

John Gauden, First Biographer of Richard Hooker: an Influential Failure

DAVID NEELANDS

University of Toronto

Introduction

In publishing the first complete edition of Richard Hooker's *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiasticall Politie* in 1662, Bishop John Gauden also provided the first account of the "Life and Death of Mr. Richard Hooker". This biography was notoriously inadequate and was rapidly replaced by the venerable biography of Izaak Walton, which endured as the only available biography, largely unquestioned until the middle of the twentieth century. Now, through the work of C. J. Sisson, David Novarr, George Edelen and Philip Secor, a biography correcting Walton can be constructed. John Gauden's Life has never been republished. The purpose of this paper is to attempt to investigate the enduring importance of Gauden's biography, now that Walton is discounted.

Although Richard Hooker (1554-1600) has long been one of the most admired stylists of the English language in the sixteenth century, and the most frequently identified theologian of Anglicanism, accounts of his life have been remarkably inadequate. *The Life and Death of Mr. Richard Hooker*, the first biography of Richard Hooker, appeared with the first complete edition of his *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiasticall Politie* [Lawes], in 1662.¹ The biographer was John Gauden (1605-1662), newly appointed Bishop of Exeter and editor of the edition. John Gauden is well-known for another composition, *Eikon Basilike*, which purports to be an auto-biographical work of the executed King Charles I, and which is an important contribution to English literature, biography and politics. *Eikon Basilike* was a work of Royalist propaganda composed during the period of the Commonwealth and was so effective that the republican government commissioned John Milton to attack it and its monarchical positions. Gauden's biography of Hooker, however, has been totally supplanted by another commission, this time the very famous biography by Izaak Walton, and is almost unknown. The purpose of this essay is to review the assessment implied in this long obscurity, and to ask if it is entirely deserved.

First, it is necessary to give a brief summary of the factual details of the life of Richard Hooker and some testimonies to his importance, as John Gauden conveyed them in 1662, since they are not readily available.

Summary of Gauden's Biography of Richard Hooker

Hooker was born AD 1550, on Southgate Street, Exeter [p. 7].² He was the nephew of John Hooker, Chamberlain of Exeter, who contributed "both care and cost" towards his education in the Free School in Exeter [p. 7]. His parents lived contentedly and died in peace, leaving Hooker no hereditary maladies [pp. 7, 8]. By choice, Hooker had few friends [p. 9].

He was educated at the Grammar School in Exeter [p. 9]. He became a student at Oxford [p. 9]. He was, eventually, M.A. and Fellow of Corpus Christi College; he never achieved a B.D. or D.D., although well enough learned. He remained a Fellow of Corpus for seven years [pp. 9, 34, 35]. He remained in a retired mode at Corpus "for some years" before ordination and pastoral appointment, deliberately choosing obscurity [pp. 9-10]. John Jewel and John Reynolds were fellow members of Corpus, but their relationship with Hooker is not stated [pp. 10-11].

Not wishing to overstay at University, Hooker eventually fulfilled his duty of pastoral ministry and accepted, in turn, two "small obscure livings", although he was fitter for "higher and more accurate work". Hooker had no more than one living at a time, and "one or two prebendaries at most", throughout his life [pp. 11, 13, 34]. He remained in two country parishes for eight years, honing his skills there for "his great work" [p. 14]. The first parish was Boscomb, to which he was presented by Corpus Christi College [pp. 11, 12]. In 1584, he left Boscomb "in the West" to take up Drayton Beauchamp in Lincolnshire, "not much better than Boscomb", to which he was presented by a private patron [pp. 11, 12, 35].

