

The Suppression of the Voyage to Cadiz in Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations*

Anthony Payne

Introduction

This essay explores the possible reasons for the removal of the 'report of the Honorable voyage unto *Cadiz*' in the first volume of the second edition of Richard Hakluyt's *The Principal Navigations* (1598).¹ The excision of these leaves is a well-established point and has been noted by bibliographers, booksellers and collectors since the 1720s. It has generally been linked to the disgrace or fall of the controversial favourite of Queen Elizabeth I, the hero of the Cadiz raid in 1596, Robert Devereux, earl of Essex, and its imposition attributed to royal displeasure with him.² Essex's political position became

This is a revised version of an article first published as 'Richard Hakluyt and the Earl of Essex: The Censorship of the Voyage to Cadiz in the *Principal Navigations*', *Publishing History*, vol. 72 (2012) [issued 2014], pp. 7–52. I am grateful to Catherine Armstrong, co-editor of *Publishing History*, for inviting me to submit it for its original publication, and, earlier, to give the initial paper on the subject at the Print Networks Conference, 'Travel, Topography and the Book Trade', University of Chichester, 23–25 July 2013. For a recent discussion of the matter by another scholar, see Michael G. Brennan, 'Editorial Matters', in *The Routledge Research Companion to Travel Writing*, ed. Alasdair Pettinger and Tim Youngs (London: Routledge, 2020), pp. 325–7.

¹ Richard Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations, Voiages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation*, 3 vols (London: George Bishop, Ralph Newbery and Robert Barker, 1598–99–1600). A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, *A Short-title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475–1640*, second edition, rev. W. A. Jackson, F. S. Ferguson and K. F. Pantzer, 3 vols (London: Bibliographical Society, 1976–91) (cited hereafter as STC) 12626. For Hakluyt (1552–1616) and his works generally, see George Bruner Parks, *Richard Hakluyt and the English Voyages*, second edition (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1961); Anthony Payne, *Richard Hakluyt: A Guide to His Books and to Those Associated with Him 1580–1625* (London: Quaritch, 2008); D. B. Quinn, ed., *The Hakluyt Handbook*, 2 vols (London: Hakluyt Society, 1974).

² See, e.g., the advertisement by the booksellers Daniel Browne and James Woodman in *The Post-Boy*, 21 February 1723 (quoted below, p. 41); [William Oldys], *The British Librarian* (London: Thomas Osborne, 1738), pp. 158–9; A. G. Camus, *Mémoire sur la collection des grands et petits voyages* (Paris: Baudouin, 1802), p. 12 (n.); Jacques-Charles Brunet, *Manuel du libraire et de l'amateur de livres*, fifth edition, vol. 3 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1862), column 18; William Thomas Lowndes, *The Bibliographer's Manual of English Literature*, new edition, rev. Henry G. Bohn, vol. 2 (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1864), pp. 971–2; Joseph Sabin, *A Dictionary of Books Relating to America*, vol. 7 (New York: J. Sabin & Sons, 1875), pp.

increasingly tenuous from 1599, and he was executed for treason in February 1601, but such an explanation is not entirely adequate, not least because the period of suppression seems to have been over by the time he had fallen irrevocably and taken up arms against the Queen.³

The observable bibliographical points can be readily described. The first volume of the *Principal Navigations* appeared originally with an imprint dated 1598 and a title including the statement, ‘*And lastly, the memorable defeate of the Spanish huge Armada, Anno 1588. and the famous victorie atchieved at the citie of Cadiz, 1596. are described*’. These two accounts were duly included at the end of the volume. That describing the victory at Cadiz, headed ‘*A briefe and true report of the Honorable voyage unto Cadiz, 1596. of the overthrow of the kings Fleet, and of the winning, sacking, and burning of the Citie, with all other accidents of moment, thereunto appertaining*’, occupied the final pages (pp. 607–19, leaves Eee4–Fff4; Fff4^v [p. 620] is blank; p. 608 is misnumbered ‘605’). Subsequently, the ‘Cadiz leaves’, as they are often termed, were removed. The title-page of the volume was reprinted with the mention of Cadiz omitted (to say simply ‘*As also the memorable defeat of the Spanish huge Armada, Anno 1588.*’) and the year of publication changed from 1598 to 1599.⁴ Brief references to the raid in the volume’s dedication, preface and the contents list remained undisturbed.⁵

An examination of roughly 240 surviving copies of the book does not reveal a neat

543–4; George Watson Cole, *A Catalogue of Books Relating to the Discovery and Early History of North and South America, Forming a Part of the Library of E. D. Church*, vol. 2 (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1907), p. 756; [William A. Jackson and Emma V. Unger], *Carl H. Pforzheimer Library: English Literature 1475–1700*, vol. 2 (New York: privately printed, 1940), p. 436; Charles E. Armstrong, ‘The “Voyage to Cadiz” in the Second Edition of Hakluyt’s “Voyages”’, *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, vol. 49 (third quarter, 1955), pp. 254–62; Quinn, ed., *Hakluyt Handbook*, vol. 1, p. 312, vol. 2, pp. 382, 491.

³ Paul E. J. Hammer, ‘Devereux, Robert, Second Earl of Essex (1565–1601)’, in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004–21) (cited hereafter as *ODNB*) supersedes previous biographies. Political studies include Janet Dickinson, *Court Politics and the Earl of Essex, 1589–1601* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012); Alexandra Gajda, *The Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); Paul E. J. Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585–1597* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Paul E. J. Hammer, ‘Shakespeare’s *Richard II*, the Play of 7 February 1601, and the Essex Rising’, *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 59, no. 1 (Spring 2008), pp. 1–35. For Essex’s relationship with the Queen, see also Susan Doran, *Elizabeth I and Her Circle* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 165–92.

⁴ STC 12626a. For illustrations of the two title-pages, see Quinn, ed., *Hakluyt Handbook*, vol. 2, figs 24, 25 (pp. 499, 501).

⁵ Hakluyt, *Principal Navigations*, vol. 1, *2^v, **2^v, **4^v.

or ideal bibliographical sequence of states or issues of the first volume.⁶ It might be thought that those copies with a 1598 title-page should contain the Cadiz leaves, while those with the 1599 title-page should not. In fact there is no correlation and 1598 copies can lack the Cadiz leaves and 1599 ones can contain them. Giving the breakdown in round numbers, 115 copies, or almost half of the recorded extant copies contain the Cadiz leaves. Of the 110 copies with the 1598 title-page, sixty copies, or just over half, have the Cadiz leaves, and of the 130 copies with the 1599 title-page, fifty-five copies, a little under a half, have them. So there is only a slight bias towards 1599 copies lacking the Cadiz leaves.⁷ It might be reasonable to infer, therefore, that 1598 copies with these leaves excised were those undistributed or readily retrievable when the suppression took place, while the 1599 copies that have them were those remaining when the suppression of the leaves was no longer considered necessary. The implication of this is that if there was censorship, it was not especially effective as the Cadiz leaves survive in so many copies, and, as will be discussed below, that it was short-lived and confined to a particular time and set of political circumstances.⁸

The Raid on Cadiz

The amphibious assault on the Spanish port of Cadiz in June 1596 took place under the joint command of Charles Howard, the lord admiral,⁹ and Essex, as general of the land forces. Including a substantial Dutch contingent, the expedition comprised more than one hundred ships and over 9000 soldiers. It was initially conceived as a naval operation to

⁶ P. A. Neville-Sington and Anthony Payne, 'An Interim Census of Surviving Copies of Hakluyt's *Divers Voyages and Principal Navigations*', in *Richard Hakluyt and His Books*, by Anthony Payne (London: Hakluyt Society, 1997), pp. 47–76. Not that coherent bibliographical stability should be expected in books of this period. See David McKitterick, *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order, 1450–1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 139–52, 224–30.

⁷ Cf. the survey in Quinn, ed., *Hakluyt Handbook*, vol. 2, p. 494.

⁸ This is very much in line with the general pattern of Elizabethan censorship described by Cyndia Susan Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984), considers censorship to have been far more pervasive.

