

The Religious Beliefs of Richard, Oliver and Edmond Hakluyt: The Word of the Cross

David Harris Sacks

Richard Hakluyt (1552?-1616) had at least five siblings, three brothers and two sisters. They were orphaned in 1557 when first their father, Richard Hakluyt, Citizen and Skinner of London, died of ‘the visitation of almighty god’, i.e. the bubonic plague. His death was followed shortly thereafter by their mother Margery.¹ Richard’s sisters, about whom we know very little, were still alive when Richard wrote his own will 1612.² However, of Richard’s brothers, only one, Oliver, also was living at that time. His oldest brother, Thomas, had died before June, 1592, and his youngest brother, Edmond, in the winter of 1592-3.³ All four brothers studied at the Westminster School. Two of them were then elected as Queen’s Scholars to Christ Church, Oxford: Richard in 1570 and Oliver in 1573.⁴ They were there together for a decade before Richard departed from the college in September 1583 to serve as ‘preacher’ to Sir Edward Stafford, Elizabeth I’s ambassador in Paris.⁵ As we shall see, the two brothers remained close thereafter.

¹ Will of ‘Richard Hackelette, Citizen and Skynner of London’, 31 March 1557, probate granted to Margery Hakluyt, 27 May 1557; The National Archives, PROB 11/39/197, printed in *The Original Writings & Correspondence of the Two Richard Hakluyts*, 2 vols, ed. E. G. R. Taylor, London, The Hakluyt Society, 1935, vol II, pp. 88-89; cited hereafter as *Original Writings*; further citations will be from the printed version.

² Will of ‘Richard Hackluit, person of wetheringsett in the Countie of Suffolke’, 20 August 1612, probate granted to Edmond Hakluyt, 23 November 1616, The National Archives, PROB 11/128/590, printed in *Original Writings*, vol. II, 506-09; further citations will be to the printed version. It is not known if either of Hakluyt’s sisters wrote wills. If they did, they have not to my knowledge been located.

³ Will of ‘Edmond Hackluyte of Eaton in the Countie of Hereford, gentleman’, 20 June 1592, probate granted to Richard Hakluyt, 1 February 1592/3, The National Archives, PROB 11/81/99, printed *Original Writings*, 2:413-14; further citations will be to the printed version, Thomas Hakluyt, who was three or four years older than his brother Richard, was living in Oxford at his death. He had been elected to Trinity College, Cambridge in 1567, matriculated at Easter in 1570; received his BA in 1571-72 and his MA in 1575; *Alumni Oxonienses: The Members of the University of Oxford, 1500-1714*, ed. Joseph Foster, 4 vols, Oxford, James Parker & Co, 1891, vol II, p. 627; cited hereafter as *Alum. Ox.*; see also *Alumni Cantabrigienses: A Biographical List of All Known Students, Graduates and Holders of Office at the University of Cambridge from the Earliest Times to 1900. Part I: From the Earliest Times to 1751*, eds. John Venn and J. A. Venn, 4 vols, Cambridge, at the University Press, 1922, vol. II, p. 279; cited hereafter as *Alum. Cant.* Thomas Hakluyt’s Cambridge MA was incorporated in Oxford on June 5, 1576. We have no record of the date of his death, or a copy of any will that he might have made. However, his youngest brother, Edmond, indicates in his own will, dated 20 June 1592, that Thomas had pre-deceased him; *Original Writings*, vol. II, p. 414.

⁴ Thomas, Richard, and Oliver are listed among the Queen’s Scholars in the school during Elizabeth I’s reign *The List of the Queen’s Scholars of St Peter’s College, Westminster, Admitted to that Foundation since 1663; and of Such as Have Been Thence Elected to Christ Church, Oxford and Trinity College, Cambridge, from the Foundation by Queen Elizabeth, 1561, to the Present*, ed. Joseph Welch, new ed., London, G. W. Ginger, 1852, pp. 47, 48, 50. Edmond, however, matriculated in St John’s College, Oxford, probably in 1575; *Alum. Ox.*, vol. II, p. 627; Andrew Hegarty, *A Biographical Register of St John’s College, Oxford, 1555-1660*, Oxford, Oxford Historical Society, 2011, p. 209.

⁵ On 14 December 1583, the Dean and Chapter of Christ Church, acting on a certificate from the Earl of Leicester made on behalf of Elizabeth I, officially granted Richard Hakluyt leave from Christ Church, backdated

Their youngest brother, Edmond, also seems to have been close with his family. He overlapped in Oxford with both Richard and Oliver between his admission at age 18 to St John's College, Oxford in 1575 and his receipt of his BA in 1582.⁶ In his last will and testament, he not only left gifts to his two sisters and asked to be buried near his cousin Richard Hakluyt, the lawyer or his brother Thomas, he also bequeathed his 'free land' in Eyton, Herefordshire to his brother Richard and his male heirs, with Oliver and his male heirs as residual legatees. He singled out Richard as his executor.⁷ Although their oldest brother Thomas had studied in Trinity College, Cambridge between 1567 and his receipt of his MA there in 1575, he too appears to have overlapped with his all three of his brothers in Oxford, likely from 1576 when his Cambridge Master's degree was incorporated in Oxford until his death and burial there ca. 1590. However, since no personal documents or record of his will or the site of his burial have been located, we cannot say anything about him beyond these bare facts.

Richard Hakluyt the cosmographer is known most commonly today for his publications as a geographer, especially the two editions of his *Principal Navigations of the English Nation* (1589; 2nd ed., 3 vols. 1598-1600),⁸ which served during his lifetime and beyond to promote what one of the founders of Hakluyt Society called 'the advancement of navigation and commercial advantage'.⁹ As is well known, he was also an ordained Church of England clergyman who regularly referred to himself as a 'preacher'.¹⁰ Nevertheless, many modern scholars, while acknowledging his career as a Church of England minister, have argued in light of his published writings that his ecclesiastical career played little or no role in the development his thoughts about geography and related topics or in the conduct of his activities in his secular career. In David Armitage's view, for example, 'religion shaped little, if any, of Hakluyt's corpus, either generically or rhetorically'.¹¹ Similarly, Peter Mancall has argued that Hakluyt's interests 'lay in geography, not theology'. Where others might have

to 31 August 1583, to join Sir Edward Stafford's service in Paris, while retaining his 'full allowance'; D. B. and A. M. Quinn, 'A Hakluyt Chronology,' in *The Hakluyt Handbook*, ed. D. B. Quinn, 2 vols, London, The Hakluyt Society, 1974, vol II, p. 281, citing Christ Church Archives, Chapter Book, 1549-1645; cited hereafter as 'Hakluyt Chronology'.

⁶ Hegarty, *Biographical Register of St John's College*, 297; *Alum. Ox.*, vol. II, p. 627.

⁷ Will of Edmond Hakluyt, *Original Writings*, vol. II, pp. 413-4.

⁸ Richard Hakluyt, *The Principalll Navigations, Voiages and Discoveries of the English Nation*, London, George Bishop and Ralph Newberrie, 1589 (STC 12625); Richard Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations, Voiages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation*, 3 vols, London, George Bishop, Ralph Newberrie and Robert Barker, 1598-1600 (STC 12626 and STC 12626a), cited hereafter as STC 12626; 12626a.

⁹ William Desborough Cooley, *The History of Maritime and Inland Discovery*, 3 vols, London, Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, & Green and John Taylor, 1830-31, vol. I, pp. 1, 123; cited in R. C. Bridges, 'William Desborough Cooley and the Foundation of the Hakluyt Society', in *Compassing the Vaste Globe of the Earth: Studies in the History of the Hakluyt Society, 1846-1996*, eds. R. C. Bridges and P. E. H. Hair, London, The Hakluyt Society, 1996, p. 57.

¹⁰ Hakluyt was ordained in 1580: 'Hakluyt Chronology', vol. I, p. 272; he listed himself, e.g., as 'Preacher and sometimes student of Christ-Church in Oxford' on the title pages of his three-volume second edition of *Principal Navigations*.

¹¹ David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000, p. 71.

seen the pursuit of cosmographical knowledge as a sacred quest, Mancall says, he ‘had more secular goals in mind’.¹² Richard Tuck also has held the same. Hakluyt’s intellectual projects, he says, ‘eschewed any religious justification’.¹³ For many commentators, Hakluyt’s ecclesiastical offices served him primarily or mainly as sources of income as he pursued his secular work as a cosmographer and as a promoter of exploration and colonizing enterprises.¹⁴ In this essay, I proposed to question the distinctions implicit in these frequently repeated claims.

I. Testaments

The austerity of the forty-four words in Richard Hakluyt’s last will and testament ‘commending’ his soul ‘into the hands of God’ might lend some credence to view that he sharply separated the secular from the spiritual in his outlook. Dated 20 August 1612, four years before his death, its terms conform to the very carefully drafted articles on ‘justification’ and on ‘predestination and election’ of the Church of England’s *Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion*, which Hakluyt at his ordination had sworn to uphold.¹⁵ The language he employed followed the pattern in the brief testamentary clause adopted by his cousin Richard Hakluyt, the Middle Temple lawyer, in his 1587 last will and testament. It also carefully followed the terms of the relevant articles in the *Thirty-Nine Articles*.¹⁶ Both of those

¹² Peter C. Mancall, *Hakluyt’s Promise: An Elizabethan’s Obsession for an English America*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2007, p. 72.

¹³ Richard Tuck, *The Rights of War and Peace. Political Thought and the International Order from Grotius to Kant*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1999, p. 110; see also Andrew Fitzmaurice, *Humanism and America: An Intellectual History of English Colonisation, 1500-1625*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003, pp. 3-5, 53-54, 138-40, 144-46.

¹⁴ See, e.g. James A. Williamson, ‘Richard Hakluyt’, in *Richard Hakluyt & His Successors*, ed. Edward Lynam, London, The Hakluyt Society, 1946, p. 24; Mancall, *Hakluyt’s Promise*, p. 5, Mordechai Feingold, ‘Science as a Calling? The Early Modern Dilemma’, *Science in Context*, 15:1 (2002), pp. 95-6; Mordechai Feingold, *The Mathematicians’ Apprenticeship: Science, Universities and Society in England, 1560-1640*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1984, p. 210.

¹⁵ Will of Richard Hackluit, person of Wetheringsett’, *Original Writings*, vol. II, pp. 506-9, at p. 506. See Articles 11 and 17 in *Articles whereupon it was agreed by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces, and the whole cleargie, in the convocation holden at London in the yere of our Lorde God. 1562*, London, Richarde Iugge and Iohn Cawood, 1571 (STC 10039.3), pp. 8-9, 11-12. Article 11 ‘Of the iustification of man’ reads in full: ‘We are accompted ryghteous before God, only for the merite of our Lord & saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, & not for our owne workes or deservynges. Wherefore, that we are iustified by fayth onely, is a moste wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homilie of iustification’. Article 17 ‘Of predestination and election’ includes the following comment on the doctrine: ‘[T]he godly consyderation of predestination, and our election in Christe, is full of sweete, pleasaunt, and unspeakeable comfort to godlye persons, & such as feelee in themselves the working of the spirite of Christe, mortifying the workes of the fleshe, and their earthly members, and drawyng vp their mynde to hygh and heavenly thinges, aswell because it doth greatly establish and confirme their fayth of eternall salvation to be enioyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kyndle their love towards God’. The Church of England’s *Canons*, promulgated in 1571, required every ordained minister to subscribe to the *Thirty-Nine Articles*; *A Booke of certaine Canons, conceryning some parte of the discipline of the Church of England*, London, Iohn Daye, 1571 (STC 10063.5), pp. 13-14.

