

Queen Mary, University of London

Reducing these loose papers into this order:

A Bibliographical Sociology of
The Principall Navigations (1589)

A Dissertation Submitted to the School of English for the Degree
of PhD

Katherine Diamond

September, 2012

Abstract

This thesis takes the first edition of *Principall Navigations, Voiages and Discoveries of the English Nation* (1589) as its focus. A significant, sixteenth-century printed text and Richard Hakluyt's major work, it is familiar to scholars of the period. Its rich archival source has aided understanding of early modern geography, English discovery and cultural encounters. It has also been evaluated in relation to Hakluyt's substantial contribution to the burgeoning literature of vernacular prose and to imperial expansionism.

My thesis conceives a social history of the production, transmission and reception of *Principall Navigations* from bibliographical analysis, an investigative method that has remained largely untapped. In each chapter, I incorporate information drawn from the material text into an appreciation of historical practice and relocate *Principall Navigations* more precisely in its socio-historical moment. This engages with and, in some cases, destabilizes current critical positions.

In the first chapter, I explore the importance of Hakluyt's patrons. Francis Walsingham's essential role is recorded through his connection with the various interdependent networks of people involved in the book's production and Hakluyt's description of his 'prescribed limites'. This chapter re-evaluates authorial subjectivity. In chapter two, Walsingham's authority over the Queen's printing house generally and the production of *Principall Navigations* particularly is traced through the examination of the Stationers' Company archive and the evolution of the office of the royal printer. This chapter contends that Walsingham commanded the production of *Principall Navigations*. Chapter three represents a bibliographical study which integrates the production of *Principall Navigations* into the Queen's printers' general work patterns and investigates textual variants and paper-stocks. The date of the interpolation of the Drake leaves is posited with reference to the debate concerning their suppression. The final chapter explores the relationship between early modern readers and empirical records, through historical reading practice, and concludes by evaluating the location of discursive authority.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	5
Abbreviations.....	7
Editing Criteria.....	9
Introduction.....	10
Chapter One: ‘The compasse of [Richard Hakluyt’s] prescribed limites’: Re-evaluating authorial subjectivity.....	24
Chapter Two: Reaping ‘the Tenth parte of his charge’: The Queen’s Printer, the Principal Secretary and the Production of <i>Principall Navigations</i> (1589).....	53
Chapter Three: ‘[T]he censure of the learned phisitian M. Doctor Iames’: Printing, Proof-reading and Signs of Censorship in <i>Principall Navigations</i> (1589).....	101
Chapter Four: ‘Vale, atque aut meliora dato, aut his utere mecum’: Indications of Anticipated Use in <i>Principall Navigations</i> (1589).....	168
Conclusion.....	216
Bibliography.....	222
<u>Appendices</u>	
<u>Appendix A</u>	245
<u>Details of the activities of the Queen’s printing house during the years 1577-1589, which includes:</u>	
1) The Queen’s Printers’ activities (1577-1589) taken from <i>STC</i> – Column Headers refer to the work of the office of royal printer as detailed by patent.....	246
2) Units of work in sheets from 1586-1589 (taken from items listed in <i>STC</i> , with reference to EEBO, ESTC and, where possible, the books).....	296
3) Transcription Christopher Barker’s Reversionary Patent.....	298
<u>Appendix B</u>	300
<u>Analytical Bibliographical Details from <i>Principall Navigations, Voiages and Discoveries of the English Nation</i> (1589) — a study of five texts — which includes:</u>	

1) Quasi-facsimile title page.....	301
2) Collation formula for an ideal copy (with illustrative notes).....	302
3) Statement of format.....	302
4) Range of paper dimensions across copies studied	303
5) Collational formulae of individual copies studied.....	303
6) Chain-line measurements & beta-ray images.....	305
7) BL: enhanced photograph of Drake leaves watermark.....	310
8) Hand-drawn <i>deux colonnes</i> watermark Bodleian Ashm. 1690.....	311
9) Example of the print-publication history of <i>The Principal Navigations, Voyages [Traffiques] and Discoveries of the English Nation</i>	312
10) Textual variants discovered across 5 copies (using McLeod collator):.....	314
<i>Principall Navigations</i> (1965):	Signet
Bodleian Asm. 1690:	Bod1
Bodleian Douce H 419:	Bod2
British Library BL C.32.m.10:	BL
University of London Library	
[S.L.] I [Hakluyt – 1589] FOL.	ULL
11) Recurrence of Skeleton Formes.....	329
Appendix C.....	331
1) A list of Richard Hakluyt's works.....	332

Acknowledgements

In researching the production history of *Principall Navigations*, I was assisted by many generous scholars and friends. A project of this nature is only possible within a knowledge-sharing community as fostered at Queen Mary and I am extremely grateful to have been given the opportunity to study here under the supervision of Jerry Brotton. Jerry always engaged carefully with my ideas, provided incisive, thought-provoking criticism, inspiration and pertinent direction for further exploration. Moreover, the progression of this project was greatly enabled by his sustained support of my own developing research interests and his personal readiness to re-assess familiar material from alternative perspectives. Despite this thesis representing the culmination of my own interpretations, my indebtedness to Jerry is obvious throughout. In studying at Queen Mary, I also benefitted from teaching alongside Warren Boucher and Mary Flannery and from meetings with David Colclough and Evelyn Welch who read and commented upon early drafts. Further, the *viva* examination was extremely constructive and I would like to thank Professor Woudhuysen and Professor Hadfield for their generous discussion of my work and their advice on how best to improve the thesis.

In the early years, when examining the archives at Stationers' Hall, I learnt invaluable from lively dialogue with Robin Myers. Her familiarity with the history of the Stationers' Company and her willingness to reflect upon the detail prompted by my basic enquiries gave me the confidence to ask questions of others. Fortunately, as I began to explore the activities of the Queen's printer, Maria Wakely and the late Graham Rees were preparing their book on the royal printing house under James I. Their enthusiasm for printers' invoices, laid paper and compositor practice encouraged me further along this avenue and I profited from their personal introductions to Randall McLeod and Carter Hailey, to whom I turned for expert opinions at later stages in the project.

The librarians at the British Library and the Bodleian were always amenable to my requests for lighting sheets, magnifying glasses and millimetre rules. Moira Goff and Karen Limper-Herz, curators at the British Library, organized the use of the collating machine in a basement room. The imaging department at the Bodleian produced several

superb beta-ray images of watermarks, a time-consuming process, to aid my distinction between paper-stocks. As these images were indispensable for my enquiries, I was particularly thankful for their provision of this service. The University of London Library also provided me with their 1589 holding of *Principall Navigations* for use with the collating machine.

On a personal note, I would like to thank my friends and family. First, I would like to thank the members of the English department at Tiffin School for their support of my research. At Queen Mary, Una McIlvenna, Tessa Whitehouse and Jacqui Johnson engaged with various chapters, offered invaluable advice and made my time here all the more enjoyable. The writing of this thesis has inevitably had an impact on my family. My wonderful husband could not have been more supportive of my endeavours both in his constructive consideration of my work and in his love. Finally, however, I wanted to dedicate the culmination of my efforts to my parents, from whom I learnt to recognize, from an early age, the extraordinary benefits and shared pleasure of conversation, that essential yet unrecorded component of all written research.

Abbreviations

Arber	<i>A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London: 1554-1640 AD</i> , ed. by Edward Arber, 5 vols (London & Birmingham: Privately Printed, 1875-1877 & 1894)
BL	British Library
CPR	<i>Calendar of Patent Rolls</i>
CSP	<i>Calendar of State Papers</i>
CSPF	<i>Calendar of State Papers Foreign</i>
EEBO	Early English Books Online
ESTC	English Short-Title catalogue of books published between 1473-1800 (mainly, but not exclusively, in English), online version
fol./ fols	folio(s)
HMSO	His / Her Majesty's Stationery Office
HN	Huntington Library
MS(S)	Manuscript(s)
n. s.	New series
ODNB	<i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography</i>
OED	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i>
<i>Original Writings</i>	<i>The Original Writings and Correspondence of the Two Richard Hakluyts</i> , ed. by E. G. R. Taylor, 2 vols, Hakluyt Society, 2 nd series, nos 76-77 (London: Cambridge University Press for the Hakluyt Society)
<i>Principall Navigations</i> (1965)	<i>The Principall Navigations, Voiages and Discoveries</i> , a photolithographic facsimile, ed. by D. B. Quinn, 2 vols, Hakluyt Society, extra series, nos 39a & 39b (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for the Hakluyt Society, 1965)
<i>Principal Navigations</i>	<i>The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation</i> , 3 vols (London: George Bishop, Ralph Newberie and Robert Barker, 1598-1600)
<i>Principall Navigations</i>	<i>The Principall Navigations, Voiages and Discoveries of the English Nation</i> (London: George Bishop and Ralph Newberie, Deputies to Christopher Barker, Printer to the Queenes most excellent Maiestie, 1589)
ser.	series
sig. / sigs	signature(s)
STAC	Star Chamber

STC

A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad: 1475-1640, ed. by A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, 2nd edn, rev. and enlarged by W. A. Jackson & F. S. Ferguson & completed by Katharine F. Pantzer, 3 vols (London: Bibliographical Society, 1976-1991)

TNA

The National Archives

vol./ vols

volume(s)

Editing Criteria

In my transcriptions of early modern English manuscripts, I have endeavoured to retain a semblance of the original by limiting editorial mediation. I have not modernized spellings, preserving the use of u and v, i and j as presented by the original. The long s has, however, been modernized. Expanded contractions are signalled by italics. I have used square brackets to denote editorial interpolation, followed by an additional question mark if the transcription is uncertain. A single vertical line |, where used, denotes a line break in the manuscript. Where the manuscript has been corrected (crossing through the original word and interpolating another above), I have crossed the original word through with a single line and used the caret symbol ^ on either side of the corrected, interpolated word.

In my transcriptions of early modern printed materials, I have modernized the long s but retained the u, v, i and j except when recording textual variants between copies of *Principall Navigations*. Here I have retained the long s, u and v, i and j as presented by the originals and have not expanded contractions.

Introduction

This thesis constructs a history of the first edition of *Principall Navigations, Voiages and Discoveries of the English Nation* (1589) through an examination of the social, economic and political motivations intrinsic to its publication and contemporary reception.¹ *Principall Navigations* is a disjointed compilation of a diverse range of documents and has been described by Anthony Payne as ‘an old house with original features intact.’² Payne’s comment implies that *Principall Navigations*’ material form, its compilation and textual presentation bear witness to the socio-historical circumstances of its production and consumption.

As this research has been influenced by developments in book history in general and the works of D. F. McKenzie and Robert Darnton particularly, it is of value to consider McKenzie’s ‘sociology of texts’ and Darnton’s ‘communications circuit’ by way of introduction.³ This will help determine the remit of my project which attempts to reconstruct, as fully as possible, the social history of the production and transmission of *Principall Navigations* from bibliographical data, patronage networks and sixteenth-century printing-house practices. This work is informed further by an analysis of the interaction between oral and literate cultures as conditioning forces on the construction of the sixteenth-century book as material object.

David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery state that book history represents a relatively new field of study which seeks to understand the complex dynamic between ‘print culture and the role of the book as material object within that culture.’⁴ The ‘prior

¹ *Principall Navigations*.

² Anthony Payne, *Richard Hakluyt and his Books*, in Anthony Payne and P. A. Neville-Sington, *Richard Hakluyt and his Books / An Interim Census of Surviving Copies of Hakluyt’s Divers Voyages and Principal Navigations* (London: Hakluyt Society, 1997), p. 6.

³ D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999) and Robert Darnton, ‘What is the History of Books?’, in *The Book History Reader*, ed. by David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery, 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 2006), pp. 9-26 (first publ. in *Daedalus*, 111 (1982), 65-83).

⁴ David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery, Introduction, *The Book History Reader* (see Darnton, above), pp. 1-4 (p. 1).

disciplines' of bibliography and social history are cited as its 'ancestors'.⁵ In the Panizzi lectures of 1985, however, D. F. McKenzie surveyed the variety of research activities commonly undertaken by bibliographers, the future of bibliography in an age of electronic forms of data recording and the impact of recent developments in the various fields of communication studies and critical theory. McKenzie suggested that bibliography needed a new 'principle' to order its evolving nature.⁶ Given that bibliography has always been interested in the socio-historical and technical processes of a text's transmission, McKenzie argued that bibliographers would not need to 'shift to another discipline' in order to undertake such projects as the history of the book in Britain.⁷ Rather, to encompass the changing modes of textual transmission and the corollary on bibliographical enquiry, McKenzie suggested bibliography as a discipline needed to be more accurately described to reflect the broad range of current bibliographical practice. On consideration, McKenzie defined 'bibliography as the study of the sociology of texts.'⁸ Since 'text' refers to the process of material construction — its etymological root *texere* being 'to weave' — it does not determine form.⁹ Thus defined, bibliography can evolve to include the advances in media communications and changing methods of data recording. Further, McKenzie's employment of the term 'sociology' directed bibliographers 'to consider the human motives and interactions which texts involve at every stage of their production, transmission, and consumption.'¹⁰

McKenzie set this more wide-ranging description of bibliography against the 'pure bibliography' as defined by Fredson Bowers and commonly associated with W. W. Greg's work of the 1930s.¹¹ McKenzie aligned Greg's focus on an analysis that restricted itself to the physical evidence conveyed by the document alone with the

⁵ David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery, Introduction, *The Book History Reader*, p. 1.

⁶ D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*, p. 12.

⁷ D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*, p. 11.

⁸ D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*, p. 13.

⁹ D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*, p. 13.

¹⁰ D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*, p. 15.

¹¹ Fredson Bowers, 'Bibliography, Pure Bibliography and Literary Studies', in *The Book History Reader* (see Darnton, above), pp. 27-34 (first publ. in *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 46 (1952), 186-208).

emergence of New Criticism in literary studies during the same period.¹² In his paper ‘Bibliography — An Apologia’, Greg defined bibliography as ‘the science of the transmission of literary documents’ and argued that the bibliographer should pay no attention to the subject-matter of a text:¹³ ‘the study of textual transmission involves no knowledge of the sense of a document but only of its form.’¹⁴ Greg’s paper outlined the fundamental importance of bibliography to literary criticism and the need to distinguish between critical and metacritical problems. For Greg, critical problems are essentially bibliographical, as they relate to the mechanical recording of variants or transcriptional steps. Metacritical problems, however, inevitably involve the critic’s intuition or personal judgement when s/he is called to select between readings of equal authority or to emend the material.¹⁵

In 1952, Fredson Bowers was to echo these sentiments. In ‘Bibliography, Pure Bibliography and Literary Studies’, Bowers described the five major divisions of bibliography: enumerative; historical; analytical; descriptive; and textual or critical.¹⁶ ‘Pure’ or analytical bibliography was again posited as a ‘technical’ investigation ‘based exclusively on the physical evidence of the books themselves’ (e.g. formes, paper, running titles, cancellans) rather than the external evidence drawn from historical bibliography or literary criticism.¹⁷ The Panizzi lectures offered McKenzie the opportunity to be ‘responsibly speculative’ and, in this spirit, he re-visited the common distinction between the formal, technical aspects of transmission (or analytical bibliography) and symbolic meaning.¹⁸ Rather than defining bibliography as the ‘non-symbolic study of signs’, a sociology of texts purposely acknowledges its need to incorporate the ‘complexities of linguistic interpretation and historical explanation.’¹⁹

¹² W. W. Greg, ‘Bibliography — An Apologia’, *The Library*, 4th ser., 13.2 (Sept., 1932), 113-143 (p. 122) and McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*, p. 15.

¹³ W. W. Greg, ‘Bibliography — An Apologia’, p. 115.

¹⁴ W. W. Greg, ‘Bibliography — An Apologia’, p. 122.

¹⁵ W. W. Greg, ‘Bibliography — An Apologia’, pp. 126-130.

¹⁶ Fredson Bowers, ‘Bibliography, Pure Bibliography and Literary Studies’, pp. 27-34.

¹⁷ Fredson Bowers, ‘Bibliography, Pure Bibliography and Literary Studies’, p. 28.

¹⁸ D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*, p. 5.

¹⁹ D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*, p. 15.

In the Presidential address to the Bibliographical Society (1983), McKenzie considered the importance of oral-memory and manuscript as modes of dissemination prior to print. As the social circumstances of production inevitably shape the form and function of a text, McKenzie suggested that a book is a ‘rich complex of signs, each of which has its own human history.’²⁰ If understood in this manner:

[T]he book as physical object becomes the book as expressive form. The inert materials of bark, clay, vellum or paper, script or type, ink, decoration, illustration, binding — we discover — were never really inert, never merely physical. For each and every one shared in a creative act, an expressive decision, within a definable historical context, to serve an author’s intention, a bookseller’s pocket, or an implied reader’s comprehension of the ‘text’.²¹

This move fully to incorporate the wider concerns of historical bibliography, symbolic meaning and the social processes involved in textual transmission into the principles of bibliographical study was informed, McKenzie argued, by the developments in book history.

In his essay ‘What is the History of Books?’, Robert Darnton presented his ‘communications circuit’ as a model that can be applied generally to printed books despite the inevitable idiosyncrasies that will relate to individual examples. Darnton demonstrated that book history is interested all aspects of a printed book’s ‘life cycle’:

To be sure, conditions have varied so much from place to place and from time to time since the invention of movable type that it would be vain to expect the biography of every book to conform to the same pattern. But printed books generally pass through roughly the same life cycle. It could be described as a communications circuit that runs from the author to the publisher (if the bookseller does not assume that role), the printer, the shipper, the bookseller, and the reader. The reader completes the circuit because he influences the author both before and after the act of composition.²²

Despite Darnton’s professed concern with the construction of the biography of a *book*, later critics were to point out that his communications circuit actually foregrounds

²⁰ D. F. McKenzie, ‘The Sociology of a Text: Orality, Literacy and Print in early New Zealand’, p. 206.

²¹ D. F. McKenzie, ‘The Sociology of a Text: Orality, Literacy and Print in early New Zealand’, p. 206.

²² Robert Darnton, ‘What is the History of Books?’, pp. 10-11.

the various historical agents involved in the processes of the book's cycle and the socio-economic, political and legal conjunctures that shape and are shaped by the printed book.²³ For Darnton, the essential focus of book history is the cycle of human interactions, motivations and influences ushered in by the production, transmission and reception of a book. The concept of the cycle emphasizes the unending interaction between printed books (as medium for the transmission of ideas) and their producers and consumers and foregrounds the social conditions that determined its form.

In constructing a 'biography' of the first edition of *Principall Navigations*, I have drawn upon both bibliographical evidence and the subject-matter of the documents contained within the book, its recorded form and its modes of transmission to establish a better sense of the producers' original anticipated function(s) for the book in its original edition and of its implied and varied readership. As the printers and patrons played a crucial role in bringing the book into being, I have also tried to establish (where possible), from extant printed matter, details of the Queen's printing house and the remit of the office of royal printer under Elizabeth. This has developed an understanding of the relationship between *Principall Navigations* and all other extant documents printed by the Queen's printers in this period. The thesis, therefore, focuses on the historical agents involved in the production of the first edition as determining social forces and draws upon bibliography in its most general sense. It is a bibliography because it is a written work on one particular book but simultaneously it constructs a sociology through an analysis of the human motives and interactions created by the publication and reception of the book.

By 1600, two folio editions of *Principall Navigations* had been published. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, it was published again in quarto in a limited edition run. Since 1812, it has been reproduced in quarto and octavo formats, in a litho-facsimile edition and in numerous abridged selections.²⁴ A fourteen-volume work is currently underway for Oxford University Press. In focusing on the first edition's

²³ See Thomas R. Adams and Nicolas Barker, 'A New Model for the Study of the Book', in *The Book History Reader* (see Darnton, above), pp. 47-65 (first publ. in *A Potencie of Life: Books in Society* (London: British Library, 1993), pp. 1-15, 37-39).

²⁴ See Appendix B.9.

conception, production and anticipated reception, this thesis can only make a very small contribution to a vast and rich field of further research. The aim of this thesis is, therefore, twofold: first, it seeks to prompt research interest in the history of the manufacture of *Principall Navigations*; secondly, it demonstrates that an enquiry into its modes of transmission and reception can enhance understanding of the processes of early modern geographical knowledge and its making. Pamela H. Smith and Benjamin Schmidt point out: ‘Attention to the active production of knowledge, however — knowledge and its making, as we have termed it — can be enormously rewarding. It can point to a whole other roster of historical themes and questions, which move beyond the surfeit of objects of knowledge.’²⁵

Focusing on the reconstruction of social practices around the textual production of *Principall Navigations* has inevitably produced a synchronic rather than a diachronic narrative. Critical understanding of Hakluyt’s motives is generally influenced by the diachronic narrative that understands Hakluyt’s work as the ‘prodrome of Empire,’²⁶ or Hakluyt as the ‘prophet, indeed the architect, of the English Empire that later took shape’.²⁷ James P. Helfers views *Principall Navigations* as the culmination of Richard Hakluyt’s ‘lifework’ undertaken for the ‘love of his country’ in a quest to present England’s complete maritime history:

As we look at Hakluyt’s lifework, it is easy to see that complex motives underlie his collecting of this monumental group of voyage materials; among the principal of these motivations is patriotism, a new kind of patriotism implicit in Hakluyt’s references to “the English Nation.” [...] Besides his strictly patriotic and pragmatic motivations, Hakluyt had a historian’s goal as well: he wanted to publish a complete record of England’s involvement in

²⁵ Pamela H. Smith and Benjamin Schmidt, *Making Knowledge in Early Modern Europe: Practices, Objects and Texts, 1400-1800*, ed. by Pamela H. Smith and Benjamin Schmidt (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), Introduction, p. 4.

²⁶ Anthony Payne, ““Strange, remote and farre distant countreys”: the travel books of Richard Hakluyt”, in *Journeys through the Market: Travel, Travellers and the Book Trade*, ed. by Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Folkestone: St. Paul’s Bibliographies, 1999), pp. 1-37 (p. 2).

²⁷ David A. Boruchoff, ‘Piety, Patriotism, and Empire: Lessons for England, Spain, and the New World in the Works of Richard Hakluyt’, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 62 (2009), 809-858 (p. 813).

maritime and exploratory ventures, as well as a general record of the historical sweep of England's foreign trade.²⁸

For Mary C. Fuller: 'Hakluyt's achievement was to posit England's future as its history; his inspiration, to suppose from the scattered bodies of voyagers, merchants, and colonists the prior heroic body of a lost and glorious past.'²⁹ Without detracting from Hakluyt's personal industry, his significant contribution in gathering materials for purposeful redeployment and the importance of his compilations for history, I suggest the presentation of Hakluyt as individual author, in control of his compilation, self-consciously constructing a narrative in fulfilment of his personal intentions, has to be tempered in relation to the production history of the 1589 edition of *Principall Navigations*.

In the first two chapters, I analyse the essential role of the patrons in the conception and publication of *Principall Navigations*. The collaboration of men involved in its compilation can be traced to an established network of 'vertuous gentlemen, and others which partly for their priuate affection to [Hakluyt], but chiefly for their deuotion to the furtherance of this [his] trauaile, haue yelded [him] their seuerall good assistances.'³⁰ Hakluyt's description of his 'prescribed limites' indicates that he undertook the work on behalf of a patron or patrons and complicates any sense of Hakluyt's authorial autonomy.³¹ Hakluyt's overt remit is then considered for an enhanced appreciation of anticipated use. The significance of Francis Walsingham, Anthony Jenkinson and William Borrough, Richard Staper, John Hawkins and Walter Raleigh in the compilation process — they were all thanked in the address to the reader — suggests that much of the material in the 1589 edition (which was drawn from manuscripts or company archives) was made available to Hakluyt through a wider

²⁸ James P. Helfers, 'The Explorer or the Pilgrim? Modern Critical Opinion and the Editorial Methods of Richard Hakluyt and Samuel Purchas', *Studies in Philology*, 94 (1997), 160-186 (p. 169 & p. 171).

²⁹ Mary C. Fuller, *Voyages in Print: English Travel to America, 1576-1624* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 173.

³⁰ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *4v.

³¹ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *3v.

network of participants collaborating in the venture, undermining concepts of Hakluyt's singular creative prerogative in his material selection.³²

Richard Staper, sometime Master of the Clothworkers' Company, had former connections with Hakluyt's work, Francis Walsingham and the Levant Company. Whilst the Clothworkers had been petitioning the Privy Council for political aid to implement measures to augment the export of dressed cloth since the 1560s, by 1589 almost all exporting merchant companies would have had a heightened awareness of the need for market diversification.³³ Although Pauline Croft has established that English trade to Iberian ports did not cease between 1585 and 1604,³⁴ Walsingham's personal debt, accrued from the annual fee for farming customs (between 1585 and 1589), demonstrates a slump in port revenues was notable.³⁵ F. J. Fisher argues that it was the sustained instability of English merchant access to traditional overseas markets that prompted Privy Councillors to consider new markets for trade.³⁶ *Principall Navigations* is posited, therefore, as a stimulus for market diversification rather than national expansionism and its potential political impetus is hinted at through a re-evaluation of Francis Walsingham's role.

In chapters two and three, the print-production history of *Principall Navigations* is reconstructed and I argue that Walsingham's authority was necessary to effect the initial publication of the text. A history of the responsibilities of the royal printing house and its printing practice, the employment of the Queen's printers' imprint, and Walsingham's patronage of Christopher Barker (the Queen's printer) are set against the

³² Both G. D. Ramsay and S. A. Skilliter comment on Hakluyt's exclusion of the Merchant Adventurers' and the Mercers' companies respectively. Significant participants in the history of export trade generally, in which the Mercers made early contributions to the re-establishment of trade links with Turkey particularly, their exclusion from *Principall Navigations* seems extraordinary. See S. A. Skilliter, *William Harborne and the Trade with Turkey, 1578-82: A documentary study of the first Anglo-Ottoman relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1977) and G. D. Ramsay, 'Clothworkers, Merchants Adventurers and Richard Hakluyt', *English Historical Review*, 92 (1977), 504-521.

³³ Increase in exports was to be achieved either through market diversification or the mandatory export ratio of the less profitable dressed cloths when conveying undressed cloth to established trading centres. For more detail see G. D. Ramsay, 'Clothworkers, Merchants Adventurers and Richard Hakluyt'.

³⁴ Pauline Croft, 'Trading with the Enemy, 1585-1604', *Historical Journal*, 32 (1989), 281-302.

³⁵ TNA, C82/1500.

³⁶ F. J. Fisher, 'Commercial Trends and Policy in Sixteenth-Century England', *Economic History Review*, 10 (1940), 95-117.

disputes within the Stationers' Company between patent holding master-printers and those members working without privilege. These disputes were complicated and, in part, induced by the government's bid to control religious heterodoxy and political censure by cultivating obligation amongst the Stationers' executive through the bestowal of privileges. In 1577, Christopher Barker, a Draper (and thus a non-member of the Stationers' Company), fostered by Walsingham's patronage, was appointed to the office of royal printer, thereby securing the most lucrative printing privilege in England. Once in post, Christopher Barker argued, in response to a Privy Council enquiry, that privileged patent holders were beneficial to the commonweal as they were willing to invest in books that would not produce immediate returns.³⁷ When *Principall Navigations* is re-integrated into these histories, its mode of production seems to be encapsulated by Barker's comments: it was a costly publication, undertaken for the benefit of the commonweal, on the command of an influential patron and Privy Councillor, who had exerted his authority through the remit of the royal printing patent to ensure its publication.

Chapter two concludes by evaluating a paradox which is presented by the production history of *Principall Navigations*. In the historiography of Elizabethan trade crises, Conyers Read has suggested that Walsingham's interest in trade was an adjunct to the business of state and F. J. Fisher has argued that the piecemeal political strategies point, at least, to some suggestive connections 'between trade fluctuations and the various phases of [sixteenth-century] government policy.'³⁸ The socio-economic mechanisms of patronage, intrinsic to the production of *Principall Navigations*, can explain this divergence in critical opinion. Walsingham's position as Privy Councillor and patron illustrates both the extensive influence of an individual agent working on behalf of his political, corporate counterpart and the Privy Council's limits as functioning government, lacking either sufficient political and fiscal autonomy or

³⁷ BL, Lansdowne MSS 48, fol. 173.

³⁸ See Conyers Read, *Mr Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth*, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925; repr. New York: AMS Press, 1978), III, p. 370. F. J. Fisher, 'Commercial Trends and Policy in Sixteenth-Century England', p. 96.

monarchical will, to implement a rationalized economic policy in response to the export crisis.³⁹

In the third chapter, the print production of *Principall Navigations* is considered in relation to government censors and its process through the press. Annabel Patterson's work on the 'indeterminacy inveterate to language' is employed to explain the potential for anticipated censure on the publication of *Principall Navigations*.⁴⁰ Conclusions do not suggest government intervention in the production of the different states of the edition.⁴¹ Rather, they point to a process of textual construction that was highly alert to the interpretative role of the reader and a printing fraternity primed to litigate if printing patents were infringed. Chapter three also examines Hakluyt's employment commitments in France alongside his decision (which seems to have been taken after careful consideration) to undertake the compilation of the work on his return in the winter of 1588/1589, 'my selfe being the last winter returned from France with the honorable the Lady Sheffield [...] determined notwithstanding all difficulties, to vndertake the burden of that worke.'⁴² When the processes of compiling manuscript sources and preparing printers' fair-copy are taken into account, it is clear that the first edition of *Principall Navigations* was produced under different circumstances from the second. Although both editions were published by the printers who held the office of royal printer, the first edition was produced under the Queen's printers' imprint whilst the second edition was not. Furthermore, the 1589 edition was printed in under a year (possibly very quickly). The second edition suffered stops and starts and, although the

³⁹ Werner L. Gundersheimer, 'Patronage in the Renaissance: An Exploratory Approach', in *Patronage in the Renaissance*, ed. by Guy Fitch Lytle and Stephen Orgel (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), pp. 3-23 (p. 19).

⁴⁰ Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1984), p. 18.

⁴¹ The different states are represented by the interpolation of Francis Drake's circumnavigation (the Drake leaves) and the emendation of the record of Jerome Bowes' embassy to Ivan IV (the Bowes cancels) and their different combinations. The map after Ortelius is found in some copies.

⁴² *Principall Navigations*, sig. *2v.

first two volumes represented smaller printing tasks, the 1598-1600 edition was printed over an extended period of three years.⁴³

Chapter four will assess the material artefact to evaluate how its form, structure and contents can disclose details regarding the variety of readers anticipated by its producers. This analysis makes it apparent that *Principall Navigations* would have attracted a range of readers. Extant copies carry inscriptions that infer that individuals from various walks of life owned *Principall Navigations*. Copies are inscribed by the religious, political and intellectual elite, scholars, project planners and investors. Such a diverse audience would have inevitably prompted different approaches to reading. Whilst it would not always have inspired active reading, I shall argue that the patrons involved in its production considered its publication, first and foremost, in terms of the dissemination of useful information for re-deployment. Drawing on William H. Sherman's work on John Dee, I shall propose that *Principall Navigations* can be understood as part of the wider project in England to launch voyages of discovery in the search for new markets.⁴⁴ Its publication had a practical purpose.

The second half of the chapter will then evaluate how its producers hoped it would instigate action and integrate the narratives into wider processes of strategic planning. This will consider how this particular use of the text depended upon judging eye-witness testimonials alongside each other in order to establish, through the reiteration of information, matters of fact. However, as knowledge of the world was changing, reading all extant (or accessible) written sources could only provide the projector- investor with the foundations. The examination of pilots and merchants presented another valuable source of information. In 1558, Stephen Burrough (d. 1584), whose brother William is thanked in Hakluyt's prefatory material, visited the *Casa de la Contratación*.

⁴³ Collational formula for *Principal Navigations* (1598-1600), BL 984.g. 1,2.: Vol. 1 (1599) *⁶ **⁶; A-3E⁶ (-3E4, - 3E5, -3E6); a-d² (-d2), 322 leaves (Cadiz leaves, 7 paras 52 lines, c. 1720); Vol. 2 (1599) *⁸; A-2C⁶; 3A-3R⁶, 266 leaves; Vol. 3 (1600) (A)⁸; A-I⁶; K⁸; L-4C⁶, 442 leaves.

⁴⁴ William H. Sherman, *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), p. 114.

Stephen Borough's specialist navigational knowledge acquired on that route [the 1556 voyage of discovery towards the north east] meant that he was ideally placed to go to Seville in 1558, in response to covert diplomatic arrangements made by Philip and Mary; his knowledge of the near Arctic was to be exchanged for an insight into the training of Spanish pilots. He later described to Hakluyt the organization of navigational training in Seville as he witnessed it in 1558.⁴⁵

Although Spanish pilots were trained here, the *Casa de la Contratación* also functioned as a centre for the collation of new information generated by voyages of discovery. David Turnbull has shown how a 'systematic attempt was made [in the *Casa*] to bring together the diverse fragments of knowledge about the newly discovered world.'⁴⁶ Hakluyt's interest in founding a lectureship in navigation is relatively well documented.⁴⁷ Publication of the material collated in *Principall Navigations* enabled the wider dissemination of essential information for future endeavours. Joint-stock projectors were now able to read eye-witness reports and, if necessary, call the relevant experts into further oral examination.⁴⁸ In his address to the reader, Hakluyt explained his reasons for citing his authors so carefully: '*to the ende [...] that euery man might answere for himselfe, iustifie his reports, and stand accountable for his owne doings*'.⁴⁹ This can be understood both literally and figuratively. A literal interpretation suggests Hakluyt was encouraging his readers to examine the narrator in further oral forums. Hakluyt is known to have recorded information after similar interviews.⁵⁰ Figuratively, Hakluyt appears to position his narrators' voices within a wider frame and invite a

⁴⁵ R. C. D. Baldwin, 'Borough, Stephen (1525–1584)', in *ODNB* <<http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/view/article/2914>> [accessed 23 July 2012] (para. 3 of 9).

⁴⁶ David Turnbull, 'Cartography and Science in Early Modern Europe: Mapping the Construction of Knowledge Spaces', *Imago Mundi*, 48 (1996), 5–24 (pp. 7–9).

⁴⁷ See the prefatory material in *Divers voyages touching the discoverie of America*, in *Original Writings*, I, p. 179 and Hakluyt's letter to Walsingham (1584), *Original Writings*, I, pp. 208–210.

⁴⁸ David Turnbull, 'Cartography and Science in Early Modern Europe: Mapping the Construction of Knowledge Spaces', *Imago Mundi*, 48 (1996), 5–24 (p. 7).

⁴⁹ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *3v.

⁵⁰ See *Principall Navigations*, sig. 3Bv for details of Hakluyt's interview with Thomas Butts and *Principal Navigations*, sig. 4C6v for the examination of Spanish pilots at the request and gratification of Hakluyt; a note by Hakluyt prefaced to *Divers voyages touching the discoverie of America* records an interview with Don Antonio, see *Original Writings*, I, p. 174 and Hakluyt's letter to Francis Walsingham, 1584, 'I have talked twise with Don Antonio of Portugal and with five or sixe of his best captaynes and pilotes.' *Original Writings*, I, p. 206.

particular type of reading practice. The reader was to understand each narrator, or eye-witness, as a voice, whose personal testimony is presented in relation to the other voices included in the compilation. Hakluyt called upon the reader to judge the various accounts and construct an understanding of the matters of fact from the evidence presented.⁵¹

Principall Navigations was important because it contained an abundance of matter. In commonplacing practices, matter (or ‘*res*’) denoted the useful material or substance relating to an argument or topic under consideration. This was distinguished from ‘*verba*’, an ornamental verbal polish, which enabled the skilful presentation of the argument. Riches were found in the reiteration of information relating to similar ventures: eye-witness testimonials, charters, patents and ambassadorial reports. The recurrence of particular details contained within the accounts, drawn from the experiences of individual voyages, enabled a process through which concordance between accounts could be established. It was the reader not the eye-witness, however, who constructed understanding from the materials through the judicious comparison between testimonials.

Finally, I argue that the study of the importance of oratory and the oral-aural dynamic in sixteenth-century education complicates critical opinion regarding Hakluyt’s intention to construct a myth of origin or narrative of nation in *Principall Navigations*. In the last chapter, I propose that *Principall Navigations* drew on traditional practices of an oral culture but exploited the possibilities of print. If the narratives contained in *Principall Navigations* are seen as additional voices, it can be argued that it forms part of a process more akin to oratorical composition than narrative construction. When *Principall Navigations* is fully reintegrated into the historical reading practices of a predominantly oral culture (and set within the humanist tradition of examining textual witnesses to construct an authoritative account), Hakluyt’s compilation methods take on additional meanings. Hakluyt’s invitation to his readers to call the various authors of the gathered materials to account suggests that he saw his work as part of a larger project.

⁵¹ Barbara J. Shapiro, *A Culture of Fact: England 1550-1720* (London: Cornell University Press, 2000), p. 47.

His role of facilitator may be better conceived in terms of oratorical composition (*inventio, dispositio, elocutio, memoria, actio*). In his mature works, *De Partitione Oratorio* and *De Oratore*, Cicero considered the stages of oratory to be *inventio, dispositio, elocutio, memoria, actio*.⁵² *Actio* encompasses both the necessary actions for oratorical delivery (gesture, intonation) and the sense of subsequent audience motivation to action. Drawing on the potential of the printed press, Hakluyt — enabled and directed by willing patrons — gathered and arranged the materials to facilitate the construction of useful policy by his *readers* in explicitly dynamic processes beyond the text. Viewed from this perspective, *Principall Navigations* can be seen as part of a phase of communications reorganization prompted by the cultural assimilation of the medium of print into a predominantly oral culture. Although Hakluyt's modes of material gathering were influenced by oratory and seemed to anticipate his reader's desire for the further examination of eye-witness narrators, I suggest that the publication of *Principall Navigations* was undertaken, in part, to disseminate important information in print in order to facilitate these oral processes of consultation and examination prior to venture planning.

⁵² Brian Vickers, 'Shakespeare's use of Rhetoric', in *A New Companion to Shakespeare Studies*, ed. by Kenneth Muir and S. Schoenbaum (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), pp. 83-98. M. T. Cicero, *De Oratore*, trans. by E. W. Sutton (London: Heinemann, 1942; repr. 1967).

Chapter One

‘The compasse of [Richard Hakluyt’s] prescribed limites’: Re-evaluating authorial subjectivity

Critical analyses of Richard Hakluyt’s *Principall Navigations, Voiages and Discoveries of the English Nation* (1589) and its expanded, revised second edition *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation* (1598-1600), published during Hakluyt’s lifetime, have generally either focused on both editions to examine editorial intentions behind narrative constructions, selection processes and paratextual contributions, or have used the material as ‘repositories of information’ for related research.¹ Hakluyt’s book drew together a variety of different manuscript and printed documents and the complex processes of textual reconstruction, through editorial compilation, have drawn many critics into an evaluation of Hakluyt’s intentions.² Simultaneously, this vast collection of early printed English texts (many of which have not survived in manuscript form) is a highly significant archival resource for scholars working across the academic disciplines. *Principall Navigations* has aided understanding of early modern geography, discovery, imperial expansionism and early English encounters with distant cultures. Hakluyt’s compilation also represents a substantial contribution to the burgeoning literature of vernacular prose and the development of the eye-witness narrative as genre.³ More recent research has considered

¹ Anthony Payne, *Richard Hakluyt and his Books*, p. 3.

² Critics who have written on Richard Hakluyt’s intentions include: James P. Helfers, ‘The Explorer or the Pilgrim? Modern Critical Opinion and the Editorial Methods of Richard Hakluyt and Samuel Purchas’; Richard Helgersson, ‘The Voyages of a Nation’, in *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), pp. 149-191; Mary C. Fuller, *Voyages in Print*; David Harris Sacks, ‘Richard Hakluyt’s Navigations in Time: History, Epic, and Empire’, *Modern Language Quarterly*, 67 (2006), 31-62; David A. Boruchoff, ‘Piety, Patriotism, and Empire: Lessons for England, Spain, and the New World in the Works of Richard Hakluyt’; Peter Hulme, *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492-1797* (London: Routledge, 1986); and Julia Schleck, “‘Plain Broad Narratives of Substantial Facts’: Credibility, Narrative, and Hakluyt’s “Principall Navigations””, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 59 (2006), 768-794, amongst others.

³ All recent research on Richard Hakluyt and his work is indebted to the invaluable contributions made by D. B. Quinn (namely the introduction to *Principall Navigations* (1965) and *Hakluyt Handbook*, ed. by D. B. Quinn, 2 vols, Hakluyt Society, second series, nos 144 & 145 (London: Hakluyt Society, 1974)), George Bruner Parks, *Richard Hakluyt and the English Voyages* (New York: American Geographical Society, 1928), E. G. R. Taylor, *Original Writings* and K. R. Andrews, *Trade, Plunder and Settlement: Maritime Enterprise and the Genesis of the British Empire, 1480-1630* (Cambridge: Cambridge

Hakluyt's work through Christian frames of reference.⁴ The discovery of the New World is understood as a manifestation of God's grace: an additional revelation of creation to humankind, moving human knowledge from darkness to greater light and signalling man's *rapprochement* with the divine. Previously, E. G. R. Taylor had argued that '[i]t was commonly held that the diversity of natural products between one country and another was divinely appointed to promote intercourse between nations.'⁵

F. J. Fisher's observation that 'it is almost an axiom of historiography that each generation must re-interpret the past in terms of its own experience,' informs recent re-appraisals of Hakluyt's work.⁶ Wide-ranging critical analysis, influenced by post-colonial theoretical frameworks, has focused on assessing Hakluyt's contributions in *Principal(l) Navigations* to the articulation of an emergent sense of English nationhood during Elizabeth's reign.⁷ J. A. Froude's definition of the text in 1852, as 'the Prose Epic of the modern English nation', is re-interpreted by Richard Helgerson in his important work *Forms of Nationhood*.⁸ Helgerson contends that Hakluyt's central purpose in *Principal(l) Navigations* is to describe the world to English readers and to demonstrate 'proof of England's active place in it.'⁹ Hakluyt's editions reflect his

University Press, 1984) in these and related fields of research on travel, discovery, trade, plunder and settlement in the Elizabethan period, all of whom draw heavily from the contemporary narrative sources in the Hakluyt texts. Papers written by Pamela Neville-Sington and Anthony Payne do not fit comfortably into these categories of recent critical analyses but I will be using their research as a basis for my own. They have both contributed significantly to the importance of the study of the book as artefact. For further details see: Pamela Neville-Sington, "'A very good trumpet': Richard Hakluyt and the Politics of Overseas Expansion,' in *Texts and Cultural Change in Early Modern England*, ed. by Cedric C. Brown and Arthur F. Marotti (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997), pp. 66-79 and Anthony Payne, "'Strange, remote and farre distant countreys": the travel books of Richard Hakluyt', in *Journeys through the Market: Travel, Travellers and the Book Trade*, ed. by Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Folkestone: St. Paul's Bibliographies, 1999), pp. 1-37.

⁴ For the influence of Christian frames of reference on Hakluyt's work, see David Harris Sacks, 'Richard Hakluyt's Navigations in Time: History, Epic, and Empire' and David A. Boruchoff, 'Piety, Patriotism, and Empire: Lessons for England, Spain, and the New World in the Works of Richard Hakluyt'.

⁵ In the introduction, *Original Writings*, I, p. 11, n. 1.

⁶ F. J. Fisher, 'Commercial Trends and Policy in Sixteenth-Century England,' p. 95.

⁷ The use of *Principal(l) Navigations* refers to both the first edition *Principall Navigations* and the second edition *Principal Navigations*.

⁸ The repeated use of J. A. Froude's article 'England's Forgotten Worthies' reflects the deep-seated influence the history of the Victorian Empire continues to bear on interpretations of Hakluyt's book. Critics do not generally record that Froude was reviewing the publication of a very small edition of 270 copies in 5 volumes, *Hakluyt's Collection of the Early Voyages, Travels, and Discoveries of the English Nation*, 5 vols (London: Evans, Mackinlay, Priestly, 1810-12). 'England's Forgotten Worthies', *Westminster Review*, n. s. 2 (1852), 32-67 (pp. 34-5).

⁹ Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood*, p. 179.

‘nationalist ambition of showing England active everywhere.’¹⁰ For Peter Hulme, Hakluyt’s expansive endeavour was ‘to create a continuous epic myth of origin for the emerging imperial nation.’¹¹ With creative, critical finesse, Mary C. Fuller interprets nationalist sentiments in Hakluyt’s analogy between the obscured or scattered narratives and strewn limbs.¹² Fuller suggests that this complex trope would have simultaneously evoked in the reader’s response a national body and a narrative of nation. For Fuller, Hakluyt constructs a sense of nation through his editorial work as he draws together a body of historical documents relating to English activity. Fuller’s conception of the construction of a narrative of English participation can be paralleled with the contemporary dissemination and interest in Christopher Saxton’s maps of English regions.¹³ As with Saxton’s maps, the analytic cataloguing of *Principal(l) Navigations* presumes, for Fuller, ‘a non-empty space’, the order of which only needed rediscovering.¹⁴ Finally, Fuller argues that the violence of the devoured limbs represents a ‘violence of forgetting’ that Hakluyt countered through the re-composition of a body of visible and memorable narratives.¹⁵ Thus, Hakluyt ensured that contemporary English readers remembered their *national* story.

Through the examination of the production, transmission and reception of *Principall Navigations*, I aim to construct a more complex assessment of authorial subjectivity which examines the agents behind the various actions involved in the production of the book (an appropriate definition for ‘author’ is ‘[h]e who gives rise to or causes an action, event, circumstance, state, or condition of things’, *OED*).¹⁶ As the

¹⁰ Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood*, p. 171.

¹¹ Peter Hulme, *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492-1797*, p. 90.

¹² This analogy is found in the prefatory materials of the first volume of the second edition *Principal Navigations*, 3 vols (1598-1600), I, sig. *4r. Mary C. Fuller, *Voyages in Print*, p. 152.

¹³ However, see also David A. Boruchoff on the contemporary understanding of symbolic unity implied by this trope: ‘[R]eaders of Hakluyt’s time would undoubtedly have interpreted his words very differently, viewing the “body” in the making to be that, not of English history, but instead of the unity, fellowship, knowledge, harmony, and civility lost in the biblical Fall, and now brought again to light by God’s Providence, as suggested by the pointed use of terms such as *revocare* (to call back), *reducere* (to lead back), and *recupere* (to recover) by Hakluyt and his contemporaries.’ In ‘Piety, Patriotism, and Empire: Lessons for England, Spain, and the New World in the Works of Richard Hakluyt’, p. 823.

¹⁴ Mary C. Fuller, *Voyages in Print*, p. 152.

¹⁵ Mary C. Fuller, *Voyages in Print*, p. 152.

¹⁶ See ‘author’, in *OED* <<http://0-www.oed.com.catalogue.oxford.ac.uk/Entry/13329>> [accessed 28 April 2011]. Furthermore, I intend to question assumptions inherent in the idea of narrative construction by re-reading Hakluyt in the light of commonplace books and the composite processes of reading and

patrons, writers and printers were all essential to this process, I will set Hakluyt's personal intentions within a larger frame of socio-economic and political motivations to retrieve a sense of the first edition's anticipated functions.

In resituating this edition within its particular print-production history, I hope to enable new readings that will move away from the post-nineteenth century interest in nationalism that has governed recent Hakluyt studies. Undoubtedly, it was common practice to emphasize a text's usefulness to the *res publica* in dedicatory epistles:

Both the works themselves and their dedicatory pages almost invariably stressed political, religious, or educational usefulness to Queen and country. [...] Books tended to be purposely propagandistic. No true humanist would raise an objection to this, for what use are the *bonae litterae* if they fail to serve the interests of the *res publica*?¹⁷

A review of the contents of the first and second editions, however, immediately introduces certain textual problems that undermine the notion that Hakluyt set out to produce an epic myth of nation. For travel and discovery to be depicted as inherently English (and therefore national) practices, these activities would need to have been presented as self-evident traditions that had been performed throughout history. A compendium of English overseas ventures, drawing on the rich archival sources that reached back beyond antiquity to time out of memory, would represent England as a sea-faring nation and colonial venture as a natural and eternal characteristic of Englishness. The exclusive achievements of all successful English enterprises of discovery, war or trade would have constituted vital component parts of such a history. However, to read both the depth of historical narrative required to represent a 'myth of origin' and an *exclusive* focus on English achievements at sea into *Principal(l)*

writing when compiling useful notes in preparation for action. Helgerson has suggested that the multitude of voices and texts represent the equally diverse voices of the nation. The '*Voyages* has its effect by paratactic accumulation rather than by some more obviously willed hypotaxis.' Here, his linguistic analogy demonstrates his position that the narratives are somehow joined despite their awkward relationship to one another. The use of the passive voice, however, means Helgerson fails to disclose where the action of joining takes place: is it in the reader's mind, in the structure of the book or in the intentions of the author? Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England*, p. 179.

¹⁷ Jan van Dorsten, 'Literary Patronage in Elizabethan England: The Early Phase', in *Patronage in the Renaissance*, ed. by Guy Fitch Lytle and Stephen Orgel (see Gundersheimer, above), pp. 191-206 (p. 192).

Navigations, the reader would have to conflate and select material from both the first and the second edition of *Principal(l) Navigations* to produce a *Principal(l) Navigations* 'of the mind.'¹⁸ This imagined edition, whilst not produced in Hakluyt's lifetime, was published in J. M. Dent's (1907-1910) quarto edition in eight volumes, which immediately invokes a more populist and thus potentially nationalistic outreach.¹⁹ This confirms D. F. McKenzie's observation that 'new readers [...] make new texts, and that their new meanings are a function of their new forms.'²⁰ In J. M. Dent's edition, the depth of historical narrative is included and the foreign material excised so echoing, in its structure, Froude's 'mid-nineteenth-century imperial thinking', which Anthony Payne argues 'should not be read back into Hakluyt's own time.'²¹ By focusing on the agents involved in the publication of the 1589 edition (individuals, companies and government), a 'sociology' of this edition will emerge and on consideration of insights gained from bibliography, 'an insurrection of subjugated knowledges' will ensue, as new interpretations will be enabled through greater understanding of the socio-economic networks that were necessitated by the production of this particular text. D. F. McKenzie argues:

In the ubiquity and variety of its evidence, bibliography as a sociology of texts has an unrivalled power to resurrect authors in their own time, and their readers at any time. It enables what Michel Foucault called 'an insurrection of subjugated knowledges'. One of its greatest strengths is the access it gives to social motives: by dealing with the facts of transmission and the material evidence of reception, it can make discoveries as distinct from inventing meanings.²²

¹⁸ Constructing erroneous meaning through anachronism draws upon the essay by D. F. McKenzie, 'Printers of the Mind: Some Notes on Bibliographical Theories and Printing-House Practices', *Studies in Bibliography*, 22 (1969), 1-75. The edition of 1598-1600, whilst updating the English voyages, was expanded primarily through the inclusion of historical narratives. Hakluyt also included the foreign material in the second edition.

¹⁹ This was reprinted in 1913 and again in 1927. J. M. Dent did publish an octavo 10 volume work in 1927 which reprinted the foreign material but excised it from the main body of the text, relocating it in a penultimate (the final volume contains indices only) almost supplementary ninth volume.

²⁰ *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*, p. 29.

²¹ Anthony Payne, "'Strange, remote and farre distant countreys': the travel books of Richard Hakluyt", p. 2.

²² D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*, pp. 28-29.

Inevitably, in studying Hakluyt's intentions, critics have drawn on both editions of *Principal(l) Navigations* and the individual circumstances of the different publications seem to have been conflated through time. This is, perhaps, in part due to the widely available *Principal Navigations* published by James MacLehose (Glasgow, 1903-05), which includes the prefatory material from all the volumes (from the 1589 edition and the separate volumes of the second edition) and thereafter reprints the second edition.²³ Invariably, critical analysis focuses on the second edition but frequently draws textual support from the prefatory material of the first: Hakluyt's dedication to Walsingham is commonly employed in examinations of authorial intention. Contemporary codes of practice regarding patronage and the dedicatory epistle, however, prevented Hakluyt from making any reference to the 1589 edition in his dedication to Charles Howard (Lord High Admiral) in the first volume of the 1598 edition.²⁴ Furthermore, selecting quotations from the prefatory material of the first edition to inform an understanding of the causes of the production of the second confounds the production histories of both.

The history of the print-production of *Principall Navigations* will re-integrate its publication more precisely into its immediate socio-economic context. Notably, the years between the two editions (1589 and 1598-1600) represent identifiably different geo-political phases in Elizabeth I's reign. This would have impacted upon aspects of both editions. The political composition of the Queen's Privy Council had altered perceptibly by the end of the century. The powerful anti-Spanish and pro-war ministers, Walsingham and Leicester, had both died. Elizabeth was in her late sixties and James VI, a known proponent for peace with Spain, 'was the obvious successor to the childless queen.'²⁵ Although, his succession was by no means certain, Robert Cecil was in secret

²³ James MacLehose re-published the 1598-1600 edition of *The Principal Navigations* in 12 volumes with additional illustrations and appendices. The title-page of first volume (1598) was reprinted without mention of the cancelled Cadiz leaves and sold with the second volume (1599) and the third volume was printed in 1600, with a different short title: *The Third and Last Volume of the Voyages, Navigations, Traffiques, and Discoueries of the English Nation*. For further reading see D. B. Quinn's introduction in *Hakluyt Handbook*, II, pp. 335-337.

²⁴ It is referenced obliquely in the preface to the reader.

²⁵ Jenny Wormald, 'James VI and I (1566-1625)', in *ODNB* <<http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/view/article/14592>> [accessed 17 April 2012] (para. 42 of 116).

negotiations with James before the Queen's death.²⁶ Two prominent, aggressive privateers and sea-captains, John Hawkins and Francis Drake, had both lost their lives at sea during the expedition to San Juan Ulua (from 1595 to 1596). The financial burden of more than a decade of sporadic conflict between Elizabeth and Philip II and Philip's death in 1598 further diluted pro-war sentiment at court. Finally, as Pauline Croft has demonstrated, Elizabeth could not uphold the trade embargoes she had imposed during the crisis years from 1585 to 1589 and by 1600 trade had resumed in different guises. Despite political hostilities, merchants were driven 'to trade as a bird is to fly'.²⁷ By the publication of the second edition of *Principal Navigations* (1598-1600), astute Privy Councillors, in fostering new allegiances with James, had altered their policies on war with Spain accordingly.²⁸

A history of the publication of the first edition of *Principall Navigations* has brought the necessary degree of collaboration to the fore. As *Principall Navigations* incorporates many diverse texts from different sources (royal patents, ambassadorial negotiations, company records and mariners' accounts of voyages undertaken), it is generally acknowledged that Hakluyt relied on the influence and support of senior company or Privy Council members to gain access to these records. The focus on Hakluyt as author or editor, as the driving impetus behind the book, has not taken sufficient note of the enormous financial undertaking its production presented for any stationer of the early modern period.

In researching the technological production of the 1589 edition of *Principall Navigations*, Francis Walsingham's participation in its intellectual origins, its process through the press and in the selection of government censors is indicative of an important but hitherto subjugated narrative. As patron to both the Queen's printer and Richard Hakluyt, and with connections to Hakluyt's cousin, the pirates, privateers,

²⁶ Jenny Wormald, 'James VI and I (1566–1625)', in *ODNB* <<http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/view/article/14592>> [accessed 17 April 2012] (para. 43 of 116).

²⁷ Pauline Croft quoting from BL, Lansdowne MSS 14, fol. 163 in 'Trading with the Enemy, 1585-1604', *Historical Journal*, 32 (1989), 281-302 (p. 283).

²⁸ For more on the 'nadir' of English maritime policy and the deaths of Drake and Hawkins see K. R. Andrews, *Trade, Plunder and Settlement*, p. 241. For more on English trading activity around monarchical embargoes see Pauline Croft, 'Trading with the Enemy, 1585-1604'.

merchants, and courtiers, Walsingham acted as a social nexus and created the political, financial and authorial momentum necessary for the production of this expensive book. In 1965, D. B. Quinn suggested that Walsingham may have contributed to the production of the text but the under-researched activities of the Queen's printing house prevented Quinn from drawing any significant conclusions:

We must remember that Sir Francis was, as secretary of state, responsible for the conduct of the Queen's relations with France, and so, in effect Hakluyt's employer. This enables us to see Hakluyt's return from France and his immersion in the preparation of his book as part of, or a continuation of, his official duties. Walsingham therefore stands in a triple sense as the sponsor of *The Principall Navigations*. He certainly encouraged and possibly also commanded its production. He employed his infrequently used powers as secretary of state to license the book. He permitted Hakluyt to use his name in the dedication, thus giving a valuable boost of a semi-official sort. We might also see in the employment of the Queen's printer's deputies, George Bishop and Ralph Newberie, to produce and publish it, more evidence of Walsingham's official patronage, although it would be unwise to make much of this. We can say with some confidence that Walsingham is likely to have paid some of the costs of publication. Moreover, he chose the 'corrector' whose task it was to supervise the copy preliminary to a licence being issued.²⁹

Whilst the following chapter will seek to address a series of questions D. B. Quinn inadvertently raises here, this chapter will briefly outline Walsingham's personal interest in both the development of trade and Hakluyt's work as products of the active role he undertook throughout his secretariat to promote projects and projectors.

Acknowledgement that the practices of patronage were integral to the very fabric of Elizabethan society and its social processes is commonplace. However, the subtle interdependency between the obligation of an individual (patriarch, courtier, Privy Councillor), who retained a position of authority within a corporation (extended family, court, council), to fulfil his role as patron and that individual's own successful integration into the larger body is perhaps less well understood. 'Rank carried with it the duty of supporting and sustaining learning in all its forms.'³⁰ Werner L. Gundersheimer

²⁹ *Principall Navigations* (1965).

³⁰ H. S. Bennett, *English Books & Readers 1558 to 1603: Being a Study in the History of the Book Trade in the Reign of Elizabeth I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), p. 37.

explores how ‘an individual patron, however self-indulgent or idiosyncratic, functioned as part of a corporate network no less real, if more elusive, than his corporate counterpart.’³¹ Suffice it to say for the parameters of this argument that Walsingham’s successful integration into the Privy Council as Elizabeth’s government secretary depended upon the recognition of his obligations to that body and the fulfilment of his role as patron.