Hooker's commitment to his major literary work began when he was alerted by "Non-conformists" pressing "parochial Presbyters and their lay-elders", and then alarmed by a *Supplication* signed by 1,000 ministers [p. 14]. It is uncertain what support Hooker had from eminent persons in writing and publishing his defence of the established polity, but probably Whitgift encouraged Hooker [p. 15] in this project. Hooker responds to "T.C.", at least in Book V of the *Lawes* [p. 23].³

Hooker settled at the Temple "one of the Inns of Court" through the agency of Whitgift, on the authority of Queen Elizabeth. The responsibility of the Master "or Guardian" of the Temple was to preach in the forenoon [p. 29]. Mr. Travers was elected ("popularly chosen") by the [legal] Society to be Lecturer in the afternoon [p. 29]. The lawyers were sympathetic to "the Disciplinary Party" in part because of long-standing jealousy, as practitioners of the Common Law, for the power of the Ecclesiastical courts [p. 29]. In the contests between Hooker and Travers, Travers drew a larger but more vulgar audience. Although Travers was thought to be the better preacher, Hooker's sermons had more substance [pp. 29-30]. The dispute came to the attention of the Queen and her Council. Both Hooker and Travers were brought before the Queen and Council [pp. 30-31]. The root of

their disagreement was based on a difference of opinion with respect to the status of the Church of Rome: Hooker held that the Church of Rome was a true church, though not a pure, sound and perfect one; Travers held that the Church of Rome was no church [p. 30].

Hooker “removed to another place of less envy, and more privacy in Kent” (Bishopsbourne) in 1594, and was also made Prebend of Canterbury. Hooker and Travers respected each other and admired each other more after they were separated [pp. 31, 35]. In 1592, Hooker became Prebendary in Salisbury and Sub-dean [p. 35]. Hooker died before the last three books of the *Lawes* were published, perhaps before they were completed. Unnamed antagonists hoped he had not finished them and would have wished to suppress them, if they had known they were completed [p. 23]. The last three books are clearly of Hooker’s authorship, though perhaps not polished [p. 24]. Book VII is in Hooker’s handwriting; Book VIII in another hand, corrected in Hooker’s hand [p. 26]. Hooker died aged 50, in 1599 [p. 35]. He was never married [p. 35]. His will was not known; a modest estate is assumed [p. 36]. Hooker’s body was interred in the chancel of the church at Bishopsbourne [p. 36], and his effigy was erected there in 1634 by Sir William Cowper [p. 36].

Gauden’s *Life* was to enjoy only a very brief currency, and Gauden himself was to die within a year. Almost immediately after the biography appeared, Izaak Walton (1593-1683), twelve years Gauden’s senior, was recruited to compose a more appropriate and flattering biography, which was printed with Hooker’s *Works* in the second edition (1666) and all subsequent editions of the *Works* until the Folger Library Edition (begun in 1977). In addition to being a much-read biography, Walton’s *Life of Richard Hooker* is itself an ideological masterpiece, supporting the official viewpoint of the Restoration, as it enforced conformity to Laudian standards of church polity and practice, in exhibiting a saintly learned and “churchy” ideal pastor.

Walton’s accuracy was sometimes modestly questioned, as by John Keble in his edition of Hooker’s *Works* in 1836,⁴ but no extended criticism was leveled at its details or interpretation until C. J. Sisson, working with material available in the Public Records Office and elsewhere, showed, in 1940, that Walton’s biography was based on manifold untruths.⁵ In 1958, David Novarr provided a comprehensive treatment of Walton’s method and compositional practice, further undermining confidence in the accuracy of Walton’s biography.⁶ For the critical apparatus of the Folger Library Edition of Hooker’s *Works*, George Edelen assembled the hard chronology of Hooker’s life.⁷ Finally, in 1995, the first modern biography of Hooker, written by Philip Secor, appeared.⁸ Now that Walton is thoroughly replaced as a biography, whatever the literary merits of his *Life of Richard Hooker* may continue to be, the accuracy of his nearly forgotten predecessor John Gauden may be assessed. In contrast to what Gauden wrote, the following are now assumed or established as factual details.