¹⁶ Will of ‘Richard Hakluyt of Eyton in the Countie of Hereford’, 13 September 1587, proved 4 March 1587/8; transcribed from the record in the Hereford Probate Registry in George Bruner Parks, *Richard Hakluyt and the English Voyages*, ed. James A. Williamson, New York, American Geographical Society, 1928, pp. 240-1; an

testamentary clauses adopted in turn a similar formulation to the one used in 1557 by Richard Hakluyt, citizen and skinner of London, the cosmographer's father and the lawyer's uncle. Although Richard Hakluyt the Skinner's will shows unambiguous evangelical influences,¹⁷ it also reveals him adhering to aspects of pre-Reformation practice. He asked, for example, to be buried in the church as near as possible to the 'littel pulpitt' in the Church of St Augustine. Watling Street, London; likely the site indicated was near where he was accustomed to be seated during services there. In addition, he bequeathed 3s 4d to 'the high Aulter in the same churche' for any of the 'tithes and oblacions' he may have 'negligently forgotten'.¹⁸

Richard Hakluyt the Skinner's will also reveals him to have had a brother who he named as 'Sir Walter Hackletts.' 'Sir' Walter was an ordained Catholic priest, secular chaplain and canon lawyer. He practiced, at least for a time, as proctor in the Chancellor's court in the University of Oxford. In April 1530, four months after receiving his bachelor of canon law degree from Oxford, he became vicar of Kempsford in Gloucestershire, a benefice he had vacated by 1550, almost certainly because he would not conform to the requirements of the 1549 Prayer Book.¹⁹ Richard Hakluyt the Skinner also had another kinsman who was an ecclesiastical official: Giles Hakluyt, likely a cousin. He was a Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford, held civil and canon law degrees from Oxford, and was for around forty years sub-dean of Salisbury cathedral. He vacated the latter post in 1559, in his case almost certainly because he declined to conform to the Protestantism of the Elizabethan settlement.²⁰

According to Richard Hakluyt the Skinner's own will, 'Sir' Walter Hakluyt, who had predeceased him, left £7 for 'the poore and otherwise at Oxforde', including 6s 8s for the poor in St Aldate's parish and 10 marks, paid over two years, to a priest in Broadgates Hall, Oxford to preach and to pray for all Christian souls. On Walter's death these obligations then fell to Richard the Skinner to fulfill. Since those sums were left unpaid at Richard's death, the obligation then passed to Margery Hakluyt, his widow, who was the executor of his will. On her death soon thereafter, it went to Richard Hakluyt the lawyer, who her husband had made overseer of his will.²¹ Richard Hakluyt the lawyer almost certainly fulfilled the duty.

While we not know what were Richard the lawyer's personal religious convictions at the time, his election an MP for Leominster in Herefordshire in the 1558 Parliament would

edited version is printed in *Original Writings* vol. II, pp. 370-71; future citation will be from the version in *Original Writings*.

¹⁷ Its testamentary clause reads in part: 'First and principally I do commende my soule into the hands of Almightye god my maker redeemer and onlie Savyor in whome and by the merits of whose blessed passion I do verilie beleave to have free and clere remission and forgivenes of all my synnes which I have done and commyted against god, either in word thought or dede'; Will of Richard Hakluyt, Skinner, *Original Writings*, vol. I, pp. 69-70, at p. 69.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, vol. I, pp. 69-70.

¹⁹ A. B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford, A.D. 1501 to 1540*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1974, p. 258; *Alum. Ox.*, vol. II, p. 627.

²⁰ Emden, *Biographical Register*, p. 258; *Alum Ox.*, vol. II, p. 627; he became rector of Timsbury in Somerset in 1526, a benefice he retained until his death in October 1560.

²¹ Will of Richard Hakluyt, Skinner, *Original Writings*, vol 1, p. 70. Sir Walter Hakluyt's donations, because of their proximity in location to Christ Church, suggest his possible association with that college. However, there is nothing in its archives about him.

have obliged him to conform, at least outwardly, to the ceremonies followed in connection with its official opening. In keeping with the pre-Reformation tradition and the practice followed during Mary I's reign, it began with a mass and sermon, the latter usually delivered by the Archbishop of Canterbury, who in 1558 was Cardinal Reginald Pole.²² As a member of the Middle Temple from 1555, Richard the lawyer also likely attended Roman Catholic religious service in the Temple church during Mary I's reign.

Richard Hakluyt the cosmographer was certainly a Protestant long before he was called upon to declare his convictions in the testamentary clause in his will. Baptized in Edward VI's reign, at about the same time as the Church of England adopted the 1552 *Book of Common Prayer*, which is the most unambiguously Protestant of its three versions, he spent most of the first five years of his life during the reign of Philip and Mary (1553-8) when the English Church had returned to the Roman Catholic fold. However, after coming to his 'years of discretion' early in the years of Elizabeth I's reign, he was confirmed as a member of the Church of England under the Royal Supremacy according to the terms set forth in 1559 in the Protestant *Book of Common Prayer*.²³ Elected in 1564 as a Queen's Scholar at the Westminster School, at which he was required regularly to attend Church of England religious services,²⁴ his education also was unambiguously Protestant in character. The requirement to regularly attend Church services then continued when he became a Queen's Scholar in Christ Church, Oxford in 1570. In Oxford during the period, the Latin version of the Protestant *Book of Common Prayer* was used for church services.²⁵ His ordination in 1580 as a Church of England priest confirmed him as a priest in the Church of England as established by law. The ordination ceremony formally required his subscription to the terms of the doctrines set forth in the Protestant *Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion*. A decade later, in 1590, he was installed according to the Church's canons as rector in the parish of Wetheringsett with Brockford in Suffolk. A dozen years after that, in 1602, he became a Canon of Westminster Abbey, a post he received through the patronage of Sir Robert Cecil whose chaplain he had become by 1601.²⁶

At the time the cosmographer joined Westminster Abbey's chapter, it was already on its way to becoming what Diarmaid MacCulloch has called 'a showcase of the English

²² John Hooker, alias Vowell, *The Order and Usage of the Keeping of the Parliament in England*, [London?, J. Charlewood, 1572?] (STC 24886.7), sig. P3r; Vernon F. Snow, *Parliament in England: John Hooker's Order and Usage*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977, pp. 136-39; Jennifer Loach, *Parliament and the Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1986, pp. 40-41. In Mary I's reign, the mass and sermon were delivered in Westminster Abbey. Hooker's description, dating from 1572, mentions only the sermon. However, it is likely that in 1558 the mass concluded with those attending receiving the Eucharist.

²³ *The Book of Common Prayer, 1559: The Elizabethan Prayer Book*, ed. John E. Booty, Washington, The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1976, pp. 282-89.

²⁴ See *Statutes of Westminster School, 1560*, in Arthur F. Leach, *Educational Charters and Documents, 598-1909*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1911, pp. 496-525.

²⁵ [Walter Haddon], *Liber precum publicarum*, London, Apud Reginaldum Volfum, 1560 (STC 16424).

²⁶ See Richard Hakluyt, 'To the Right Honorable, Sir Robert Cecil, Knight, principall Secretary to her Maiesitie', London, 19 October 1601, in Anthony Galvano, *The Discoveries of the World from Their Original unto the Yeere 1555*, trans. Richard Hakluyt, London, G. Bishop [at the Eliot Press], 1601 (STC 11543), sigs. A2r-[A4r]. at sig. [A4r].

cathedral ethos'.²⁷ In addition to emphasizing sacramentalism, ceremony, and church music in its practices, it was peopled by many of the early leaders of the theological and ecclesiastical movement that Peter Lake has called 'avant-garde conformity'. Prominent among them at the end of Elizabeth I's reign, was Lancelot Andrewes (1555–1626), who when Hakluyt joined Westminster Abbey's chapter was its Dean.²⁸ Once installed at Westminster, Hakluyt was himself a very active chapter member, not only in regularly attending its meetings, but in serving in the Abbey's administration, including as archdeacon, steward, and treasurer.²⁹ In a manner of speaking, then, his life history demonstrated in principle what he attested to in the testamentary clause of his will. From this perspective, the language he employed in his testament was sufficient to demonstrate that he conformed to what was expected of him in his beliefs as a member of the Church of England as established by law.

Although the divisions in religious belief and practice set in motion by the Reformation had the power to irreconcilably divide families,³⁰ the members of the Hakluyt family during the reigns of Edward VI, Philip and Mary, and Elizabeth I found means to negotiate their ways through the twists and turns of religious politics in the period while upholding their personal beliefs, meeting their obligations to their kin, and adhering to the requirements imposed by law. As an ordained clergyman, Richard Hakluyt the cosmographer found no need to express more than his acceptance of the terms of the *Thirty-Nine Articles* in the testamentary clause of his will. His commentaries on God's Creation in his cosmographical and other writings spoke for him,³¹ as did his dutiful performance in his

²⁷ Diarmaid MacCulloch, review of Stanford E. Lehmberg, *Cathedrals under Siege: Cathedrals in English Society, 1600-1700*, Exeter, University of Exeter Press; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 48:3 (July, 1997), p. 581; see also Diarmaid MacCulloch, 'The Church of England, 1533-1603', in *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity, Change and the Search for Continuity*, ed. Stephen Platten, Norwich, Canterbury Press, 2003, pp. 18-45, 223-24; Diarmaid MacCulloch, 'Putting the English Reformation on the Map: The Prothero Lecture', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th ser. 15 (2005), pp. 86-95.

²⁸ Peter Lake, 'Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge and *Avant-Garde* Conformity at the Court of James I', in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. Linda Levy Peck, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991, pp. 113-33; see also Peter Lake, *On Laudianism: Piety, Polemic and Politics During the Personal Rule of Charles I*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2023, pp. 47-79; Anthony Milton, 'Attitudes towards the Protestant and Catholic Churches'; Peter Lake, "'Puritans" and "Anglicans" in the History of the Post-Reformation English Church'; and Peter McCullough, "'Avant-Garde Conformity" in the 1590s', in *The Oxford History of Anglicanism. Volume I: Reformation and Identity, c. 1520-1662*, ed. Anthony Milton, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010, pp. 333-411.

²⁹ 'Hakluyt Chronology,' vol. I, pp. 317-19, 320, 323, 329-30.

³⁰ Norman Jones, *The English Reformation: Religion and Cultural Adaptation*, Oxford, Blackwell Publishers, 2002, p. 33.

³¹ I have commented at length on this issue in *The Certain and Full Discovery of the World* (forthcoming), and discussed it in a number of my publications: 'Richard Hakluyt's Navigations in Time: History, Epic, and Empire', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 67:1 (2006), pp. 31-62; 'Discourses of Western Planting: Richard Hakluyt and the Making of the Atlantic World', in *The Atlantic World and Virginia, 1550-1624*, ed. Peter Mancall, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007) pp. 410-53; 'Rebuilding Solomon's Temple: Richard Hakluyt's Great Instauration', in *New Worlds Reflected: Travel and Utopia in the Early Modern Period*, ed. Chloë Houston, Farnham, Surrey, UK and Burlington, VT., Ashgate, 2010, pp. 17-56; 'Richard Hakluyt and his Publics, c. 1580-1620', in *Making Publics in Early Modern Europe: People, Things, Forms of Knowledge*, eds. Bronwen Wilson and Paul Yachnin, New York and London, Routledge, 2010, pp. 159-176; 'The True Temper of Empire: Dominion, Friendship and Exchange in the English Atlantic. c. 1575-1625', in 'The

ecclesiastical offices. What more, if anything, can we then learn about the religious outlooks of the members of the family who remained close to Richard up to the time of his death? We turn to first to Oliver.

II. Oliver Hakluyt: ‘Galen on this side, Paracelsus on that’

When Richard was in Paris, but still on the rolls of Christ Church as a Student, Oliver appears to have acted as his agent, including reporting on Richard’s behalf to the college’s Sub-Dean in June 1586 that his brother had been installed as a Prebend in the diocese of Bristol, a development that then led to Richard vacating his Studentship the following October.³² In addition, Richard, having at some point in his life acquired tenements in Leominster Ore [Oare] in Herefordshire, initially leased them to Oliver, who held them in the interest of the family until Richard bequeathed the properties to his son Edmond in his 1612 will. At the same time, Richard made a bequest to Oliver himself to be ‘bestowed’ by him on his sons and another to Oliver’s daughter to be given to her within two months of her marriage.³³ In the same year, 1612, Oliver, who undoubtedly was aware of these forthcoming bequests, presented Richard with the rectory of Gedney in Lincolnshire, the patronage of which had come into Oliver’s hands at that time by virtue of a 1603 grant from Queen Anne of Denmark, the wife of James I.³⁴

As readers of this *Journal* do not need to be reminded, the life, activities, and writings of Richard Hakluyt the cosmographer have generated a large number of publications. The same cannot be said of Hakluyt’s brothers. Regrettably, as already indicated, we know almost nothing beyond the bare biographical facts of Thomas’s life. We are in a somewhat better position regarding his other brothers, Oliver and Edmond. Since I am especially interested in providing a context for Richard Hakluyt the cosmographer’s religious outlook, my focus will

Intellectual History of Empire’, Andrew Fitzmaurice, guest editor, *Renaissance Studies* 26:4 (2012), pp. 531-558; “‘To deduce a colonie’: Richard Hakluyt’s Godly Mission in its Contexts, c. 1580-1616’, *Richard Hakluyt (c. 1552-1616): Life, Times, Legacy*, eds. Daniel Carey and Claire Jowitt, *Hakluyt Society Extra Series* 47, Farnham, Surrey, Ashgate, 2012, pp. 197-217; ‘To Heal the World: Commercial Exchange as a Form of Friendship in Renaissance Thought’, in *Friendship and Sociability in Premodern Europe: Contexts, Concepts and Expressions*, eds. Amyrose McCue Gill and Sarah Rolfe Prodan, Toronto, Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2014, pp. 273-312; ‘The Certain and Full Discovery of the World: Richard Hakluyt and Thomas Harriot’, in *Thomas Harriot: Science and Discovery in the English Renaissance*, ed. Robert Fox, London, Routledge, 2023, pp. 11-49.