Hakluyt’s success in collating, translating and putting to press sundry narratives concerning the northeast coast of America entitled *Divers voyages touching the discoverie of America* (1582) was commended to Walsingham by both the mayor of Bristol (by letter) and Sir George Peckham (in conference). Its value for the *res publica* as material for prospective projectors, who were considering plantation in America, is obvious as Peckham had read *Divers voyages touching the discoverie of America* in conjunction with his own proposal to plant a Catholic colony in Norumbega, a concession of land he had been granted under Gilbert’s patent.³² Furthermore, in a letter to Walsingham, Thomas Aldworth, the mayor of Bristol, commended Hakluyt for his endeavours to raise financial support from the Bristol merchants for Gilbert’s venture. Aware of Hakluyt’s ‘obvious capacities for usefulness’, Walsingham took Hakluyt into his service.³³

Although contact between Walsingham and Hakluyt may have been established earlier, Walsingham’s encouragement of Hakluyt’s own work (in extant sources currently available) can be traced back to 11 March 1582/3.³⁴ Here, Walsingham wrote

³¹ Werner L. Gundersheimer, ‘Patronage in the Renaissance: An Exploratory Approach’, in *Patronage in the Renaissance*, p. 19.

³² *Original Writings*, I, p. 27 & p. 196 (footnote). Peckham refers to *Divers voyages touching the discoverie of America* in his 1583 *Report*, p. 196.

³³ *Original Writings*, I, pp. 26-27.

³⁴ Hakluyt knew Michael Lok, secretary to the Muscovy Company, and used his map in *Divers voyages touching the discoverie of America* (1582). Lok was the principal investor in the three Frobisher voyages in search of a Northwest Passage (1576-1578). Walsingham was also a member of the Muscovy Company and Hakluyt’s cousin wrote the notes for Gilbert’s failed voyage (1578) that, E. G. R. Taylor suggests, were handed on to those considering Frobisher’s voyage. Richard Hakluyt’s cousin also worked with John Dee, Adrian and Humfrey Gilbert and Francis Walsingham in preparation for Gilbert’s voyage. The Muscovy Company employed Arthur Pet and Charles Jackman to discover the Northeast Passage and Hakluyt was involved here as his letter to Gerard Mercator (1580) indicates. Some critics also argue that Hakluyt wrote the pamphlet ‘A discourse on the commodity of the taking of the straight of Magellanus’ for Walsingham in 1579-1580.

to Hakluyt from the court commending him for his study into the ‘Westerne partes yet unknown.’³⁵ This letter, prompted by communications with Peckham and Aldworth, signals Walsingham’s intentions to patronise Hakluyt. Walsingham requested Hakluyt to ‘continue [his] trouble in these and like matters’ and assured him that his endeavours were ‘like to turne not only to [his] owne good in private, but to the publike benefite of this Realme.’³⁶ Walsingham actively sought out Hakluyt and offered him personal profit if he continued the work he had started.

On the publication of *Divers voyages touching the discoverie of America*, at his own expense, Hakluyt was still seeking a formal patron. In the prefatory materials, dedicating the work to Philip Sidney, Hakluyt ostensibly sought a financial award of twenty pounds a year to help support a lectureship in the ‘arte of navigation’.³⁷ Simultaneously, he would have been seeking ‘support for a cause or [...drawing] attention to [his] loyalty and personal expertise in an attempt to improve [his] own social position through “preferment”’.³⁸ The importance of preferment is outlined by Eleanor Rosenberg ‘[W]riters themselves were more interested in obtaining preferments as the rewards of their labors than in gifts of money or other forms of direct support. Once appointed to a clerical or governmental post, a writer might utilize his leisure and security for further literary endeavor.’³⁹ Hakluyt was thus caught in the tripartite dynamic between the patron, the book as gift, and the patronised. Following the intricate rituals usually involved in seeking out a patron and at this point in his career, he would have been more concerned with ‘attract[ing] patronage downwards’ than with exerting political influence from below.⁴⁰

On the very same day that Walsingham wrote to Hakluyt commending him for his work, Walsingham employed him to confer with Thomas Aldworth on the delivery of Walsingham’s letter: Hakluyt was cited as one of its ‘bearers’.⁴¹ The following

³⁵ *Original Writings*, I, pp. 196-7.

³⁶ *Original Writings*, I, p. 197.

³⁷ *Original Writings*, I, p. 179.

³⁸ Jan van Dorsten, ‘Literary Patronage in Elizabethan England: The Early Phase’, p. 192. Sidney’s common interest in voyages of discovery is evidenced in his financial investment in Gilbert’s project.

³⁹ Eleanor Rosenberg, *Leicester: Patron of Letters* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), p. xviii.

⁴⁰ Anthony Payne, *Richard Hakluyt and his Books*, p. 10.

⁴¹ *Original Writings*, I, p. 196.

September, Walsingham had sent Hakluyt to France as chaplain to Edward Stafford, Elizabeth's ambassador in Paris. Hakluyt had intended to follow his friend Stephen Parmenius to America. Parmenius, who had sailed with Gilbert in the previous June, wrote to Hakluyt in Paris: 'You thought in June last to have followed us your selfe.'⁴² Hakluyt remained in Stafford's employment until 1588,⁴³ collecting an annuity from the Clothworkers' Company,⁴⁴ but returned home on occasions, once to write 'A discourse of western planting' for Walter Raleigh, the new patent holder (following Humfrey Gilbert's death) for plantations on the northeast coast of America. Hakluyt presented his detailed argument regarding the benefits of plantation in an audience with the Queen. 'A discourse of western planting' was an attempt, which proved unsuccessful, to secure royal funding for Raleigh's ventures. Seeking personal preferment simultaneously, Hakluyt also presented the Queen with his handwritten manuscript analysis of Aristotle's *Politics* (originally undertaken as an expression of gratitude upon award of his position as embassy chaplain), for which the Queen granted him the reversion of a prebend in Bristol. Encouraged by Walsingham's 'goodnes extended diverse ways unto [him]', Hakluyt successfully petitioned Walsingham from France in April 1585 for assistance to secure this stipend, as a 'Mr Sanders, a prebend of that place, ether hath or meaneth to resigne his roome to another.'⁴⁵ During Hakluyt's employment as chaplain (from 1583 to 1588), he made 'diligent inquirie of such thinges as may yeld any light into our western discoveries' for Walsingham,⁴⁶ for he collated information from the Portuguese navigators resident in Don Antonio's exiled court, from the French royal

⁴² Letter from Stephen Parmenius to Richard Hakluyt (1583) in *Original Writings*, I, p. 199.

⁴³ See Conyers Read, *Mr Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth*, III, p. 266, and *ODNB* for Stafford's role as a double agent, who, whilst working as Elizabeth's ambassador in Paris, passed information on to the Spanish ambassador and jeopardized England's position in negotiations with Spain. Stafford's familial connections with Charles Arundel (cousin to his wife Douglas Sheffield) and the production and circulation of *Leicester's Commonwealth* gave Walsingham reason to distrust Stafford's judgement and integrity. Stafford had loyalties to Burghley, but as English ambassador in France, came under Walsingham's political supervision. For more details see James McDermott, 'Sir Edward Stafford', in *ODNB* <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26203>> [accessed 10 May 2011].

⁴⁴ D. B. Quinn states that Lord Burghley requested the continuation of this pension whereas G. D. Ramsay argues it was more likely to have stemmed from the Clothworkers' Company's own interest in Hakluyt's work. *Hakluyt Handbook*, I, p. 280 & G. D. Ramsay, 'Clothworkers, Merchants Adventurers and Richard Hakluyt', *English Historical Review*, pp. 519-520.

⁴⁵ *Original Writings*, II, pp. 343-344.

⁴⁶ *Original Writings*, I, p. 205.

cosmographer André Thevet and from the French royal skinners regarding their successful fur trade with the American Indians.

In an earlier letter of January 1584, Hakluyt again recorded his humble thanks to Walsingham for his ‘special favour and good will towards [Hakluyt]’ and acknowledged this particular research as an obligation or, more precisely, an ‘expectation’. Hakluyt again referred to Walsingham’s expectation in the dedicatory epistle of the 1589 edition of *Principall Navigations*.⁴⁷ Walsingham’s guiding influence and patronage, his encouragement of mercantile projects, his belligerent anti-Spanish position and his Protestant zeal all inform the tone of Hakluyt’s address in his dedication of *Principall Navigations*, published in the year following the Spanish Armada. The years from 1585 to 1589, however, represent an atypical moment in diplomatic relations between Elizabeth and Philip II, which simultaneously provoked the ‘crisis’ years in trade.⁴⁸

By 1589, the dearth of trade had had a significant impact on Walsingham’s own financial circumstances, informing further his personal interest in Hakluyt’s work and his need to promote new trading opportunities. A chancery record of 6 August 1589 is significant because it demonstrates both the extent to which Walsingham had been personally affected by the slump in trade and the impact it had had on government revenues. The document outlines the successful outcome of Walsingham’s petition to the Queen and her exchequer to reconsider the terms of his rent on the lease of the customs farmed from harbours predominantly found on the south, southwest and northeast coasts in ‘Plymouth Exeter Poole Bridgewater Bristol Gloucester Mylford Cardiff Chester Barwick Newcastle upon Tyne Kyngston upon Hull Lyme Regis and Yarmouth.’ Bestowed upon Walsingham on 17 August 1585 for a six year term, this privilege enabled Walsingham to farm customs duties for a fee. However, the bill of 1589 acknowledges the financial burden the privilege had placed upon Walsingham due to trade restrictions prompted by troubles in France and fears of war with Spain, and demonstrates the severe financial straits Walsingham had found himself in:

⁴⁷ ‘I understand from your servant Curtis [...] your special favour and good will towards me, as also your expectation of my diligent inquirie of such things as may yeld any light into our western discoveries’, *Original Writings*, I, p. 205.

⁴⁸ Pauline Croft, ‘Trading with the Enemy, 1585-1604’, p. 285.

Wee lett you wytt in consideration of the manye and frequente restraints of shipping of wares & merchandises to be transported from the said portes unto the partes beyond the seas made by us and our counsell since the first commencement of the said Lease and of the [smalences? — presumably ‘smallness’ in some spelling] of trade bothe into the Realme & out of the Realme which hath contynewed by the moste parte of the same tyme by reason of the troubles in ffrance and feare of warres betwene us & the king of Spayne.⁴⁹

The terms of the privilege demanded that Walsingham pay a staggering yearly sum of eleven thousand, two hundred and sixty three pounds and seven pence to the exchequer. Walsingham’s petition was apparently successful as the Queen did reduce the annual levy by almost seven thousand pounds on the condition that trade did not improve and his outstanding debt of over twelve thousand pounds was written off:

And lastlie for that the said Sir ffrances hath been at verye greate charges in the levying and gatheringe the said customes and subsidies in the said three yeres; wee haue remytted released & pardoned and of our especiale grace certen knowledge & mere mocion doe by theis *presentes* for us our heires & succesors Remytt release & pardon unto the said Sir ffrancis Walsingham the said somme of twelve thowsand seaven hundred fourescore & nyne pounds & xxid beinge the wholle remayning & resydue of the said somme of thirty three thowsand seaven hundred fourescore & nyne poundes xxid due unto us for the forsaid rente reserved upon the foresaid indenture for the saide three yeres ending the said nyne & twentieth of September in the said thirtieth yere of our reigne.⁵⁰

Walsingham’s interest in Hakluyt’s work now assumes another dimension as it was fostered in his personal need to encourage new trade links during 1585 to 1589 when traditional networks had been all but severed. By the early 1580s, prolonged political instability between European monarchs and Philip’s recent annexation of Portugal had prompted anxiety amongst English merchants trading overseas. ‘A discourse of the commodity of the taking of the straight of Magellanus’,⁵¹ which E. G. R. Taylor attributes to Hakluyt and may have been written for Walsingham,⁵² warned all European princes against a Habsburg domination of international markets. In controlling

⁴⁹ TNA, C82/1500.

⁵⁰ TNA, C82/1500.

⁵¹ Transcribed and printed in full by E. G. R. Taylor, *Original Writings*, I, pp. 139-146.

⁵² *Original Writings*, I, p. 17 (footnote).

trade networks to both the East and West Indies, Spanish dependence on trade with merchants from other countries would cease. In addition, the challenges for English merchants were compacted by the potential loss of Muscovy Company privileges in Russia in the event of ‘the suddaine death of the Russian’,⁵³ the disruption to trade at French ports due to the ongoing wars of religion and Antwerp’s dwindling importance to London merchants.⁵⁴ It was the successful military action led by Alexander Farnese (subsequently Duke of Parma) for the control of Antwerp, however, that finally prompted Elizabeth to commit herself to negotiations of support in the Low Countries and sign the treaty of Nonsuch (1585). Philip understood this as a declaration of war and by March 1585 Edward Stafford, the English ambassador in Paris, had heard that French and English ships were being impounded in Iberian ports in preparation for Philip’s armada:

On 29 May, orders came down to the *corregidor* of Biscay to arrest all the larger ships of any nation which were then to join the fleet in Lisbon or Seville. A fortnight later English ships on the Guadalquivir were stayed; some of them were attempting to take off such English goods as remained in Andalusia. Factors and sailors caught in the embargo were imprisoned, some of them later being handed over to the Inquisition.⁵⁵

By 1585 almost all investor confidence in trade to both Antwerp and the Iberian coast had faded, informing Parliament’s perception of the potential loss on import duties, a mainstay of the Crown’s revenue. Hitherto, ‘profits to be earned at Antwerp [had] left merchants content to be tied to Europe and reluctant to face the retaliation that any infringement of the Spanish and Portuguese monopolies might bring.’⁵⁶ The closure of ports and the seizure of goods and ships had deprived English merchants and traders of their habitual exporting centres. Although Pauline Croft argues that trade embargoes

⁵³ *Original Writings*, I, p. 140.

⁵⁴ London was a “satellite” of the Antwerp centre as English wool was predominantly finished on the looms in Antwerp and traded for dyestuffs and spices from Iberian suppliers. Antwerp was closed to English trade in the early 1560s, the early 1570s and eventually fell to the Habsburgs in 1584.

⁵⁵ Pauline Croft, *The Spanish Company* (Chatham: Mackay for London Record Society, 1973), p. xxviii. The significant quantity of various commodities and shipping seized is remarkable as it demonstrates how English merchants continued to risk reprisals throughout this period of political uncertainty. Although Philip II had previously granted safe-conduct passes for ships carrying grain, due to the crop failure in Andalusia, this can only partially explain the presence of English merchants in Spanish ports in 1585.

⁵⁶ F. J. Fisher, ‘Commercial Trends and Policy in Sixteenth-Century England’, p. 106.

were impossible to regulate,⁵⁷ it was the sustained nature of the hostilities, and the destabilizing effect on merchant confidence in export trade, that eventually prompted certain Privy Councillors to turn their attention to new markets in new lands.

Whilst it is commonly agreed that Hakluyt's five years in France (from 1583 to 1588), his return in 1588 and his publication of the first edition of *Principall Navigations* were all closely observed by Walsingham, I suggest that a greater degree of his involvement is indicated in Hakluyt's address 'to the fauourable Reader.'⁵⁸ Here, Hakluyt set out the *prescribed* limits for his work, indicating that the information that he chose to include in the work followed a direction from above.⁵⁹ These prescribed limits are worth some consideration as they complicate a consensus that maintains Hakluyt's central purpose in *Principal(l) Navigations* was to articulate a nationalistic depiction of English activity in the world. Hakluyt acknowledged that he has purposely excluded the most notable of English maritime achievements (the inclusion of which would seem imperative if the principal intention was to create a successful prose epic of the English nation) to focus specifically on long-distance voyages in search of strange coasts, the chief subject of his labour:⁶⁰

⁵⁷ Illegal trading activities persisted through entrepôts in France, authorized routes through the Channel Islands, boats masquerading under other flags and finally by direct contravention of the embargoes (customs officers being more interested in profit than edicts from above). Croft also describes the decade following the re-opening of Spanish ports (1573/4-1584) as 'outstandingly prosperous' for the Spanish Company, see 'Trading with the Enemy, 1585-1604', p. 283.

⁵⁸ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *3v.

⁵⁹ *OED* demonstrates that the verb to *prescribe* was used most commonly in the second half of the sixteenth century to mean ordered, set down as a direction or rule to be followed. See 'prescribe', in *OED* <<http://oed.com:80/Entry/150644>> [accessed 05 April 2011].

⁶⁰ Although Hakluyt states that he omits Drake's achievements at sea because Drake's contributions to maritime history are in the process of being collected for a separate publication, he offers no other excuses for the omission of the other singular and happy voyages of our renowned countrymen that he lists in the prefatory material. Drake's circumnavigation is subsequently included in many of the first editions (sigs. 3M4-3M9) but it is added after the continuous printing phase of the book as corrections in pagination are not made to accommodate its inclusion. The date of inclusion at present ranges from 1590 to 1596 (see Harry Kelsey on Drake and Anthony Payne's discussion on Kelsey included in chapter 3. For Kelsey on Drake see *Sir Francis Drake: The Queen's Pirate* (London: Yale University Press, 1998), p. 89 and for Payne's response see "'Strange, remote and farre distant countreys": The travel books of Richard Hakluyt', in *Journeys through the Market: Travel, Travellers and the Book Trade*, pp. 1-37 but as the title-page is not overtly altered to advertise its inclusion it remains ambiguous. I have used R. Carter Hailey's 'mugshot and fingerprint' method to compare watermarks and chain-lines in *Principall Navigations* to establish a more accurate printing date for this interpolation. See chapter 3.

And it is a thing withall principally to be considered, that I stand not vpon any action perfourmed neere home, nor in any part of Europe commonly frequented by our shipping, as for example: Not vpon that victorious exploit not long since atchieued in our narrow Seas agaynst that monstrous Spanish army vnder the valiant and prouident conduct of the right honourable the lord Charles Howard high Admirall of England: Not vpon the good seruices of our two woorthie Generals in their late Portugall expedition: Not vpon the two most fortunate attempts of our famous Chieftaine Sir Frauncis Drake, the one in the Baie of Cales vpon a great part of the enimies chieftest shippes, the other neere the Islands vpon the great Carrack of the East India, the first (though peradventure not the last) of that imployment, that euer discharged Molucca spices in English portes: these (albeit singular and happy voyages of our renowned countrymen) I omit, as things distinct and without the compasse of my prescribed limites, beyng neither of remote length and spaciousnesse, neither of search and discouerie of strange coasts, the chiefe subiect of this my labour.⁶¹

The reasons for the book's remit — long-distance travel undertaken by the English to uncover as yet unknown foreign shores — can be mapped more immediately on to the needs of the Clothworkers' Company. G. D. Ramsay affirms that the Clothworkers were 'unique among livery companies in being governed chiefly by merchants interested in longer-range markets, where cloths fully dyed and dressed were the main commodity of trade.'⁶² These trained artisans had been petitioning Parliament from 1566, complaining of their penury and underemployment. The members simultaneously sought legislation to control the exports of unfinished cloth, ensuring that quotas were met with a relative proportion of finished cloth.⁶³ Extraordinarily generous terms, for the benefit of the Clothworkers, were recommended by the Privy Council and supported by Walsingham

⁶¹ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *3v. Discovery, arguably, does not have the same colonial connotations in the sixteenth century due to the slippage of its meaning over time. In the sixteenth century it did not hold today's immediate inference of originality or initiation, *the first to know*. In Hakluyt's text the Muscovy Company discover Russia. Peopled with a civilized society, the term was used to demonstrate that their existence was now made known (uncovered) to English merchants.

⁶² G. D. Ramsay, 'Clothworkers, Merchants Adventurers and Richard Hakluyt', p. 513. Ramsay's detailed research suggests that the Clothworkers' and the Merchant Adventurers' divergence of export interests impacted upon the content of *Principall Navigations*. A large section of *Principall Navigations* is devoted to trade with Russia and the publication of the Muscovy Company's records. The original Muscovy Company members were almost all initially Merchant Adventurers 'to new lands'. Merchant Adventurers also held livery membership to the Clothworkers, as Ramsay notes, as they constituted the trading arm of all the different livery companies. The content of *Principall Navigations* is more appropriately understood in terms of its patrons.

⁶³ G. D. Ramsay, 'Clothworkers, Merchants Adventurers and Richard Hakluyt', p. 518.

(a ratio of nine undressed cloths to one dressed).⁶⁴ Exports could not, however, be properly controlled as the Clothworkers initially lacked the legal right to search warehouses, ships or packs (from 1566 until 1576) and subsequently were fined if packs were opened erroneously, thereby deterring investigative action.⁶⁵

The Clothworkers' longstanding interest in distant markets can be aligned more precisely with Hakluyt's work through the unusual circumstances around Hakluyt's receipt of a pension drawn from the Company (£6 13s) until 1585. It was remarkable because, despite being an exhibition for students studying divinity at university, it was continued whilst Hakluyt was working as chaplain within Stafford's household in Paris. Ramsay suggests this is an indication of Richard Staper's investment in research to establish trade links with distant lands. Richard Staper (upper Warden of the Clothworkers' Company and Master in 1590) and Edward Osborne (alderman, Mayor of the City of London and a freeman of the Company) had previously played 'a leading part in the foundation of the Levant and Eastland Companies.'⁶⁶ The search for different routes to access the coveted commodities from the East, prompted by the ramifications of war and its financial burden to Antwerp and Venice, was successfully accomplished by Osborne and Staper in re-establishing trade-links with Turkey.⁶⁷ The Venice-Antwerp overland route had previously connected Europe to the Eastern trade but, traversing numerous commercial centres, customs duties considerably inflated prices. In 1575, Staper and Osborne sent Joseph Clements and John Wight to obtain a safe-conduct pass from Murad III for William Harborne.⁶⁸ This private initiative, which was

⁶⁴ G. D. Ramsay, 'Clothworkers, Merchants Adventurers and Richard Hakluyt', p. 510.

⁶⁵ G. D. Ramsay, 'Clothworkers, Merchants Adventurers and Richard Hakluyt', p. 508.

⁶⁶ G. D. Ramsay, 'Clothworkers, Merchants Adventurers and Richard Hakluyt', p. 520. See also S. A. Skilliter who argues that Osborne and Staper were members of the Drapers' Company and thus, as rivals to the Mercers' Company, may have influenced Hakluyt's decision to exclude Thomas Cordell's (a mercer) previous ventures for the rediscovery of trade links to Turkey. S. A. Skilliter, *William Harborne and the Trade with Turkey, 1578-82: A documentary study of the first Anglo-Ottoman relations*, p. 11. As this contradicts the understanding that members were only permitted to hold membership with one city livery company, it seems peculiar that they were members of the Drapers as well as Clothworkers.

⁶⁷ The wars referred to include: a) the States-General against the Habsburgs for control of the city of Antwerp, and b) the Venetian Republic, allied with the Holy League, against the Ottomans to regain control of Cyprus (which had been lost in 1571 and was recognized as Ottoman territory in the Treaty of Cyprus (1573)).

⁶⁸ *Principall Navigations*, sig. O4r and for more detail see *The Principall Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation*, 10 vols (London: J. M. Dent, 1927), III, p. 51.

closely observed by Walsingham, was hugely successful and led to the incorporation of the Levant Company (1581). London members of the Levant Company were renowned for their accrual of vast wealth. Their success would have inevitably informed contemporary opinion in London of the potential profits in long-distance trade. Hakluyt's access to the Levant Company's archives demonstrates that senior members of the Levant Company agreed to the print dissemination of the practices of a successful company. Connections between Staper's office as Warden of the Clothworkers' Company, his personal contribution to the production of the work, the Clothworkers' decision to continue Hakluyt's pension and Staper's own contribution to the development of trade to the Levant illustrate another network of vested interests behind the publication of *Principall Navigations*.⁶⁹

In his dedicatory epistle, however, Hakluyt described *Principall Navigations* as representing a 'particular duty' to Walsingham:

[A]nd whereas I acknowledge in all dutifull sort how honorably both by your letter and speech I haue bene animated in this and other my trauels, I see my selfe bound to make presentment of this worke to your selfe, as the fruits of your owne incouragements, & the manifestation both of my vnfaigned seruice to my prince and country, *and of my particular duty to your honour: which I haue done with the lesse suspition either of not satisfying the world, or of not answering your owne expectation, in that according to your order, it hath passed the sight, and partly also the censure of the learned phisitian M. Doctor Iames, a man many wayes very notably qualified.*⁷⁰

Principall Navigations represented the outcome of a specific task undertaken for Walsingham and the fulfilment of Walsingham's 'expectation'. Further, Hakluyt was more assured of its success in achieving its objective as it had been passed by Doctor James, a man Walsingham had personally nominated to license the text.

Conyers Read describes the intricacies of foreign policy in the period: 'A half-hundred threads of policy were so knotted and joined that the pulling of any one meant the displacement of all the rest',⁷¹ but he presents Walsingham's interests in trading

⁶⁹ Staper is thanked in Hakluyt's prefatory material. The Clothworkers continued this pension until Hakluyt obtained his prebendary post in Bristol in 1585.

⁷⁰ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *3r, emphasis added.

⁷¹ *Mr Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth*, II, p. 1.

companies as adjuncts, somehow separate from the 'business of state'. Read addresses Walsingham's investment in, and encouragement of, trade in the closing pages of the final volume, a positioning of the narrative content that is echoed in Read's phraseology, which infers this division:

So far Sir Francis Walsingham has been considered almost entirely in connexion with the business of the state. He was indeed primarily a statesman. But there are other sides to his career which deserve attention. Next to Burghley, no one of Elizabeth's advisers was more interested than he in the development of English trade.⁷²

However, F. J. Fisher has argued that the commercial crises throughout Tudor history did affect policy making, as the correlation 'between trade fluctuations and the various phases of government policy is close enough at least to be suggestive.'⁷³ Fisher's essay, which stresses the 'piecemeal methods by which the mosaic of official ideas and actions [was], in fact, built up',⁷⁴ argues that by the 1570s Privy Councillors and merchants, prompted by the sustained and protracted problems experienced through the effects of exchange depreciation, internal price rises and the decline in the demand for English cloth in Antwerp, had turned their thoughts to discovery and exploration of new lands for new markets.⁷⁵

During William Cecil's influential years, first as secretary of state (from 1558 to 1571) and later as Lord Treasurer (until his death in 1598),⁷⁶ Privy Councillors developed an interventionist approach to help improve local economic conditions by actively supporting small scale projects and projectors. Heightened political awareness of the need for socio-economic reform, stimulated initially by the peasant riots, is witnessed in extant printed copies of sermons preached shortly after 1549.⁷⁷ Joan Thirsk

⁷² *Mr Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth*, III, p. 370.

⁷³ F. J. Fisher, 'Commercial Trends and Policy in Sixteenth-Century England', p. 96.

⁷⁴ F. J. Fisher, 'Commercial Trends and Policy in Sixteenth-Century England', p. 95.

⁷⁵ Henry's wars in France in the 1520s prompted the exchange depreciation. Initially export trade in wool profited by this but over production, enclosures and exhausted markets saw inflation soar and prompted the reactionary burgeoning of local industries to counter unemployment and poverty. The debasement of coin also affected depreciation until Thomas Gresham recalled the debased specie in the 1560s.

⁷⁶ Wallace T. MacCaffrey, 'Cecil, William, first Baron Burghley (1520/21–1598)', in *ODNB* <<http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/view/article/4983>> [accessed 7 July 2011].

⁷⁷ Joan Thirsk, *Economic Policy and Projects: The Development of a Consumer Society in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978).

discusses the sustained ideological influence of those men (now known as the ‘commonwealth-men’) on statesmen like Walsingham who addressed the ills felt by the commoners.⁷⁸ The commonwealth-men had been preachers and social reformers who presented their thoughts largely through the sermon, which focused on social justice and agricultural issues. Although G. R. Elton refutes the notion that the commonwealth-men were ever an organized party and questions later critical interpretations of the sermons delivered by John Hales and Hugh Latimer, he agreed that these men encouraged debate concerning the well-being of the commoners and the evils of covetousness which retained powerful ideological currency throughout Elizabeth’s reign.⁷⁹ However, by the 1570s the principal reformers were merchants and councillors, searching for economic expediency rather than social justice, and their focus was trade and domestic industry rather than agriculture.⁸⁰ Thirsk examines how local initiatives concerned with domestic production, which was often stimulated by immigrant expertise, sought to counter poverty and the instability of international trade. In the closing decades of the sixteenth century, the ideals of the commonwealth-men informed the practical responses of Privy Council members to socio-economic concerns. This dynamic between ideology and praxis was manifested in the rise of a projector culture.⁸¹ Projectors often petitioned Parliament for patents to protect their vested interests and to support their cause:

Both [William Cecil and Sir Thomas Smith] were products of that Cambridge in which Cromwell had found many recruits for his administration and which he had endeavoured to turn into a nursery for servants of the state. It is this line of thought and action that now merits better attention: the succession of men who thought coolly, secularly and constructively about the problems of the common weal and who faced the *practical tasks involved in turning aspiration into action*. They [...] were the true reform party of the sixteenth century.⁸²

⁷⁸ The leading agents of the group were Hugh Latimer, John Hales, Thomas Lever and Robert Crowley.

⁷⁹ As Mary C. Fuller has noted there is a dynamic tension between discursive representations of profit, joint-stock ventures and early colonial ventures and the need to disavow the covetousness integral to their impetus, see *Voyages in Print*, p. 154.

⁸⁰ G. R. Elton, ‘Reform and the “commonwealth-men” of Edward VI’s Reign’, in *The English Commonwealth, 1547-1640*, ed. by Peter Clark, Alan G. R. Smith and Nicholas Tyacke (Chatham: Mackay for Leicester University Press, 1979), pp. 23-38.

⁸¹ Joan Thirsk, *Economic Policy and Projects: The Development of a Consumer Society in Early Modern England*, p. 1.

⁸² G. R. Elton, ‘Reform and the “commonwealth-men” of Edward VI’s Reign’, pp. 37-38, emphasis added.

Although '[f]oreign trade handled a very small part of the nation's total industrial and agricultural production',⁸³ *Principall Navigations* was produced during a period in which Privy Councillors, under Cecil's influence, felt it necessary to give official encouragement and protection to projects to help establish them, thus addressing the practicalities of turning 'aspiration into action.' With limited access to liquid capital (from either the treasury or his own personal estate), Walsingham drew on his position of political authority and his influential patronage network to facilitate the production of *Principall Navigations* in order to encourage further capital investment from joint-stock projectors in voyages of discovery.

As 'decisions of patronage reflect[ed] personal tastes',⁸⁴ Walsingham's interest in navigations, voyages and discoveries must be aligned more effectively with overseas trade. George Bruner Parks describes Walsingham, with Gilbert, as the mastermind behind the North American colonial project as he spearheaded an alliance of men (Edward Dyer, Philip Sidney, and Walter Raleigh amongst others) who invested in voyages of discovery, trade and plunder.⁸⁵ Bruner Parks' description illustrates the intellectual, financial and navigational collaboration necessary to undertake a voyage of discovery but arguably again distorts the complexity of the vested interests to a colonial focus. The plantation of America was one of many proposals to secure investment in voyages of discovery alongside plunder, gains from commercial opportunities and grants of land acquisition. Hakluyt's central argument in the dedicatory epistle of *Divers voyages touching the discoverie of America* focused upon his compilation of eight substantial proofs for the existence of a Northwest Passage. An English settlement in North America was sought to provide a base from which English ships could explore the Northwest Passage to Cathay, thereby initiating direct links with the lucrative markets of the East. Walsingham's interest in overseas trade generally, and the discovery of the Northwest Passage particularly, is recorded in the archives of the Levant Company, the

⁸³ Joan Thirsk, *Economic Policy and Projects: The Development of a Consumer Society in Early Modern England*, p. 2.

⁸⁴ Werner L. Gundersheimer, 'Patronage in the Renaissance: An Exploratory Approach', p. 18.

⁸⁵ George Bruner Parks, *Richard Hakluyt and the English Voyages*, p. 78. Whilst my attention has focused on Walsingham as patron of *Principall Navigations*, Raleigh, as patron of Hakluyt, was also highly influential in Hakluyt's publications on North American exploration.

Muscovy Company, even as an honorary member of the Spanish Company (perhaps merely as a means for the Company to gain Walsingham's favour),⁸⁶ the manuscript letters from patentees for the discovery of the Northwest Passage and Drake's pirate ventures as well as the projects of plantation in northeast America.⁸⁷ The diversity of his interests is representative of those of the courtiers, councillors, merchants and gentry who also invested joint-stock in the maritime ventures of the period.

Walsingham's connection with the Muscovy Company may date back to 1562, as Conyers Read suggests Walsingham could have acquired stocks through his marriage to Anna Carleill. He is listed as a stock-holder by 1568.⁸⁸ E. G. R. Taylor argues that the extant 'Notes framed by a Gentleman heretofore to bee given to one that prepared for a discoverie, and went not' was written by Hakluyt's cousin for Gilbert's 1578 venture but that they were subsequently passed on 'to a member of Frobisher's expedition of 1578, in case [Frobisher] should succeed in reaching the South Sea and the Sierra Nevada (California).'⁸⁹ This explains why they are printed in *Principall Navigations* under the title 'Notes framed by M. Richard Hakluyt [...] giuen to certaine Gentlemen that went with M. Frobisher'.⁹⁰ Walsingham was also one of the eighteen joint-stock members in Frobisher's voyage.⁹¹ However, meetings between John Dee, Walsingham and Adrian Gilbert were recorded in Dee's diary in the period before Humfrey Gilbert's planned departure.⁹² After Humfrey Gilbert's inability to manage the venture of 1578, he wrote

⁸⁶ See Conyers Read on the surprising nature of Walsingham's connection with the Spanish Company as 'his policy of war with Spain made him one of the most dangerous enemies to the prosperity of the company in England.' *Mr Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth*, III, p. 372.

⁸⁷ In 1579, Walsingham also commissioned a pilot to scout the northeast coast of America.

⁸⁸ *Mr Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth*, III, p. 370.

⁸⁹ A copy of these notes is reprinted in E. G. R. Taylor, *Original Writings*, I, pp. 116-122. For the quotation and further details on the elder Hakluyt's work for Gilbert's proposed voyages (the elder Hakluyt assumed climate conditions akin to Spain and Southern France), see E. G. R. Taylor's introduction, pp. 13-14 (p.13). Walsingham may have established contact with Hakluyt's cousin in the late 1570s during Gilbert's proposed but unsuccessful 1578 venture to North America. By 1589, however, Hakluyt's cousin is described as 'well knowen vnto' Walsingham, see the dedicatory epistle, *Principall Navigations*, sig. *2r.

⁹⁰ *Principall Navigations*, sig. 3L6r.

⁹¹ K. R. Andrews, *Trade, Plunder and Settlement*, p. 169.

⁹² In 1577, Frobisher had returned from Baffin Island with two hundred tons of rock to be analysed for traces of gold. Michael Lok, who had invested heavily in the Company of Kathai and Frobisher's ventures, was bankrupted. In 1578, Frobisher discovered the Frobisher strait off Greenland, parts of the Hudson strait and the Labrador coast. His three ventures are generally seen as failures. According to E. G. R. Taylor, Hakluyt may have contributed to Gilbert's document, 'How her Majesty may annoy the King

to Walsingham in order to disassociate himself from all implication in Sir Henry Knollys's behaviour. In the letter, Gilbert also cited Walsingham as his principal patron:

But my principall care is to satisfie you above all other, by cause yo^r hono^r was the only meanes of my lycence. And therefore as my patron I studie principallie, next unto her Ma^{tie}, to mayntayn myselfe in yo^r good opynyon, whom I my selfe will honor and serve during life, no man more.⁹³

By 1578, Walsingham was also observing the development of trade and diplomatic relations with Turkey, penning his personal reflections in a manuscript entitled 'A consideration of trade into Turkey'.⁹⁴ S. A. Skilliter suggests Walsingham was 'the mind behind the whole Turkish enterprise'.⁹⁵ Walsingham was not convinced that trade would be successful as the journey was still hazardous and ships needed to travel in large flotillas for safety. The commodities for export would need to fill English holds, whether exported originally from England or not, to make the commercial venture a success. The difficulties introduced by the need to carry foreign commodities, collected *en route*, may have undermined Walsingham's confidence in the enterprise. Despite these concerns, K. R. Andrews describes the Turkey enterprise as 'the most important event between the forging of the sea link with Muscovy and the founding of the East India Company,' as 'English merchantmen could now fetch for the home market without intermediaries cotton wool and yarn, Turkish carpets and cloths, galls, Persian silk, and the sweet oils, sweet wines and currants of the islands.'⁹⁶

Walsingham also recommended the dispatch of 'an apte man' to 'procure an ample safe conduct' from Murad III and thereafter to remain in Constantinople,⁹⁷ in view of developing diplomatic relationships in Turkey concurrently.⁹⁸ By 1581, William

of Spain,' as the '[p]assages of a geographical character in this document suggest the assistance and influence both of John Dee and the younger Hakluyt.' *Original Writings*, I, pp. 12-13.

⁹³ *Original Writings*, I, p. 135.

⁹⁴ For more details see S. A. Skilliter, *William Harborne and the Trade with Turkey*, pp. 28-30.

⁹⁵ S. A. Skilliter, *William Harborne and the Trade with Turkey*, p. 27.

⁹⁶ K. R. Andrews, *Trade, Plunder and Settlement*, p. 93.

⁹⁷ S. A. Skilliter, *William Harborne and the Trade with Turkey*, p. 29.

⁹⁸ Negotiations between Company and Privy Councillor represent Walsingham's understanding that commerce in distant lands would inevitably become entangled in diplomatic relations with foreign rulers (despite Elizabeth's continued desire to circumvent overtly political alliances) and profitable trading ventures were dependent upon resident ambassadors.

Harborne's ambassadorial role was in place.⁹⁹ Significantly, this earlier profitable project brought Walsingham and officials of the Clothworkers' Company together. Both corporation and councillor collaborated again in the publishing venture of *Principall Navigations*.

Walsingham's active support of maritime trade and discovery was, therefore, enabled by his position of authority within a complicated social network. The material included in *Principall Navigations* represents the co-operation of entrepreneurial men who obligingly participated in its production in a bid to address contemporary geo-political and socio-economic concerns: Anthony Jenkinson and William Burrough, as representatives of the Muscovy Company, Richard Staper of the Clothworkers' and Levant companies, together with the older Richard Hakluyt, John Hawkins, Walter Raleigh, Richard Hakluyt and Walsingham.

Collaborative investment in its production immediately signifies that it was expected to be used purposely, rendering a return from the venture. It also indicates that the producers were familiar with the demographics of the book buying public and confident of their potential market. Despite H. S. Bennett's suggestion that '[t]o speak of the reading public is to speak of a body about which we are very imperfectly informed',¹⁰⁰ Jennifer Loach argues that merchants and landowners represented the greatest proportion of the book buying public by the 1550s.¹⁰¹ Evidently merchants and landowners represented a group of potential investors in long-distance maritime ventures and would have made up part of the targeted audience. Patrick Collinson, Arnold Hunt and Alexandra Walsham argue that 'the assumed impersonality of "publication" may be another anachronism' and that '[b]ooks were often targeted to a known audience, rather than broadcast to strangers.'¹⁰² Whilst this statement is made in

⁹⁹ K. R. Andrews, *Trade, Plunder and Settlement*, p. 90.

¹⁰⁰ H. S. Bennett, *English Books & Readers 1558 to 1603: Being a Study in the History of the Book Trade in the Reign of Elizabeth I*, p. 2.

¹⁰¹ Jennifer Loach, 'The Marian Establishment and the Printing Press', *English Historical Review*, 101 (1986), 135-148 (p. 136).

¹⁰² Patrick Collinson, Arnold Hunt and Alexandra Walsham, 'Religious Publishing in England 1557-1640', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, 1557-1695*, ed. by John Barnard, D. F. McKenzie, David McKitterick, I. R. Willison & others, planned in 7 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998-), IV, ed. by John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie, with the assistance of Maureen Bell (2002), pp. 29-66 (p. 31).

relation to religious publications, Collinson, Hunt and Walsham list other general anachronistic assumptions that they believe may need correcting. The first is the assumption that the term “religious” marks off a more or less discrete area of life’ as “religion” permeated much, if not all, of what is now secularized.’¹⁰³ The second anachronism relates to that of publication and highlights the importance of oral and manuscript dissemination throughout this period. As the sermon is an obvious example of oral publication, they argue that ‘to interpret “religious publishing” in the narrow and specialized sense familiar to the twentieth century may be distorting and limiting.’¹⁰⁴

Further research into the sociology of the readership of *Principall Navigations* is necessary and is the subject of my final chapter. However, ventures to discover distant lands ultimately depended upon attracting considerable capital into a high-risk but potentially highly profitable speculation and *Principall Navigations* targeted investors. K. R. Andrews has indentified three particular groups of men who engaged in the sea-war after 1585: a ‘powerful body of merchants’, ‘revengeful traders’ and a ‘rapacious gentry’.¹⁰⁵ Their common interest in new markets, however, only emerged after the closure of Spanish ports. Thus, it is only after 1585 that they constituted a cohesive social force. *Principall Navigations* seems both to reflect this newly established alliance through its compilation and to present an argument to alleviate their common difficulties. Information drawn from overseas factors, London merchant companies, investors and ambassadors was collated from manuscript records and redistributed in print. The search for new markets grew out of several inter-related conditions, namely: the deterioration of trading relationships with ports under Habsburg control (now including Antwerp); the diminishing returns on trade in Moscow; the continued difficulties prohibiting trade in French ports; and the seizure of goods, ships and merchants in Iberian ports.

¹⁰³ Patrick Collinson, Arnold Hunt and Alexandra Walsham, ‘Religious Publishing in England 1557-1640’, p. 29.

¹⁰⁴ Patrick Collinson, Arnold Hunt and Alexandra Walsham, ‘Religious Publishing in England 1557-1640’, p. 30.

¹⁰⁵ K. R. Andrews, *Elizabethan Privateering: English Privateering during the Spanish War, 1585-1603* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1964), p. 18.

The risks involved in trade to Spain after 1585 had a notable impact on this social cohesion as the powerful London merchants of the Spanish Company had recently aligned themselves vociferously with Bernardino de Mendoza, the Spanish ambassador in London, when he petitioned Elizabeth in the early 1580s for the return of the spoils plundered from the *Cacafuego*. Traders, dwelling in foreign ports and reliant on privileges from both the foreign authority and Elizabeth, depended upon peaceful diplomatic conditions and amicable relations of trust. Usually resident near the port, these factors were vulnerable representatives of the Company and the Crown and suffered the immediate consequences of reprisal (imprisonment, seizure of goods and / or boats) and, in the particularly hostile political reaction in 1585, from the decision to close ports to trade.

A ‘powerful body of merchants’, whose trading prospects to the Iberian coast and Antwerp were suddenly thwarted, now allied themselves wholeheartedly with the ‘revengeful traders’ who had lost their goods, ships and men in Spanish harbours.¹⁰⁶ These men initially sought letters of reprisal from the Admiralty Court for recompense, but this formal procedure was only tenuously adhered to as hostilities between Philip and Elizabeth intensified. Overseas traders who owned merchant ships ‘converted [them] for purposes of warfare simply by the addition of a few guns and a great many men.’¹⁰⁷ Despite alerting his readers to the dangers of a reductive understanding of the complexity of the social groups involved in the sea war, K. R. Andrews stipulates:

It is not suggested that all merchants with a considerable interest in privateering had been trading to Spain and Portugal before the war, nor even that all the members of the Spanish Company went in for privateering. It is very clear, however, that the Iberian traders formed the weightiest element in the mass of merchant privateering promoters.¹⁰⁸

Previously Don Antonio’s cause had enabled English pirates to veil their predatory activities as commissions for the Portuguese pretender from the 1580s. The ‘rapacious gentry’ who saw the potential for profits either invested in these voyages of trade or

¹⁰⁶ K. R. Andrews, *Elizabethan Privateering*, p. 18.

¹⁰⁷ K. R. Andrews, *Elizabethan Privateering*, p. 34.

¹⁰⁸ K. R. Andrews, *Elizabethan Privateering*, p. 112.

plunder or took to the seas themselves.¹⁰⁹ During the decade before the Armada, the nobility and gentry were increasingly drawn to investing openly in privateering ventures and to the patronage of pirates. Whilst fully aware that the aggressive and predatory nature of these ventures could destabilize the necessary conditions for trade, the potential for advantageous returns and the political message these actions encoded gained support from the court throughout the years leading up to the Spanish Armada. The circumnavigations of Cavendish and Drake were also of tremendous political significance, as formidable demonstrations of navigational prowess that sought to undermine not only Iberian domination of the new trading potential in Africa and the raw materials of the Caribbean but also the Habsburgs' evolving position as the foremost political power in Europe.

The 1589 edition of *Principall Navigations* is, therefore, a textual witness to the recent cohesion of interests amongst powerful merchants, tradesmen and investors (namely courtiers and gentry) which was prompted by the extraordinary and relatively short-lived need for a group of merchants and traders to diversify, and by the opportunities for patrons to invest openly in privateering during the closing years of the 1580s. I shall argue, however, that *Principall Navigations* represents a political attempt to engage this social alliance and divert its investments away from the short-term profits reaped from a sea-war into longer range, long-term profits offered by the discovery of new markets. *Principall Navigations* bears testimony to the energies divested by Privy Council members to support projectors in the face of protracted economic hardship felt by particular communities of people. These communities sued the Privy Council for assistance in initiating projects that could alleviate their circumstances. Prompted by dwindling export opportunities to Europe and spearheaded by the Clothworkers' more historical search for non-European outlets, all English merchant companies trading overseas would have been alert to the apparent need for market diversification in 1589.

The importance of Walsingham's role, already witnessed implicitly in Hakluyt's ability to access certain materials included in the compilation, will become clearer when turning to the costs of the production of *Principall Navigations*. If measured in terms of

¹⁰⁹ K. R. Andrews, *Elizabethan Privateering*, p. 18.

market value to the printer-publishers, *Principall Navigations* would have demanded substantial capital investment as returns in sales were slow. It took almost a decade to sell the first edition. Proceedings in the Star Chamber demonstrate small format popular pirated books were printed much more regularly, in large editions. As *Principall Navigations* was published in folio and contained over 200 edition sheets, its print-production would have depended upon a patron with power and influence. This challenges Fuller's argument that printers suddenly became interested in the massive publishing ventures of Hakluyt and Purchas because of their commercial viability:

It is remarkable, then, to go from the 1550s, with "the obvious failure of England's printers to register any real interest in Renaissance exploration and travel," to the massive publishing ventures of Hakluyt and Purchas fifty-odd years later.¹¹⁰

And yet the successful incorporations of the East India Company (1600) and the Virginia Company (1606) can, in part, be attributed to the methods employed by this group of men to provide an impetus through the production of *Principall Navigations* for planning further action.

In conclusion, it can now be argued that *Principall Navigations* (1589) was not the independent work of a single author, in control of his narrative selection, seeking to influence policy from below in a bid to represent mercantile expansionism within a nation building narrative. Rather its production was reliant upon a collaborative enterprise, its material compilation 'prescribed' most probably by Secretary Walsingham, and invested in by the Clothworkers' Company (amongst others). It was a patron-led project which directed Hakluyt's research to meet a particular objective which, I suggest, more readily points to the practical needs of market diversification rather than national expansionism (expansion implicitly implying growth). For maximum profitability, its astute publication had to catch the spirit of the moment to attract investment from merchants (whose commercial activities had been hampered) and from patrons (who were more willing to invest in privateering). The conception and production of *Principall Navigations* emanated from a period of crisis in trade and

¹¹⁰ Mary C. Fuller, quoting John Parker from *Books to Build an Empire: A Bibliographical History of English Overseas Interests to 1620* (Amsterdam: N. Israel, 1965), p.30, in *Voyages in Print*, p. 11.

diplomatic relations with Spain (from 1585). Arguably, published the year after the Armada, it sought to divert private investment in particularized privateering ventures, and short-term gains, rendered by disenfranchised gentry and merchants previously trading in Spain, to the potential for long-term profit from longer-range markets as an outcome from voyages of ‘remote length and spaciousnesse’ in the ‘search and discoverie of strange coasts’ as investment was not forthcoming from the Crown.¹¹¹

¹¹¹ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *3v.

Chapter Two

Reaping 'the Tenth parte of his charge': The Queen's Printer, the Principal Secretary and the Production of *Principall Navigations* (1589)

[P]riviledges are occasion, that many bookes are nowe prynted, *which* are more beneficiall to the common welth, then proffitable to the prynter, for the Patentee being benefitted otherwise by Bookes of profitable sale is content to bestowe parte of his gayne in other bookes, *which* are within the Compas of his patent, verie beneficiall for the common welth, and yet suche wereby the printer shall scarce reape the Tenth parte of his charge. (Christopher Barker to Lord Burghley, on the benefits of the patent system, 1586)¹

At the Hakluyt Society annual lecture of 1996, Anthony Payne outlined the need for a comprehensive study of *Principal(l) Navigations* as material objects, comparing the potential of Richard Hakluyt's books to archaeological artefacts, or 'quarries' in need of an alternative excavation.² For, as D. F. McKenzie suggests, '[i]f a medium in any sense effects a message, then bibliography cannot exclude from its own proper concerns the relation between form, function, and symbolic meaning.'³ Drawing a further analogy between *Principal(l) Navigations* and 'an old house with original features intact',⁴ Payne advises that the unfamiliar characteristics of *Principall Navigations* should be recognized as signposts which alert us to the different technological and social environments in which the early modern book was produced. This would lead the researcher to a more sensitive appreciation of the book's production, dissemination and contemporary purpose. Adrian Johns enhances this conception of the book as artefact, describing it as 'the material embodiment of [...] a collective consent.'⁵ The material form of the book conveys valuable information regarding the different and specific social networks that necessarily developed to fashion its production. Pamela Neville-Sington agrees that insights gained from 'forensic bibliography' can reveal the 'complex

¹ BL, Lansdowne MSS 48, fol. 173.

² Anthony Payne, *Richard Hakluyt and his Books*, p. 3.

³ D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 10.

⁴ *Richard Hakluyt and his Books*, p. 6.

⁵ Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (London: The University of Chicago Press, 1998), p. 3.

layers of meaning dictated by vested private interests, government policy and factions at court' that have influenced the production of a given text.⁶

This chapter will now examine the immediate political and socio-economic environments of the printing venture of *Principall Navigations*. It will focus on early modern Stationers' practices in London generally and those of the royal printing house in particular. As Darnton has argued, reconstructing the histories of the agents involved in the print-production of a text like *Principall Navigations* will inevitably enhance appreciation of the book's immediate circumstances of transmission and reception.⁷ Previously, an assessment of the social alliances, mediated through mechanisms of patronage, has demanded a re-evaluation of authorial subjectivity. Hakluyt's 'prescribed limites', the collaboration of various agents and the patronage of both the Clothworkers and Francis Walsingham have undermined an understanding of Hakluyt as a solitary author in control of the selection of his materials. Authorship now constitutes a network of men with connections to a powerful patron whose personal influence is evident throughout the conception, production and the publication of *Principall Navigations*. As the processes of publication were also embedded in social negotiations, it will become apparent that Francis Walsingham not only played a formative role in constructing the message of the book, he was also necessary to its production in print.

In the first edition of *Principall Navigations*, the title-page records the names of the printer-publishers involved in its publication. The imprint in the 1589 edition records their interests thus:

Imprinted at London by GEORGE BISHOP | and RALPH NEWBERIE, Deputies
to | CHRISTOPHER BARKER, Printer to the | Queenes most excellent
Maiestie. | 1589.⁸

In the closing pages of this edition, the colophon reiterates the printer-publishers' status as deputies to the Queen's printer. A close comparison of the title-pages of the editions printed in 1589 and 1598-1600 registers a disparity between the printers' imprints, even

⁶ Pamela Neville-Sington, "'A very good trumpet': Richard Hakluyt and the Politics of Overseas Expansion', in *Texts and Cultural Change in Early Modern England*, p. 67.

⁷ Robert Darnton, 'What is the History of Books?', in *The Book History Reader* (see Darnton, above), pp. 9-26.

⁸ *Hakluyt Handbook*, II, p. 479.

though both editions were produced by almost exactly the same group of printer-publishers. The imprint of the second edition, the first volume of which was printed in 1598, is presented without mention of the office of the royal printer:

[Printer's flower] Imprinted at London by GEORGE | BISHOP, RALPH
NEWBERIE | and ROBERT BARKER. | 1598.⁹

Although the second edition is composed of three volumes and D. B. Quinn has identified four variant states of the title-page of the first volume,¹⁰ the Queen's printers' imprint is not employed in any of these title-pages.

Drawing on data collated specifically for this research, I can demonstrate that the personal names of George Bishop and Ralph Newberry are not listed alongside their status as deputies to the Queen's printer in any other extant book produced in the period between 1587 (the date Barker deputized the Queen's printers' patent) and 1589, marking the collaboration behind the publishing venture as very unusual, if not unique.¹¹ Indeed, analysis of almost five hundred entries recorded in the ESTC under the imprint, 'printer to the Queenes [most excellent] maiestie' between 1577 and 1600 verifies that the combination of the names of both deputies and the Queen's printer's imprint is only witnessed in this specific instance.¹² *Principall Navigations* was entered for Bishop's and Newberry's copy in the Stationers' register on 1 September 1589. If the imprint records their personal investment in the project, this is corroborated by the entry in the register under their personal names. This seems to disclose a more complicated

⁹ *Hakluyt Handbook*, II, p. 499.

¹⁰ There is also a fifth title-page which is considered to be an eighteenth-century reproduction, see *Hakluyt Handbook*, II, p. 493.

¹¹ I have found one book printed in three editions (STC 22908, 22909 & 22912) with the entry: 'Imprinted at London by George Bishop, deputie to Christopher Barker, printer to the Queenes most excellent maiestie.' This is a 'Godly treatise containing and deciding certaine questions, Robert Some Doctor of Diuinitie.' It was entered as Master Bishop's copy and was licensed by the Archbishop of Canterbury. See Arber, II, p. 521. All other books printed by the deputies that I have seen only record 'Deputies to Christopher Barker, printer to the Queenes most excellent maiestie' in the imprint. See *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company: 1576 to 1602 from Register B*, ed. by W. W. Greg and E. Boswell (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1930), pp. 95-96. Ralph Newberry was a bookseller in London 1560-1604. He succeeded to the sales outlet of Thomas Berthelet and often published with Henry Bynneman from 1578. In 1581-2, he collaborated as assignees of Richard Tottell and C. Barker. In 1584, along with Henry Denham, Newberry took over many of Bynneman's copies, others they yielded to the Stationers' Company. From 1586, he published with George Bishop. In 1587 he became deputy to C. Barker. George Bishop: Bookseller in London 1566-1611.

¹² This figure is represented by searching the online edition by publisher search and imprint details.

contractual relationship between the deputies and the office of Queen's printer than was usual.

Barker nominated Bishop and Newberry as his deputies in late 1587. At this point he probably also contracted them to oversee the final years of Barker's son's apprenticeship, usually a term of seven years. In June 1589, Robert obtained his freedom from the Company, an entitlement through patrimony. Henry R. Plomer asserts that Robert also held an interest, through partnership, in the Queen's printer privilege at this point.¹³ However, his name is not recorded with those of the deputies on the title-page of *Principall Navigations* issued in the following December (or perhaps January 1589/1590). The *Short Title Catalogue* and the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* posit his entry into partnership with the Queen's printers' deputies in 1593, the date of his entry into the ranks of the livery.¹⁴ R. B. McKerrow proposes that he was printing with them from 1596.¹⁵

On 8 August 1589, Christopher Barker secured a reversion of the royal printers' patent for his son to come into effect on Barker's death (29 November 1599).¹⁶ Extant printed texts witness Robert Barker's inauguration to this role in proclamations and bibles from 1599. Some imprints in 1600, however, do still record the printers as 'the deputies to Christopher Barker, Printer to the Queenes most excellent maiestie', documenting 1599 to 1600 as a period of financial negotiations and transferrals of

¹³ Henry R. Plomer, 'The King's Printing House under the Stuarts', *The Library*, 2nd ser., 2.8 (Oct., 1901), 353-375 (pp. 353-354).

¹⁴ *STC*, III, p. 11. Vivienne Westbrook, 'Translators of the Authorized Version of the Bible (act. 1604-1611)', in *ODNB* <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/74199>> [accessed 22 June 2011]. See also 'Christopher Barker', in *Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of Foreign Printers of English Books 1557-1640*, ed. by R. B. McKerrow (London: Blades, East & Blades for the Bibliographical Society, 1910), pp.18-20 and 'Robert Barker', in *Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667*, ed. by Henry R. Plomer (London: Blades, East & Blades for the Bibliographical Society, 1907), pp. 13-14.

¹⁵ McKerrow argues that in 1589 Christopher took his son into partnership and in 1596 Robert was printing with his father's deputies. The year 1596 represents seven years after Robert Barker obtained the freedom of the company through patrimony, perhaps conjecturing a term of apprenticeship. Ronald B. McKerrow, *Printers' and Publishers' Devices in England & Scotland, 1485-1640* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1913), p. 165.

¹⁶ See BL, Egerton MSS 1835, fol. 167, for translated details of the reversionary patent. This is partially transcribed in Appendix A.3. This could represent Plomer's claim that Robert Barker held a partnership interest in the royal printing patent from 1589. For Barker's biography, see David Kathman, 'Christopher Barker', in *ODNB* <<http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/view/article/1390>> [accessed 23 Jan 2008].

interests in the Queen's printers' patent that were not immediately foreclosed at Christopher Barker's death.¹⁷

The basic business relationship between Christopher and Robert Barker, George Bishop and Ralph Newberry remained stable over the period from 1589 (the printing of the first edition of *Principall Navigations*) to 1598 (that of the second edition). Robert Barker's entry into partnership with the printer-publisher syndicate sometime between 1593 and 1596 constituted the only development. His investment in the production of the second edition was accordingly recorded in the imprint. Christopher had already secured the reversionary patent by 1589, Robert was a freeman with potentially some interest at least in the royal printing patent (if only by reversion) and Bishop and Newberry were Barker's appointed deputies. The absence of the words 'Deputies to CHRISTOPHER BARKER, Printer to the Queenes most excellent Maiestie' in the 1598-1600 edition represents, I propose, a change in publication interests and responsibilities beyond the business relationships between the printer-publishers themselves.

These bibliographical discrepancies raise some important issues which this chapter will attempt to address. I will examine the Queen's printers' output during the period between 1577 and 1589 to understand how the imprint of the office of Queen's printer was employed. This will involve an initial consideration of the general printing and publication practices of early modern London to appreciate the wider contexts. I will focus on three important and inter-connected relationships: between the printers, the monarch and Parliament; between the patent holders and the Stationers' Company; and between the printers and their patron. This will develop an understanding of the use of the imprint in the publication details of *Principall Navigations* and evaluate all other types of extant work that were issued from the royal printing house.