Current Assumptions about Richard Hooker Correcting John Gauden's Account

Hooker was born about early April 1554 (not 1550), in Heavytree, just outside Exeter (not inside Exeter). He was indeed educated at Exeter Grammar School, there being no available alternative, probably with considerable support from his uncle, John Hooker. His parents were not unremarkable and ordinary, and not particularly supportive: his father had little to do with Richard Hooker and was absent in Ireland on important public business most of his life after Hooker was born; his mother is and probably was unknown; Richard Hooker was possibly illegitimate. He often experienced bad health.

Hooker did attend Oxford: in Fall 1569, he matriculated at Corpus Christi College. In October 1573, he supplicated BA, was admitted January 1574, and determined early 1574; on 24 December 1573, he was admitted disciple at Corpus Christi College; on 4 February 1577, he supplicated MA, was licensed 29 March 1577, and incorporated later in 1577; on 16 September 1577, he became a Scholar (probationary Fellow) of Corpus Christi College; by September 1578, he was a full Fellow; on 14 July 1579, he was appointed deputy Professor of Hebrew. Hooker was ordained deacon in London, 14 August 1579, that is, while he was still at Corpus Christi College.

Hooker may have had important relations with Jewel, and certainly knew Reynolds. According to Walton and Secor, Hooker visited Jewel in Summer 1571, and received financial support from him; he and Reynolds were expelled together from Corpus Christi College in October 1580.

Hooker's appointment to Boscomb came after his stay at the Temple and was not his first benefice; it was not an insignificant parish, and he was not presented by his college; in July 1591, having been Master of the Temple for six years, Hooker exchanged benefices with Nicholas Baldgay, rector of Boscomb, in Wiltshire, Diocese of Salisbury.

About Drayton Beauchamp, Gauden was more accurate. In October 1584, Hooker was presented by John Cheyne, and appointed to the parish of Drayton Beauchamp in Buckinghamshire, Diocese of Lincoln; on 12 October 1585, Hooker resigned Drayton Beauchamp (he had been Master of the Temple since March).

Hooker was indeed supported by Whitgift: he was identified by Whitgift and clearly assisted by him, as well as by a group of influential persons in and around the household of the wealthy draper John Churchman. All deserved the title "eminent persons".

Gauden's details about the appointment to the Temple are more accurate: on 17 March 1585, Hooker was appointed as Master of the Temple by Letters Patent from the Crown. Gauden's interpretation of Hooker's work and controversy at the Temple are not accurate in detail. His duties were far broader than preaching the morning sermon. Further, divisions at the Temple do not appear to have been based on jealousy between the

practitioners of the Common Law and the officials of the ecclesiastical courts, as Gauden held; this may be a recollection of difficulties in the seventeenth century leading up to the Civil War. There is every reason to accept the fact that Hooker was a less popular preacher than Travers, but it is almost certain that neither Hooker nor Travers was summoned before either Queen or Council. Gauden's story sounds much more like the commotions of the reign of King Charles I in the seventeenth century.

Hooker was indeed appointed to Bishopsbourne in January 1594/5, presented by the Queen. But it was actually to Boscomb and the other appointments in the Diocese of Salisbury (not to Bishopsbourne) that he moved on leaving the Temple in 1591. In July 1591 (not 1592), as rector of Boscomb, he was indeed appointed prebend of Netheravon attached to Salisbury Cathedral.

Richard Hooker died November 2, 1600 (not 1599), aged approximately 47, although his monument gives his age as 50 (and his year of death as 1603). Hooker was married: on 13 February 1588, he married Joan Churchman at St. Augustine's Church, London, the London parish church of the Churchman household; they had at least two sons and three daughters between 1589 and 1597.

Hooker did indeed have a will, which in its own way became the basis of famous litigation, and he left a substantial estate. The will was made 25 October 1600, and was referred to in famous suits in Chancery 1610-1624. Gauden was correct about the place of burial and the monument. In fact, he actually corrected one of his sources, Fuller, who had written that Sir Edwin Sandys, not Sir William Cowper, had erected the monument.