³² ‘Hakluyt Chronology’, vol. I, pp. 289, 290.

³³ Will of Richard Hakluyt of Wetheringsett, *Original Writings*, vol. II, pp. 506, 507. It is uncertain how the properties in Leominster Ore came into Richard Hakluyt’s possession. They are not mentioned in the will of his cousin Richard Hakluyt, the lawyer; Will of Richard Hakluyt, of Eyton, *Original Writings*, 2:370-71. Possibly these properties came directly to Richard Hakluyt the cosmographer on his father’s death in 1557 or from his eldest brother Thomas on his death before 1592. It is also possible that the properties in question were connected with the ‘free land in Eaton’ that Edmond bequeath to his brother Richard in his 1592 will; *Original Writings*, vol. II, p. 413.

³⁴ ‘Hakluyt Chronology’, vol. I, pp. 326, 327; Parks, *Richard Hakluyt and the English Voyages*, pp. 200, 201; for Queen Anne’s biography, see Maureen M. Meikle and Helen Payne. ‘Anne [Anna, Anne of Denmark (1574–1619), queen of England, Scotland, and Ireland, consort of James VI and I’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, cited hereafter as *ODNB*.

be on what can be learned for our purposes about their beliefs concerning divinity. I turn first to Oliver and the social and religious climate in Christ Church, Oxford in September 1583 at the time just before Richard Hakluyt began his service in Paris with Sir Edward Stafford.

When the Hakluyt brothers studied at Christ Church, Oxford's academic year began at Michaelmas, as it still does. During Queen Elizabeth I's reign, the occasion was marked in Christ Church by a feast for its senior members, i.e. its Dean and eight Canons, and those on the college's roster who had already received their MA degrees. In September 1583, 45 of Christ Church's Students, i.e. its stipendiary scholars, had attained that status. 'Master' Richard Hakluyt, who had been admitted in 1570, stood eighth in seniority in the list; he had received his MA on 27 June 1577. 'Master' Oliver Hakluyt, who had been admitted in 1573, was twenty-seventh among the MA's; he had received his MA degree on 15 June 1580. Since Michaelmas in 1583 fell on a Sunday, the feast took place beforehand that year on 26 September, a Thursday. For the occasion, William Gager, the Latin poet and at the time also a Student of Christ Church, prepared a celebratory *Catalogue* praising by name the Dean, the eight Canons and each of the MA Students with an elegiac distich in Latin. Gager, who had been admitted to Christ Church as a Student in 1574 and received his MA on the same occasion as Oliver, was himself ranked twenty-ninth in seniority among the senior Students.³⁵

The poem was meant to serve an epideictic purpose, and almost certainly was delivered orally at the Michaelmas feast in 1583. About Richard Hakluyt, he wrote: '*in terras, Haklete novas meditaris, et Indos, / Catiaequae vias freta longa*' ('Hakluyt you ponder on new lands and the Indies, describing the route to Cathay via the long straits'). About Oliver, he wrote, '*dum tu. Haklete minor, Galenum hinc, hinc Paracelsum expendis, medici spem facis eximii*'. ('As you weigh Galen on this side, Paracelsus on that, Hakluyt Minor, you give promise of becoming a distinguished doctor').³⁶ Although, Oliver very likely was in attendance at the 1583 Michaelmas feast, Richard probably was not, having already departed from Oxford in preparation to become chaplain to Sir Edward Stafford, Elizabeth I's newly appointed ambassador in Paris.³⁷

The Students of Christ Church in the 1580s, given their earlier educations, were already well-versed in the study of Scripture before they matriculated. This was certainly the case for those like the Hakluyt brothers who had studied at the Westminster School where religious education went hand-in-glove with the rest of the curriculum.³⁸ The formal

³⁵ *Alum. Ox.*, vol. II, pp. 242, 627; William Gager, '*Catalogus Nominum Decani Praebendariorum Magistrorumque Studentium Qui Iam Sunt Aedis Christi Oxoniae A. D. 1583, Sept. 26*', in William Gager: *The Complete Works*, ed. Dana F. Sutton, 4 vols, New York and London, Garland Publishing Inc., 1994, vol. III, pp. 170-83. In Sutton's edition of Gager's *Works*, the *Catalogue* is included among 'The Private Poems'. From December 1584 to December 1585 Gager was Christ Church's Rhetor, charged with supplying speeches on official occasions; see note to item CXLVI in Gager: *Works*, vol. II, p. 383; J. W. Binns, 'Gager, William (1555–1622), Latin playwright and poet', *ODNB*.

³⁶ Gager: *Works*, vol. III, pp. 174-75, 178-79.

³⁷ Richard Hakluyt appears to have left Christ Church in mid-September in connection with his appointment in Stafford's household, 'Hakluyt Chronology', vol. I, pp. 278, 280. Hakluyt's official leave from Christ Church was back-dated to 31 August 1583; *Dean and Chapter Book, 1549-1645*, ChCh Archives i.b.2. granted on 14 December 1583; 'Hakluyt Chronology', vol. I, p. 281.

³⁸ *Alum. Ox.*, vol. II, p. 627; *Alum. Cant.*, vol. II, p. 279; *Statutes of Westminster School, 1560*, in Leach, *Educational Charters*, pp. 496-524, esp. pp. 496-97, 502-05.

requirement that they regularly attend church services would only have advanced their already well-developed familiarity with Scripture. Many, like Richard Hakluyt himself, were also on their way to ecclesiastical careers. They thus would have understood the significance for Christ Church itself of Jesus's comments to the Pharisees in Matthew 12:25: 'Everie kingdome devided against it self shalbe broght to naught: & everie citie or house devided against it self, shal not stand'.³⁹ Nevertheless, William Gager, commenting in the early 1580s, found it deeply divided and lacking in peace. His *Catalogue*'s overt aim was to represent Christ Church as a unity of parts; a harmonious commonwealth composed of a diversity of members each contributing to it as a house of learning under the headship of its Dean. However in 1583 Gager also commented in one of his other 'private poems' explicitly 'against discord within the House'. There he pointedly asked his implied audience, Christ Church's Students, 'where are we rushing, helpless? Or why are our cruel tongues being sharpened on bloody-minded whetstones? Have we expended too little on squabbles and dire imprecations?...What base custom is this? It befits savage bears and wolves thus to behave among themselves'.⁴⁰ A year later, he wrote explicitly of their 'impious discord'.⁴¹ Some features of the division are hinted at in another of Gager's 'private poems'—an apology (of sorts) made to Oliver Hakluyt, Richard's younger brother, for insulting him with a joke. We do not know the actual occasion of the insult, but it appears to have occurred sometime during Michaelmas term in 1583 after Gager wrote his *Catalogue*.⁴²

It has been suggested that the joke might have concerned the putative Welsh ancestry of the Hakluyts.⁴³ It is true that as an established landholding family in Herefordshire, the Hakluyts had an historic connection with the Welsh border region. If Leland is to be believed, they had 'bene gentlemen in tymes out of memory', took their name 'of the forest of Cluid in Radnorland, and had a castle and habitations not far from Radnor'. The 'elder branch', according to Leland, were knights at the time of Edward III, i.e., in the mid-fourteenth century, and continued to have a presence in Wales into Henry VIII's reign. However, during Henry V's reign, the younger branch, descending from a 'William Hakcluit', who had served at the battle of Agincourt (1415), settled in Herefordshire in the village of Eyton, located near Leominster about thirty miles north the city of Hereford. From there, Richard's and Oliver's father, also named Richard, moved to London as a young man, eventually to become a Citizen of the City and a freeman of its Company of Skinners. In other words, Richard's London-born sons were at least four generations removed from their Welsh roots, which

³⁹ Matt. 12:25, GNV (1560), *Newe Testament*, f. 7v.

⁴⁰ Gager, 'In Discordiam Domesticam/ Against Discord Within the House', item CXX, Gager, *Works*, vol. III, pp. 164-5.

⁴¹ Gager, 'Discordiarum Domesticarvm Nullum Esse Finem Querela /A Complaint That There Is No End to Dissent Within The House', item CXXII, Gager, *Works*, vol. III, pp. 168-9.

⁴² Gager, 'Olivero Hakleto /To Oliver Hakluyt', item CXXXVII, Gager, *Works*, vol. III, pp. 194-7.

⁴³ The suggestion is offered by Sutton; see his notes to items CXXXVII and CXXVIII in Gager, *Works*, vol. III, pp. 372, 374

suggests that the joke Gager had made at Oliver's expense is unlikely to have involved ridicule of his Welsh ancestry.⁴⁴ What then might it have been about?

In his apology to Oliver, Gager asks 'what bone of contention can arise if I playfully choose to prefer the lawyer (*jurisconsultus*) to the physician (*medicus*)'?⁴⁵ The joke then appears to have turned on the fact that Gager, once he had taken his MA, was pursuing studies in civil law, while Oliver Hakluyt, his Christ Church contemporary, was pursuing a medical degree.⁴⁶ What contrast might Gager have been emphasizing? There is not much to go on, but it is clear from what Gager had said about Oliver in his *Catalogue* that just as Aristotelian models were being challenged across Oxford, the study of medicine in the University, especially in addressing biological and physiological questions, was itself in the throes of a transformation. Juxtaposed to Galen's understanding, with its focus on the four humors and conceptual debt to Plato, was Paracelsus's alchemical form of physic, which rejected the ancient humoral economy and replaced it with attention to material causes based on a mystical cosmology focused on a 'Trinity', as it sometimes was called, of primary materials: sulphur, mercury, and salt. The need to weigh the differences between these two paradigms—'Galen on this side, Paracelsus on that'—would remain in play in medicine into the seventeenth century and beyond.⁴⁷

Against this, civil law—Gager's subject—was regarded as a settled field of study, guided by the law of nature and therefore reflecting what would be called that 'portion of divine law' that had been left to humans by God after the Fall.⁴⁸ In Oxford in Gager's day,

⁴⁴ John Leland, *The Itinerary of John Leland in or about the years 1535-1543*, ed. Lucy Toulmin Smith. 5 vol, Carbondale, Illinois, Southern Illinois University Press, 1964 [first pub. London: G. Bell, 1906-1910], vol II, p. 75; on the Hakluyt family's genealogy, see E. G. R. Taylor, 'Introduction: The Two Richard Hakluyts, I. The Hakluyts of Herefordshire', *Original Writings*, vol. I, pp. 1-7]; see also Duncan James, 'The Herefordshire Hakluyt Houses', *The Journal of the Hakluyt Society*, January 2017 [online], esp. pp. 3-9.

⁴⁵ Gager. "Olivéro Hakleto," Gager, *Works*, vol. III, pp. 196-7.

⁴⁶ Gager took his MA on 14 June 1580 and his B.C.L and D.C.L. on 30 June 1589; Oliver Hakluyt took his MA on 15 June 1580 and his B. Med. on 11 July 1588 at which time he was also licensed to practice; *Alum. Ox.*, vol. II, pp. 242, 627.

⁴⁷ See Gillian Lewis, "The Faculty of Medicine," in *The Collegiate University*, ed. James McConica [The History of the University of Oxford, vol. III], Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1986, pp. 213-56; R. J. Hankinson, 'Philosophy of nature' in *The Cambridge Companion to Galen*, ed R. J. Hankinson, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008, pp. 210-41, esp. pp. 217-25; Armelle Debreu, "Physiology," *ibid.*, pp. 263-82; Allen G. Debus, *The English Paracelsians*, New York: Franklin Watts, Inc., 1966, pp. 49-85, 137-74; Allen G. Debus, *The Chemical Philosophy: Paracelsian Science and Medicine in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 2 vols, New York, Science History Publications, 1977, vol. I, pp. 173-91 and vol. II, *passim.*; Walter Pagel, *Paracelsus: An Introduction to Philosophical Medicine in the Era of the Renaissance*, 2nd ed., rev., Basel: Karger, 1982, pp. 126-202, esp. pp. 129-34; Charles Webster, *Paracelsus: Medicine, Magic and Mission at the End of Time*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008, pp. 130-68.