⁹ Charles Howard succeeded his father as Baron Howard of Effingham in 1573 and was created earl of Nottingham in 1597. James McDermott, 'Howard, Charles, second Baron Howard of Effingham and first earl of Nottingham (1536–1624)', in *ODNB*. To avoid confusion he will be referred to throughout this essay as the lord admiral, an office he held from 1585 until 1619.

destroy Spanish shipping, but Essex's involvement transformed it into a more ambitious enterprise, of seizing and garrisoning the city for further offensive operations, not only to mount a blockade of the incoming treasure ships from the New World, on which Spanish war-finance depended, but also to take the war to Spain itself, capturing and holding coastal bases. In this it went against the Queen's preference for indirect operations and avoidance of excessive, and expensive, military commitments on the Continent. As it turned out the English occupation of Cadiz was brief: Howard and other senior commanders, who had initially acquiesced in Essex's strategy despite its contravention of royal wishes, concluded that the large amount of booty captured in a swiftly executed attack with few English losses was sufficient achievement and, after some coastal raiding, the expedition returned to England. By early August, even as the last ships were reaching home, the raid was mired in controversy, that Essex had blatantly attempted to manipulate the expedition to further his own interests and his preferred Continental strategy, as well as royal anger at the excessive number of knights dubbed in the field by the commanders, at the private embezzlement of the prize, and not least, at the loss of further plunder because the Spanish had managed to destroy their merchantmen at Cadiz to prevent the cargoes falling into enemy hands.¹⁰

Despite this acrimony there was little doubt that the raid had been a resounding tactical success¹¹ and, to the wider public, it was a heroic victory which had dealt Spain a

¹⁰ Paul E. J. Hammer, *Elizabeth's Wars: War, Government and Society, 1544–1604* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 192–8; Wallace T. MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I: War and Politics 1588–1603* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), pp. 116–23, 495–501; N. A. M. Rodger, *The Safeguard of the Sea: A Naval History of Britain Volume One 660–1649* (London: Harper Collins, 1997), pp. 284–7, 487; R. B. Wernham, *The Return of the Armadas: The Last Years of the Elizabethan War against Spain* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), pp. 82–121. The fullest description of the raid and its documentation remains Julian S. Corbett, *The Successors of Drake* (London: Longmans, Green, 1900), pp. 56–133, 439–5, but for the sources see also Paul E. J. Hammer, 'New Light on the Cadiz Expedition of 1596', *Historical Research*, vol. 70, no. 172 (June 1997), pp. 182–202. Corbett gave the conventional explanation that, because 'Essex had fallen', Hakluyt's account was 'officially suppressed' for 'fear of resuscitating his past popularity' (p. 440); similarly in a longer notice on the forestalling of printing on the Cadiz raid, Julian S. Corbett, 'War Correspondence and the Censorship under Elizabeth', *The Anglo-Saxon Review*, vol. 10 (September 1901), p. 62. For the context of Corbett's book, and the lessons he drew from the warfare of the 1590s about the limitations of maritime power, see Andrew Lambert, *The British Way of War: Julian Corbett and the Battle for a National Strategy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2021), pp. 61–7. For a recent discussion of the maritime strategies of the Anglo-Spanish war, see Beatrice Heuser, *Strategy before Clausewitz: Linking Warfare and Statecraft, 1400–1830* (London: Routledge, 2018), pp. 69–90.

¹¹ 'The taking of Cadiz was in many ways a greater victory than that over the Armada. It is quite possible to argue that bad weather and defective logistics would have frustrated Medina Sidonia even if the English fleet had been a hundred miles away, but Cadiz was a positive triumph. It was an amphibious combined

bloody defeat, worthy of great celebration. John Stow recorded the rejoicing following the raid:

 Sunday the 8. of August [1596], great triumph was made in London, for the good successe of the earle of Essex, and his company in Spaine, the winning, sacking & burning of the famous towne of Cadiz, the overthrow and burning of the Spanish navie, and other accidents. A sermon of thanksgiving was preached at Pauls crosse in the fore neune, bone fires throuhe the streets in the afternoone, from 2. of the clock till x. or xi. drinking, banketting, & other waies reioycing.¹²

Booksellers clamoured for material on the raid according to Thomas Nashe, who, soon after the fleet's return, told a friend that printers were 'gaping' 'for the copy of my L. of essex voyage' and the ballad celebrating 'the three score & foure knights' dubbed in the field by Essex.¹³ In *Prothalamion*, composed in the late summer or autumn of 1596, Edmund Spenser alluded to the 'noble victorie' achieved by 'Great England's glory' whose 'dreadfull name, late through all Spaine did thunder'.¹⁴ Even the distinctive spade-shaped beard grown by Essex during the voyage created a stir, and the style was widely sported by young blades and military types anxious to bask in the earl's reflected glory – 'lusty-bloud Bravemente segniors, with Cales beards as broade as scullers maples', as Nashe described them on another occasion.¹⁵

Elizabeth's government had no aversion to publishing news of overseas successes as propaganda for its foreign alliances and commitments. While it is difficult to gauge the degree of coherent popular support for the war, it could normally be relied upon if

operation in which English and Dutch, soldiers and seamen, operated in perfect harmony, and the bile of the earl of Essex should not be allowed to conceal that'. David Loades, *The Making of the Elizabethan Navy, 1540–1590: From the Solent to the Armada* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009), p. 217.

¹² John Stow, *A Summarie of the Chronicles of England. Diligently Collected, Abridged, & Continued unto This Present Yere of Christ. 1598* (London: Richard Bradock, 1598) (STC 23328), p. 450 (Ff1^v).

¹³ Thomas Nashe, *The Works*, ed. Ronald B. McKerrow, corrected reprint, ed. F. P. Wilson, vol. 5 (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958), p. 194.

¹⁴ Edmund Spenser, *The Shorter Poems*, ed. Richard A. McCabe (London: Penguin Books, 1999), pp. 496, 727–8, 732–3.

¹⁵ Paul E. J. Hammer, 'Myth-Making: Politics, Propaganda and the Capture of Cadiz in 1596', *Historical Journal*, vol. 40, no. 3 (1997), p. 636; *Nashes Lenten Stuffe*, in Nashe, *Works*, ed. McKerrow & Wilson, vol. 3, p. 147.

measures were seen as part of a national home defence effort, but despite prevalent anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish attitudes, demands for ship money could cause local resentment, as could impressment for overseas military service (the legality of which was challenged on occasions), so a sense of wider purpose needed to be encouraged.¹⁶ In the 1580s news pamphlets describing political developments in France and French triumphs against the Spanish were translated and printed by John Wolfe, often with official encouragement,¹⁷ while various forms of publications were printed for propaganda abroad.¹⁸ Notable in the context of the Cadiz raid is the *Declaration of the Causes Moving the Queenes Maiestie of England, to Prepare and Send a Navy to the Seas, for the Defence of Her Realmes against the King of Spaines Forces, to Bee Published by the Generals of the Saide Navy, to the Intent that It Shall Appeare to the World, that Her Maiestie Armeth Her Navy Onely to Defend Her Selfe, and to Offend Her Enemies, and Not to Offend Any Other, That Shall Forbeare to Strengthen Her Enemie, but to Use Them with All Lawfull Favours*. Printed in London by the deputies of Christopher Barker (the royal printer) shortly before the expedition set sail in 1596, this public justification of English military action and fair warning to neutrals was intended for wide distribution on the Continent and was printed in several languages besides English:

And likewise wee have put the same in Print, in French, Italian, Dutch, and Spanish, and have also caused the same to bee distributed into as many Ports of Spaine and Portugall, as conveniently might be for the better knowledge to

¹⁶ See Neil Younger, *War and Politics in the Elizabethan Counties* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), pp. 58–101.

¹⁷ Lisa Ferraro Parmelee, *Good Newes from Fraunce: French Anti-League Propaganda in Late Elizabethan England* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1996), pp. 31–5. See also Clifford Chalmers Huffman, *Elizabethan Impressions: John Wolfe and His Press* (New York: AMS Press, 1988), pp. 69–90; Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 101–7. For the circulation of news in printed and other forms, see Natalie Mears, *Queenship and Political Discourse in the Elizabethan Realms* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 145–82; David Randall, *Credibility in Elizabethan and Early Stuart Military News* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2008).