After considering the social processes that evolved through government, Company and patent holder interests, I will argue that the publication of *Principall Navigations* was dependent upon Walsingham's authority over the Queen's printing house. As a Privy Councillor, he was able to order the print-production of materials he deemed necessary for the business of state. It was through this position of authority that he was

¹⁷ For example: *STC* 2181.

able to action the publication of *Principall Navigations*. This is corroborated by the use of the Queen's printers' imprint, the entry in the registers and the history of its copy. The printer-publisher relationship was further complicated, however, by Walsingham's personal patronage of Christopher Barker. This had commenced well before Barker 'bought' the office of royal printer from Thomas Wilkes in 1577.¹⁸

As the deputies' names appear in the imprint, it suggests they were also personally involved in underwriting the cost of publication in some way. George Bishop and Ralph Newberry were two of the most influential Elizabethan publishers facilitating many publications for various printers (particularly Henry Middleton and Thomas Dawson). 'Impensis G. Bishop' recurs frequently in imprints of the period. Furthermore, they were senior members of the Stationers' Company: Bishop was Master of the company in 1590, 1592, 1593, 1600, 1602, 1603 and 1608, upper Warden in 1584 and 1586 and under Warden in 1578 and 1579; Newberry was Master in 1598 and 1601, upper Warden in 1589 and 1590 and under Warden in 1583 and 1584. The license to print the bibles that came into the royal printing house remained with the office rather than the individual printers. The bibles (including: The Great Bible, which was brought to the office by Richard Grafton; The Bishops' Bible, or the amended Great Bible, by Richard Jugge; The Geneva Bible, by Christopher Barker; The Bible in Welsh, by George Bishop) were brought to the office by the individual post-holders. Thomas Adams' later interest in *Principall Navigations*, however, confirms that rights to the book's copy were not held exclusively by the royal printer. On Bishop's death, Bishop transferred his stock and interest in copies (including that of *Principall Navigations*) to Adams, his journeyman printer.¹⁹ Therefore, the license to print *Principall Navigations* was not incorporated, like the bibles before and after, into the royal printing office in the usual manner.

The office of royal printer was conferred by patent and in September 1577 (the commencement of Barker's period in office) included the privilege to print the Geneva Bible, the Bishops' Bible and the *Book of Common Prayer*. The connection between the

¹⁸ Arber, I, p. 115.

¹⁹ See *Abstracts from the Wills of English Printers and Stationers from 1492 to 1630*, ed. by Henry R. Plomer (London: Blades, East and Blades for Bibliographical Society, 1903), p. 3.

monopoly over English bibles and the office of royal printer is crucial. The economic benefits reaped from the privilege were tied to the office's obligation to print matters relating to the Queen's affairs. This suggests that the publication of *Principall Navigations* was enacted under the terms of the office's obligation to print material for the government. This position was complicated, however, by Walsingham's personal patronage of Christopher Barker and the interests held by Bishop and Newberry in its production.

In 1588, on deputizing the office to Bishop and Newberry, Barker augmented the royal printing house's capacity to print bibles in folio format alongside quarto editions and octavo New Testaments. On receipt of a share in the office (through deputation), Bishop and Newberry seem to have provided the necessary economic security to initiate more profitable bible production, the mainstay of Barker's growing empire. As the production of a Geneva Bible generally consumes about 280 edition sheets in folio (e.g. *STC* 2133) and 140 edition sheets in quarto (e.g. *STC* 2145 & 2152) decisions regarding format would have had a direct consequence on the initial outlays as paper represented the greatest single expenditure in book production (between 30% and 40%).²⁰ Over the first eleven years in office, the *STC* records that Barker produced four Geneva Bibles, two Bishops' Bibles and four editions of the *Book of Common Prayer* in folio format, or almost one folio every year, alongside quarto, octavo and sixteenmo publications.²¹ In 1588, the year following Barker's deputation of the Queen's printing office to Ralph Newberry and George Bishop, the annual rate of production increased significantly. In 1588 alone, the printing house produced three substantial folios (The Bishops' Bible, *STC* 2149, The Welsh Bible *STC* 2347, and Rastell's unabridged Statutes, *STC* 9317), alongside quartos and octavos. A further two folios were printed in 1589 (*STC* 2888 Rheims and Bishops' Bible and *STC* 12625 *Principall Navigations*). Notably, the *STC* records a number of variants or re-issues in their bibliography of printed items and

²⁰ Peter W. M. Blayney estimates that the paper for a play quarto amounted to 30% of the total production costs. See David L. Gants, 'Patterns of Paper Use in the *Workes of Beniamin Jonson* (William Stansby, 1616)', *Studies in Bibliography*, 51 (1998), 127-153 (p. 131).

²¹ Four editions of the Geneva Bible (1577, 1578, 1582, 1583); two editions of the Bishops' Bible (1584 and 1585); and four editions of the *Book of Common Prayer* (1580, 1581, 1586, 1587), for details see Appendix A.1.

production statistics must only take account of new editions.²² The *STC* also records three variant witnesses of the Statutes (both unabridged and abridged) in folio dated 1589 (*STC* 9487.7, 9487.9 and 9488 — 9488.5 seems to be a partial witness of 9488) but Barker should have produced Rastell's Statutes with Richard Tottel. In a document in the records of the Chancery, the deponent William Tottel argued that his father held some interest in the copy of Rastell's Statutes.²³ Furthermore, although the editions of 1589 have distinguishing features, they are very closely related and may represent variants or reissues of previous impressions. Alternatively, the re-use of standing type would have reduced compositor and proof-reading labours but a recent series of complaints from journeymen printers had directed '[a] certified copy of certain provisions for the protection and advantage of journeymen, resolved on December 1587, [...] [which had] order[ed] among other things "that no formes or letters be kept standing to the prejudice of workmen."'²⁴

However, paper consumption also depended upon the size of a particular edition. Notably, the Queen's printers were not limited to a number of copies in any one impression.²⁵ Graham Rees and Maria Wakely have shown that in a court case of 1627 two witnesses, John Bill and Robert Constable, testified to the usual sizes of editions printed in the office of royal printer in the preceding years. 'John Bill declared that the standard edition sizes "of the said office are 6000. 3000. & 1500: or thereabouts."'²⁶ Whilst this testimony relates to practices in the royal printing house some thirty years later, regulation relating to the general edition sizes of works 'of the said office' are set out in the Stationers' ordinances of 1588. These also acknowledged that the Queen's printers (when printing under the terms of the royal printing office) were able to print as

²² Peter W. M. Blayney, 'STC Publication Statistics: Some Caveats', *The Library*, 7th ser., 8.4 (Dec., 2007), 387-397 (p. 390).

²³ See Richard Tottel's son, William Tottel's plea in the conciliar courts: TNA, C2 Eliz/T4/ 41.

²⁴ W. W. Greg, *Some Aspects and Problems of London Publishing between 1550 and 1650* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), pp. 15-16.

²⁵ Arber, II, p. 43.

²⁶ Graham Rees and Maria Wakely, *Publishing, Politics, and Culture: the King's Printers in the Reign of James I and VI* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 67.

many copies as they saw fit: 'bookes belonging to ye office of her maiesties printer which by reason of her maiesties affayres are to be limited to no numbers.'²⁷

The Queen's printers' folio production continued to be within the remit of the patent: the Bishops' Bible (from Richard Jugge's royal patent), a Bible in Welsh (a new edition *STC* 2347 acquired by Bishop and Newberry but printed as Deputies to the Queen's Printer); the New Testament (from the Rheims and Bishops' Bible in parallel columns, again newly obtained by the Queen's printing house); The Geneva Bible (Barker) and the Statutes. What is apparent is that folio bibles begin to be printed more regularly after 1587 and by James' reign, Graham Rees and Maria Wakely state:

The King's Printers could supply the market with Bibles and Testaments only because they had the productive capacity, and unless we have a clear understanding of that we cannot understand either the King's Printers or their output. They were eagles amongst the quarrelsome magpies and crows who otherwise represented the London book trade in the reign of James I.²⁸

An understanding of the relationship between the privilege to print bibles in English and the obligation to publish official matter is, therefore, crucial to the sociology of *Principall Navigations*.

The confusion of interests that arose from the incorporation of the Stationers' Company and the royal prerogative to grant individual printing patents represents in microcosm a dynamic that can be observed more generally in early modern society. The cultivation of inter-personal relations of indebtedness and favour provided a mechanism for the exchange of goods or services in lieu of potential or deferred social or economic gain within societies with limited access to monetary currency. The ambiguity or contiguity of awards, however, frequently produced conflicts of interest.

As the monarch's bestowal of printing monopolies was intricately bound to government's desire for greater control of the printed word, the alliance between Company and Crown has been habitually analysed through a consideration of the

²⁷ Arber, II, p. 43.

²⁸ Graham Rees and Maria Wakely, *Publishing, Politics, and Culture: the King's Printers in the Reign of James I and VI*, p. 66.

government's implementation of censorship laws.²⁹ However, it will become apparent that Christopher Barker, like every privileged Stationer of this period, continually employed his executive authority more effectively to pursue his personal interests, which were never synonymous with those of the Crown.

The date of the production of *Principall Navigations* is also of paramount importance. In the late 1580s, both the Stationers' and Parliament's attention was focused uncompromisingly on patents. The controversy which had grown up within the Stationers' Company between privileged and unprivileged members threatened the viability of the Company itself. The potential internal fracture and its solution (from 1577 to 1586) induced a heightened awareness amongst all members of the Company of the rights of copy and their more stringent enforcement. After 1586 there was an increase in Company searches and searchers, greater activity in the courts as privileged members sought protection of their patents in the Star Chamber and more regular licensing practices both in the Stationers' registers and from external authority.³⁰ These details will help contextualize the importance of Barker's qualification that all additional publishing work, undertaken by patent holders for the benefit of the commonweal and not for profit, would also fall 'within the Compas of [their] patent[s]'.³¹

Company Regulation and Unlawful Printing

Parliament's evolving measures to censor seditious material through monarchical decrees were enmeshed with the Stationers' Company's incorporation and complicated by the endowment of individual printing monopolies, which could be, and often were, bestowed upon those outside the printing fraternity. Consequently, the government's desire to employ the Stationers to police and regulate their members' activities,

²⁹See particularly Cyndia Susan Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). Clegg sees her book as a corrective to the common perception that the Elizabethan government was habitually aggressive when dealing with issues of censorship.

³⁰ W. W. Greg suggests between 60% and 70% of extant books published in London were registered in the period between 1576 and 1640 and on the appointment of official licensors, 87% of those registered books were licensed between 1589 and 1590. 'Entrance, Licence, and Publication', *The Library*, 4th ser., 25.1-2 (June, 1944), 1-22 (pp. 7-8).

³¹ BL, Lansdowne MSS 48, fol. 173.

preventing them from publishing religious heterodoxy or political censure, was never entirely satisfied as the powerful Stationers' own concepts of both unlawful printing and control of the trade were markedly different. For the Stationers, Company regulation meant bringing all press-work in London under the control of the Company for the benefit of its members. The Stationers' reaction to the patents awarded to William Byrd and Thomas Marshe can represent, by example, the effect awarding royal privileges to non-members (foreign) was having on the Company:

Thomas Marshe hathe a great licence for *latten bookes vsed in the grammer scoles of Englande*, the which was the generall livinge of the whole Companie of Stacioners / [...]

One BYRDE a Singingman hathe a licence for printinge of all Musicke bookes / and by that meanes he claimeth the printing of ruled paper /³²

Furthermore, unlawful printing, for the Stationers, signalled first and foremost the printing of another member's copy. As anxiety over the power of printed heterodoxy or political censure increased, Parliament introduced piecemeal strategies for its containment through a patchwork of proclamations, statutes, letters patent, a charter and injunctions, which were employed by the Stationers for distinctly different purposes. H. S. Bennett, Cyprian Blagden, Cyndia Susan Clegg and Peter W. M. Blayney have all published on the negotiations between successive monarchs and the Stationers' Company in early modern England. Each sovereign inherited and evolved sundry censorship and treason laws in an effort to manage the printed word.

Attempts by the Crown to control print through decrees and proclamations were hampered by the lack of provision for their regulation or enforcement. A degree of order was sufficiently enabled, however, by the incorporation of the Stationers' Company in 1557.³³ The complexity of the relationship between Company and Crown represents both the limits of monarchical power in this early period and its coercive inducement by the manipulation of a privileged few within the corporation through financial incentives bequeathed as monopolies. The different objectives of the privileged patent holders,

³² Arber, I, p. 111.

³³ Cyprian Blagden, *The Stationers' Company: A History, 1403-1959* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1960), pp. 29-33.

(protection of their privileges) and those of Parliament (delegating executive power to enforce censorship laws) were both seemingly facilitated through the ordinances for the Company's self-regulation. As control of the number of master-printers and presses in London, and titles available for publication, satisfied both prominent Stationers and government, this facet of governance was most effectively enacted.

Privileges enabled wealthy Stationers, who had achieved their position of influence within the Company through royal protection, to pursue profits successfully. It tied them ultimately, however, irrevocably to the Crown (their economic security depending upon the royal grant). The monarch, who usually acted in reaction to, rather than in anticipation of, political crises, was now able to lean on the Company to aid the containment of seditious texts when it was deemed necessary.

The bequeathed privilege was an amorphous entity: an intangible asset which included both potential economic benefit and (with or without the monarch's intention) goodwill: a royal privilege to print exclusively (a book or class of books) and the protection of that exclusivity, transferred, as if in fief, from the Crown. Patent holders were also able to seek legal recourse in the conciliar courts if their privileges were infringed. After incorporation, Parliament delegated the daily supervision of the press to the Stationers' executive body.³⁴ At different stages in the history of the Stationers, Queen Mary, Queen Elizabeth and their parliaments, issued instructions to the Company in the form of the Charter of 1557, the injunctions of 1559 and the decrees of 1566 and 1586 in an attempt to control the printed word. However, at each stage, the Company's executive consolidated an increment of autonomous power. Company officials obtained the rights to search property, to arrest malefactors (who were usually fellow members of the Company), to imprison offenders without bail or mainprize, to destroy presses and to redistribute or destroy the offending texts. As the Company's objectives were never synonymous with those of government, Cyprian Blagden overstates their relationship when describing the Stationers as the government's 'executive arm.'³⁵

³⁴ Parliament and the Church hierarchy were usually involved when concern over seditious thought and its dissemination became extreme.

³⁵ Cyprian Blagden, *The Stationers' Company: A History, 1403-1959*, p. 31.

In 'William Cecil and the Stationers', Peter Blayney describes Henry VIII's proclamation of November 1538 as the basis upon which the rules governing books evolved.³⁶ Whilst its main focus, in reaction to the import of Lutheran tracts, was to establish some control over the import of books, it initiated external licensing practices (allowance from Crown or Privy Council to print or to sell) that were to continue throughout the Tudor period. All books transported from outward parties into the realme needed 'his maiesties speciall licence' on pain of imprisonment and the surrender of all property to the Crown.³⁷ Henry nominated himself as sole licenser of imported books in response to his particular concerns at that time. The proclamation also decreed that all other books printed in English were to be examined and licensed (prior to publishing) by members of the Privy Council or those designated to do so by Henry, notably granting secular authorities the power to license books.³⁸

Mary, on her accession to the throne and acting through fear of the dissemination of damaging propaganda,³⁹ initially reclaimed sole monarchical control to license books.⁴⁰ However, her inability to suppress seditious material played a part in the Stationers' Company's bid for incorporation in 1557. The Company had unsuccessfully sought a charter for the advancement of their trade fifteen years earlier. Crucially, incorporation was not imposed upon the Stationers by the Crown, but was sought again at a time when the Crown was striving to implement more effective measures of

³⁶ Peter Blayney, 'William Cecil and the Stationers', in *The Stationers' Company and the Book Trade, 1550-1990*, ed. by Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Winchester: St Paul's Bibliographies, 1997), pp. 11-34 (p. 11).

³⁷ *STC* 7790.

³⁸ Whilst Henrician press controls were repealed on Edward's accession, granting five years (1547-51) of relative press freedom, Blayney demonstrates that external licensing did continue. William Cecil was appointed a principal licenser of books along with Thomas Smith and William Petre. Although these men only worked together for a short period, Cecil's responsibility, if temporarily relinquished in 1549, was resumed in 1550 at the latest, after which date, Blayney argues, he licensed a great deal of works before the proclamation in April 1551. This proclamation again required pre-print licensing from the Privy Council. Cecil's licensing role came to an abrupt end with the accession of Mary Tudor. Peter Blayney, 'William Cecil and the Stationers', pp. 11-14.

³⁹ Richard Grafton had published the proclamation declaring Lady Jane Grey as the new Queen (*STC* 7846).

⁴⁰ Before the incorporation of the Stationers' Company, Henry, Edward and Mary had all at some point in their reign 'required that printers obtain a license from the Crown to print any book, but that license was contingent upon the approval of specified officials.' Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, p. 15.

control.⁴¹ On 4 May 1557, Mary granted the Stationers' Company their charter and delegated some powers of self-regulation to the Company's governing body (the Crown could still control the Company where necessary through injunctions or dissolution). Incorporation effectively centralized the various artisans involved in book production: by that time predominantly printers and publishers, but also including, amongst other skilled artisans and tradesmen, bookbinders, illuminators, rubricators and paper suppliers. The Company itself, as a corporate subject, now assumed the prerogative of the Crown and was able to grant its members licences to print. The Company's enjoyment of these benefits was reliant, theoretically at least, upon the printers' understanding that they 'did not engage in printing works which the laws of the realm defined as treasonous or seditious.'⁴² The standard privilege of incorporation enabled the Company to make such ordinances as were necessary for their governance.⁴³ Controversially, however, the Company could now stipulate that the art of printing must only be practised by its members, or by those with royal prerogative. This enforced freemen of the City to translate to the Stationers if they chose to work as printers, which contravened the recognized honour bestowed upon freemen of all London corporations to practise the trade of another company.⁴⁴

Opposition to this element of the charter increased during Elizabeth's reign, especially from the Drapers' Company, whose members were concerned by the Stationers' growing control of the book trade: a trade they had often chosen to pursue as publishers or booksellers. Moreover, buoyant membership was imperative to any company's financial stability and the Drapers, one of the twelve great livery companies, resented losing their members to the newly incorporated Stationers. Forcing printers to become members of the Stationers represented legislation sought by both the Crown and the Company. Its consequence inevitably concentrated printing in London and anchored

⁴¹ Blagden argues that perhaps it was unsuccessful as the Company sued for too much power. *The Stationers' Company: A History, 1403-1959*, p. 28.

⁴² Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, pp. 20-21.

⁴³ *The Stationers' Company: A History, 1403-1959*, p. 38.

⁴⁴ If they were tradesmen they could trade in other trades, if artisans they could practise other artisanal skills. See Gerald D. Johnson, 'The Stationers versus the Drapers: Control of the Press in the Late Sixteenth Century', *The Library*, 6th ser., 10.1 (March, 1988), 1-17.

the Stationers' activities to the capital city, whence its members could be vigilantly monitored by Parliament.⁴⁵

Although the Company of Stationers existed before 1557 (founded in 1403 and identified, in extant records, as the 'stacioners' from 1441),⁴⁶ incorporation permitted the Company to 'buy, rent or sell real property,' and to 'bring and defend lawsuits as a corporate body.'⁴⁷ It also enabled them 'to protect the trade from "foreigners" (nonmembers) and poor workmanship.'⁴⁸ The practice of licensing and entering a book pre-publication 'for their copy' in a register had been in effect before 1557, illustrating that an internal system was already in place. This Company procedure now ran in parallel with their need to seek the necessary external license from the authorities to print certain works. The Stationers' register was a record of the Company's bestowal of a licence (allowance) to print to the individual Stationer which could simultaneously record their right of copy to the text. Various forms of entry in the registers have been listed by W. W. Greg, 'entered for their copie' or the allowance / license to print.⁴⁹ Blayney proposes that licensing was a two-tiered process: 'the license, actually procured by showing copy to the Wardens (which entailed one fee), and the record of the license or entrance (entailing a second fee).'⁵⁰ The charter also empowered the Master and Wardens to enter and search printers', booksellers' and bookbinders' premises (shop, house, chamber or building) for unauthorized texts. The power to search was instigated by the Crown in order to seek out printed books that contravened various proclamations, to seize these items and 'to imprison anyone who printed without the proper qualification or resisted their search.'⁵¹

⁴⁵ Oxford University obtained a licence to print in 1586, Cambridge University in 1534.

⁴⁶ Peter W. M. Blayney, *The Stationers' Company before the Charter, 1403-1557* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 9-15.

⁴⁷ Peter W. M. Blayney, *The Stationers' Company before the Charter, 1403-1557*, p. 21.

⁴⁸ Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, p. 14.

⁴⁹ W. W. Greg, *Some Aspects and Problems of London Publishing between 1550 and 1650*, pp. 21-40.

⁵⁰ Clegg, with reference to Peter Blayney, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, p. 17. Register A does record both entries for licence and entries for copy.

⁵¹ Blagden, *The Stationers' Company: A History, 1403-1959*, p. 21. The term of imprisonment was 3 months and a fine of £5 was levied, half to be paid to the Stationers' Company and half to the Crown.

Elizabeth confirmed the Stationers' charter of 1557 in November 1559.⁵² At this point, the Stationers sought simultaneously to consolidate their power through legislation to compel all *booksellers* in London and Westminster to abide by the Company's laws and to ensure 'every piece of printing was to be authorized by the Company before work could be put to press.'⁵³ Cyprian Blagden suggests the latter was approved through the enactment of the Company's ordinances. In the Act of Supremacy (July 1559), Elizabeth re-instituted Crown control of the Church through injunction and visitation. Before passing the Act, the Queen had also created the 'Ecclesiastical Commission for London,' now known as the High Commission, a body of seventeen members, 'six of whom must act together, "to put in execution throughout the realm the Acts (1 Elizabeth) of Uniformity and Supremacy."'⁵⁴ This also entailed an inquiry into heretical opinions, false rumours and seditious books. The injunctions further decreed that books had to be licensed by the Queen, or her Privy Councillors, the Archbishops of Canterbury or York, the Bishop of London, or the chancellors of both universities.⁵⁵ As censorship controls responded predominantly to the containment of theological heterodoxy, Clegg points out that the injunctions did not actually demand all books to be licensed, as those that had either been commonly published and received or were held to be the work of 'anye prophane [secular] aucthours' were not included in the remit.⁵⁶

Although the importance of the 1559 injunctions in the history of the Stationers' Company may have been exaggerated, the decrees of 1566 and 1586 were significant to

⁵² See Clegg on the anomalous wording in the confirmation of the charter by Elizabeth, as what constituted religious heterodoxy obviously altered on Elizabeth's accession, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, pp. 21-23.

⁵³ Blagden, *The Stationers' Company: A History, 1403-1959*, p. 41.

⁵⁴ Clegg, quoting from the Calendared letters patent, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, p. 36.

⁵⁵ STC 10099.5: 'Item because there is a great abuse in the printers of bokes, which for couetousnes cheifly regard not what they print, so thei may haue gaine, whereby arriseth great dysorder by publicatyon of vnfrutefull, vayne, and infamous bokes and papers: The Quenes maiestie straitly chargethe and commaundeth, that no manner of person shall print any manner of boke or paper, of what sort, nature, or in what language soeuer it be, excepte the same be first licenced by her maiestie by expresse wordes in writynge, or by. vi. of her priuy counsel, or be perused & licensed by the archbishops of Cantorbury & yorke, the bishop of London, the chauncelours of both vnyuersities, the bishop beyng ordinary, and the Archdeacon also of the place where any suche shalbe printed, or by two of them, wherof the ordinary of the place to be alwaies one.' sig. D1r.

This item included in the injunctions was in response to the perceived disorder of publications and the covetousness of unscrupulous printers.

⁵⁶ Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, p. 38.

the Company's history. In 1566, the Privy Council, ruling from the Star Chamber, issued the 'Ordinaunces decreed for reformation of diuers disorders in the pryntyng and vtterying of Bookes.'⁵⁷ Cyprian Blagden observes that the implementation of the controls relied upon the Stationers' assistance. However, it is unclear whether the Stationers originally applied to the courts for greater legislation or government insisted upon the new measures:⁵⁸

This document, published only seven years after Elizabeth's confirmation of the Charter to the Company of Stationers, is of special importance because it announces publicly that the Government and the Company were compelled to work together – the former providing the authority and the latter the local knowledge and the executive ability, the former being vulnerable to printed criticism and the latter to invasion of literary property.⁵⁹

This decree permitted the deputies and Wardens of the Company to search *any* properties that gave cause for suspicion, warehouses at ports now being specifically

⁵⁷ 29 June 1566 'Ordinances decreed [from the Star Chamber] for reformation of diuers disorders in printing and vttering of Bookes .

1) That no person shall print, or cause to be imprinted, nor shal bring, or cause, or procure to be brought into this Realme imprinted, anie Booke or copie against the forme and meaning of anie ordinance, prohibition, or commandement, contained, or to be contained in anie of the Statutes or Lawes of this Realme, or in anie Iniunctions, Letters patents, or ordinances, passed or set foorth, or to be passed or set foorth by the Queenes most excellent Maiesties grant, commission, or authoritie.

2) That whosoever shall offend against the said ordinance, shall not onelie forfeit all such Bookes and Copies, as shall be so printed or brought in; but also shall from thencefoorth neuer vse or exercise, nor take benefit by anie vsing or exercising of the feate of printing, and shall susteine three moneths imprisonment, without baile or mainprise. And if he be not before such offence bound with sureties, in forme hereafter expressed, then he shall also forfeit for euerie offence. x.li.

3) That no person shall sell, vtter, put to sale, bind, stitch, or sowe, anie such Bookes or Copies, so printed or brought in, contrarie to the said ordinance, vpon paine to forfeit all such Bookes and Copies, and for euerie Booke. xx.s.

4) That all Bookes to be so forfeited, shall be brought into the Stationers hall in London, and there the one moitie of all such forfeitures of monie shall be reserued to the Queenes Maiesties vse, and other moitie shall be deliuered to him or them that shall first seize the same Bookes or Copies, or make complaint therof to the Wardens of the said Companie. And all the Bookes so to be forfeited, shal be destroyed or made waste paper, by the discretion of the said Wardens.

5) That it shall be lawfull for the Wardens of the said Companie for the time being, or anie two of the said Companie, thereto deputed by the said Wardens, as well in anie ports, as other suspected places within this Realme, to open and view all packs, drifats, maunds, and other things, wherein Bookes or Paper shall be contained, brought into this Realme: and also to make search in all workehouses, shops, warehouses, and other places, [...] or where they shall haue reasonable cause of suspicion.' Arber, I, p. 322.

⁵⁸ Cyprian Blagden argues that there were no special court fees paid by the Company at this time.

⁵⁹ Cyprian Blagden, 'Book Trade control in 1566', *The Library*, 5th ser., 13.4 (Jan., 1958), 287-292 (p. 289).

mentioned.⁶⁰ Both Parliament's and the Stationers' interests merged (again for slightly different reasons) in clamping down on the import of illegal books: the latter was concerned with eliminating foreign competition for an English market and the former, with prohibiting heterodoxy. At this time 'Catholic presses on the Continent had mounted a formidable campaign against the English Church, provoking the concern of Elizabeth's government.'⁶¹ Books seized were to be taken to Stationers' Hall and destroyed or turned into waste paper at the Wardens' discretion.⁶² Printers and bookbinders were to be fined. The fines and 'any return on the disposal of the book' were to be divided between the Crown and the informer or searcher, instigating financial reward for the active monitoring of press work.⁶³ The decree of 1566 records the Privy Council transferred the authority of the High Commission to the Stationers' executive to seek out seditious works.⁶⁴

The Masters and Wardens, being the influential printer-publishers and patent holders in a seemingly hand-in-glove relationship with government, exploited these powers more readily to eliminate those print-pirates encroaching on their royal privileges. Whilst this prerogative was not exploited initially, in 1576 the Company increased the numbers of men involved in the search parties to twenty-four for the benefit of the control of Company business. Searches were now to be carried out weekly.⁶⁵ This date also marks the beginnings of a movement within the Company amongst journeymen and master-printers working without privilege. The aggressive pursuit of printers who infringed patents through searches and subsequent litigation in the Star Chamber became common practice. This explains the presentation of the disregard for monopolies in the conciliar courts as a form of sedition.

The monopolists regularly presented the subversive attitude of the accused to the Crown: the disobedient subjects, who printed the patent holders' texts protected by royal

⁶⁰ Blagden, *The Stationers' Company: A History, 1403-1959*, p. 70.

⁶¹ Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, p. 45.

⁶² If printed works were licensed for print but printed by pirates, the seized books were not destroyed but taken as stock and sold. A real incentive to search out print-pirates as profits could be gained without outlay.

⁶³ Blagden, 'Book Trade control in 1566', p. 289.

⁶⁴ Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, p. 45.

⁶⁵ Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, p. 48.

privilege, were presented as disregarding the Queen's express commandments in a display of contemptuous behaviour towards her most excellent majesty. In a wilful manipulation of the Crown's intentions to control religious heterodoxy and political censure, the monopolists presented the malefactors (who were usually printing *A.B.C.s*, grammar books or prayers) as a potential danger, whose actions would infect those of others and would lead, if left unchecked, to the disregard of all her majesty's commandments held in letters patent. The case brought to the Star Chamber by Francis Flower's assignees (which included Christopher Barker) against Roger Ward reveals with absolute clarity the language employed by the plaintiffs in presenting their case. It also demonstrates the vast quantities of books that were printed in illegal editions and testifies to the regularly assumed right of the patent holder to recourse through the Star Chamber, confirming Arnold Hunt's assertion that '[p]atents had teeth' and that the monopolists frequently went to court to re-enforce their prerogative.⁶⁶

yf it pleas your most excellent maiestie that aboute six monethes sence Roger Warde, citizen and stationer of London knowing and understanding of the decree aforesaid and knowing also of your maiesties said letters Pattentes and the contente of the same, yet in contempte of your maiestie, and of the decree aforesaid made in that behalfe in your said most honorable courte, He the said Roger Warde hath put in printe without the lycence, writing or consent of any your subiectes aforesaid, Three Thousande of the booke cauled the *Grammer*, And Three Thousand of the booke cauled the *Accidence* being two of the bookes graunted by your maiesties said letters Pattentes unto your said subiectes fflower and his assignees and deputies and the same booke so by him imprinted contrarie to your maiesties expresse commaundement as aforesaide, he the said Roger Warde hath published and dispersed in such sorte as your said subiectes can not atteyne to the knowledge wher they are becom; And lykewise one Walter Mantell citizen and stationer of your maiesties said cittie of London, also knowing and verie well understanding of the decrees aforesaid, and of the contente of your maiesties said letteres Pattentes hath notwithstanding within the space of Eight monethes now last past, uttered, put to sale, bound, stiched or sowed Two thousand of the saide bookes cauled the *Grammer*, And Two thousande of the booke cauled the *Accidence* nowing the same booke to be imprinted contrarye to the Decrees aforesaid, And contrarie to your maiesties said Letteres Pattentes to the greate hinderaunce of your said

⁶⁶ Arnold Hunt, 'Book trade patents, 1603-1640', in *The Book Trade & Its Customers, 1450-1900: Historical Essays for Robin Myers*, ed. by Arnold Hunt, Giles Mandelbrote & Alison Shell (Winchester: St Paul's Bibliographies, 1997), pp. 27-54 (p. 29).

subiecte and his assignees, And to the evill example of all others insomuch that except your most excellent maiestie with thadvice of the right Honorable the Lordes of your priuie Counsayle siting in the highe courte of starchamber doe take some spedie order for the punishement of the said offenders according to the decrees aforesaid, the said contemptuous and disobedient persons together with divers such others as them selves are will not refrayne to attempt the breaking of all other your maieties commaundementes conteyned in any the like letters pattentes to the defaceing of your maieties princely prerogative in that behalfe and to the utter ouerthrowe of the said science of printing.⁶⁷

The printing of someone else's protected privilege was constructed as an 'evil' in need of speedy punishment otherwise it would lead to the breaking of all royal commandments, inferring utter lawlessness, by 'defaceing' or destroying the form (often disseminated by printed proclamation) of the princely prerogative.

If the decrees of 1566 were prompted by the Privy Council in a bid for enhanced control of the printed word, and encouraged by the Stationers' executive for other reasons, the decrees of 1586 were the culmination of an enquiry initiated in 1582 by William Cecil in response to prolonged and organized resistance from those master-printers working without royal privileges and the ordinary members of the Stationers' Company. These printers, who petitioned Parliament for support in their penury, had wilfully begun to infringe printing monopolies. The monarchical prerogative to bestow printing patents and to restrict the setting up of presses to specific locations (London, Oxford and Cambridge) increasingly caused contention amongst those printers working without privilege. By the 1570s, the monopolies had consumed all obvious university, school and religious publications. In the cases of Barker and Tottel, their monopolies made them rich but deterred them from investing in potentially high risk ventures. Both men relied upon the profits reaped from their protected titles for many years. In deputizing to Bishop and Newberry, the Queen's printers' patent was extended to include Welsh bibles and comparative bible translations but these books could also be presented as falling within the bible monopoly. As impecunious printers were risk-averse, it was far more practicable simply to reprint small books for an assured audience. John Day's *A.B.C.* and *Catechism*, William Seres' books of private prayers, or

⁶⁷ TNA, STAC 5, F28/17, Lines 27-28.

Francis Flower's *A Short Introduction of Grammar* all represent frequently infringed patents in this period.⁶⁸

Print-piracy was developed into organized resistance during the 1580s by John Wolfe. On his return from Italy, Wolfe encouraged members from the lower ranks of the Stationers' Company to resist print monopolies. A member of the Fishmongers and a self-styled 'Luther', Wolfe thought the patent system was corrupting the printing trade and instigated action for its reformation. Wolfe, Roger Ward and John Charlewood, Thomas East and Robert Waldegrave, all of whom were printers, are believed to have been its five ringleaders but Francis Adams (maker of writing tables), William Lobley (book binder), Henry Bamford (compositor), William Wright, Abraham Kidson, Thomas Butter (booksellers) and Robert Neal (lawyer) were recognized activists. John Wolfe focused his attack on Christopher Barker, identifying him as the holder of the most profitable patent. Roger Ward was illegally printing John Day's *A.B.C.* and *Catechism* and, in a case brought by Day, admitted to producing over ten thousand copies of the patented work.⁶⁹ Robert Waldegrave was also printing books protected by William Seres' patent.⁷⁰ Cecil, in response to the Stationers' petition, ordered an enquiry into the impact of royal privileges on the printing community. The outcome inevitably favoured the monopolists:

[Tottel and Barker and a few other wealthy Stationers] realized that there were too many stationers in London, and in this way did all they could to check the increase in the hope of capturing the market, for the owners of smaller

⁶⁸ Entire classes of books were often given to one patent holder: Richard Tottel printed the law books; John Day, the *A. B. C.*, *Catechism* & Psalms; William Seres, the psalters & primers; James Roberts and Richard Watkins, the almanacs, Reyner Wolfe (and later Francis Flower), *Lily's Latin Grammar*. The royal privilege to print books in Latin, Greek and Hebrew was granted to Francis Flower in 1573 at Reyner Wolfe's death. It was to become the most frequently infringed patent as it included *Lily's Latin Grammar*; a small book (and thus easy to print) with a considerable market, being used as a school textbook in the teaching of Latin. Students who were taught Latin were also taught how to write: 'Writing began with Latin', see Margaret Spufford, 'First Steps in Literacy: The Reading and Writing Experiences of the Humblest Seventeenth-Century Spiritual Autobiographers', *Social History*, 4.3 (1979), 407-435 (p. 411). The assignees (Christopher Barker was amongst them) each paid Flower an annuity of £100 but were often in the Star Chamber suing printers for printing *Lily's Latin Grammar* illegally. See the numerous cases heard in the Star Chamber in this period for evidence of the patents' infringement. For more details see Arber, I, p. 111.

⁶⁹ Harry R. Hoppe, 'John Wolfe, Printer and Publisher, 1579-1601', *The Library*, 4th ser., 14.3 (Oct., 1933), 241-287 (pp. 247-250).

⁷⁰ Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, p. 177.

establishments would be unable to compete with them through lack of resources. Thus they both supported these regulations [of 1586], which were in part designed to bring about a state of affairs particularly advantageous to them, paying £5 each towards the Company's costs in getting them passed.⁷¹

Christopher Barker (upper Warden and royal printer at the time) submitted his subjective report in 1582 in which he stated:

There are 22. printing howses in London, where. 8. or 10. at the most would suffice for all England, yea and Scotland too. but if no man were allowed to be a Master Printer, but such whose behaviour were well knowne, and auctorised by warrant from her Maiestie, the arte would be most excellently executed in England.⁷²

Barker's desire for all master-printers to be of good character and to be authorized by warrant is noteworthy as it indicates a personal self-assessment. Barker also commented upon the disordered behaviour amongst journeymen (their numbers standing at about threescore) and the growing number of apprentices.⁷³ To alleviate the penury of distressed printers, Barker (along with other prominent stationers and patent holders) yielded some titles from his patent on 8 January 1584 to the Company.⁷⁴ Barker's titles included the homilies and Erasmus' *Paraphrases upon Liturgical Epistles*, a mandatory text for Elizabethan parishes, but demand seems to have been exhausted by 1584 and the benefit to the printers seems negligible. By July of the same year John Day had died and sometime between the date of his death and November, his son had assigned his father's patent to the recognized activists William Wright, Thomas Butter, Francis Adams and John Wolfe. By this time, however, the *A.B.C.* and the *Psalms in metre* were being printed by all and sundry in their thousands.⁷⁵ Cecil's enquiry culminated in the Star Chamber decree of 1586, which granted more power to the monopolists and now sought to control the numbers of apprentices entering the printing trade, the numbers of presses

⁷¹ H. J. Byrom, 'Richard Tottel: His life and work', *The Library*, 4th ser., 8.2 (Sept., 1927), 199-232 (pp. 218-219).

⁷² Arber, I, p. 111, pp. 115-116, p. 144.

⁷³ Arber, I, p. 144.

⁷⁴ This represented the initial move to create a Company-controlled, joint-stock holding that printers without privilege could invest in. It calmed demonstrations against monopolies (thus enabling their prolongation) and created work for the printers without privileges.

⁷⁵ This syndicate of printers assumed the first of the larger patented privileges (William Seres' primers and psalters, being another) through reversion and assignation which became the basis of the Company's English stock in 1603.

any printer could own, and the number of master-printers allowed to set up a press at any one time in London. For a short period after 1586, control over the printing trade was enforced more stringently, searchers were to work in groups of three, seeking out illegal presses more regularly and their number was again increased to twenty-seven.⁷⁶

At the beginning of the 1580s, the Stationers' Company had to deal with insurrection from within their own ranks, spearheaded by John Wolfe, and pressure from Parliament to contain the print-production of Edmund Campion's *Ad Rationes Decem* by the Greenstreet press and John Stubbs' *The discoverie of a gaping gulf*.⁷⁷ Hugh Singleton (the printer), John Stubbs and its distributor William Page were tried before the Queen's Bench. Stubbs and Page both lost their right hands. *Ad Rationes Decem* was deemed seditious as it argued that religious integrity was the cause of recusancy amongst faithful Catholics in England. The Greenstreet press moved to three different locations between London and Henley in ten months and was eventually foreclosed within the year, the printers incarcerated.⁷⁸ By the end of the decade, the Stationers were also searching out Robert Waldegrave, a puritan printer who was printing the Marprelate tracts on his itinerant press.⁷⁹ The Stationers, backed by the Privy Council and the High Commission, were unable to arrest Waldegrave whilst he was involved in the printing of the first four tracts over 1588-1589. Their dogged pursuit, however, forced Waldegrave to flee to the Continent and eventually to migrate to Scotland, where he worked as a printer under James VI. Previously the Stationers had been able to locate and destroy his press in response to his 'illegally printing Udall's radical anti-episcopal tract *Diotrephes*

⁷⁶ W. W. Greg suggests that the year 1589 represented a period of very effective external licensing practice. Furthermore, the number of printing presses in London remained stable for many years. Charlton Hinman argues there were 21 master-printers with 33 presses in London between 1621 and 1623. See: 'Entrance, Licence, and Publication', *The Library*, 4th ser., 25.1-2 (June, 1944), 1-22. Charlton Hinman, *The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare*, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963), I, p. 48.

⁷⁷ *The discoverie of a gaping gulf* ([London]: [H. Singleton for W. Page] 1579) was a tract against Elizabeth's proposal to marry the Duke d'Alencon. Singleton was pardoned, see Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, p. 123.

⁷⁸ H. S. Bennett, *English Books & Readers 1558 to 1603: Being a Study in the History of the Book Trade in the Reign of Elizabeth I*, p. 80.

⁷⁹ Waldegrave moved from Kingston to Molesey and then to Coventry within a year, sought refuge in France and finally moved to Scotland. The Marprelate tracts attacked the established Church.

(that is, for printing without license or authority)',⁸⁰ his wife having to sign for receipt of the defaced press in June 1588.⁸¹ When pressures mounted following the controversy of the Marprelate tracts, Waldegrave relinquished his role to John Hodgskin (assistants Arthur Thomlin and Valentine Simmes), who was captured, incarcerated and tortured within three months.⁸²

Incriminated in print-piracy after a successful raid on Wolfe's premises, John Wolfe finally translated to the Stationers' Company in 1583. Barker had failed to secure Wolfe's translation in earlier negotiations. The raid on Wolfe's printing house 'marked the end to [Wolfe's] participation in the organised resistances to patent holders' privileges.'⁸³ Day and others broke down the door of his premises, confiscated his stock and broke up his presses. In characteristic vein, Wolfe sued (without success) the Company for damages. On translation, Wolfe became a successful searcher and hunted down his previous associates.

These instances all represent some control of the printed word when the Crown leant on the Company to bring their affairs into order, but it is also apparent that the Stationers' executive were more inclined to use their authority to protect their privileges. Clegg argues that the occasional reliance on aggression by the state or the Company to contain sedition misrepresents the Company's court, which was predominantly a court of arbitration. Here, members were encouraged to reach a reasonable compromise through negotiation. Inevitably, however, the monopolists habitually benefitted from court proceedings in their own courts. Furthermore, Crown intervention was generally necessary in cases of censorship, was reactive rather than pro-active, piecemeal, and implemented in response to, rather than in anticipation of, specific publications.

Secretary Walsingham and the Queen's Printer

⁸⁰ Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, p. 53 & p. 123 and H. S. Bennett, *English Books & Readers 1558 to 1603: Being a Study in the History of the Book Trade in the Reign of Elizabeth I*, pp. 81-86.

⁸¹ M. A. Pearson, 'An Index to Liber A: A volume of the records of the Stationers' Company of London for the period 1559-1791' (Unpublished MA Thesis: Victoria, University of Wellington, 1980), p. 108 & pp. 121-122.

⁸² H. S. Bennett, *English Books & Readers 1558 to 1603: Being a Study in the History of the Book Trade in the Reign of Elizabeth I*, p. 84 and Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, p. 194.

⁸³ Harry R. Hoppe, 'John Wolfe, Printer and Publisher, 1579-1601', p. 253.

Peter Blayney maintains that the Principal Secretary was largely responsible for the granting of patents and those that were irresponsibly conferred contributed to the Stationers' disturbances in the late 1570s and early 1580s.⁸⁴ Individual applications for patents entailed an extensive workload therefore the secretaries would sort and reject applications before presenting certain cases to the Queen. The Principal Secretary 'could exercise considerable influence over the number and nature of the patents issued during his term of office.'⁸⁵ During Cecil's tenure, printing privileges were predominantly granted to members of the printing fraternity: Totell's privilege for the whole class of law books was renewed and granted for life; William Seres received an enlarged patent including primers, and books of private prayers, in acknowledgement of his imprisonment during Mary's reign; others included John Day, Richard Watkins and James Roberts. In the period from 1572 to 1573, Thomas Smith, in his role as senior Principal Secretary, granted patents to Thomas Marshe, Francis Flower, Thomas Tallis and William Byrd in quick succession. None of these patentees was a Stationer.⁸⁶ In 1577, when conflicts between the privileged master-printers and ordinary members of the Stationers were gathering momentum, Christopher Barker was awarded the office of Queen's printer, Francis Walsingham was Principal Secretary and Barker, as a member of the Drapers' Company, was not a member of the Stationers.

Walsingham had clearly already fostered relationships with Barker in the years directly preceding Barker's successful bid for the royal printers' privilege and it is evident that Walsingham maintained his interest in Barker's career at several strategic points: from his original licence to print the Geneva Bible through to his appointment to the office of Queen's printer, to the protection of his patent from infringement by other Stationers whilst a Draper, to his personal letters to the Drapers' Company commending Barker for translation, and finally to the reversion of the patent to Barker's son. Walsingham's association with Barker may well have been initiated by Walsingham's desire for a 'purer' Protestant bible which was met by Barker's decision to seek a

⁸⁴ Peter Blayney, 'William Cecil and the Stationers', pp. 20-24.

⁸⁵ Peter Blayney, 'William Cecil and the Stationers', p. 15.

⁸⁶ Peter Blayney, 'William Cecil and the Stationers', pp. 23-25.

privilege to underwrite its publication in England. Hitherto printed abroad, the Geneva edition employed copious marginalia to assist Calvinist biblical interpretation, satisfying several prominent Protestants in the Privy Council. Walsingham's patronage of Barker seems to have commenced with this significant work and was to continue until Walsingham's death in 1590.

On 9 June 1575, Christopher Barker presented the Stationers' Company with a grant and licence to print the Geneva Bible and a New Testament:

Whereas Christopher Barker citizen and draper of London. hath obteyened a grant & licence in writinge under *the* hands of seven of the Quenes maiesties honourable privie counsell according to her highness iniunctiones for *the* printing of theise twoo Bookes hereafter mencioned That is to saye. a Byble in Englishe with notes in *the* same which was dedicated unto hir maiestie in the ffirst yere of hir highnes reign & [commonly?] called or knowen by *the* name of *the* geneva Byble & a Testament to be translated out of the latin tongue into thenglishe.⁸⁷

Signed by seven Privy Councillors, the document wielded tremendous political authority. To Patrick Collinson's surprise the Geneva Bible, which represented 'a travesty of the legally established prayer book' in its substitution of the term 'minister' for 'priest' and other emendations in a similar Puritanical vein, was published 'with every appearance of official sanction.'⁸⁸ Clearly, this edition of the Bible was officially licensed by Privy Council members and after 1577 (when Barker attained the royal privilege) rightfully produced under the terms of the Queen's printers' patent, which also acknowledged the authority of Parliament to command publication. In 1575,

⁸⁷ BL, Microfiche, M.985/71, *Stationers' Hall Part Four*, 'Charters of Incorporation, Bylaws of the Company: Decrees and Ordinances 1557-1902', see entry in Liber A, 9 June 1575.

⁸⁸ Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (London: Methuen, 1982), p. 165. It is thought that Christopher Barker may have been related to Sir Christopher Barker (knight of the Garter) as he was born in Yorkshire, had interests in land in Yorkshire, and had influential friends. 'Joseph Ames wrote in the mid-eighteenth century that he "came of an ancient family, beinge, as I have heard, descended from Christopher Barker, knight, king at armes" (Ames, 357). Sir Christopher had also been a native of Yorkshire, and when he died in 1550 after long and influential service in the court of Henry VIII, his estate went to his nephew Edward Barker, who may have been the printer's father.' See David Kathman, 'Christopher Barker', in *ODNB* <<http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/view/article/1390>> [accessed 30 March 2008] (para. 1 of 10).

however, Richard Jugge was still in office and he feared the impact the new Bible would have on his privilege:

The Geneva version was different from the Bishops' Bible, and not Jugge's 'copy' at all. Neither Jugge nor the Stationers relished Barker's success. Hurriedly, ten Stationers formed a Bible partnership, and then, actually on the same day, they and Jugge met Barker, to assert their rights to the Bishops' Bible.⁸⁹

Jugge's monopoly of the Bishops' Bible (the Archbishop's authorized Bible) had been granted after Matthew Parker, the Archbishop of Canterbury, had petitioned Burghley in October, 1568.⁹⁰ Notably, Archbishop Parker had died in mid-May, just three weeks before Barker obtained his written licence to print the Geneva Bible, enabling the potential for the mass production of a new bible edition. The Stationers' Company on 'consideracion of the greate charges costes and expences w^{ch} Richard Jugge [...] hath sustained in the printinge of the Bibles and Testamentes in Englishe' licensed Richard Jugge sole printing rights to 'everye Englishe Byble in Quarto and of every Inglish Testament in decimo sexto.'⁹¹

P. M. Handover describes how Jugge, after John Cawood's death, was unable to meet the printing demands of the royal house and produce sufficient supply of bibles:

In the year of the second edition [of the Bishops' Bible], 1572, Cawood died. The [Queen's printers'] patent remained with the longest liver, but Jugge now discovered, as later holders would discover, that to exercise the royal patent alone was a heavy undertaking. With all the work that flowed into his printing house from the patent, he found difficulty in organising the production of Bibles.⁹²

⁸⁹ P. M. Handover, *Printing in London: From 1476 to Modern Times* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1960), p. 78.

⁹⁰ See the correspondence from Archbishop Parker to William Cecil (5 October, 1568) in *Correspondence of Matthew Parker: Comprising letters written by and to him, from A.D. 1535, to his death, A.D. 1575.*, ed. by John Bruce and the Rev. Thomas Thomason Perowne (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1853), pp. 334-337.

⁹¹ *An Index to Liber A*, pp. 69-71. T. Dawson printed the Bishops' Bible for Christopher Barker in octavo and The New Testament in sixteenmo, demonstrating a continuation of this division of the privilege agreed upon through negotiation with the Stationers in 1575 between Jugge and Barker.

⁹² Handover, p. 77.

Senior members of the Stationers, in remarkably deft negotiations and in an assertion of Company authority (implemented by Wardens Richard Tottel and William Cooke) over the Privy Council members' prerogative, were able to curtail Barker's licence, preventing him from printing the Geneva Bible in quarto or the Testament in sixteenmo on the very day Barker presented it to the Company. They were also able to renegotiate Jugge's patent, enabling a syndicate of printers to print all other formats of the Bishops' Bible to assist Jugge in the undertaking of his role of royal printer. Barker is recorded to have given his faithful promise to Jugge to refrain from printing the Geneva Bible in the most popular formats:

[T]o the said Richard Iugge [...] not at any tyme ymprint or cause to be ymprinted any maner of Englishe Testament in xvj^{to} or any Englishe Byble in Quarto or in any other volume or volumes whatsoever w^{ch} shall or may be hurtfull or preiudiciall vnto the seid Richard Iugge.⁹³

Jugge died soon after, prompting the syndicate to relinquish their negotiated rights, and the Bishops' Bible reverted to the Queen's Printer's patent, ironically also falling into Barker's control.

By December 1573, Barker was paying an annuity of £100 to Francis Flower who had assigned his patent, for Latin, Greek and Hebrew texts to a group of men. At this point, Barker worked at premises in St. Paul's Churchyard, identified by the sign of the Grasshopper (until 1576).⁹⁴ As an assignee to Flower, Barker had an interest in William Lily's *A Short Introduction of Grammar* (also known as Lily's Grammar), the best seller of the Elizabethan period, and the only book recorded in several editions in the *STC* under Flower's name.⁹⁵ In 1575, when Barker secured a licence to print the Geneva Bible, it is safe to assume that he would have been working as a publisher only, underwriting the cost of its production. In the petition of August 1577 he signed as a bookseller. The Geneva Bible, probably printed on Vautrolier's press, used Walsingham's crest (a tiger's head) on the frontispiece after the New Testament,

⁹³ *An Index to Liber A*, pp. 69-71.

⁹⁴ *Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of Foreign Printers of English Books*, p. 18.

⁹⁵ *STC*, III, p. 65.

indicating Walsingham's patronage, and was sold at Barker's new shop also based in St Paul's Churchyard but now under the sign of the Tiger's head (from 1576 to 1579).⁹⁶

The Privy Councillors' support of Barker was also recorded in the *Acts of the Privy Council*. In occasional entries before the date of Barker's official translation to the Stationers' Company (1578), the Privy Councillors responded favourably to Barker's petitions. Working outside the jurisdiction of the Stationers' Company, Barker only had recourse to the Privy Council or the Star Chamber for support when he considered his privilege to be infringed (as on the 19 February 1577/8). Walsingham, as Principal Secretary and Barker's patron, would again have exerted influence here as he was present at Barker's hearing:

[F]orasmuche as there is good reason that Barker shoulde be favored and mainetained in his right, their Lordships have thought good to require them, by vertue hereof, to call before them suche personnes as he shoulde nominate unto them to encroche uppon those thinges belonging unto [Barker's] office.⁹⁷

Here, Barker called Richard Tottel (sometime Master, Warden and senior member of the Company), to be examined for printing the abridgements of the statutes.⁹⁸ The litigation that arose between Barker and Tottel over the wording in their patents illustrates how privileges overlapped and interpretations were often manipulated in order to assume the right to print titles that belonged to others. Barker was still being sued by Tottel's son after Tottel's death for *Justice Rastell's Collection of Statutes* in an exemplary instance of wilful interpretation:

Christopher Barkar notwithstandinge although the wordes in his *letters* Patentes conteyned weare no other nor larger then the wordes conteyned in the graunte of his predecessours yet his desier being much larger began with great

⁹⁶ *STC*, III, p. 10. For evidence of the Tiger's head imprint associated with Francis Walsingham and presented in the Geneva Bible (London: C. Barkar, 1576), see images 471 and 589 reproduced on EEBO. Image 471 occurs on the unsigned frontispiece of the New Testament and image 589 immediately after Revelation (*STC* 2117). Perhaps this indicates Walsingham's particular interest in the New Testament.

⁹⁷ *Acts of the Privy Council of England*, n. s. Vol. 10, AD 1577-1578, ed. by direction of the Lord President of the Council by John Roche Dasent (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1895), p. 169.

⁹⁸ 'About 1580 Tottell, like many other stationers, found his profits affected by the activities of Christopher Barker.' H. J. Byrom, 'Richard Tottel: His life and work', p. 218.

vehemence and meanes to make tittle to the imprintinge of the said
Abridgement or Collection of statutes made by the said *Iustice* Rastall.⁹⁹

A negotiated compromise had been achieved during Tottel's life as Barker and Tottel apparently printed this work jointly. Despite Tottel's son's claim that Tottel had originally paid Rastell for the copy of his abridged statutes, Barker seems to have benefitted from litigation. At Tottel's death, the Queen's printer and his deputies took to printing it without recourse to Tottel's estate. Two significant common practices are evident from this case: first, that the wording of privileges was invariably exploited, and secondly that the monopolists also took each other to court in a bid to secure their privileges.

In a demonstration of Walsingham's continued patronage, he was cited again when Barker petitioned the Drapers to enable his translation to the Stationers:

In May of 1578 Barker appeared before Drapers' Court, 'hauing made his Sute along tyme to be translated frome this Company to the Company of the Stationers and therefor presented a *lettre* wrytten in his fauor to this Company from M^r Secretary Walsingham.' [...] After some delay, during which Barker got yet another letter of support from Walsingham, the permission was finally granted on 4 June. Barker's purse was considerably lightened in the process. He agreed to pay four pounds 'for a hogshed of wyne' at a Company dinner; he paid fines to the clerk and the beadle and promised to pay his quarterage of twelve pence to the Company.¹⁰⁰

The Drapers did not appreciate losing a senior member of their company and Gerald D. Johnson argues that a case heard in the court of the Aldermen in May 1600 represents the 'culmination of a controversy in which the Stationers and the Drapers had been embroiled during the last decades of the sixteenth century.'¹⁰¹ The Master and Wardens of the Drapers' Company brought twelve of their members, working in the book trade, to court. The Drapers resented the fact that they had to translate to the Stationers. However, freemen, prior to translation, were obliged to seek approval from both companies. The Drapers evidently procrastinated in Barker's case and only acted after receiving two letters from secretary Walsingham requesting translation.

⁹⁹ TNA, C2, Eliz/T4/ 41.

¹⁰⁰ Gerald D. Johnson, p. 5.

¹⁰¹ Gerald D. Johnson, p. 2.

Finally, on 8 August 1589, just over three weeks before *Principall Navigations* was entered in the Stationers' register, Christopher Barker secured the reversion of the royal printing patent for his son. In the narrative perambulations, the royal voice paid tribute to Barker's valuable contribution to the mystery of printing in England, commending Barker for the successful fulfilment of the office of royal printer:

Whereas also the said Christopher Barker by his proper industry, care and costs hath improved & adorned the art of printing in this ^our ^ kingdom of England, with types, characters & other instruments belonging to the said office of our printer more plentifully then heretofore in times past.¹⁰²

A similar tribute was recorded in a memorial in the churchyard of the church in Datchet in which he was buried: 'typographiam Anglicanam lateritiam invenit, marmoream reliquit.'¹⁰³

Barker's report to Cecil has now been located within this climate of active and organized resistance to the privilege system. These important contexts have been reconstructed through an analysis of the Stationers' own ordinances which demanded printers to be members; an understanding of the dearth of work for existing printers working without privilege; the Stationers' petition to William Cecil; the recent Privy Council investigation into these issues (Star Chamber Decree, 1586); and the powerful Stationers' undertaking to yield the rights to certain books. These factors divulge important information regarding Barker's personal understanding of his responsibilities as patentee and the need to negotiate the interests of a number of different authorities. In his report of 1586, in which he argued for the preservation of privileges, Barker claimed that patentees were willing to invest monies accrued from the sale of profitable books protected by patent into unprofitable books of benefit to the commonwealth. Crucially for the production of *Principall Navigations*, Barker qualified the description of these unprofitable books as still falling 'within the compas of his patent:'

¹⁰² BL, Egerton MSS 1835, fol. 167, transcribed in Appendix A.3.

¹⁰³ 'He found English printing like brickwork and left it like marble.' David Kathman, 'Christopher Barker', in *ODNB* <<http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/view/article/1390>> [accessed 1 April 2011] (para. 10 of 10).

[P]riviledges are occasion, that many bookes are nowe prynted, *which* are more beneficiall to the common welth, then proffitable to the prynter, for the Patentee being benefitted otherwise by Bookes of profitable sale is content to bestowe parte of his gayne in other bookes, *which* are within the Compas of his patent, verie beneficiall for the common welth, and yet suche wereby the printer shall scarce reape the Tenth parte of his charge.¹⁰⁴

Barker's qualification could either represent his own anxiety about printing books outside the scope of his privilege in this climate of printer-activism or that his monopoly assured a continuous flow of work into the Queen's printing house. In the years directly after the Star Chamber decree of 1586, Barker's printing activities were controlled, registering external authority if printing beyond the negotiable limits of his patent (as recorded in the Stationers' registers) and recording the publication details in the imprint carefully. Whilst work on false imprints has been instructive and the Queen's printers obviously printed some propaganda anonymously, the royal printers' imprint was used (in the period 1577-1589) on works that were issued under the terms of the office as specified by Letters Patent.¹⁰⁵ This included the privileged publications of bibles and prayer books alongside works ordered by the state. The publications issued from the office of royal printer will now be assessed against those issued under the names of Christopher Barker, George Bishop and Ralph Newberry without reference to the office. Through the analysis of Appendix A.1, it will become apparent that the imprint is not used to advertise their status as printers for the Queen on everything they published. It seems, therefore, that the Queen's printers only used the royal imprint on works that were issued under the terms of the office.¹⁰⁶

The Office of Royal Printer

¹⁰⁴ BL, Lansdowne MSS 48, fol. 173.