⁴⁸ See Alberico Gentili, *De Iure Belli. Libri III*. Hanover: Apud Haeredes Guilielmi Antonii, 1612 (USTC 2130374), [first published, Hanover, 1598], 10; in Alberico Gentili, *De Iure Bellii Libri Tres*, 2 vols [Classics of International Law, ed. James Brown Scott; Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, DC, No. 16], vol. I: *Photographic Reproduction of the Edition of 1612*; vol. II: *Translation of the Edition of 1612*, trans. John C. Rolfe, ed. Coleman Phillipson, Oxford: Clarendon Press; London: Humphrey Milford, 1933, vol. II, pp. 6-7; an earlier and somewhat briefer version of this work was first published in 1589: *Alberici Gentilis I.C. professoris regij de iure belli commentationes tres*, London, Iohannem Wolfum 1589 (STC 11735.7); see Annabel S. Brett, *Changes of State: Nature and the Limits of the City in Early Modern Natural Law*, Princeton: Princeton University Press. 2011, pp. 83, 153-4, 154n46, 191; Jeremy Waldron 'Ius gentium: A Defence of Gentili's Equation of the Law of Nations and the Law of Nature', in *The Roman Foundations of the Law of*

this view was put forth with particularly cogency by the civil lawyer Alberico Gentili, a Protestant exile from Italy, who, with the Earl of Leicester's patronage, first came to the university in March 1580/1.⁴⁹ Soon after, his ideas on this theme were made known in his *Lectiones & Epistolarum*, published in London in 1583 and 1584; the topic is especially addressed in the first chapter of its third book.⁵⁰ By the time this work appeared, i.e. at about the same time as Gager aimed his joke at Oliver Hakluyt's expense, Gager had become a close enough friend to Gentili to supply an epigraph to this work's second book. A decade later, Gentili would reciprocate by contributing epigraphs to two of Gager's own publications.⁵¹ Although we can only speculate, it appears likely that Gager's insulting comment had emphasized his conviction that the civil law embodied the truth firmly grounded in natural law,⁵² while medicine remained troubled by uncertainty not just about whether Galen's model of the science or Paracelsus's represented the truth, but about the relationship of the health of the body to that of the soul in the two models.⁵³

Was there, then, also a second consideration in play, one involving differences in religious outlook between Gager and Oliver Hakluyt? Gager's apologetic poem itself gives us nothing to go on. However, during the summer or autumn of 1583, before or soon after he wrote his *Catalogue* and sent his apology to Oliver Hakluyt, Gager also drafted three short poems representing his responses to the questions in theology disputed by his close friend Martin Heton in his exercises for the BTh at Oxford's *Comitia* in July of that year. The questions were: "*an sit liberum arbitrium?*" (whether there is free will?); "*an sola fides iustificat?*" (whether we are justified by faith alone?); and "*an opera infidelium sint*

Nations: Alberico Gentili and the Justice of Empire, ed. Benedict Kingsbury and Benjamin Straumann, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010, pp. 283-7.

⁴⁹ See Anthony à Wood, *Athenae Oxoniensis: An Exact History of all the Writers and Bishops who have had their Educations in the University of Oxford, A New Edition*, ed. Philip Bliss, 4 vols, London: F. C and J. Rivington, et al., 1813, vol. II, column 90. Gentili took up residence in New Inn Hall at around the same time as he was incorporated in Oxford as a doctor of civil law on 6 March 1580/1. He remained in Oxford until 1586, when he left for Germany, but returned in the following year when he was elected Regius Professor of Civil Law; Wood, *Fasti Oxoniensis*, 2:217; see John Barton 'The Faculty of Law', in *Collegiate University*, pp. 261, 265-6, 274, 278, 279, App., pp. 289-93; G. B. Duncan, 'Public Lectures and Professorial Chairs', *Collegiate University*, pp. 360-61; Coleman Phillipson, 'Introduction', in Gentili, *De Iure Belli*, trans. Rolfe, vol. II, pp. 12a-15a; 6; Diego Panizza, *Alberico Gentili, giurista ideologico nell'Inghilterra elizabetiana*, Padua: LaGarondola, 1981; Gesina H. J. van der Molen, *Alberico Gentili and the Development of International Law: His Life Work and Times*, 2nd ed. rev., Leyden, A. W. Sijthoff, 1968, pp. 38-52; Artemis Gause, 'Gentili, Alberico (1552-1608), jurist', *ODNB*.

⁵⁰ Alberico Gentili, *Lectionum & Epistolarum quae ad iure civile pertinent*, London. Iohannes Wulfus, 1583 and 1584 (STC 11739), pp. 141-58; the first chapter of Book 3 is entitled '*De iure naturali, gentium, & civili*'; see also Alberico Gentili, *De Iuris Interpretationibus: Dialogi Sex*, London, 1582, Apud Iohannem VVolfium, 1582 (STC 11736); Gentili's fullest expression of his identification of *ius gentium* with *ius natural* within the civil law is to be found in his book on just war.

⁵¹ For Gager's epigram, see Gentili, *Lectionum & Epistolarum*, sig. [A1v]; Gager, *Works*, vol. III, pp. 2, 281; for Gentili's epigrams in 1592, see William Gager, *Meleager Tragoedia nova*, Oxford, Iosephus Barnesius, 1592 (STC 11515), sig. A[3]v, and William Gager, *Ulysses redux tragoedia nova*, Oxford, Iosephus Barnesius, 1592 (STC 11516), n.p.; on Gager's connections with Gentili, see C. F. Tucker Brooke, 'The Life and Times of William Gager (1555-1622)', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 95:4 (1951), pp. 419-425.

⁵² It is of relevance that, as Annabel Brett shows, Gentili's natural law ideas were associated with a form of Epicureanism., Brett, *Changes of State*, pp. 82-83, 153-57, 189-94.

⁵³ See Debus, *The Chemical Philosophy*, vol. I, pp. 96-109.

peccata?” (whether the works of unbelievers are sin?).⁵⁴ These questions undoubtedly reflected topics then currently under discussion in Oxford’s theology school which themselves grew out of the religious concerns put into sharp focus in Oxford by the Jesuit Mission headed by Robert Persons and Edmund Campion that provided the context for the university’s 1581 statute on matriculation.⁵⁵

The questions themselves obviously derive from the predestinarian convictions associated with Reformed Protestantism which were advanced in Elizabethan Oxford by its party of godly Puritans, such as John Rainolds of Corpus Christ College and Laurence Humphrey, president of Madgalen College who also was sometime *censor theologiae* in Christ Church. Although we do not know who set the questions in 1583, Humphrey, Regius Professor of Theology at the time, very likely was among them. As is revealed by the answers Gager gave to the three questions, he held Reformed Protestant views close to those of his friend Martin Heton as well as to Rainolds’s and Humphrey’s: ‘We have no free will’; ‘Our sole trust is in Christ in Heaven’; ‘All the works of unbelievers are sin.’ His answer to the first question makes abundantly apparent the theological framework on which he grounded his responses.

Whoever boasts of the free will of the first Adam, thinking himself his own master, half divine, let him ponder at the same time poor Adam’s fall, when he hurled himself and his free will headlong. Our volition, born free, becomes a slave to chance, and is deposed from its former grand estate. And unless the grace of our Christ redeems it, nobody can loosen the knot of his servitude.⁵⁶

Martin Heton was a product of London’s godly community. He would succeed Humphrey as Dean of Winchester in February 1588/9 and eventually become Bishop of Ely. He also shared Humphrey’s Reformed religious outlook. On Heton’s death, Gager, who composed his memorial inscription in Ely Cathedral, said his life had been dedicated ‘*Deo et Ecclesiae Reformatae*’ (‘to God and the Reformed Church’). Gager also thought of himself in similar terms as he made clear in the testamentary clause of his last will.⁵⁷

⁵⁴William Gager, “*Non Habemus Liberum Arbitrum: Questio Magistr Martini Hetoni in Comitibus 1583*,” item CXXIV; “*Sola Fide Iustificatimur*,” item CXXXV and “*Omnia Opera Infidelium Sunt Peccata*,” item CXXXVI, in Gager, *Works*, vol. III, pp. 192-5, commentary, pp. 371-2. Heton was granted a dispensation by Congregation to respond to the MA inceptors in Theology at the *Comitia* in 1583 and to have this count as the exercises he was required to complete for his BTh; *Register of the University of Oxford, Vol II (1571-1622), Part I*, ed. Andrew Clark, Oxford, Oxford Historical Society, 1887, p. 195. Gager and Heton were lifelong friends; see Gager, *Works*, vol. III, items LXII, XCVIII, CXIII, CXLVI, CXXVII as well as CXXXIV-CXXXVI; Tucker Brooke, ‘Life and Times’, pp. 406, 412, 413, 415, 427-8, 430; Brett Usher, ‘Heton, Martin (1554–1609), bishop of Ely’. *ODNB*.

⁵⁵ *Statuta Antiqua Universitatis Oxoniensis*, ed. Strickland Gibson, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1931, pp. 421-23; Anthony à Wood, *The History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford in Two Books*, ed. John Gutch, 2 vols., Oxford, Printed for the Editor, 1796, vol. II, pp. 207-8 and vol. II, pp. 198-219 *passim*; S. L. Greenslade, ‘The Faculty of Theology’, in *Collegiate University*, pp. 324-7, 329-34.

⁵⁶ Gager, *Works*, vol. III, pp. 192-3. For Gager’s clash with Rainolds, see Tucker Brooke, ‘Life and Times’, pp. 413n76, 414, 416, 420, 422-6; in those debates Gager had the strong support of Gentili.

⁵⁷ James Bentham, *The History and Antiquities of the Conventual & Cathedral Church of Eli: From the Foundation of the Monastery, A.D. 673 to the Year 1771*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1771, p. 197. Usher, ‘Heton, Martin’, *ODNB*. The testamentary clause of Gager’s will, written on 24 July 1615, his 60th birthday, seven years before his death, is personal in speaking to his Reformed religious outlook:

What then were Oliver Hakluyt's religious convictions at the time? Although he was willing to consider the radical and mystical ideas of Paracelsus and the Paracelsians, who attacked the authority of the ancients, Galen above all, Oliver at base was a traditionalist in his medical outlook, leaning toward Galen and Galenism. In Oliver's day, and for some time before as well as after, the vast majority of learned physicians in England, especially those with strong connections to the two universities and the Royal College of Physicians in London not only were steadfast Galenists, who vigorously opposed Paracelsianism, but also were religious conservatives. In Elizabeth I's reign a number were crypto-Catholics, if not committed Papists. One sign of this linkage can be discerned in history of the College of Physicians in this period.

The Royal College's president at the time of Elizabeth I's accession was Dr John Caius (1510-1573), a humanist in the tradition of Thomas Linacre (c. 1460-1524), the Royal College's first President. Caius headed the College from 1555 to 1560 and again in 1562-4 and 1571. He not only was a leader among English Galenists in the 1560s and early 1570s, but like Linacre was an Erasmian in his religious outlook. As Master of Gonville and Caius College in Cambridge, the College that he refounded, he preserved many features of medieval Catholic religious practice including prayers for the dead.⁵⁸ When Caius was out of his office in the College of Physicians, he was replaced by several figures who shared his outlook, including about religion. One of them, for example, was Richard Caldwell, who had been present at the trial of Archbishop Cranmer and was of Brasenose College and then of

First I surrender my soul into the hands of my blessed Lord and Saviour Ihesus Christ, where it cannot miscarry, most humbly beseeching him to present it to God the Father spotless of blame, being closed with the garment of his own righteousness and innocency, whom I do constantly believe to be the only Saviour of the world, and my Saviour, by the virtue, power, efficacy, and ineffable mystery of his Mediatorship between God and mankind, whereat men and Angels may well be astonished as a thing rather to be wondered at than thoroughly comprehended. (Tucker Brooke, 'Life and Times', pp. 430-1).

⁵⁸ Vivian Nutton, 'Caius, John (1510–1573), scholar and physician', *ODNB*; Vivian Nutton, 'Linacre, Thomas (c. 1460–1524), humanist scholar and physician', *ODNB*; John Venn, 'Memoir of John Caius', in *The Works of John Caius, M. D.: Second Founder of Gonville and Caius College and Master of the College, 1559-1573 with a Memoir of his Life by John Venn, Sc. D.*, ed. E. S. Roberts, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1912, pp. 1-78; William Munk, *The Roll of the Royal College of Physicians of London: Comprising Biographical Sketches of all the Eminent Physicians, Whose Names are Recorded in the Annals from the Foundation of the College in 1518 to its Removal in 1825 from Warwick Lane to Pall Mall East*, 2nd ed. rev and enl., 5 vols, London, Published by the College, 1878, vol. I, pp. 37-49; for the College of Physicians during Caius's era, see George Clark, *A History of the Royal College of Physicians of London*, 2 vols, Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1964, vol. I, pp. 107-24. In 1572, for example, Cambridge's vice chancellor, acting on information received from Edwin Sandys, then the Bishop of London, made a search for 'popishe trumpery' in Caius College. It turned up 'vestments, albes, tunciles, stoles, manicles, corprases clothes, with the pix and sindon and canopie, besides holy water stoppes with sprinkles, pax, sensars, superalteries, tables of idollies, mass books, portuise and graile' that had been hoarded by Caius arguably in anticipation of the restoration of the Roman Catholic Church in England. As the Vice Chancellor reported to Lord Burghley at the time, it was 'thought good to burne the books, and such other things as served most for idolatrous abuses, and to cause the rest to be defaced'; Munk, *Roll*, vol. I, pp. 43-4; Munk also printed Caius own account of this event, which he considered a scandalous exercise in fanaticism; *ibid*, vol. I. p. 44. Although Caius was a religious conservative, the testamentary clause of his last will is very austere, with only the reference to St Mary to hint at his underlying beliefs: 'First I commend my soule to God Almighty and my bodie to be buried in the Chappell within my College of Gonville and Caius in Cambridge under the Tabernacle wherein the Image of our Ladie sometime did stand in a Tumbe there to be made of Allabaster'; 'Will of Dr. Caius: From Copy in Our Treasury', Appendix V, *Works of John Caius*, 73.