Gauden and his Sources

Even given the challenges Gauden faced in reconstructing Hooker's life, his performance as a factually accurate biographer is not inspiring. In part, this could be attributable to his sources. Gauden had characterized those who had previously written about Hooker as biased, brief, envious and unsympathetic persons [p. 2]. This assessment, however, is not fair to Gauden's known sources, except perhaps for the matter of brevity, whatever other sources if any Gauden may have had.

For Gauden's known sources included the second portion of the Latin *Annals of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* by the venerable William Camden (1551-1623), first published in 1625 and *The Church History of Britain* by Thomas Fuller (1608-1661), first published in 1655. Neither of these sources could be characterized as unsympathetic. Mr. Camden, indeed, praised Hooker for "modesty, temperance, meekness and other virtues" [p. 39], and almost the whole of Camden's brief notice is translated into Gauden's treatise. From Camden, Gauden took not only this praise, but also the erroneous death date of 1599. From Fuller, Gauden took the misinfor-

mation that Hooker died unmarried and the account of the quarrel between Hooker and Travers.

There may be other written sources, but they are not obvious and it might be suspected that Gauden made much of the absence of sources. In any case, neither Camden nor Fuller can be thought of as biased, envious or unsympathetic, although Camden treats only briefly of Hooker, and only in noting his death. And Fuller spends less time on Hooker than on Travers, since Travers was deemed to be of greater interest.

In specifying an erroneous place of birth within Exeter, Gauden referred to a Dr. Vilvain, "an Ancient and Learned Physician in Exeter". Dr. Vilvain was apparently still alive in 1662, which would make him fairly remote from the actual birth of Hooker 108 years earlier, but the strange reference lends an air of credibility and may even have indicated that Gauden had done some primary research in Exeter.

Further, although Gauden was seriously wrong about the timing and means of Hooker's appointment to the parish of Boscomb, Gauden does have correct information about Hooker's degrees, the length of the period Hooker was a Fellow at Corpus (seven years, 1577-1584, although Gauden may have had another period in mind), his appointment to Drayton Beauchamp, the means of his appointment to the Temple, the date and place of his appointment to Bishopsbourne and the approximate date and titles of his appointments in Salisbury. This means that he indeed had other sources not disclosed, but it is hard to identify who his predecessors unsympathetically disposed to Hooker could have been.

Gauden's Obtuseness

Gauden's perspicuity may be gauged by his use of sources known to us: even when the sources were in front of him, Gauden did not interpret them accurately. In summarizing Hooker's writings, for instance, he offers an account of twelve folio pages (over one quarter of his treatise), but the value does not match the attention given to it. Book I, the second longest of the books, is dispatched in half a page that notes the subject of laws and some other details that could be taken from the chapter summaries printed at the beginning. Book II has a much longer summary, emphasizing the appropriateness of the church's power in the details of religion. In defending the freedom of the church to make rules for itself, Hooker is declared to have struck "the right vein" of the body of Non-conformity [p. 20], a blow Gauden interprets as one of Hooker's principal and lasting contributions. Book III, Book IV and Book VIII are summarized briefly; the subject of Book IV sounds more like the subject of Book V. The summary of Book V is longer, but with few indications of knowledge of detail. In the case of Book VI, Gauden appears to summarize only the topics as originally announced, not the book as published. Book VII (which was actually set and inserted by the printers after the type of the rest of the text of the

volume had been set), now published for the first time, gets a longer treatment, but the seven points Gauden makes in his summary appear to be his own apologia for episcopacy and do not relate easily to the book printed. The smaller tractates, which Gauden includes in the edition, are not mentioned at all in Gauden's treatise, with the exception of the possible reference to Travers' *Appeal to the Council* and Hooker's response to Whitgift, which may be the source of Gauden's dubious claim that Hooker and Travers were both summoned to appear before the Queen and her Council.

Thus, whether or not Gauden had extensive sources not known to us, we may make a judgement of his ability by the way in which he introduces and summarizes the material he presents that is known to us.