¹⁸ Denis B. Woodfield, *Surreptitious Printing in England 1550–1640* (New York: Bibliographical Society of America, 1973), pp. 24–45. For the Elizabethan's government use of printed propaganda, which was closely associated with William Cecil (Lord Burghley), see also Stephen Alford, *Burghley: William Cecil at the Court of Elizabeth I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), pp. 248–51, 307–8; Conyers Read, 'William Cecil and Elizabethan Public Relations', in *Elizabethan Government and Society: Essays Presented to Sir John Neale*, ed. S. T. Bindoff, J. Hurstfield and C. H. Williams (London: Athlone Press, 1961), pp. 25–31, 37–53.

bee had in the saide Portes, as also in all other Partes under his [the king of Spain's] subiection.¹⁹

The Prohibition of Accounts of the Cadiz Raid

If there was a general willingness to deploy the printed word in the war effort, little – and nothing official – was forthcoming in print about the Cadiz raid. The various senior officers, all anxious to publicise their personal contribution to the victory, sent messengers ahead with their dispatches, but almost immediately the authorities moved to prevent the spread of unauthorised reports of the victory. As the author of a manuscript newsletter which survives among Essex's papers advised, 'Yt may please your worshippe not to make these newes comon, but only to your deere friends, bycause there be proclamations sett owte agaynst the reporters of newes'.²⁰

Instead of allowing rival narratives to surface, aggravating and drawing attention to the rivalries between the commanders, an official account, which could allocate credit as thought appropriate, was considered, and materials were gathered for its preparation.²¹ Prepared under the direction of William Cecil, Lord Burghley, the lord treasurer, and his son, Sir Robert Cecil, who had been appointed principal secretary in July 1596, this was never printed, although a manuscript draft survives with amendments by Robert Cecil that tend to downplay the role of Essex in favour of Sir Walter Raleigh and other officers.²²

¹⁹ *A Declaration of the Causes Moving the Queenes Maiestie of England, to Prepare and Send a Navy to the Seas* (London: deputies of Christopher Barker, 1596) (STC 9203), p. 3. The foreign-language editions, as well as one in Latin, are STC 9204–8. See also Hakluyt, *Principal Navigations*, vol. 1, p. 607 (Eee4^r); Wernham, *Return of the Armadas*, p. 82.

²⁰ 'Newes of the Earl of Essexes voyage 1596', in Historical Manuscripts Commission 58, *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable The Marquess of Bath Preserved at Longleat, Wiltshire Volume V: Talbot, Dudley and Devereux Papers 1533–1659*, ed. G. Dyfnalt Owen (London: HMSO, 1980), p. 264 (Devereux Papers II/89). This newsletter is undated; its latest dated reference is the arrival, with further news of the expedition's progress, back in Bristol on 20 July of 'one Matthew Rize, a Bristol man, who had been taken prisoner by the Spaniards in March last' and had been 'an eye-witness of our men's prowess'. Hammer, 'Myth-Making', p. 628 (n.41), gives this (from the manuscript) as his reference for the prohibition by the Queen and privy council of all publications relating to Cadiz. It may be noted that proclamations were not necessarily royal, and the proclamations mentioned in this newsletter could have been issued by the military commanders or local authorities, perhaps to control oral rumours as much as printed reports. For non-royal proclamations, see Frederic A. Youngs, *The Proclamations of the Tudor Queens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), pp.10–12.

²¹ Wernham, *Return of the Armadas*, pp. 122–3.

²² Hammer, 'Myth-Making', pp. 628–9. See also 'A Relation of the Winning of Cadiz', in *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1595–1597*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green

Aside from these court-political concerns there was a need to curb the enthusiasm of radical protestants, who cast the war against Spain as an apocalyptic struggle against the Antichristian forces of the Habsburgs and papacy. In this Essex was held to be God's instrument and imagined by some as the rider on a white horse, prophesied in the Book of Revelation, who would go forth to conquer.²³ Given that further celebration of the victory could only fuel the hopes of the apocalyptic militants and that the official account was unlikely to be seen as neutral by Essex at least, it was probably preferable from the Queen's perspective not to allow anything at all about Cadiz into print.

Several projected accounts appear to have been abandoned or prevented from reaching print. A major journal, that of Sir George Carew, which might have been intended for publication, seems to have been impounded or surrendered to the authorities in 1596.²⁴ A composite account, 'An English Quid, for a Spanish Quo . . . or a true Relation of the late Honorable Expedition . . . at Cadez . . . Diligently collected' by the hack author and copyist, Richard Robinson in October 1596, which included the *Declaration of the Causes Moving the Queenes Maiestie of England, to Prepare and Send a Navy to the Seas*, the journal (from 8 April to 21 June) of one Swansley, a servant of the Lord Admiral, and the lord admiral's letter of 8 July to his father-in-law, Lord Hunsdon, survives in manuscript.²⁵ Perhaps compiled with the assistance of the lord admiral, this,

(London: Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer, 1869), pp. 271–3 (no. 114). A draft for the official account, drawn up at Burghley's request and submitted to him by Sir Anthony Ashley, the Cadiz expedition's secretary, was in hand by 8 August: see Ashley's letter to Burghley, 8 August 1596, British Library Lansdowne MS 82, ff. 178^r, 179^v; John Strype, *Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion, and Other Various Occurrences in the Church of England, during Queen Elizabeth's Happy Reign: Together with an Appendix of Original Papers of State, Records, and Letters*, new edition, vol. 4 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1824), pp. 400–1 (extract).

²³ Richard Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse: Sixteenth Century Apocalypticism, Millenarianism and the English Reformation* (Appleford: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1978), pp. 175, 352–8; Gajda, *Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture*, p. 77; George Gifford, *Sermons upon the Whole Booke of the Revelation* (London: [Joan Orwin] for Thomas Man and Toby Cooke, 1596), A2^r–5^v (dedication to Essex); Hammer, *Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics*, pp. 213–14, 230; David Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*, revised edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 116–19.

²⁴ Corbett, *Successors of Drake*, pp. 444–5; Stephen Usherwood and Elizabeth Usherwood, *The Counter-Armada, 1596: The Journall of the 'Mary Rose'* (London: The Bodley Head, 1983), pp. 9–10. The manuscript is at Lambeth Palace Library (MS 250, ff. 344–62). It is not known exactly when it arrived there, but as the archbishop of Canterbury was responsible for censorship, it is plausible, as the Usherwoods suggest, that it remained at Lambeth Palace, his official residence, after its confiscation in 1596.

²⁵ Bodleian Library, Rawlinson MS B. 259, ff. 47–61. For the lord admiral's letter to Hunsdon, see Hammer, 'Myth-Making', pp. 626, 628 (n.42). For Robinson, see H. R. Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts 1558–1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), pp. 195–203 (but, p. 197,

too, may have been designed for printing had it not been for the ban.²⁶ A poetic celebration, *The Welcome Home of the Earle of Essex, and the Lord Admiral from the Victorious Voyage of Cales* by Thomas Churchyard, was entered in the Stationers' Register on 5 October 1596, but as no printed copy from that time survives, publication might have been abandoned or the edition suppressed because of the prohibition.²⁷

Essex himself went to extreme lengths in attempting to publish a 'True Relation' of the victory at Cadiz. Beyond marking his own part in the action, it was part of a concerted political attempt to promote his strategy of taking the war to the heart of the enemy and to encourage support for the war against Spain by appealing to the wider public over the heads of the Queen and council.²⁸ In late July 1596, Essex had instructed Henry Cuffe, one of his staff sent back with dispatches to England in advance of the rest of the fleet, to prepare such an account, taking care not to put it out under the name of Essex or any of his associates. Cuffe suggested that it be printed under the title 'A true relation of the action at Cadiz the 21st of June under the earl of Essex and the lord admiral, sent to a gentleman in court from one, that served there in good place', with a preface saying that the supposed addressee (to be identified by his initials only), 'not altogether misliking the form, was the easlier persuaded to suffer it to go abroad; by which means it hath fallen into the press'.²⁹ In the event Essex's plans were frustrated.

erroneously stating that official accounts of the raid were printed, and, n.7, apparently mistaking *A Declaration of the Causes* for such an account). Robinson also included a short notice of the Cadiz expedition in his manuscript 'Eupolemia; Archippus; and Panoplia . . . 1576 . . . 1602', British Library Royal MS 18. A. LXVI, f. 29^v.

²⁶ Hammer, 'Myth-Making', p. 632. Robinson recorded that the lord admiral rewarded him for a history of the Cadiz adventure and other participants advised him on how the original version could be revised. BL Royal MS 18. A. LXVI, f. 9^{r-v}; and see quotation from f. 9^v in Mark Eccles, 'Sir George Buc, Master of the Revels', in *Thomas Lodge and Other Elizabethans*, ed. Charles J. Sisson (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1933), p.425 (n.1). This portion of the manuscript (ff. 5–13) is printed in George McGill Vogt, 'Richard Robinson's "Eupolemia" (1603)', *Studies in Philology*, vol. 21, no. 4 (October 1924), pp. 631–48.

²⁷ See Edward Arber, ed., *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London; 1554–1640 A.D.*, vol. 3 (London: privately printed, 1876), p. 71; Michael Woodcock, *Thomas Churchyard: Pen, Sword, and Ego* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), p. 255. The poem is preserved in a manuscript version, apparently copied from a printed text (British Library Egerton MS 2877, f. 16). A fragment only survives of an edition printed in 1598 (STC 5259.5).