Christ Church, Oxford; he was the Physicians' President in 1570.⁵⁹ Another was Roger Giffard, a religious conservative, who was involved in the religious controversies in 1561 involving the selection of a new Warden of Merton College, and served as the Physicians' President between 1581 and 1584.⁶⁰ Although Oliver Hakluyt himself never entered the Royal College, he undoubtedly was acquainted with many of its members, especially those who received their university educations in Oxford while he studied there. The vast majority of learned physicians, in and out of the Royal College were Galenists and religious conservatives.

Paracelsus's English followers in this period were few in number. Although staunchly opposed to the Galenism that dominated their profession, the majority were attracted to Paracelsian medicine primarily for its practical uses, rather than to Paracelsus's occultism and hermeticism.⁶¹ Nevertheless, Paracelsianism in England was in some measure associated with Reformed Protestant religion. Writing in 1585, Richard Bostocke, Esq., an MP for Bletchingley in Surrey in Elizabeth I's third, fourth and seventh Parliaments, claimed that just as Wycliffe, Luther, Oecolampadius, Zwingli and Calvin had 'expelled the Clowdes of the Romish religion', and were the restorers of Christ's church to its purity according to God's word, and just as Copernicus had brought knowledge of 'the Motions and Places of the starres ... to their former puritie', Paracelsus and his followers were restoring the true knowledge of physic that had descended from Adam before it was brought to its corrupt condition by Galen and his followers.⁶² To Bostocke, then, the chemical remedies used in

⁵⁹ Munk, *Roll*, vol. I. pp. 59-61.

⁶⁰ For the election of a new Warden of Merton in 1561 and Roger Giffard's involvement in it, see *Registrum Annalium Collegii Mertonensis, 1521-1567*; ed. John M. Fletcher, Oxford, Oxford Historical Society, 1974, pp. 183-280; *Registrum Matthei Parker: Diocesis Cantuariensis, A. D. 1559-1575, Register I*, transcribed. E. Margaret Thompson, ed. W. H. Frere, 3 vols, London, Canterbury and York Society, 1928-33, vol. II, pp. 684-717; Norman Jones, *The English Reformation*, pp. 115-22; George C. Brodrick, *Memorials of Merton College with Biographical Notices of the Wardens and Fellows*, Oxford, Oxford Historical Society, 1885, pp. 50-9; G. H. Martin and J. R. L. Highfield, *A History of Merton College, Oxford*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 155-6. For Giffard at the College of Physicians, see Munk, *Roll*, vol. I, p. 64. For the conservatism of the learned physicians in the period, especially in the College of Physicians, see Jones, *English Reformation*, pp. 17-8, 121. Harold J. Cook, *The Decline of the Old Medical Regime in Stuart London*, Ithaca and London, Cornell University Press, 1986, pp. 70-93; Charles Webster, *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine and Reform, 1626-1660*, New York, Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1975, pp. 251-2, 308-23.

⁶¹ Allen G. Debus, 'The Paracelsian Compromise in Elizabethan England', *Ambix* 8:2 (1960), pp. 71-97; Allen G. Debus, *The English Paracelsians*, New York, Franklin Watts, Inc. 1966, pp. 49-85; Debus, *The Chemical Philosophy*, vol. I, pp. 173-82.

⁶² R[ichard] B[ostocke], *The difference between Phisicke, first taught by the godly forefathers, consisting in vnitie peace and concord: and the latter Phisicke proceeding from idolators, Ethnickes, and Heathen: as Gallen, and such other consisting in dualitie, disocrde, and contraritie And wherein the natural Philosophie of Aristotle doth differ from the trueth of Gods worde, and is iniurious to Christianitie and sounde doctrine*, London, [By G. Gobinson] for Robert VValey, 1585 (STC 1064), Sig H[7]r; Debus, 'The Paracelsian Compromise in Elizabethan England', pp. 77-8; Debus, *The English Paracelsians*, pp. 57-9. Debus erroneously attributes Bostocke's work to a 'Robert Bostock', a London printer; see Debus, 'The Paracelsian Compromise', p. 77n23. Bostocke matriculated as a Pensioner in St. John's College, Cambridge 1545 and, entered the Inner Temple in 1551. In his book, he mentions being at 'the last Parliament before this'; B[ostocke], *The difference between the auncient Phisicke...and the latter Phisicke*, sig. D1r. This suggest that he wrote his book while in London during the Parliament which began meeting in November 1584 and was dissolved in September 1585; the 'last Parliament' then, must have been Elizabeth I's 4th Parliament, which first assembled in May 1572 and met for three sessions before being formally dissolved in April 1583.

Paracelsian medicine, contrast with the ‘rawe and grosse medicines’ in Galenic practice in the same way as ‘the true doctrine of Christ’ contrasts with ‘the Romish doctrine’. For just as ‘the doctrine of Christ for the health of the Soule is altogether spirituall’, Roman doctrine is ‘mixed with impurities’, he said, ‘& standeth in outward ceremonies & traditions, corporal exercises, which be lets to the works of the spirit’. So too ‘the corporall and grosse medicines which serve for the bodie’ hinder ‘the heavenly vertues’, while in the ancient medicine of Adam, and in Paracelsus, ‘are ministred and ioyned with the lively Sprits of mans body’ and ‘brought to unitie’.⁶³ These formulations, which closely connect Paracelsianism with the Protestant cause, treat Galenism, in effect, as heathen and antithetical to true Christian religion.⁶⁴

Was there, then, an unreconciled religious difference dividing Gager and Hakluyt? Gager hints at as much in his mocking conclusion to his apology. ‘I should take it harder’, he says, ‘that I excited your bile, but since you are a doctor you can heal thyself, you can purge your bile’.⁶⁵ Gager meant, as Oliver would have recognized, that he should attend to his own defects before calling out those of others. That is, whatever lay behind Gager’s insult, his joking apology not only places Oliver among the followers of Galen, but implies that the source of irritation with Gager was a fault in Hakluyt himself. Oliver would not have missed the reference to the ancient proverb, alluded to by Jesus in preaching in the synagogue in Nazareth according to the Gospel of Luke—‘Physician, heal thyself’—according to which one was to attend to his own defects before calling out those of others.⁶⁶ Whatever lay behind the joking insult, this biting final remark suggests that the bitter bile aroused in Gager’s exchange with Hakluyt had not been assuaged.

⁶³ B[ostocke], *The difference between the auncient Phisicke...and the latter Phisicke*, sig. C[8]v-D1r. In a work published in defense of Bostocke a year later, the author argued that Paracelsian physick ‘had his beginning with our first father Adam’, and that Paracelsus himself was ‘a pure and true Christian, a friend and fauourer of the flocke of Christ, & a great enemie to the enemies of Iesu, as the deuil, pope, & turke’; I. W., *The copie of a letter sent by a learned Physician to his friend*, [London, J. Wolfe, 1586?] (STC 24906), sig A1v.

⁶⁴ A number of physicians were attracted to Paracelsian medicine for the good that its practices and cures could do for their patients rather than adherence to it as a theory, and that, as the surgeon William Clowes would emphasize, because it was in keeping with God’s design. Paracelsus himself was an advocate of free will and on this point his views had affinities with Catholicism and were remote from both Luther’s and Calvin’s; Charles Webster, *Paracelsus: Medicine, Magic and Mission at the End of Time*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2008, pp. 125, 127, 135 144, 188, 231-2; William Clowes, *A right frutefull and approoved treatise for the artificial cure of that malady called in Latin Struma*, London, Edward Allde, 1602 (STC 5446), sig. A2v; see also ‘William Pickering Gent. of London, Chirurgion, his Epistle in behalf of the Author’, in William Clowes, *A Briefe and necessarie Treatise touching the cure of the disease called Morbus Gallicus ,or Lues Venerea* (London, printed [by Thomas East] for Thomas Cadman, 1585 (STC 5448), f. 59r; Debus, *The Chemical Philosophy*, vol. I, p. 178.

⁶⁵ Gager, *Complete Works*, vol. III, pp. 196, 197.

⁶⁶ Luke 4:23 (KJV). The proverb is paraphrased in Aeschylus’s *Prometheus Unbound* and appears in the fable of *The Frog and the Fox* in Aesop as well as in rabbinic literature and in the Midrash. Aeschylus, *Prometheus Bound*, ed. and trans. Herbert Weir Smyth, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926, ll. 473-5; ‘Physician, heal thyself,’ in E. D. Hirsch, Jr., Joseph F. Kett, and James Trefil, eds., *The New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy*, 3rd ed., Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2002.; John Nolland, ‘Claasical and Rabbinic Parallels to ‘Physician Heal Yourself’ (Lk IV 23), *Novum Testamentum* 21:3 (1979), pp. 193-209; H. Freedman and Maurice Simon, *Midrash Rabbah, Translated into English*, 10 vols, London and New York, Soncino Press, 1983, vol. I, p.195.

III. The Protestantism of Edmond and Oliver Hakluyt

Oliver Hakluyt was certainly a Protestant. The question is what kind? Although there is no surviving statement of Oliver's religious beliefs before he wrote his last will in 1621, that document is fulsome in revealing the religious foundations of his thought at that time. It begins with a uniquely personal declaration of Oliver's condition when he wrote it. In place of a standard formulation in which the testator speaks of him or herself, as did Oliver's cousin Richard Hakluyt the lawyer, of 'being hole of bodie and sounde of mynde', Oliver writes of 'being Crasie and infirm in bodie but of good and perfect remembraunce'.⁶⁷ In one way, the formula makes the same conventional distinction between body and mind as did his cousin, but with a twist. 'Crasie' is unusual. As he used it, its roots are in Middle English, where its core meaning is 'full of cracks or flaws'; when referring to the body, its meaning is 'broken down', 'unsound', 'impaired', or 'frail.' However, at about the same time as Oliver wrote his will, the word 'crazy' was just beginning to mean manifesting deranged behaviour. Accordingly, it is a term that could be used to draw a distinction between purposive actions resulting from rational choices and erratic actions moved by the passions.⁶⁸ This suggests that Oliver may have thinking along lines that treated the condition of the body affecting through the passions, one's humoral condition or state.

'Remembraunce' also is unusual. More commonly, as in the wills of Oliver's brother Richard and their father, the word 'memory' appears; it is used, as a metonymy for the mind as a whole.⁶⁹ In the context of Oliver's will, however, 'remembraunce' represents a separate or distinct faculty of the mind free from the effects caused by the humors. Viewed in connection with 'crasie', its use suggests that his formulation relates to the distinction, discussed by Galen at the beginning of *On the Natural Faculties*, between the soul (*psyche*) and nature (*physis*), according to which animals, including human beings, subject to fluctuations in their humors as well as to their reason 'are governed at once by their soul and by their nature, and plants by their nature alone'.⁷⁰ At the time Oliver wrote his will in 1621, then, there is no doubt that he was a committed Galenist as a physician. He almost certainly was one while at Christ Church using his studies of Galenic medicine to weigh and resist the Paracelsian challenge to the prevailing medical paradigm. Gager intimates the same in calling on Oliver should purge himself of his excess of bile.

On receiving his MA in 1580, Oliver Hakluyt continued on as a Student of Christ Church for some years. Although according to the University's statutes current at the time, he would have become eligible to proceed to his Bachelor of Medicine degree in 1583 or 1584,

⁶⁷ Last will and testament of Oliver Hackluyt, dated 16 October 1621, proven in the PCC, 5 September, 1623, The National Archives, PROB 11/142/268, f. 221r; for his cousin Richard Hakluyt the lawyer's formulation, see "Will of Richard Hackluyt, of Eyton," in *Original Writings*, vol. II, p. 371. Oliver's older brother Richard Hakluyt the cosmographer spoke simply of being of good and perfect memory thanked be to God', Will of Richard Hakluyt, 1612, *Original Writings*, vol. II, p. 506.

⁶⁸ *OED*. 'crazy', adj., senses I.1, I.2.a., I.2.bi, and II.3.a.

⁶⁹ See *Original Writings*, vol. I, p. 69; vol. II, p. 506.