Gauden's Legacy

For all his mistakes, Gauden's account was not only the stimulus for Walton's famous *Life*; it was also the source for some of Walton's most significant fictions and enhancements. Gauden's first and most important legacy stemmed from his very inadequacy: if it had been a more appropriate biography from the point of view of those now in power, Walton's biography would probably not have been. The appearance of the *Life and Death of Mr. Richard Hooker* precipitated an urgent commission for Isaac Walton, already an old man, quickly to write his *Life of Richard Hooker*. And, although it has become stylish since the work of C. J. Sisson and David Novarr to discount the accuracy of Walton, Walton's *Life of Hooker* (first published 1665) is a remarkable enough work, and remains well-known, not least for its convincing *apologia* for Restoration ideology.

Walton corrected several of the mistakes in Gauden's history. Indeed, Novarr has argued that it was incumbent on him to go out of his way to seek accurate sources for the details of Hooker's life precisely to discredit Gauden.⁹ Walton, for instance, correctly places Hooker's appointment to Boscomb in the period after the Mastership of the Temple. Walton, apparently on the basis of records at Corpus Christi College, establishes a much more accurate account of Hooker's birth and possibly the support of Jewel. In his *History of the Worthies of the Church of England* (published posthumously in 1662), Fuller had corrected his earlier mistakes, copied by Gauden, about Hooker's marital state and the originator of the monument in Bishopsbourne parish church. Walton followed Fuller's correction, but overcorrected Gauden on the marriage: Fuller added the comment in 1662 that Hooker's wife and children "were neither to his comfort, when living, nor credit when dead". Whatever Fuller may have meant, this comment may be a principal source for Walton's fictional calumny about Hooker's spouse, Joan Churchman, exposed by C. J. Sisson – a fiction useful to Walton as casting doubt on the contents of the posthumous three books of Hooker's *Lawes*, which in their published form included views on the

episcopacy and monarchy that had been out of favour in royalist circles since William Laud.

Just possibly Walton owed a considerable debt to Gauden's observations: Gauden had presented Hooker as receiving unsympathetic treatment from previous authors, although it is difficult to find any such. Gauden had acknowledged difficulties in the texts of the last three books of the *Lawes*, although he vouched for Hooker's handwriting in Books VII and VIII [p. 26]; he also expressed the opinion that there were those who had hoped, until their appearance, that they had not been finished, and would have wished to suppress them [p. 23]. It was perhaps only a slight leap for Walton to offer us the account of those who did mutilate them, with the connivance of Hooker's spouse, whose reality had been affirmed by Fuller at the same time as her character had been sullied. As well, it may be from Gauden's reference to Jewel, as a former member of Hooker's college, that Walton developed the account of Jewel offering financial support to Hooker, which is not otherwise documented, except in Walton.

Gauden is almost certainly the author of the strange account of Hooker's blackmail [pp. 32-33]. Gauden claims to have received the "strange narrative" from Fuller, but the story is not in Fuller. In at least three different places, Fuller refers to aspersions cast at Hooker and his character (Fuller, ix, 40, 50, 58) but he does not relay the story told by Gauden, which may be summarized as follows:

Hooker was the subject of scurrilous pamphlets, whose authors also entrapped him in a blackmail plot involving a woman. Hooker paid the blackmail on the spot and later at his lodgings. His friend, Sir Edwin Sandys, shocked at the presence of the blackmailers in Hooker's chamber, eventually discovered the truth, had the blackmailers arrested and interrogated separately. They were convicted and sent to Bridewell prison [pp. 32-33].

In the first part of this story, Gauden may have been thinking of the anonymous authors of *A Christian Letter*, published at the very end of Hooker's life, but the story is, in detail, an extraordinary and an incredible one. Walton, however, did not simply drop it. He summarized it as an embarrassing story, to be told apparently since not to tell it would give it undue credibility. Walton added credibility by indicating that the plot was contrived by a dissenter, whose undisclosed name had been given to Walton; he also added that George Cranmer was involved with Sandys in delivering Hooker from his hour of trial; he added the detail that the accusers begged Hooker's pardon, thus providing a long soliloquy about forgiveness from the Christ-like Hooker; and finally, he added that Hooker sought their judicial pardon, but was unsuccessful in obtaining it (Keble, i, 82-3).