¹⁰⁵ Lotte Hellinga, "'Less than the whole truth': False Statements in 15th-century Colophons", in *Fakes and Frauds: Varieties of Deception in Print and Manuscript*, ed. by Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Winchester: St Paul's Bibliographies; Detroit: Omnigraphics, 1989), pp. 1-27.

¹⁰⁶ W. W. Greg has argued in relation to different printers that 'distinctions in the form of imprints were recognized as significant and were carefully observed.' *Some Aspects and Problems of London Publishing between 1550 and 1650*, p. 86.

For an appreciation of the vast remit of the Queen's printer patent and the terms of its use, I shall briefly trace its development. This will set out the financial benefit of the Queen's printers' patent (imperative to underwriting the production of other expensive folio texts or the cost of works produced in relation to the Queen's affairs) and the terms under which the Queen's printers' imprint seems to have been used in relation to extant items. With reference to the texts published by the Queen's printers between 1577 and 1589, I will suggest that Christopher Barker (who was the first to hold the office of Queen's printer single-handedly successfully) and his deputies (after 1587) were fully occupied in this role, seldom printing anything outside the compass of the patent during this period. As the market for bibles was almost completely controlled by the Queen's printers — as noted, both the popular Geneva and the previously 'authorized' Bishops' Bible came within their patent — bible production represented their most profitable, regular work. When they were called to print beyond the remit of their patent in this period, however, the works were externally licensed and various publication details were recorded in the imprint.¹⁰⁷

In September 1577, Christopher Barker, a member of the Draper's Company, patronised by Walsingham was granted the Queen's printers' patent. Barker explained elsewhere that he bought it from Thomas Wilkes: 'Myne owne office of her Maiesties Printer of the English tongue gyven to Master Wilkes [...] the great somme I paide to Master Wilkes...' ¹⁰⁸ Yet perhaps as recently as August 1577, Barker had also signed a petition to Parliament, as bookseller (and publisher), which claimed that 'the priviledges latelie granted by her Maiestie vnder her highnes greate seale of England [...] Conserninge the arte of printing of bookes hath and will be the overthrowe of the Printers and Stacioners within this Cittie.' ¹⁰⁹ By the time Barker occupied the office of Queen's printer it encompassed an array of lucrative monopolies brought to the royal printers' patent from successive holders. Although Barker was able to hold the expansive office alone (between 1577 and 1587), deputizing to Bishop and Newberry

¹⁰⁷ For details on the Queen's Printers' printing activities in this period, see Appendix A.1. Work patterns will be analysed in the following chapter.

¹⁰⁸ Arber, I, p. 115. I cannot find the letters patent appointing Wilkes to the office of Queen's printer. I have looked in the closed and patent rolls and the chancery proceedings.

¹⁰⁹ Arber, I, p. 111.

could either demonstrate that he also needed assistance in the role or that he understood how further capital investment would increase the profit-making potential of the office of Queen's Printer.¹¹⁰ By 1577, the monopoly included statutes, acts, proclamations, injunctions, visitations, the *Book of Common Prayer*, or other service books, prayers ordered by Parliament, the Bishops' Bible, the Geneva Bible and the New Testaments (both Bishop and Geneva).

Invoices from previous and subsequent royal printers to the hanaper (written petty cash invoices to the Exchequer) are to be found in the British Library and the National Archives.¹¹¹ These outline interim payments drawn up every three months or so and represent a regular cash demand throughout the year. The royal printer was paid for all official work, proclamations, statutes, acts, ordered prayers, as well as the Queen's household's orders for religious works and the enigmatic but substantial costing of the 'bokes of the subsidie' (usually the costs of an edition of 1500 copies).¹¹² Robert Barker's invoice and receipt (relating to a different invoice) were both over one hundred pounds for these interim periods.¹¹³ Plomer argues that Robert Barker's family estimated Robert's annual income at £3000 in 1607, shortly after Christopher's death.¹¹⁴ This was an enormous amount of money in contemporary terms. A sense of its value can be gauged by comparing it to the annual stipend of £3000 that the Privy Council had to raise for the young Princess Elizabeth, an income only enabled by the 'princely endowment' of extensive lands.¹¹⁵

¹¹⁰ Whilst John Cawood held the office under Mary alone, he printed neither visitations, Bibles nor the *Book of Common Prayer*, although he did print one papal bull and injunctions. This was the first time in a quarter of a century that the English press issued a papal bull. Richard Jugge received the office through 'survivorship' (i.e. 'The condition of a survivor, or the fact of one person surviving another or others, considered in relation to some right or privilege depending on such survival or the period of it.' See 'survivorship' in *OED*, 2nd edn, 1989; online version June 2012 <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/195114>>; accessed 12 June 2012) but, as detailed above, was unable to supply demands for the Bishops' Bible.

¹¹¹ BL, Additional MSS 5756, fols 134-140 and TNA, E101/228/5.

¹¹² Enigmatic as no evidence of the 'bokes of the subsidie' remains in the records of extant books published in the *STC*. I suspect they may have been printed forms to enable the collection of the subsidy.

¹¹³ BL, Additional MSS 5756, fols 134-140.

¹¹⁴ 'The King's Printing House under the Stuarts,' p. 354. Plomer also states the value of the office in Robert's lifetime has been estimated at £30,000. See 'Robert Barker', in *Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667*, p. 13.

¹¹⁵ David Starkey, *Elizabeth: Apprenticeship* (London: Vintage, 2001), pp. 94-96.

In her chapter 'Press, politics and religion', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, 1400-1557*, Pamela Neville-Sington documents the evolving role of the royal printer and each different monarch's exploitation of the press as a tool of governance.¹¹⁶ Wolsey's contribution to the evolution of an official post was vital as he gave exclusive rights to the printers to print all official publications in 1512. Henry VII was the first to commission a propagandist document *Ordenaunces of Warre* (1492) which Richard Pynson printed.¹¹⁷ The *Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic Henry VIII* document that Pynson received a patent to print statutes for two years in 1513. He continued to print official texts, statutes, proclamations and acts for the King until his death.¹¹⁸ By 1526, Pynson's proclamations could have been printed in leaded text (although it is more likely that they would have been set from type cast on a larger body) to facilitate their dissemination amongst the reading public.¹¹⁹ From the outset, the print production of all official documentation and state or monarchical propaganda fell to the royal printer. This can enhance an understanding of *Principall Navigations*. By the 1580s, contemporary audiences would have recognized books printed under the Queen's printers' imprint to represent an official record, which, although religious or occasionally propagandist in nature, would have inevitably conveyed the license of the state.

¹¹⁶ Pamela Neville-Sington, 'Press, politics and religion', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, 1400-1557*, ed. by John Barnard, D. F. McKenzie, David McKitterick, I. R. Willison & others, planned in 7 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998-), III, ed. by Lotte Hellinga and J. B. Trapp (1999), pp. 576-607. Henry's authorized publication, under Wolsley's guidance, of '*Assertio septem sacramentorum*' demonstrated how the printed word could be exploited successfully to reinforce religious orthodoxy. Pope Leo X bestowed Henry with the title 'Defender of the Faith' in an acknowledgement of his efforts to counter the flood of heterodoxy disseminated ever more easily by the propagation of printing presses throughout European town centres.

¹¹⁷ This document was given to soldiers who had fought in the wars in France. It was the first printed document to bear the royal arms. The colophon statement witnesses it was printed by Pynson. P. M. Handover and Cyndia Susan Clegg maintain that William Faques was the first to claim the office of King's printer as his is the earliest extant example of a printed royal proclamation (1504) and he also printed for Henry VII. Lotte Hellinga and J. B. Trapp argue that Pynson first claimed title to this office in 1506 and his responsibilities included the printing of statutes and year books. See their 'Introduction', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, 1400-1557*, III, pp. 1-30 (p. 11).

¹¹⁸ See Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, p. 8 and P. M. Handover, ch. 3.

¹¹⁹ The epistemological effect, Neville-Sington argues, was paradoxically to strengthen the law and limit the King's prerogative.

Thomas Berthelet, Pynson's successor on his death in 1530,¹²⁰ almost always printed variant forms of '*regius impressor excudebat*' at the foot of acts and proclamations. The authority of the King's word was endorsed, its reliability indicated by the King's printers' imprint, and accepted by the reading public in its printed form. Conflation in the reading public's mind of the imprint '*cum privilegio regali*' (with the privilege of the King) with the same sense of the King's official endorsement was evidently a cause for some concern. The '*cum privilegio regali*' imprint was employed when printing any text which had been allowed or conferred on a printer by monarchical privilege. A proclamation of November 1538 witnessed this tension.¹²¹ In 1538, the King decreed that printers had to add *ad imprimendum solum* (to print alone) to their '*cum privilegio regali*' imprints to clarify the status of the work.¹²² After Berthelet, Richard Grafton, Richard Jugge, John Cawood and Christopher Barker all employed the imprint: 'printer[s] to the [King's] Queenes maiestie' to indicate the publication of particular works. During Christopher Barker's tenure, on the basis of evidence collated for this research, the imprint was only employed on publications issued under the terms of the royal printing patent.

After Henry's breach with Rome in 1533/4, Berthelet's remit included the printing of injunctions and the findings from visitations, measures initiated by the Crown to regulate church governance following the Act of Supremacy (1534). During the early years of religious reform Henry, counselled by Thomas Cranmer and Thomas Cromwell, also agreed on what was to become the first authorized Biblical text now known as the Great Bible (because of its size) or the Cranmer Bible as subsequent editions published Cranmer's prefatory material. In 1538 it was decreed that every parish should have a copy of the Bible set up in some convenient place for their

¹²⁰ John Rastell did print some proclamations in the closing months of 1529.

¹²¹ *STC* 7790.

¹²² Neville-Sington, 'Press, politics and religion', p. 593, and Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, p. 10, who argues that the addition of *ad imprimendum solum* when taken more precisely from within the terms of the 1538 proclamation was probably indicative of the monarchical response to the objectionable addenda and marginalia which were added to privileged works. The additional printed notation *ad imprimendum solum* stresses that the royal privilege covered the right to print the original work only, without addenda.

parishioners to see.¹²³ A large volume would usually be chained to the pulpit in the parish church. As this Bible went through repeated editions between 1539 and 1541 it confirms the impact of the 1538 decree and its obvious commercial appeal for the office of King's printer.¹²⁴

A brief synopsis of the print-production of the first folio editions of bibles in England is useful as it demonstrates the technological demands an edition made upon a printing house. This is relevant to the printing of *Principall Navigations* as it corresponds to a similar challenge in printing house outlay in paper, press work (if printed in similar edition sizes) and compositor labour. It is vital to understand the commitment involved in the publication of a work of the size of *Principall Navigations*.

For comparison, Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas S. Freeman have argued that the 1563 edition of John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* took about eighteen months to print. Casting off appears to have begun in the autumn of 1561 and printing was completed by March 1563.¹²⁵ Furthermore, preparations for Foxe's edition of 1570 were underway by 1566. Foxe wrote to his patron, William Cecil, in July 1566 to ask if certain constraints could be waived (the numbers of presses and of foreign workmen employed) because the printer, John Day, already had enough material to keep three presses employed continuously.¹²⁶ In the prefatory material of Raphael Holinshed's *Chronicles* (another large folio edition printed in the period), the cost of printing seems to have impacted upon the sequence of its publication and its contents. In the prefatory material of the 1577 edition, Holinshed alerted his readers to the problems he had encountered in publication:

[Y]et when the volume grewe so great, as they that were to defray the charges for the Impression, were not willing to go through with the whole, they resolved first to publishe the Histories of Englande, Scotlande, and Irelande, with their descriptions, whiche descriptions, bycause they were not in such

¹²³ STC 7790.

¹²⁴ STC 2068, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2076, for example.

¹²⁵ Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas S. Freeman, *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: The Making of Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 116.

¹²⁶ Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas S. Freeman, *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: The Making of Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs'*, p. 163.

readinesse ,as those of forreyn countreys , they were enforced to vse the helpe of other better able to do it than I.¹²⁷

This unwillingness to defray the charges of the impression of a large book was evidently a problem that partially shaped the first edition of Holinshed's *Chronicles*. Indeed, Evenden and Freeman argue that Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* would not have been produced, at least in the imposing form in which we know it, unless William Cecil and other influential Elizabethans had not been willing to reward Day for his efforts.¹²⁸

P. M. Handover records Richard Grafton as the commercial agent who invested in the printing venture of the first Bible in English and he petitioned Cromwell for protection before investing in the enterprise. The production of a Bible in English in a large folio edition was a massive undertaking and printing houses in England did not have the sophisticated typographical equipment needed in the 1530s to produce the text. Initially its production began in France, but was completed in England in 1539.¹²⁹ A Bible contains almost eight hundred thousand words, a challenging task for any printing house. As demand for bibles was constant and customers came from different social strata, the supply of bibles, or books from the Bible, in all formats (from sixteenmo to folio) needed to be efficient and frequent.¹³⁰ As the Bible represented the word of God, all misprints had to be corrected before it was available for market. Thorough proof-reading at each stage of production would hinder efficiency and thus financial return for both printers and publishers.¹³¹

¹²⁷ This may also represent a means to evade responsibility for the offensive material included in Richard Stanyhurst's "History of Ireland" which came to the Privy Council's attention in 1577. See Cyndia Susan Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, p. 139. The Holinshed quotation is from 'The Epistle Dedicatorie', *The Firste volume of the Chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Irelande* (London: for Iohn Hunne, 1577), sig. ¶.ij.v.

¹²⁸ Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas S. Freeman, *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: The Making of Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs'*, p. 16.

¹²⁹ It was not finished in France due to the growing political and religious discord between Protestants and Catholics at this time. Grafton came back to England and in 1539, when most of the typographical equipment that had been used for the Great Bible was sent from France to England, its production resumed in London. See Meraud Grant Ferguson, 'Richard Grafton', in *ODNB* < <http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/view/article/11186> > [accessed 30 March 2008].

¹³⁰ P. M. Handover, p. 74.

¹³¹ See also Robert Barker's production of the 'Wicked Bible' in 1631 in which one of the Ten Commandments, 'thou shalt not commit adultery' omitted the 'not'.

Whilst Grafton was initially the commercial agent overseeing its production, he was granted the office of King's printer under Edward VI on 22 April 1547/8 in recognition of this work. This, in turn, brought the production of Cranmer's Bible (or the Archbishop's approved version of the Bible) to the King's printing house. In 1547/8, Grafton and Whitechurche were also awarded a patent to print all authorized service books in 'survivorship' and a seven year copyright of these service books.¹³² By 1547, the royal printers had assumed into their office the official printing on behalf of the Crown for which they invoiced the exchequer, the authorized bibles and New Testaments in the English tongue, the *Book of Common Prayer* and books of prayers commanded by Parliament.

The office of Queen's printer became available on Richard Jugge's death.¹³³ Initially granted to Thomas Wilkes, Christopher Barker, supported by Walsingham in his petition for the patent and in financial negotiations with Wilkes, secured the office in 1577. The original letters patent (C 66 / 1158), from Windsor castle and dated 27 September, officially conferred the status of Queen's printer to Christopher Barker.

¹³² 22 April 1547 Greenwich

Licence and privilege to the King's servant Richard Grafton and Edward Whitchurche, in survivorship, to print all books "concerning divine service or containing any kind of sermons or exhortations that shall be used, suffered or authorized in our churches of England and Irelande or either of them, by whatsoever name or names the same book or any of them be or shall be called, being in the English or Latin Tongue." No other printer is to print such books on pain of forfeiture of the books and imprisonment at the king's will, and no person shall print or set forth any books that Grafton and Whitchurche have been at the cost of printing, for seven years after the printing of such books.

Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward VI, Vol. 1, 1547-1548, p.100.

22 April 1547

'Grant, for life, to the king's servant Richard Grafton of the office of king's printer of all books of statutes, acts, proclamations, injunctions, and other volumes issued by the king, his heirs or successors, in English or English mixed with any alien tongue, except only instructions in the rudiments of Latin grammar; with the fee of 12*d* yearly at Easter.

Also grant, for life, of an annuity of £4, after the death of Thomas Bertlet, late printer of Henry VIII, now deceased, at the Receipt of the Exchequer; taking the 12*d*. yearly also at the Receipt of the Exchequer. Also prohibition to other persons of printing or importing the above works on pain of forfeiture of the same: and authority to Grafton to arrest all such prohibited work to the king's use.' *CPR: Edward VI*, Vol. 1, 1547-1548 (London: HMSO, 1924), p. 187.

¹³³ Mary I explained in her letters patent of 29 December 1553 why she removed Richard Grafton from office and bestowed the privilege to John Cawood (a printer with Catholic sensibilities): 'The said office is now void because Richard Grafton who held it forfeited it by printing a proclamation in which was contained that a certain Jane, wife of Guildeford Dudley, was queen of England.' John Cawood and Richard Jugge held the office jointly, witnessed by extant printed documents (*STC* 7890) on Elizabeth's accession. For details of their patents see *CPR: Philip and Mary*, Vol. 1, 1553-1554 (London: HMSO, 1937), p. 53, and *CPR: Elizabeth*, Vol. 1, 1558-1560 (London: HMSO, 1939), pp. 92-93.

Written in ink on vellum, it is the final letter contained in its scroll. Positioned thus, the patent has suffered from greater contact with the atmosphere and has been rendered more vulnerable to handling. This has caused the vellum to deteriorate and the ink to fade through time. Archive conservationists of the previous century, anxious lest the document be lost forever, painted the patent with a chemical that initially gave new depth to the script. Unfortunately the chemical has now stained the document and the script is predominantly illegible today, even under ultra-violet light.¹³⁴ Whilst the *Calendar of Patent Rolls* lists the letters patent, important details may be elided. Currently its only accessible documentation is recorded in the calendar on 27 September from Windsor thus:

Grant for life to Christopher Barker of London, printer, of the office of printer of all statute books, libels of acts of Parliament, proclamations, injunctions and Bibles and New Testaments in the English tongue of any translation with or without notes, printed or to be printed by royal command, and of such service books for churches as shall be ordered and other volumes and things whatsoever, by whatever name they be called, or issued by command of Parliament, in English, or English and another tongue mixed (except the rudiments of Latin grammar); no others to print such books or reprint them abroad and import them, under pain of forfeiture of 40s. for each book and confiscation of the books; the grantee may seize such books; the grantee may take up workmen when needed; with an annuity of £6 12s. 4d., payable at the Exchequer.¹³⁵

A preliminary understanding of the office of royal printer suggests that any book, other than the bibles, New Testaments (in English) service books (including the *Book of Common Prayer*) and official works, printed within the ‘compas of his patent’ would have to have been commanded by Parliament: being those ‘things whatsoever, by whatever name they be called, or issued by command of Parliament in English, or English and another tongue mixed (except the rudiments of Latin grammar).’ This is of vital significance to the 1589 edition of *Principall Navigations*, as it was issued from the Queen’s printers’ office.

¹³⁴ This information concerning the history of the care of the patent was obtained in discussion with an employee at the National Archives who worked in the conservation department.

¹³⁵ *CPR: Elizabeth*, Vol. 7, 1575-1578 (London: HMSO, 1982), p. 334.

The Stationers' Registers and the Short Title Catalogue

Turning now to the Stationers' registers, the record of *Principall Navigations*' entry also suggests a command from Walsingham to print the book. *Principall Navigations* was entered into the register on 1 September 1589 thus:

master Byshop
master newberie primo die Septembris

Entred for their copie by warrant of a lettre vnder Sir FFRAUNCIS
WALSINGHAMS hand: a booke Entitled, *the voiages and Discoueries of th[e]*
Englishe nation.¹³⁶

The term 'warrant', when aligned with the terms of the patent which expressed the royal printers' obligation to print any volume in English on the command of the Queen or Parliament, seems to indicate: '[a] writing issued by the sovereign, an officer of state, or an administrative body, authorizing those to whom it is addressed to perform some act.'¹³⁷ In this instance the authority was conveyed by Walsingham's hand. Although the Stationers' registers are not a comprehensive account of all the books that were printed between the years 1576-1640, W. W. Greg suggests that, on the appointment of official licensers, nearly ninety per cent of books entered in the register between 1589 and 1590 were licensed.¹³⁸ On analysis of the Stationers' registers it is apparent that Walsingham only used his political powers in this way on four other occasions and on only one does he use the term warrant to instruct the printing of a title:

John woulfe xxij. Die octobris./

¹³⁶ See Register A, Stationers' Archives, in the entry of copies, under primo die Septembris 1589 and Arber, II, p. 529.

¹³⁷ The *OED* offers this meaning for the term warrant: See 'warrant', in *OED* <<http://oed.com:80/Entry/225837>> [accessed 03 April 2011].

¹³⁸ W. W. Greg, 'Entrance, Licence, and Publication'. W.W. Greg, using three different strategies, suggests 60% of extant printed books were entered in the registers, Adrian Johns suggests 10% and D. F. McKenzie argues that the extent of the loss of printed books experienced over time renders comparisons between extant books and those entered for register a futile exercise. See Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making*, W. W. Greg, 'Entrance, Licence and Publication', *The Library*, 4th ser., 25.1-2 (June, 1944), 1-22, and D. F. McKenzie, 'Printing and Publishing 1557-1700: Constraints on the London book trades', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, 1557-1695*, ed. by John Barnard, D. F. McKenzie, David McKitterick, I. R. Willison & others, planned in 7 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998-), IV, ed. by John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie, with the assistance of Maureen Bell (2002), pp. 553-582.

Entered for John wolff to prynte, a booke intytuled, *a letter sente to Don BERNARDIN DI MENDOZZA, with th[e] advertisementes out of Ireland*, in the Italian tongue, by warrant of a letter from Sir FFRAUNCIS WALSINGHAM to the master and wardens of the Cumpanye. Dated the xvijth day of this october. 1588.¹³⁹

This entry discloses that Walsingham had written to the Company instructing them to print this letter to Mendoza. The term ‘warrant’ was a delegation to the Company of Walsingham’s authority to print the letter. Walsingham’s instructions were concerned neither with rights to copy nor with bestowing a licence on a particular printer. Furthermore, no sum was paid on the entry by the printer. Wolfe was appointed to print the text but it was not entered for his copy.

Appendix A.1 provides an analysis of extant books printed by Christopher Barker, from the inauguration of his role as the Queen’s printer in 1577 through the assigning of the office to his deputies in 1587 to the year of the production of *Principall Navigations*.¹⁴⁰ Barker, as royal printer, did not have to enter books for license, but it seems he entered those titles beyond the customary remit of his privilege to confirm their external authority. It is apparent from the work set out that the Queen’s printer and his deputies presented the information in the imprint carefully: it was not only an advertisement, exploiting the credit that could be attained by adding the words ‘printer to the Queenes most excellent maiestie’. This is apparent as George Bishop and Ralph

¹³⁹ Arber, II, p. 504.

27 novembris [1587]

John wolff Allowed vnto him for his copie aswell in Italian as in Englishe. *The Description of Scotland sett forth by PETRUCCIO [UBALDINI]* and auctorised vnder th[e h]and of Sir FFRAUNCIS

WALSINGHAM...vjd. Arber, II, p. 480.

.1. Februarij [1589]

Thomas Cadman Entred for his copie, vnder Sir FFAUNCIS WALSINGHAMS hand and master Coldockes. *An answere to the vntruthes published in Spaine against the English navie*, Wrytten in the Spanish tonge by a Spanyard...vjd. Arber, II, p. 515.

4 Augusti [1589]

Master Bishop.

master newberry Entred for their copies bothe in Latin and Englishe. *A Declaration of the causes wherewith the navie of the noble Quene of England beinge moved Did in their voiage to Portingal take certen ships furnished with corne &c...*xijd.

Allowed by direction from Sir FRAUNCIS WALSINGHAM. Arber, II, p. 527.

¹⁴⁰ This will be analysed more fully in the following chapter. It is compiled first from *The English Short Title Catalogue* and compared with the Stationers’ register. The title-pages and imprints have all been recorded if they are accessible on EEBO.

Newberry were both actively producing works outside the remit of the patent, whilst in office through deputation, yet none of these works was printed with the Queen's printers' imprint. Latin works were never printed under the terms of the office. There is, however, one proclamation, directed by Walsingham, regarding the taking of grain in Lisbon (*STC* 9197) which was printed in the international language. The remit of this work explains why it was also printed in Latin and it is clearly related to the business of state. Further, Stow's *A summary of the chronicles of England* (*STC* 23326) is printed in 1587 by Ralph Newberry and is reprinted in 1590 (*STC* 23327). It is never printed under the royal printers' imprint. In 1577, before assuming the office of Queen's printer, Barker printed his Geneva Bible with the correct 'cum privilegio' (*STC* 2119) having the authority through license and the exclusive privilege to print this Bible in English in England. On 16 September, whilst waiting for the official letters patent, he issued his first proclamation for the Queen with 'Commanded by the Queen' (*STC* 8093), rather than 'printer to Queenes Maiestie' witnessed in the imprint on proclamations after the 27 September. Barker received license to print S. A. I.'s *Carminum Proverbialium*, a collection of proverbial commonplaces in Latin, before assuming the office of Queen's printer and this book is never published with the words 'printer to the Queenes maiestie' on the title-page, although 'Excudebat Christophorus Barkerus' is recorded in the colophon. Printed in 1577 (*STC* 14059), 1579 (*STC* 14060) and 1583 (*STC* 14060.5), the imprint only ever records 'Impressum Londini.' Imprints designated different publishing interests and a variety of imprints are used in this period: Imprinted at London by CB; *Excudebat C. Barker, impressum Londini; ex officio CB*; and later under the deputies, the frequently used *impensis* George Bishop.

Although it is very difficult to discern whether the printing of individual religious tracts or prayers was commanded by authority, the terms of Barker's patent were flexible enough to incorporate them even if they were not ordered, being allowed to print 'such service books for churches.' The coveted goodwill inferred by the royal imprint would have encouraged the Queen's printers to exploit it when they could. The Queen's printer was commanded to print prayers to be said in churches on specific occasions (after the earthquake, the Queen's recovery from illness and on the anniversary of her accession, 17 November). Books with patently political ends were

printed under the terms of the royal patent and again verify their authority through their external licensing in the Stationers' register, e.g. *A sermon preached at the christening of a certain iew, at London* (STC 11248 – requested by Francis Walsingham), William Charke's *An answer to a seditious pamphlet lately cast abroade by a Iesuite* – i.e. Edmund Campion (STC 5005 – licensed by the Bishop of London), Edmund Campion's sworn testimony, *A particular declaration or testimony, of the vndutiful affection borne against her Maiestie by Edmund Campion Iesuite* (STC 4536 – published by authority). The Privy Council also used the Queen's printer to counter sedition witnessed by the anonymously printed tracts, some of which were instructed or written by senior members of the Queen's Privy Council (e.g. STC 4901, 4902, 4903), *A discoverie of the treasons [...] Throckmorton* (STC [24050], [24050.5], [24051], [24051.5])¹⁴¹ and *An aduertisement from a French Gentleman [...] regarding the intentions of Charles de Guise* (STC 5010), which was commanded by members of the Privy Council.

The royal printing house was fully occupied with its bible monopolies and the printing demands of the government. In 1589 alone, extant records demonstrate that the deputies printed two editions of the Geneva Bible in quarto (one is uncertain so has not been included), one in octavo, two editions of the Geneva concordance in quarto (which may be re-issues and one is a ghost), one New Testament edition in sixteenmo, an edition of the Rheims and Bishops New Testament in parallel columns in folio, two editions of the *Book of Common Prayer* in quarto (perhaps a comprehensive edition of the Statutes in folio) and *Principall Navigations* in folio: that is two (perhaps three) substantial folio editions, eight quartos, two octavos and one editions in sixteenmo, without including the proclamations (these were generally printed on single sheets but if the text was longer, e.g. the sentencing of Mary Queen of Scots (STC 8160, 3 sheets) and the proclamation against excess clothing and the wearing of swords (STC 8119, 8 sheets) text was printed on the recto only), articles in quarto and two (and one closely related) editions of *An admonition to the people of England; wherein are answered, not onely the slaunderous untruthes reprochfully vttered by Martin...* (STC 5682, 5683, 5683a) in quarto and a quarto edition of *A forme of prayer* – for the army in France (STC

¹⁴¹ Numbers in square brackets 'indicate the name or place being indexed is supplied in STC itself', for more information, see STC, III, p. xviii.

16521). Christopher Barker had five presses in 1584 but could occupy six by 1586, which probably represents an increased workload. Furthermore, Barker was also able to assign other titles to Henry Bynneman, Henry Middleton, Thomas Dawson, Ralph Newberry, Hugh Singleton and Thomas Woodcock during this period. What is clear from these statistics is that even a printing house of this size did not produce folios of over two hundred edition sheets regularly throughout the year.

After tracing Walsingham's active and causal role in the production processes of *Principall Navigations*, it now seems that *Principall Navigations* was published in response to Walsingham's order to the Queen's printer to print the text. His ability to command the Queen's printer to produce works of benefit for the commonweal depended upon his position as government minister. However, Barker's role as royal printer and his printing-house practices were obviously influenced by the conflicting expectations and pressures from the Stationers' Company, from government and from Barker's established personal relationship with Walsingham.

Close analysis of the terms of the Queen's Printer's patent and the use of the imprint 'printer to the Queenes most excellent maiestie' suggests that during the period between 1577 and 1589 the imprint was only used on works that were published under the terms of the royal printing office. Whilst imprints were employed in different ways by different printing offices, the use of 'Printer to the Queenes most excellent Maiestie' related to works issued from the Queen's printing house in its official capacity. Thus, in the case of *Principall Navigations*, the imprint represents a carefully composed record of vested publisher interests. As the privilege to print bibles, prayer books and the *Book of Common Prayer* was tied to an obligation to print matters for the state, the combined circumstances of the use of the imprint and the terms of the patent indicate that *Principall Navigations* could only have been issued from the office of the royal printing house if it had been ordered by Parliament or the Queen or had been licensed as a privileged text under the remit of the Queen's printers' patent. However, I have proposed that Bishop and Newberry were named in the publication details in order to record their separate shares in rights to copy. These shares were not relinquished on Christopher Barker's death (1599) and the consequent termination of their role as deputies to the Queen's printer. On George Bishop's death in 1611, his wife registered

his rights and stock in the Stationers' register. This included '[h]is parte of Englishe voyages 3 vol.'¹⁴² Furthermore, as Walsingham's warrant to the Queen's deputies to print the text is documented in the Stationers' registers and the second edition is not issued from the royal printing house, it seems highly probable that the first edition was ordered by Walsingham and published in 'the service of her maiestie and the Realme.'¹⁴³

In the first two chapters, I proposed that *Principall Navigations* depended upon Francis Walsingham's authority, from its composition through to its publication. Walsingham's patronage of Hakluyt's work and Hakluyt's 'prescribed limites' have now been aligned with Walsingham's prerogative as Privy Councillor to action the production of texts in the royal printing house and his patronage of Barker. These findings complicate the critical consensus already deconstructed by David A. Boruchoff in his recent study 'Piety, Patriotism, and Empire: Lessons for England, Spain, and the New World in the Works of Richard Hakluyt', in which Boruchoff questions representations of Hakluyt's intentions:

Although often tacit, the teleology of the studies that unduly restrict their attention to what one of them calls 'strictly patriotic and pragmatic motivations' assumes that Hakluyt, foremost among his peers, not only wrote and compiled works with the intent to create an imperial project, but was moreover the prophet, indeed the architect, of the English Empire that later took shape.¹⁴⁴

It is now evident that the production of *Principall Navigations* depended upon a powerful patron with extensive authority over a printer, or printing house, to facilitate its initial production in print. Consequently, this undermines further the concept of a single author shaping the cause of imperial expansion.

However, the command for its production in the Queen's printing house raises some important issues. Previously, I have shown that the works issued from the royal printing office (and under the terms of the patent) were either propagandist or official

¹⁴² *Hakluyt Handbook*, I, p. 324.

¹⁴³ Star Chamber Decree, 1586, reprinted in Arber, II, p. 812.

¹⁴⁴ 'Piety, Patriotism, and Empire: Lessons for England, Spain, and the New World in the Works of Richard Hakluyt', *Renaissance Quarterly*, p. 813.

works (statutes, acts and proclamations) which were commanded by the monarch and government or were religious bibles and other approved service books. In the period from 1577 until 1589, Elizabeth's royal printers were commanded to print various political rejoinders on behalf of Leicester, Cecil and Walsingham in reaction to specific crises. The publication of *Principall Navigations* was undoubtedly political in nature as the compilation of the text signified a practical response by Walsingham and his collaborators to the ramifications of war with Philip II, the closure of Habsburg controlled ports and the consequences on the export economy, merchants and traders. I propose its publication in print represents an official attempt to promote reader participation in further ventures of discovery to strange coasts to counter the closure of ports and traditional overseas markets.

Paradoxically, however, although the production of the book constituted an impetus for further action or investment from its readership, these voyages were never supported by the treasury and only infrequently invested in by the Queen. The publication of *Principall Navigations*, therefore, also signifies the limits of official support in the lack of treasury investment in the ventures it promoted. Although the Crown bequeathed monopolies in new trade opportunities and land, it did not establish a great centre for the advancement of trade and navigation akin to the *Casa de la Contratación* in Seville.¹⁴⁵ David Turnbull suggests that the *Casa de la Contratación* represented an early attempt by a Spanish state to create a space in which it could regulate and accumulate new geographical knowledge. From its original conception it was closely concerned with the practical needs required for the development of trade in new lands and the subsequent collection of taxes:

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, Portugal and Spain were the first nations to attempt to construct spaces within which to accumulate and regulate all geographical knowledge. They set up bureaucracies in Lisbon and Seville to supervise their rapidly burgeoning empires in the East Indies and the Americas. Called respectively the *Casa da Mina* (Lisbon) and the *Casa de la*

¹⁴⁵ For details of Peter Ramus's endowment see Richard Hakluyt's letter to Walsingham in *Original Writings*, I, p. 208 and Richard Hakluyt, *Divers voyages touching the discoverie of America*, ed. by John Winter Jones, facsimile reprint from the *Legacy Reprint Series* (London: T. Woodcocke, 1582; repr. The Hakluyt Society, 1850), pp. 16-17. A lectureship in the art of navigation was finally endowed by Thomas Smith, as governor for the East India Company. For more detail see *Original Writings*, II, p. 510.

Contratación (Seville), these bureaucracies were essentially Boards of Trade whose primary task was to regulate imports from the New World and the East Indies so that the state could maintain a trade monopoly and impose taxes.¹⁴⁶

By contrast, Elizabeth's fundamental lack of interest can be intimated by her inaction, post repeated petitions, to endow a small annuity of twenty pounds to establish a lectureship in the art of navigation, something Hakluyt and Drake considered imperative to the reduction of the loss of life at sea and the development of trade and discovery. Despite citing Peter Ramus's personal provision of an endowment of five hundred livres, or fifty pounds sterling, for a similar lectureship in Paris and Francis Drake's offer of an annual endowment of twenty pounds to employ 'a learned man' in addition to an initial outlay to 'furnish him with instruments and maps', the Crown never agreed to the insignificant investment.¹⁴⁷

The history of the production of *Principall Navigations* can elucidate, through example, the government's response to the export crisis. Previously, Conyers Read positioned trade beyond the scope of the business of the Elizabethan state and F. J. Fisher argued that links between trade crises and political action were close enough throughout the sixteenth century to be suggestive. If *Principall Navigations* can be taken as an example, this divergence in critical opinion can be explained by an evaluation of the mechanisms of patronage. *Principall Navigations*, as historical outcome, represents the work of a powerful patron, and Privy Councillor, who endeavoured to implement policy in a bid to appease immediate and local adversity for and on behalf of his corporate counterpart, his Privy Council.¹⁴⁸ On the one hand, *Principall Navigations* represents the government's inability to respond to economic crises through a rationalized economic policy, lacking either sufficient political and fiscal autonomy or monarchical will. On the other hand, however, it also represents the extensive influence of an individual Privy Councillor drawing upon his patronage network and his authority over the royal printing house to effect political action.

¹⁴⁶ David Turnbull, 'Cartography and Science in Early Modern Europe: Mapping the Construction of Knowledge Spaces', p. 7.

¹⁴⁷ *Divers voyages touching the discoverie of America*, ed. by John Winter Jones, facsimile reprint from the *Legacy Reprint Series* (London: T. Woodcocke, 1582; repr. The Hakluyt Society, 1850), p. 16.

¹⁴⁸ Werner L. Gundersheimer, 'Patronage in the Renaissance: An Exploratory Approach', in *Patronage in the Renaissance*, p. 19.

Chapter Three

‘[T]he censure of the learned phisitian M. Doctor Iames’: Printing, Proof-reading and Signs of Censorship in *Principall Navigations* (1589)

In the dedicatory epistle of *Principall Navigations*, Richard Hakluyt introduced another less apparent potential influence upon the final content of the text. John James, previously clerk of the papers of the Privy Council and an ‘experienced archivist’, was appointed by Francis Walsingham as licenser to correct and oversee its publication:¹ ‘according to your order, it hath passed the sight, and partly also the censure of the learned phisitian M. Doctor Iames, a man many wayes very notably qualified.’² As the concluding sentence of the last paragraph before the formulaic epistolary closure, it represents Hakluyt’s final thoughts to his patron on the reasons for embarking on the publication of this particular book. His word-choice, that *Principall Navigations* only ‘partly’ passed ‘censure’, exemplifies the Elizabethan predilection for multiple and contradictory meanings that can be conveyed simultaneously through language.³ Here, Hakluyt could be inferring that part of *Principall Navigations* provoked such official disapproval that some material had to be suppressed or equally that it was published despite only ‘partly’ passing James’ censure. The book’s passage through the press may not have been affected by the licenser’s censure.

Significantly, Annabel Patterson argues that ‘late modern criticism has not paid enough attention to the interpretive status of introductory materials in early modern

¹ His notable qualifications possibly allude to his role as licenser for medical texts, as he acted as censor for the College of Physicians in 1588 (and again in 1591 and 1594), and the archival work he did for the Privy Council. ‘[James] found the state papers scattered among the shelves and storage chests of an inadequate Whitehall muniment room, on loan to government departments and antiquaries, and “in the study” of Walsingham’s “post house” in Seething Lane, London. Consequently, he soon joined the council clerk Robert Beale in requesting that “publicke” papers no longer remain in government officials’ homes; and then set about to make an inventory of all of Secretary Walsingham’s manuscripts, and to catalogue them in a volume entitled “Walsingham’s table book”’. F. Jeffrey Platt, ‘John James’, in *ODNB* < <http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/view/article/40511> > [accessed 15 May 2009] (para. 2 of 5).

² *Principall Navigations*, sig. *3r.

³ An ‘indeterminacy inveterate to language’ that Annabel Patterson argues was exploited by writers in response to censorship controls. See Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England*, p. 18.

texts.’⁴ She argues that the prefatory materials can disclose the strategies authors employed when writing under repressive regimes and can demonstrate an awareness of the potential for aggressive punishment, if an offence was detected. If protection was sought through the dedicatory epistle, it suggests a contemporary recognition of the book’s potential for censure. This, in turn, informed the author’s own need to exploit the ‘indeterminacy’ of language, to work within and through the confines of *anticipated* censorship. As Hakluyt’s reference to censure could signal subsequent intervention in the publication, prompted by John James, an investigation into the revisions witnessed by the variant states may assist current debate on the role of censorship in the history of *Principall Navigations* (1589).

This chapter will now assess evidence from a bibliographical perspective. First, I will consider the variant states of *Principall Navigations* and their histories. I will use analytical bibliography to evaluate the paper-stocks and textual variants witnessed in the 1589 edition. As I suggest that rights of printers’ copy may represent a further reason for the late interpolation of the Drake leaves, I will then turn to the printing conditions in London and consider rights to copy and the production capacity of the Queen’s printers. This will be set against other London printers working in the period. Here, I will indicate the number of editions sheets contained in *Principall Navigations* and the size of the task in relation to a large six press operation. This will then be mapped on to Hakluyt’s own movements and the history of the organization of his documents. The objective is to demonstrate that the print production of *Principall Navigations* not only demanded a powerful patron but also called for a compliant printer who had the financial security to underwrite the book’s production. If produced in an edition of seven hundred and fifty copies, it would have occupied a single press and at least two, but probably three, compositors working at maximum outputs for over one hundred and ten days. While printers would not focus on the exclusive production of one book and they would integrate the production of other works into their routines to keep their businesses afloat, books of over two hundred edition sheets, if printed by a printer who owned one or two presses, would take a very long time to produce in this manner. From the analysis

⁴ Annabel Paterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England*, p. 56.

of hypothetical calculations of maximum outputs (which are probably quite unreasonable), it can be argued that *Principall Navigations* would have tied up substantial capital investment for some time.

In 1974, D. B. Quinn published an extensive bibliography of extant copies of the 1589 edition that he had constructed in close collaboration with libraries, booksellers and collectors around the globe. Through the comparison of copies, he was able to determine that *Principall Navigations* had been marketed in three variant states, corroborating Willis Holmes Kerr's earlier work.⁵ Quinn's bibliography has since been updated by Anthony Payne and P. A. Neville-Sington in their census of surviving copies and this work is now available online at the Hakluyt Society's webpage.⁶ Having analysed the thirty-six copies that were believed to be in near-contemporary or contemporary bindings, Quinn published his findings in the second volume of *The Hakluyt Handbook* and these can be summarized thus:

- State 1– the first state of the Jerome Bowes leaves, without the Drake leaves;
- State 2– the first state of the Jerome Bowes leaves with the Drake leaves;
- State 3– the second state of the Jerome Bowes leaves with the Drake leaves.⁷

Quinn's census lists one extant copy that he believed to be in the original condition (Quinn, no. 11), because it is in near-contemporary binding, which contains the emended Jerome Bowes leaves but not the Drake leaves. Quinn did not consider this to be an additional variant state due to its single occurrence in those books bound in the period and he assumes a chronological sequence which places the interpolation of the Drake leaves before the emendation of the Bowes leaves. In the updated census undertaken by Anthony Payne and P. A. Neville-Sington, the number of books

⁵ Willis Holmes Kerr, 'The Treatment of Drake's Circumnavigation in Hakluyt's "Voyages," 1589', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 34 (1940), 281-302.

⁶ Anthony Payne and P. A. Neville-Sington, *An Interim Census of Surviving Copies of Hakluyt's Divers Voyages and Principal Navigations*, in Anthony Payne and P. A. Neville-Sington, *Richard Hakluyt and his Books / An Interim Census of Surviving Copies of Hakluyt's Divers Voyages and Principal Navigations* (London: Hakluyt Society, 1997) and The Hakluyt Society webpage: 'Hakluyt: census of copies' <http://www.hakluyt.com/hakluyt_census> [accessed 1 August 2012].

⁷ *Hakluyt Handbook*, II, p. 480.

containing the Bowes leaves in the second state without the Drake leaves is raised: three copies are listed in contemporary bindings, two having undergone more recent repair.⁸

It is worth establishing immediately the ambiguities inherent in seeking a chronology of the variant states from the analysis of bibliographical evidence carried by bindings. As *Principall Navigations* is a substantial early modern printed text, it has attracted the interest of collectors and individual copies have become susceptible to degrees of sophistication or cannibalization. It is universally recognized that copies which are not bound contemporaneously may have undergone these processes and the potential bibliographical insights they may have otherwise preserved are undermined.⁹ However, Mirjam M. Foot employs G. Thomas Tanselle's argument regarding evidence conveyed by original bindings (and how their removal by librarians deprives the bibliographer of relevant historical data) and suggests books bound contemporaneously may also have undergone alteration:

‘[I]n a rebound book nothing can be trusted, because one cannot know what else has been altered in the process of rebinding.’ This is perfectly true, but it is equally true of earlier bindings; and the fact that these were often (not always) added well after the book had left the printer's shop (or the scribe's workplace) does not alter the fact that binders could, and often did, obscure and alter evidence.¹⁰

As early modern bookbinders contributed to the physical form of each individual book, their practices also introduced a range of measures a particular book could have undergone before it was finally bound, backed with boards and covered. Master-printers,

⁸ The second state of the Bowes leaves without the Drake leaves is represented by copies held at the London Library, London [Safe 4, 4to], Christ Church, Oxford [f.1.34] (Q11 — i.e. no. in Quinn's earlier census), Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, Paris [4to H315], Library of Congress, Washington [G240.H142] (Q90 but Quinn listed this copy with the Drake leaves), Boston Public Library, Boston, MA [G351.24] (Q52), Hispanic Society of America, New York I [G240 H15 1589 (1)] (Q66), State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, III [Q58/3] (Q31). Copies held at the London Library, London and Christ Church, Oxford are in repaired contemporary bindings and the copy held at the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal is in a contemporary binding. See *Hakluyt Handbook*, II, pp. 481-489 and Anthony Payne's census (first compiled by Anthony Payne and P. A. Neville-Sington) on the Hakluyt Society webpage: 'Hakluyt: census of copies' <http://www.hakluyt.com/hakluyt_census> [accessed 25 April 2012].

⁹ See Mirjam M. Foot, *Bookbinders at Work: Their Roles and their Methods* (London: British Library, 2006), p. 12.

¹⁰ Mirjam M. Foot, *Bookbinders at Work: Their Roles and their Methods*, p. 23, quoting G. Thomas Tanselle from 'Bibliographers and the Library', *Library Trends* (April, 1977), 745-762 (p. 753).

alert to the economies of trade, knew investment in bindings would be tied to slow returns if the book remained unsold for any period.¹¹ Books were, therefore, frequently sold either as unbound sheets or were stitched into text blocks that could be bought in a variety of stages of interim binding (with sewing supports to be attached later to boards; with end bands and put into boards but not covered; with tackets (loops) and a parchment cover).¹²

Arriving at the binders as loose leaves ‘roughly assembled into some sort of order,’ the unwanted folds in the sheets would have to be flattened out, the quires and gatherings assembled correctly and new folds made afresh.¹³ Plates or maps were mounted on ‘guards’ before being inserted by the binder.¹⁴ Cancels were generally marked in some way by the printing house and the binder would have been responsible for finding and removing the cancellanda and correctly inserting the cancellantia.¹⁵ When folded, the gatherings were pressed and beaten to remove unwanted air and even out discrepancies of density inherent in laid paper. Only then would the book have been stitched on the sewing frame into a text-block.¹⁶ Endpapers were added as pastedowns for the cover and to protect the end pages. The book would then have been returned to the printing house either in paper or parchment wrappers or with plain boards attached by the head and tail bands.¹⁷ Customers could, therefore, have bought a book as sheets or as text-block in variable states of readiness for boards and covers. Be-spoke orders could also have been put into place for individual customers or for the printing house, but printers would only ever have bound and covered the most popular books that were guaranteed to sell quickly.¹⁸ As a second, enlarged edition of *Principall Navigations* was not produced until 1598-1600, it is highly unlikely that it would have been sold by the

¹¹ Philip Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972; repr. Delaware: Oak Knoll Press, 2007), p. 146.

¹² Mirjam M. Foot, p. 12.

¹³ Mirjam M. Foot, pp. 35 & 41 respectively.

¹⁴ Mirjam M. Foot, p. 43.

¹⁵ Mirjam M. Foot, p. 42.

¹⁶ Mirjam M. Foot, p. 50. Books were stitched through the inner folds of the sheets on to five or six bands or cords that were placed along the back of the book for this purpose. See Gaskell’s chapter on ‘Binding’ in *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, pp. 146-153.

¹⁷ Mirjam M. Foot, p. 12.

¹⁸ Binders were also often booksellers and were obviously frequently paid for their binding work in books.

printer in a permanent cover unless such an order had been placed by a credit-worthy customer.

If the map, the second state of the Bowes leaves or the Drake leaves had been printed before the stitching of the individual book had concluded, these leaves could have been inserted at this point. If printed after the copy had been sewn into a text block, either the customer could have bought the additional leaves and had them inserted whenever the book was finally bound with permanent covers or the printing house could have arranged for any unsold, but stitched, stock of the edition to be returned to the binder with the cancels and interpolations. Even the thirty-six contemporaneously bound copies do not preclude the possibility that the book may have already undergone some customer specification (for example, perhaps the customer made a choice between the different edition of the Bowes leaves and decided (not) to pay for the additional Drake leaves and / or map) before binding.¹⁹ The printers' ability to print supplementary material (i.e. the Drake leaves and the map) or improved texts (i.e. the Bowes leaves) in discrete gatherings indicates a variety of additional factors that could have had a bearing on the different states witnessed in extant copies: the particular tastes and values of early modern customers; their ability to pay for the extra material (although the map is not found in many extant copies it could have been included and then removed); or the printing house's decision to upgrade its stock to stimulate flagging sales. After his analysis of the variant states of *Principall Navigations*, Kerr asks, '[i]n other words, was not the Hakluyt book issued in every-which way, all things to all men?'²⁰

The absence of archival sources has driven critics to conjecture as to the motivations behind the variant states of the first edition of *Principall Navigations*. Book catalogues and academics alike have habitually hypothesized that the government, exerting controls over aspects of the publication, was responsible for the altered states. It is frequently reiterated, since first posited by Quinn, that the corrections to the Bowes

¹⁹ 'Of thirty-six copies, the contents of which we have good reason to believe to be in their original condition, there are six of State I, three of State II, twenty-six of State III, and one (no. 12) with the Bowes leaves in the second state but no Drake leaves. State II is, however, represented by fifteen copies which may be in original condition, though positive evidence is wanting.' *Hakluyt Handbook*, II, p. 480.

²⁰ Willis Holmes Kerr, 'The Treatment of Drake's Circumnavigation in Hakluyt's "Voyages," 1589', p. 287.

leaves were instigated by Francis Walsingham on behalf of the Muscovy Company. Auction catalogues have generally claimed that the Drake leaves were ‘suppressed’ by the state in a bid to maintain a policy of secrecy, a position Harry Kelsey has also recently substantiated.²¹ There is no evidence, however, that the Bowes leaves were ever recalled and the date of the interpolation of the Drake leaves continues to incite debate.²² Combined with the enigmatic quality of the recorded ‘censure’, the uncertainty around the variant states has prompted sufficient academic discussion to render *Principall Navigations* worthy of detailed bibliographical analysis.

Whilst not a forensic science capable of establishing irrefutable facts, analytical bibliography can draw out the possibilities of production through a reconstruction of the manufacturing processes that have left traces upon the text:

[Analytical bibliographers] should normally proceed in [their] inquiries by the hypothetico-deductive method which welcomes conjectures in the positive knowledge that productive conditions were extraordinarily complex and unpredictable, but which also insists that such conjectures be scrutinized with the greatest rigour and, if refuted, rejected.²³

With a degree of ‘hypothetico-deduction’ (informed by an appreciation of sixteenth-century London printing house practice), an examination of the ‘internal bibliographical peculiarities’ will characterize certain conditions of *Principall Navigations*’ production.²⁴

A study of the manufacture of *Principall Navigations* will engage with the work initiated by Quinn in 1974 in which he concluded:

No variety in paper, type-fount, and make-up of pages in the book as originally prepared, and no divergence in these respects in the Drake leaves and the second state of the Bowes leaves, have been observed. The paper is a ‘pot’

²¹ See for example Thomas Grenville’s own account which makes reference to Evan’s Catalogue of 1828 and includes the catalogue entry in his copy (G. 6604) now held at the British Library: ‘*It appears however, he had printed the account privately, and THESE VI SUPPRESSED LEAVES ARE FOUND IN THIS COPY.*’ Auctioneers, presenting the leaves as suppressed, would inevitably have been seeking to increase their potential value to the prospective purchaser. See also Harry Kelsey, *Sir Francis Drake: The Queen’s Pirate*, pp. 86-87.

²² Anthony Payne, *Richard Hakluyt and his Books*, pp. 12-13.

²³ D. F. McKenzie, ‘Printers of the Mind: Some Notes on Bibliographical Theories and Printing-House Practices’, p. 6.

²⁴ Charlton Hinman, *The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare*, I, p. 16.

watermark, commonly used by the Queen's printer. A detailed analysis of the typographical variants, using modern techniques, has still to be made.²⁵

As the variant states, through speculation, have become entwined with the concept of government intervention, the conjectured causes need summarizing before the bibliographical data can be examined separately.

The prefatory materials are signed with an asterisk which illustrates that the Queen's printers followed traditional practice, printing these pages last. Both Hakluyt's address to the reader and his dedicatory epistle constitute the same quired gathering (*⁸), which would have represented a unit of composition. If the 'censure' Hakluyt discusses in his dedicatory epistle refers to the only known emendation — the Bowes leaves — which Quinn maintains was undertaken in response to Walsingham's intervention,²⁶ it is apparent that Hakluyt makes no reference to the late interpolation of the Drake leaves in his address to the reader, implying that at this point in the printing process they remained unobtainable. This, at least potentially, questions Quinn's sequencing of the emendations: the interpolation of the Drake leaves was followed by the emendation of the Bowes leaves. Hakluyt's assessment of the Cavendish account, as 'more particular, and exact', also discloses he considered this more recent circumnavigation a substitution for the absent Drake narrative:

*For the conclusion of all, the memorable voyage of Master Thomas Candish into the South sea, and from thence about the globe of the earth doth satisfie mee, and I doubt not but will fully content thee: which as in time it is later then that of Sir Frauncis Drake, so in relation of the Philippinaes, Iapan, China, and the Isle of S. Helena it is more particular, and exact: and therefore the want of the first made by Sir Frauncis Drake will be the lesse:*²⁷

The discord between the address to the reader (foregrounding the absence of the Drake narrative) and the dedicatory epistle (relating the censure of the licenser), therefore introduces certain complications: the term 'censure' may not be a reference to

²⁵ *Hakluyt Handbook*, II, p. 476.

²⁶ *Principall Navigations* (1965), I, p. xiii.

²⁷ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *4v.

government intervention; if it does indicate the state's intervention and the suppression of a text, the offending material may not have related to the Bowes leaves; the sequencing (interpolation followed by emendation) may need reconsidering; it may only signal anticipated censure and offer a means for the producers of the book to evade responsibility of an offence later readers may discover within the compilation.

There is, however, one further complication in the sequencing of the emendations which concerns the interpolation of the Drake leaves. This suggests another reason why the Drake leaves may not have been overtly advertised. Whilst neither the Bowes cancels nor the Drake interpolation was recorded in the contents or index pages, Kerr has pointed out that the title-page does make an oblique reference to Drake's circumnavigation in the contents of the third part of the book:

The third and last, including the English valiant attempts in searching almost all the corners of the vaste and new world of *America*, from 73. degrees of Northerly latitude Southward, to *Meta Incognita, Newfoundland*, the maine of *Virginia*, the point of *Florida*, the Baie of *Mexico*, all the Inland of *Noua Hispania*, the coast of *Terra firma, Brasill*, the riuer of *Plate*, to the Streight of *Magellan*: and through it, and from it in the South Sea to *Chili, Peru, Xalisco*, the Gulfe of *California, Noua Albion* vpon the backside of *Canada*, further then euer any Christian hitherto hath pierced.²⁸

Nova Albion, 'a faire and good Baye' named by Francis Drake on his circumnavigation for its 'white bankes and cliffes' and its potential affinity with England,²⁹ was sought after an unsuccessful attempt to find an exit on the 'backside of America' for the Northwest Passage.³⁰ In 1589, Francis Drake was the only English man to have sailed this far north along the western coast of Canada,³¹ so the reference to Nova Albion not only ushers in the discursive practices inherent in the principle of its naming (possession, appropriation or assimilation), it also suggests that Drake's circumnavigation was included in the compilation. The informed reader would have expected to have found an account of the circumnavigation in the book as purchased.

²⁸ Included in the long-title, listing the contents of the third part, *Principall Navigations*, title-page.

²⁹ *Principall Navigations*, sigs. 3M7r -3M8r.

³⁰ *Principall Navigations*, sig. 3M7r.

³¹ Willis Holmes Kerr, 'The Treatment of Drake's Circumnavigation in Hakluyt's "Voyages," 1589', p. 288.

Margaret M. Smith summarizes the uses printers made of the title-page in an earlier period (1460-1510), which is still of value:

The title-page is part of a text's macro-articulation, presenting its general nature to the reader or purchaser by its layout, its style of letterform and level of ornamentation, and of course by its words – an abbreviated identification of its contents: naming the author, the text, and giving its production pedigree, who produced it, when and where.³²

Printed on single sheets, additional copies of the title-page were habitually used to publicize new book-stocks. Re-issues of updated stock were frequently announced by the resetting and reprinting of new title-pages. The Drake leaves represented an important supplement to *Principall Navigations*, increasing its market value for a range of readers. They contained accounts of Drake's execution of Thomas Doughty and the capture of the *Cacafuego*, which were both politically sensitive matters, alongside the extraordinary nautical feat of Drake's circumnavigation. The title-page of the 1589 edition is only ever witnessed in one state (over the extant copies) which never explicitly published the inclusion of the Drake leaves but trumpeted the Thomas Cavendish account in the long-title as 'the last most renowned English Nauigation, round about the whole Globe of the Earth'.³³ Indeed, even intentions to circumnavigate the globe were listed on the title-page of the third volume of the second edition of *The Voyages, Navigations, Traffiques and Discoueries of the English Nation* (1600), which published both the successful circumnavigations as outstanding achievements deserving particular attention:

Together with the two renowned, and prosperous voyages of Sir *Francis Drake* and M. *Thomas Candish* round about the circumference of the whole earth, and diuers other voyages intended and set forth for that course.³⁴

³² Margaret M. Smith, *The Title-Page: Its Early Development, 1460-1510* (London: The British Library, 2000), p. 23.

³³ *Principall Navigations*, title-page.

³⁴ *The Voyages, Navigations, Traffiques, and Discoueries of the English Nation* (London: George Bishop, Ralfe Newberie, Robert Barker, 1600), title-page. This is referred to as volume III of *Principal Navigations* in the bibliography.