⁷⁰ Galen, *On the Natural Faculties*, trans. Arthur John Brock, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1916, [Loeb Classica Library 71], pp. 2-3.

he did not receive it, and his formal license to practice, until 11 July 1588.⁷¹ He remained at Oxford during nearly all of the intervening time.⁷² His younger brother Edmond, who received his BA in 1582, moved on to serve for four years as tutor to the young William Howard, son and heir of Lord Charles Howard, 2nd Baron Effingham, who would become Elizabeth I's Lord Chamberlain and a Privy Councilor in 1584 and then in May 1585 her Lord Admiral. The Hakluyts had multiple ties to him. Richard Hakluyt the cosmographer, who owed his parish ministry in Wetheringsett to the patronage of Lord Charles's sister Douglas Howard, Lady Sheffield, would dedicate volume I of the second edition of *Principal Navigations* to him.⁷³ Although in Edmond's last will and testament, dated 20 June 1592, he declared himself to be 'in perfect healthe of bodye and good understanding of minde,' he died at age 36 or 37 of an unspecified cause sometime in the winter of 1592-3, less than eight months later.⁷⁴ His will, providing insight into his religious outlook at the time, reveals him also to have been a Protestant, but in keeping with his Oxford experience, a traditionalist with deeply personal religious convictions. Although key features of the latter were explored by Daniel Carey in his 2014 *Journal of the Hakluyt Society* article, a few further points, derived from the limited information we have about him, deserve attention for our purposes.

The first concerns the course of Edmond's education after he completed his studies at the Westminster School, ca. 1575. Although he had followed his brothers Thomas, Richard and Oliver there, on completing his course of study at Westminster, unlike them, he was not then elected a Queen's Scholar to attend either Trinity College, Cambridge or Christ Church, Oxford. Instead, he was admitted to St John's College, Oxford, founded in 1555 by Sir Thomas White for students of divinity and arts in part to serve as a training institution for priests in the reestablished Roman Catholic Church under Queen Mary I. White, along with being Lord Mayor of London in 1553-4 and a strong supporter of Queen Mary I, was a

⁷¹ *Alum Ox.*, vol II. p. 627; *Statuta Antiqua*, pp. 346, 379; Gillian Lewis, 'The Faculty of Medicine,' *Collegiate University*, pp. 217-19.

⁷² Christ Church's records show that except for a brief period in 1587, Oliver remained in residence in the college between receiving his MA in 1580 and his B. Med in 1588. I am grateful to Judith Curthoys, Archivist in Christ Church, Oxford, for this information.

⁷³ Richard Hakluyt, 'To the right honorable my singular good Lord., the Lord Charles Howard, Erle of Nottingham...', 7 October 1598; STC 12626, 12626a, vol. I, sigs. *2r-*3v; Robert W. Kenny, *Elizabeth's Admiral: The Political Career of Charles Howard, Earl of Nottingham, 1536-1624*, Baltimore and London, Johns Hopkins Press, 1970, pp. 33-35; James McDermott, 'Howard, Charles, second Baron Howard of Effingham and first earl of Nottingham (1536-1624), naval commander', *ODNB*. Howard would become the 1st Earl of Nottingham in 1597. After leaving service in the Howard household, Edmond appears to have taken up residence on property in Eyton, the Hakluyt family's base in Herefordshire. If, as seems likely, Edmond began serving as the young William Howard's tutor soon after receiving his Oxford BA in 1582, his four year's of service would have ended in 1588 or possibly 1589, i.e. ca. four years before his death the winter of 1592-93. Edmond in his own will identified himself as 'Edmond Hackluyte of Eaton [i.e. Eyton] in the Countie of Hereford gentleman'; will of Edmond Hakluyt, *Original Writings*, vol II. p. 413. When he matriculated ca. 1575 in St John's College, he also was identified as a 'generosus of London'. Hence, it seems likely that by that time he was already in possession of properties sufficient to be recognized as having gentry status; Andrew Hegarty, *A Biographical Register of St. John's College, Oxford 1555-1660*, Oxford, Oxford Historical Society, 2011, p. 297. Carey, 'Edmund Hakluyt', p. 2.

⁷⁴ His will was granted probate in London, on 1 February, 1592/3, Will of Edmond Hakluyt, *Original Writings*, vol. II, pp. 413-14.

leading figure the City's Company of Merchant Taylors and one of the principal promoters of the Muscovy Company which received its charter in 1555. He also was a devoted Catholic.⁷⁵ The College's dedication to St John the Baptist, the patron saint of the Merchant Taylors, reflected his deep connections to the gild in all its aspects; he had been Master in 1535.⁷⁶ Although after Elizabeth I's succession. St John's was purged of two of its Presidents for refusing to swear the Oath of Supremacy, it remained a religiously conservative college well into the 1570s. The provision in the College's statutes that it maintain a choir of three chaplains, four singing men, and six choristers reinforced its commitment to the traditions of worship followed at its foundation.⁷⁷ Although we cannot be certain, it seems likely that Edmond became connected with the College's choir after he matriculated in 1575; possibly he joined the College because of the musical interests, talents and skills he had developed during his studies in the Westminster School. When in the autumn of 1577 St John's choir was dissolved for financial reason,⁷⁸ he took up the post of lay clerk and singing man in New College, receiving payments for teaching its choristers while officially remaining a member of St John's. He supplicated for his BA from the latter on 13 June 1582.⁷⁹ New College itself was also a religiously conservative establishment even after it was purged of thirty-three Catholic fellows during the 1560s and five more after 1568.⁸⁰ During Edmond's time at both colleges, they were especially noteworthy for their crypto-Catholicism.

Soon after receiving his BA from St John's, Oxford in 1582, Edmond took up the post of tutor to Lord William Howard, a post he held for four years during which he was a member of the household of Lord William's father, the Lord Charles Howard, 2nd Baron Effingham. Along with Sir Robert Cecil, who was his political ally and close friend,⁸¹ Effingham was one of Richard Hakluyt the cosmographer's principal patrons in the 1590s.⁸²

⁷⁵ Alexandra Shepard, 'White, Sir Thomas (1495?-1567), founder of St John's College, Oxford', *ODNB*; W. K. Jordan, *The Charities of London, 1480-1660: The Aspirations and Achievements of the Urban Society*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1960, pp.174, 215, 257-58.

⁷⁶ W. H. Stevenson and H. E. Salter, *The Early History of St. John's College, Oxford*, Oxford: Clarendon Press for the Oxford Historical Society, 1939, pp. 119, 129, App. XXIII, pp. 411-15; 'Statuta Omnia Collegii Sancti Johannis Baptistae in Academia Oxonii', *Statutes of the Colleges of Oxford; with Royal Patents of Foundation*, 3 vols, Oxford, J. H. Parker, 1853, vol. III, pp. 61-62.

⁷⁷ *Statutes of the Colleges of Oxford*, vol. III, pp. 12-13.

⁷⁸ Carey, 'Edmund Hakluyt', p. 2; Stevenson and Salter, *Early History of St. John's*, pp. 169-72, 209-10.

⁷⁹ *Alum. Ox.*, vol II, p. 627; Carey, 'Edmund Hakluyt,' p. 2; Hegarty, *Biographical Register*, p. 297.

⁸⁰ Penry Williams, 'From the Reformation to the Era of Reform, 1530-1830', in *New College, Oxford, 1379-1979*, ed. John Buxton and Penry Williams, Oxford: Warden and Fellows of New College, Oxford, 1979, p. 49; Penry Williams, 'Elizabethan Oxford: Church, State and University', in *Collegiate University*, pp. 407-8; Jennifer Loach, 'Reformation Controversies', in *Collegiate University*, p. 381; Hastings Rashdall and Robert S. Rait, *New College*, London, F. E. Robinson, 1901, pp. 114-39; James McConica, 'The Catholic Experience in Tudor Oxford,' in *The Reckoned Expense: Edmund Campion and the Early English Jesuits*, ed. Thomas M. McCoog, Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 1996, p. 63n93.

⁸¹ See Kenny, *Elizabeth's Admiral*, pp.164, 204-6, 246-7, 253-4. 284.

⁸² After dedicating volume I of *Principal Navigations* to the Lord Admiral in 1598 [see note 73], Hakluyt dedicated volumes II and III to Sir Robert Cecil, Richard Hakluyt. 'To the Right Honorable Sir Robert Cecil Knight, principall Secretarie to her Majestie...', London, 24 October 1599, STC 12626, 12626a, vol. II. sigs. *2r-4v; Richard Hakluyt, 'To the right honourable sir Robert Cecil, knight, principall Secretary to her Majestie...', London, 1 September 1600, STC 12626, 12626a, vol. III, sigs. A2r-A3v

It was through the patronage of these two figures that he received the London-based ecclesiastical posts that he would hold until the end of his life: a chaplaincy in the hospital of the Savoy and a Prebend in Westminster Abbey where he was installed as a Canon in 1602. Cecil had patronage privileges in both places.⁸³ As we have already commented, the cosmographer's connection with Cecil associated with the 'avant-garde conformity' that had taken hold, especially through Cecil's influence, in Westminster Abbey before Hakluyt became one of its Canons.⁸⁴

Lord Charles Howard, 2nd Baron Effingham, descended from a long line of Catholic noblemen, several of whom were convicted of treason during the Tudor period. Among them was his grandfather, Thomas Howard, 4th Duke of Norfolk, who was executed in 1572 for his treasonable support of Mary Queen of Scots. With many Catholic kin during Elizabeth I's reign, he also seems to have had a religious sensibility similar to Cecil's. As Carey's account of Edmond's time as a 'singing man' and tutor in New College suggests, the youngest of the Hakluyt brothers held similar views. Very likely that was a primary reason he was chosen as Lord William's tutor and mentor. Importantly the relationship of teacher to student was very close. In his own will, Edmond not only singled the young William Howard out as a 'sweete courteous and honorable younge gentleman', but bequeathed to him 'as a shadow of loving and dutifull mynde forte shillinges to be put into a Ringe with his Armes to be engraven thereon: desyring hym to accept of my name and to knowe them the rather for my sake'.⁸⁵

In the testamentary clause of his last will, Edmond speaks of 'bequeathing his soul into the hands of the blessed trinitie by whose infinite and unspeakable goodness and mercey I was created redeemed sanctified and preserved so many yeres in this huge sea of daungers and vale of teares: whose gracious goodness in stead of punishing my grevous sinnes hath bountiffully powred many benefits upon me'.⁸⁶ Then, in thanking the Lord for caring for him in the absence of his father and mother, he alludes to Psalm 27:10 in English—'Wil he set his desire on the Almightye? wil he call upon at all times?'⁸⁷—and adds '*Tibi laus tibi honor tibi gratiarum actis in secula seculorum. Amen*'. As Daniel Carey has shown, the latter line paraphrases the responsory and antiphon in the Catholic Trinity Office.⁸⁸ The will concludes with Edmond directly addressing Christ on the cross, declaring that his 'soul thirsteth, longeth, and gaspeth after thee' in the knowledge that Christ is 'ready to embrace everyone

⁸³ 'Hakluyt Chronology', vol I, pp. 313, 317-8; Lords of the Privy Council to George Abbott, Archbishop of Canterbury, 18 May 1600; *Acts of the Privy Council*, vol. 30, pp. 300-1; J. F. Merritt, 'The Cecils and Westminster, 1558-1612: The Development of an Urban Power Base,' in *Patronage, Culture, and Power: The Early Cecils*, ed. Pauline Croft, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2002, pp. 231-46; J. F. Merritt, *The Social World of Early Modern Westminster: Abbey, Court, and Community, 1525-1640*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002, pp. 71-79; J. F. Merritt, 'The Cradle of Laudianism?: Westminster Abbey, 1558-1630', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 52:4 (2002), 623-46; Pauline Croft, 'The Religion of Sir Robert Cecil', *The Historical Journal*, 34:4 (1991), 792. In connection with his chaplaincy at the Savoy, Hakluyt retained rooms there until his death; see Will of Richard Hakluyt, 1612, *Original Writings*, vol. II, p. 508.

⁸⁴ Croft, 'The Religion of Sir Robert Cecil', pp. 730-96.

⁸⁵ Will of Edmond Hakluyt, *Original Writings*, vol II, p. 413.

⁸⁶ Will of Edmond Hakluyt, *Original Writings*, vol. II. p. 413.

⁸⁷ Psalm 27:10, GNV (1560), f.230r.

⁸⁸ Carey, 'Edmund Hakluyt', pp. 4-5.

that seeketh salvation' through his 'agonies and merits'. Edmond commended himself 'body and soul' into Christ's outstretched arms calling him to 'preserve me now and in the hour of my death'. He concluded with reference to Apocalypse 22:20 in the Vulgate: '*Veni domino Jesu, veni cito et noli tardare. Amen*', which the King James Version translates as 'Surely I come quickly, Amen. Even so, come Lord Jesus'.⁸⁹

Although he remained a loyal member of the Church of England, Edmond's religious sentiments, and also his theology, were distant from the form of Protestantism advance in Oxford by such figures as Laurence Humphrey and John Rainolds. He did not adhere to a strict doctrine of predestination but held instead held that God was ready to take into his protection anyone who freely sought salvation. Oxford's Puritans undoubtedly would have regarded him as a Pelagian. Since Edmond had not married and had no children, he passed the bulk of his estate in succession to Richard and Oliver, his two living brothers, then to their children, who if they had deceased, to his sisters and their children. In default of heirs from his family, he made Queen Elizabeth I and her heirs and successors his residual legatees. What stands out most of all is his religious traditionalism.

