

Chapter 1

‘That Glorious Beam of the English Church’ The Man and his World

In a significant measure theology is a matter of biography. The theological vision a person constructs and espouses, together with the form of its expression, are deeply related to personal life and circumstances. Certainly that is so of Richard Hooker.

Hooker’s biographers, though, have often obscured that. This is partly owing to the fact that the first biography of Hooker by the somewhat sympathetic bishop of Exeter, John Gauden, was written in the year of the Restoration, a lengthy sixty years after Hooker’s premature death in 1600. It is also the result of the complex motives which surrounded the writing and publication in 1665 of what might be called the official *Life of Mr Richard Hooker* by the seventeenth-century biographer Izaak Walton. Walton was already well known for his lives of eminent clerics John Donne and Robert Sanderson, so he was the obvious candidate when Archbishop of Canterbury Gilbert Sheldon, unhappy with Gauden’s portrait of Hooker, sought to replace it with something more satisfying.¹ Walton could be relied upon to depict Hooker in terms wholly consonant with the interests of the neo-Laudianism of the restored Church of England: learned, reasonable, prayerful and, more to the point, utterly committed to royal supremacy, the *Book of Common Prayer*, and episcopacy by divine right.²

Walton’s *Life*, however, was thin on sources. Never mind that long periods of Hooker’s bookish life were uneventful; even where his life was worth recording documentary evidence was in short supply. So Walton was often left to construct his picture from an oral history available to him from his wife’s relatives. In some cases that made for erroneous facts and an innocently misleading picture of Hooker. Nor was Walton’s *Life* free from ideological bias. His appended discussion of the last three books

1. Lee Gibbs cites, for instance, Gauden’s assertion of Hooker’s academic mediocrity (‘Life of Hooker’, *CRH*, pp. 3-4).

2. Walton’s *Life* was published in 1666 and then in all subsequent editions of Hooker’s works through the nineteenth century (Gibbs, ‘Life’, p. 5). Texts cited here are from Walton’s *Life* in *The Lives of John Donne, Sir Henry Wotton, Richard Hooker, George Herbert, Robert Sanderson* (Oxford, 1927). On the conservative shape that the Restoration Church took and why, see I. M. Green, *The Re-Establishment of the Church of England 1660-1663* (Oxford, 1978).

of the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, for instance, tried to undermine their authenticity, and so their authority, in an effort to 'neutralise' Hooker's advocacy of the principle of consent in governance.³ Something like hagiography was the result. Still, Walton's classic displaced the preceding biography and shaped generations of readers' picture of the learned and judicious Hooker: less a defender of the Elizabethan Church than of its neo-Laudian Restoration version.

As part of the nineteenth-century Tractarians' return to the sources and a wider English cultural tendency toward 'imaginative historical reconstruction'⁴, John Keble published the first critical edition of Hooker's works in 1838. He revisited Walton's *Life* for inclusion among its introductory material and added his own theological assessment of Hooker's place and value as an 'Anglican' authority. Keble's special interest was episcopacy and its origin by divine right.⁵ Keble's own investigation into the textual history of Hooker's *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* and other writings prompted questions about the adequacy and accuracy of Walton's picture. Thus began what Arthur McGrade has called the 'deflationary trend' especially notable in recent Hooker scholarship, a steady displacement of Hooker from his role as a Restoration icon on a near-saintly pedestal.⁶

The critical posture begun by Keble has gathered such momentum in the intervening century and a half that it has become possible to construct a life of Hooker which, while not free of some probably insurmountable uncertainties, gives us a far more reliable account of Hooker's life and of the context and development of his thought than has hitherto been possible.⁷ There is no need to repeat those biographical results in detail. It is important at the start of this theological study, however, to relate with broad brush stroke the circumstances, issues, institutions and associations that helped generate Hooker's theological vision, and then elicit its exposition.

3. Gibbs, 'Life', p. 6. See also Michael Brydon, *The Evolving Reputation of Richard Hooker* (Oxford, 2006), pp. 105-20.

4. So Peter Nockles in his essay 'Survivals or New Arrivals? The Oxford Movement and the Historical Reconstruction of Anglicanism', in Stephen Platten, ed., *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition* (Norwich, 2003), p. 144.