Harry Kelsey, in his recent Drake biography, has revisited discussion on the timing of the interpolation of the Drake leaves. Drawing on contemporary literary sources, Kelsey suggests that this must have occurred after January 1593. ‘The Hakluyt version certainly had not appeared in print by January 1593, when Drake addressed a letter to the queen, complaining that reports of his journey “hitherto have been silenced”’.³⁵ Furthermore, he cites John Stow’s ready appropriation of Hakluyt’s Cavendish narrative for the *Annales* (1592) but Stow’s need to turn to John Cooke for the Drake voyage.³⁶ Certainly, in October 1584, Sir Edward Stafford had heard from Hakluyt ‘that Drake’s journey is kept very secret in England.’³⁷ Kelsey supports his argument with bibliographical comment:

David Quinn argues that the Drake leaves were printed at almost the same time as the original book and that almost all copies came with the Drake leaves already inserted. [...] This is clearly not the case. I have inspected many copies, including some that are supposed to be in the original binding. In each one the Drake leaves were obviously inserted after the edges were trimmed for binding, after vermin had eaten holes in the paper, and/or after the facing pages were otherwise stained or marred.³⁸

In response, Anthony Payne argues that the trimming of paper and its deterioration cannot offer the precision around dates that Kelsey seeks:

[W]hile condition is useful in establishing in particular instances that the leaves have been added at a much later date (as is undoubtedly often the case), such deterioration is generally improbable in copies to which they were added only five years or so later. Kelsey’s observation about trimming is not conclusive in establishing when the leaves were inserted in particular copies: trimming could equally well have occurred within a few weeks or months as five years after the book’s first publication.³⁹

The circumstances around the emendation of the Bowes leaves are both more accessible and more complex. Within the sub-titles of ‘A briefe discourse of the voyage

³⁵ Harry Kelsey, *Sir Francis Drake: The Queen’s Pirate*, p. 86.

³⁶ Harry Kelsey, *Sir Francis Drake: The Queen’s Pirate*, pp. 86-87.

³⁷ *Hakluyt Handbook*, I, p. 287.

³⁸ Harry Kelsey, *Sir Francis Drake: The Queen’s Pirate*, pp. 447-448.

³⁹ Anthony Payne, ““Strange, remote and farre distant countreys”: The travel books of Richard Hakluyt”, in *Journeys through the Market: Travel, Travellers and the Book Trade*, p. 6.

of Sir Ierome Bowes' (the second state), Hakluyt explained that these leaves were 'printed this second time, according to the true copie [he] receiued of a gentleman that went in the same voyage, for the correction of the errours in the former impression.'⁴⁰ This reference in the heading to the previous account of Bowes' embassy complicates Ann Blair's evaluation of the cancel as being a radical solution, eradicating all evidence of a fault. This type of eradication would have been the most probable action the printers would have taken in response to state intervention:

A more costly and radical solution, and the only one that rendered the error invisible to the reader, was to reprint a new page (called a "cancel") to be substituted for the faulty one. Although we do not often know why one method of correction was chosen over another, the cancel was likely the optimal response to the intervention of a censor during the printing process, since it erased the offending passage without a trace.⁴¹

The fact that this second impression corrected the former confirms that the leaves were an intended replacement to be included in this work. As it made a specific reference to the cancels, it did not erase the offensive leaves without a trace. The new six-leaf gathering was broadcasted as an improved, more reliable account. The overt recognition of the first state (in the advertisement printed at the head of the replacement) may simply indicate printing house and publishing marketing strategies to provide a better text for its readers. The impetus behind the need for 'correction', what constituted 'errours' and the date the emendation was undertaken are all open to conjecture. On the publication of Giles Fletcher's *Of the Russe Commonwealth* (1591), the Muscovy Company wrote to William Cecil, listing its offensive aspects. The Company requested Cecil call 'in of all the bookes that are printed' and requested that 'some cowrse holden therein signifyinge her Majesties dislike of the publishinge of the same' to protect the merchants and their goods from Feodor's displeasure. Likewise, this manner of petition from the Muscovy Company to a Privy Councillor may have had some influence on the

⁴⁰ *Principall Navigations*, Bowes leaves, second state, sig. 2Y1r.

⁴¹ Ann Blair, 'Errata Lists and the Reader as Corrector', in *Agent of Change: Print Culture Studies after Elizabeth L. Eisenstein*, ed. by Sabrina Alcorn Baron, Eric N. Lindquist, and Eleanor F. Shevlin (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007), pp. 21-41 (p. 21).

printers' decision to reprint the Bowes leaves.⁴² Lloyd E. Berry has found evidence which suggests Fletcher's *Of the Russe Commonwealth* was successfully called in and was rare. Furthermore, Hakluyt was informed by letter of the actions of the Warden of the Stationers:

On sig. A^r of *The Russe Commonwealth* in Trinity College, Cambridge, a W. Dallye has written:

To my worthy and ever honoured freind Mr Palmer Esquire secretary to the right honourable the Lord Keeper.

I signified in Mr Hackeltes letter what is now really done by Mr Stirropp, who now by his soone preventeth what I premised. The booke was called in and rare, and therefore I pray you be carefull of it.⁴³

Berry suggests that the Lord Keeper would have referred to Sir John Puckering and that "Mr Stirropp" would have referred to Thomas Stirropp, a bookseller in London, 1576-1600, and Warden of the Stationers Company, 1593-94.⁴⁴ It is noteworthy that John Puckering's secretary was borrowing a copy of a suppressed book. Suppression of the Cadiz leaves in the second edition of *Principal Navigations* did not prevent Robert Cecil from owning a copy of the edition with the Cadiz account in place.⁴⁵

In the most recent assessment of *Principall Navigations* in *Richard Hakluyt and his Books*, Anthony Payne concurs with Quinn's earlier estimation that:

Hakluyt did print Sir Jerome Bowes' own narrative of his dealings with the Russian court, which was too frank to put him in a favourable light, and was — for this as much, perhaps, as for any other reason — censored and replaced by a less damaging version, not at Hakluyt's instance, but, almost certainly, at Francis Walsingham's.⁴⁶

If this is so, intervention to implement the emendation must have occurred before the end of March 1590, as Walsingham died at the beginning of April shortly after the book

⁴² The transcription of the letter is found in *Russia at the Close of the Sixteenth Century*, ed. by Edward A. Bond (London: Hakluyt Society, 1856), Appendix IV, pp. 352-5 (p. 352).

⁴³ *The English Works of Giles Fletcher, the Elder*, ed. by Lloyd E. Berry (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964), p. 153.

⁴⁴ *The English Works of Giles Fletcher, the Elder*, ed. by Lloyd E. Berry, pp. 153-154.

⁴⁵ See Pamela Neville-Sington on Robert Cecil's copy, "A Very Good Trumpet": *Richard Hakluyt and the Politics of Overseas Expansion*, in *Texts and Cultural Change in Early Modern England*, pp. 66-79.

⁴⁶ *Principall Navigations* (1965), I, p. xiii.

was first issued. The Bowes leaves in the first state, however, are witnessed in forty-two of the one hundred and eleven extant copies listed in the most recent census.⁴⁷ Despite evidence in the state papers (foreign) that relations with Russia were strained immediately after Jerome Bowes' embassy of 1583 to 1584,⁴⁸ Anthony Payne reiterates that there are no archival sources as yet discovered that support the conjecture that copies of the first state were ever recalled.⁴⁹ Furthermore, Walsingham (in his role of Principal Secretary) would have definitely read Jerome Bowes' account of his embassy to Ivan IV and it is most probable that Walsingham (of all Hakluyt's contacts) enabled Hakluyt's access to ambassadorial material in the first place. It seems improbable, although not entirely impossible, that Walsingham would have subsequently censored material that he had handed on to Hakluyt for inclusion in the text, unless the Muscovy Company had requested such action. However, it is still unclear whether the emended Bowes leaves were prompted by state intervention or by Hakluyt to produce a more persuasive account regarding the nature of trade in Moscow for the benefit of his readers.

On comparing the different texts, it is apparent that Jerome Bowes' ambassadorial negotiations were portrayed more successfully, being exaggerated to point of error, in the second. The first account berated the embassy's inability to achieve its objectives, which were 'to conclude such matters of importance' detailed in two letters from the Queen.⁵⁰ Ivan's ambassador, Theodore Pissemsky, failed to conclude certain negotiations in London and so the Queen sent her ambassador to Moscow in the following year. Jerome Bowes' embassy sought to re-affirm the Muscovy Company's privileges whilst circumventing political entanglements. In the first account negotiations falter at the request for a trading monopoly in extensive market locations (the Dutch were establishing their presence) and the exact nature and conditions of the political alliance. Bowes was unable to reach an agreement on either of these issues before Ivan's

⁴⁷ See Anthony Payne and P. A. Neville-Sington, 'Hakluyt: census of copies' <http://www.hakluyt.com/hakluyt_census> [accessed 4 August 2012].

⁴⁸ See for example, Feodore, Emperor of Russia to the Queen, in *CSPF: Elizabeth*, Vol. 19, 1584-1585 (London: HMSO, 1916), pp. 692-693.

⁴⁹ Anthony Payne, *Richard Hakluyt and his Books*, pp. 12-13.

⁵⁰ *Principall Navigations*, first state, sig. 2X5r.

death.⁵¹ In the second account, the necessity of English trade to Russia was emphasized and all points of negotiation were settled before Ivan's untimely death. The subsequent disarray in the negotiations was not attributed to the breakdown of relations but to the treasurer's bigoted dislike of the English and Ivan's demise. Further, Ivan's desire 'to marry some kinswoman of her Maiesties' was recorded and the previously proposed marriage to Mary Hastings, Elizabeth's cousin, as means to a political alliance was mentioned.⁵² Both accounts list some success in the particular 'doleances and petitions' to Ivan IV from the merchants of the Muscovy Company, the second far more comprehensively.⁵³

The recent works by Randall McLeod, David L. Gants and R. Carter Hailey and Charlton Hinman's seminal study on the printing of the Shakespeare first folio indicate that these textual problems may all be profitably addressed from the perspective of analytical bibliography, their research having addressed similar issues. In his work on 'The peaceable and prosperous regiment of the blessed Queene Elisabeth' from Holinshed's *Chronicles*, Randall McLeod illustrates how the printed page can bear witness to signs of pressure on the space of the page (e.g. irregular use of type fount; concentrated use of contractions or marginalia; alteration in spelling; variation of the quantity of lines of type per page) or the need for spacing out (the overuse of decorated initials, generous leading, ample spacing between letters).⁵⁴ These signs suggest that the compositor needed to incorporate either more or less text than anticipated in the allocated space of the page, which, in turn, alerts the bibliographer to the possibilities of either poor casting off, if the compositors were setting by forme, or the need for emendation after the continuous printing phase, a 'getting in' or removal through potential mandatory correction.⁵⁵

⁵¹ For more details see Robert M. Croskey, 'Hakluyt's Accounts of Sir Jerome Bowes' Embassy to Ivan IV', *Slavonic and East European Review*, 61 (1983), 546-564 (p. 547).

⁵² *Principall Navigations*, second state, sig. 2Y2v.

⁵³ *Principall Navigations*, first state, sig. 2X5r.

⁵⁴ Randall McLeod's textual commentary on the printing processes of 'The peaceable and prosperous regiment of blessed Queene Elisabeth', A Facsimile from Holinshed's *Chronicles* (1587), ed. by Cyndia Susan Clegg, textual commentary by Randall McLeod, pre-publication copy, pp. 46-47, now published (California: Huntington Press, 2005).

⁵⁵ Joseph Moxon, *Mechanick Exercises on the Whole Art of Printing* (1683-4), ed. by Herbert Davis and Harry Carter, 2nd edn (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), p. 237.

Recent methodologies outlined by R. Carter Hailey for dating paper, using both chain-line and watermark measurements, have enabled more precise dating of undated texts or the component but interpolated parts of books.⁵⁶ This line of enquiry will help determine whether the supplementary gatherings in *Principall Navigations*, which constitute the known variant states of the book, were printed on same paper-stocks used elsewhere in the book. Furthermore, the variety of paper-stocks in William Stanby's 1611 edition of Ben Jonson's *Workes*, informed David L. Gant's research into the relationship between printers' copy and financial investment in the Jonson folio.⁵⁷

My research has engaged in the close comparison of six copies of the 1589 edition, five of which have been compared for variants. Through the use of a collating machine, four texts have been analysed against the photo-lithographic facsimile copy from the Signet Library, Edinburgh, which was held in 1962 by the bookseller Frank Maggs. As honorary treasurer to the Hakluyt Society, Maggs provided this copy for the 1965 photo-lithographic facsimile edition. It was edited by D. B. Quinn and Richard Skelton and includes a modern index compiled by Alison Quinn.⁵⁸

As few libraries in England have more than one holding of the 1589 edition and moving early printed texts between libraries was not feasible, the use of the photolithographic-facsimile enabled a comparison between five books, all representing different states of the 1589 edition.⁵⁹ Unfortunately, however, photo-lithographic facsimiles are not completely trustworthy and so all variants recorded exclusively in the litho-facsimile copy (of the Signet holding) have been checked against further copies reproduced on EEBO. There are now just over twenty single variants that appear in the Signet copy exclusively which cannot be verified through their presentation in at least one of the EEBO facsimiles. These have been marked and should be discarded or

⁵⁶ R. Carter Hailey, 'The Dating Game: New Evidence for the Dates of Q4 *Romeo and Juliet* and Q4 *Hamlet*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 58 (2007), 367-387.

⁵⁷ David L. Gants, 'Identifying and Tracking Paper Stocks in Early Modern London', *Bibliographical Society of America*, 94 (2000), 531-540 and 'Patterns of Paper Use in the *Workes of Benjamin Jonson* (William Stansby, 1616)', *Studies in Bibliography*, 51 (1998), 127-153.

⁵⁸ This information is taken from the preface of the 1965 edition written by Alan Burns, then president of The Hakluyt Society. *Principall Navigations* (1965), p. vi.

⁵⁹ Cambridge University Library now holds the greatest number with four copies (one of these is tightly bound and so more difficult to use on the McLeod collator), the Bodleian and the British Libraries both hold two.

assessed with caution. On reading the correspondence between Quinn, Skelton and Lund Humphries (the producers of the litho-facsimile sheets), it is clear that Quinn and Skelton endeavoured to produce an authentic facsimile copy of the text. They were disappointed that the edition would have to be gathered in eights rather than sixes and they would not let the map be re-sized.⁶⁰ The decision on weight and colour of the paper took some considerable thought. Inevitably, however, the litho-facsimile process presented the editors with the problem of show-through: ‘The only technical difficulty arises from the “show-through” of the type on the backing pages of the original.’⁶¹ Quinn wrote to Skelton that the camera would pick up more than the eye and ‘unless retouching was carried out on the negatives there might be an objectionable amount of “show-through” in the reprint.’⁶² In January 1962, Skelton wrote to Quinn, ‘[t]he show-through has been skilfully removed without loss of realism.’⁶³ Fredson Bowers, in his review of the Kökeritz (Yale) facsimile of the first folio of Shakespeare, pointed out that the action of “opaquing” or painting over the negative to prevent show-through can actually seriously distort the detail of the original image. In the case of the Kökeritz (Yale) facsimile, Bowers states:

As a part of the preparation of the final negative, the second round of opaquing, added to the first, seems to have wiped out some parts of letters, excised various line-ending punctuation marks, as well as some few signatures and catchwords, and, by carelessness in opaquing about them, succeeded in altering the appearance of various letters and punctuation marks (in addition to the interlinear effects), so that they are either illegible or else are changed to resemble some other letter or mark.⁶⁴

Furthermore, the correspondence between D. B. Quinn and R. A. Skelton confirms that Alan Burns’ description of the Signet copy in the Preface is incorrect. The Signet

⁶⁰ R. A. Skelton to D. B. Quinn, BL, The Hakluyt Society Archives, *Principall Navigations* (1965), archives 10 January 1962 and 17 August 1962 (not catalogued).

⁶¹ D. B. Quinn to R. A. Skelton, BL, The Hakluyt Society Archives, *Principall Navigations* (1965) archive, 7 March 1960 (not catalogued).

⁶² D. B. Quinn to R. A. Skelton, BL, The Hakluyt Society Archives, *Principall Navigations* (1965) archive, 7 March 1960 (not catalogued).

⁶³ R. A. Skelton to D. B. Quinn, BL, The Hakluyt Society, *Principall Navigations* (1965) archive, 10 January 1962 (not catalogued).

⁶⁴ Fredson Bowers, ‘The Yale Folio Facsimile and Scholarship’, *Modern Philology*, 53.1 (Aug., 1955), 50-55 (p. 52).

Library holding actually contained the Bowes leaves in the second state and Cambridge University Library holding ([Young, 224] (Quinn, 15)) provided Lund Humphries with the Bowes leaves in the first state.⁶⁵ The map was supplied for the facsimile by the British Library from their Grenville copy (G.6604).⁶⁶

Appendix B.10 presents a table of all substantive and accidental emendations discovered across different copies of the book accessed through the use of a collating machine. As chain-line measurements and watermarks will disclose crucial information on paper-stocks held in the interpolated Drake and emended Bowes leaves, I have supplied both beta-ray images from the Bodleian copy of *Principall Navigations* [Douce H 419] and enhanced photographic images of the paper-stocks used in the British Library holding [C.32.m.10] in appendix B.6. This will assist the dating of the Drake leaves.

The books compared were held at the British, University of London and Bodleian libraries. Fredson Bowers suggests the presentation of a collational formula of an ideal copy should be constructed as a standard for reference purposes:

The collational formula and the basic description of an edition should be that of an ideally perfect copy of the original issue. A description is constructed for an ideally perfect copy, not for an individual copy, because an important purpose of the description is to set up a standard of reference whereby imperfections may be detected and properly analysed when a copy of a book is checked against the bibliographical description.⁶⁷

The collational formula for an ideal copy of the book as it would have been issued originally is:

POT 2^o: *⁸; A-T⁶ V-X⁴ (X4 blank); 2A-2X⁶ 2Y⁶ (2Y6v blank); 3A-3Y⁶; 4A-4E⁶ 4F⁴ (4F4 blank); 428 leaves

⁶⁵ Anthony Payne and P. A. Neville- Sington, online 'Hakluyt: census of copies' <http://www.hakluyt.com/hakluyt_census > [accessed 1 August 2012].

⁶⁶ In 1962, the University Library, Cambridge held three copies (numbered 15, 16, 17 under D. B. Quinn's census). All copies contained the Bowes leaves in the second state, one copy, 15, also held the Bowes leaves in the first state.

⁶⁷ Fredson Bowers, *Principles of Bibliographical Description* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949, repr. Winchester: St Paul's Bibliographies, 1986), p. 113.

This signature run almost testifies to expected conventions, although unusually it does not use the Z signature.⁶⁸

The Bodleian Library holding (Ashm. 1690) represents the book as it would have been issued originally (i.e. no map; the first state of the Bowes leaves; no Drake leaves). The two leaves that are blank on both recto and verso have been removed. The collational formula for Ashm. 1690 is:

POT 2^o: *⁸; [no map]; A-T⁶ V-X⁴ (-X4); 2A-2Y⁶ (2Y6v blank); 3A-3Y⁶; 4A-4E⁶; 4F⁴ (-4F4); 426 leaves
[stub apparent between X1 & X2]

The first signature run ends in a four-leaved quire signed X. This represents part one. The second signature run finishes with a six-leaved quire signed 2Y, representing the second part (quire 2Y⁶ contains the Bowes leaves). The third part constitutes 3A-3Y⁶; 4A-4E⁶ 4F⁴. The Y signature is not used after X⁴ as the signature run moves immediately to the second alphabet. This could indicate that composition of the second part of the book had commenced before the first part had been finished. Thus, the signatures demonstrate that each part of the book could represent a discrete unit of composition and that more than one press and a team of compositors could have been working on the text simultaneously. As with all copies, it contains certain pagination errors alongside those that have been emended, confirming that almost all errors in pagination were proof-read and corrected during the continuous printing phase.⁶⁹ The Bodleian holding (Ashm. 1690) does not include either the Wright Molyneaux map or the map ‘after Ortelius’. Anthony Payne and P. A. Neville-Sington describe its binding as contemporary and of calf-skin, but which has undergone stages of repair. It has at

⁶⁸ By the late sixteenth century, printing houses in London generally followed the same convention using these signature runs: prefatory material was either unsigned or signed with symbols, as these were usually printed last, followed by the 23 letter alphabet i.e. A-Z without the letters W, either J or I but not both, either U or V but not both. Having used these signatures once, they would continue 2A, then 3A etc.

⁶⁹ Errors recorded in page numbers across all copies are recorded by Quinn as: 93 for 39; 59 for 51; 52 for 64; 89 for 90; 90 for 91; 150 for 138; 151 for 139; 211 for 215; 466 for 463; 463 for 466; 559 for 593; 789 (this corrects Quinn’s 798 in the *Hakluyt Handbook*, II, p. 477) for 779. Notably, the pagination errors created by the second state of the Bowes leaves and the interpolation of the Drake leaves are never emended.

some point been re-backed.⁷⁰ Kerr hypothesised, '[t]he Ashmole copy has been rebacked, a long time ago apparently. Mr Gibson, of the Bodleian staff, suggested that since the Ashmole library came to the Bodleian in the seventeenth century (about 1672), this copy of Hakluyt may have escaped any doctoring.'⁷¹

The second Bodleian holding (Douce H 419) is in near contemporary, but repaired calf-skin binding, 'blindstamped' with a 'central ornament on upper cover, rebacked',⁷² and from the library of Francis Douce (1757-1834). This copy has both the interpolation of the six-leaved Drake quire, bound into the middle of the uncut 3M⁶. The first 3 leaves of the interpolated Drake quire are signed 3M4, 3M5, 3M6 and when interpolated into the centre of 3M⁶ seem to 'mak[e] a gathering of 12 leaves.'⁷³ This is shown in the formula thus: 3M⁶ (3M3, + '3M4'.1, '3M5'.1, '3M6'.1). This copy also contains the emended and shorter second state of the Bowes leaves, collational formula:

POT 2^o: *⁸; [no map]; A-T⁶ V-X⁴ (X4 blank); 2A-2X⁶ (-2X5, -2X6) 2Y⁶ (±2Y⁶) (2Y6v blank); 3A-3L⁶ 3M⁶ (3M3, + '3M4'.1, '3M5'.1, '3M6'.1) 3N-3Y⁶; 4A-4E⁶ 4F (-4F4); 431 leaves

The University of London Library copy ([S.L.] I [Hakluyt – 1589]) represents a highly sophisticated copy and, for bibliographical analysis, is to be considered a less valuable testament to an original state. Bound in nineteenth-century, olive, morocco leather and gilt-tooled, the pages have been re-trimmed and gilt-edged.⁷⁴ The map ('after Ortelius') has been inserted and it contains both the second state of the Bowes leaves and the Drake leaves. Its collational formula is:

⁷⁰ P. A. Neville-Sington and Anthony Payne, *An Interim Census of Surviving Copies of Hakluyt's Divers Voyages and Principal Navigations*, in Anthony Payne and P. A. Neville-Sington, *Richard Hakluyt and his Books / An Interim Census of Surviving Copies of Hakluyt's Divers Voyages and Principal Navigations*, p. 34, and also D. B. Quinn (bg 17th cent), *The Hakluyt Handbook*, II, p. 481.

⁷¹ Willis Holmes Kerr, 'The Treatment of Drake's Circumnavigation in Hakluyt's "Voyages," 1589', p. 284.

⁷² P. A. Neville-Sington and Anthony Payne, *An Interim Census of Surviving Copies of Hakluyt's Divers Voyages and Principal Navigations*, p. 34.

⁷³ D. B. Quinn, *Hakluyt Handbook*, II, p. 478.

⁷⁴ "'Thomas de Lavale", 17th cent. insc. (?Delavals of Northumberland); "Bound for George Rutland Newcastle-on-Tyne", signed 19th-cent. bdg.; Sterling Library', P. A. Neville-Sington and Anthony Payne, *An Interim Census of Surviving Copies of Hakluyt's Divers Voyages and Principal Navigations*, pp. 33-34.

POT 2°: *⁸; map (O); A-T⁶ V-X⁴ (X4 blank); 2A-2X⁶ (-2X5, -2X6) 2Y⁶ (±2Y⁶) (2Y6v blank); 3A-3L⁶ 3M⁶ (3M3, + '3M4'.1, '3M5'.1, '3M6'.1) 3N-3Y⁶; 4A-4E⁶ 4F⁴ (-4F4); 431 leaves & Map after *⁸

The British Library holds two copies, one (G.6604) has been rebound in the nineteenth century and is from the library of the great bibliophile Thomas Grenville (1755-1846). The binding is English, red morocco, gilt and blind-tooled with all edges gilt.⁷⁵ This copy contains the Drake leaves, the second state of the Bowes leaves and the map and so replicates the composition of the Senate House holding. Its collational formula is:

POT 2°: *⁸; map (O); A-T⁶ V-X⁴ (X4 blank); 2A-2X⁶ (-2X5, -2X6) 2Y⁶ (± 2Y⁶) (2Y6v blank); 3A-3L⁶ 3M⁶ (3M3, + '3M4'.1, '3M5'.1, '3M6'.1) 3N-3Y⁶; 4A-4E⁶ 4F⁴ (- 4F4); 431 leaves & Map after *⁸

In a rather less robust state with its detached boards and loose quires (this has since been rebound), the other British Library copy, inscribed by Edward Keighley (1655), contains the Bowes leaves in the first state interpolated after the Bowes leaves in the second state, the Drake leaves, but no map. This copy was used for purposes of comparison on the collating machine. Its collational formula is:

POT 2°: *⁸; [no map]; A-T⁶ V-X⁴ (X4 blank); 2A-2X⁶ (-2X5, -2X6) 2Y⁶ (±2Y⁶) (2Y6v blank) $\chi_{1,2}$ 2Y⁶ (2Y6v blank); 3A-3L⁶ 3M⁶ (3M3, + '3M4'.1, '3M5'.1, '3M6'.1) 3N-3Y⁶; 4A-4E⁶ 4F⁴ (- 4F4); 439 leaves
[$\chi_{1,2}$ 2Y⁶: i.e. the interpolation of first state of Bowes leaves on repaired, resized leaves after the second state]

⁷⁵ I am grateful to Karen Limper-Hertz, curator of the British Library who is currently studying Thomas Grenville's pre-19th century collection, for this information. See also P. A. Neville-Sington and Anthony Payne, *An Interim Census of Surviving Copies of Hakluyt's Divers Voyages and Principal Navigations*: 'Thomas Grenville (1755-1846); 19th-cent. red morocco gilt, w. note that map was present in previous bdg.', p. 33.

It is bound in nineteenth-century English, blind-tooled, calf-skin with all edges painted or stained red. It has a central ornament on both covers (three lions in first and fourth quarters, single lion in the second quarter, a harp in the third quarter, encircled with a garter with text in upper case ‘HONI SOIT QUI MAL Y PENSE’ with a crown crest; 72.5mm x 32mm). The interpolated Bowes leaves (in the first state) have been stamped in red ink by the British Museum. The stamp used conforms to type 3 outlined in the British Library’s guide to researchers on the provenance of the material held at their library. Guidelines on the combination of the red ink and the type of stamp indicate that the library purchased this material between 1929 and 1973.⁷⁶

On opening any copy of the 1589 edition of *Principall Navigations* to browse through the pages, one is immediately struck by the consistency and the quality of presentation. Its production in small folio format (i.e. folio format on pot paper, sheets of smaller dimensions) reflects publisher consideration of potential market interest and targeted audiences when aligned with methods of contemporary retail pricing. As options for binding, backing and covering were generally made by the book purchaser and paper was the greatest single outlay in the production process, a book’s price was overtly linked to the number of sheets it consumed. This would depend additionally upon type fount choices. Even texts as sizable as the Bible could be published in the more affordable quarto format, if printed in a smaller fount. The producers’ decision to publish *Principall Navigations* in folio and to print it in the larger pica (predominantly black letter) fount demonstrates something about its anticipated readership.

Principall Navigations is predominantly in sixes, each quire constituting three sheets of paper folded once to make six leaves: an outer, middle, and inner sheet, all of

⁷⁶Again thanks to Karen Limper-Hertz for directing me to the British Library’s guide to their collections. Round stamps containing the royal arms but no lion or unicorn and the words BRITISH MUSEUM were used from 1929 to 1973, red ink indicates a purchase. An abbreviated date of acquisition is incorporated into the stamp. ‘B1 repaired, prob. suppl. later; “Edward Keighley his booke 1655”? (matr. New Hall Inn, Oxford 1651); “1657” after name scratched out; 19th-cent. calf.’ P. A. Neville-Sington and Anthony Payne, *An Interim Census of Surviving Copies of Hakluyt’s Divers Voyages and Principal Navigations*, p. 33.

two leaves.⁷⁷ Running-titles in ‘white letter’ or roman type, contained within single rules, announce the short title of the book across the opening: the verso records ‘The voyages and discoveries’ and the recto ‘of the English nation’. Only two quires and five verso pages have running-titles which do not conform to the remainder of the book: A1v-A6v, B1v, B2v, B3v, B5v and C3v record ‘The trauailes and discoveries’, perhaps an indication of an earlier, rejected title as it is recorded thus in the heading of the first part;⁷⁸ and the versos of all the interpolated Drake leaves read ‘The voiages and discoveries’. This replicates the spelling of ‘voiages’ in the title but differs from the spelling in all the other running-titles in the book indicating that they were either set later or by a different printing house. As the book was registered at the Stationers with the title ‘the voiages and discoveries’, the altered running-titles in the initial pages could illustrate printing had started just before its registration in September, when decisions on the title had not been finalized. Closest to the gutter, still within the rules and printed in italic fount, additional and particular headings relating to each individual account facilitate the reader’s ability to locate specific texts. Ease of reference is enhanced by pagination. Both contents and index pages marry reference to page number extraordinarily successfully.⁷⁹

Running-titles, pagination, contents and index pages all represent elements of the sophisticated para-textual apparatus (enhanced by headings, sub-headings, decorated letters and marginalia) that helps to orientate the reader around Hakluyt’s collection. It anticipates a need for quick reference and points to an expectation of reading in fragments or in isolated parts without a necessary knowledge of the whole book. The sophistication of presentation coupled with the regularity of composition alone renders

⁷⁷ An outer sheet of two leaves (the first leaf, representing pages one and two of the quire, conjugates with the last leaf, representing pages twelve and eleven of the quire); a middle sheet of two leaves (pages three and four of the quire conjugate with the second to last leaf, i.e. pages ten and nine of the quire); and an inner sheet of two leaves (pages five and six of the quire conjugate with pages eight and seven of the quire).

⁷⁸ *Principall Navigations*, sig. A1r.

⁷⁹ For example there are only seven errors in over two hundred and fifty references in the contents pages: p. 231 should be p. 238; p. 241 should be p. 240; p. 367 should be p. 376; p. 339 should be p. 338; p. 639 should be p. 673; p. 159 should be p. 519; p. 634 should be p. 635. The index will be addressed in detail in the next chapter.

Principall Navigations worthy of bibliographical analysis as it is an outstanding example of printing from this period.

In 1589, compositors in London generally set by forme, a complicated procedure as type-pages were never seen in sequence and copy had to be cast off (i.e. an estimate made from fair-copy of ens / letters per printed page). This meant, however, that type was released more quickly for re-use and, as most printing houses did not stock cases with sufficient type to set a whole quire in metal, it would have aided more efficient employment of all workmen. Once copy was cast off, ‘more than one part of [the book] could be set in type at any time’ which enabled teams (or ‘companions’) of compositors to work concurrently on the same book, setting consecutive formes (established through former calculations) simultaneously.⁸⁰ When composing a folio in sixes from cast off copy, only the inner forme of the inner sheet would contain pages of type that ran on consecutively. After the forme had been through the press and corrected, type was distributed back to the case. It was not until the majority of the quire had been printed off that the compositor, or the corrector, would have read the text as a continuous narrative.

Miscalculation inherent in the casting off process could produce inconsistencies between requisite space and type still to be set which were eased by certain common compositor practices: the number of lines of type per page was altered; narrative that should have been in the body of the text was moved to marginalia; contractions in spellings, the use of tildes and other methods of ‘getting in’; or a generous use of quads to create spaces or ‘pigeon holes’ between letters and words to ‘drive out’ mistakes and even the omission of, or compositor additions to, text. Notably, the resolution of spatial and typographical problems often affected meaning and it should be recognized as another potential site for minor authorial contribution.⁸¹ Moxon described how a

⁸⁰ Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, pp. 42-43.

⁸¹ After casting off copy, ‘composition of a quire can begin and end anywhere’, therefore as miscalculation in casting off copy is witnessed in a reaction to pages (or formes) that have already been through the press, so the resolutions for spatial inconsistency can also occur anywhere within the quire. Significantly their presence can help calculate the sequence of a quire’s composition, error commonly appearing in the last part of the quire composed and sent to the press. See Randall McLeod, p. 47.

compositor would ‘botch’ his work rather than go through the onerous task of correcting mistakes that would run-on into the subsequent pages:

If the *Compositor* is not firmly resolv’d to keep himself strictly to the Rules of good Workmanship, he is now tempted to make *Botches*; viz. *Pidgeon-holes*, *Thin-Spaces*, no *Space* before a *Capital*, *Short &s*, *Abbreviations* or *Titled Letters*, *Abbreviate Words*, &c. And if Botching is in any Case excusable, it is in this; for with too great *Spacing-out* or too *Close Setting*, he many times may save himself a great deal of Labour, besides the vexation of mind, and other accidental mischiefs that attend *Over-running*.⁸²

Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas S. Freeman have analysed the strategies John Day adopted to get in additional text when copy had been poorly cast off. Day would set more lines per page, reduce the width of the margins or use a smaller fount (although he would set in smaller type for other purposes, too).⁸³ The compositors in the royal printing house had various sizes of decorative initials at their disposal and these ornamental letters occur very frequently throughout most of the quires in *Principall Navigations*. This obviously gave them enough flexibility to produce a very well presented work. There is no obvious evidence of the *ad hoc* strategies employed by John Day to ‘get in’ additional material. However, when compositors of *Principall Navigations* were forced to interpolate more text in the requisite space they replaced the large decorative letters with smaller letters, they moved additional matter to the margins (in the Drake leaves) and moved data into double rather than single columns (in the Bowes leaves cancels).

Before moving to an analysis of textual variants, it is crucial to understand that stop-press emendations discovered across the five copies of *Principall Navigations* represent the final stages of contemporary proof-reading practice. In *The Texts of ‘King Lear’ and their Origins: Nicholas Okes and the First Quarto*, Peter W. M. Blayney engages with the commonly held hypothesis that proof was not read against copy before presswork started in the printing of Renaissance plays. He moves from this misconceived premise to consider the different stages of proof-reading practised in the

⁸² Moxon, p. 237.

⁸³ Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas S. Freeman, *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: The Making of Foxe’s ‘Book of Martyrs’*, p. 117.

period. Blayney argues that ‘foul-proofing was an indispensable part of printing.’⁸⁴ The foul proof’s scarcity does not disprove foul-proofing as a general practice. These sheets constituted printers’ waste and, as such, were not intended to survive. Their occasional witness in contemporary bindings discloses that this stage of proof-reading was certainly undertaken before presswork began. Additionally, there is evidence of a further stage of proofing which is witnessed by a number of different (not so foul) proof-sheets that survive which, like foul proofs, are only printed on a single side of the sheet. These however are not foul proofs. Blayney calls these proof-sheets ‘first house proofs’. Additionally, there are numerous examples of proof-sheets which are printed on both sides and bound into books. These can only be identified because they bear the corrector’s marks. Blayney describes these more precisely as revises but is happy to continue to use the term proof-sheet because they bear the corrector’s marks. It is a revise because earlier stages of proofing would have been undertaken already.⁸⁵

Initially, the foul proof would be checked for all obvious errors before the first house proof was pulled. This first house proof would then be checked for gross compositor error (e.g. turned and foul-case type); errors of imposition (catchwords, running-titles and pagination) and that ‘the substantives of the text were correct.’⁸⁶ Both the corrector (who would occasionally be the master-printer) and the compositor (who had set from copy) were responsible for correction. Gaskell argues that the larger printing houses employed a corrector to oversee the compositor’s work because the compositor was a piece-worker, and as such would have had ‘to correct his own mistakes in his own time’ so may have been less inclined to identify his own error.⁸⁷ If the printing house employed a corrector (as Christopher Barker was known to have done),⁸⁸ the copy may have been read by a reader to a corrector, although again terminology slips in this period and the corrector becomes the reader and the reader, the

⁸⁴ Peter W. M. Blayney, *The Texts of ‘King Lear’ and their Origins: Nicholas Okes and the First Quarto* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 196.

⁸⁵ For Peter W. M. Blayney’s work on Jacobean proofing practices, see his chapter entitled ‘Proof-reading, revising, and press-correcting’, in *The Texts of ‘King Lear’ and their Origins: Nicholas Okes and the First Quarto*, pp. 188-218.

⁸⁶ Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, p. 112.

⁸⁷ Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, p. 111.

⁸⁸ Peter W. M. *The Texts of ‘King Lear’ and their Origins: Nicholas Okes and the First Quarto*, p. 191.

reading boy.⁸⁹ Blayney cites a near-contemporary account from Hieronymus Hornschuch (1608) to argue that the corrector may have read his proofs more than once.⁹⁰ Moxon describes how a proof-sheet (Blayney's first house proof), once printed,⁹¹ would be taken by the compositor to the corrector and the forme would be placed on the correcting stone, to await emendation. Once the compositor received the corrected proof-sheet, he would set the emendations to be made in his compositor's stick and reset the type in the forme at the correcting stone.⁹² Blayney argues that further error could have been introduced at point of correction. If the corrected proofs were not re-checked, it would explain why some obvious errors seem to have escaped proof-reading altogether. Type could also have been misplaced, Blayney points out, during the process of inking. If the beater accidentally raised type from the forme, he may well have replaced it incorrectly.⁹³

Blayney cites William Jaggard's 'Apologie' and the dispute between Jaggard and Ralph Brooks to demonstrate that the author would most probably have read one set of corrected house proofs, which Blayney calls the author's first revise, and that this activity would most probably have been undertaken in the printing house immediately before or during the press-run.⁹⁴ Gaskell also maintains '[d]uring the earlier hand-press period authors commonly attended at the printing house to correct proofs'⁹⁵ and D. B. Quinn has pointed out that Richard Hakluyt 'found time to organize and execute (partly at least in person) an interesting index of names [...] and subjects' as the book went through the press.⁹⁶

⁸⁹ See Moxon, pp. 246-247 and Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, pp. 110-112, for different perspectives on the corrector and the reader.

⁹⁰ Peter W. M. Blayney, *The Texts of 'King Lear' and their Origins: Nicholas Okes and the First Quarto*, p. 192.

⁹¹ A printing house may have kept a proof-press for this purpose, if not the press-man would have had to interrupt another printing job to print the first proof. Blayney thinks owning a proof-press may have been common.

⁹² Moxon, p. 233.

⁹³ Peter W. M. Blayney, *The Texts of 'King Lear' and their Origins: Nicholas Okes and the First Quarto*, p. 206.

⁹⁴ Peter W. M. Blayney, *The Texts of 'King Lear' and their Origins: Nicholas Okes and the First Quarto*, p. 192.

⁹⁵ Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, p. 115.

⁹⁶ *Principall Navigations* (1965), I, p. xi.

D. F. McKenzie has illustrated that a press was frequently occupied with other works, printing whatever was ready. Presswork was generally interrupted to print the initial first house proofs, if the master-printer did not have a proof-press, in order for correction to take place whilst the press was otherwise occupied.⁹⁷ The textual variants recorded across five copies of the book exhibit the rigorous quality control practised by the Queen's printers prior to stop-press variants, due to the insubstantial findings gleaned from this research which reinforces Blayney's argument for the lost stages of earlier proof-reading processes.

The corrections implemented in the final stages of the proof-reading process (after the initial house proofs had been read and corrected and the press-run had started) are witnessed in the variants recorded between copies. These could represent authorial correction, further house correction or the introduction of error in the processes of correction. These variants are recorded in Appendix B.10.

The close comparison of texts for variants through the use of a collating machine brings the researcher into a startling proximity with the mechanical processes of production and the handiwork undertaken by men whose lives and names have long been forgotten. A collating machine uses two mirrors suspended from a bar which is supported by bipods at each end. A bookstand holds both texts to be compared upright and at an adjustable distance from these mirrors which are used to reflect the image of one of the pages to be compared. This reflected image of the page, held in the vision of one eye, can then, by adjusting distances and perspectives, be precisely superimposed on to the same page from the other copy, held in the vision of the other eye. The human brain, conditioned to binocular vision, then conflates the two images and any discrepancy between the pages produces a visual disturbance.

The level of detail made available by this process is surprising: missing or altered punctuation marks, smudges (from overly-inked type-pages) or missing details (due to insufficient inking), ink bleeds (when the ink is cheaply produced) or show-through in pages (that are too wet or of a poor quality) and marginalia added by the reader all cause visual disturbances. A decision regarding data selection had to be taken and I decided to

⁹⁷ Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, p. 111.

record all substantive and accidental variants alone. Textual variants of this nature not only foreground proof-reading practice identified by the corrections of simple compositor error but also help establish agreed printing house convention. Substantive emendations could be due to potential issues of censorship, to clarify imprecise meaning or simply to correct typographical error.

Across the five copies there are almost two hundred variants, representing different issues the corrector or compositor deemed worthy of alteration.⁹⁸ Most emendations recorded are, in Charlton Hinman's words, 'remarkable only in their triviality',⁹⁹ as the press was often stopped to correct insignificant accidentals, the placement of commas and full-stops or for the alteration of punctuation when meaning was already plain.¹⁰⁰ Accidental emendations could also affect meaning and it is clear in some instances emendation was necessary. An example on P4r delineates how the placement of commas can alter meaning. Irregularly placed in a list of the recipients of the Turkey patent, the commas muddle issues regarding who is 'nominated and appointed' with reference to the renewal of the patent. The emended meaning, when a comma is inserted, conveys that Edward Osborne and Richard Staper, being recipients of the original Turkey patent, would be able to nominate and appoint others as recipients of the patent at point of its renewal after seven years.

Although spelling was not standardized in this period, the stop-press emendation of Egypto to Ægypto (C4r), or vice-versa, hints at an orthographic printing house convention. These extracted examples illustrate an apparent interest in accurate presentation of both the meaning conveyed by the text and an agreed typographical presentation of the text which counters Charlton Hinman's findings when he undertook the analysis of textual variants in the first folio of Shakespeare:

And we shall also find that [proof-reading] was not ordinarily concerned with the accuracy of the text — that it only rarely resulted in the correction of

⁹⁸ For details see Appendix B.10.

⁹⁹ Charlton Hinman, *The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare*, I, p. 230.

¹⁰⁰ Almost 1/5 of the emendations record emendations in accidentals: e.g. sig. 3R1r witnesses the movement of the comma in 'Chrifchurche Master of Art,' and 'Chrifts church, Master of Art,'. Accidentals, which may affect meaning, are apparent in the Mandeville text, which is only recorded in Latin.

anything more than obvious typographical blemishes; and that, moreover, such changes as it did produce tended rather to corrupt than to recover and preserve what Shakespeare wrote.¹⁰¹

Spelling corrections,¹⁰² including place names,¹⁰³ turned type, page numbers,¹⁰⁴ missing letters,¹⁰⁵ erroneous spaces (quant ò for quantò or voy age for voyage) and driving out of the duplication of words (2O2r owne owne horses; 4D5r pay pay) constitute the largest proportion of emendations and again show that the printing house felt a degree of responsibility for the correction of their errors. Paper was too great an outlay to waste, however, and stop-press variants are accessible only because the printer would not discard sheets machined prior to emendation. The emendations would be returned to the heap along with the earlier states and would be gathered up in quires with those that would have been emended later, producing an infinite variety of printed sheets in different combinations in every copy of *Principall Navigations*.

The smallest category of textual variants recorded at this stage of the proof-reading process is that of substantive emendation. Given that the main focus of the initial stages of proof-reading was to correct substantives, this confirms expected convention. Some emendations indicate the need to ‘get in’ words that have been omitted to clarify meaning.¹⁰⁶ One example alone represents the need to accommodate an unusual amount of additional text on 4D2r, which was instigated by the compositor’s visual slip across his fair-copy, mistakenly setting southward for southwest and skipping four lines. As this part of the text was just above a new narrative sequence (Thomas

¹⁰¹ Charlton Hinman, *The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare*, I, p. 227.

¹⁰² For example: Hakluyt for Hackuyt (sig. 3D1v); quickfilver for quikfilver (sig. 4D5r); archers for arches (sig. T5v); greatly for grealy (sig. 3E6v); Engleles for Englifes (sig. 3F3r); fpritsayle for pritsayle (sig. 3O5r: this may be an example of the opaquing process); yeres after for yeere after (sig. 3R1v); ftakes for ftacks (sig. 3C1v); unicorns for unicones (sig. 3C6v). See Appendix B.10.

¹⁰³ For example: Mare Ponticum, /Mare Goticum, (sig. 3J2r); Penguin Illand / Pengin Illand (sig. 4D2v); Northwest / Nothwest (sig. 3H5r); Vriagorod , / Vriagodrod, (sig. 2O2v); Rofstove, for Rotfcove, (sig. 2N6r); He-bron. / He-broh. (sig. C5v); Finlandia / Fynlandia (sig. 2C4v); Mecuacan, / Mecuacan, (sig. 3H2v). See Appendix B.10.

¹⁰⁴ For example 93/39 (sig. D2r); 51/59 (sig. E2r); 138/150 (sig. M3v); 139/151 (sig. M4r); 211/215 (sig. S6r); 240/241 (sig. X2v); 241/242 (sig. X3r); 463/466 (sig. 2T3r); 466/463 (sig. 2T4v); 499/494 (sig. 2Y2v); 494/499 (sig. 2Y5r) which are all witnessed in this sample. See Appendix B.10.

¹⁰⁵ For example: ratio for oratio (sig. D5r, marginalia). See Appendix B.10.

¹⁰⁶ A Spaniard captured by the Floridians was cast away fourteen years previously ‘being a’ Carauell is altered to being ‘in a’ Carauell, sig. 3C6v. Also ‘to inhabite there and then’ is altered to ‘to inhabite there with him,’ sig. 3P2v.

Cavendish's letter to the Lord Chamberlain), which was originally set with a generously leaded title, the additional text was easily incorporated without upsetting the rest of the page and further 'botching' was unnecessary.

There is another fuller example of a substantive emendation. In this case some of the original text is missed and its presentation in the Hakluyt accounts takes on different meanings. The extract is recorded in full and is entitled 'A voyage made out of England into Guinea in Affricke, at the charges of certain Merchants aduenturers of the Citie of London, in the yeere of our Lorde. 1553'. This was originally published in a compilation of works gathered from Pietro Martire d'Anghiera's *De Orbe Novo* (1530), first translated and published in England by Richard Eden (1555) but augmented by Richard Willes and republished in London in 1577. Despite D. B. Quinn maintaining it is from Richard Eden (1555), it almost exactly records the account in Willes' 1577 edition and I have used that as the source. The excerpt relates to Thomas Windam's final voyage to Guinea which set out after Edward VI's death.

Where there are variations between the source and Hakluyt's account, the variations have been underlined and omissions marked with [...] ellipses. I have not indicated variations in spelling but they are remarkably different. The variants between the two printed texts contained in the different titles (*Principall Navigations* and Willes' *The History of Trauayle in the West and East Indies*) could have many origins. The compositor could have introduced the variant reading in composition. As the Hakluyt account is never an exact representation of the Willes' text, it could represent errors in transcription from the Willes' text to a manuscript (if manuscript was used as fair copy), or variants in the Willes' text itself (if the printed book was used as fair copy), or it could suggest a different source text. However, the Hakluyt text does not include the words 'blockehouses among naked people, thynke them selues worthy' and this represents a whole line of text in the printed Willes' source so this variant may record a visual slip between printed source and fair-copy or printed source and compositor setting. On the other hand, the variants between different copies of *Principall Navigations* do demonstrate a process of intervention and change instigated either by the corrector, the author or the censor in the closing stages of production undertaken in the Queen's printing house:

The account from Willes:

Being desired by certayne of my freendes, to make some mention of these viages, that some memory thereof myght remayne to our posteritie, yf eyther iniquitie of tyme, consumyng all thynges , or ignoranuce creepyng in by barbarousnesse and contempt of knowledge ,shoulde hereafter bury in obliuion so worthy attempts , so much the greatlyer to be esteemed,as before neuer enterprysed by Englyshe men,or at the least so frequented,as at this present they are, and may be,to the great commoditie of our merchantes, yf the same be not hyndred by the ambition of such,as for the conquesting of fourtie or fyftie myles here & there,and erectyng of certayne fortresses, or rather blockehouses among naked people. thynke them selues worthy to be lordes of halfe the world, enuyng that other shoulde enjoy the commodities, which they them selues can not wholly possesse.¹⁰⁷

The account from Hakluyt in the Signet Library copy:

Being desired by certaine of my friends, to make some mention of this voyage, that some memorie thereof might remaine to our posteritie, if either iniquitie of time,consuming all things,or ignorance creeping in by barbarousnes and contempt of knowledge,should hereafter bury in obliuion so worthy attempts , so much the greatlier to be esteemed,as before neuer enterprised by English men, or at the least so frequented,as at this present they are,and may be, to the great commoditie of our Merchants,if the same be not hindred by the ambition of such , as for the conquering of 40. or 50. miles here and there,and erecting of certaine fortresses,or rather [...] to be lords of halfe the world, enuyng that other should enjoy the commodities , which they themselues can not wholly possesse.¹⁰⁸

Numbers (40 and 50) are used rather than words, ‘conquering’ is substituted for ‘conquesting’ and spelling bears very little relation to the original. As a whole line of type is missed, however, it does indicate that the compositor, or Hakluyt, was using Willes’ account. However, as spelling and certain changes have been made (numbers for words and conquering for conquesting) when setting type or preparing fair-copy, it suggests a certain freedom in transcription. It may also infer an oral element in the processes of transcription. In the variant in the Hakluyt account there is only enough

¹⁰⁷ This account was first published by Richard Eden and reprinted and augmented by Richard Willes. Willes’ account is closest to that in *Principall Navigations* and can be found in Pietro Martire d’Anghiera, *The history of trauayle in the West and East Indies, and other countreys lying eyther way, towards the fruitfull and ryche Moluccaes [...]* Gathered in parte, and done into Englyshe by Richarde Eden, newly set in order, augmented, and finished by Richarde Willes (London: Richard Jugge, 1577), sig. 2V8v

¹⁰⁸ *Principall Navigations*, sig. G6r

space to get in ‘thinke to be Lords’ which replaces the ‘rather to be lords’. The ‘thinke to be Lords’ notably changes the meaning, but the full correction of the erroneous transcription is never undertaken.

The source text, already self-consciously acknowledging a censorious ear, speaking ‘under correction,’ exploits similar ambiguities around contentious meanings to those explored in dedicatory material. This seems to acknowledge, through evasion, the tensions inherent in the networks instigated by trade and discovery: that the ambition of ‘such’ (does ‘such’ intend to point at all Englishmen abroad or some of the merchants or the Spanish or anyone who sacrifices the potential for trade in pursuit of land acquisition?) to be lords of halfe the world that would hinder the same (does ‘same’ mean the great commodity of our merchants or the merchants themselves?). Who have ambitions to be lords of half the world? Is it the Spanish or the merchants? The passage’s use of ‘such’ and ‘same’ is notably vague and represents the conflict inherent in the English ventures of exploration, which sought out new markets in the New World but lacked significant financial investment from the Crown. The acquisition of foreign lands and the displacement of peoples by force simultaneously jeopardized the development of possible trade relations with the indigenous people of the region. Hakluyt had already recorded how the French were trading with North American Indians and the French court was now profiting by its new import supply of furs and skins. However, as merchant companies also needed a building (whether fortified or not) and a safe harbour to initiate trading networks, they formed partnerships with those who pursued land acquisition, settlement or quick financial gains through privateering and piracy. This alliance, much like the Stationers’ executive and the Crown, would be better represented as a compromise. Although the interests of each party were never entirely synonymous, they were sufficiently inter-dependent to enable the construction of a working party that could instigate further participation and action.

Before moving on to a comparison between paper-stocks used in the body of the book with those in the Bowes and Drake leaves, it is worth considering the letterpress in the emendation and interpolation for particular detail. Decorative letters witnessed in the Bowes leaves are present in the remainder of the text, indicating that these leaves were most probably printed by the Queen’s printing house (although type was shared between

houses). Type has been re-set completely from the letter to Henry Lane onwards (2Y3v) in the quire, despite constituting exactly the same narratives, establishing that the text was not still in standing type when the second state was produced. The decorative initial ‘M’ used in 2Y3v recurs at 2Y6r (i.e. p. 6 and p. 11 of the emended quire) which could confirm setting *seriatim* or from cast off copy, but again signifies that the compositor had recycled type and that the whole quire was not set in metal. There are no textual variants recorded throughout the emendation across the five copies compared. To help decrease typographical demands on the space of the page (the second state of the Bowes leaves and the subsequent narratives are printed in a single six-leaved quire of twelve pages rather than over fifteen pages (2Y6v is blank) that were required for the first state, i.e. 2X5, 2X6, 2Y⁶) smaller decorative initials are used in ‘A testimonie to the Northeastern discoverie’ and ‘The testimone of Gerardus Mercator’ and the leading around the headings is reduced accordingly. ‘The scroule of the new diet’ is recorded in two columns in the second state and in one in the first. Pagination, after the insertion of the cancels, jumps from 501 (the last page number of the 2Y quire) to 506 (the first page number of the subsequent 3A quire) and is never corrected, suggesting that these pages were printed after the 3A quire had been through the press. The letterpress in the running-titles records the short-title of the book across the opening within single rules positioned at the same distance and in the same manner as the rest of the book. The same running-titles recur throughout the quire (tracked through the recurrence of the distinguishable f in ‘of’ of the English nation) which cannot be identified in the remainder of the book, denoting a one-forme process through the press and a running-title set after the book’s completion.

The Drake leaves also use one forme throughout the quire as testified by the repeated letter press in the running-titles. The single rules are set slightly more closely together and, as has already been noted, ‘voiages’ repeats the spelling in the title-page but diverges from the ‘voyages’ of the running-titles in the remainder of the book. The only decorated letter ‘T’ in the Drake leaves suggests that this quire was most probably printed by the Queen’s printers.¹⁰⁹ The type-setting appears dense, although indented

¹⁰⁹ T on 3M4r replicates that on 3L3r.

paragraphs conform to compositorial practice followed in the rest of the book. Marginalia supply additional information (e.g. 572 terses, 55. degrees and a terse of Southerly latitude)¹¹⁰ not found in the body of the text, rather than simply emphasising points of note, indicating again that the text was compressed in order to be contained within a discrete gathering of six leaves. Pica, black letter fount in fifty-eight lines of type per page ensures that the interpolation is incorporated seamlessly into the body of the text. There are no textual variants recorded throughout the Drake leaves across the five copies compared. The catchword (Instructions) on 3M3v (which is repeated on 3M9v) tallies with the first word on what would have been 3M4r before the interpolation.

The Bowes leaves in the first state appear in about forty per cent of extant copies and must have made their way on to the market over a period of time, the second state, in over sixty per cent and the Drake leaves in almost eighty per cent. The significant proportion of books presenting the Bowes leaves in the first state may indicate that the cancels were sold alongside the original account. To establish more exactly the dating of the variants, I shall turn to R. Carter Hailey's methodology for dating paper.¹¹¹ In 'The Bibliographical Description of Paper', G. Thomas Tanselle remarks on the bibliographer's historical neglect of paper as a source for textual analysis, despite the 'classic examples of the use of paper evidence' and argues that 'a bibliographer's routine examination of a book is deficient if it does not include an analysis of paper.'¹¹² A comprehensive description of paper including weight, strength, colour and finish as modelled by G. Thomas Tanselle is both too specialized for me and beyond the remit of this chapter. However, certain contributing factors are of note.

The paper-stock in *Principall Navigations* is laid and its dimensions vary between the least trimmed (Bodleian Ashm. 1690) of 392mm x 299mm, to the most trimmed (London University Library [S.L.] I [Hakluyt – 1589]) of 372mm x 279mm. If guided by Gaskell, these dimensions indicate it is more closely aligned to the smaller 'pot'

¹¹⁰ *Principall Navigations*, sig. 3M6r.

¹¹¹ R. Carter Hailey, 'The Dating Game: New Evidence for the Dates of Q4 *Romeo and Juliet* and Q4 *Hamlet*', pp. 367-387.

¹¹² G. Thomas Tanselle citing W. W. Greg's discovery of the false dating of the Pavier quartos as example in 'The Bibliographical Description of Paper', *Studies in Bibliography*, 24 (1971), 27-67 (p. 29 and p. 30).

rather than the more common ‘foolscap’ range.¹¹³ In the case of trimmed books, because trimming introduces a measure of uncertainty, Tanselle suggests that ‘the general size class’ of the sheet be given.¹¹⁴ Whether printed on foolscap or pot, *Principall Navigations* is certainly a small folio, it is significantly smaller than Barker’s folio bibles. The chain-lines run vertically and confirm format.¹¹⁵ The watermark appears in the centre on the left of the sheet (when viewed mould side and the right way up). ‘As a rule the mark was supposed to be seen from the mould side of the sheet and the design was therefore made in wire as a mirror image of what was intended to appear in the paper.’¹¹⁶ Details of the watermarks and chain-lines in a sample of sheets taken from *Principall Navigations* are recorded below. This information is useful for both the description of paper generally and for establishing further evidence.

As paper was expensive, it is generally accepted that it was used quickly and not stored in the printing house for any length of time.¹¹⁷ Evenden and Freeman quote Annie Parent’s work with regards to usages of paper: ‘Annie Parent has estimated that an early modern printer need[ed] 25-30 reams of paper *per day* to supply four or five presses.’¹¹⁸ David L. Gants corroborates Allan H. Stevenson’s understanding that paper was not stored:

Allan Stevenson has observed that, when planning the various components of a proposed book, the printer or publisher ‘generally arranged for paper sufficient for that book only and paper homogenous in size and quality.’ Economic circumstances fostered such practices, for ‘Paper was too expensive a

¹¹³ Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, pp. 74-75.

¹¹⁴ G. Thomas Tanselle, ‘The Bibliographical Description of Paper’, p. 38.

¹¹⁵ Whilst this is a general rule there are exceptions. G. Thomas Tanselle explains: ‘Actually, it is more accurate to say that chainlines run parallel to the shorter dimension of the *mould*; sometimes large moulds were used to produce either double-size paper or two sheets side by side, with the result that the half-sheets or individual sheets — though the size of ordinary sheets — had chainlines running in the opposite direction from those in ordinary sheets.’ See G. Thomas Tanselle, ‘The Bibliographical Description of Paper’, p. 33.

¹¹⁶ Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, p. 61.

¹¹⁷ Peter W. M. Blayney estimates that the paper for a play quarto amounted to 30% of the total production costs. See David L. Gants, ‘Patterns of Paper Use in the *Workes of Beniamin Jonson* (William Stansby, 1616)’, p. 131.