²⁸ Hammer, *Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics*, pp. 252–3.

²⁹ Henry Cuffe to Essex (letter sent via Edward Reynoldes), 30 July 1596, Lambeth Palace Library MS 658, f. 88^{r-v}. Printed in Thomas Birch, *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, from the Year 1581 till Her Death. In Which the Secret Intrigues of Her Court, and the Conduct of Her Favourite, Robert Earl of Essex, Both at Home and Abroad, Are Particularly Illustrated. From the Original Papers of His Intimate Friend, Anthony Bacon, Esquire, and Other Manuscripts Never before Published*, vol. 2 (London: A.

On 9 August 1596 Edward Reynoldes, the earl's personal secretary, told Essex that he had learnt from the printers that on the council's direction, the archbishop of Canterbury (John Whitgift) had forbidden the publishing of any such discourses without special authorisation from the council itself. Fulke Greville, the courtier and friend of Essex, was sent by the Queen to warn Cuffe on pain of death not to attempt to print any account 'without her privity'. Reynoldes, nevertheless, persisted and contrived to let the archbishop have sight of the manuscript, pretending it was a letter written by 'a gentleman in the army' at Cadiz to Anthony Bacon (Essex's chief of intelligence). Whitgift, in fact, commended it but insisted that he could not by himself permit its publication and resisted all Bacon's efforts to persuade him, and the printers, to let it through.³⁰ Defeated in their attempts to have the 'True Relation' printed, Essex and his followers went ahead to circulate it in manuscript in England and abroad, with versions in Dutch, French and Italian.³¹ As part of this European-wide publicity campaign, Henry Hawkyns, Essex's agent in Venice even attempted to have it included in a new edition of Cesare Campana's *Delle historie del mondo*, planning by the 'cordial working of gold' to overcome any fear the author might have of Spanish displeasure, but this was without success because the printer would not delay any longer.³² Another tract apparently distributed in manuscript

Millar, 1754), pp. 81–2. For this letter's evidence of the collaborative authorship of the 'true relation' and the tactics deployed to evade truly naming any of those involved in its composition, see Alan Stewart, 'The Making of Writing in Renaissance England: Re-thinking Authorship through Collaboration', in *Renaissance Transformations: The Making of English Writing (1500–1650)*, ed. Margaret Healy and Thomas Healy (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), pp. 85–7.

³⁰ Edward Reynoldes to Essex, 9 August 1596, Lambeth Palace Library MS 658, f. 259^{r-v}. This letter (ff. 259^r–60^v) is the principal source for the prohibition of publications relating to Cadiz in 1596. It is closely paraphrased or quoted in Birch, *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, vol. 2, pp. 95–7. It is among the papers of Anthony Bacon (Lambeth Palace Library, MSS 647–662), extensively printed by Birch, who is the reference for the ban given by Corbett, *Successors of Drake*, p. 129 (n.); MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I: War and Politics*, p. 498 (n.11); Wernham, *Return of the Armadas*, p. 122 (n.23). Hammer, *Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics*, p.252 (n.301), cites Lambeth Palace Library MS 658 directly. No contemporary documentation is offered by Armstrong, 'The "Voyage to Cadiz"', or Quinn, *Hakluyt Handbook*. A great deal of concern with the plunder and difficulties in collecting ship money to pay for the raid, but nothing relating to the dissemination of journals and other reports, is recorded between early August and mid-October 1596 in *Acts of the Privy Council of England. New Series. Vol. XXVI. A.D. 1596–7*, ed. John Roche Dasent (London: HMSO, 1902), pp. 84–274.

³¹ Hammer, 'Myth-Making', pp. 632–5, detailing manuscripts of the 'True Relation' (notably British Library Sloane MS 1303, ff. 1–6). For Essex's self-promotion and his fostering of popular endorsement of his actions, see Paul E. J. Hammer, 'The Smiling Crocodile: The Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan "Popularity"', in *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*, ed. Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), pp. 95–115.

³² Birch, *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, vol. 2, pp. 226–7; Hammer, 'Myth-Making', pp. 632–3. Cesare Campana, *Delle historie del mondo, descritte dal sig. Cesare Campana, gentil'huomo aquilano*,

by Essex and his associates is one known as ‘The Omissions of the Cadiz Voyage’, which survives in several copies and was a rebuttal of accusations of various failures in the Cadiz operations.³³

Normally the archbishop of Canterbury would have had some discretion in exercising his power to oversee authorisation to print, but the Cadiz raid is an instance of political sensitivity being such that decision making was reserved to the highest council in the land.³⁴ Political considerations meant that a de facto ban on publishing accounts of the raid came into being, in that permission could be sought but there was little chance of it being granted. This is not the same as a formal prohibition with permanent legal force, such as the treason act of 1571 which stipulated imprisonment for anyone writing about the royal succession (a highly contentious issue throughout the Elizabethan period), or the statute of 1581 that stipulated the death penalty for anybody found guilty of publishing matter defamatory of the Queen or inciting rebellion (no statutes expressly intended to control the press were passed during Elizabeth’s reign, but it is quite clear that challenging the Queen’s authority in print or any other manner would fall foul of the laws against treason and sedition).³⁵ If the ban was expressed by a formal royal proclamation, such a document does not survive. Proclamations were anyway of inferior legal status to common and statute law, nor were they designed to have enduring authority, often having

libri tredici, ne’ quali si narrano le cose avvenute dall’anno 1580, fino al 1596 (Venice: Giorgio Angelieri, 1596), had been completed shortly before the Cadiz raid (the dedication, A4^v, is dated 18 May 1596) and a second edition was in preparation (it would be published in 1597).

³³ It was included as ‘The Omissions of Cales Voyage, Stated and Discussed by the Earl of Essex. Now First Printed from a Manuscript in the Possession of the Most Noble Marquis of Stafford’ in *Hakluyt’s Collection of the Early Voyages, Travels, and Discoveries, of the English Nation. A New Edition, with Additions*, vol. 5 (London: R. H. Evans and R. Priestley, 1812), pp. 591–5, and in the separate publication of this edition’s additional matter, *A Selection of Curious, Rare, and Early Voyages, and Histories of Interesting Discoveries, Chiefly Published by Hakluyt, or at His Suggestion, but Not Included in His Celebrated Compilation, to Which, to Purchas, and Other General Collections, This Is Intended as a Supplement* (London: R. H. Evans and R. Priestley, 1812), pp. 803–7. The ‘Omissions’ was part of a longer, unfinished manuscript in which Essex outlined his views on the broader military strategy to be followed in the war against Spain (unknown to Corbett, this is now British Library Add. MS 74287). Corbett, *Successors of Drake*, p. 445; Hammer, *Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics*, pp. 255–7; L. W. Henry, ‘The Earl of Essex as Strategist and Military Organizer (1596–7)’, *English Historical Review*, vol. 68, no. 268 (July 1953), pp. 363–93; Wernham, *Return of the Armadas*, pp. 124–9.

³⁴ For Elizabethan press controls, see Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, pp. 36–76.

³⁵ Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, pp. 30–5. See also Debora Shuger, *Censorship and Cultural Sensibility: The Regulation of Language in Tudor-Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2006), pp. 69–76. For the succession, see Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes, eds, *Doubtful and Dangerous: The Question of Succession in Late Elizabethan England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014).

an explicit or implicit duration. They were efficient administrative tools for making the government's views known, especially in response to particular events that required immediate action. They were used in the censorship of printed texts, but their very nature made them essentially ad hoc instruments unsuited as permanent legislation. Examples of the use of royal proclamations to control the written word during states of emergency are during the threat of Spanish invasion in 1588 when they were used to suppress pro-Spanish printed propaganda (smuggled into the country) by making its possession punishable by death (under martial law, indicative of the exceptional legal circumstances), and after the execution of Essex in February 1601, when the authorities attempted to halt the flow of writing on his attempted rebellion, much of it favourable to the earl, by issuing a proclamation offering a reward for information leading to the arrest of those responsible for such matter.³⁶

If accounts in regular printed pamphlet- or book-form did not materialise, a map of the action at Cadiz, engraved by Thomas Cockson after Baptista Boazio, and including letterpress descriptive text, did appear.³⁷ It was signed into the Stationers' Register by Essex himself and both wardens of the Stationers' Company on 15 December 1596,³⁸ but

³⁶ Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, pp. 66–76; Youngs, *Proclamations of the Tudor Queens*, pp. 31–2, 54–6, 67, 81, 226. See also Shuger, *Censorship and Cultural Sensibility*, pp. 14–20.

