer* in order to take the end of this world somewhat seriously. Perhaps the judicious Richard Hooker might have agreed.

Notes

¹ For a broad historical overview, see Andrew Cunningham and Ole Peter Grell, *The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse: Religion, War, Famine and Death in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

² Egil Grislis, "The Role of Sin in the Theology of Richard Hooker", *Anglican Theological Review* 84/4 (2002), 881-896.

³ Peter Lake with Michael Questier, *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists & Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2002).

⁴ *The Folger Library Edition of The Works of Richard Hooker*, W. Speed Hill, General Editor, subsequently abbreviated as *Lawes and FLE* (Cambridge, MA, USA and London, England: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977). A Preface I.1; *FLE* 1.1-1:9-13.

⁵ *FLE* 5.367. A general appreciation of sermons (v.xxi and v.xxii) and funeral sermons in particular (v.xxv) is recorded in the *Lawes*. A significant modern interpretation is offered by

John K. Stafford, "Sorrow and Solace: Richard Hooker's Remedy for Grief", 131-147, in W. J. Torrance Kirby (ed.), *Richard Hooker and the English Reformation* (Dordrecht, Boston, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003).

⁶ Hooker, *Remedie*, FLE 5.367.16.

⁷ John 14:27.

⁸ Hooker, *Remedie*, FLE 5.367.4-27.

⁹ Hooker, *Remedie*, FLE 5.368.5.

¹⁰ Hooker, *Remedie*, FLE 5.368.7-9.

¹¹ Hooker, *Remedie*, FLE 5.368.12-13.

¹² Hooker, *Remedie*, FLE 5.368.23.

¹³ Hooker, *Remedie*, FLE 5.368.27-29.

¹⁴ Hooker, *Remedie*, FLE 5.369.22-25.

¹⁵ Hooker, *Remedie*, FLE 5.370.5-6.

¹⁶ Hooker, *Remedie*, FLE 5.370.18-20.

¹⁷ Hooker, *Remedie*, FLE 5.370.22-30.

¹⁸ See Peter Lake, *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat*.

¹⁹ *The Secularization of Early Modern England: From Religious Culture to Religious Faith* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 178.

²⁰ Hooker, *Remedie*, FLE 5.371.10-11.

²¹ Hooker, *Remedie*, FLE 5.371.12 and 14.

²² Hooker, *Remedie*, FLE 5.371.22-24.

²³ Hooker, *Remedie*, FLE 5.372.5-6.

²⁴ Hooker, *Remedie*, FLE 5.372.23-26.

²⁵ Hooker, *Remedie*, FLE 5.373.7-14.

²⁶ Hooker, *Remedie*, FLE 5.375.8.

²⁷ Hooker, *Remedie*, FLE 5.377.3-24.

²⁸ Hooker, *Lawes* V.46.1, FLE 2.184.5-6.

²⁹ Egil Grislis, "Providence, Predestination, and Free Will in Richard Hooker's Theology", 79-95, in W. J. Torrance Kirby (ed.), *Richard Hooker and the English Reformation* (Dordrecht, Boston, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003).

³⁰ Art. XXVII, *Of baptism*: "The baptisme of young children (*baptismus paruulorum*), is in any wyse to be retained in the Church [...]" See G. R. Evans and J. Robert Wright (eds), *The Anglican Tradition: A Handbook of Sources* (London: SPCK and Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1991), 167.

³¹ Will Coster, "Tokens of Innocence: Infant Baptism, Death and Burial in Early Modern England", 266-287, in Bruce Gordon and Peter Marshall (eds), *The Place of the Dead: Death and Remembrance in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

³² Hooker, *Lawes* V.60.6, FLE 2.260.2-3.

³³ Hooker, *Lawes* V.60.6, FLE 2.260.3-4. Hooker did not argue that "salvation was not imparted by the sacraments" as claimed by Will Coster, "Tokens of Innocence", 271; that would have been a Zwinglian position. Here Hooker's arguments appeal to the love of God.

³⁴ Hooker, *Lawes* V.60.6, FLE 2.260.4-5.

³⁵ Hooker, *Lawes* V.60.6, FLE 2.260.6-7.