Oliver's religious outlook also was traditionalist. For example, in making provision for his wife Rose after his own death, he speaks of payments to her from two separate sources to be made twice a year as 'the feastes of S^t Michael the archeangell and the Annunciacion of our blessed lady the virgin Mary'; the latter day is designated a second time as 'the Annunciacion of the blessed virgin S^t Mary'.⁹⁰ These designations look back to formulations common before the Reformation and that persisted in conservative religious circles in Oliver's time. Both days were acknowledged more austere in the Elizabethan *Book of Book Prayer*: the former, which coincides with 29 September, is there labelled 'Saint Michael and All Angels'; the latter, which coincides with 25 March, by tradition the beginning date of the annual calendar, is called simply 'The Annunciation of the Virgin Mary'.⁹¹

Oliver's doctrinal views also were similar to Edmond's. The testamentary clause in his 1621 will reads:

ffirst I give and present my sinfull soule to the throne of mercy of [the] gracious ffather, the God of all flesh by and for the mediation of Jesus Christe my sole savior and Redeemer with full assuraunce and trust, that this cannot perish and be lost, which he hath vouchsafed to purchase with so deare a prise as his owne most pretious bloud wherein onelie by the hope of our most holie spirit the holie ghoste I hope to be saved and sanctified, and in now other measure or meanes of salvation whateover And therefore with sure confidence thereof I comitt my soule to the mercy onlie belonging and desiring to be dissolved at his pleasure, and so to be with him in the kingdome of his faithfull ones thereto singe *Alleluiah* with the blessed whiche followe the lambe for ever And my sinfull body I Comitt unto the earth

⁸⁹ Will of Edmond Hakluyt, *Original Writings*, vol. II, p. :413. In the KJV, the passage is *Rev.* 22:30.

⁹⁰ The National Archives, PROB 11/142/268, f. 221r-v.

⁹¹ *The Book of Common Prayer, 1559: The Elizabethan Prayer Book*, ed. John E. Booty, Washington: The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1976, pp. 224-5, 239-40.

untill the day of the glorious appearance of our Lord Jesus on the day of his greate Judgement Att which tyme I am assured it shalbe reunited to this my soule and then both beinge made one immortall and incorruptible creature shall rise to that great iudgment and receave that blessed sentence *Come ye blessed of my ffather*.⁹²

The scriptural reference at the end is to Matthew 25:34 in the King James Version: ‘Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world’. The same passage commonly is cited by Roman Catholics in support of the doctrine of works.⁹³ The will then concludes, as did Edmond’s, with ‘*Veni domino Jesu, veni cito et noli tardare. Amen Amen*’.⁹⁴

⁹² The National Archives, PROB 11/142/268, f. 221r. The Scriptural reference is to Matthew 25:34 (KJV): This passage comes after Jesus had gone out of the Temple and went up to the mount of Olives where he spoke with the disciples of the Last Days which he says will be preceded by nation rising ‘against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places’ (Matt. 24:7). The following chapter contains the parable of the talents (Matt. 25:14-30). The passage in question depicts ‘the Son of man’ sitting in glory on his throne to separate those gathered before him ‘as a shepherd divideth his sheep from his goats’, keeping the ‘sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left’, (Matt. 25:31-33). Then comes the passage cited by Oliver, which reads in full as follows (Matt. 25:34-40, KJV):

³⁴ Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world:

³⁵ For I was an hunged, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in:

³⁶ Naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me.

³⁷ Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink?

³⁸ When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee?

³⁹ Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee?

⁴⁰ And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.

However, to those on Jesus’s left hand who, when given the chance to perform those acts of charity, failed to do them he says: ‘Depart from me, ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.’ These, he says, ‘shall go away into everlasting punishment’ (Matt. 25:41, 46).

⁹³ *The Homilies of S. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, of the Gospel of St. Matthew*, trans. Sir George Prevost, 3 vols, London, Walter Smith, 1885, Homily LXXIX, vol. III, pp. 1046-57. This passage is also subject to a Protestant interpretation consistent with Calvin’s view of predestination; it turns on explicating the call to ‘the blessed of my Father’ to ‘inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world’. However, Chrysostom draws a distinction between the sheep and the goats, whose fate is according to their nature, and the human beings from all the Nations awaiting divine judgment who ‘have it from choice’—i.e., God’s choice—‘wherefore some are punished and others crowned’. The former, he says, are ‘not punished’ until God ‘has pleaded with them’ and mentioned ‘the charges against them’, and been given a chance to respond charitably and ‘with meekness’. In other words, in contrast to sheep and goats whose actions reflect their given natures, Chrysostom’s interpretation grants a modicum of free will to humans to accept or reject God’s pleading when He presents them the choice, Chrysostom does acknowledge God’s foreknowledge of who would inherit, but not as preordaining the same. Note that Richard Hakluyt, the lawyer, who was the guardian the children of Richard Hakluyt of London, alludes to Matt. 25:31-46 in his own will from 1587; it begins with a Protestant testamentary clause, which by referring, albeit obliquely, to Matt. 25:31-46, leaves open the possibility that human beings retain a modicum of free will in regard to their salvation: ‘First I bequeathe my sowle redeemed by the mearitts and passions & death of Jesus Christ [the Saviour of the] Worlde, to the same Christe that is deyd, buried, risen, and ascended, and that shall be the Judge of all Nations under heaven. My body I bequeath

Neither Edmond nor Oliver was a Church Papist, let alone a Recusant. They were instead early adherents of the religious outlook we previously referred to as ‘avant-garde conformity’. Although it was grounded in theology, especially associated with opposition to Calvinism,⁹⁵ it was as much an aesthetic and cultural movement as a doctrinal one especially in following the admonition to ‘worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness’ as set forth early Reformation translations into English of Psalm 96 and revived in 1611 in the King James Version. The Psalm itself begins by calling on believers to ‘sing unto the Lord a new song: sing unto the Lord, all the earth’ and then goes on to declare that ‘strength and beauty are in his sanctuary’.⁹⁶ The concept of the ‘beauty of holiness’ especially took hold in England’s cathedrals, which had the space, the resources and the personnel to implement its requirements. Westminster Abbey, as royal ‘peculiar’, and therefore not directly under the governance of a bishop, proved itself a place for the making of experiments in form and practice in the style of ‘avant-garde conformity’ that came especially to characterize worship in England’s cathedrals.⁹⁷ Those adhering to the concept favored, where necessary, the replacement of communion tables with altars; the adoption of elaborate vestments in church ceremonies; the preservation, restoration, or reintroduction of rood screens and rood lofts and of religious imagery and statuary in the interior and exterior fabric and the windows of church buildings. In regard to music, they also favoured new-built organs and organ screens, and part-singing in choral music over the simple singing of hymns and psalms.⁹⁸

to the earthe till the general resurrection [when] bodie and sowle shall joyne to everlasting salvacion’. Will of Richard Hakluyt, of Eyton,’ *Original Writings*, vol. II. p. 371.

⁹⁴ The National Archives, PROB. 11/142/268, f. 222r.

⁹⁵ See Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590-1640*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1987; see also Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995; Anthony Milton, *England’s Second Reformation: The Battle for the Church of England, 1625-1662*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021, pp. 12-67; Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547-1700*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007, pp. 74-125.

⁹⁶ Psalm 96:1, 6, 9 (KJV); ‘The beauty of holiness’ in verse 9 in KJV looks back especially to similar phrases in Bible translations dating from the early stages of the English Reformation in Henry VIII’s reign: Tyndale Bible (1520), Coverdale Bible (1535), Matthew’s Bible (1537), and the Great Bible (1539). However, the verse in the Bishops’ Bible of 1568 reads: ‘Worshyp you God in the majestie of holynesse...’ In the Geneva version (1560 and 1599), the passage reads: ‘Worship the Lord in the glorious Sanctuarie...’ Earlier, a version of it appeared in the Wycliffe Bible: ‘praise ye the Lord in his holy hall. All earth be moved of his face; (praise ye the Lord in the beauty of his holiness. All the earth tremble before him/All the earth dance before him;’. There were two versions of the Wycliffe Bible, an ‘Early Version’ dating from ca. 1382 and a ‘Later Version’ dating from c. 1388; the phrase ‘the beauty of his holiness’ appear in the ‘Later Version’; see Francis Aidan Gasquet, ‘The Pre-Reformation English Bible’, in *idem*, *The Old English Bible and Other Essays*, London: John C. Nimmo, 1897, pp.102-78.

⁹⁷ See *supra* at n. 28.

⁹⁸ See, e.g. Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, 74-125; Felicity Heal, ‘Art and Iconoclasm’, in *The Oxford History of Anglicanism*, ed. Milton, 186-209; Stanford Lehmberg, *The Reformation of Cathedrals: Cathedrals in English Society*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989, pp. 139-65, 182-225; Stanford Lehmberg, *Cathedrals under Siege: Cathedrals in English Society*, University Park, PA, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996, pp. 157-91; see also Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 78-82, 315-16; Lake, *On Laudianism*, pp. 133-50.

IV. Λογος Σταυρου: The Word of the Cross

Although nowhere in Richard Hakluyt's published writings, or in his own last will and testament, were his religious views spelled out in language as rich as his two brothers used, he was in agreement with Edmond's and Oliver's understanding as expressed in their last wills and testament.⁹⁹ Although they implicitly associated themselves with the style of worship that took hold at Westminster Abbey while their brother Richard was a Canon there, Richard's own will, while strictly conforming to the *Thirty-Nine Articles*, was very business-like including, as we saw, in its testamentary clause. However, once he joined Westminster's chapter as a Canon in 1602, and began faithfully attending chapter meetings at the Abbey, he was, until his death in 1616, fully involved at the Abbey as its Canons, under its Deans—Lancelot Andrewes (1601-05), Richard Neile (1605-10), and George Mountain (1610-17)¹⁰⁰—made the renovations and changes in its fabric, ornamentation, and overall appearance necessary to implement the program of 'beauty of holiness' in the form of worship for which Westminster Abbey itself became a model.¹⁰¹

The surviving records of the Abbey provide detailed evidence of Hakluyt's official actions as a Canon during his fourteen years as a member of the Chapter during which he served as archdeacon (1603-05), as steward (1608-09), and as treasurer (1614-15). He appears to have been absent from only one chapter meeting.¹⁰² However, the sources in

⁹⁹ The substance of two of Richard Hakluyt's explicitly religious writings— a sermon and a theological lecture—composed in the early 1580s and delivered orally by him was detailed in the manuscript Commonplace Book of John Rogers, a student in Oxford studying for the ministry at the time: 'Note of a sermon by Mr Hackluite of Christechurche p[re]ched at St Maries 21 Septemb. (1582)' and 'Notes of Mr Hackluites lector upon this article of belefe (that is) He descended in hell'; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson MS D 273, f. 194v (sermon) and f. 267r-268v (lecture); for commentary see Emily Stevenson, 'Captaining Men's Souls: Richard Hakluyt's Ministerial Works', *Renaissance Studies*, 37:1 (2023), pp. 92-110. .

¹⁰⁰ For overviews of Andrewes's, Neile's lives and Mountain's ecclesiastical careers, see P. E. McCullough, 'Andrewes, Lancelot (1555–1626), bishop of Winchester'. *ODNB*; Andrew Foster, 'Neile, Richard (1562–1640), archbishop of York'. *ODNB*; Andrew Foster, 'Mountain [Montaigne], George (1569–1628), archbishop of York'. *ODNB*. For Neile, see also Andrew Foster, 'The function of a bishop: the career of Richard Neile, 1562–1640', *Continuity and change: personnel and administration of the Church of England, 1500–1642*, ed. Rosemary O'Day and Felicity Heal, Leicester, Leicester University Press, 1976, pp. 33–54. Hakluyt's expressed hope for a "happie resurrection" links him with views the Andrewes' views as expressed in Lancelot Andrewes, "A Sermon Preached at the Court on XXXV. of March A. D. MDXVII, being Good Friday," in *Lancelot Andrewes, Selected Sermons and Lectures*, ed. Peter McCullough, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005, pp. 122-37; see also Peter McCullough, 'Introduction', *ibid.* pp. xxii-xxiii; Nicholas Lossky, *Lancelot Andrewes, the Preacher (1555-1626): The Origins of the Mystical Theology of the Church of England*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1991, pp. 34, 101-211; Keith D. Stanlin and Thomas H. McCall, *Jacob Arminius: Theologian of Grace*, Oxford, Oxford University Press. 2012, pp. 106-88.