³⁷ Baptista Boazio, *An Exact Map of the Town of Cales, Made by Commandment of the Lords Generals* (London: Thomas Purfoot, 1596) (STC 3171.5). See also Julian S. Corbett, ed., 'Relation of the Voyage to Cadiz 1596 by Sir William Slyngisbie', in *The Naval Miscellany*, ed. John Knox Laughton, vol. 1 ([London:] Navy Records Society, 1902), pp. 27–8; Arthur M. Hind, *Engraving in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: A Descriptive Catalogue*, vol. 1, *The Tudor Period* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1952), p. 254. Corbett (followed by Hind) describes the duke of Northumberland's copy (at Alnwick Castle), which is bound up with the Slingsby's 'Relation'. A second known example is at York Minster Library, Special Collections – Old Library III.A.6(3), which is bound in an atlas volume with Christopher Saxton's county maps of England and Wales (STC 21805.5) and Boazio's five maps of *The Famous West Indian Voyage* (of Sir Francis Drake in 1585–86) (STC 3171.6). This volume does not appear in the library's catalogues until the nineteenth century, but the early signature 'Hodson' on the portrait-frontispiece to the Saxton maps might be that of Phineas Hodson, chancellor of York Minster from 1611–46. With thanks to Steven Newman of York Minster Library for this information.

³⁸ Arber, ed., *Transcript of the Registers*, vol. 3, p. 77; W. W. Greg, *Licensers for the Press, &c. to 1640* (Oxford: Oxford Bibliographical Society, 1962), p. 33; Hammer, 'Myth-Making', pp. 636–7. The regulatory procedures for publishing printed maps were as those for printed books. See Laurence Worms, 'The London Map Trade to 1640', in *The History of Cartography Volume Three: Cartography in the European Renaissance*, ed. David Woodward, pt 2 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), pp. 1714–15. While entry into the Stationers' Register was not in itself an instrument of censorship, the wardens would need to have been reasonably confident that the material entered had official authorisation or would not prove to be controversial. See Peter W. M. Blayney, 'The Publication of Playbooks', in *A New History of Early English Drama*, ed. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), pp. 396–405. Essex's authority as a privy councillor might well have reassured the wardens when entering the Cadiz map, but authorisation to print did not prevent a work being

it was not partisan, with its narrative matter balanced evenly between Essex and the lord admiral.³⁹ Some celebratory ballads, such as ‘The Winning of Cales [Cadiz]’, now either lost or no longer extant in their contemporary printings, seem also to have been published.⁴⁰

Hakluyt’s Account of the Cadiz Raid

In 1598 when Hakluyt published the first volume, including the voyage to Cadiz, of his new edition of the *Principal Navigations*, no substantial narrative of the Cadiz raid had yet appeared in print (at least in England),⁴¹ even if it had been much discussed and publicly celebrated. Strictly, neither the Cadiz raid nor the Armada campaign met the criteria Hakluyt had originally set himself for inclusion of material in his book, which, he had stated in the preface to the original edition, the *Principall Navigations* of 1589, excluded voyages ‘neere home’ and ‘neither of search and discoverie of strange coasts, the chiefe subiect of this my labour’. Indeed in 1589 he had also made a special point of excusing the absence because of these limitations of the defeat of the Armada, ‘that victorious exploit not long since atchieved in our narrow Seas agaynst that monstrous Spanish army under the valiant and provident conduct of the right honourable the lord

subsequently called in. See Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, pp. 62–5. Corbett, ed., ‘Relation of the Voyage to Cadiz 1596 by Sir William Slyngisbie’, p. 28, speculates that the map’s rarity ‘is probably due to its having been suppressed officially’.

³⁹ It may be read in the illustration of the map provided by Corbett, ed., ‘Relation of the Voyage to Cadiz 1596 by Sir William Slyngisbie’, plate facing p. 68.

⁴⁰ Hammer, ‘Myth-Making’, p. 641; Francis Oscar Mann, ed., *The Works of Thomas Deloney* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912), pp. 367–70, 580–1. The exploits of Englishmen against Spaniards was an immensely popular subject for ballads, but although the titles of some might be known from entries in the Stationers’ Registers, the survival of an actual text such as the ‘Winning of Cales’, albeit not in a contemporary printing, is exceptional. See C. H. Firth, ‘The Ballad History of the Reigns of the Later Tudors’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, third series, vol. 3 (1909), p. 107; C. H. Firth, ed., *Naval Songs and Ballads* ([London:] Navy Records Society, 1908), pp. xvii–xix, 21–23.

⁴¹ In 1596 Robert Cecil had sent Essex ‘a pamphlet printed in Paris of the taking of Cadiz’, as mentioned in his letter to Essex of 12 August 1596, printed by Birch, *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, vol. 2, p. 103. The pamphlet itself is now untraced. The political and military background and a brief notice of the raid itself were noticed under the year 1596 in Emanuel van Meteren, *Historia Belgica nostri potissimum temporis, Belgii sub quatuor Burgundis & totidem Austriacis principibus coniunctionem & gubernationem breviter: turbas autem, bella et mutationes tempore regis Philippi, Caroli V. Caesaris filii, ad annum usque 1598. plenius complectens, conscripta: & senatui, populo Belgico, posterisq[ue] inscripta a. E. Meterano Belga* (N.p., [1598]), pp. 612–16 (Ggg6^v–Hhh2^v).

Charles Howard high Admirall of England'.⁴² However, as he explained in the 'preface to the Reader' in the new edition, Hakluyt had now relaxed his criteria to admit the Armada and Cadiz victories because of their exceptional interest to his countrymen:

But to leave our ancient shipping, and descend unto later times; I thinke that never was any nation blessed of IEHOVA, with a more glorious and wonderfull victory upon the Seas, then our vanquishing of the dreadfull *Spanish Armada*, 1588. . . . An excellent discourse whereof, as likewise of the honourable expedition under two of the most noble and valiant peeres of this Realme, I meane, the renoumed Erle of *Essex*, and the right honorable the lord *Charles Howard*, lord high Admirall of *England*, made 1596. unto the strong citie of *Cadiz*, I have set downe as a double *epiphonema*⁴³ to conclude this my first volume withall. Both of which, albeit they ought of right to have bene placed among the Southerne voyages of our nation: yet partly to satisfie the importunitie of some of my special friends, and partly, not longer to deprive the diligent Reader of two such woorthy and long-expected discourses; I have made bold to straine a litle curtesie with that methode which I first propounded unto my selfe.⁴⁴

The volume was dedicated to the lord admiral, who, the year before, had been created earl of Nottingham in special recognition of his service in these actions.⁴⁵ Hakluyt extolled the lord admiral's service to his country, drawing particular attention to the two great events:

⁴² Richard Hakluyt, *The Principall Navigations, Voiages and Discoveries of the English Nation* (London: George Bishop and Ralph Newbery, deputies to Christopher Barker, 1589) (STC 12625), *3^v.

⁴³ The rhetorical term 'epiphonema', a rousing exclamatory conclusion, was uncommon in late sixteenth-century England and tended to be used in a moral or religious context. See David A. Boruchoff, 'Piety, Patriotism, and Empire: Lessons for England, Spain, and the New World in the Works of Richard Hakluyt', *Renaissance Quarterly*, vol. 62, no. 3 (Fall 2009), pp. 832, 851.

⁴⁴ Hakluyt, *Principal Navigations*, vol. 1, **2^{r-v}. In the dedication (7 October 1598) Hakluyt hoped that the succeeding volumes would soon follow: 'The first Volume of this worke I have thus for the present brought to light, reserving the other two untill the next Spring, when by Gods grace they shall come to the Presse' (*2^r). The first volume concerned voyages to the north (including Russia) and those from medieval times. The 'Southerne voyages' (including those towards and beyond Spanish waters) appeared in the second volume (1599), those to America in the third (1600).

⁴⁵ Robert W. Kenny, *Elizabeth's Admiral: The Political Career of Charles Howard Earl of Nottingham 1536-1624* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1970), p. 208.

I meane (among others) that glorious, triumphant, and thrise-happy victory atchieved against that huge and haultie *Spanish Armada* (which is notably described in the ende of this volume) wherein being chiefe and sole Commander under her sacred and roiall Maiestie, your noble government and worthy behavior, your high wisdom, discretion and happinesse, accompanied with the heavenly blessing of the Almightye, are shewed most evidently to haue bene such, as all posteritie and succeeding ages shall never cease to sing and resound your infinite prayse and eternall commendations. As for the late renoumed expedition and honorable voyage unto *Cadiz*, the vanquishing of part of the king of Spaines *Armada*, the destruction of the rich West *Indian* Fleete, the chasing of so many brave and gallant Gallies, the miraculous winning, sacking, and burning of that almost impregnable citie of *Cadiz*, the surprising of the towne of *Faraon* upon the coast of *Portugal*, and other rare appendances of that enterprise, because they be hereafter so iudicially set downe, by a very grave and learned Gentleman, which was an eye witnesse in all that action, I referre your good L. to his faithfull report, wherein I trust (as much as in him lay) he hath wittingly deprived no man of his right.⁴⁶

Hakluyt was therefore flattering his patron as well as celebrating his nation's naval victories, but he had no wish to be controversial, only to publish two good stories that would bring honour to his country.