³⁶ Hooker, *Lawes* V.60.7, FLE 2.262.1-5.

³⁷ Timidly though kindly, covered by an almost brutal sense of humor, Erasmus had affirmed that for the first two centuries the Early Church did not practice infant baptism. See *Erasmus and the Seamless Coat of Jesus: De sarcienda Ecclesiae Concordia (On Restoring the Unity of the Church) With Selections from Letters and Ecclesiastes*. Translations with Introduction and Notes by Raymond Himelick (Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Studies, 1971), 96. Since Hooker evaluated truth by reference to judicious and wise interpreters, the Early Church precedent would not have been binding, but it may nevertheless influenced Hooker's attitude.

³⁸ Hooker, *Lawes* III.1.2, FLE 1.194.27-29.

³⁹ Hooker, *Lawes* III.1.2, FLE 1.195.3-5.

⁴⁰ Hooker, *Lawes* III.1.3, FLE 1.195.27-98.

⁴¹ Hooker, *Lawes* III.1.6, FLE 1.197.23-29.

⁴² Hooker, *Lawes* III.1.7, FLE 1.198.9.

- ⁴³ Hooker, *Lawes* III.1.7, *FLE* 1.198.11-12.
- ⁴⁴ Hooker, *Lawes* III.1.10, *FLE* 1.201.6-8.
- ⁴⁵ Hooker, *Lawes* III.1.10, *FLE* 1.201.8-12.
- ⁴⁶ Hooker, *Justification* 8, *FLE* 5.117.1-2.
- ⁴⁷ Hooker, *Justification* 19, *FLE* 5.126.9-11.
- ⁴⁸ Hooker, *Justification* 20, *FLE* 5.127.26-27.
- ⁴⁹ Hooker, *Justification* 26, *FLE* 5.140.2-3.
- ⁵⁰ Hooker, *Justification* 26, *FLE* 5.141.5-6.
- ⁵¹ Hooker, *Justification* 20, *FLE* 5.127.29-31.
- ⁵² Hooker, *Justification* 35, *FLE* 5.162.24-164.2. The reference to the emperor under pope's foot recalls the incident at Canossa in 1077 where Emperor Henry IV submitted to the humiliation by Pope Gregory VII (Hildebrand). Luther's view of the Pope as the Antichrist had gained wide but not universal following among Protestants. The reference to a Cardinal riding in the blood of the saints just might be a reference to the St. Bartholomew's massacre in Paris on August 24, 1572.
- ⁵³ Rowan Williams, *Anglican Identities* (Cambridge, MA: Cowley Publications, 2003), 24.
- ⁵⁴ Hooker, *Lawes* V.17.2, *FLE* 2.62. 5-12.
- ⁵⁵ Hooker, *Lawes* V.17.2, *FLE* 2.62.16-17.
- ⁵⁶ Hooker, *Lawes* V.17.5, *FLE* 2.63.6-10 and 33-64.2.
- ⁵⁷ Hooker, *Lawes* V.17.4, *FLE* 2.63.9-10.
- ⁵⁸ Hooker, *Lawes* V.17.5, *FLE* 2.64.20-22.
- ⁵⁹ Hooker, *Lawes* V.2.1, *FLE* 2.22.28 and 23.5-6.
- ⁶⁰ Hooker, *Lawes* V.2.1, *FLE* 2.22.19-22.
- ⁶¹ Hooker, *Lawes* V.2.1, *FLE* 2.23.22-26.
- ⁶² Hooker, *Lawes* V.2.3, *FLE* 2.25.25.
- ⁶³ Hooker, *Lawes* V.22.4, *FLE* 2.26.8.
- ⁶⁴ Hooker, *Lawes* V.2.4, *FLE* 2.26.23-27.
- ⁶⁵ Hooker, *Lawes* III.1.11, *FLE* 1.203.9-11.
- ⁶⁶ Egil Grislis, "Providence, Predestination, and Free Will in Richard Hooker's Theology", 79-95, in W. J. Torrance Kirby (ed.), *Richard Hooker and the English Reformation*.
- ⁶⁷ Hooker, *Lawes* Preface.9.4, *FLE* 1.53.5-15