5. He concluded that Hooker's views were so contradictory as to 'neutralise' his testimony one way or another; see Keble's Editor's Preface [I, p. lxxvii].

6. In his editor's introduction to *Richard Hooker and the Construction of Christian Community* (Tempe, AZ, 1997), p. xiii.

7. Philip Secor has capitalised on this in his biography *Richard Hooker Prophet of Anglicanism* (London/Toronto, 1999), but readers must be aware of significant amounts of conjecture; Lee Gibbs' essay 'Life of Hooker' cited in note 1 above draws upon the close but unfinished biographical research of George Edelen.

Early Life and Education

Richard Hooker was probably an only child born on or near Easter Day in 1553 or 1554 in Heavitree, a suburb of the prosperous and proud cathedral city of Exeter in Devon.⁸ His father, Roger, was of a prestigious local family though he himself did not inherit either the family property or the strong family tradition of involvement in local civic affairs. That was the good fortune of his brother John.

From the point of view of Richard Hooker's eventual contribution as a theologian, his uncle John was an important influence both materially and ideologically. John Hooker was an Oxford-educated, successful, civic-minded man who also theologically aware. His friendship with Bishop John Jewel went back to the days of the Marian exile when John Hooker joined Jewel and the roughly eight-hundred English religious exiles in Switzerland and the Rhineland. By the time of Elizabeth's settlement of religion in 1558, John Hooker was what we would now consider a committed Protestant of the magisterial sort, that is, in the stream of Martin Luther and John Calvin.

He was also a thorough-going Erastian. He viewed religious reformation as a small price to pay for civic peace and the good order of the commonwealth. When it came to the relationship between church and state his was a 'broad and pragmatic route' which viewed religion as a prop and servant of a prior political good.⁹ From both civil and ecclesiastical ministers, therefore, loyalty to the crown was an essential requirement. He once asserted that:

Preposterous, then, is the judgment of those who would have [it] that religion should pertain only to the bishops and clergy, and the chief magistrates should deal only in matters of policy. But the law of Moses and the law of the Gospel, doth determine the contrary.¹⁰

'Magistrates are God's ministers' too, he insisted, 'substitutes, and vicars, upon earth from whom all power and authority is ordained.'¹¹ Those, to be sure, were not the precise sentiments of his nephew in later years, but the theme of a variegated and over-lapping jurisdiction between civil and ecclesiastical spheres surely was.

Given John Hooker's intellectual commitments (he wrote several books on ecclesiastical and local history) it is no surprise that he sponsored his nephew's tuition at the Exeter Grammar School from the age of eight.

8. March 25th, the probably day of Hooker's birth, was the day on which the new calendar year began; but Gibbs, following Edelen's carefully researched chronology, gives April 1554 as the time of birth ('Life', p. 8). The matter remains unsettled.

9. Secor, *Prophet*, p. 35.

10. *Ibid.*

11. *Ibid.*

Richard Hooker was an able student. Walton wrote that as a school-boy 'he was an early Questionist, quietly inquisitive.' 'Why this was and that was not to be remembered? Why this was granted, and that denied?'¹² That description surely fits the probing habit of the mature Hooker. Whether or not the education provided by his uncle at the Grammar School was sufficient preparation for admission to an Oxford college, John Hooker intended it to be so. Did his well-placed friend, John Jewel, play a part? We do not know. But Richard Hooker was admitted to Jewel's own Oxford college, Corpus Christi; he arrived late in 1569 at the age of fifteen.

Oxford

Perhaps the two university towns of Oxford and Cambridge experienced the traumas and transitions of the era of church reform even more than London. When it is remembered how thoroughly ecclesiastical the origins and subsequent habits of the universities were, it follows that the consequences of religious upheaval and change would be deep and wide for their colleges and halls. Although Oxford was never as bent on reform as Cambridge, it too felt the stresses and strains.¹³

Corpus Christi College had been founded early in the sixteenth century by Richard Fox, who was deeply imbued with the spirit of the 'new learning' of Renaissance humanists like John Colet and the Dutchman Desiderius Erasmus. Indeed, Erasmian humanism profoundly influenced Oxford throughout the first half of the sixteenth century. The inherited emphasis on Aristotelian, or 'scholastic,' logic was enriched by the new rhetorical aspects of the curriculum. With the help of Erasmus' interpretation of classical Ciceronian rhetoric, Hooker's education at Corpus was a powerful combination of logical rigor and rhetorical precision.