Although Hakluyt does not name the 'very grave and learned Gentleman' responsible for the 'true report of the Honorable voyage unto *Cadiz*' at the end of the volume, he was Roger Marbeck, one of the Queen's household doctors, who had sailed with the expedition as physician to the lord admiral.⁴⁷ Several manuscripts of Marbeck's narrative are known and it could well have circulated privately in manuscript form.⁴⁸ An especially fine example is in the British Library, Sloane MS 226, 'A Breefe and a true

⁴⁶ Hakluyt, *Principal Navigations*, vol. 1, *2^v.

⁴⁷ Elizabeth Lane Furdell, *The Royal Doctors 1485–1714: Medical Personnel at the Tudor and Stuart Courts* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2001), pp. 79–80, 82, 99–100; W. A. Greenhill, 'Marbeck, Roger (1536–1605)', rev. Sarah Bakewell, in *ODNB*.

⁴⁸ Hammer, 'Myth-Making', p. 632 (n.65).

Discourse of the late honorable voyage unto Spaine, and of the wyunning, sacking and burning of the famous Towne of Cadiz there, and of the miraculous overthrowe of the Spanishe Navie at that tyme, with a reporte of all other Accidents thereunto appertayning, by Doctor Marbeck attending upon the person of the right honorable the Lorde high Admirall of England all the tyme of the saide Action'.⁴⁹ Marbeck, it is said, was acclaimed for his calligraphy and the suggestion that this manuscript is in his own hand is sometimes noted,⁵⁰ but it could equally be a scribal production commissioned by Marbeck, perhaps for presentation, which would not be at all unusual.⁵¹

Hakluyt's printed text is readily recognizable as Marbeck's, with few substantial differences and often unchanged paragraphing, although some passages are reworded, rephrased or shortened in varying degrees. We do not know exactly how Hakluyt edited his Cadiz text for printing, because the particular manuscript from which he worked is lost. It cannot, therefore, be confidently said whether some differences result from Hakluyt's possession of more accurate information, or simply represent revisions or scribal errors in the various manuscripts including the one used by Hakluyt.⁵² Comparing the text in Sloane MS 226 to Hakluyt's version in the Cadiz leaves, two features become apparent. First, is that Hakluyt's narrative, although kept in the first-person, has been depersonalised. Marbeck's name and occupation, clearly given in the manuscript, are omitted by Hakluyt, while Hakluyt leaves out much personal detail concerning the lord admiral.⁵³ Marbeck, serving in the same ship and close to the lord admiral, inevitably

⁴⁹ British Library, Sloane MS 226, f. 2^r. A second manuscript is in the British Library, Stowe MS 159, ff. 353–69, 'A Breife & a true discourse of the late honorable voyage unto Spaine . . . by Doctor Marbecke attending upon . . . the Lo. high Admirall . . . all the time of the said Action'. This is not of comparable quality; some of the paragraphing differs, but the text is the same (apart from some insignificant variations, such as under 19 June, when Sloane MS 226 has 16 or 18 galleys, but Stowe MS 159 gives 17 or 18). Also extant are Bodleian Library MS Rawl. D. 124, and a fourth, Madrid, Museo Naval, CF-112, which is described by Boruchoff, 'Piety, Patriotism, and Empire', p. 853, as 'nearly identical' and 'in a similar hand' to Sloane MS 226; in comparing the four manuscripts Boruchoff is 'unable to determine their filiation'.

⁵⁰ See, e.g., Corbett, *Successors of Drake*, p. 442 (misnumbering it '229'); *ODNB*, but the external evidence for saying that Marbeck was a skilled calligrapher is unclear. A digital copy of the manuscript is freely available via the British Library website:

http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Sloane_MS_226

⁵¹ See Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts*, pp. 96–7.

⁵² In Marbeck's text (cited here and subsequently from Sloane MS 226), e.g., the entry for 19 June (f. 10^r) is in Hakluyt dated 18 June and the number of galleys given is 18 or 19 rather than 16 or 18; Hakluyt gives 2 or 3 rather than 3 or 4 miles as the width of the navigable channel between Cadiz and Port S. Mary (f. 13^r); and Marbeck's entry for 30 June (f. 26^r) is dated 28 June in Hakluyt.

⁵³ Marbeck, ff. 11^r–12^r, has a long passage describing Howard at prayer and his care for and familiarity with the men under his command (see Corbett, *Successors of Drake*, pp. 443–4); ff. 14^v–15^r continue the

composed an account that reflects this perspective and Hakluyt would have been justified in omitting this material in attempting a balanced account of the action. Moreover, Hakluyt clearly wished to avoid partiality, giving equal credit to all concerned (to deprive ‘no man of his right’), to create the impression of harmony, hence his most significant exclusion, Marbeck’s remarks about the dissensions between Howard and Essex from the very outset of the expedition.⁵⁴ Hakluyt had no wish to draw attention to personal rivalries in telling his national story. He also removed Marbeck’s description of the great cheering throughout the fleet on intelligence of the rich store of Spanish shipping,⁵⁵ and therefore promise of loot, lying at Cadiz. Memories of royal annoyance at the time over the distribution of the booty would have made it sensible to gloss over such selfish interest, as would have been the difficulty in collecting ship money contributions to pay for the raid, many of which were still, in 1598, outstanding. This reluctance indicates that despite its popularity as a blow to Spanish power, not all were convinced that the Cadiz expedition was truly a measure of national defence, and to some it may have seemed more of a looting spree to the benefit of Essex and others involved in the fighting, rather than to the good of the country at large.⁵⁶

Some aspects of Hakluyt’s version seem to reflect sensible editorial decisions, such as his shortening of Marbeck’s fascinating but lengthy description of flying fish.⁵⁷ Elsewhere his editing seems less explicable (or perhaps just hurried or careless). For example, Hakluyt retained the examples of Marbeck’s Latinity, including his Latin translation of the Queen’s prayer for the expedition’s success, the letters to the Spanish commander at Cadiz (the duke of Medina Sidonia), which Marbeck composed in Latin on

description of the lord admiral, after leaving the *Ark Royal*, as being in the in the ‘hottest of the battell’ and laying and firing guns himself (see also Corbett, *Successors of Drake*, p. 85); and ff. 22^v–3^r describe the lord admiral personally helping children into boats during the evacuation of Cadiz. None of these passages is present in Hakluyt’s rendering.

⁵⁴ f. 4^{r-v}. See the short quotation in M. Oppenheim, ed., *The Naval Tracts of Sir William Monson*, vol. 1 ([London:] Navy Records Society, 1902), p. 378.

⁵⁵ f. 10^r. Quoted by Corbett, *Successors of Drake*, p. 68.

⁵⁶ Younger, *War and Politics in the Elizabethan Counties*, pp. 81–3. In late 1596 the City of London had flatly refused a royal request to provide further ships for naval service because of its dissatisfaction with the distribution of the Cadiz prize-money and the substantial loss it had incurred in contributing to the raid. See Ada Haeseler Lewis, *A Study of Elizabethan Ship Money 1588–1603* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1928), pp. 31, 75–7.

⁵⁷ ff. 9^r–10^r; Hakluyt, *Principal Navigations*, vol. 1, p. 610 (Eee5^v).

behalf of the lord admiral, as well as Marbeck's classical tags from Caesar and Tacitus.⁵⁸ Marbeck was justly proud of his skills as a Latinist, but an editor of a compendium of voyages might be forgiven for omitting these displays of scholarly accomplishment to concentrate on the maritime action. Hakluyt's text gives a brief reference to the custom of hailing between ships,⁵⁹ but does not repeat the manuscript's extensive description of this procedure,⁶⁰ although this might have been of interest to his contemporary readers and is considered by the naval historian, Julian Corbett as the most informative early account of the practice.⁶¹ Soon after its beginning Marbeck's manuscript has a note that the *Declaration* justifying English military action, issued as the expedition set sail, could be included at this point if required.⁶² Hakluyt does not do this, although the *Principal Navigations* as a whole prints many documents that justify, sanction or provide precedents for various enterprises.⁶³ The only reference in the Cadiz leaves not to be found in Marbeck's manuscript is Hakluyt's direction of the reader 'to the Mappe that is set foorth of this journey' to assist understanding of who did what during the expedition, yet no such map of Cadiz is included or more fully identified in the *Principal Navigations*.⁶⁴

In sum it is apparent that Hakluyt was attempting a balanced narrative and did not intend offence in the text printed in the Cadiz leaves, nor was he acting in a partisan or calculated political manner as, for example, Essex had been in scheming to publish the 'True Relation' in 1596.