In this "strange narrative" Walton does not give all the embarrassing particulars that Gauden had; but he explicitly compares Hooker with Susannah, another innocent and holy victim of scurrilous lies. Gauden had not mentioned her name, but the source for Walton in Gauden is not far to

seek. Gauden had mentioned that the blackmailers were trapped by being interrogated separately. This is precisely what the Hebrew prophet Daniel had done with Susannah's accusers in the well-known biblical narrative (Susannah, 51-55). Thus Walton apparently saw an opportunity in what was otherwise simply fabulous in Gauden: Hooker becomes the figure of innocence accused, like Susannah (and like Athanasius too, as Walton adds for good measure). More significantly, the figure of a woman duping the innocent Hooker is possible the origin of Walton's story of Mrs. John Churchman and Joan Churchman forcing Hooker into an unwanted marriage.

Perhaps the most interesting possibility of a legacy from Gauden in Walton is a simple reference Gauden made to the attractiveness of Hooker's theological qualities beyond the Reformed household. Gauden referred to the notice of Hooker by Dr. Richard Holdsworth (1590-1649), whom he styles "a Confessor and Martyr in the late Persecution". Gauden then quotes Holdsworth: "*Hookerus magnus ille mysta, quem pro sanctissimo & modestissimo viro nostraeque, doctrine conseis habendum esse, & inter nos Pontificii liberrime fateri non aspernantur*"¹⁰, and gives his own paraphrase: "The very Papists owned Mr. Hooker that profound Divine, to be one of the most Learned, Holy and Modest of those that have asserted the Church of England, and Reformed Religion" [p. 39].

This praise fits in well with Gauden's emphasis on the moderate Reformed Orthodoxy of Hooker, together with his appeal to the broadest range of theological opinion, an emphasis that will be considered later in this essay. But is this not as well a possible, even likely, source of another of Walton's fables? For Walton, in assembling his list of authorities for Hooker's significance, brings in the most unlikely voice, that of the Pope himself, specifically Clement VIII. Here is Walton's story:

And I have been told more than forty years past, that either Cardinal Allen, or learned Dr. Stapleton (both Englishmen, and in Italy about the time when Hooker's four Books were first printed) meeting with this general frame of them, were desirous to read an author that both the reformed and the learned of their own Romish Church did so much magnify, and therefor caused them to be sent for to Rome; and after reading them, boasted to the Pope, which then was Clement the Eighth "That though he had lately said he never met with an English book whose writer deserved the name of an author; yet there now appeared a wonder to them, and it would be so to his Holiness, if it were in Latin; for a poor obscure English priest had writ four such Books of Laws and Church-Polity, and in a style that expressed such a grave and so humble a majesty, with such clear demonstration of reason, that in all their readings they had not met with any that exceeded them"; and this begot in the Pope an earnest desire that Dr. Stapleton should bring the said four books, and looking on the English read a part of them to him in Latin; which Dr. Stapleton did, to the end of the first book; at the conclusion of which, the Pope spake to this purpose: "There is no learning that this man hath not searcht into; nothing too hard for his understanding; this man indeed deserves the name of an author; his books will get reverence by age, for there is in them such seeds of eternity, that if the

rest be like this, they shall last till the last fire shall consume all learning" (Keble, i, 70-71).