Corpus was founded before the formal separation from papal jurisdiction. Its founding religious perspective was liberal, humanist, and Roman Catholic. Despite subsequent formal acts of separation at the national level, and in the face of widening currents of reformed theological ideas within the university as a whole, Corpus continued (as did many other English institutions) to include Roman Catholic sympathisers among its fellowship. In fact, such was the strength of this sympathy that William Cole, president of the college at the time of Hooker's admission, had to be forcibly installed by the Bishop of Winchester on the Queen's personal order in the face of staunch resistance by the fellows who preferred their own pro-Roman Catholic candidate. Later, when a replacement for Cole himself was proposed, Hooker and other fellows were temporarily expelled from the

12. *Life*, pp. 162-3.

13. See, for instance, C. M. Dent, *Protestant Reformers in Elizabethan Oxford* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 47-73.

college.¹⁴ Corpus was hardly the 'Garden of Piety, Peace, and Pleasure' that Walton's *Life* of Hooker had described,¹⁵ although periods of discord were, of course, due to internal politics as well as national religious reform.

Intellectual and Practical Influences

Hooker's collegiate and university years between 1569 and 1583 formed the first half of his short life and a key phase of philosophical, rhetorical and theological training. In addition, he made contacts that had a determining impact on his intellectual posture and profession course. Three major influences and two minor ones deserve mention.

First among the major influences stands John Rainolds. When Hooker arrived at Corpus he was put under the tutorial care of Rainolds who, at the age of twenty, was already well known and highly respected in the university. He was an able mixture of Renaissance learning and strong Reformed theological commitment – an advocate of John Calvin's theological system as found, say, in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, as well as of the writings of Oxford's Reformed professor of divinity, Peter Martyr Vermigli. We cannot doubt the impact on Hooker of Rainold's intellectual world.

Another influence was the dashing, brilliant Henry Saville.¹⁶ Saville was, among many intellectual strengths, an eminent Greek specialist. He edited the first critical edition of St John Chrysostom's works and was a likely promoter of Greek patristic interest among Hooker's cohort. Another influence – and here too we must emphasise likelihood rather than certainty – was Antonio del Corro, a one-time Spanish monk who had become a keen advocate of Luther's theology. It is impossible to trace his influence with certainty, but it is noteworthy that at least one of Hooker's later critics likened Hooker's views on predestination to those of del Corro.¹⁷ It is reasonable to suppose that, broadly speaking, the influence of both Saville and del Corro enabled Hooker to consider wider theological options than those of the increasingly regnant English Calvinism.

Two other figures, who were to exert influence of a different kind, appeared on the scene during Hooker's years as tutor and lecturer: George Cranmer and Edwin Sandys.¹⁸ Both, it seems, were intentionally put under Hooker's care. The close friendship that grew between them had huge consequences for Hooker's later career and on the writing and character of his great work, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*.

14. Gibbs, 'Life', p. 9.

15. *Life*, p. 178.

16. See Church's comments, *Introduction*, p. viii.

17. Walter Travers in his *Supplication* (III, pp. 558-9).

18. Cranmer was the grand-nephew of the Archbishop by the same name; Sandys was the son of the Bishop of London who later became the Archbishop of York.

We know little of the particulars of Hooker's collegiate and university life apart from the general duties expected of college tutors and university lecturers. In 1579, the year in which Hooker was made a deacon, he began deputising for Thomas Kingmill, the professor of Hebrew. Two years later, in 1581, he was ordained as a priest. College fellows were also expected to preach learned sermons. From this period we have Hooker's earliest extant writing: his two sermons on the Letter of Jude.¹⁹ Soon the offer of the parochial living of Drayton Beauchamp allowed Hooker to leave the college.²⁰ But Hooker continued his studies. It is likely that in this period Hooker resided in the London home of the wealthy merchant John Churchman, whose daughter Joan Hooker soon married.²¹