Hakluyt's Patrons

Essex was the recipient of the largest number of dedications of books in the 1590s: sixty-six, it is estimated, between 1590 and 1600, followed by the Queen who received fifty-six

⁵⁸ Hakluyt, *Principal Navigations*, vol. 1, pp. 608 (misnumbered '605'), 614, 617–18, 619 (Eee4^v, Fff1^v, Fff3^{r-v}, Fff4^r).

⁵⁹ Hakluyt, *Principal Navigations*, vol. 1, p. 609 (Eee5^f). This passage is quoted by Ian Woodfield, *English Musicians in the Age of Exploration* (Stuyvesant: Pendragon Press, 1995), p. 56.

⁶⁰ ff. 7^v–8^r.

⁶¹ Corbett, *Successors of Drake*, p. 443, who prints the manuscript's description and is extremely critical in general of Hakluyt's editing of Marbeck's account, saying he 'sadly mutilated' it. Hakluyt is similarly condemned by Oppenheim, ed., *Naval Tracts of Sir William Monson*, vol. 1, p. 378 (n.59).

⁶² f. 3^v. For the *Declaration*, see n.19 above.

⁶³ See, e.g., Quinn, ed., *Hakluyt Handbook*, vol. 2, pp. 383–401.

⁶⁴ Hakluyt, *Principal Navigations*, vol. 1, p. 614 (Fff1^v). Hakluyt may well have had Boazio's map in mind (see n.37 above).

during the same period. All manner of books were dedicated to him, among them treatises on chivalry, humanist translations, music, and devotional and controversial religious works,⁶⁵ and of special interest in the context of Essex's military career and thought, Matthew Sutcliffe's *The Practice, Proceedings, and Lawes of Armes* (1593), which anticipated the offensive strategy involving the seizure and holding of Spanish ports that Essex was later to develop and attempt himself.⁶⁶ Besides this literary patronage, Essex had an extensive personal following and developed his own secretariat of ambitious and able young men.⁶⁷

Hakluyt was not part of this circle although there were familial links and shared policy interests between some of his patrons and Essex.⁶⁸ In 1582 Hakluyt had dedicated his first collection of voyages to Philip Sidney, an Oxford contemporary at Christ Church, who at one point contemplated joining an expedition to America.⁶⁹ After Sidney's heroic death fighting in the Netherlands in 1585, Essex self-consciously assumed Sidney's mantle as a proponent of martial and chivalric values, while his advocacy of an aggressive, pan-European anti-Spanish policy was very much in accord with Sidney's ideas.⁷⁰ Essex, however, does not seem to have been interested in or associated with trans-oceanic colonial enterprises at this time or later, and, although well connected, had only just arrived at court in 1585.⁷¹ More fitting in the context of

⁶⁵ Alistair Fox, 'The Complaint of Poetry for the Death of Liberty: The Decline of Literary Patronage in the 1590s', in *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*, ed. John Guy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press with the Folger Institute, 1995), pp. 230–1, 245–8.

⁶⁶ Matthew Sutcliffe, *The Practice, Proceedings, and Lawes of Armes, Described Out of the Doings of Most Valiant and Expert Captaines, and Confirmed Both by Ancient, and Moderne Examples, and Præcedents* (London: deputies of Christopher Barker, 1593) (STC 23468), discussed by Heuser, *Strategy before Clausewitz*, pp. 91–116 ('A National Security Strategy for England: Matthew Sutcliffe, the Earl of Essex and the Cádiz Expedition of 1596').

⁶⁷ Dickinson, *Court Politics and the Earl of Essex*, pp. 99–113; Hammer, *Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics*, pp. 269–315.

⁶⁸ For Hakluyt's patrons and connections, see Anthony Payne, 'Hakluyt, Aristotle and Oxford', in *Hakluyt & Oxford: Essays and Exhibitions Marking the Quatercentenary of the Death of Richard Hakluyt in 1616*, ed. Anthony Payne (London: Hakluyt Society, 2017), pp. 7–10, 16–20; Payne, *Richard Hakluyt: A Guide*, pp. 3–21.

⁶⁹ [Richard Hakluyt], *Divers Voyages touching the Discoverie of America* (London: Thomas Dawson for Thomas Woodcock, 1582) (STC 12624). For Sidney and the Americas, see Roger Kuin, 'Querre-Muhau: Sir Philip Sidney and the New World', *Renaissance Quarterly*, vol. 51, no. 2 (Summer 1998), pp. 549–85; Alan Stewart, *Philip Sidney: A Double Life* (London: Chatto & Windus, 2000), pp. 156–7, 265–74.

⁷⁰ Dickinson, *Court Politics and the Earl of Essex*, pp. 11–19; Gajda, *Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture*, pp. 4–5, 68–9.

⁷¹ Hammer, *Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics*, pp. 13–14. Closer to home, the settlement of Ireland was a major English concern, but even there Essex evinced little positive interest and the hopes of Edmund

Hakluyt's thinking was Sir Walter Raleigh, the Queen's favourite (Essex was later to become his rival) and the leading figure engaged in English trans-Atlantic colonial ventures in the mid- to late 1580s.⁷² It was under Raleigh's direction in 1584 that Hakluyt wrote an extensive 'discourse' promoting the colonisation of North America, which was not intended for publication in print but circulated in manuscript only for the Queen and senior courtiers to consider.⁷³ Hakluyt's next books were dedicated to Raleigh,⁷⁴ but in 1589 he dedicated the original edition of the *Principall Navigations* to Philip Sidney's father-in-law, the Queen's principal secretary, Sir Francis Walsingham, who had taken a close interest in Hakluyt's work during the 1580s and also licensed the book for publication.⁷⁵ Had he not died in 1590, Walsingham might well have remained a natural supporter of Hakluyt in the 1590s. Hakluyt did not, however, look again to Raleigh. While Raleigh's faltering support for his colony at Roanoke and its failure by 1590 might lie behind this, it is more likely that an association with Raleigh was less attractive after Raleigh's exclusion from royal favour in 1592 as a result of his clandestine marriage to Elizabeth Throckmorton, one of the Queen's ladies in waiting. Despite talk of Raleigh as

Spenser, for example, that Essex would assume a commanding role in Ireland's systematic colonial subjugation were disappointed. See Hammer, *Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics*, pp. 132–7.

⁷² Mark Nicholls and Penry Williams, *Sir Walter Raleigh: In Life and Legend* (London: Continuum, 2011), pp. 24–35, 46–51, 72–4. For Raleigh and Essex, see also Hammer, *Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics*, pp. 63–70, 83–7, 115–16.

⁷³ The sole extant manuscript, a scribal copy produced in 1585, is now in the New York Public Library, Manuscripts and Archives Division, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations, MssCol 1282. See the facsimile edition, *A Particular Discourse concerninge the Greate Necessitie and Manifold Commodities That Are Like to Growe to This Realme of Englande by the Westerne Discoueries Lately Attempted, Written in the Yere 1584. By Richarde Hakluyt of Oxforde. Known as Discourse of Western Planting*, ed. David B. Quinn and Alison M. Quinn (London: Hakluyt Society, 1993).

⁷⁴ René Goulaine de Laudonnière, *L'histoire notable de la Floride* (Paris: Guillaume Auvray, 1586), edited by Martin Basanier and dedicated by him to Raleigh, published with Hakluyt's help and then translated by him, with his own dedication to Raleigh, as *A Notable Historie Containing Foure Voyages Made by Certayne French Captaynes unto Florida* (London: Thomas Dawson, 1587) (STC 15316); Pietro Martire d'Anghiera (Peter Martyr), *De orbe novo . . . decades octo* (Paris Guillaume Auvray, 1587), edited by Hakluyt. See Payne, *Richard Hakluyt: A Guide*, pp. 87, 89, 91–92. Modern printings of the dedications in these (and Hakluyt's other books) can be found in E. G. R. Taylor, ed., *The Original Writings & Correspondence of the Two Richard Hakluyts*, 2 vols (London: Hakluyt Society, 1935).