¹¹⁸ Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas S. Freeman, *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: The Making of Foxe’s ‘Book of Martyrs’*, p. 10, quoting Annie Parent, *Les métiers du livre à Paris au XVIe siècle (1535-1560)* (Geneva, 1974), p. 57. A ream is c. 500 sheets.

commodity, too space consuming, to make any other system really practicable.’¹¹⁹

Whilst Gants argues that this frequently produced books ‘partially or completely printed on paper bearing a common watermark,’ Stevenson acknowledges that, ‘paper homogenous in size and quality’ did not preclude the frequent witness of a variety of watermarks throughout a substantial text. Stevenson suggests that early books were seldom printed on paper from a single stock:

Most early books are printed on a variety of papers. They contain a number of different watermarks. Though now and then a small volume has ‘one mark throughout,’ and a tall folio shows a single stock of fine paper, the majority of books are not so consistent. Often a well-printed folio, starting out with a run of grape paper (say), shifts to crown or fleur-de-lis paper by the time it reaches its second alphabet. In other folios, no less proud ones, the preliminaries alone disclose several marks, and the text a dozen or sixteen more, with alternation of marks through successive sheets.¹²⁰

The use of remnants for preliminaries (as usually printed last) is not surprising nor are the ‘runs’ of different watermarks used consecutively through a large folio, as the printing and then perfecting of a sheet (inner forme of inner leaves outward or vice versa) through sequential quires was common practice. Later emendations or interpolations would obviously anticipate ‘remnants’ of either previous or later stock as different printing projects inevitably intersected in busy printing houses. Notably, whether paper-stocks within a given book were homogenous or not, as paper was expensive it would not have been stored for any length of time but returned to the publisher, patron or paper-merchant.¹²¹

Although there is no need to rehearse Philip Gaskell’s introduction to paper in its entirety, some information will assist the later analysis of different paper-stocks.¹²² Two people worked at the vat: the vatman and the coucher. After fitting one of a pair of moulds (a rectangular sieve of criss-crossing wires) with a wooden deckle (a rimmed

¹¹⁹ David L. Gants, ‘Patterns of Paper Use in the *Workes of Beniamin Jonson* (William Stansby, 1616)’, p. 129.

¹²⁰ Allan H. Stevenson, ‘Watermarks are Twins’, *Studies in Bibliography*, 4 (1951-1952), 57-91 (p. 57).

¹²¹ David L. Gants, ‘Patterns of Paper Use in the *Workes of Beniamin Jonson* (William Stansby, 1616)’, p. 129.

¹²² See Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, pp. 57-77.

frame that helped contain the mixture), the vatman, with one hand on each of the mould's shortest sides, would partially submerge the mould into the vat at an angle. On removing the mould from the vat and levelling it out, he would immediately disperse the stuff retained across the whole mould in slight deft movements 'locking' together the fibres of the sheet as excess water drained away.¹²³ Once the deckle was removed, the mould was passed to the coucher who would exchange a previously emptied mould for this one. After moments to allow the 'friable' forming paper to settle,¹²⁴ the coucher would then turn the paper out from the mould on to the felts to dry. One side of the paper became known as the 'mould side' (on which the impression of the mould is clearest) the other, the 'felt side'. The coucher would create a pile known as a 'post', interspersing each new sheet with a felt.¹²⁵ Meanwhile the vatman would be producing the next sheet in the mould he had exchanged with the coucher. The two moulds and one deckle operation enabled simultaneous employment and a more efficient production of paper (averaging about 2,000 dips a day).¹²⁶

Stevenson was first to consider how a two mould production would inevitably produce watermark 'twins' within same paper-stocks. No paper-stock used within a printed book, even if it consisted of the same reams, would therefore have a single watermark throughout. There is considerable disparity between the degrees of similarity witnessed by watermark 'twins':

The maker of moulds can hardly have intended to deceive anyone. It was enough if a pair of moulds resembled each other so closely that the vatman would always know them for mates. What was important was that the *formier* [the maker of formes] should cut the mould frames precisely alike, so that the single deckle would fit them both neatly. But the twin watermarks might vary somewhat in height or position or details of design without affecting the certitude of their belonging together.¹²⁷

¹²³ Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, p. 58.

¹²⁴ Allan H. Stevenson, 'Watermarks are Twins', p. 61 and Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, p. 58.

¹²⁵ Allan H. Stevenson, 'Watermarks are Twins', p. 61.

¹²⁶ R. Carter Hailey, 'The Dating Game: New Evidence for the Dates of Q4 *Romeo and Juliet* and Q4 *Hamlet*', p. 372.

¹²⁷ Allan H. Stevenson, 'Watermarks are Twins', p. 64.

R. Carter Hailey initially turned attention away from the historically exclusive interest in a paper-stock's watermarks and described the distances between chain-lines to the nearest half-millimetre in paper as 'fingerprints'. The chain-line and wire-line impressions in paper record the particular details of a specific mould. Gants asserts, '[a]s a product of human design and construction, early modern paper moulds differ in size and placement of their constituent parts.'¹²⁸ The combination of chain-line measurements and the watermark type encouraged Gants to extend the fingerprint metaphor by coupling it with the 'mugshot', when referring to the watermark. This definition exploits the language of criminal investigation, appropriately drawing details of visual proof for identification purposes together with that of forensic science. R. Carter Hailey explains the usefulness of paper identification when dating undated, printed texts:

For the purpose of dating, two interrelated factors make printing paper useful. First, because of the heavy wear resulting from as many as 2,000 dips per day in the vat of 'stuff' (the mixture of macerated linen rags and water), the lifespan of a paper mold is relatively brief and 'a pair of moulds in continuous use could be worn out and due for replacement in less than twelve months.' Second, because paper was expensive — probably between 30 and 40 percent of a publisher's total production cost, depending on the quality used — stocks of printing paper were almost always bought for a particular job or jobs and rapidly consumed. Thus, if paper-stocks in two books are found to match — one book dated the other not — there is a high probability that the books were printed no more than a year apart, and often much closer together.¹²⁹

On analysis of the Bodleian copies it is clear that D. B. Quinn's statement, '[t]he paper is a "pot" watermark, commonly used by the Queen's printer',¹³⁰ is reductive. On the evidence of only two copies, it can be observed that the Ashmolean 1690 holding is almost entirely printed on paper with a 'Deux Colonnes enlacées' watermark from A. Richard's Auvergne paper mill (Briquet's *Les Filigaines*, like 4444-4446, Appendix B.8

¹²⁸ David L. Gants, 'Identifying and Tracking Paper Stocks in Early Modern London', p. 533.

¹²⁹ R. Carter Hailey, 'The Dating Game: New Evidence for the Dates of Q4 *Romeo and Juliet* and Q4 *Hamlet*', p. 372.

¹³⁰ *Hakluyt Handbook*, II, p. 476.

includes a ‘careful freehand drawing’ of the watermark).¹³¹ There are fewer than five sheets bearing the pot watermark. As it is whiter, smoother, firmer paper and almost entirely printed on one paper-stock, it implies that the Ashmolean copy was originally a presentation copy.

The Douce H 419 holding is a better example of the different paper-stocks that may be used within one edition of a substantial book. The Bodleian Library kindly developed beta-ray images of samples of watermarks taken from the Douce holding. Processing these images is expensive and time consuming, as Gants explains: the page under enquiry is placed ‘between x-ray film and a beta source; the rays [pass] through in proportion to the thickness of the intervening paper, producing a negative image of the sheet when the film [is] developed.’¹³² The result, however, is of tremendous value as a precise image of the watermark is produced replicating exactly all its dimensions. From the images it can be stated that the Bowes leaves in the second state are printed on paper bearing the ‘Main, généralement lacée au poignée aux quatre doigts serrés, le pouce très écarte’ like Briquet 11362,¹³³ which was a common watermark used by mills in northwest France. The particular watermark witnessed in *Principall Navigations* would be better described as Main, Hand or Glove, fingers together, with fleuron, and lacing at the wrist, decorated with initials (P? N) and heart (also like Heawood 135-137).¹³⁴ The beta-ray image has been produced from felt-side. The paper is of unusually poor quality and most probably a remnant. I have found proclamations from 1588 and 1589 printed on paper which bears a similar mark but no exact match. As my research to date has not been able to identify this stock in other printed texts produced by the Queen’s printers, this line of enquiry could be furthered by systematically working through all the British Library holdings published by Christopher Barker in this period.¹³⁵

¹³¹ Charles Moïse Briquet, *Les Filigranes: Dictionnaire Historique des Marques du Papier Des Leur Apparition vers 1282 jusqu’en 1600*, ed. by Allan Stevenson, facsimile of the 1907 edn, 4 vols (Amsterdam: Paper Publications Society, 1968), III, ‘colonne’ ref. 4444-6. R. Carter Hailey suggests the careful, freehand drawing, see Appendix B.8.

¹³² David L. Gants, ‘Patterns of Paper Use in the *Workes of Beniamin Jonson* (William Stansby, 1616)’, p. 127.

¹³³ My translation: Hand, commonly laced at the wrist with four fingers together and thumb separated.

¹³⁴ Edward Heawood, ‘Sources of Early English Paper-Supply’, *The Library*, 4th ser., 10.4 (March, 1930), 427-454 (p. 441).

¹³⁵ This still needs undertaking for an accurate dating of the emended Bowes leaves.

Amongst the pot watermarks there are three distinct types witnessed in samples collected, only two are used across the Drake leaves.¹³⁶ The pot watermark of 3M5 and C5 is most like Briquet 12661 but apparently different and that of 3M4 and F5 which is unlike anything in Briquet's collection. R. Carter Hailey argues, however, that 'to claim that a watermark is like Briquet 12345, is to say essentially nothing.'¹³⁷ A comprehensive description of the watermark is only informative when aligned with its position on the sheet (on or between the particular chain-lines) and when the chain-line measurements are noted.

Drawing on R. Carter Hailey, my initial strategy was to measure the distances between chain-lines in the paper-stock used in both the Drake leaves and the Bowes leaves. As the paper is very heavily inked in the Drake leaves, the watermarks themselves are impossible to access with certainty, even when backlit.¹³⁸ The specific chain-line measurements were an essential guide for identifying potential identical paper-stock in the body of the book. If possible, R. Carter Hailey composes a chain-line model by averaging the different distances between chain-lines over a sample (having identified the twin mould) of seven to eight sheets. As I was working with such a heavily inked folio, and the watermarks were generally imperceptible, certainty of same paper-stock could only be established through beta-ray images coupled with chain-line and wire-line measurements. Following R. Carter Hailey, I have recorded the distances between chain-lines (the chain space measurement) to the nearest half-millimetre. I have ordered the chain space measurements so they form a sequence across the sheet (I have not measured the margins). 'The use of curly braces in the middle of the model indicates [...] the part loss in the gutter fold in a folio.'¹³⁹ I have noted the position of the watermark on the sheet. This information is represented by recording in bold the measurement of the chain space in which the watermark falls. From the information gathered, it can be established that sheets at signatures C2/C5 and 3M8/3M5 represent

¹³⁶ See beta-ray images in Appendix B.6.

¹³⁷ R. Carter Hailey, 'The Dating Game: New Evidence for the Dates of Q4 *Romeo and Juliet* and Q4 *Hamlet*', p. 376.

¹³⁸ See Appendix B.7 for the enhanced photograph from the British Library collection. This is a good deal clearer than the watermarks on most pages.

¹³⁹ R. Carter Hailey, 'The Dating Game: New Evidence for the Dates of Q4 *Romeo and Juliet* and Q4 *Hamlet*', p. 373.

one paper-stock and those at F5/F2 and 3M4/3M9 represent another paper-stock. C2/C5 and 3M8/3M5 represent watermark twins. The minute differences between chain-lines, wire-lines and watermark positions can establish this. The similarity between the individual marks and the very close chain space measurements suggests they are twins. However, F5/F2 and 3M4/3M9 is paper from exactly the same mould.

Sheet dimensions recorded from C2r & C5v

Watermark: Pot; like Briquet 12661. Allan H. Stevenson states that the watermark was generally placed in the right-hand side of the mould so it would appear in the left-hand side of the sheet if viewed from mould side. As it appears here in the right-hand side, this is most probably a left-handled pot viewed from felt-side.¹⁴⁰ Measurements were taken from left to the right, with the watermark in the right-hand side of sheet, i.e. as seen in C5v. The watermark in C5v is inverted in relation to printing but measurements were taken from the paper as upright:

21.0	20.5	21.0	21.0	20.5	20.5	21.0	21.0	9	13	20.5	21.0	21.5	21.0	20.5
20.5	20.5	21.5												

Watermark dimensions

Height through the centre: 42mm

Width across bowl & handle: 21mm

However, there are very slight differences and these can be most clearly identified in the shape of the bowl of the jug and its handle.

Smallest distance of bowl from RH chain-line: 3mm

Distance of handle as it curves away from the neck of the jug: 4mm

¹⁴⁰ Allan H. Stevenson, 'Watermarks are Twins', p. 72.

Sheet dimensions recorded from 3M8v & 3M5r

Watermark: Pot; like Briquet 12661. Again, as the watermark appears here in the right-hand side of the sheet, this is most probably a left-handled pot, viewed from felt-side.

Measurements were taken from left to the right, with watermark in the right-hand side of sheet, i.e. as seen in 3M5r:

21.0 20.5 20.5 21.0 20.5 20.5 20.5 21.5 6 } { 17 20.5 20.5 21.0 20.5 20.5
20.5 20.5 21.5

Watermark dimensions

Height through the centre: 42mm

Width across bowl & handle: 21mm

Smallest distance of bowl from RH chain-line: 2mm

Distance of handle as it curves away from the neck of the jug: 3mm

Sheet dimensions recorded from F5v / F2r

Watermark: Pot; no record in Briquet. Measurements were taken from left to right, with the watermark appearing in the left-hand side of sheet, i.e. in F5v:

25.0 24.5 25.0 24.5 24.5 24.5 25.0 12 } { 8 24.
5 25.0 25.0 24.5 24.5 24.5 25.0

Watermark dimensions

From highest point of watermark to centre of its base: 59mm

Greatest width of bowl: 21mm

Smallest width from chain-line to bowl: 20mm

Sheet dimensions recorded from 3M4r / 3M9v

Watermark: Pot; no record in Briquet. Measurements were taken from left to right, with watermark in the left-hand side of sheet, i.e. in 3M4r, watermark is inverted in relation to printing but measurements are from the paper as upright:

25.0 24.5 25.0 24.5 24.5 24.5 24.5 9 } { 14 24.5 24.5 24.5 24.5 24.5 24.5
25.0

Watermark dimensions

From highest point of watermark to centre of its base: 59mm

Greatest width of bowl: 21mm

Smallest width from chain-line to bowl: 20mm

When the beta-ray images, which offer extremely valuable evidence in their accuracy, are aligned with watermark dimensions, their distances from the chain-lines and the fingerprints of the chain spaces, it is certain that paper-stock in the Drake leaves is used elsewhere in *Principall Navigations*.¹⁴¹

In conclusion, with our understanding of printing house practice, the rapid consumption of paper, the limited life-span of a pair of moulds and the high cost of paper, it would seem highly improbable for two different paper-stocks contained within *Principall Navigations* to be witnessed again in two of the three printed sheets that constitute the Drake leaves, if they were printed after a sustained interval of three or four

¹⁴¹ See appendix B.6.

years, as suggested by Kelsey. Further, as both paper stocks and type match those contained in the rest of the book, it now seems highly probable that the Drake leaves were printed by the same printer-publisher. Findings drawn from beta-ray images corroborate Quinn's initial hypothesis on the dating of the interpolation of the Drake leaves, which he based upon their habitual inclusion in books witnessed in contemporary or near-contemporary bindings.

On consideration of the importance of the Drake leaves as a marketable commodity in conjunction with the recognition that they were printed soon after the continuous printing phase, it is remarkable that they were not overtly advertised on the title-page. Having argued that they were not published after a period of at least three years, Hakluyt's own explanation, in his address to the reader, regarding their absence is brought to the fore: 'not to anticipate or preuent another mans paines and charge in drawing all the seruices of that worthie Knight into one volume.'¹⁴²

Foregrounding relationships between printers' copy and published texts now appears highly relevant and I shall suggest that Hakluyt's position on the Drake material points more explicitly to conflicts over rights to copy and the contemporary sensitivity to printing another man's copy than to the involvement of government in a bid to suppress material to maintain its policy of secrecy.

In his address to the reader, Hakluyt self-consciously sets down his inability to satisfy his friends' requests (a familiar rhetorical *topos*) to include the Drake narrative as this would have encroached upon another man's financial venture:¹⁴³

I must confesse to haue taken more then ordinarie paines, meaning to haue inserted [Drake's circumnavigation] in this worke: but being of late (contrary to my expectation) seriously delt withall, not to anticipate or preuent another mans paines and charge in drawing all the seruices of that worthie Knight into one volume, I haue yeelded vnto those my freindes which pressed me in the matter, referring the further knowledge of his proceedinges, to those intended discourses.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴² *Principall Navigations*, sig. *4v.

¹⁴³ Willis Holmes Kerr argues that the Drake leaves were not 'suppressed' and that the booksellers' catalogues erroneously describe them as rare and suppressed as they are present in most extant copies of the 1589 edition. See Willis Holmes Kerr, 'The Treatment of Drake's Circumnavigation in Hakluyt's "Voyages," 1589', p. 281.

¹⁴⁴ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *4v.

As conflict over rights to copy may have had some bearing on the Drake leaves it is worth considering the various ways rights to copy were obtained. Working without privilege, master-printers scrabbled for print-pickings in every possible way, but in the main: they could be commissioned to print works for those who held royal privileges or rights of copy but did not own a press; they could be assigned either parcels of work or a whole work from other overly burdened printing houses; they could print illegally another man's copy, political and religious heterodoxy; or they could try to make a living from printing ephemera (popular ballads or prayers were in continual circulation and there were many other types of 'little jobs').¹⁴⁵ If they were commissioned to print a new work by a client, or sourced an existing work not as yet printed in England, they could enter it into the Stationers' registers as their own copy. H. S. Bennett records how printers continually and actively sought out work:

Printers could not rely solely on what was brought to them, or what they were able to obtain from those who had manuscripts rightly or wrongly come by. They had to take more positive action to keep their presses running, and we therefore hear of them commissioning translations to be made, and books to be compiled by disbursing 'great summes for the copies, translations, pictures, and impressions [of] as much as is written and extant in any language'.¹⁴⁶

However, analysis of Barker's outputs indicates that the more successful printers (for example Barker and Tottel) relied wholly on producing the works they had been awarded by patent, that they controlled the market share (Tottel printed all law books) and became extremely rich. As wealthy printers did not invest in higher risk publications, market potential remained under-explored and smaller printing houses reproduced little books for a known market. Finally, a printer could acquire rights of copy through marriage alliances or other kinship ties. In September 2006, David L. Gants discussed the importance of kinship to the movement of stock between printers.¹⁴⁷ For example, George Bishop was already a significant publisher when he married Mary

¹⁴⁵ Peter Stallybrass, "'Little Jobs': Broadsides and the Printing Revolution', in *Agent of Change: Print Culture Studies after Elizabeth L. Eisenstein* (see Blair, above), pp. 315-341.

¹⁴⁶ H. S. Bennett, *English Books & Readers 1558 to 1603*, p. 276.

¹⁴⁷ David L. Gants, 'Printer-Publisher Collaboration: The Case of Humphrey and Matthew Lownes', The Jacobean Printed Book Seminar, Queen Mary, University of London, 2 September 2006.

Cawood, daughter of John Cawood, formerly the Queen's printer. George Bishop's stock, as noted earlier, was transferred to his journeyman printer on his death.

As I have argued that the royal printing office was different from the majority of printing houses in the period, the numbers of master-printers working in London will be evaluated from extant documents. Although by the end of the sixteenth century the generic term 'stationer' was more frequently applied to those working within the book-trade (because it encompassed the many diverse roles undertaken by the members of the Stationers' Company), the title 'master-printer' seems to have already accrued specific meanings.¹⁴⁸ Most significantly, the 'master' of a printing house was defined by his ability to employ a small team of workmen (including an apprentice or apprentices). He would have needed a mastery of the necessary knowledge to work a press and he would have preferably held the rights to print some copy. Most significantly, a master-printer would also have needed sufficient capital to invest in premises, a variety of type founts, all other requisite compositor tools and at least one press. In the 1680s Joseph Moxon states:

[A master-printer] is the Director of all the Work men, he is the Base (as the *Dutchmen* properly call him) on which the Workmen stand, both for providing Materials to Work withal and successive variety of Directions how and in what manner and order to perform that Work.

His Office is therefore to provide a House, or Room or Rooms in which he is to set his *Printing-House* [... and to furnish] a House with *Printing Tools*.¹⁴⁹

The master-printer also often acted as bookseller and publisher (although there were publishers who underwrote the cost of the production of a text who were not printers) as these different aspects of book production were as yet indistinct, the printing house being a centre for both production and distribution. Inevitably, not all journeymen, on completion of their seven-year apprenticeship, could establish themselves immediately as masters and employ apprentices and so would have to work for another established printer. There were always more fully-trained printers, free of the

¹⁴⁸ See Arber, I, p. 144 and elsewhere in the illustrative documents for examples of the term 'master printer' (not hyphenated) being used prior to the *OED*'s listing from Moxon.

¹⁴⁹ Moxon, pp. 15-16.

city of London, seeking work, than masters managing small business operations.¹⁵⁰ Journeymen printers would usually have to secure ‘piece work’ within a master-printer’s house.

Whilst there are no extant lists of master-printers working in London in 1589, we do have some records from an entry in *Liber A* dated July 1586, indicating the Company’s prompt response to the Star Chamber decree of the previous June. If the list of printers with working presses is analysed alongside the decree, the imprints recorded in extant books of the period (from ESTC), R. B. McKerrow’s *Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of Foreign Printers of English Books 1557-1640* and the infrequent changes of roles within printing houses, largely due to death, an approximation of those master-printers in operation in London in 1589 can be made. The number of printing houses remained relatively stable due predominantly, as argued in the previous chapter, to the power of the privileged master-printers and the Company’s bid for self-regulation. This self-regulation was itself informed by the Stationers’ own assessment of market conditions which remained conservative throughout most of Elizabeth’s reign.

A sense of the mixed nature of the Company’s knowledge of its members’ activities and its need for continual vigilance can be gauged from the additional detail recorded in the 1583 list of named printers with their number of presses. This is composed by Francis Coldocke and Christopher Barker: ‘master Tottell hath iij presses and vseth but one’ and ‘John Wolf hath iij presses, and ij more since found in a secret Vau[l]t.’¹⁵¹ Although some members declared their presses with honesty and some didn’t, it appears that the Stationers’ Wardens kept a careful eye on their members’ activities. When Christopher Barker complains in his report of December 1582 about the over abundance of printing houses in London, when ‘8. or 10. at the most would suffice for all England, yea and Scotland too’,¹⁵² it is the number of legitimate master-printers

¹⁵⁰ Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, pp. 172-3. In a bid to control the excess numbers of journeymen printers seeking work, the Privy Council decreed that masters must take fewer apprentices. See Natalie Zemon Davis on the unrest amongst journeymen printers in the same period in ‘A Trade Union in Sixteenth-Century France’, *Economic History Review*, n. s. 19 (1966), 48-69.

¹⁵¹ Arber, I, pp. 247-248, emphasis added.

¹⁵² Arber, I, p. 144.

and the nature of their characters, rather than illegal or undisclosed presses, that gave him cause for concern. These were the problems, he argued, that were impacting upon the general working conditions within the printing trade. Charlton Hinman, drawing on the Stationers' Company *Court Book C*, records that there were again only twenty-two master-printers with thirty-three presses in 1623 (substantially fewer presses held by master-printers than were declared to the Company in 1583 and 1586, signifying a less comprehensive survey undertaken for the Company rather than the Crown)¹⁵³ and even D. F. McKenzie, who scrutinizes inherent and misleading assumptions about numbers of master-printers and presses, argues that the real problem for the Stationers' Company lay in controlling the numbers of presses held by declared stationers rather than clandestine printers working outside the authority of the Company itself.¹⁵⁴

Small-scale master and journeymen printers, who had served an apprenticeship in view of a lifetime of employment, would have benefitted from working within the Stationers' Company. As a corporate body, the Stationers' Company offered individual printers protection from each other in conflicts over rights to copy and formal recognition of their competence as craftsmen because it regulated their entry into the trade through apprenticeship. The printer's reputation for craftsmanship was essential for building a creditable business and securing regular work.¹⁵⁵ Although the level of concern for quality and reputation varied tremendously between London stationers, Peter W. M. Blayney's analysis of extant foul proofs has demonstrated that some proofing was absolutely essential.¹⁵⁶ This suggests all master-printers must have

¹⁵³ Charlton Hinman, *The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare*, I, p. 48.

¹⁵⁴ D. F. McKenzie, 'Printers of the Mind', pp. 55-7. Clandestine presses were more generally involved in religious or political heterodoxy alone as they were established for this purpose whereas master-printers and idle journeymen would print both patented works and religious and political heterodoxy to enhance potential for income. Moxon suggests a single press needed at least seven square foot of space to be adequately accommodated and therefore would not be so easy to hide in a master-printer's shop. Moxon, p. 16.

¹⁵⁵ This is illustrated most effectively by William Jaggard's printed disclaimer written by his friend Augustine Vincent entitled *A Discovery of Errors* in a published dispute with Ralph Brook. Charlton Hinman, *The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare*, I, pp. 20-21.

¹⁵⁶ Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, p. 116 and Peter W. M. Blayney, *The Texts of 'King Lear' and their Origins: Nicholas Okes and the First Quarto* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 194.

undertaken some measure of quality control.¹⁵⁷ Finally, the movement, which had commenced in 1584 and culminated in the creation of the English Stock in 1603, to distribute work more evenly between all Company members would have also benefitted those working without patents.¹⁵⁸

It is with some confidence, therefore, that the number of printers managing presses legally in London can be assessed but that details of presses are less reliable.

Here folowe all suche presses as the printers presented to the mr and wardens in wrytinge vnder their handes in Iuly 1586 after the publication of the decrees made in starre chamber this yere touchinge orders in printing etc. Printers: Robert Bowrne [Bourne], j presse; Anthonie hill, j presse; Iohn Charlwood, ij presses; Robert walgraue, ij presses; Richard Iones, j presse; mr Watkins, ij presses; Robert Robinson, ij presses; Arnault hatfield wth the rest [i.e. Edmund Bollivant; John Jackson & Ninian Newton or The Eliot Court Press], ij presses; mr middleton, iij presses; mr dawson, iij presses; George Robinson, ij presses; Thomas van[ul]troll[i]er, ij presses; hierom Hawltin, j presse;¹⁵⁹ Abell Iess[ff]es, j presses; Iohn windet, iij presses; Thomas purfoote, ij presses; mr Barker, vj presses; mr Denham, iij presses; mr Tottell, iij presses; mr howe, j presse; Roger Ward, iij presses; Iohn wolf, iiij presses; Thomas Easte, j presse; Edward Aldee, j presse; Hughe Iackson, j presse.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁷ The Queen's printers, who were responsible for printing statutes, proclamations and authorized versions of the Bible, were accustomed to the demands of rigorous proof-reading practices and employed a corrector. Peter W. M. Blayney, *The Texts of 'King Lear' and their Origins: Nicholas Okes and the First Quarto*, p. 191.

¹⁵⁸ After 1603, the Stationers created what was to become known as the English Stock. Company members could now invest joint-stock in titles previously held by privileged individual master-printers, who were protected by royal patent, which were now inherited by the Company. This work was then distributed amongst its members in response to the inequitable access to work within the Company. An earlier ideologically similar, but less successful, movement towards improving the Company's maintenance of the welfare of its poor was made in January 1584, when prominent stationers yielded rights to some of their protected titles to the Company in response to the growing unrest. For more details see my previous chapter.

¹⁵⁹ McKerrow lists Hawltin's press as a 'proof press for a type founder', i.e. 'Jerome Hawltin', in *Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of Foreign Printers of English Books 1557-1640*, ed. by R. B. McKerrow (London: Bibliographical Society, 1910), pp. get this

¹⁶⁰ M. A. Pearson, 'An Index to Liber A: A volume of the records of the Stationers' Company of London for the period 1559-1791' (Unpublished MA Thesis, Victoria: University of Wellington, 1980), p. 118. Details of undeclared printers of 1586, extracted from *Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of Foreign Printers of English Books 1557-1640*, and considered below.

Printers actively printing illegally:

Gabriel Simson and William White (first entered a ballad in 1585) were publishers in the 1580s but became printers, were printing without licence by 1595 and were warned by the Company not to print certain texts in 1599;

Edward Venge, McKerrow lists him as a secret printer, *STC* extant books record him as publisher only; John Danter freed of the company in September 1589, disabled from printing until September 1589, *STC* lists first extant title bearing his imprint in 1591;

In 1586, twenty-five master-printers were working under the auspices of the Stationers' Company (an increase of three houses since 1582, two since 1583): nine master-printers with one press, eight with two, six with three, one with four presses (John Wolfe) and one (the Queen's printer) with six presses, giving at least some idea of the production potential of each house. Furthermore, although impossible to control effectively, the Star Chamber simultaneously attempted to prohibit the setting up of new presses and outlawed the use of those acquired within the last six months indefinitely:

[T]yll the excessiue multytude of Prynters hauinge presses already sett vp, be abated, dyminished, and by death gyvinge over, or otherwyse brought to so small a number of maisters or owners of pryntinge houses, beinge of abylyty and good behauyour, As the Archbishop of CANTERBURY and Bishop of LONDON for the tyme being shall therevpon thinck requisyte and convenyent for the good service of the Realme, to haue somme more presses or ynstrumentes for pryntinge, erected and sett vp.¹⁶¹

A single press demanded a compositor, who could also work as a proof-reader, to compose the type-pages and prepare the forme and two pressmen to manage the press (one to ink the type-pages — the beater, the other to work the press — the puller). If labour costs were too great, a compositor could also act as the pressman and presswork

William Hoskins shared printing work with John Danter after 1591, *STC* lists him as printing two titles in the 1570s;

John Hodgkins, secretly printed the Marprelate tracts after Robert Waldegrave in 1589;

Valentine Simmes seemingly a compositor in 1589, but by 1595 was printing both *The Grammar* and *The Accidents*, the most commonly infringed patents.

Printers who inherited or bought into printing businesses after 1586:

James Roberts set up with Watkins listed above in 1588;

Peter Short (apprenticed under Denham) and Richard Yardley 1589 ;

Henry Marsh printed three titles from 1584-7 and consented to Abel Jeffes printing Ascham's *Toxophilus* in 1589;

Richard Field (apprenticed under Thomas Vautrollier) printed his first work as named printer in 1588.

Thomas Orwin, who had been censored by the Privy Council, on the recommendation of the Archbishop was again printing legally by 1589 see entry 20 May 1588, *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company: 1576 to 1602 from Register B*, p. 28.

Nicolas Dyos apprentice printer to John Day, free of the company May 6th 1587, no extant titles listed with his imprint in *STC*.

Some anomalies:

Robert Bahere (1562-99) only mentioned as typographus see McKerrow, p. 14;

Richard Bradock (1581-1615) admitted to Stationers' Company in 1577 and first printed as named printer in 1600;

Richard Webber, the only book known with Webber's imprint is *Mirror for Magistrates* (1578).

¹⁶¹ Star Chamber Decree, 1586, reprinted in Arber, II, pp. 807-812 (p. 809).

could be undertaken by one person. Some larger printing houses would employ at least one more workman: a warehouseman, who would both prepare the paper for the press and then collect together all the necessary printed sheets (that constituted a given text) which would subsequently be delivered to a binder. Some houses also employed a corrector.¹⁶² In 1586 it is clear, even if we allow for a number of undisclosed presses and some clandestine printers, that none of the printing houses in England was a great establishment ‘with ten or more presses, run by masters of discrimination and learning, but [that almost all] were poky little shops with one, two or three presses (and eight or ten workmen in all).’¹⁶³ Only one, the royal printing house, could be considered as a larger business operation.

Natalie Zemon Davis estimates that a master-printer, who — like Barker — owned six presses, could have employed up to twenty-five workers and would have represented a significant business operation.¹⁶⁴ In 1586, only the Queen’s printer and John Wolfe (who became printer to the City of London) seem to have been in pursuit of the highly rewarding returns generated by a sophisticated printing business analogous with that founded by Christopher Plantin in Antwerp.¹⁶⁵ The numbers of master-printers operating in London in this period, when compared with those of Paris, Lyons and Antwerp indicate how, when freed from the controls of a Stationers’ Guild but not the Crown, printing activities diversified and expanded very differently.¹⁶⁶ In the same

¹⁶² Peter W. M. Blayney, *The Texts of ‘King Lear’ and their Origins: Nicholas Okes and the First Quarto*, p. 191.

¹⁶³ Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, p. 6. On a visit to the Plantin-Moretus museum in Antwerp we were told that Christopher Plantin, at his industrial height, had 16 presses, a chapel to regulate the working day, and an industrialized attitude to production.

¹⁶⁴ Natalie Zemon Davis, ‘A Trade Union in Sixteenth-Century France’, p. 50.

¹⁶⁵ The previous printers with substantial privileges (William Seres, John Cawood, John Day and Henry Bynneman) had all died by 1589 and Richard Tottel had retired to Pembrokeshire. Henry Denham, who inherited Henry Bynneman’s privileges, had also died by 1590. Plantin’s accounts illustrate that Plantin had 15-16 working presses in the 1570s and 10 in 1583, see Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, p.165.

¹⁶⁶ Natalie Zemon Davis estimates that there are more than one hundred printers in Lyons by the second half of the sixteenth century, see ‘A Trade Union in Sixteenth-Century France’, p. 50. Also Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin, *The Coming of the Book: The Impact of Printing, 1450-1800*, trans. by David Gerard, ed. by Geoffrey Nowell-Smith and David Wooton (London: NLB, 1976), pp. 187-192.

period, between five hundred and one thousand presses were thought to be in operation throughout France and one hundred presses were located in Lyons alone.¹⁶⁷

Barker's entrepreneurial success was facilitated by his esteemed role as printer 'for the service of her maiestie and the Realme.'¹⁶⁸ As holder of the Queen's printer privilege, Barker was allowed as many presses as he could employ and up to six apprentices at any one time. Masters and Wardens of the Company were restricted to three apprentices, under Wardens and members from the ranks of the livery — two, and yeoman — one.¹⁶⁹ The potential output of a printing house was affected by the number of apprentices because, as D. F. McKenzie argues, '[o]ne of the reasons why Elizabethan printers tried so often to exceed their allowed number of apprentices may have been that apprentices could be commanded to work regularly where journeymen could not.'¹⁷⁰ Master-printers were, however, caught in a double bind as whilst apprentices proved to be the more reliable workmen, their training accomplished, they inevitably swelled the ranks of the journeymen printers who, by the end of the century, were engaging in organized activity to instigate the redistribution of work within the Company. The journeyman's potential for unreliability also foregrounds different Elizabethan attitudes to work. It is anachronistic to envisage a consistent working week, which invites erroneous assumptions regarding employee commitment to daily attendance. The employer's pursuit of maximum productivity could only be enabled as and when the employee desired excess income over subsistence needs. D. F. McKenzie warns that we 'too readily [impute] our own twentieth-century ideas and interests and the assumptions of our own society — especially our economic assumptions — to men whose attitudes to work were quite different from ours.'¹⁷¹

However, it is widely accepted that a single press, working at full press over a twelve to fourteen hour period, would have been able to print and perfect between one

¹⁶⁷ Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin, *The Coming of the Book: The Impact of Printing, 1450-1800*, p. 40.

¹⁶⁸ Star Chamber Decree, 1586, reprinted in Arber, II, pp. 807-812 (p. 812). John Wolfe became company beadle in 1587 and in 1593, printer for the City of London. See Harry R. Hoppe, 'John Wolfe, Printer and Publisher, 1579-1601', pp. 263-266.

¹⁶⁹ Star Chamber Decree, 1586, reprinted in Arber, II, pp. 807-812 (p. 812).

¹⁷⁰ D. F. McKenzie, 'Printers of the Mind', p. 11.

¹⁷¹ D. F. McKenzie, 'Printers of the Mind', p. 10.

thousand, two hundred and fifty and one thousand, five hundred sheets. This has been argued in recent publications by Adrian Johns and Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas S. Freeman. Adrian Johns states: '[w]orking up to fourteen hours a day, a pair of such workers [at the press] might be expected to produce some twelve to fifteen hundred [perfected] sheets in that time — that is, to make 250 impressions an hour.'¹⁷² Evenden and Freeman have posited that maximum press outputs can be estimated at about three thousand single sides of a sheet (i.e. not perfected) per day.¹⁷³ This estimate is generally based on the Stationers' ordinances of 1588 which limited the number of copies in any one impression to one thousand, five hundred and a sixteenth-century account on printing house practices in Paris (taken from Louis Le Roy) which 'suggests that the heap [the reams of paper set out for the press-man]¹⁷⁴ was normally printed as white paper ['First Form' or a sheet as yet not perfected]¹⁷⁵ in the morning, turned at the midday break, and perfected in the afternoon.'¹⁷⁶ Whilst maximum output figures may be of interest (Le Roy estimated thirteen hundred imprinted sheets), Le Roy's description demonstrates that an edition sheet (whatever the size of the run) was completed within a working day. This would have been entirely appropriate as reams of paper had to be dampened prior to taking the impression.

In his analysis of the rich archival sources of the early seventeenth-century Cambridge printing house, D. F. McKenzie has established that these outputs cannot be accepted as standard, particularly in England. Presswork at Cambridge, although enormously varied, rarely achieved these figures and his article 'Printers of the Mind' stresses that these hypothetical outputs are certainly far too high.¹⁷⁷ Further, if we take the six press operation, as managed by Christopher Barker, and calculate an annual

¹⁷² Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making*, p. 93.

¹⁷³ See Gaskell and Moxon who suggest a token an hour (250 sheets — 12 x 250 = 3000), and Louis Le Roy who suggests 1250-1300 sheets. Moxon, p. 292 and Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, p. 132, Le Roy, '...prenant le barreau tire tant qu'il peut en sorte que la feuille s'imprime d'un costé. En quoy ils employent la demy-iournee, & l'autre moitié du iour à l'autre costé, rendans pour la iournee entiere douze cens cinquante feuilles, ou treze cents imprimees,' The Louis Le Roy quotation is taken from K. Povey's transcription of the original, *De la vicissitude ou variété des choses en l'univers* (Paris, 1579), fols 19v-20r, in 'Variant Forms in Elizabethan Printing', *The Library*, 5th ser., 10.1 (March, 1955), 41-48 (p. 41).

¹⁷⁴ From Moxon's dictionary, p. 343.

¹⁷⁵ From Moxon's dictionary, p. 354.

¹⁷⁶ Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, p. 132.

¹⁷⁷ D. F. McKenzie, 'Printers of the Mind', p. 10.

yearly output on these averages, presswork capacity is extraordinarily high (1,500, i.e. daily press output x 300, i.e. estimated available working days in a year, x 6, i.e. number of presses = 2,700,000 sheets i.e. the average annual production through the press). This would correlate to one thousand, eight hundred editions sheets in runs of one thousand, five hundred copies. It can be demonstrated from extant invoices that proclamations were sometimes printed in smaller runs of five hundred copies and that editions, charged to the hanaper, were sometimes printed in runs of one thousand or one thousand two hundred copies. In 1589, the *STC* lists five substantial printing jobs (i.e. over forty sheets) undertaken by the Queen's printers: three quartos (of about one hundred and forty sheets, one of which may be a re-issue) and two folios (one of two hundred and fifty sheets and one of two hundred and twenty sheets).

The number of copies of an edition (that is '*the whole number of copies of a book printed at any time or times from substantially the same setting of type-pages*') would inevitably have had a significant impact on costing.¹⁷⁸ The master-printer would, therefore, always be calculating economies of scale. Investment in compositor labour, presswork and paper would have had to have been set against potential income in returns, anticipated market interest and retail prices. Although the Queen's printers were not bound by the same Company ordinances to limit the number of copies printed in 'one ympression' when printing for the realme,¹⁷⁹ the capacity to underwrite the cost of paper, presswork and compositor labour would have represented an alternative limiting factor. Barker's thoughts on Henry Bynneman's privilege to print dictionaries, chronicles and histories are instructive:

But if the printer should print many of the said volumes [dictionaries, chronicles and histories], he must needes stande betwixt two extremes, that is, if he print competent numbers of each to mayntayne his charges, all England Scotland and much more, were not able to vtter [*dispose of*] them; and if he should print but a few of each volume, the prices should be exceeding greate, and he in more Daunger to be vndone, then likely to gayne, the provision of varietie of letter and other thinges, would be so chargeable.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁸ Fredson Bowers, *Principles of Bibliographical Description*, p. 39.

¹⁷⁹ Arber, II, p. 43.

¹⁸⁰ Arber, I, p. 116.

When faced with the predicament of printing a dictionary or a history, Barker seems to suggest over-supply was the lesser of the two evils. However, over-supply was obviously a problem. On the other hand, if printed in too few copies, a book's price would have to be augmented to such a degree to cover the charge 'of the provision of varietie of letter and other things' that it would not sell at market. The consideration of the number of copies to print in an edition run was crucial to the master-printer but ultimately it is impossible to establish with any confidence from the available evidence. Although it can be shown that hypothetical production rates of one, thousand five hundred edition sheets per day appear to be unreasonably high when set against extant books produced by the Queen's printer within the year and their extant invoices.

Turning from presswork averages to estimates around compositor labour, a perfected sheet (i.e. printed on both sides) would require the setting of two formes (an inner forme and an outer forme). One forme (which would contain two folio pages) was required to print each side of the sheet. An analysis of *Principall Navigations* and the remarkably regular fifty-eight lines per folio page, of roughly seventy-five letters of predominantly pica, black letter per line (an average that does not include the additional marginalia on almost every page)¹⁸¹ would lead to a conservative estimate of about eight thousand, seven hundred 'ens or letters' for each forme (i.e. 58 x 75 (per galley page of type) x 2 (as 2 galley pages are contained within the forme) = 8,700).¹⁸² This would represent seventeen thousand, four hundred ens per perfected sheet (8,700 X 2 = 17,400) and, if we take the later hypothetical norm (c. 1785) that proposed compositors set at

¹⁸¹ Print fount and type: Printed generally in pica black letter: Body 81, Face 76 x 2: 3 [body and face measurements= mm heights taken over 20 lines; Face is the vertical distance between an ascender and a descender again over twenty lines; 2= mm height of the x type and 3= capital height, see Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, pp.13-16. The relationship between the size of the body and face (and the gaps between ascenders and descenders that measure over 0.5mm) potentially suggests thin interlinear leads were used. In email communication with Randall McLeod, he determined that the regular typed line, without the distortions that occur when leads slip, indicates that this was not leaded but the fount had an oversized body and small face.

¹⁸² D. F. McKenzie, 'Printers of the Mind', p. 8. For an illustration of the two formes for a sheet of folio with the disposition of pages see Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, p. 81.

one thousand ens per hour,¹⁸³ at least seventeen hours of dedicated compositor work per perfected sheet.¹⁸⁴

Continuing with this hypothesis which also assumes a twelve hour day, a single compositor would have needed a day and a half to compose each perfected sheet (there are two hundred and twenty sheets in *Principall Navigations* — two and a half leaves of which are blank) or about three hundred and thirty days to compose the entire text. Gaskell argues that compositor outputs were so varied in the hand-press period that it is pointless discussing outputs in standardized averages. The records of the Cambridge University Press demonstrate that compositor weekly outputs could vary enormously.¹⁸⁵ ‘The average weekly output of the fastest compositor [at the Cambridge University Press] over the year 1701-2 was 38,000 ens, but he was also capable of setting 64,000 ens per week for five weeks.’¹⁸⁶ The Cambridge compositor, working at maximum output, would still have needed more than a year to set *Principall Navigations*. Peter W. M. Blayney has pointed out that ‘[t]he potential productivity of a printing house is limited by presswork rather than by composition. Given an adequate supply of type, the rate of composition can be increased by hiring extra personnel, but a press has a working limit which cannot be raised by increasing the work-force.’¹⁸⁷ Presswork is, therefore, the important determining factor and the size of an edition run could significantly alter presswork demands. For example, if *Principall Navigations* was printed in a print run of seven hundred and fifty copies, the edition run would constitute one hundred and sixty-five thousand sheets ($750 \times 220 = 165,000$) and would represent just over four months of work if it was printed on a single press at maximum output ($165,000 / 1,500 = 110 /$

¹⁸³ D. F. McKenzie, ‘Printers of the Mind’, p. 8. Gaskell reports that a scale for piece-work prices expected 1000 ens an hour as a normal rate of production in 1785. However, even in the nineteenth century, it was still apparent that different compositors set at very different rates. See Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, pp. 54-55.

¹⁸⁴ An en is $\frac{1}{2}$ an em. An em was so-called as it represented the space the letter ‘M’ of the selected type occupied when turned on its side. This calculation was used to set the measure for the purposes of justification. D. F. McKenzie in ‘Printers of the Mind’ equates ens with letters, p. 8.

A compositor would also be expected to fulfil certain other roles, including the imposition of pages into formes, incorporating headlines, direction lines and marginalia, and the distribution of the letters, once a forme had been printed.

¹⁸⁵ Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, p. 55.

¹⁸⁶ Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, p. 55.

¹⁸⁷ Peter W. M. Blayney, *The Texts of ‘King Lear’ and their Origins: Nicholas Okes and the First Quarto*, p. 42.

26 (working days per calendar month) = 4.2) and would need at least three competent compositors working exclusively on its composition for the duration. If, however, it was printed in a larger edition of (say) one thousand, five hundred copies, the calculations regarding presswork would have to be increased, whether in the time allocated for its production or in number of presses employed in its production.

Whilst press and compositor outputs can only be presented as guides, there are two valuable points to be made from this exercise. First, it enables an estimation of the shortest period of time that would have been required to print *Principall Navigations* on a single press in an edition run of seven hundred and fifty copies. Secondly, it is significant because it foregrounds the extraordinary levels of labour that were involved in the production of an early modern book of two hundred and twenty sheets. The study of the production capacity of printing houses in London demonstrates that a master-printer with a single press could not have undertaken this size of job unless he had considerable financial security to underwrite the production or was allowed to treat his copy as 'stock' rather than job work and fall back on it when job work was scarce.

Charlton Hinman argues:

Job work – the printing of small miscellaneous items to fill the more or less immediate needs of the customer – was doubtless a more important part of the business of some printers than of others. Books, and large books especially, required more substantial long-term investments than some printers could regularly manage. Yet even well-established firms like Jaggard's, firms which were able to undertake very ambitious projects and which concerned themselves chiefly with the printing of big books, evidently valued job work – and, presumably, quick cash returns. Conversely, even the smaller firms would find it desirable to provide themselves with a certain amount of book work, if only to maintain a stock of material on which they could fall back in slack times, when job work was scarce. Copy that did not require immediate publication would supply them with 'Stock Work' – material with which 'to keep the Hands [i.e. all the regular workmen of the establishment] constantly employ'd, and without which an advantageous Number cannot be retain'd'.¹⁸⁸

Hinman argues that even the smaller firms liked to have book work as security to fill up idle hours when job work was scarce.

¹⁸⁸ Charlton Hinman quoting from a document dated 1756 in *The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare*, I, p. 18.

Finally, the flow of varied jobs through the press needs to be considered as a master-printer would prioritize work according to economic expediency and invariably would not focus exclusively on the production of any given text. Indeed, Christopher Barker and his deputies had to respond immediately to the publishing demands of Queen and Privy Council in their role as printers for the realm and Barker is recorded complaining that:

Proclamations come on the suddayne, and must be returned printed in hast: wherefore by breaking of greater worke I loose oftentimes more by one Proclamacon, then I gayne by sixe, before my servantes can comme in trayne of their worke agayne, and in many yeres there hapeneth not a proclamation of any benefit at all.¹⁸⁹

Proclamations of two or more sheets in length were printed on the recto side alone (see for example *STC* 8119 and *STC* 8167) but most frequently they were single broadside or single sheet folio publications. All proclamations were printed either in leaded type or in a fount which had an oversized body and small face for clarity.¹⁹⁰ The royal printing house invoices reveal that proclamations were sometimes only produced in limited runs of two token units (500 sheets printed on rectos only) and their insignificant costs were charged to the hanaper.¹⁹¹ This explains Barker's irritation at having to break up work for such small but mandatory requests.¹⁹²

Having considered, from the available evidence, the nature of the role of the master-printer, their approximate numbers working in London, the average size of printing house operations in 1589, hypothetical compositor and press maximum outputs and the variety of different work that flowed through presses, Christopher Barker's claim to have invested £3000 in the initial production of the Geneva Bible and the subsequent anxiety this kind of printing venture would have caused a printer-publisher now seems plausible. Barker's Geneva Bible, which was printed initially in various

¹⁸⁹ Arber, I, p. 115.

¹⁹⁰ Claire Bolton suggested turned type may help clarify whether the Queen's printers were using leaded type or type with small faces cast on large bodies. There are instances of turned type recorded in the textual variants of *Principall Navigations*, see Appendix B.10. In these instances, the inked 'footprint' of the body seems to correlate to the distance between the ascender and descender in the type face.

¹⁹¹ See for example, BL, Additional Manuscripts MSS 5756, fol. 134.

¹⁹² For example of proclamation invoices see BL, Additional MS 5756, fols 139-140.

formats, was an enormous publishing venture. Barker was aware of the risk for he knew that if '[he] had died, [his] wife and children [would have] ben vtterlie vndone, and many of [his] frendes greatlie hindered.'¹⁹³

The period of time available to the printing house for the production of a text was an essential consideration for the master-printer and this is also crucial to the production history of *Principall Navigations*. It is of value to return to Hinman's remark in which he states that the production of large books was economically viable if it was '[c]opy that did not require immediate publication.'¹⁹⁴ In September 1583, Hakluyt sailed to France as chaplain for Sir Edward Stafford, England's ambassador in Paris, a position he held until the winter of 1588. Working within Stafford's household, Hakluyt came under the supervision of Francis Walsingham, who as 'secretary of state, [was] responsible for the conduct of the Queen's relations with France.'¹⁹⁵ As discussed in previous chapters, Hakluyt's extended personal brief from Walsingham included Walsingham's 'expectation of [Hakluyt's] diligent inquirie of such thinges as may yeld any light into our western discoveries'.¹⁹⁶ Hakluyt's letter to Walsingham in January 1584 attests that he had set about this task with industry, having already established, within three months, an intelligence network in Rouen, Dieppe and St. Malo. He had also initiated contacts with Don Antonio and his court, with André Thevet, the French king's cosmographer and with a substantial merchant, named Perousse, who traded in skins and furs from North America.¹⁹⁷

Between 1583 and 1588, Hakluyt is known to have made frequent visits to London, Bristol and Oxford, on occasions for extended periods. Some time in July 1584, Hakluyt returned to England and was commissioned to write 'A discourse of western planting' for Walter Raleigh which he presented in an audience with the Queen at the beginning of October, two days before his departure. Hakluyt was in Bristol in May 1585 (after communication with Walsingham from France in the previous month for

¹⁹³ Arber, I, p. 115.

¹⁹⁴ Charlton Hinman, *The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare*, I, p. 18

¹⁹⁵ *Principall Navigations* (1965), I, p. xx.

¹⁹⁶ *Original Writings*, I, p. 205.

¹⁹⁷ According to D. B. Quinn, Hakluyt generally used new style dating when writing from Paris. *Hakluyt Handbook*, I, p. 264.

assistance in securing the Queen's gift of the prebendary stall)¹⁹⁸ and 'exhibited his mandate of 5 October 1584 to the Dean and Chapter of Bristol Cathedral for the next vacancy.'¹⁹⁹ In March 1586, Hakluyt was again in England, this time for a protracted period during which Hakluyt was installed at Holy Trinity in Bristol. Hakluyt's delay was unexpected as Sir Edward Stafford wrote to Walsingham at least three times to request Hakluyt's return, which also testifies to Stafford's personal need of Hakluyt's services within his household. Archival sources verify that Hakluyt was still in London in late July as he is known to have taken down, or been present at, the delivery of oral narratives of exploration at the end of this extended stay.²⁰⁰

It is reasonable to assume that Walsingham, as Hakluyt's patron and employer, was able to control Hakluyt's movements between Paris and London if necessary, an assumption which is supported by Stafford's need to address Walsingham on the issue of Hakluyt's return. This period, extended as it was, may have been the point at which Walsingham, exploiting and supporting Hakluyt's endeavours, facilitated Hakluyt's project to collect maritime narratives in view of an ambitious publication, permitting Hakluyt access to ambassadorial communications and royal privileges regarding overseas trade relations. Sir Edward Dyer's personal interest in exploration and his assistance with *Principall Navigations* extends the network of courtiers with vested interests in the book's production.

E. G. R. Taylor cites Hakluyt's first reference to *Principall Navigations* in his dedicatory epistle to Walter Raleigh dated February 1587.²⁰¹ Found in Peter Martyr's *De Orbe Novo*, it was published in Paris after Hakluyt's return and Hakluyt seemed to employ the dedication to seek Raleigh's support (which he obtained at least through collaboration) in this new project. Hakluyt returned to England in 1587 potentially for several months and it is here that D. B. Quinn posits that Hakluyt commenced his project in earnest, as his use of the future tense in the dedicatory epistle implied that the

¹⁹⁸ *Original Writings*, II, letter dated 7 April, 1585, pp. 343-345.

¹⁹⁹ An entry in the Sub-Dean's Book at Christ Church records 'notification of his installation on 24 June 1586'. *Hakluyt Handbook*, I, p. 290 and p. 289 for the entry of June 1586.

²⁰⁰ *Hakluyt Handbook*, I, p. 289.

²⁰¹ This date is taken as new style as Hakluyt is writing from Paris.

work had not as yet begun.²⁰² As material in the Muscovy Company and Levant Company archives represents a substantial source for the book, it seems likely that Hakluyt could only have prepared manuscript copies of these documents when in London.

Lastly, Hakluyt is known to be in England between June and July 1588, terminating his period as embassy chaplain in the winter of 1588. Whether the project was started in 1587 or 1588, it is highly unlikely that a collected body of narratives would have been ready for the printing house immediately on his return, given Hakluyt's obligations to Sir Edward Stafford when in Paris and the ordering of his private affairs when in England (instalment in the prebendary stall and marriage).²⁰³ Hakluyt was still referring to the compilation of materials for *Principall Navigations* in the future tense on his return from France in the winter of 1588/9, 'my selfe being the last winter returned from France with the honorable the Lady Sheffield, [...] determined notwithstanding all difficulties, to vndertake the burden of that worke.'²⁰⁴ As *Principall Navigations* was conceived in 1587, Hakluyt's use of 'determined' could infer that he had taken some time to reach a decision to undertake the work (see 'determine' in *OED*) as it indicates that he had brought a doubtful matter to conclusion.²⁰⁵ In his dedicatory epistle, Hakluyt asserted the compilation still represented a 'huge toile' on his return and that it was subjected to further 'delayes' through the 'backwardnesse of many from whom [he] was to receiue [his] originals.'²⁰⁶ As Hakluyt's collection of materials had previously focused on voyages to America, E. G. R. Taylor suggests 'a tremendous task still remained to be done' on his return from France. 'The work occupied, in fact, the greater part of a year (from about November 1588 to November 1589).'²⁰⁷ Philip Jones' decatory epistle to Francis Drake in *Certaine briefe, and speciall instructions* (1589)

²⁰² *Principall Navigations* (1965), I, p. xvii.

²⁰³ Quinn posits that it was 'probably during one of his visits to England in 1587 or 1588, Hakluyt married Douglas Cavendish'. *Hakluyt Handbook*, I, p. 298.

²⁰⁴ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *2v.

²⁰⁵ See to 'determine' *OED*, II. 4.a — to bring to an end a dispute, controversy, or doubtful matter, *OED*, <<http://oed.com/view/Entry/51244?redirectedFrom=determine>> [accessed 1 August, 2012].

²⁰⁶ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *2v.

²⁰⁷ *Original Writings*, I, p. 48.

recorded Hakluyt was still working on *Principall Navigations* at the end of January.²⁰⁸ Arguably, the narratives could not have come into the printing house until the following spring.

Essential to the printing history of *Principall Navigations*, however, is Hakluyt's own record of its organization. The collected narratives were not 'vnprofitable ramassed and hurred together' but were meticulously arranged into a systematic order from 'loose papers', to render the use of the papers more profitable to the reader.²⁰⁹ Clearly the arrangement of the material was critical to purpose and Hakluyt took this aspect of his endeavours extremely seriously. This is significant from the perspective of a print-production because the bulk of the collection process, entailing the selection and transcription of source material into compositors' fair-copy, must have been largely in place, its arrangement accomplished (apparently over 800 pages of 825 were arranged according to its principle of organization), before the work started.²¹⁰

Evenden and Freeman demonstrate how the printer John Day incorporated Foxe's new materials after presswork had started. On Foxe's decision to include the works, Day was faced with three options: he could have added the material in the appendices; or added the material out of sequence and cross-referenced it; or he could have printed the new material in a discrete gathering to be interpolated in its proper location within the book at the bindery. The latter was Foxe's favoured choice.²¹¹ Undoubtedly, Hakluyt's desire to order his materials correctly would have taken some considerable time as extant books of the 1589 edition only witness the interpolation of the Drake material, the Bowes leaves cancels and some additional material at the very end of the book which is appended and cross-referenced in the subtitles: 'The voyage set foorth by Master Iohn Newton, and Master Iohn Bird' (sigs. 4Er-4Ev) and 'The most solemne, and magnificent coronation of Pheodore Iuanowiche' (sigs. 4Ev-4E4v). The last text that is included in the correct sequence is added hurriedly at some point after 10 September 1589. Hakluyt

²⁰⁸ *Hakluyt Handbook*, I, p. 302.

²⁰⁹ *Principall Navigations*, sigs. *3v and *4v.

²¹⁰ The narrative order under: time; place; time within place, is adhered to until page 818 of 825 pages. See *Principall Navigations* (1965), I, p. xxxv and *Hakluyt Handbook*, II,

²¹¹ Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas S. Freeman, *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: The Making of Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs'*, p. 118.

extracted the information from a letter sent to Edward Wilkinson from the master, William Mace, captain of the Dog: 'Thus much in generall termes onely, I haue as yet learned.'²¹² *Principall Navigations* was entered into the Stationers' registers on 1 September.

This chapter, which has focused on bibliographical analysis, has retrieved certain historical details. The printing of the first edition of *Principall Navigations* was a substantial undertaking and, if printed in an edition of seven hundred and fifty copies, would have demanded considerable investment in paper-stocks and labour. It is a beautifully printed work and represented a substantial proportion of the Queen's printers output for that year (even if every sheet in Appendix A.2 is taken as an edition, it still represents a fifth of the extant editions produced in the year). In the prefatory material, Hakluyt reported that in the winter of 1588/1589 he decided to undertake the work and that this work represented a 'burden' and 'a huge toile'.²¹³ Hakluyt had been in France since 1583 but had returned on occasion. In the months he was in England, he composed 'A discourse of western planting' for Walter Raleigh, took down accounts from returning pilots, was installed in his prebendary stall at Bristol Cathedral and was married. As many of the records in *Principall Navigations* are drawn from London merchant company manuscript archives, they were most probably copied in London. The dedicatory epistle is dated 17 November 1589 and signals the book's near completion on that date.