Preferment

But Hooker was not destined for obscurity. In the same year he left Oxford, Hooker was invited to preach at the famous outdoor pulpit at St Paul's Cross, close by St Paul's Cathedral in the City of London. For several centuries it had been the recognised platform for the dissemination and debate of issues of church and state especially during periods of religious reform or political uncertainty.²² It could reasonably be counted the most famous pulpit in England; sermons preached there were often an 'event'. The great and the good, the powerful and the weak, statesmen, churchmen, commoners, and even royalty, attended. Whatever the audience, the atmosphere could be raucous, combustible, and confrontational. That Hooker would even face the prospect belies Walton's picture of him as a dove-like, softly-spoken saint. Hooker must have possessed a convincing pulpit presence, oratorical forcefulness, and just plain nerve.²³ No text of that sermon exists. However, we can reasonably suppose that his views, however much they may have dissatisfied non-conformists like Walter Travers, found a favourable hearing among some highly-placed and influential churchmen.²⁴

19. For the text see III, pp. 659-99; the sermons are interesting at various levels, not least in that they reveal Hooker's basically Reformed view of the Church of England at that time.

20. The Buckinghamshire parish was located about 20 miles northeast of Oxford. There is no evidence that Hooker ever took up residence in the parish.

21. On the significance of the marriage see C. J. Sisson, *The Judicious Marriage of Mr. Hooker and the Birth of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (Cambridge, 1940), pp. 1-2, 17-44.

22. See Secor, *Prophet*, pp. 105ff.

23. On Hooker as a preacher, see *ibid.* p. 127, note 7.

24. Critical comments on the content of the sermon were later made by Travers in his *Supplication to the Privy Council*; for that text see note 17, above.

At the time of the St Paul's Cross sermon Hooker's cousin, Walter Travers, was Reader of the Temple Church at the inns of court.²⁵ Despite his unhesitating advocacy of further reform in the Church of England, Travers had, with the patronage of Lord Burghleigh, been appointed as Reader to support the ailing Master of the Temple, Dr Alvey. It was Travers' expectation that, upon the retirement of the Master, he would be succeed him.²⁶

Archbishop Whitgift, unlike Bishop Aylmer of London, was all too familiar with Travers. As Vice-Chancellor Whitgift had expelled him from Cambridge for abetting Thomas Cartwright in sowing Puritan discontent among the fellowship at Trinity College, and, more impertinently, for refusing episcopal ordination as a requirement for a full college fellowship.²⁷ By any reckoning the Mastership was a prestigious post with an influential pulpit; it was, after all, at the heart of England's legal world.²⁸ Both Whitgift and Burghleigh realised its strategic importance as a platform of advocacy for competing visions of the church among the increasingly influential corps of London's common lawyers.²⁹ In the end Whitgift convinced the Queen to disallow Travers' appointment to the Mastership, although he continued as Reader.³⁰ However, a concession was exacted from the Archbishop in that he had to settle for a compromise candidate. Hooker was appointed Master in March 1684/5. It is important to note that Hooker was not Whitgift's first choice. That fact weakens the argument that Hooker was appointed precisely as an apologist for the Archbishop's views and policy and that his *Laws*, as it began to take conceptual shape in the Temple years, was simply a conformist manifesto.

Master of the Temple

The time of Hooker's Mastership was contentious. While there was personal respect between Hooker and Travers, their public and professional relations were often highly oppositional. From the start it was clear that Hooker was unsympathetic to the creeping Presbyterianism that

25. These inns were the centres of England's legal culture and practice. At the centre of the Temple was its chapel, originally a church of the order of the Knights Templar.

26. The post of Master of the Temple was a crown appointment.

27. After a period in Geneva Travers had gone to Antwerp where he was ordained by elders and appointed as pastor to the English congregation there. Upon his return to England he aimed to complete the reformation of the church along a Genevan model.

28. On the post see W. Speed Hill, 'The Evolution of Hooker's *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*', *SRH*, p. 120.

29. On a possible influence on the *Laws* of the 'new learning' of the common lawyers, see H. C. Porter, 'Hooker, the Tudor Constitution, and the *Via Media*', *SRH*, pp. 86-9

30. The disallowance was based on the fact that he had not been canonically ordained, i.e., by a bishop.

Travers was advocating.³¹ Hooker's perceived unsoundness on issues of polity engendered suspicion about Hooker's theology in general; whence Walton's description: '*The Forenoon Sermon spake Canterbury, and the Afternoon Geneva*.'³²