¹⁰¹ Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, pp. 82-4, 100; Diarmaid MacCullough, 'The Great Transition: 1530-1603', in *Westminster Abbey: A Church in History*, ed. David Cannadine, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2019, pp. 137-77, esp. 166-77; Julia F. Merritt, 'Monarchy, Protestantism and Revolution', *ibid.*, pp. 197-223, esp. pp. 180-84, 190-91; Merritt, 'The Cradle of Laudianism?', pp. 623-46.

¹⁰² 'Hakluyt Chronology', vol. I, pp. 317-18. Hakluyt was absent from the chapter meeting on 19 May 1606, *ibid.* vol. I. p. 318, citing Westminster Abbey Muniments, Chapter Act Book, 1542-1609, f. 289v. We do not know the reason for his absence, but since it occurred only five weeks after Hakluyt, along with seven others, had obtained from the Crown the first charter of the Virginia Company, it is possible that he was unable to attend the chapter meeting because he was engaged at the time with matters concerned with Virginia and the Virginia Company; 'The First Charter of Virginia, April 10, 1606', *The statutes at large; being a collection of all the*

Westminster's archives, given their nature as administrative records, do not—cannot—inform us whether or not Hakluyt was an enthusiastic supporter of the revival of ceremonialism underway in the Abbey during his time there, let alone whether he was a leader in advancing the movement. Nevertheless, the bequest he made in his last will and testament of £5 for the repair of the rose window in the north transept of the Abbey reveals his material support for the program of 'avant-garde conformity' to which his brothers Edmond and Oliver were themselves committed.¹⁰³ Although charitable giving intended for the improvement or repair of the fabric of churches had experienced a steep decline during the second half of the sixteenth century, Hakluyt's bequest to the Abbey came as the tide turned among the leadership of the Church of England towards the program for the 'beauty of holiness' favored by the supporters of 'avant-garde conformity'.¹⁰⁴ Richard Hakluyt's will does not describe what repair that window required. However, since the occasion for his making it in 1612—'revoking and frustrating ... all former wills or testaments'—was the need to include his recently purchased 'manour of Bridg-place' in his bequests to his son Edmond (and not as was common in the period because he believed himself near death), the repair does not appear to have been urgent. It seems instead to have been Hakluyt's response to the deterioration suffered over time to the existing medieval window.¹⁰⁵ There is no image of the window itself dating from when Hakluyt wrote his will in 1612, but there is a partial view of it in a painting, dating from ca. 1665, of the north transept of Westminster Abbey by Samuel van Hoogstraten (1627-1678). Since the Abbey's records give no indication that any substantial work was done to alter that window in its design or iconography between ca. 1600 and when Hoogstraten made his painting, we can rely on the latter for an impression of the window's overall design at the time Hakluyt wrote his will in 1612. Its outer ring consists of niches in which the heads and shoulders of a series of figures are displayed. Inside of this ring is another series of niches, much larger than the outer ring, in each of which can be seen a tall standing male figure. At the center of the window, surrounded by a series of smaller niches, the images of a cross and a book are just discernible. The most prominent features are the standing male figures and the central image of the cross and the book. It is not possible to know from the painting whether or not any words are inscribed on the image of the book.¹⁰⁶

laws of Virginia, from the first session of the legislature in the year 1619, ed. William Walter Hening, 13 vols, New York, Printed for the Editor, 1819-23, vol. I, pp. 57-66.

¹⁰³ Will of Richard Hakluyt, 1612, *Original Writings*, vol. II, p. 508. The sum of £5 in 1612 is the equivalent of ca. £1,200 for the price of a commodity in 2024 and of ca. £32,500 in income needed in 2024 to purchase a commodity of that value in that year.

¹⁰⁴ For data and evidence that the tide turned ca. 1610, see W. K. Jordan, *Philanthropy in England, 1480-1660; A Study of the Changing Patterns of English Social Aspirations*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1960, pp. 299, 301, 302, 317 and pp. 297-322 *passim*; Jordan, *Charities of London*, pp. 294-5 and pp. 267-307 *passim*,

¹⁰⁵ Will of Richard Hakluyt, 1612, *Original Writings*, vol. II, p. 506; for Hakluyt's acquisition of Bridge Place in Coddensham, Suffolk, see Parks, *Richard Hakluyt*, p. 258.

¹⁰⁶ Samuel Dirksz van Hoogstraten, 'View from the North Transept of Westminster Abbey, London' (1663/1668), Dordrecht Museum, Dordrecht, Netherlands [<https://artsandculture.google.com/asset/view-from-the-north-transept-of-westminster-abbey-london-hoogstraten-samuel-van/YAEFqNb6BPHEtw?hl=en>]. I am grateful to Dr. Matthew Payne, Keeper of the Muniments at Westminster Abbey, for calling my attention to this image and for his comments and advice in general regarding the rose window in the Abbey's north transept. Although Hakluyt signed his will on 20 August 1612, probate was granted to his executor, his son Edmond Hakluyt, only on 23 November 1616, which suggests that he died within a few weeks of that date in

Although the window was subsequently remodeled in 1722 under the supervision of Sir Christopher Wren, the Abbey's Surveyor, it is clear that it retained much of the overall design visible in Hoogstraten's painting, most especially the standing male figures and the cross and the book at the center. The current window, remodeled in the late Victorian period, also displays those same two prominent features.¹⁰⁷ The 1722 version is somewhat simpler in design than the one depicted by Hoogstraten, since apart from items that are primarily decorative, there are only two prominent features. At the center is a representation of a cross on which an open book is hung; in some commentaries the book is said to be the Holy Scriptures. Inscribed on the two pages in view are the Greek words *Λογος Σταυρου* (*Logos Staurou*), which translates literally into English as 'the word (or the reason or the logic) of the cross'. Around the circumference, we see sixteen niches each occupied by a male figure, twelve of them standing and four reclining. At the top is the standing figure of Christ holding an orb in his left hand and offering a blessing with his right. Halfway around on his left are the figures of the Evangelists St Mark and St John; halfway around his right are the Evangelists St Luke and St Matthew. They are shown reclining and are identifiable by their symbols: Mark with a lion, John with an eagle, Luke with an ox, and Matthew with an angel. The Apostles, excluding Judas Iscariot, occupy the remaining eleven niches. Since the large niches in Hoogstraten's painting show only standing male figures without any clear signs or symbols to identify them, it is not certain who they represented. Nevertheless it seems likely that Christ, the four Evangelists, and eleven of the twelve Apostles filled those places.¹⁰⁸

The most important feature of the window in all its versions is the juxtaposition of the image of the cross and book at the centre to the large male figures also portrayed in relation to it. If the window in 1612 showed, as is probable, the Greek words *Λογος Σταυρου* (*Logos Staurou*) on the open page of the book, as in 1722, Hakluyt with his training in theology and divinity and knowledge of the language would have recognized them as a reference to 1 Corinthians 1:18 in the Greek New Testament: *ο λογος γαρ ο του σταυρου τοις μεν απολλυμενοις μωρια εστιν τοις δε σωζομενοις ημιν δυναμις θεου εστιν*.¹⁰⁹ In the Latin Bible in use at the time the window was first created, the passage reads: '*Verbum enim crucis*

the Autumn of 1616; Will of Richard Hakluyt, 1612, *Original Writings*, vol II, pp. 506, 509. Westminster Abbey's records do not record that Edmond as his executor carried out this bequest. This is likely because the required repair had already been made before Richard Hakluyt's death in 1616.

¹⁰⁷ See William Combe, *The history of the Abbey Church of St. Peter's Westminster: its antiquities and monuments: In two volumes*, London: R. Ackermann, 1812, vol. II, p. 24; E. W. Brayley and J. P. Neale, *The History and Antiquities of the Abbey Church of St. Peter, Westminster*, 2 vols, London, Hurst, Robinson, and Co., 1823; vol. I, pp.117-32; vol II., pp. 11-12; W.R. Lethaby, *Westminster Abbey & the King's Craftsmen: A Study of Medieval Building*, London, Duckworth & Co., 1906, pp. 69-76; June Cray, 'Paintings by Thornhill at Chinnor', *The Burlington Magazine*, 132:10522 (1990), pp. 789-93; see also the typescript sheet entitled 'NORTH TRANSEPT ROSE WINDOW' in Westminster Abbey Muniments, WAM 65099, file 3.

¹⁰⁸ For an image of the 1722 window in colour, see Combe, *History of the Abbey Church*, between p. 24 and p. 24. Although the window was altered in some of its details between 1884 and 1892 and repaired in 1956, it still retains the main elements of its iconography as seen in its 1722 version and that are discernible in Hoogstraten's painting from the mid-1660s; <https://www.flickr.com/photos/amthomson/51621860114/>

¹⁰⁹ See the Greek New Testament printed by Robert Estienne in Paris in 1550: [Henri Estienne] *Tēs Kainēs Diathēkēs apanta. Euaggelion kata Matthaion. Kata Markon. Kata Loukan. Kata Iōannen. Praxeis tōn Apostolōn*. = *Novum Jesu Christi Domini Nostri Testamentum*, Paris, officina Robert Estienne, 1550 (USTC 150710).

pereuntibus quidem stultitia est: iis autem qui salvi fiunt, id est nobis, Dei virtus est’/ ‘For the word of the cross is foolishness to them that perish, but to us that are saved it is the power of God’.¹¹⁰

In the English of the King James Version of the Bible—authorized and published in 1611, a year before Hakluyt wrote his will—1 Corinthians 1:18 reads: ‘For the preaching of the Crosse is to them that perish, foolishnesse: but unto us which are saved, it is the power of God’.¹¹¹ This verse, it has been said, can ‘be read as a vindication of preaching as an instrument for discerning the elect and damning the reprobate,’¹¹² a view very much in keeping with the fact that Hakluyt regularly identified himself as a ‘Preacher’.¹¹³ However, in the context of religious politics at the time Hakluyt wrote his will, the juxtaposition in 1 Corinthians 1:18 between those that perish and those that are saved was open to divergent interpretations. One emphasized a strict Calvinist interpretation of the doctrine of predestination, according to which who was save and who was damned was preordained by God. A second offered an alternative understanding according to which preaching could be the instrument to bring sinful members of the audience toward belief and salvation.¹¹⁴ These possibilities also suggest that the citation of 1 Corinthians 1:18 at the center of the rose window in Westminster Abbey’s north transept should be read in light of the rest of the imagery depicted in the window—whether or not the standing male figures in 1612 were the same as those seen in the 1722 version of the window. On this reading, the imagery employs the ‘beauty of holiness’ to touch the souls of those who view it, so that the male figures surrounding the image of the cross and the book at the center of the window not only relate to their roles in preaching the ‘word’, but as is emphasized by Christ almost certain presence among them, to the divine truth they stand for, represent and convey. Viewed in this light, the central meaning of ‘the word of the cross’ is that it brings salvation to believers. Richard Hakluyt’s bequest to Westminster Abbey for the repair of the rose window in its north transept with its inscription reveals him to have held religious views, consistent with those put forth by his bothers Edmond and Oliver in the testamentary clauses of their will, of his own salvation by the ‘power of God’ transmitted by and through ‘the word of the cross’.

¹¹⁰ Among early translations of I Cor. 1:18 into English, there are only two that are close to the formulation in the Greek New Testament and the Vulgate: the Wycliffe Bible of 1382 and the Coverdale Bible of 1535. The former begins ‘For the word of the cros is foli to hem that perischen...’; the latter begins ‘For the worde of y^e crosse is foolishnesse to them that perishe...’. The translations into English in the Wycliffe Bible of 1382 and in the Coverdale Bible of 1535 are closest to a literal translation of the Latin in the Vulgate.

¹¹¹ *The Holy Bible conteyning the Old Testament, and the New: newly translated out of the originall tongues: & with the former translations diligently compare and reuised*, London, Robert Barker, printer to the Kings most excellent Majestie, 1611 (STC 2216). In substituting ‘peaching’ for ‘word’ in translating ‘*λογος* / *verbum*’, the translators of the King James Version followed the Tyndale Bible (1534), the Matthew Bible (1537), the ‘Great’ Bible (1539), the Geneva Version (1560/1599), and the Bishops Bible (1568).

¹¹² Professor Alexandra Walsham, personal communication, 5 May 2025.

¹¹³ See, e.g., Richard Hakluyt, ‘To the right honorable my singular good Lord., the Lord Charles Howard, Erle of Nottingham...’, 7 October 1598; STC 12626, 12626a, vol. I, sigs. *2r-*3v; Richard Hakluyt, ‘To the Right Honorable Sir Robert Cecil Knight, principall Secretarie to her Majestie...’, London, 24 October 1599, STC 12626, 12626a, vol. II, sigs. *2r-4v; Richard Hakluyt, ‘To the right honourable sir Robert Cecil, knight, principall Secretary to her Majestie...’, London, 1 September 1600, STC 12626, 12626a, vol. III, sigs. A2r-A3v

¹¹⁴ Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and their Audiences, 1590-1640*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2010, esp. pp. 343-89.