The quality of presentation exhibited throughout *Principall Navigations*, recorded by the rarest occasions of pressure on the space of the page, indicates that its process through the press seems to have been relatively trouble-free, although additional material added at the end of the book does not observe Hakluyt's careful ordering (a problem he alerted his reader to within his headings).²¹⁴ In consideration of the timings between Hakluyt's return and the book's readiness for market, the work demanded in

²¹² *Principall Navigations*, sig. 4D6v.

²¹³ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *2v.

²¹⁴ 'The most solemn and magnificent coronation of Pheodore Ivanowiche [...] the right place is immediately after the Embassage of Sir Ierom Bowes, in the second part of this historie: which being fully printed, before this matter came to my hands, I am forced here to annexe,' *Principall Navigations*, sig. 4E1v.

preparing fair-copy for the printers from different London based company archives, the sheer quantity of the materials in the collection, the maximum production capacity of a single press and a team of compositors, the Queen's printers' production capacity (having six presses), their ability to print other materials (that would have promised more immediate returns) on their other presses, it seems that the Queen's printers may have focused compositor labour and at least one press (although, probably two) to the steady production of the book.²¹⁵ Francis Walsingham wrote his last will in December 1589 and his health deteriorated steadily over the months before his death on 6 April 1590.²¹⁶

Printing and proof-reading practices witnessed by the emendation of the Bowes leaves, the Drake leaves and the textual variants have pointed to an environment of production which never lost sight of the reader. Indeed the production process itself was reliant on and interspersed with readings which prompted re-workings. In this way, early modern printing practices encouraged self-censorship as proof-readers, at various stages of the production process, sought out and eliminated potential for offence. The producers also supplied better texts for their users. Significantly, there is no evidence of any repercussion on the circulation of the Bowes leaves or demands for the suppression of the Drake leaves post-publication of *Principall Navigations*. Perhaps the only suppression encountered by the Drake leaves was an in-house decision not to advertise explicitly their inclusion in the title-page. The oblique reference to Nova Albion does, however, indicate a resolution had been reached to incorporate the Drake leaves in *Principall Navigations* by the time the title-page was finally printed (usually occurring after the conclusion of the edition printing) despite the increase in litigation in response to print piracy at the end of the 1580s.

²¹⁵ I have looked at headline data over six quires and have seen a pattern of production which correlates with the position put forward by Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas S. Freeman: 'When there were two presses or more in operation, the procedure would usually be for one press to print one side of a sheet and have another press print the other side *before* the sheet had dried.' As I have only been able to look at six quires this is not as yet sufficient evidence for the argument. *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: The Making of Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs'*, p. 8. See Appendix B.11.

²¹⁶ Simon Adams and Alan Bryson and Mitchell Leimon, 'Walsingham, Sir Francis (c.1532–1590)', in *ODNB* <<http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/view/article/28624>> [accessed 5 August 2012], see passage entitled 'The outbreak of war with Spain and final years, 1585-1590', paras. 13-15 of 15.

If the Drake material was in the process of being collected into one volume by someone who had already invested in the project (as Hakluyt inferred) and it was printed by the Queen's printer almost simultaneously with the book's publication, the details would not be trumpeted on the title-page. The leaves were printed despite this prior investment.²¹⁷ The seemingly covert acknowledgement of their inclusion further substantiates the position that the Queen's printing house decided to contravene the rights of someone else's investment and can be explained in terms of Annabel Patterson's notion of anticipated censorship. Had the Drake leaves been printed without any anxiety, their inclusion would have been advertised more effectively. As the Stationers' court books do not record any legal action taken on the publication of *Principall Navigations*, it cannot be determined whether an agreement between the initial investor and the Queen's printer was successfully obtained after publication. However, the Stationers' courts were internal courts arbitrated by their executive and in 1590 Bishop was Master of the Company and Newberry, upper Warden. In previous cases in the Star Chamber, Walsingham's patronage of Barker seems to have protected him from penalty even when charged by other powerful stationers, giving all three stationers involved in the production of *Principall Navigations* a consolidation of executive power beyond that available to any other fellow stationer.

In conclusion, whilst Walsingham's influence is explicit throughout the production of *Principall Navigations* (as Privy Councillor, as patron to Hakluyt and the Queen's printers and in appointing the licenser), there is still no evidence of any radical alteration in the processes of the book's production. The emended Bowes leaves make an explicit reference to the previous account of the embassy and the first state (or the offensive text) is present in nearly forty per cent of extant copies. The case of the Drake leaves is different. In the prefatory material, Hakluyt stated that they were not included

²¹⁷ Similarly, the last minute decision to include *Troilus and Cressida*, Henry Walley's copy, in the first folio of Shakespeare's plays also had a bearing on the index and location of the play. 'Troilus appears in the Folio, though certainly not in the place originally planned for it. Only at the very last moment, if at all, was Walley persuaded to allow the syndicate to print his play.' *Troilus* does not appear in the index of plays included in the folio either. For more details, see Charlton Hinman, *The Printing and Proof-Reading of the First Folio of Shakespeare*, I, p. 28.

because he did not want to ‘anticipate or preuent another mans paines and charge’.²¹⁸ In direct comparison to the advertisement of Cavendish’s circumnavigation printed in the first edition, the voyages of Cavendish and Drake printed in the second edition with all other circumnavigations set forth but not accomplished, the interpolation of the Drake leaves was never announced explicitly on the title-page. An analysis of the Drake sheets in the Bodleian Douce holding has demonstrated that they were, however, printed on same paper-stocks that were used elsewhere in general print-run of *Principall Navigations*. As paper was expensive, consumed rapidly, was generally ordered for the production of particular jobs and was made in pairs of moulds that had limited life-spans, it would seem highly improbable for two different paper-stocks contained within *Principall Navigations* to be witnessed again in two of the three printed sheets, that constitute the Drake leaves, if they were printed after an extended delay. Bibliographical analysis suggests that the decision to include the Drake leaves was taken shortly after the book’s print production and that this late interpolation was not advertised openly. Whilst the pre-emptive printing of another man’s copy may not have represented grounds for state censorship, it would have provided an excellent reason for censure on the publication of *Principall Navigations*.

²¹⁸ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *4v.

Chapter Four

‘*Vale, atque aut meliora dato, aut his utere mecum*’: Indications of Anticipated Use in
Principall Navigations (1589)

At each stage of this thesis, my objective has been to situate *Principall Navigations* within the contemporary processes of book production and to construct, as fully as possible, a sociology of the text.¹ By pausing to consider the necessary socio-economic conditions required for the publication of *Principall Navigations*, the collaboration between powerful patrons and viable printing house practice is brought to the fore and a more complex history of its composition is presented. In previous chapters, the social networks involved in its production have prompted a re-evaluation of authorial subjectivity. This has destabilized the notion of the independent author fashioning a ‘myth of origin for the emerging imperial nation’,² and re-integrated the production of *Principall Navigations* into a series of contingent and communal projects. Prompted by a range of causes, *Principall Navigations* drew on a network of interdependent socio-economic associations which were largely enabled through the socio-historical circumstances of patronage and the patent system.³

Furthermore, an investigation into the history of the manufacture of *Principall Navigations* (with its witness to stop-press variants, compositor errors, cancels, interpolations and binding practices) has demonstrated that the text itself is unstable. Recognition of the inherent instability of the Elizabethan printed text (engendered by the nature of its production) is imperative to an appreciation of contemporary reception. Both Randall McLeod and David McKitterick have illustrated that the concept of the definitive text cannot be applied to the early modern printed book. With ‘infinite’ possibilities of variance between copies of the same edition, it is more fruitful to

¹ D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*.

² Peter Hulme, *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492-1797*, p. 90. See chapter 1 for full details of this discussion.

³ The various causes behind the production of the book which have been considered in the previous chapters include: impecunious Clothworkers’ petitions to the Privy Council, Francis Walsingham’s personal debts accrued from farming customs, the economic innovations of a project establishing and projector culture and the impact of intensified Anglo-Spanish hostilities on habitual trading relations.

understand the English book from the early hand-press period as a site of compromise.⁴ In an observation of significance to the inherent problems in studies of early modern reading practices, David McKitterick has argued that '[m]odern bibliography and historical practice have tended constantly to project the values and judgements of the present back to the values and practices of the past.'⁵

In this final chapter, I will consider the interaction between particular readings anticipated by the producers, as witnessed by *Principall Navigations* — retrieved through an analysis of the text's material and discursive forms — and reading as historical practice. Clearly, there is a gap between the imagined reception of *Principall Navigations* and its multiple and untraceable early modern 'actualizations', for 'the same text could be diversely apprehended, handled, and understood.'⁶ However, I shall argue that distinct and distant modes of anticipated reading practices can be retrieved when late sixteenth-century attitudes to material texts, produced on London presses, are aligned with the text itself. Although the material form of *Principall Navigations* envisaged diverse consumption, analysis of its structure suggests that it aspired to a hierarchical 'order' of readings.⁷

This hierarchy will be assessed through an analysis of the paratexts. As the organization of the material enabled distinct and different ways into the text, the different investors (printers, patrons and authors) were obviously aware of its appeal for a variety of audiences. Here, the book as object and its general principles of organization will be examined for guidance on anticipated reading practice and targeted audiences.

⁴ See Randall McLeod's textual commentary in *The Peaceable and Prosperous Regiment of Blessed Queene Elisabeth: A Facsimile from Holinshed's Chronicles (1587) and Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order, 1450-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 137. Randall McLeod uses 'infinite' to emphasize, in word-play, its opposition with 'definite' or 'definitive'. David McKitterick supports this idea of a book as compromise by citing printing house practice which always retained pages printed prior to stop-press corrections in an edition run.

⁵ *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order, 1450-1830*, p. 2.

⁶ On the need to recognize the historical dimensions that affect the actualization of texts: e.g. forms, structures, reading competencies, reading habits, spaces and gestures, expectations and diverse interests that different groups of readers 'invest in the practice of reading,' see Roger Chartier, 'Labourers and Voyagers: From the Text to the Reader', in *The Book History Reader*, ed. by David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery, 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 2006), pp. 87-98 (pp. 88-90) (first publ. in *Diacritics*, 22 (1992), 49-61).

⁷ Roger Chartier, *The Order of Books: Readers, Authors and Libraries in Europe between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, p. viii.

Although the prevailing method Hakluyt employed in compiling the materials reflected the consensus of hopes and expectations invested in the publication of *Principall Navigations*, I shall argue that the different *foci* witnessed in the paratexts demonstrate that the producers were aware of its diverse market potential and organized the texts accordingly.

In the first part of this final chapter, I shall discuss format, price, translation decisions, prefatory materials and the structure of one part (part two — voyages and additional matter relating to the north and northeast) of the three-part book as these can all develop an understanding of *Principall Navigations*' targeted audiences.

In the second part of this chapter, I shall evaluate reading as a historical practice and the continued importance of oral modes of communication to its immediate publication circumstances. An analysis of the contemporary reception of *Principall Navigations* depends upon a familiarization with the interpretative strategies shared between producers and consumers in the cultural economies of late Elizabethan communities.⁸

High prices and the relative scarcity of books encouraged communal or shared reading practices and the circulation of particular books between users. Literacy rates were low and the transmission of new geographical information (gathered on particular oceanic voyages) from the illiterate domain to the literate was imperative to the construction of new geographical knowledge. Sailors and pilots presented a source of essential information but were generally illiterate. 'Although unlettered, many people had highly developed skills which were relevant to the circumstances of their lives and at which the book-learned might only wonder.'⁹ The literate (e.g. each ship's masters, captains and, when on board, merchants) were responsible, first and foremost, for recording new data *en route*. However, the data collected was generally understood to be for the benefit of the Company (or the joint-stock projectors) and it was here that it was effectively analysed and matters of fact constructed from the unmediated materials.

⁸ Stanley Fish, 'Interpreting the Variorum', in *The Book History Reader* (see Darnton, above), pp. 450-458 (p. 457) (first publ. in 'Is there a text in this class?', *Critical Inquiry*, 2 (1976), 66-102).

⁹ Adam Fox, *Oral and Literate Culture in England 1500-1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 10.

The narratives of voyages in *Principall Navigations* invariably start by recording the dates of departure, the principal investors, the owners of the ships, the ships' tonnage and the numbers of men in the party. In the body of the narratives, details from the navigation are recorded and generally make note of some or all of the following: wind directions, currents, distances measured in leagues over calendar days, soundings, latitude readings (occasionally noting the variation of the compass), the description of good natural harbours and remarkable landmarks (the pike of Tenerife is frequently described) of the lay of the land. Further notes include the fresh produce that can provide the crew with nourishment *en route* and the commodities (raw and manufactured) that could be of value. I shall argue that the producers of *Principall Navigations* anticipated the book would fulfil different functions. However, undoubtedly print enabled the wider dissemination of necessary information for further ventures.

This is significant because the material compilation was not reduced into a singular linear narrative of a history of English travels because Hakluyt and his patrons prioritized this particular anticipated function for the book. In 1601 Hakluyt responded to Walter Cope's suggestion that the narratives included in *Principall Navigations* should be drawn into a 'short sum':¹⁰

Which trauailes of our men [compiled in *Principal(l) Navigations*], because as yet they be not come to ripenes, and haue been made for the most part to places first discouered by others; when they shall come to more perfection, and become more profitable to the aduenturers, will then be more fit [for the narratives in *Principal(l) Navigations*] to be reduced into briefe epitomes by my selfe or some other endued with an honest zeale of the honour of our countrey.¹¹

¹⁰ *The discoueries of the world from their first originall vnto the yeere of our Lord 1555. Briefly written in the Portugall tongue by Antonie Galuano, gouernour of Ternate, the chiefe island of the Malucos*, corrected, quoted, and now published in English by Richard Hakluyt (Londini: [Eliot Court Press], impensis G. Bishop, 1601), sig. A2r.

¹¹ *The discoueries of the world from their first originall vnto the yeere of our Lord 1555. Briefly written in the Portugall tongue by Antonie Galuano, gouernour of Ternate, the chiefe island of the Malucos*, sig. A4r.

Hakluyt knew that a collection of unmediated material would be more profitable to the adventurers but less desirable to those seeking a more coherently structured singular narrative. Hakluyt recognised, however, that the significance of his work lay in fact that he had gathered previously dispersed materials together for further use. In addition, he understood the importance of preserving materials in print for the benefit of posterity and the advancement of learning. Hakluyt gathered many compilations and frequently translated materials for publication. He only ever authored one work, ‘A discourse for western planting’, for the benefit of his patron, Walter Raleigh, who was seeking support from the Crown for a new venture to North America. I will argue that the importance of this activity of gathering has been absorbed into more modern notions of authorship and that a better sense of Hakluyt’s work can be gleaned if *Principall Navigations* is integrated more effectively into processes of information transmission in a predominantly oral culture and the stages of oratorical composition as taught at the universities in the period.

Throughout the course of this chapter, various practices that are now habitually understood as distinct and separate will be presented as contiguous: notably, the practices of reading and writing; of authors and of readers; of oral and of literate cultures; of the laboratory and of the library (or event / action and text / words). Indeed, William H. Sherman points out:

We now tend to put the mental business of reading and the physical work of sailing in separate spheres, but geographical and textual exploration went hand in hand during this early period, and libraries played an important role in the launching and directing of voyages of exploration and colonization.¹²

Principall Navigations: the material artefact and the implied reader and reading practices

First, I will consider the material artefact of *Principall Navigations* to aid the initial reconstruction of anticipated communities of readers, for all discussion of readers should rightfully ‘begin [...] with the book itself,’ as ‘[t]he early modern book conveyed

¹² William H. Sherman, *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England*, p. 114.

meaning even before its pages were opened.’¹³ The decision to publish in a small folio without elaborate illustrations is noteworthy as it infers something of *Principall Navigations*’ anticipated function.¹⁴ It was small enough to be transportable, and substantial enough for repeated handling. However, it was not produced with further illustrative materials (such as fauna and flora or of indigenous peoples that were found in Ramusio’s *Viaggi* and Thodore De Bry’s *America*). Nonetheless, as noted earlier, folio bibles consumed almost twice as much paper as their quarto counterparts and its choice of format and size of font inevitably impacted upon its price.

Retail price can also offer concrete direction regarding targeted audience through prospective purchaser power, beyond hypotheses drawn from size and format. Over a period of more than sixteen years, Francis R. Johnson compiled a list of the prices of books marketed between 1550 and 1640 from contemporary merchants’ inventories, their accounts, library catalogues, or purchasers’ manuscript additions recording the price, and infrequently the date, somewhere within the book.¹⁵ Despite Johnson’s acknowledgement that his data cannot offer precision (the date and price are rarely recorded together, differentiating between original or subsequent owner manuscript is often only conjectured), it is sufficient in scope to retrieve some valuable general information on the price of books in the period. In 1589, having fallen in the previous decade, book prices were generally already in line with those decreed by Stationers’ Company in 1598, an ordinance effected to curb their continued and excessive inflation throughout the 1590s:

Forasmuch as divers abuses have been of late committed by sundry persons in enhauncing the prices of books and selling the same at too high and excessive rates and prices, for remedy thereof it is this day ordered as followeth, viz.:

¹³ Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker, ‘Introduction: Discovering the Renaissance Reader,’ in *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 1-40 (p. 5).

¹⁴ Sheets of paper differed tremendously in size: Comparing the dimensions of the Royal with Lombard paper (60cm x 44cm) and the smallest pot (38cm x 28cm), which were both manufactured in France during the 16th century, demonstrates the range of sizes of books produced in folio in the period. See Philip Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography* (Delaware: Oak Knoll Press, 2007), pp. 73-74.

¹⁵ Francis R. Johnson, ‘Notes on English Retail Book-prices, 1550-1640’, *The Library*, 5th ser., 5.2 (Sept., 1950), 83-112.

That all books being new copies which hereafter shall be printed, without pictures, in the pica (the Roman, the Italica), and the English letter (and the Roman and Italica to the same), and the brevier and long primer letters shall not be sold above these rates following, viz.:

Those of the pica (Roman, Italica), the English (and the Roman and Italica to the same), to be sold not above a penny for two sheets.

Those of the brevier and the long primer letters not to be sold for above a penny for one sheet and a half.¹⁶

Philip Gaskell suggests that books already retailed at *.5d* per sheet in the earlier sixteenth-century, and although '[t]he evidence is not very full, [...] sixteenth-century English retail prices may have been something like three times the cost of production.'¹⁷ It seems that in comparison to continental prices, books in England were expensive.

Prices of *Principall Navigations* (numbered two hundred and thirty-five in Johnson's inventory) are taken from two copies in different states bound (b) and unbound (u): '12625 [*STC* No.]: Hakluyt, R., *Voyages*, 1589:Y. (Quaritch catalogue No. 517, item 44), b. 11s.11d.; X. (HN. copy 12625, inscribed by Tho. Egerton) u. 9s.'¹⁸ Unbound, the text commanded almost exactly half a penny a sheet on the market: neither overpriced by the standards of 1598 nor a bargain. Anthony Payne's census documents Edward Wytt's marginalia on the Bernard Quaritch copy (cat. 1185 (1993) no. 43(Q75b.78)* 'Edwarde Wytt R xis vid 1590'.¹⁹ In the analysis of the extant witnesses of both editions, Payne is able to demonstrate that collectors, investors, Privy Councillors, merchants and merchant companies owned a copy of the book:

The book's readership and influence is more difficult to establish, although its contemporary ownership is well documented. Surviving copies include those of Robert Burton, Thomas Egerton, Lancelot Andrewes, John Selden, John Whitgift, Lord Lumley (whose library was used by Hakluyt), Sir Robert Cecil, Sir Ferdinando Gorges, Prince Henry, George Wilmer (an

¹⁶ Francis R. Johnson, 'Notes on English Retail Book-prices, 1550-1640', p. 84.

¹⁷ Philip Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, p. 178.

¹⁸ Note: 'X.: Inscription by original purchaser in an extant copy which has been personally examined by the writer; the copy is identified in parentheses. Y.: Inscriptions in extant copies reported to the writer, but not checked by him.' Francis R. Johnson, 'Notes on English Retail Book-prices, 1550-1640', p. 95 and p. 103.

¹⁹ Anthony Payne and P. A. Neville-Sington, 'Hakluyt: census of copies' <http://www.hakluyt.com/hakluyt_census> [accessed 1 August 2012].

investor in the Virginia and East India Companies, perhaps typical of the merchant and gentry investors to whom Hakluyt is often thought to have primarily addressed his work), the 'Wizard Earl' of Northumberland and Sir Edward Coke.²⁰

The census of the 1589 edition records that Thomas Egerton (the solicitor-general), Philippe Desportes (a French poet) and the merchant investor (George Wilmer) have left their inscriptions on copies. Several owners have signed their books noting dates of matriculation or degrees undertaken at Oxford or Cambridge and a further copy was bequeathed to the Middle Temple.

Hakluyt's decision to translate all works formerly written in Latin, Spanish, French or Italian and to print both his translation and his source in *Principall Navigations* also deserves some consideration. It suggests that Hakluyt was fully aware that translation was 'a messy compromise, involving losses or renunciations.'²¹ However, Hakluyt actively encouraged and participated in the translation of travel narratives and improved the translation of Antonio Galvano's *The Discoveries of the World* (London: George Bishop, 1601). In the dedicatory epistle, he complained about the previous translation and described the skills required to improve the work: 'a good translator ought to be well acquainted with the proprietie of the tongue out of which, and of that into which he translateth, and thirdly with the subiect or matter it selfe.'²²

By 1580, he had paid John Florio to prepare an English copy of Jacques Cartier's *A Short and Briefe Narration* for print: 'the last yeere, at my charges and other of my friendes, by my exhortation, I caused Iaques Cartiers two voyages of discovering the grand Bay, and Canada, Saguinay, and Hochelaga, to bee translated out of my Volumes'.²³ This work, first taken from the French into the Italian by Giovanni Battista

²⁰ Anthony Payne, *Richard Hakluyt: A guide to his books and to those associated with him 1580-1625* (London: Bernard Quaritch, 2008), p. 43.

²¹ Peter Burke, 'Cultures of Translation in early modern Europe', in *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Peter Burke and R. Po-chia Hsia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007, repr. 2009), pp. 7-36 (p. 9).

²² From the dedication Antonio Galvano, *Discoveries of the world from their first originall vnto the yeere of our Lord 1555*, trans. by Richard Hakluyt (Londini: [Eliot Court Press], impensis G. Bishop, 1601) reprinted in *Original Writings*, II, p. 485.

²³ Richard Hakluyt, *Divers voyages touching the discoverie of America*, ed. by John Winter Jones, facsimile reprint from the *Legacy Reprint Series* (London: T. Woodcocke, 1582; repr. The Hakluyt

Ramusio, was now translated from Ramusio's Italian into English by Florio. Hakluyt also personally translated two further works: René de Laudonnière, *A Notable Historie* (London: Thomas Dawson, 1587), Gentleman of Elvas, *Virginia richly valued* (London: 1609 and 1611) and commissioned or encouraged many others.²⁴ Like Hakluyt, John Florio worked with a continuum of classical and vernacular languages and Warren Boutcher's evaluation of the contents of Florio's library, which 'contained about 340 Italian, French and Spanish books', illustrates how the late sixteenth-century scholar-diplomat and reader was submerged in a culture dependent upon linguistic aptitude in different vernaculars:

This is the ground between university Latin and the European vernaculars, between the world of the academe and the world of diplomacy and commerce, a cultural environment which was not only interdisciplinary but interlinguistic in a particular and highly consistent fashion: people utilized a continuum of languages that most usually included Latin, French, Italian and Spanish — alongside, in the case of English humanists, English itself, and with other, less common inclusions such as Greek and German.²⁵

Although Boutcher suggests that English was not so widely read as Spanish, Italian and French within the scholarly community, archival evidence proves that the production of *Principall Navigations* in English did not preclude from its readership some particular scholars inhabiting this interlinguistic world. Emanuel van Meteren referred to Hakluyt's book by folio (actually page) reference in his letter to Jacob Valcke,²⁶ which presupposed Valcke's ability to access and read *Principall Navigations* when in the Low Countries.²⁷ Further, in the dedicatory epistle to Thomas Smith in van Neck's *Iovrnall, or Dayly Register* (1601), William Walker argued that the '*Hollanders*

Society, 1850), p. 17. See E. G. R. Taylor for her suggestion that the prefatory material, whilst signed by Florio, was the work of Hakluyt. *Original Writings*, I, p. 22.

²⁴ For a complete list of Hakluyt's works see Appendix C.1. This is extracted from D. B. Quinn, *Hakluyt Handbook*, II.

²⁵ Warren Boutcher, 'Vernacular humanism in the sixteenth century', in *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, ed. by Jill Kraye (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 189-202 (pp. 190-191).

²⁶ Emanuel van Meteren to Jacob Valcke, 'I know not what your worship has in mind concerning a disputation by Jenkinson; but in Haccliet's book on folio 597 there is a discourse about the north-west passage written by Sr. Humfrey Gilpert Knight,' in *Original Writings*, II, p. 418.

²⁷ Jacob Valcke was one of the signatories on the Act of Abjuration (1581) and was a pensionary of Goes.

[...had] borrowed a great part of their light from [the English]’ for their 1598 venture to the east which they had accessed through the published circumnavigations of Francis Drake and Thomas Cavendish and the voyages of Ralph Fitch (to Syria, 1583) and Thomas Stevens (around the Cape of Good Hope to Goa, 1579), which were all to be found in *Principall Navigations*.²⁸ Even if this only indicated rhetorical justification for an English publication of a Dutch account, it represents an assumed contemporary understanding of the movement of specialist vernacular texts across linguistic borders. The scholar’s role, as translator, was crucial in the dissemination of new discoveries. Burke argues that the Drake, Raleigh and Frobisher narratives are notable in the late sixteenth-century because they were translated from English into other vernaculars.²⁹ Hakluyt’s personal correspondence with Emanuel van Meteren and Gerard Mercator and his involvement with the Barents venture demonstrate a network of interest beyond linguistic borders.³⁰ Burke, however, proposes that the translation of English texts in the Netherlands represented a particular case:

In the case of the Netherlands, returned immigrants form a special category, notably those who fled to England in the days of the Duke of Alba’s persecution of Protestants and later returned to their native country to become Calvinist ministers. The prolific translator Vincentius Meusevoet, for instance, lived for some years in Norwich. Michael Panneel lived in Ipswich. Johannes Beverland lived in Yarmouth. Jan Lamoot went to school in London.³¹

Abraham Ortelius’ kinsman, Daniel Rogers, conveyed a letter from Richard Hakluyt, the lawyer, to Ortelius. Additionally, the refugee community that gathered in

²⁸ Whilst this may relate to the second edition, all the narratives listed are included in the first edition. Further, the circumnavigations were not republished until 1600 and the narratives to east were republished in 1599. As this was in regard to the 1598 Dutch venture, it points to the 1589 edition. See *The Iovrnall, or Dayly Register, Contayning a trve manifestation, and Historicall declaration of the voyage accomplished by eight shipes of Amsterdam [...]* (London: Cuthbert Burby & Iohn Flasket, 1601), sig. ¶2v.

²⁹ Peter Burke, ‘Cultures of Translation in early modern Europe’, in *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*, p. 23.

³⁰ Letter from Emanuel van Meteren in *Original Writings*, II, p. 417; letter from Gerard Mercator, *Principall Navigations*, sigs. 2Xr-2Xv, for involvement in the Barents venture see *Hakluyt Handbook*, I, p. 307.

³¹ Peter Burke, ‘Cultures of Translation in early modern Europe’, in *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*, p. 14.

the Dutch church at Austin Friars provided another connection with the Netherlands and Gerard Mercator.³² The scholar-diplomats in and beyond England, who could access the English vernacular would also have been able to read the un-translated texts (Latin, Greek, Spanish, Italian and French) Hakluyt always provided. The decision to retain the original sources, therefore, self-consciously targeted a polyglot or educated audience (who could also read English), who would have been sensitive to modulations through translation and could access the text without mediation. Undoubtedly, recording the original not only endowed the English version with a verifiable source, it exhibited the translator at work and furnished the linguist with the opportunity for revision. However, as the educated elite could have accessed the source texts, Englishing all texts also obviously targeted a less formally educated, specifically English readership.

Printed in Latin alone, the John Mandeville text is noteworthy in *Principall Navigations* because almost '[e]verything else he prints is given in English' and when in translation additionally rendered initially in the language of the source.³³ Wrangling with concepts of the narrative's status, its inherent truth value or its dubious 'factual' elements, critics have traditionally followed Quinn's original conjecture:

We might think that the Mandeville is a remnant of an earlier plan for a *Principall Navigations* of a more scholarly character, in which concessions would not have been made to those who had little or no Latin, but there is no other evidence of such a plan. Or, it might be thought, Hakluyt kept Mandeville in Latin because he did not want ignorant sailors to be misled too far by his dubious tales of marvels.³⁴

From a print-publishing perspective, I propose this could designate the lasting popularity of the Mandeville text in English and its value as copy to its publishers, Thomas East, Thomas Snodham and William Stansby sequentially.³⁵ Whilst the lack of an appended translation is remarkable, as is the decision not to include Mandeville in the second

³² *Original Writings*, I, pp. 6-7.

³³ *Principall Navigations* (1965), I, p. xxvi.

³⁴ *Principall Navigations* (1965), I, p. xxvi.

³⁵ Mandeville's *Travels* was published by Richard Pynson, in 1496, Wynkyn de Worde, in 1499, Thomas East in 1568 and 1582, Thomas Snodham in 1612, 1618 and 1625, and William Stansby in 1632. For further details consult ESTC. Its continued market interest during the early seventeenth century demonstrates its potential value in rights to copy.

edition, Hakluyt's scepticism of some parts of the text was overtly flagged for the reader on its inclusion in the 1589 edition.

Hakluyt's decision to translate and publish three books in addition to the texts included in *Principall Navigations* (and to encourage or participate in the translation of fourteen others — not all of which were in English or published in London) was notable for its insight.³⁶ Drawing on his personal experience as a polyglot public servant and joint-stockholding projector, he recognized the importance of a text's wider dissemination amongst a local (or linguistically specific) audience. Quinn applauded Hakluyt's respect for vernacular writing which Quinn emphasized was unusual in this period.³⁷ Anthony Grafton has argued that the common valorization (amongst Hakluyt's contemporaries) of Latin and Greek texts above the contemporary experiences of practical men, which were recorded in the vernacular, prompted Francis Bacon (in his *Advancement of Learning*, 1605) to conceive of Renaissance humanism as a fatal disease:

The humanists had entirely failed to see how much they could have learned from the practical men of their own day, whose theories about the natural world rested on practical experience, not mere textual exegesis — and who lived their intellectual lives, with every appearance of satisfaction, in the vernacular.³⁸

The diversity of the social make-up of the predominantly English speaking communities (who participated in overseas ventures initiated in England) demanded that these texts were written in the vernacular to enable the circulation of knowledge amongst both investors and / or projectors of further voyages.

Principall Navigations is a rich textual witness to the dynamics of knowledge exchange between scholars, who still exploited textual exegesis, and practical men. On the one hand, it depended upon and self-consciously contributed to the shifting intellectual understanding of the space of world. *Principall Navigations* published

³⁶ See appendix C.1 for a list of Hakluyt's works.

³⁷ D. B. Quinn, *Richard Hakluyt, Editor: A Study Introductory to the Facsimile Edition of Richard Hakluyt's Divers Voyages (1582)* (Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1967), p. 39.

³⁸ Anthony Grafton, 'The new science and the traditions of humanism', in *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism* (see Boucher, above), pp. 203-223 (p. 205).

important discoveries and eye-witness testimonials that held significant interest for a specifically academic and cosmopolitan community.³⁹ On the other hand, it was published in the vernacular, compiling data collated from pilots, sailors and factors, for investors and projectors planning future ventures.

In the 1589 edition, the minor contributions from non-English born academics and cartographers on English activity, such as Giovanni Battista Ramusio, Gerard Mercator, Sebastian Cabot, Stephen Parmenius and Abraham Ortelius (the map which is occasionally found in the 1589 edition is ‘after Ortelius’), sit with those of English origin: John Dee, the Richard Hakluyts. Accounts from English courtiers (e.g. Humfrey Gilbert, Hugh Willoughby, Martin Frobisher, Walter Raleigh, Francis Drake, Richard Grenville, the Burroughs) and diplomats or great merchants (e.g. William Harborne, Edward Osborne, Richard Staper, Richard Chancellor, Jerome Horsey, Anthony Jenkinson and Jerome Bowes) are interspersed with those written (or taken down from oral delivery) by factors whose names may have otherwise been lost forever: Richard Cheiny, George Wrenne, Thomas Alcock, Richard Johnson, Alexander Kytchen, John Sparke, Richard Pingle and Geoffrey Ducket. These networks of contributors are important as they can help identify those of its readers.

Clearly, specialist books in the vernacular frequently traversed linguistic borders as humanist endeavours to seek out texts from classical antiquity in order to correct ‘faulty texts, especially ones with obvious gaps,’⁴⁰ also informed scholarly attitudes to texts in the vernacular. The structure of Hakluyt’s *Principall Navigations* is widely accepted to be influenced by Giovanni Battista Ramusio’s *Delle Navigationi et Viaggi raccolte da G. B. Ramusio in tre volumi divise* (published in three volumes, vol. i, 1550, vol. ii, 1559, vol. iii, 1556). Although printed in Venice and in Italian, Hakluyt owned the volumes.⁴¹ Hakluyt’s work was evidently influenced by Ramusio’s but the

³⁹ Gerard Mercator alters his map of Europe in response to enhanced knowledge drawn from English exploration and Hakluyt records Mercator’s acknowledgement of English enterprise, *Principall Navigations*, sig. 2Y6r.

⁴⁰ Michael D. Reeve, ‘Classical Scholarship’, in *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism* (see Boutcher, above), pp. 20-46 (p. 27).

⁴¹ We know Richard Hakluyt owned Ramusio because he lent his copies to John Florio for the Jacques Cartier translation, ‘to bee translated out of my Volumes’. See prefatory material in *Divers voyages*

divergences and similarities between their compilation methods are of note. Hakluyt, like Ramusio, published in the vernacular and Hakluyt's tri-part structure was similar to Ramusio's arrangement across the volumes. Ramusio's first volume included voyages to Africa, Calicut and the Moluccas, the second to Tartary, Persia and Babylon and the third to the New World. Ramusio omitted all the documentary material relating to joint-stock ventures and monopolies for trade and plantation that Hakluyt carefully compiled. Hakluyt did not include illustrations and his 1589 edition only compiled ventures undertaken by Englishmen.⁴²

Although particular titles were obviously profitably sought out by travellers or itinerant book buyers for individual clients (John Bill bought for Thomas Bodley) or home markets, success was not always guaranteed, especially when the book had not been published in print. Amongst the letters collated in *Principall Navigations*, John Newberie describes his fruitless endeavours to trace Abulfeda Ismael's fourteenth-century manuscript for Hakluyt:

I have made very earnest inquirie both there and here, for the booke of Cosmographie of Abilfada Ismael, but by no meanes can heare of it. Some say that possibly it may be had in Persia, but notwithstanding I will not faile to make inquirie for it, both in Babylon and in Balsara, and if I can finde it in any of these places, I will send it to you from thence.⁴³

Hakluyt's desire to trace the manuscript was emphasized both in a marginal note and again in the index, flagging this failure to his reader in an attempt, perhaps, to encourage a collective effort to accomplish this personal objective. D. B. Quinn suggests there was some thought in Hakluyt's mind at this time of an English printed edition of 'Abulfeda's

touching the discoverie of America, ed. by John Winter Jones, facsimile reprint from the *Legacy Reprint Series* (London: T. Woodcocke, 1582; repr. The Hakluyt Society, 1850), p. 17. Significantly, the second volume of Ramusio's *Delle Navigationi et Viaggi raccolte da G. B. Ramusio in tre volumi divise* (Venetia: I. Giunti, 1553-9) was completed by Ramusio's publisher, I. Gunti, after Ramusio's death.

⁴² The dedicatory epistle of *Divers voyages touching the discoverie of America* (1582), addressed to Philip Sidney, recorded Hakluyt's own dependence upon further international sources to formulate an argument for a Northwest Passage (the principal aim in encouraging plantation in North America): Giovanni Battista Ramusio, John Verrazano, Francis Lopes de Gamora and Jacques Cartier were all cited.

⁴³ *Principall Navigations*, sig. S2v.

geography’,⁴⁴ which was hitherto only available in epitome, a single page of coordinates published in the second volume of Ramusio’s collection.⁴⁵

It appears from contemporary catalogues of books at the continental fairs that only a very small minority of English booksellers exploited these markets to sell their Latin works produced on English presses. In “‘Omnium totius orbis emporiorum compendium’: the Frankfurt fair in the early modern period”, John L. Flood has established that between 1580-1589, only 27 titles of the 5576 in the fair catalogues were from England, although it is possible that some books printed on English presses were available for sale but not included in the catalogues.⁴⁶ Significantly, one of Hakluyt’s works, published in Latin and printed in Paris, was represented here, which again infers the potential interest his publications incited in an audience that spanned linguistic borders. In May 1589 Ortelius wrote to Jacob Cool, ‘noting that he had seen advertised in the Frankfurt book fair catalogue Hakluyt’s [Latin] edition of Peter Martyr’s *Decades* (Paris, 1587).’⁴⁷ Graham Rees and Maria Wakely have registered the embryonic activities of the King’s printer-publishers, John Bill and John Norton, as commencing at the turn of the seventeenth century. Their seven works (including three potentially printed in Geneva) recorded in the autumn catalogue of 1605 were, however, all published in Latin, the continental, scholarly *lingua franca*.⁴⁸

Communities of readers and the reading experience envisaged by the producers of *Principall Navigations* can also be explored through its paratextual apparatus. Evidence

⁴⁴ ‘25 November 1588. Abraham Ortelius wrote to William Camden that he had heard from Emanuel van Meteren that Hakluyt was hopeful of producing an edition of Abulfeda’s geography.’ *Hakluyt Handbook*, I, p. 300.

⁴⁵ Abulfeda Ismael’s coordinates are reproduced in the second volume of Ramusio’s *Delle Navigazioni et Viaggi raccolte da G. B. Ramusio in tre volumi divise*, fol. 18. Also see E. G. R. Taylor, *Original Writings*, I, p. 19.

⁴⁶ John L. Flood, “‘Omnium totius orbis emporiorum compendium’: the Frankfurt fair in the early modern period”, in *The History of the Book in the West: 1455-1700*, ed. by Ian Gadd, 5 vols (Surrey: Ashgate Publishing, 2010), II, pp. 321-362 (p. 346) (first publ. in *Fairs, Markets and the Itinerant Book Trade*, London: Oak Knoll Press, 2007, pp. 1-42). The Frankfurt catalogue from the autumn of 1594 also records one title (STC 18100) in Latin published by George Bishop. See Graham Rees and Maria Wakely, *Publishing, Politics and Culture: The King’s Printers in the Reign of James I and VI* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 192.

⁴⁷ *Hakluyt Handbook*, I, p. 303.

⁴⁸ Graham Rees and Maria Wakely, see particularly chapter 9, ‘John Norton, John Bill and the Frankfurt Catalogues’, *Publishing, Politics and Culture: The King’s Printers in the Reign of James I and VI*, pp. 191-215.

of audiences will now be considered through the prefatory materials, the contents and index pages and the tri-partite structure. As findings are often contradictory, they indicate the producers were marketing the book for varied consumption. As Francis Bacon recognized, the practice of reading could take many forms: ‘for delight [private leisure], for ornament [to aid discursive ability], and for ability [to make men able in judgement and business of practical life].’⁴⁹

The publication of *Principall Navigations* under the office of royal printers’ imprint and its dedication to Francis Walsingham as patron announced that this book was very effectively buttressed by authority. Influential printer and patron immediately ‘locate[d] and legitimize[d] the text, [and] place[d] the reader within a geography of textual, economic and political power.’⁵⁰ In a world which recognized the instability of a textual transmission, Adrian Johns has argued that the character of the stationer who produced the book and the printing house it emanated from were fundamental to the readers’ assessment of a book’s credibility: ‘[i]n such a world, questions of credit took the place of assumptions of fixity.’⁵¹ Readerly trust was established in part by the credentials of its producers. ‘A central element in the reading of a printed work was likely to be a critical appraisal of its identity and its credit.’⁵²

In the dedicatory epistle, addressed to Walsingham, Hakluyt followed traditional practice, seeking protection from the Principal Secretary as the text passed into the hands of different users. By publishing a personal letter to his patron, Hakluyt adopted a familiar literary *topos* and both sender and addressee would have been attuned to the formulaic staging of the very public, private exchange between two individuals. The letter generally conformed to conservative practice, initially citing God’s wondrous bounty for his inspiration. Hakluyt, in extracting lines from psalm 107, however, exploited its meaning excerpting only that which was of profit: ‘they [merchants] which go downe to the sea in ships, and occupy by the great waters, they see the works of the

⁴⁹ ‘Of Studies’, in *Francis Bacon: The Major Works*, ed. by Brian Vickers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 439. Additions in parenthesis are taken from Brian Vicker’s editorial notes, p. 773.

⁵⁰ Kevin Sharpe and Stephen N. Zwicker, ‘Introduction: Discovering the Renaissance Reader’, p. 6.

⁵¹ Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making*, p. 31.

⁵² Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making*, p. 31.

Lord, and his wonders in the deepe, &c.⁵³ The psalm, taken from the Geneva Bible, with its précised marginalia included within square brackets, continues:

For [the Lord] commandeth and raiseth the stormie wind, and it lifteth up the waves thereof.

They mount up to heaven and descend to the deepe so that their soul melteth for trouble [God's mercy in their deliverance from death at sea, is deliverance from a thousand deaths through their spiritual rapprochement with God].

They are tossed to and fro and stagger like a drunkenman [Their fear and danger are so great], and all their cunning is gone [When art and means fail them].

Then they cry unto the Lord in their trouble and he bringeth them out of their distress [they are compelled to confess that only God's providence preserves them].⁵⁴

Here, Hakluyt (who was chaplain to Edward Stafford) seems to have employed the psalm to validate, in the name of God, the importance of navigation. Paradoxically, when read in full and guided by the marginal notes, the psalm actually addresses the inability of man's cunning to counter the power of God as those who take to the sea in ships (symbolizing inappropriate human ambition and material desire) are brought back down to size through God's wrath (the tempest) and subsequent mercy (their survival). Humbled and full of wonder, the sailor-merchants are brought closer to God by the experience.⁵⁵

This extract indicates how Elizabethan readers excerpted materials for purposeful redeployment in subsequent acts of writing. Elizabethan reading strategies seem to have been able to process texts for different purposes simultaneously: whilst interpreting the narrative as a whole (as witnessed by the supporting marginalia accompanying psalm

⁵³ *Principall Navigations*, sigs. *2r-*3r.

⁵⁴ The Bible (London: Christopher Barker, 1583), sig. 3C3r.

⁵⁵ This reading is antithetical to that of David Harris Sacks. In 'Richard Hakluyt's Navigations in Time: History, Epic, and Empire', he cites this quotation referring to St Augustine's reading of the passage in reference to Revelation. The sea is interpreted as the descent into hell and the wonders of the deep as baptism and resurrection. Harris Sacks suggests this moment in his cousin's chambers represents Hakluyt's personal conversion from 'intellectual self-indulgence' to his 'godly calling' (p. 46) which was to continue to influence his work as trade, discovery and the circumnavigations 'loomed large in Hakluyt's thinking as a fitting culmination of England's Godly mission' for 'the final unification of the world [...which] still depended upon human reason and skill' (p. 50). 'Richard Hakluyt's Navigations in Time: History, Epic, and Empire', 31-62.

107) the reader was also highly alert to a narrative's composite parts, a reading process undoubtedly informed by the contemporary practice of commonplacing. Texts, therefore, also represented an assemblage of free-floating components, of sentences or phrases, which could be, and were, redeployed within extraordinarily different contexts, without seemingly causing contention amongst their readers.

The dedication of the material reality of the book, the single copy given in lieu of some form of personal benefit, again returns discussion to anticipated readership. The perceived value of the book as gift would have been intrinsically tied to the profitability of its use to the reader.⁵⁶ As Harold Love argues, textual production and consumption are more appropriately conceived as a never-ending, communications' circuit.⁵⁷ Authors or producers are simultaneously readers and consumers, reformulating ideas in writing through the accumulation of reading and discussion.

Reading is not the end of the cycle — a cycle has no end — but leads on toward authorship. Between reading and authorship I would place an additional stage of reconstitution. This is what occurs both communally and individually as the fruits of reading are digested and reformulated in personal and group experience prior to their being employed in new acts of writing.⁵⁸

The producers involved in the process of production envisage like-minded interests in their consumers and the community of producers and 'those vertuous gentlemen'⁵⁹ were represented by members of the Privy Council, courtiers, sailors and great merchants. Hakluyt's dedicatory epistle to Walter Raleigh again demonstrates, however, his interest in the practical objectives of production and its significance for posterity:

We shall endeavour moreover, with heaven's help, to collect in orderly fashion the maritime records of our own countrymen, now lying scattered and

⁵⁶ Dedicatory copies were generally printed on fine paper, purposely placed during a print run and collated separately. The Ashmolean 1690 copy held at the Bodleian Library may be an example of a presentation copy.

⁵⁷ See for example models for the communications circuit put forward by Thomas R. Adams and Nicolas Barker, 'A New Model for the Study of the Book', p. 52.

⁵⁸ Harold Love, 'Early Modern Print Culture: Assessing the Models', in *The Book History Reader* (see Darnton, above), pp. 74-86 (p. 80).

⁵⁹ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *4v.

neglected, and brushing aside the dust bring them to the light of day in a worthy guise, to the end that posterity, carefully considering the records of their ancestors which they have lacked so long, may know that the benefits that they enjoy they owe to their fathers, and may at last be inspired to seize the opportunity offered to them of playing a worthy part. If we succeed in this, we shall have achieved a long-cherished desire and a wish that we have often prayed for; if we fall short of this, we shall at any rate show that the desire to please was not lacking.⁶⁰

Under Walsingham's influence, Hakluyt was able to arrange a printed publication for dissemination amongst a wider community. Undoubtedly, the producers of *Principall Navigations* envisaged a rolling out of successful practice and hoped that it would inspire others to seize the opportunity to play a worthy part in England's maritime ventures. The sentiments contained in the dedicatory epistle of the translation of Jacques Cartier's *A Shorte and Briefe Narration of the two Nauigations and Discoueries to the Northwest partes called Newe Fraunces* (1580) could, perhaps, help establish understanding of Hakluyt's targeted audiences for *Principall Navigations*.⁶¹ Addressed to 'To all Gentlemen, Merchants and Pilots' the dedication not only disclosed a specific network of readers for whom the work was undertaken, it also argued that if 'the Marchant Venturer, or skilfull Pilot, or whosoever desirous of newe Discoveries have the readyng and perusing thereof', the 'barraine' discourses would furnish them with 'matter worthy the looking.'⁶² Again, John Florio, on Hakluyt's behalf, intimated the reader would be rewarded if the texts were read for use and not considered (being 'barraine') for their value as scholarly works of literature. Hakluyt understood the remarkable value of *Principall Navigations* as a fertile store of useful material.

Despite such obvious indications of a specific readership and reading practice drawn from *A Shorte and Briefe Narration*, the paratextual apparatus also suggests the 'early modern book trade recognized the diversity of communities of reading.'⁶³

⁶⁰ *Original Writings*, II, p. 369.

⁶¹ 'Florio's genius was for language and letters rather than science, and on the evidence alike of the cosmographical knowledge displayed, and the propagandist attitude adopted in the Preface to the Reader, it is permissible to infer that the inspiration of this Preface was Hakluyt's.' See *Original Writings*, I, p. 21.

⁶² *Original Writings*, I, p. 164, emphasis added.

⁶³ Kevin Sharpe and Stephen N. Zwicker, 'Introduction: Discovering the Renaissance Reader', p. 8.

Although the manner of its compilation suggests its principal targeted audience were readers deliberating an overseas venture, the contents pages sort narratives into voyages and subsidiary information regarding ‘other necessarie matters of circumstance appertaining to the voyages.’⁶⁴ The subordination of the latter is represented typographically as the narrative titles of the voyages are set in the larger pica body-size and the ‘other necessarie matters’ in the smaller long primer.⁶⁵ Again, it is clear from the arrangement of headings in the contents pages that different groups of readers were anticipated as these pages enable the reader to bypass the subsidiary materials. D. B. Quinn has already observed: ‘His arrangement of his tables of contents shows that he was very conscious that he was attempting to satisfy a dual readership.’⁶⁶ Those curious just to read reports of other countries would also have been very interested in the book. The contents pages extracted the voyages from the additional material and presented them as a fully itemized and impressive list of attempts and successes.

Finally, the index indicated another type of reader, interested in accessing precise information quickly. The entries under the index, which is entitled ‘A Table Alphabeticall, containing a compendious extract, of the principall names and matters comprised in the whole precedent worke: the numbers shewing the pages, where each particularitie is to be founde’ predominantly relates to famous people, rather than places and predicted a different focus for reading, one which would have engaged the contemporary historian. Here John Mandeville, King Richard, Prince Edward, Ivan the Terrible, the Turk, the Sarracen and the Great ‘Can’ were all thoroughly referenced, promoting ready access to all that was strange and new or of historical interest. Descriptions of lands, peoples, armies, fortifications and social structures, although also indexed, were notably subsumed under the names of specific people rather than places. As place represents one of the two principles of organization within the book, indexing predominantly by named person is surprising and designates the constitution of a further community of readers. The index employed its header to explain its value and to instruct

⁶⁴ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *6r.

⁶⁵ See Gaskell on descriptions of body sizes, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, p. 15.

⁶⁶ *Hakluyt Handbook*, II, p. 336.

the reader on its use, illustrating the producers' anticipation of its readers reading in parts.

As noted, however, the principal method of compilation interspersed the voyage narratives with all relevant letters and privileges that related to travel to each region; the first and second parts also included records of relevant diplomatic activity undertaken in support of or alongside a particular voyage, and all other 'necessarie matters of circumstance.' The second part incorporated 'treatises' and 'other observations'; the third lacked the diplomatic negotiations but did include 'relations' and 'other circumstances incident to voyages' to the west.⁶⁷ The precise wording of these headers in the contents pages succinctly represents the degree of various (diplomatic, mercantile, colonizing, joint-stock venturing) and established interests in the different regions overseas. As readers or projectors would have also needed to understand the details of various previous finance initiatives, terms of charters and privileges for future voyages or trade endeavours, it was mandatory to purpose that they were included with the actual voyage.

The first part, to the south and southeast, opens the volume because 'the oldest travels as well of the ancient Britains, as of the English, were ordinarie to Iudea which is in Asia.'⁶⁸ Documents relating to the north and northeast are contained in the second part 'because our accesse to those quarters of the world is later and not so ancient to the former.'⁶⁹ Finally the western (west, southwest and northwest) navigations and 'trauailles' are 'in the third and last roome, for as much as in order and course those coastes, and quarters came last of all to our knowledge and experience.'⁷⁰ Early modern scholars, cartographers, geographers and mariners were all alert to the pervasive problem of geography (as the description of the earth) when compiling travel accounts without providing details of specific locations.⁷¹

⁶⁷ For full details of the headings contained in the contents pages see *Principall Navigations*, sigs. *5v-*8v.

⁶⁸ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *3v.

⁶⁹ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *4r.

⁷⁰ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *4r.

⁷¹ Every nineteen years, the solar and lunar years commenced together, this was also tabled as the (nineteen year luni-solar) Metonic cycle. *A Regiment for the Sea* also has chapters on the longitudinal

As the book runs to over eight hundred pages, my examination of the contents will focus predominantly on the second part (within the tri-partite structure) of *Principall Navigations* to extrapolate targeted readers and their anticipated practices. This part comprises the voyages to the north and northeast and all the additional related materials. Despite K. R. Andrews' observation that there was a striking difference between social groups involved in ventures to the east (predominantly merchant companies and trade) and those to the west (predominantly gentry chasing land acquisition and plantation), the collection of materials gathered in each part includes new geographical data, previous successful entrepreneurial ventures and different cultural encounters and thus, I shall argue, anticipated similar reading strategies.⁷²

Both additional accompanying parts of *Principall Navigations* to the 'South and Southeast' and the 'West, Southwest and Northwest', involved similar compilations and arguably anticipated equivalent use: historical activity (e.g. Macham and Mandeville, amongst many, in the south and southeast, Madoc, son of Owen Gwyneth, and Christopher Columbus in the west); diplomatic, ambassadorial or entrepreneurial negotiations in patents, charters or letters (William Harborne, Edward Osborne, Richard Staper, the Levant Company and Edmund Hogan as Queen's envoy to the King of Fez and Suz in the south and southeast: the patents for Adrian Gilbert to discover the Northwest Passage and those of Humfrey Gilbert and Walter Raleigh for plantation and discovery in the west); several accounts of journeys to the same regions (e.g. William Towerson's three voyages to Guinea in the south and southeast and Humfrey Gilbert, John Davis, John Hawkins, Francis Drake and John White and Richard Grenville for Walter Raleigh to the west); new navigational data (the Magellan Strait, Northwest

mapping of the earth (360 degrees in minutes) in relation to the passage of time, the roundness of the earth and the observation of the sun's 'path'.

⁷² K. R. Andrews admits that whilst useful it is also impossibly reductive. Members of the gentry were often joint-stock holders in merchant companies, and investors in the Company of Cathay and the Northwest Passage Company were also merchants with interests in the Muscovy Company. Further, wealthy sleeping partners have always invested in entrepreneurialism. However, ventures to the north and northeast, south and southeast necessarily entailed trading relationships with societies and their established exchange mechanisms employing specie, manufactured and raw commodities. This inevitably attracted merchant interest for new markets more readily. The lack of similar social systems of exchange in North America rendered potential profits from trading projects less certain and enterprises more complex. See K. R. Andrews, *Trade, Plunder and Settlement*.

Passage ventures undertaken by Frobisher and Davis, the circumnavigations of Drake and Thomas Cavendish); and various eye-witness testimonials (from Anthony Jenkinson in the southeast and Miles Philips or David Ingram in the west) furnishing descriptions of peoples, interaction with rulers, a society's religious activities, methods of defence and modes of exchange, lists of raw and manufactured commodities, coastlines and climates.

The initial successes of the Muscovy (1555) and the Levant (1581) Companies were unusual in a history of frequent failures or disappointments. The bulk of the second part maps the decline of the Muscovy Company and their privileges and records the two failed attempts at the Northeast Passage. Despite securing privileges in Shirvan, Anthony Jenkinson's overland journey to Persia was excessively slow, fraught with all the usual difficulties of personal survival when travelling across great distances and trading with foreign cultures (safe-conduct passes, potential ambushes, loss of merchandize and inhospitable terrain) and complicated by the political instability between the Ottoman Empire, its vassal states and its wars with Persia. It was, nonetheless, attempted and recorded several times, as the capacity for prospective exorbitant profit on silk maintained sufficient allure for the Muscovy Company. The ventures of 1564, 1565, 1568, 1569 and 1579 were frequently frustrated and several Company agents lost their lives. Moreover, by the early 1580s these endeavours had all come to nothing as the Ottomans now controlled Shirvan and the Turkey (latterly the Levant) Company had established access to the same east-west trade via the Mediterranean.

The navigation of the Northeast Passage was attempted by Hugh Willoughby (1553) and Arthur Pet and Charles Jackman (1580).⁷³ Stephen Burrough also acquired vital new geographical information in his exploration of the Vaygach strait and the River Ob (1556-7). These accounts provided invaluable data for any future navigation. Finally, the Company's initial commercial success in Moscow was already in decline by the end of Elizabeth's reign as the Dutch prevailed after Ivan's death (1584). English merchants

⁷³ Henry Hudson also sailed northeast for the Muscovy Company in 1608 and the Dutch East India Company the following year, see K. R. Andrews, *Trade, Plunder and Settlement*, p. 75.

were permitted to take up houses in Khomolgory (Colmogro) and Novgorod exemplifying contemporary recognition that some form of semi-permanent presence (whether in civil or military plantations or in factor outposts) was necessary to enable successful maritime networks with England.

The founding of the first 1553 joint-stock company, so important to an appreciation of contemporary entrepreneurial practice, is also found within this part of the book. The Merchant Adventurers ‘to new lands’ of 1553 (Muscovy Company in 1555) were governed by Sebastian Cabot whose comprehensive instructions for their inaugural voyage represent an extraordinary archive. Sebastian, a veteran, Venetian pilot, had vital prior working experience of the *Casa de la Contratación*. His contributions to English discoveries explicitly represent how cross-border migration precipitated the movement of knowledge and technical skill,⁷⁴ equally manifested by other innovative domestic projects, itinerant journeymen printers and the proliferation of the press. The negotiations between Elizabeth and Ivan, witnessed only in part in letters, and the treatment of their ambassadors, Thomas Randolphe and Jerome Bowes to Russia and Osep Napia and Theodore Pissemsky to England, document experiences through contact with particular societies and their courts and highlight Elizabeth’s repeated need for political circumvention whilst simultaneously attempting the renewal or improvement of trading privileges for the Muscovy Company. The overriding objective to establish a passage to Cathay, whether by sea or overland is also apparent, as are extracts used to demonstrate historical activity in the region.

In his address ‘to the fauourable Reader’, Richard Hakluyt rehearsed his methodology for referencing his sources which suggests he anticipated some readers would approach the material with a ‘goal-orientated’ purpose.⁷⁵ For works of *authority* ‘appertaining to [his] argument’, he registered ‘the particular name and page of booke

⁷⁴ Joan Thirsk also illustrates how the migration of peoples continually aided the development of innovative, domestic projects. See *Economic Policy and Projects: The Development of a Consumer Society in Early Modern England*, see for example pp. 70-71.

⁷⁵ Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton, “‘Studied for action’: How Gabriel Harvey read his Livy”, *Past and Present*, 129 (1990), 30-78 (p. 30).

where it is extant'.⁷⁶ The historic selections in the second part to the north and northeast are represented by those of Geoffrey of Monmouth (Welsh, 12th c. recently newly printed, Heidelberg, 1587) and testimonies extracted from contemporary writers: William Lambard, Gerard Mercator, Richard Eden and John Dee. These extracts were very particularly referenced, either detailing book and chapter headings, or folio and page numbers, signalling that license for English activity in this region needed buttressing rigorously with textual force. The narratives from Geoffrey of Monmouth included Arthur's (c. 517) subjugation of Ireland and his foundation of Orkney and Gotland as tribute states. Malgo's government (of c. 580) was noted for its control of the whole of Britain but also reiterated the tributes of 'Ireland, Island [Iceland], Gotland, Orkney, Norway and Denmarke.' John Dee's narrative recounted King Edgar's (c. 973) annual naval procession (with four thousand ships) around the shores of Britain to maintain that this practice not only enabled domestic security but also confirmed Edgar as the 'true sovereign' of the bounded Albion, the 'lesser isles' and the 'British Ocean'.⁷⁷ The excerpt on Nicholas de Lynna (c. 1360) was extracted from the 'foote of [Mercator's] general Map, upon the description of the North partes' and documented both Nicholas de Lynna's frequent crossing to Iceland from Lynne (King's Lynn) and the trading privileges obtained from Edward III for the fishermen of Blakeney.⁷⁸

Once published, the claims were disseminated more extensively, a process which not only served to justify British, Christian overseas interests (in a manner akin to lifting

⁷⁶ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *3v.