Walton's simple characterisation of the divergent perspectives in play raises an important question about Hooker's role and intent during those years at the Temple: *did* Hooker speak for Canterbury? That is, in the Temple debates with Travers did Hooker represent the establishment position pure and simple? And, beyond that, was he acting intentionally and by arrangement on behalf of Whitgift, his strategists and his operatives? Was the composition of the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* planned from the start as part of Hooker's role in facing down non-conformism both in one of the capital's premier pulpits and more widely?³³ Interpreters of Hooker are not wholly agreed about this. But there seems to be enough evidence in Hooker's Temple sermons, for instance, to indicate his independence from establishment support and guidance. Far from preaching Canterbury, Hooker preached Hooker.³⁴ The debate ended when Archbishop Whitgift suspended Travers.

The Temple period was an intellectually rich and active period for Hooker. He was, for instance, in the midst of a dynamic renaissance of the English common law tradition associated with Sir Edward Coke. Echoes of that appear in the *Laws*. From this period too we have sermonic evidence of Hooker's theology. His *Sermon Of the Certainty and Perpetuity of Faith in the Elect* was composed then, as were the two sermons that now form *A Learned Discourse of Justification, Works, and how the Foundation of Faith is Overthrown*, and *A Learned Sermon of the Nature of Pride*.³⁵

Then another question arises: did Hooker begin consideration and even planning of the *Laws* while he was Master of the Temple? The issue cannot be fully settled. However, some important issues that later figure in the *Laws* made their appearance in the extant works of the Temple period.³⁶ What Hooker's Temple writings illustrate most importantly is his

31. For instance, Travers advised Hooker not to act officially until his call had been ratified by the congregation.

32. Walton, *Life*, p. 200.

33. Sisson, for instance, takes the view that the *Laws* was a joint effort with George Cranmer and Edwin Sandys planned from the start; but that is a minority view. See pp. 32-3, 45-7. 'Hooker's great book was born under his father-in-law's roof. John Churchman's hospitality in Watling Street was the common meeting-place for those with whom Hooker wished to consult...and the scene of frequent discussions between Hooker and Edwin Sandys, George Cranmer, and Dr John Spenser' (p. 45).

34. See Richard Bauckham, 'Hooker, Travers, and the Church of Rome', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 29: 1 (1978), 41.

35. See, respectively, III, pp. 469-81; pp. 483-547; pp. 597-642.

36. For instance, the hierarchy of laws and the foundational role of reason.

willingness to take an independent line, chiefly from his non-conformist critics, but also, albeit to a lesser extent, from conformist orthodoxy. So his departure from the Temple in 1591 gave Hooker the chance to develop and weave his distinctive considerations and trajectories into something more coherent and comprehensive.

The Appearance of the *Laws*

Appointments in the Salisbury diocese gave Hooker the income to support his growing family, and insofar as the posts did not require residency or actual pastoral work, Hooker was free to pursue his large project.³⁷ While the Archbishop was attempting to find Hooker a more suitable permanent post, Hooker himself was working on the Preface and first four books of his proposed eight books *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. It is reckoned that the Preface and Books I-IV were ready for the printer by the end of 1591.

But which printer? It seems that by the early 1590s the non-conforming Puritan movement had already crested and that the publication of numerous anti-Puritan rebuttals by conformist polemicists like Richard Bancroft, Thomas Bilson and Hooker's friend Hadrian Saravia had flooded the market. There was simply no will on the part of printers to assume the risks of publishing a work as large as that which Hooker was proposing, especially when it had no archiepiscopal backing.

At the point of this practical *impasse* Hooker's former pupil Edwin Sandys took a decisive step: he offered to underwrite the publication of the *Laws*. This offer meant that the Preface and the first four books could be printed immediately, in time for the Parliamentary session of late winter 1593/4 which would consider important anti-presbyterian, non-conformist legislation.³⁸ Thanks to Cranmer, Hooker's relation, the printer John Windet, entered the proffered portion of the *Laws* at the Stationers Hall at the end of January 1593. About six weeks later Lord Burghleigh received a copy in readiness for the parliamentary session.

The fact that the first published parts of the *Laws* were slow to sell did not hinder Hooker's intention to complete and publish books V through VIII. But George Cranmer's involvement did.³⁹ His overtly political concerns, coupled with his view that effective polemic meant point-by-point engagement with the opponents' arguments, compelled Hooker

37. Hooker was appointed Sub-dean of the cathedral, and Rector of St Andrew, Boscombe, and Prebendary of Netheravon. Secor thinks that Hooker, with his wife and two daughters, resided in London at the home of his father-in-law John Churchman (*Prophet*, pp. 249-50). That would have given Hooker access to sources relevant to his writing.