The first four books were published in London in 1593, the fifth in 1597. Clement VIII was pope from 1592-1605. Cardinal Allen died in 1594 and Dr. Stapleton in 1598. Thus the incident could have happened only in the brief period between 1593 and 1598. Walton claims to have heard about it before about 1620. It is not, however, simply the difficulties of the timing of the incident that make it entirely improbable. It is the sheer unlikelihood that the work of a relatively unknown Richard Hooker would be so commended and so attended to.¹¹ Is it not probable that one of the most famous legends about Hooker, first told apparently in Walton and frequently repeated thereafter, was actually suggested by a relatively innocent remark of John Gauden? David Novarr has shown us that Walton was not above telling a good story that would serve his purpose. And this story is one of his best – one that would likely have been repeated for its effect many times before 1665, if it had been known.

Was Gauden Thoroughly Wrong about Hooker? Gauden's Independent Assessment

Aside from these possible influences on the fictional flights of the much more famous biography of Walton, there is one further note that we should take of Gauden. Gauden, in stressing the importance of Hooker in his time, made clear references to Hooker's moderate position.

For Gauden, Hooker is the enemy of faction [p. 3]; Hooker prophesied the troubles that were to come after him in the seventeenth century "by the inordinate pretensions of some mens opinions and practices" [p. 3]; after Hooker, the church which he defended became the source of its own troubles through its lawless and superficial life [p. 4]; and abandoning Hooker's view, these later churchmen were arrogant, and brought private judgements to their positions of power [p. 5]. Thus, for Gauden, the Presbyterian assault was the just dessert of the Church of England's lawless behaviour [p. 5]. (These opinions must be been particularly abhorrent to the architects of the *Act of Uniformity* of 1662). The Restoration was now about to restore the church's "true liberty" after the horror of revolution, those true liberties of its "former law" so ably defended by Richard Hooker [p. 6].

This strain of Gauden's account was certainly not consistent with the attitude towards the troubles of the previous twenty years of those who ultimately triumphed in the Restoration and the new *Act of Uniformity*, which itself could hardly be termed "true Liberty". It may seem startling for the author of *Eikon Basilike*, the most successful of the Royalist propaganda pieces during the Commonwealth, but the triumph of the Restoration would not be permanent until later in the same year in which

Gauden published his edition. Gauden's position was, however, much more consistent with the attitude previously expressed by Charles II in the *Declaration of Breda* (1660) of a tolerant and inclusive settlement.

It was much also more consonant with John Gauden's own long-term convictions before he had been an exile. Gauden had initially been sympathetic to various initiatives of the Parliamentarians; he was invited to preach before the House of Commons on 29 November 1640. In 1641, he was nominated to the deanery of Bocking in Essex. But he also procured a collation to that position from Archbishop Laud, the legitimate patron, then in the Tower. (This dangerous act hardly suggests a careful trimmer, or an unconditional parliamentary loyalist.) He was chosen as one of the Westminster Assembly of Divines in 1643, but was removed from the Assembly because he was for regulating, not abolishing, the episcopacy. He continued to use the outlawed *Book of Common Prayer* longer in his parish than in any in the neighbourhood, although eventually he acceded to the regulations and abandoned it. From 1645 on, he became progressively disillusioned by the Parliamentary agenda, and began to write critical pamphlets on behalf of the traditional institutions of the Church of England. He was totally opposed to the execution of the King. He was appointed chaplain to King Charles II on his restoration in 1660 and made Bishop of Exeter later that same year. He apparently intended the edition of Hooker's works to be a New Year's Day present for the new King on New Years' Day 1661/2.

Gauden was thus an involved moderate, attempting as long as he could to conform to the Church, opposed to exaggerated claims for its institutions, but loyal to them, and to the King. He was a loyal son of the Church of England as reformed and free to order its life as it saw fit, avoiding the extreme and exaggerated positions of the King's supporters as much as the revolution of the "lawless" Presbyterians who would end the church's liberty. He praised Hooker with feeling on account of Hooker's defence of the liberty of the church to determine its own institutions – not overly dependent on Scripture stretched beyond its purposes, or on the fashions of foreign churches – and called this an attack on the vein of Non-conformity.