⁷⁷ *Principall Navigations*, sigs. 2A2v-2A3v. The third part, to the west, northwest and southwest, includes potential entitlements to land through. Also see William H. Sherman on Dee's preoccupation with establishing the realm's limits for the purposes of security. *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance* (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 1995), p. 166.

⁷⁸ This inter-textual referencing may signal the instinctive scholarly methods of a culture steeped in humanism, as Hakluyt retrieves ancient sources to inform contemporary practice. However, the works of antiquity in the first part, to the east and southeast, are mainly drawn uncritically from John Bale's recent (d. 1563) *Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytanniae* (Basle, 1557-9) and are in fact very schematically referenced implying either the self-evident nature of the information carried in the reports or perhaps anticipated reader recognition of the source material. For a detailed account of Hakluyt's sources see *Hakluyt Handbook*, II, pp. 341 – 377.

a national flag in situ as a symbolic gesture) but also to summon interested parties.⁷⁹ Furthermore, an argument for the historicity of these claims was simultaneously enabled through enhanced inter-textual referencing which had been facilitated by edition printing. The publication of *Principall Navigations* exploited all the innovative possibilities of the printing press. An assiduous or incredulous reader was invited to follow an explicit and accessible textual trail.

Only comprising about a tenth of the whole, Hakluyt's historical extracts were selected for purposes of policy: not employed for the aggrandizement of national achievement but to inform further action. As sites of negotiation, rather than attested 'facts', the distant historical records in *Principall Navigations* offered the reader relevant material for employment: to construct an argument for the rightful, prudent exercise of trade or occupation in distant shores which could, in turn, be validated through ancient and traceable sources. This would have yielded a certain assurance to those considering future investment. Francis Bacon's analysis of some histories is, therefore, entirely apposite for Hakluyt's 1589 edition,⁸⁰ as these historical extracts were placed 'amongst books of policy [those regarding courses of action]' and represented 'a scattered history of those actions which they have thought worthy of memory, with politic discourse and observation thereupon; not incorporate into the history but separately, and as the more principal in their intention.'⁸¹

The demand for a particular audience's interaction, extension, augmentation and anticipated negotiation of the historical data is also prevalent in the recent travel accounts rendered by 'those men which were the paynefull and personall travellers', signifying empirical documents drawn from *experience*.⁸² These narratives are painstakingly referenced to their authors and patently foreground the need for

⁷⁹ The potential to build a legal argument around rightful possession and legal trading activities was complicated by the papal donations of undiscovered non-Christian territories to Spain and Portugal and the evangelism either presupposed or inscribed in the papal bulls.

⁸⁰ This can be directly contrasted with the second edition in which the additional historical records constitute its increased bulk, signalling a greater appreciation of different market interests and potential uses rendered visible by the publication of the first edition.

⁸¹ 'The Advancement of Learning, Book Two', in *Francis Bacon: The Major Works*, p. 183.

⁸² The term 'authority' is used by Hakluyt, see *Principall Navigations*, sig.*3v.

subsequent essentially oral and discursive practices: practices, which although oblique, are evident in the construction of argument from the records of authority:

And to the ende [...] that every man might answer for himself, iustifie his reports, and stand accountable for his owne doings, I haue referred euery voyage to his Author, which both in person hath performed and in writing hath left the same: for I am not ignorant of Ptolemies assertion, that *Peregrinationis historia*, [...] is that which must bring us to certayne and full discoerie of the world.⁸³

Two points can be observed here: First, that Hakluyt predicted the reader's desire for supplementary investigation of particular authors for each must answer for himself, justify his reports and stand accountable for his own doings. By naming the author Hakluyt enabled networks of communication between readers and authors and the author-eye-witness of a recent relation could now be subjected to a forensic examination that was comparable with courtroom practice and akin to those examinations of returned members of overseas ventures which were undertaken in the *Casa de la Contratación*.⁸⁴ David Turnbull argues that this practice undertaken in the *Casa de la Contratación* was overseen by the Spanish state (despite acknowledging that it was essentially a board of trade). But the dynamic interaction between production and consumption, fostered by *Principall Navigations*, anticipated readers engaging in privately-funded, collaborative venture planning which was ultimately independent of the English monarch or government.⁸⁵ This examination of returning pilots, merchants and sailors depended upon verbal communication beyond the parameters of the text, an irretrievable aspect of a 'verbal' culture. Moreover, the extent of the contemporaneous network of authors (and readers), who could have provided an oral-memorial testimonial of experience, suddenly re-animates the textual record with a vitality that escapes acknowledgement today.⁸⁶

⁸³ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *3v.

⁸⁴ For more details see *Divers voyages touching the discoerie of America*, p. 15.

⁸⁵ David Turnbull, 'Cartography and Science in Early Modern Europe: Mapping the Construction of Knowledge Spaces', p. 7.

⁸⁶ Of the contributors to *Principall Navigations* many of the navigators, merchants and entrepreneurial patrons were still alive at point of the book's publication in 1589. Francis Walsingham (d. 1590), Luke Ward (d. 1590), Richard Grenville (d. 1591), Thomas Cavendish (d. 1592), Edward Osborne (d. 1592), John White (d. 1593), Martin Frobisher (d. 1594), John Hawkins (d. 1595), Francis Drake (d. 1596),

Secondly, by referencing Ptolemy's '*peregrinationis historia*', Hakluyt self-consciously echoed the words and the sentiments contained in the dedicatory epistle written by Richard Willes to the Countess of Warwick and published in his *History of Trauayle in the West and East Indies*. Here, Willes maintains that 'true reports of skilful travellers' (elaborating on Ptolemy's '*peregrinationis historia*') will lead to sufficient knowledge which will eradicate current uncertainty 'in suche controuersies of Geographie.'⁸⁷ Likewise, Hakluyt believed that the 'certayne and full discouerie of the world' was dependent upon the collection, comparison and evaluation of the relations of experience by *readers* (indicated by the pronoun 'us' in Hakluyt's address to his readers), not by authors of the narratives. The experience and its relation understood in isolation, whilst necessary, were not accorded intrinsic authority. Only through the collaboration of communities of readers, in consultation of other narrative accounts of experiences of the same region, was fuller understanding conceived.

Moving from evidence from the discursive material to the organization of the materials in the second part, the aim of establishing consensus can be understood by the inclusion and reiteration of many witnesses narrating accounts to similar locations. In the dedicatory epistle of the third volume of the second edition, Hakluyt expands on his reasons for sorting his narratives, first by place and then time:

I alwayes follow the double order of time and place [when Hakluyt had sufficient stores of material] [...] which [voyages] comming all together, and following orderly one upon another, doe much more lighten the readers

George Turbeville (d. 1597), Laurence Aldersey (d. 1597/8), William Burrough (d. 1598), Abraham Ortelius (d. 1598), Edward Fenton (d. 1603), Ralph Lane (d. 1603), John Davis (d. 1605), George Clifford (Earl of Cumberland, d. 1605), Edward Dyer (d. 1607), George Peckham (d. 1608), Richard Staper (d. 1608), Giles Fletcher (d. 1611), Ralph Fitch (d. 1611), Anthony Jenkinson (d. 1611), Edward Hayes (d. 1613), Jerome Bowes (d. 1616), William Harborne (d. 1617), George Fenner (d. 1618), Walter Raleigh (d. 1618), Thomas Stevens (d. 1619 in Goa), Michael Lok (d. 1620), Jerome Horsey (d. 1626).

⁸⁷ In the dedicatory epistle of Frobisher's voyage to the Countess of Warwick, published in Richard Willes' *The history of trauayle in the West and East Indies, and other countreys lying eyther way, towardes the fruitfull and ryche Moluccaes As Moscouia, Persia, Arabia, Syria, AEgypte, Ethiopia, Guinea, China in Cathayo, and Giapan: vvith a discourse of the Northwest passage. Gathered in parte, and done into Englyshe by Richarde Eden. Newly set in order, augmented, and finished by Richarde VVilles* (London: Richarde Iugge, 1577), sigs. 2H3v-2H4r.

understanding, and confirme his judgement, then if they had bene scattered in sundry corners of the worke.⁸⁸

The second part to the north and northeast comprises details of the different embassies of Sir Thomas Randolphe, Jerome Bowes and Giles Fletcher and diplomatic envoys undertaken by Anthony Jenkinson and Jerome Horsey to Moscow. It includes Richard Chancellor's first contact with Ivan IV and Ivan's letters to Edward VI (who had died before Chancellor's return from the inaugural voyage) to permit trade and establish amity, a development of these initial privileges, their subsequent loss, attempts at their reconstitution, and notes on the habitual taxes levied on those without privilege. Diplomatic negotiations between Anthony Jenkinson and Abdullah Khan and the journeys of Thomas Alcock, Richard Cheinie and George Wrenne (1563-4), Arthur Edwards, Alexender Kitchen and Richard Johnson (1565), Thomas Southam and John Sparke (1565), Arthur Edwards, John Sparke, Laurence Chapman, Christopher Faucet (1568), Thomas Bannister and Geoffrey Ducket (1569) are also included. The account of the 1579 venture to Persia is represented by a narrative by Christopher Burrough and the instructions drawn up by the lawyer Richard Hakluyt to Master Hubblethorne, a dyer, who was sent at the charges of the city to Persia (1579) 'to returne home with more knowledge , then [he] carried out' specifically in the techniques of dying. Hubblethorne was asked to dispatch 'by eache returne' any new information he came upon daily and had set down in writing.⁸⁹ Additional information about coins, weights and measures are recorded in John Hasse's 1554 account and supplemented by George Killingworth.

As the bulk of the 1589 edition of *Principall Navigations* represents a very recent history, Barbara Shapiro would argue it represented, to its contemporary audience, the greatest opportunity to provide the best record of events:

⁸⁸ *Original Writings*, II, p. 471.

⁸⁹ *Principall Navigations*, sig. 2S4v.

Most historians not only emphasized first hand witnessing in establishing historical “matters of fact” but, following classical historiography, continued to insist that the best history was written by participant observers.⁹⁰

The historical record’s reliability would be further advanced by the credit-worthiness of the mediating witness (through social position or political expertise) and by an analytical narrative of cause.⁹¹ *Principall Navigations* (1589), however, neither weighted the narratives by social status nor expertise, ordering strictly by chronology and geography, nor attempted any critical analysis of its data. Undoubtedly, its particular format does not characterize either models of early modern narrative history outlined by Barbara J. Shapiro:

Historians, however, were of two minds as to whether they should simply provide a narrative of the facts, based on the testimony of credible witness or documentary evidence, or whether they should also consider the causes and explanations for the events they narrated. Many preferred what they called “bare narration,” leaving the “judicious reader” to form his own opinion or interpretation, a practice adopted by many naturalists.⁹²

Whilst Hakluyt’s approach initially seems to be described in the former model, leaving the judicious reader to form his own interpretation, he did not provide a simple ‘*narrative of the facts*’ but collected within his compendium of works an abundance of both consistent and contradictory reports.

Shapiro’s evaluation of the correlation between early modern courtroom practice and the pursuit of knowledge of the unknown world, particularly her examination of the methods used by jurors in determining an approximation of the ‘facts’ (from *factum*—deed / action), can perhaps be applied here.⁹³ In 1620, Sir Mathew Hale, a distinguished judge, advised, ‘[w]hen evidences “concur and concenter in the evidence of the same thing, their very multiplicity and consent make the evidence the stronger, as the

⁹⁰ Barbara J. Shapiro, *A Culture of Fact: England 1550-1720* (London: Cornell University Press, 2000), p. 47.

⁹¹ Barbara J. Shapiro, ‘The Concept “Fact”: Legal Origins and Cultural Diffusion’, *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 26 (1994), 1-25 (p. 10).

⁹² Barbara J. Shapiro, ‘The Concept “Fact”: Legal Origins and Cultural Diffusion’, p. 10.

⁹³ Barbara J. Shapiro, *A Culture of Fact: England 1550-1720*, see chapter 3, ‘Discourse of Fact: Chorography, Description and Travel Reporting’, pp. 63-85.

concurrent testimonies of many Witnesses or many Circumstances even by their multiplicity and concurrence make an evidence more concludent.”⁹⁴ The reader of *Principall Navigations*, faced with shifting or varied testimonials, charters, privileges and navigations would construct an approximation of actual experience ‘*factum*’ in a manner akin to a seemingly impartial judge.

The parallels between courtroom practice and eye-witness accounts can explain this complex layering of textual information. In supplying various records of comparable testimonials, Hakluyt would have provided the reader with a rich array of material from which to seek concord making the establishment of matters of fact ‘more concludent’. It would be more appropriate, therefore, to view *Principall Navigations* as a tool, intended to aid the approximation of veritable experiences and assist the planning of future action. As the producers hoped for future action, the reader would have inevitably required the additional information to formulate a coherent financial strategy to attract investors through actual or potential trading privileges (in charters from Queen Elizabeth), patents for discovery, grants of new land, privileges in foreign markets from foreign rulers and opportunities for plunder. Histories of travel were (and are) read by different readers in infinite ways, but I suggest, as Walsingham oversaw the project, one of its principal purposes was to engage the communities of readers who were contemplating investment or participation in specific future ventures overseas.

In the absence of eye-witness testimonials, *Principall Navigations* also provided information drawn from literature and expert opinion. Included in the second part to the north and northeast, expert opinions were drawn from Gerard Mercator, the renowned cartographer, and John Dee, the polymath. Mercator drew on ‘Plinie, but also other writers’ and Dee, without direct citation, on Abulfeda Ismael.⁹⁵ Lacking empirical observation of the coast past Tabin, John Dee’s counsel to Arthur Pet and Charles Jackman to seek out Tabin (now Chelyuskin) and then to follow a course that would (most probably) ‘runne much Southerly and Eastward, in which you are like either to fall

⁹⁴ Barbara J. Shapiro, ‘The Concept “Fact”’: Legal Origins and Cultural Diffusion’, p. 6.

⁹⁵ William H. Sherman, *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance*, p. 178.

into the mouth of the famous river Oecharde, or some other, which yet I coniecture to pass by the renowned city of Cambalu' rested upon an erroneous assumption that Tabin was in the same latitudes (70°) as the passable strait below Vaygach Island.⁹⁶ This advice was directly countered by Gerard Mercator, some twenty five pages later, who argued the 'mightie promontorie' of Tabin, the hazards of the alterations of the compass in proximity to the magnetic pole, the perilous rocks and the icy sea, make the journey too hazardous.⁹⁷ Far better for them 'to picke and choose out some conuenient porte and Harborough for the English merchaunts, from whence afterward and with more opportunitie and lesse peril the promontorie of Tabin and all the coast of Cathaio may be discouered.'⁹⁸ The collation of contradictory material offered a range of possibilities for future ventures.

In summary of the first part, I have noted that *Principall Navigations* was published in folio, was robust, transportable and relatively expensive but did not contain illustrations of peoples, fauna or flora which would have increased its production costs. Its publishers recognized its importance for a community of readers beyond the borders of England (although this audience may have been limited to the Netherlands). As all foreign materials in *Principall Navigations* were translated, the producers also anticipated a predominantly English readership who were neither university educated nor linguists. The decision to have undertaken the work in the vernacular would have limited its international audience but increased its market interest at home. However, individual stationers, diplomats, scholars, travellers and merchants could have sought out the book either, perhaps, at the continental book fairs or in England. As the voyage narratives within the book are interspersed with the other relevant material, the principal reader would have wanted this information to be presented simultaneously. The pages are presented with running-titles which include details of particular accounts and decorative letters help the reader to locate material easily. The contents pages denote a dual readership as they enable the reader to bypass the additional matter. The index

⁹⁶ *Principall Navigations*, sig. 2T1r.

⁹⁷ *Principall Navigations*, sig. 2X1v.

⁹⁸ *Principall Navigations*, sig. 2X1v.

focuses, in the main, on famous people and place names and therefore anticipates a reader with an interest in history. As the material in the body of the work brings together narratives of experiences to similar locations, it suggests a reader would be drawn into their comparison and would be called upon to make certain value judgements between their accounts. From Hakluyt's own testimonies, it is clear that he was interested in both preserving the documents for posterity and to inspire his readers into taking a worthy part in history.

Principall Navigations and the influences of the socio-historical conditions of production and 'verbal' literacy on contemporary readings

In their introduction to *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England*, Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker called for a new history of reading: 'rather than a simple story of constitution and reception, our new history of reading stresses continuous transactions between producers and consumers, negotiations among a myriad of authors, texts and readers.'⁹⁹ In this final part, I shall examine the 'persistive interaction' between oral and literate cultures, or the conditions of a 'verbal' culture, which would have helped shape contemporary understanding of the text.¹⁰⁰ This will access extant evidence of *Principall Navigations* being used in oral forums and then will focus on the historical evidence of 'active' reading practices to discuss how this might enhance an understanding of Hakluyt's role as a learned facilitator in projects of exploration. Finally, I will argue that the nature of oratorical composition, as taught at university, will enhance our understanding of Hakluyt's work. His role as a gatherer of materials for re-use positions his work in a larger collaborative process that integrates

⁹⁹ Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker, 'Introduction: Discovering the Renaissance Reader,' in *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England*, p. 3.

¹⁰⁰ David Buchan coined the term verbal culture to heed the influence of literature in a semi-literate culture through word of mouth traditions, quoted by David Hall, in *Cultures of Print: Essays in the History of the Book* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996), p. 46 and D. F. McKenzie, 'The Sociology of a Text: Orality, Literacy and Print in Early New Zealand', in *The Book History Reader* (see Darnton, above), p. 205.

authors, gatherers and readers into a continuum. It also further destabilizes modern notions of authorship and Hakluyt's creative role in relation to the book as published.

In *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order, 1450-1830*, David McKitterick argues that a distinction between printed and manuscript books did not appear in library catalogues until the late seventeenth century. In citing the constant recourse to manuscript additions in the processes of early modern print production (e.g. indices, pagination, tables, rubrication and the 'making good of incomplete editions' were all commonly undertaken by hand), McKitterick argues the relationship between print and manuscript books demands a reassessment.¹⁰¹ In foregrounding the centrality of handwritten elements to the printed text, McKitterick renders any attempt to separate the early printed from the manuscript product problematic. Whether undertaken generally throughout an edition, or to customer specification or, as was often the case, anticipated but left unfinished, manuscript constituted an integral part of the process of production. Significantly, McKitterick establishes how the dependence upon manuscript in early modern production is seamlessly transmitted on to that of consumption:

[T]he reader was required to remain a part of the *physical* — not just the mental — continuum between author, reader, interpretation and understanding. From the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, readers were requested by authors, stationers and printers alike to amend with the pen what had been set and printed in type.¹⁰²

The emergence of printed errata lists called upon the reader to improve the text by hand after purchase. In addition, the prefatory material also frequently appealed to the reader to act as corrector, prompting a heightened consciousness of the reader as participant in the ongoing process of production.¹⁰³ Ann Blair acknowledges that these 'practices of correction,' are entirely apposite to a culture steeped in the humanist tradition: '[e]ven before the invention of printing, humanist scholars laboured toward their goal of

¹⁰¹ *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order, 1450-1830*, p. 102.

¹⁰² *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order, 1450-1830*, p. 133, emphasis added.

¹⁰³ For particular examples of this practice, see Ann Blair, 'Errata Lists and the Reader as Corrector', Seth Lerer, 'Errata: Print, Politics and Poetry', in *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England* (see Sharpe and Zwicker, above), pp. 41-71, and David McKitterick, *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order, 1450-1830*.

restoring ancient texts corrupted in transmission to their original purity.’¹⁰⁴ Indeed, Hakluyt confirmed his own scholarly engagement with the Mandeville text, ‘purging’ it from ‘the countless errors of copyists and printers’ through the collation and conflation of the ‘best copies’.¹⁰⁵ In Blair’s estimation, the correction is ‘the most common kind of annotation left by early modern readers’ and compositors, correctors, proof-readers, authors and the reading public all contributed corrections throughout the print process, introducing possibilities for new constructions of meaning at every stage.¹⁰⁶ Ironically, the humanist endeavour to produce purer texts was always self-consciously aware of its potential to transmit new corruptions in production.¹⁰⁷ Paul Saenger argues that the instability of textual transmission encouraged the reader to undertake the ‘role of textual clarifier’ in a manner which is largely forgotten today.¹⁰⁸ Whilst Saenger’s concept of the ‘passive’ modern reader appears too strong (can reading ever really be passive?), when the reader as corrector is added to the historical practice of commonplacing, i.e. extracting useful material and re-ordering it in personal notebooks for re-use, it can be argued that reading practices have altered perceptibly and that the social conditions of publication and education have conditioned such changes. Bruno Latour has assessed how certain procedures around scientific publications have encouraged the reader more readily to accept published material. Amongst other means, he cites the publication of new research in specialist journals and the peer review process.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁴ Ann Blair, ‘Errata Lists and the Reader as Corrector’, p. 24.

¹⁰⁵ Richard Hakluyt, *Principall Navigations*, ‘*ab innumeris Scribarum et Typographorum mendis repurgando, ex multorum, eorumque optimorum exemplarium collatione*’, as in *Principall Navigations*, sig. G3r. The translation is from E. G. R. Taylor in *Original Writings*, II, p. 395.

¹⁰⁶ Ann Blair, ‘Errata Lists and the Reader as Corrector’, p. 36.

¹⁰⁷ The idea that a ‘pure’ text was / is possible is contentious and Blair later argues that humanist scholars were also aware that in striving for a purer text, they would introduce corruption, whether it stemmed from printing house practice or authorial error. In this way, these scholars acknowledged purity as an objective rather than an achievement. Ann Blair, ‘Errata Lists and the Reader as Corrector’, p. 24.

¹⁰⁸ Paul Saenger, ‘The Impact of the Early Printed Page on the History of Reading’, *Bulletin du Bibliophile*, 2 (1996), 237-301 (p. 133).

¹⁰⁹ Bruno Latour also deconstructs the strategies employed by scientific argument to overwhelm or silence dissident voices: e.g. positive and negative modalities (in the representation of data), the historic use of data and the referencing (often dubiously) of previous experts to buttress argument, overwhelming the reader with technical detail, instruments and figures. See *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1987), chapter 1, ‘Literature’, pp. 21 – 62.

Hakluyt's *Principall Navigations*, however, anticipated immediate development and improvement on publication because of the nature of the material it published. As travellers continued to bring new information to England, Hakluyt and John Pory (from c. 1593) continued to gather materials, indicating the ongoing nature of the initial task. All projector-readers would have had to have complemented their initial reading of *Principall Navigations* with the most recent accounts which were often conveyed by oral-memory exclusively. Adam Fox has shown:

The [Royal] Exchange was the great entrepôt where factors and merchants met from around the country and over the seas. In addition to trade, it was said, 'they all desire newes' [...] This oral communication was the quickest and often the best or only available source of news; in lieu of other more reliable media, 'the means only lefte is to wayte at Powles or the Exchange for some communication of some ould acquayntance.'¹¹⁰

In a culture in which textual transmission was uncertain, accounts from abroad varied and the knowledge of distant lands remained unsettled, gaining relevant understanding from reading around the matter indicated a stage in a much larger process. Clearly, the preparation for a voyage of discovery would depend upon the consultation with various experts, factors and merchants. I am suggesting, however, that Hakluyt's book was an integral part of this process. The cross over between Hakluyt's published materials and his work can be demonstrated by his employment as historiographer for the East India Company and for Jacob Valke on the Barents venture. In 1594, Hakluyt's specialist knowledge of the Northwest Passage was offered for a fee to Jacob Valcke through correspondence with Emanuel van Meteren. Van Meteren writes to Valcke:

[Hakluyt] demands at least 20 marks sterling, which is about 140 gulden. Your worship will consider whether it is worth so much, I believe that there is no man living more eager in searching out the manner of voyages or who can say more about it. He is also a scholar and has been Chaplain to Stafford when he was the Queen's Ambassador at Paris in France. He is the most skilled man in research that I have ever known, and I have known him full twenty years.¹¹¹

¹¹⁰ Adam Fox, *Oral and Literate Culture 1500-1700*, pp. 346-347. The quotation is taken from John Smith, *Advertisements for the Unexperienced Planters of New England* (London, 1631), sig. A2.

¹¹¹ *Original Writings*, II, p. 417.

Despite the fee, Quinn has shown that Hakluyt was employed for his expertise in relation to the Barents venture.¹¹²

On 29 January 1601, the East India papers records:

Mr. Hakluyt, the historiographer of the East Indies, being here before the committees, and having read unto them out of his notes and books divers instructions on the provision of jewels was required to set down in writing a note of the principal places in the East Indies where trade, to the end the same may be used for the better instruction of our factors in the said voyage.¹¹³

In his dedication to the Virginia Company, on the publication of *Virginia richly valued*, Hakluyt stated that the book ‘doth yeeld much light to our enterprise now on foot.’¹¹⁴ In 1603, the ‘chiefest merchants of Bristol’ were induced by Richard Hakluyt to set forth a voyage to Virginia only after ‘divers meeting and due consultation.’¹¹⁵ Furthermore, Hakluyt’s book was also taken on voyages and used in determining the course of navigation. *Principall Navigations*’ use can be determined through various inter-textual witnesses. This account, extracted from William Keeling’s journal, recorded the East India Company venture for the East Indies in 1607. This was re-printed in Samuel Purchas (1625):

Aprill the first 1607. the *Dragon* and *Hector* were fallen as low as the Downes: and after their departure from thence their hopes were by diuers disasters so fallen downe, and crossed, that after they had passed the Line in the beginning of Iune, piercing foure or fiue degree of Southerly Latitude, they were inforced by Gusts, Calmes, Raines, Sickneses, and other Marine inconueniences to returne North-ward: and missing the Ile of *Fernando de Loronha*, certaine of nothing but vncertainties which much amazed them, The Generall on Iuly the thirtieth, hauing consulted with *Tauerner* the Master, and hearing his answeare that they must bee driuen to returne for *England*, the whole Company expecting no other (all which to recite would at once both becalme

¹¹² For Hakluyt’s involvement in the Barents venture see *Hakluyt Handbook*, I, p. 307.

¹¹³ ‘East Indies: January 1601’, Calendar of State Papers Colonial, East Indies, China and Japan, Volume 2: 1513-1616 (1864), pp. 118-121 <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=68633>> [accessed, 9 August 2012].

¹¹⁴ *Virginia richly valued* [...] Written by a Portugall gentleman of Eluas, employed in all the action, and translated out of Portuguese by Richard Hackluyt (London: Felix Kyngston, 1609), sig. A2r.

¹¹⁵ *Original Writings*, II, p. 486.

and bestorme the Reader) they consulted for their best course, wherein (you shall haue it in his owne words) we had some speech of *Sierra Leona*. I, hauing formerly read well of the place, sent for the Booke and shewed it my Master, who as my selfe, tooke good liking to the place. Wherevpon, my Company beginning to bee grieuously diseased, wee, without hope to get *Fernando de Loranha*, (water being our speciall want, and a watering place so nigh) I called a counsell: and after Dinner propounded what was fittest for vs to doe.¹¹⁶

A note in the margins adds clarification for Purchas' audience: 'M. *Hackluits* books of Voyages are of great profit. This saued the Company, as Sir *Th. Smith* affirmed to me, 20000. pounds.'¹¹⁷ Here, the book was on hand, on board ship, ready for use for contingency planning. These instances demonstrate that Hakluyt's books were used in a wider scheme of project planning.

On aural readers, Adam Fox states: '[i]n the sixteenth century, particularly, prose style had a very 'oral' quality, a high degree of colloquialism and formularity, which facilitated its spoken delivery.' Ong's work *Orality and Literacy* also analyses the period's 'residual' traditions of an essentially oral culture that play a necessary part in the reconfiguration of reading practices. Once alert to the residual orality or the 'reluctance or inability to dissociate the written medium from the spoken,'¹¹⁸ examples are ubiquitous: John White's letter to Hakluyt was written for the 'delicate eare';¹¹⁹ Hakluyt's own address to his reader interjected occasional conversational phrases to evoke the dialogic nature of a text that 'speake[s] trueth' and 'speakes thus much in a few words', he 'craves patience' of his audience and in his epistle dedicatorie '[he] humbly takes [his] leaue' designating Hakluyt's faith in his writing efficiently to conjure a sense of his voice but also his address to an aural reader. Finally, he described how his

¹¹⁶ Samuel Purchas, *Purchas: His Pilgrimes*, 5 vols (London: William Stansby for Henrie Fetherstone, 1613-1626), I, iii, p. 188. William Walker in the dedicatory epistle to Thomas Smith points out that 'Captaines, Masters, and Factors' be better directed by this work in order to 'enjoy seuerall kindes of Marchandize' and that 'the *Hollanders* (who borrowed a great part of their light from vs', have used the voyages of Thomas Cavendish, Francis Drake, Ralph Fitch and Thomas Stevens which were to be found in 'M. *Hakluyts* English Voyages', in the same manner. *The Iovrnall, or Dayly Register, Contayning a trve manifestation, and Historicall declaration of the voyage [...] of Iacob Corneliszen Neck* (London: Cuthbert Burby & Iohn Flasket, 1601), sig. ¶1v.

¹¹⁷ *Purchas: His Pilgrimes*, I, iii, p. 188.

¹¹⁸ Walter J. Ong, 'Oral Residue in Tudor Prose Style', *PMLA*, 80 (1965), 145-154 (p. 146).

¹¹⁹ 'Letter from John White to Richard Hakluyt, 1593', *Original Writings*, II, p. 415.

narrative material was sorted into ‘roomes’, a mnemonic device that maps cognitive activity to visual stimuli to aid recall when speaking from memory.¹²⁰ These instances all demonstrate the proximity of books and papers to the spoken word and a sense of the aural reader.

The place of oratory in university and public life would also have influenced scholarly reading practices. Cultivated at university, oratory demanded the presentation of a discourse in dialectical or rhetorical oral forums.¹²¹ University life prepared its scholars for public roles or civic duties, encouraged excellent public speaking skills and an on hand command of specific knowledge (for the law courts, for government ministers, for civic post-holders, for church positions) to be effectively deployed appropriately. In the prefatory materials, Hakluyt records the publication of the fruits of his learning (acquired through reading) by lecture (c. 1577) but it is notable that he never published his teachings in writing, exploiting the medium of print to translate and publish the works of others:

I fell to my intended course, and by degrees read ouer whatsoever printed or written discoueries and voyages I found extant either in the Greeke, Latine, Italian, Spanish, Portugall, French, or English languages, and in my publike lectures was the first, that produced and shewed both the olde imperfectly composed, and the newe lately reformed Mappes, Globes, Spheares, and other instruments of this Art for demonstration in the common schooles, to the singular pleasure and general contentment of my auditory.¹²²

The transmission of new knowledge was conveyed through oral networks of unwritten transactions: from the public lecture to the common school room.¹²³

Oral transmissions of information within the most powerful echelons of Elizabethan society were more likely to have been committed to writing as exemplary demonstrations of an argument fit for the royal ear. Hakluyt’s personal *oeuvre* records the details of two different consultations with the Queen. The primary intended medium

¹²⁰ *Principall Navigations*, sigs. *3v, *4v, *4v, *3r respectively.

¹²¹ Walter J. Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (London: Methuen, 1982; repr. Routledge, 2010), p. 117.

¹²² *Principall Navigations*, sig. *2r.

¹²³ It is unclear and still subject to debate as to whether these lectures were held under the auspices of the university.

for the publication of the Hakluyt's 'A discourse of western planting' was oral-aural, as it was delivered in an 'audience' with Elizabeth in October 1584.¹²⁴ Its principal purpose was to attract financial investment from the Crown, but the manuscript of twenty one heads (which are expanded in detail in chapters that consider all the benefits England will reap from plantation), provided valuable information about colonization for other interested readers. In 1565, Humfrey Gilbert and Anthony Jenkinson were invited to dispute, in Elizabeth's hearing, the likelihood of success in discovering a Northwest or a Northeast Passage respectively.¹²⁵ The 'proof' Gilbert employed in his 'discourse' to persuade his audience of the existence of the Northwest Passage is recorded in *Principall Navigations*, but was first printed in 1576 and originally published in manuscript, just after the disputation, in 1566.¹²⁶ Here Gilbert constructs his argument under ten chapter headings and exercises proofs drawn from authority, reason, experience and circumstance.¹²⁷

The construction of arguments used in disputation, however, developed a heightened awareness and dependence upon the dialogic exchange anterior to the formulation of opinion or understanding and the importance of potential variations in the processes of interpretation. Walter J. Ong argues:

[T]he object of education was to get [students] to take a stand, as an orator might, and defend it or attack the stand of others. Everyone is now aware of the partisanship encouraged by dialectic, the art of formal debate, but even scholars fail to observe that it was encouraged even more by addiction, real or fictional, to oratory. In either case, the partisanship was thought of as functioning in an oral setting: debate or persuasion was felt as an oral-aural undertaking. Over all the teaching of expression, even though writing was much employed, there hung a feeling that what was being taught was an oral rather than a written mode.¹²⁸

¹²⁴ *Original Writings*, I, p. 34.

¹²⁵ K. R. Andrews, *Trade Plunder and Settlement: Maritime Enterprise and the Genesis of British Empire, 1480-1630*, p. 71.

¹²⁶ See *Hakluyt Handbook*, II, p. 373 and Introduction to *Principall Navigations* (1965), I, p. xxx.

¹²⁷ *Principall Navigations*, sigs. 3H4v-3I5r.

¹²⁸ Walter J. Ong, 'Oral Residue in Tudor Prose Style', p. 147. Ong also argues that even the letter writing manuals of the sixteenth century 'prescribed, in accordance with medieval *Artes Dictaminis*, that letters themselves should be organized in the same fashion as orations, proceeding from exordium, through

The works of Anthony Grafton, Lisa Jardine, Lorna Hutson and William H. Sherman illustrate how a sharp appreciation of the potential for varied interpretation encouraged the employment of readers in large households. Reading relationships, formed by a desire to read with someone as guide, facilitator or additional interpreter, were, however, socio-economic relationships, derived from and embedded in the patronage system. For the suitably qualified, reading could be an economically productive exercise. 'In the Tudor and Stuart period both books and people were pictured as animated compendious collections of useful textual knowledge.'¹²⁹ Drawing upon William H. Sherman's description of Dee, Hakluyt's accumulation of maritime ventures rendered him 'a living library'.¹³⁰

Whilst Lorna Hutson's article, 'Fortunate Travelers: Reading for the Plot in Sixteenth-Century England', contextualizes an Elizabethan sense of 'plot', her work is helpful because it supports the hypothesis that readers read 'competing interpretations of the same set of narrative circumstances' in order to devise plats or plans for 'conceptual schemes for the better organization of means and resources'.¹³¹ Additionally, the introduction of means and resources not only delineates the significance of entrepreneurialism in reading for project planning but also alerts us to the entrepreneurial opportunities the traditional practices of shared reading furnished the university scholar.

That socio-economic bonds of patronage were manifested in *reading* relationships has already been observed in Francis Walsingham's patronage of Hakluyt. In gathering together all relevant materials hitherto dispersed in *Principall Navigations*, Hakluyt had undertaken the initial work of the scholar-facilitator for a powerful patron with a specific targeted audience in mind. Further examples drawn from Hakluyt's own work indicate his remuneration for gathering and putting works to print, exploiting the capacity for

statement of proposition to be proved, proof and refutation of adversaries, to a peroration or conclusion', p. 147.

¹²⁹ William H. Sherman, *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance*, p. 62.

¹³⁰ William H. Sherman, *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance*, p. 62.

¹³¹ Lorna Hutson, 'Fortunate Travelers: Reading for the Plot in Sixteenth-Century England', *Representations*, 41 (1993), 83-103 (p. 87).

material benefit intrinsic to the professional ‘reader’, once renowned as a ‘living library’ who would charge for this expertise.¹³² In 1586, Hakluyt roundly reminded Walter Raleigh of the costs and labour expended preparing and publishing Peter Martyr’s *Decades*. The bald coupling within the sentence of both the ‘acceptation of [the] dedication’ and the costing for the work entailed in compiling the book belies the ornate, mainly veiled language encountered in dedicatory epistles: ‘I heare nothing from yo^w of the acceptance of my dedication of that noble historie of the eight decades of Peter Martyr, wh^{ch} wil cost mee fortie french crownes, and five monethes travayle.’¹³³

Less well-acclaimed scholars at the university could also capitalize from the wealthy patron’s desire for communal reading. Extracts from Francis Bacon illustrate that reading alone or with ‘a good general scholar’ was considered a means to knowledge acquisition through *study*:

To help you conceive, you may do well in those things which you are to read to draw yourself [withdraw from society] to read with somebody that may give you help, and to that end you must either carry over [in travelling abroad] with you some good general scholar, or make some abode in the universities abroad, where you may hear the professors in every art.¹³⁴

The importance of the scholar-facilitator to noblemen and the role they played in purposeful reading is examined by Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton in “‘Studied for action’: How Gabriel Harvey read his Livy.”¹³⁵ Through the interrogation of Gabriel Harvey’s brief period of employment as secretary to Robert Dudley, Jardine and Grafton are not only able to argue that political reading was a particular practice (reading to apply authoritative writings from antiquity to contemporary situations), but also that there were opportunities for employment within noble households for university scholars as ‘reader’, or facilitator to aid interpretation of problematic texts:

[T]here was a specific category of employee in a noble household such as Essex’s: the scholar, retained to ‘read’ with his employer and his employer’s

¹³² William H. Sherman, *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance*, p. 63.

¹³³ *Original Writings*, II, p. 355.

¹³⁴ ‘Advice to the Earl of Rutland’, in *Francis Bacon: The Major Works*, p. 72

¹³⁵ Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton, “‘Studied for action’: How Gabriel Harvey read his Livy’.

associates. And there is a strong suggestion that this reading is politically aware, that it serves a political purpose of which the scholar / secretary is apprised, and in which he is actively involved ('hee redd Aristotles polyticks to hym wth sutch expositions as, I doubt, did hym [Southampton] but lyttle good').¹³⁶

Gabriel Harvey, a 'fellow of first Pembroke [...] and then Trinity Hall' who also 'occupied a number of university posts',¹³⁷ was employed as just such a scholar-reader in Leicester's household in 1580 and read with Philip Sidney before Sidney's embassy to Rudolf II in 1577. Grafton and Jardine also record the influence of Henry Cuffe, the 'one-time professor of Greek at Oxford' and secretary in the Earl of Essex's household,¹³⁸ citing an extract from the letter written in 1601 by Sir Thomas Arundel to Sir Robert Cecil, in which Cuffe the 'purytane skoller' and 'one of [Essex's] whottest heades' was engaged to read first with Henry Wriothsley ('my lo of Southampton') and later with the Earl of Rutland. Arundel deemed Cuffe culpable of incitement to mutinous action through his inflammatory readings and Cuffe was later hanged for his part in the abortive rebellion. Reading and action were deemed inseparable as 'Renaissance readers (and annotators) [reading politically] persistently envisage action as an *outcome* of reading.'¹³⁹ This understanding of reading, as an active and participatory process, further alerts us to the contiguities between books and action.

Francis Bacon wrote to Fulke Greville (c. 1599) in response to a request for guidance on how best to employ both a particular scholar with whom he could read 'and some two or three others to remain in the University and gather for [him]'.¹⁴⁰ This letter is significant because Bacon set out the distinction between the gathering processes when amassing materials (fundamental to oratorical invention in speech and argument) and commonplacing activities as the by-products of reading. The distinction is vital as I suggest that Hakluyt would have understood his function principally in terms of a

¹³⁶ Jardine and Grafton, "'Studied for action': How Gabriel Harvey read his Livy", p. 34.

¹³⁷ Jardine and Grafton, "'Studied for action': How Gabriel Harvey read his Livy", p. 35.

¹³⁸ Jardine and Grafton, "'Studied for action': How Gabriel Harvey read his Livy", p. 33.

¹³⁹ Jardine and Grafton, "'Studied for action': How Gabriel Harvey read his Livy", p. 40.

¹⁴⁰ 'Advice to Fulke Greville', in *Francis Bacon: The Major Works*, p. 102. This appears, from the introductory paragraphs, to be exactly the same letter that William H. Sherman transcribed and Grafton and Jardine employ in "'Studied for action': How Gabriel Harvey read his Livy' and is held at the Bodleian (Tanner MSS 79, fols 29r-30v). Jardine and Grafton attribute it to the Earl of Essex.

gatherer. He was employed in the essential, laborious and time-consuming activities of material accumulation and its useful organization for the publication of *Principall Navigations*. The processes of publication, however, in folio format could not have been conceived as a project by Hakluyt alone. Furthermore, Hakluyt was alert to the dangers of both reading for (i.e. digesting the amassed materials) and excerpting extracts in the place of his readers. His decision to include complete narratives of empirical reports, carefully attributing them to their individual authors, rather than digesting the matter demonstrates anticipated reading practice.

In response to Fulke Greville, Bacon warned of the limited use in employing gatherers for note-taking. Political or military references would, in Bacon's view, be the most useful to Greville but a gatherer, without any understanding of the purpose of his note taking (i.e. of the goal to which the reading was orientated), would be of limited profit:

Therefore, to speak plainly of the gathering of heads and common places I think, first, that in general one man's notes will little profit another, because one man's conceit [thought-processes] doth so much differ from another's; and also because the bare note itself is nothing more than the suggestion [prompt] it gives the reader. Next, I think no profit is gotten by his notes that is not judicious in that whereof he makes his notes. [...] I do confess I would gather the chiefest things out of the chiefest books yourself; and to use your other collectors in gathering arguments and examples to prove or illustrate any particular position or question. For they should, like labourers, bring stone, timber, mortar and other necessities to your building. But you should put them together, and be the master-workman yourself.¹⁴¹

Therefore, I propose that Hakluyt, despite organising his material under *loci communes*, would not have considered *Principall Navigations* to be a gigantic commonplace book, as previously suggested by Anthony Payne,¹⁴² as the methods of its compilation demand further analysis. The subtle differences between gathering processes anterior to the recording of commonplaces and the purpose of the commonplace book help explain the undigested bulk of *Principall Navigations*. The

¹⁴¹ 'Advice to Fulke Greville', in *Francis Bacon: The Major Works*, p. 105.

¹⁴² Anthony Payne, *Richard Hakluyt and his Books*, p. 10.

commonplace book was an *aide-mémoire*, a depository of records to stimulate cognitive activity by setting the power of memory in motion. The records extracted into commonplace books only provided ‘suggestions’ of the reading that had gone before and despite its personal value as a tool to aid memory retrieval, it would have had, as Bacon suggested, a very limited purpose if the collection of precepts had been constructed by another. The vapid reconstruction ‘in a flowering easy style’ of words without matter, when divorced from initial processes of reading itself, was precisely what Bacon deplored about the contemporary fashion of commonplacing for ornament alone.¹⁴³ Although Ann Blair suggests the commonplace book encompassed all aspects of invention, it was primarily a tool for retrieving information from the memory not for acquiring a depth of knowledge which could only be gained from anterior reading processes:

The commonplace book thus encompassed all the aspects of *inventio*, or the gathering of material for an argument, and became the *crucial tool for storing and retrieving* the increasingly unwieldy quantity of textual and personal knowledge that guaranteed copiousness in speech and writing.¹⁴⁴

When used for memory retrieval, it was a powerful tool. Conversely, without prior reading activity, it became a weightless list of ornamental phrases of little practical use.

Undoubtedly, Hakluyt’s description of the compilation of *Principall Navigations*, inhabiting discrete rooms, demonstrates Hakluyt’s persistent reliance on the oral-aural in reformulating writing. Mnemonic strategies exploited for memory retrieval and imperative to oral culture informed the compilation of his abundant material. Hakluyt acknowledged that his principal endeavour, and his main contributory role in this project, was to help bring these ‘rawe fruits vnto ripenesse’ and to prepare the texts for print-production and wider use by ‘reducing these loose papers into this order.’¹⁴⁵ This, as I have argued, was an enormous achievement. However, whilst his conception of order and use was inherently informed by commonplacing activities, divorcing ancient

¹⁴³ ‘Advice to Fulke Greville’, in *Francis Bacon: The Major Works*, p. 105.

¹⁴⁴ Ann Blair, ‘Humanist Methods in Natural Philosophy: The Commonplace Book’, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 53 (1992), 541-551 (p. 542), emphasis added.

¹⁴⁵ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *4v.

texts from their original context and contemporary accounts from company, government and personal files to furnish his book, he did not reduce the material to ‘an arsenal of “factoids,” [or] tidbits of knowledge.’¹⁴⁶ This activity he left to his reader. The bulk of *Principall Navigations* is a testament to the value Hakluyt placed on the reader’s personal need to interpret (individually and collaboratively) the information gathered with regard to targeted reading. Apart from the records drawn from distant history, Hakluyt collated empirical narratives in their entirety. The ubiquity of the commonplace book and the historical practice of collecting precepts, therefore, influenced both Hakluyt’s principles in structuring his compilation and his decision to record the complete text for useful extraction by the reader. In this way, Ann Blair’s coupling of the conjectured, personal commonplacing activities of Jean Bodin with those he anticipated from his readers can equally be applied to Hakluyt and *Principall Navigations*:

Just as Bodin's *Theatrum* grew out of a book of commonplaces, so too it served in turn as material to be entered in the commonplace books of its readers; the reception of Bodin's *Theatrum* through the first half of the seventeenth century is testimony to the continued vitality of the method.¹⁴⁷

Although *Principall Navigations* did not grow out of a book of commonplaces, its principles for its organization did. Hakluyt purposely left the material undigested because he understood that narrative value depended upon reader purpose, that richer interpretative possibilities were witnessed in communal and individual readings and that his *readers* needed to employ the materials according to their purposes.

These research findings have fascinating implications. Significantly, it foregrounds the importance of Hakluyt’s work in gathering the materials together and organizing them carefully for re-use. It sets *Principall Navigations* within a larger frame of reference which confounds modern distinctions between production and consumption, print and oral culture, reading and writing, author and reader, text and action. In conflating the processes of print and oral production and demanding active reader

¹⁴⁶ Ann Blair, ‘Humanist Methods in Natural Philosophy: The Commonplace Book’, p. 545.

¹⁴⁷ Ann Blair, ‘Humanist Methods in Natural Philosophy: The Commonplace Book’, p. 548.

participation in constructions of meanings beyond the text, *Principall Navigations* undertook what would be more appropriately conceived as the opening stages of oratorical composition.

Elizabethan education was suffused by classical oratory. Its effects were not confined to textual composition alone as *Principall Navigations* confirms the influence of oratory on contiguous modes of speech and deliberative action. Cicero's mature works *De Oratore* and *De Partitione Oratorio* recommend five broad sequential processes of oratorical composition: *inventio*, *dispositio*, *elocutio*, *memoria*, *actio*, which were familiar to all Elizabethan scholars.¹⁴⁸ I propose that the initial tasks of gathering (*inventio*) and arranging (*dispositio*) the relevant data from which to draw matter were undertaken by Hakluyt. The further stages of oratorical composition, extracting useful matter (*elocutio*), committing it to memory (*memoria*) and delivering it in speech or action (*actio*) comprised further stages that were anticipated in the dynamic process of reading.¹⁴⁹ As Bacon advised Fulke Greville, Hakluyt in his role as gatherer, could only perform part of the function of oratorical composition: in collating material he could 'bring stone, timber, mortar and other necessities to [the reader's] building. But [the reader] should put them together, and be the master-workman.' If *Principall Navigations* is relocated within a culture conditioned by oratory, targeted reading and shared reading practices, a reassessment of Anthony Payne's former critical opinion, as extracted below, seems necessary:

[T]he *Principall Navigations* is too bulky, the materials too undigested, to be of much use in this respect [in influencing policy], nor of much immediate practical convenience to the navigator or the colonial projector. No, I think they are more akin perhaps to William Camden's *Britannia* (London, 1586), for example, or the collecting impulses of the Society of Antiquaries and Sir Robert Cotton to preserve and construct an English history.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁸ M. T. Cicero, *De Oratore*, trans. by E. W. Sutton (London: William Heinemann, 1942; repr. 1967).

¹⁴⁹ For a concise understanding of the stages of oratorical composition see Brian Vickers, 'Shakespeare's Use of Rhetoric', in *A New Companion to Shakespeare Studies*, ed. by Kenneth Muir and S. Schoenbaum (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), pp. 83-97.

¹⁵⁰ Anthony Payne, *Richard Hakluyt and his Books*, p. 10.

Despite Harold Love's valid criticism that the 'legitimate and important' study of 'cultures of consciousness' can only be pursued at 'astronomically high level of generality',¹⁵¹ the publication of *Principall Navigations* seems to have exploited the opportunities of edition printing but its success ultimately depended upon residually oral traditions, shared reading, consultations which included reference to the material collections and oral examinations. *Principall Navigations* gathered together previously dislocated and disparate manuscript records and disseminated them in print. Harnessing the potential of edition printing to augment the availability of these materials, Hakluyt exploited the printed medium to enact the work of the scholar-facilitator in collating and organising relevant material prior to the active reading practices the producers desired on its publication.

¹⁵¹ Harold Love, 'Early Modern Print Culture: Assessing the Models', p. 79.

Conclusion

This thesis has analysed the first edition of *Principall Navigations* through an examination of the socio-historical, economic and political circumstances of its production. Throughout, I have focused on the functions of both the book's patrons and the Queen's printers. By considering the production costs of a book that runs to over two hundred edition sheets, it becomes clear that a powerful patron would have been necessary to ensure the book's passage through the press. The publication of *Principall Navigations* was only enabled by the socio-economic mechanisms of patronage and the bestowal of patents. Once Walsingham's authority over the print-production of *Principall Navigations* is established, his guiding influence over the compilation of materials is brought to the fore. Hakluyt dedicated *Principall Navigations* to Walsingham as it represented Hakluyt's 'particular duty' and fulfilled Walsingham's 'expectation'.¹ Furthermore, Hakluyt's gathering activities had 'prescribed limites'.² His compilation was to relate specifically to long-distance voyages to unknown coasts in a search for new markets.

The Clothworkers' Company had a historical interest in the exploration of longer-distance trade as dressed cloth was more difficult to sell (the craftsmanship and dying techniques were inferior to those of their European competitors) and was not as profitable as undressed cloth when exchanged in European outlets. Previously, during the late 1570s, Richard Staper, Edward Osborne and Walsingham had successfully come together to found the Levant Company (1581). Richard Staper and Edward Osborne were members of the Clothworkers Company and the Company continued to pay Hakluyt after he had left university.

In 1585, intensified Anglo-Spanish hostilities prompted the seizure of English goods and ships around Andalusia and the closure of all Habsburg ports to the English. The continued wars of religion which destabilized trade in France, the Muscovy

¹ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *3r.

² *Principall Navigations*, sig. *3v.

Company's waning influence in Moscow and the death of Ivan IV (1584) also contributed to England's growing export crisis of the 1580s.

Although Pauline Croft has argued that trade could never be completely controlled by edict or suppressed by war, Walsingham's petition to the treasury does demonstrate that revenues in customs duties between 1585 and 1589 had been seriously affected. K. R. Andrews has demonstrated that, after the closure of Habsburg ports, a 'powerful body of merchants', 'revengeful traders' and 'rapacious gentry' joined forces and turned their attention to privateering ventures.³ The vast majority of the work (both compilation and print-production) of *Principall Navigations* must have been undertaken between about November 1588 and November 1589, directly after the Spanish Armada.

As *Principall Navigations* was issued from the office of the royal printer, it infers that the work formed part of a wider policy to establish joint-stock initiatives in ventures of discovery. In previous years, the imprint was used on official works and those encompassed by the privilege, namely bibles in English, the *Book of Common Prayer*, books of service and other prayers. Official works included the production of proclamations, statutes, acts of parliament, instructions for visitations, articles, injunctions and church or state propaganda. I propose, therefore, that the objective behind the publication of *Principall Navigations* was to direct this recent cohesion of interests away from the short-term gains of privateering and into the long-term gains of trade through the establishment of long-distance trade. The 1589 edition was published primarily to fulfil a political function and represented a component part of a wider course of political action. The policy enabled the publication in print and the wider dissemination of a compilation of various manuscripts materials previously employed by merchant companies and private initiatives when setting forth voyages of discovery.

Having undertaken a closer examination of the network of alliances and vested publication interests, however, it seems that whilst the book was ordered by Walsingham and thus issued under the terms of the royal printing patent, it was also invested in by Bishop and Newberry, two significant publisher-stationers. This dual

³ K. R. Andrews, *Elizabethan Privateering: English Privateering during the Spanish War, 1585-1603*, p. 18.

acknowledgement of investor interests seems to be mirrored in the book's immediate reception. Walter Cope suggested that Hakluyt should reduce his material into 'short sum' and D. B. Quinn has remarked that literary historians and later collection-compilers criticized Hakluyt 'for putting in with voyage narratives a wide selection of historical documents relating to the background or context of the actual movement of men or ships.'⁴ Its historical interest was, however, apparent to both Hakluyt and the early modern publishers, George Bishop and Ralph Newberry, whose invested interests in its publication are witnessed by the retention of a share in its copy. It is highly significant, that the second edition, published by the syndicate including Robert Barker, Bishop and Newberry, was not issued from the office of royal printer and was greatly enlarged mainly through the inclusion of historical matter (i.e. prior to 1530).

The alliance between patrons, publishers and authors is fascinating as it indicates something of the nature of government policy on overseas ventures. The political investment in the publication of the material sought to incentivize private joint-stock initiatives. The publication, therefore, highlights the government's lack of sufficient political or fiscal autonomy, or monarchical will, to implement a rationalized economic policy in reaction to the export crisis. Conversely, it simultaneously demonstrates the work undertaken by a particular Privy Councillor, who, through his position as government minister, was able to draw upon his patronage network and the patent system to enable the publication of *Principall Navigations* in print.

As details drawn from textual variants have only focused on five copies, information drawn from this analysis cannot be confirmed until further copies are studied. However, from the research to date, it can be suggested that the text's passage through the press seems to have been remarkably trouble free. Whilst Walsingham's influence over the production of the book is evident, there is still no apparent demonstration of the need to excise or include material. As decorative letters were employed frequently, this gave the compositors a degree of flexibility to incorporate or

⁴ Richard Hakluyt, *The discoveries of the world from their first originall vnto the yeere of our Lord 1555. Briefly written in the Portugall tongue by Antonie Galuano, gouernour of Ternate, the chiefe island of the Malucos*, corrected, quoted, and now published in English by Richard Hakluyt, sig. A2r and *Hakluyt Handbook*, II, p. 336.

cancel a paragraph of text but this strategy would not have been able to mask any substantial alterations. The Bowes leaves in the first state are witnessed in nearly forty per cent of extant books, the second state is broadcasted as an improved account and makes a direct reference to the first state and Walsingham was most probably responsible for handing the report of the embassy on to Hakluyt and would have read it. It appears, therefore, that the Bowes leaves could simply represent publisher interests in producing more profitable texts for its market and a process of self-censorship. The variants demonstrate that the proof-reading practitioners in the Queen's printers' house were alert to the potential for censure and amended printed matter carefully. The correction of place names illustrates the printers were concerned to present a reliable account in print.

Analysis of paper used in the Drake leaves (from the Bodleian Douce holding H 419) has established that two of the three sheets were from same paper-stocks used elsewhere in the book. Given the rapid consumption of paper in early modern printing houses, the practice of buying in sufficient supplies for the publication of particular books and the short life-span of paper moulds, it seems highly improbable that two of the three sheets in the Drake leaves would match those used elsewhere in the book unless the Drake leaves were printed shortly after the book was first published. This would have caused some consternation within the printing community as Hakluyt commented in the address to the reader that the Drake account was not included because someone else had invested in the compilation of Drake's ventures.⁵ This is further substantiated by its late inclusion in the work and its restrained publicity.

Finally, I have analysed *Principall Navigations* for indications of the implied reader. My findings suggest that the book anticipated a variety of readers. The book is presented with index, contents pages, running titles, decorative letters and marginalia which all demonstrate different ways into the book and the ability to read in parts. Its principal mode of organization, however, intersperses all additional material into specific voyages and seems to target the projector-planner primarily. In response to

⁵ *Principall Navigations*, sig. *4v.

Walter Cope's observation that the book may be better if it was reduced and digested, Hakluyt argued that the materials were compiled in this way for maximum profit for the adventurer: 'when they shall [...] become more profitable to the aduenturers, will then be more fit [for the narratives in *Principal(l) Navigations*] to be reduced into briefe epitomes by my selfe or some other endued with an honest zeale of the honour of our countrye.'⁶

The position Hakluyt adopted in defence of his work demonstrates that he understood there was a clear distinction between gathering materials for re-use and 'authoring' or constructing a narrative through the digestion and mediation of the material. Hakluyt's collation and organization of documents represented the initial stages within a larger frame. Hakluyt's work fulfilled an enormous part of a process. Although, he undertook the gathering (*inventio*) and arranging (*dispositio*) of texts in *Principall Navigations*, their mode of compilation suggests that Hakluyt anticipated his work would prompt further action. Evidence of readers using *Principall Navigations* in this way has been provided by Hakluyt's own personal practice, extant various inter-textual witnesses and the analysis of the arrangement of the compilation. To return to Hakluyt's statement, his own reason for compiling the data in such a manner was to confirm the judgements of the reader (through the material comparison) and to enlighten understanding:

I alwayes follow the double order of time and place [when Hakluyt had sufficient stores of material] [...] which [voyages] comming all together, and following orderly one upon another, doe much more lighten the readers understanding, and confirme his judgement, then if they had bene scattered in sundry corners of the worke.⁷

In this way, Richard Hakluyt made a remarkable contribution to a contemporary policy to initiate market diversification in response to a protracted export crisis. His

⁶ *The discoueries of the world from their first originall vnto the yeere of our Lord 1555. Briefly written in the Portugall tongue by Antonie Galuano, gouernour of Ternate, the chiefe island of the Malucos*, sig. A4r.

⁷ *Original Writings*, II, p. 471.

activities encompassed the gathering and arranging of materials for the purposeful redeployment by adventurers. His patrons ensured its production in print. The potential for different readers, however, was always acknowledged by publishers and authors alike and the publication details of the second edition point more readily to a *history* of travel that has rendered his name synonymous with empire, expansion and the construction of an English maritime history.