38. On the Sandys-Cranmer involvement see Hill, 'Evolution', pp. 131ff.

39. I follow Hill's rendition of events here; *ibid*.

to rework the material in hand and chiefly Book V. 'Remember your adversaries,' Hooker was advised. 'Cranmer and Sandys were absorbed,' Speed Hill has written, 'in the immediacy of an explosive political situation,' so they advocated a direct and forthright rebuttal.⁴⁰ Indebted as he was to them, Hooker gave way. As a result Book V grew to a size equal to the previous four books altogether, and it took four more years to complete; it finally appeared in 1597. It meant too that, although they were probably completed, Hooker himself never saw the publication of Books VI through VIII.

Self-Defence and Death

Amid the writing and re-writing of Book V Hooker at last received a benefice suitable to his needs. St Mary's, Bishopsbourne, lay some three miles from Canterbury. In 1594 its incumbent was appointed bishop of Norwich and the living, which was in the Queens' gift, was offered to Hooker.⁴¹ In January 1594/5 Hooker was appointed, and instituted in early July 1595. The spacious rectory was well suited to this rather prosperous clerical family. The parish itself was accessible to the cathedral in Canterbury and its chapter library; Hooker's Dutch friend Hadrian Saravia was a canon there. In this idyllic rural setting Hooker devoted himself to his family, his pastoral work, and to the remaining books of the *Laws*.⁴²

In 1598 Hooker made his one appearance as preacher at Court. His distance from the cut and thrust of London life notwithstanding, Hooker was not wholly exempt from the continuing controversies of the time. One or two churchmen, who were unhappy with Hooker's defence of the established church in the published portions of the *Laws*, published in 1599 an attack on Hooker's theological soundness *vis-à-vis* the formularies of the Church of England entitled *A Christian Letter of certain English Protestants*. It elicited from Hooker a robust, incisive rebuttal of which only portions remain.⁴³ As far as its topics of comment, it gives important evidence of Hooker's theological views at the end of his life. *The Dublin Fragments* will be important at points during this study.

Hooker was struck down with sickness, having contracting a fever in the course of a journey to and from London. In the latter half of October 1600 Hooker registered his will. Thenceforth confined to bed, he received

40. *Ibid.*, p. 136.

41. Dr William Redman was Hooker's immediate predecessor in Bishopsbourne.

42. Gibbs relates two incidents that marred Hooker's final years ('Life', p. 15).

43. The so-called *Dublin Fragments* discovered by Keble in the library of Trinity College, Dublin [II, pp. 537-97]. On this episode and speculation as to the author of *A Christian Letter*, see Secor, *Prophet*, pp. 317-21.

the sacrament and made a final confession to Dr Saravia. He died on November 2nd. Walton tells us he died contemplating the angels and their marvellous order.

Upon hearing of Hooker's death, it was a matter of utmost importance to his friends and colleagues in London and Oxford that his papers be kept safe and secure. John Churchman immediately dispatched one of his household to Bishopsbourne to secure Hooker's papers. In the spring of 1601 those friends, Hooker's executor and others, examined the cache of papers and found among them Books VI and VII of the *Laws* in almost final form, and Book VIII incomplete. The manuscripts were distributed among the group with the intent of completing, editing and publishing them. Thus began the dispersal of Hooker's literary remains which has given to the *Laws* and the other minor works their complex and at times baffling textual, publishing and interpretive history.⁴⁴

Our purpose in this study is not to wade too far into those technical waters. Bearing in mind Stephen McGrade's evocative suggestion that in Hooker's extant corpus we have what he calls a 'church-in-text',⁴⁵ we will look to those texts to reveal the building's shape and content. To do so we must turn to the foundations upon which Hooker builds and the materials with which he works.

44. On that see Gibbs' concise review ('Life', pp. 18-23).

45. Stephen McGrade, 'Classical, Patristic and Medieval Sources', in Torrance Kirby, ed., *A Companion to Richard Hooker* (Leiden/Boston, 2008), p. 85.