This interpretation may be more historically accurate overall than that of Izaak Walton. If some in our time had tried to retrieve the "Protestant Hooker",¹² they may be in the tradition of John Gauden, who could assess Richard Hooker's significance without lifting him from the Church of England in the sixteenth century. Perhaps we can now see Richard Hooker as, indeed, first and foremost, the enemy of faction and the defender of the Church of England's true liberty, both from the constraints of a rigid Bible-based polity and from unquestioned foreign influence, or jurisdiction.

Notes

¹ *The Works of Mr. Richard Hooker* (London, 1662).

² Page references in square brackets in this summary and later in the essay are to the 1662 edition.

³ Gauden does not indicate that he knows that T.C. was the famous Puritan polemicist Thomas Cartwright.

⁴ See, for example, his comments, pages ix to xi in John Keble (ed.), *Works of Richard Hooker*, 8th edn. (Oxford, 1888).

⁵ C. J. Sisson, *The Judicious Marriage of Mr. Hooker and the Birth of The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (Cambridge, 1940).

⁶ David Novarr, *The Making of Walton's Lives* (Ithaca, New York, 1958).

⁷ Georges Edelen, "A Chronology of Richard Hooker's Life", in *The Folger Library Edition Works of Richard Hooker*, vol. 6, part 1 (Binghamton, New York, 1993).

⁸ Philip Secor, *Richard Hooker, Prophet of Anglicanism* (Tunbridge Wells, 1999).

⁹ Novarr, *The Making of Walton's Lives*, 275.

¹⁰ [Literal trans.] "Hooker, that great mystic, whom you agree [*conseis=consentis?*] to be considered a most holy and modest man and of our doctrine, and 'whom' the papists [lit. the men of the Pontiff] do not refuse [*aspernantur*] most freely to admit 'to be' one of us [lit. among us]".

¹¹ Although thirty years later, the circle of men around Viscount Falkland at Great Tew did have a Latin translation of the *Lawes* made apparently to argue for a Christian rapprochement in Europe. See Hugh Trevor-Roper, *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans* (Chicago, 1988), 191-7. Perhaps Walton had this episode in mind as well.

¹² See for example, Nigel Atkinson, *Richard Hooker and the Authority of Scripture, Tradition and Reason* (Carlisle, 1997) and W. J. Torrance Kirby, *Richard Hooker's Doctrine of the Royal Supremacy* (Leiden, 1990).

John Gauden has 25 books on Goodreads with 43 ratings. John Gauden's most popular book is *Eikon Basilike: With Selections from Eikonoklastes*. The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker by Richard Hooker, Izaak Walton (Biographer), John Gauden (Editor). 4.60 avg rating 5 ratings published 2010 42 editions. Want to Read saving Error rating book.

Richard Hooker. Encyclopedia of World Biography COPYRIGHT 2004 The Gale Group Inc. Richard Hooker. The English divine Richard Hooker (1554-1600) is best known for his "Ecclesiastical Polity," a work that provided a solid theological basis for the newly established Church of England. Nothing is known of Richard Hooker's early life apart from his birth at Exeter in Devonshire. He went to Corpus Christi College, Oxford, about 1568. An early life of Hooker by Gauden, Bishop of Worcester, was so unsatisfactory that Archbishop Sheldon of Canterbury commissioned Izaak Walton to write a biography. This has been the standard life since its publication in 1665 and was included in the 1888 edition of Hooker's Works. Richard Hooker's biography and life story. Richard Hooker (March 1554 3 November 1600) was an Anglican priest and an influential theologian. Hooker's emphases on reason, tolerance and the value of tradition came. Richard came from a good family, but one that was neither noble nor wealthy. His uncle John Hooker was a success and served as the chamberlain of Exeter. Hooker's uncle was able to obtain for Richard the help of another Devon native, John Jewel, bishop of Salisbury. The bishop saw to it that Richard was accepted to Corpus Christi College, Oxford, where he became a fellow of the society in 1577.[2] On 14 August 1579 Hooker was ordained a priest by Edwin Sandys, then bishop of London.