⁷⁵ Edward Arber, ed., *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London; 1554–1640 A.D.*, vol. 2 (London: privately printed, 1875), p. 529; Greg, *Licensers for the Press, &c.*, p. 93; Hakluyt, *Principall Navigations*, *3^r. For Walsingham's interest in overseas projects and in Hakluyt, see John Cooper, *The Queen's Agent: Francis Walsingham at the Court of Elizabeth I* (London: Faber & Faber, 2011), pp. 237–86. For his shared interests with Sidney, see Blair Worden, *The Sound of Virtue: Philip Sidney's Arcadia and Elizabethan Politics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), pp. 44–60. In 1590 Essex married Sidney's widow, Walsingham's daughter, Frances.

a possible privy councillor after his rehabilitation in 1597, he was never to attain the highest of offices.⁷⁶

If Raleigh would not, therefore, have been an ideal dedicatee for the first volume of the new edition of the *Principal Navigations*, Hakluyt's choice of the lord admiral, England's pre-eminent naval commander and a substantial figure at court, was thoroughly appropriate. Moreover, there were personal connections between the lord admiral and Hakluyt, whose dedication remembered 'how deeply' he was 'indebted for my yongest brother *Edmund Hackluyt*, to whom for the space of foure whole yeeres your Lordship committed the government and instruction of that honorable yong noble man, your sonne & heire apparant, the lord *William Howard*', and that he owed much to the kindness of the lord admiral's 'deare sister the lady *Sheffield*, my singular good lady', the wife of Sir Edward Stafford, the ambassador in Paris with whom Hakluyt had served in the 1580s.⁷⁷ Hakluyt's inclusion of the Armada and Cadiz campaigns in this volume would certainly have pleased the lord admiral. If their publication was not at his direct request, it might well have been proposed by the lord admiral's circle: as Hakluyt said in his preface (quoted above), he had added the two accounts 'partly to satisfie the importunitie of some of my special friends'.

Patronage, the Cadiz Leaves, Censorship and the Politics of 1598–99

The first volume of the *Principal Navigations* had appeared with the Cadiz leaves in 1598. It cannot be said exactly when they were removed, but, as the replacement title-page is dated 1599 and adds a reference to the contents of the second volume ('The second Volume comprehendeth the principall Navigations . . . to the South and South-east parts of the World'), it is unlikely to have been immediately after publication and was probably about a year later, in the autumn of 1599, when volume two appeared (the

⁷⁶ Nicholls & Williams, *Sir Walter Raleigh*, pp. 61–5, 75–80, 123–5.

⁷⁷ Hakluyt, *Principal Navigations*, vol. 1, *2^r-v. Hakluyt was Stafford's chaplain in Paris 1583–88. Lady Sheffield was patron of the living of Wetheringsett and Brockford (Suffolk), where Hakluyt had been rector since 1590. See Parks, *Richard Hakluyt*, pp. 99–122, 251–2. For Edmund Hakluyt, see Daniel Carey, 'Edmund Hakluyt: New College Singing Man, Tutor, and Youngest Brother of Richard Hakluyt', *Journal of the Hakluyt Society*, online (June 2014).

dedication of the first volume is dated 7 October 1598, that of the second 24 October 1599). By then, as will now be discussed, the political situation had changed.

The simplest and perhaps the most obvious explanation for the subsequent removal of the Cadiz leaves is that the ban of 1596 remained in place and was duly implemented.⁷⁸ This is not entirely convincing, because as observed earlier, there seems to have been no enduring formal prohibition against publication, but rather an impromptu ruling by the privy council in the circumstances of August 1596 that required the seeking of permission at the highest level. Neither Hakluyt, his printers (Robert Barker, George Bishop and Ralph Newbery, all prominent Stationers),⁷⁹ nor the book's dedicatee, the lord admiral, had reason to provoke controversy or cause offence, so, while perhaps forgotten or inadvertently overlooked, it is unlikely that any prohibition was deliberately flouted.

There is no known contemporary documentary evidence for the censorship of Hakluyt's Cadiz leaves. Even allowing for the loss of official records from this period,⁸⁰ it still seems probable that an act of formal censorship of such a high-profile work would have left its mark somewhere, in private if not state papers.⁸¹ There are, after all, so many instances of state censorship of printed matter in the later sixteenth century which are amply documented (the two editions of Holinshed's *Chronicles*, 1577 and 1587, for example),⁸² that there is no particular reason why the suppression of the Cadiz leaves

⁷⁸ Hammer, 'Myth-Making', p. 632.

⁷⁹ See STC, vol. 3, pp. 11–12, 22, 124; entries also in *ODNB*.

⁸⁰ There was no official collection of royal proclamations for the Elizabethan period. If a full list was made at the time, it is not extant today. Few originals survive, and although the great majority circulated in printed copies, this does not in itself ensure their survival today. Youngs, *Proclamations of the Tudor Queens*, pp. 5–9, 18–20.

⁸¹ The principal documentary evidence for the prohibition of Cadiz accounts in 1596 is found in the papers of Anthony Bacon, a private archive (see n.30 above).

⁸² Raphael Holinshed, *The Firste Volume of the Chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Irelande. Conteyning, the Description and Chronicles of England, from the First Inhabiting unto the Conquest. The Description and Chronicles of Scotland, from the First Originall of the Scottes Nation, till the Yeare of Our Lorde. 1571. The Description and Chronicles of Yrelande, Likewise from the Firste Originall of that Nation, untill the Yeare. 1547 [and] The Laste Volume of the Chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Irelande, with Their Descriptions. Conteyning, the Chronicles of Englande from William Conquerour untill This Present Tyme*, 2 vols (London: [Henry Bynneman] for John Harrison, [1577]) (STC 13568), *The First and Second [and Third] Volumes of Chronicles, comprising 1 The Description and Historie of England, 2 The Description and Historie of Ireland, 3 The Description and Historie of Scotland: First Collected and Published by Raphaell Holinshed, William Harrison, and Others: Now Newlie Augmented and Continued (with Manifold Matters of Singular Note and Worthie Memorie) to the Yeare 1586. by Iohn Hooker aliàs Vowell Gent. and Others*, 3 vols (London: John Harrison, George Bishop, Ralph Newbery, Henry Denham, Thomas Woodcock, 1587) (STC 13569).

should go unnoticed in some form or other.⁸³ Hakluyt himself was aware of the possibility of censorship and was capable of adapting his texts accordingly. He had experienced, or acquiesced in, political interference in the first edition of the *Principall Navigations* (1589) when the original account of Sir Jerome Bowes's embassy to Russia was replaced with a more anodyne version,⁸⁴ although it cannot conclusively be said whether this alteration was voluntary or imposed.⁸⁵ Also in 1589 Hakluyt alluded to the potential sensitivity of a text when he concluded his discreet summary of Giles Fletcher's *Of the Russe Common Wealth* by saying, 'The booke it selfe be thought not good, for divers considerations, to make publike at this time'.⁸⁶ At the instigation of the Russia Company, which objected to passages that might anger the Russians and jeopardise the company's position in Russia, Fletcher's book was duly suppressed after its printing in 1591.⁸⁷ Hakluyt omitted the offensive parts (and made further cuts) when he published an extracted version in the *Principal Navigations* in 1598.⁸⁸

⁸³ Numerous documented instances of censored texts can be found in Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, pp. 79–217. For Holinshed, see Cyndia Susan Clegg, 'Censorship', in *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles*, ed. Paulina Kewes, Ian W. Archer and Felicity Heal (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 42–59; STC 13568–9 (notes). For the second edition, see also Cyndia Susan Clegg, ed., *The Peaceable and Prosperous Regiment of Blessed Queene Elisabeth: A Facsimile from Holinshed's Chronicles (1587)* (San Marino: Huntington Library, 2005).

⁸⁴ Hakluyt, *Principall Navigations*, 'The Ambassage of Sir Hierome Bowes to the Emperour of Moscovie. 1583', pp. 491–500 (Xx5^r–Yy3^v), and, in the second state, 'A briefe discourse of the voyage of Sir Ierome Bowes knight, her Maiesties ambassador to the Emperour of Muscovia . . . printed this second time, according to the true copie I received of a gentleman that went in the same voyage, for the correction of the the errors in the former impression', pp. 491–6 (Yy1^r–3^v).

⁸⁵ Robert M. Croskey, 'Hakluyt's Accounts of Sir Jerome Bowes' Embassy to Ivan IV', *Slavonic and Eastern European Review*, vol. 61, no. 4 (October 1983), pp. 546–64; Payne, *Richard Hakluyt: A Guide*, pp. 12–13, 93–4; Quinn, ed., *Hakluyt Handbook*, vol. 1, p. 165, vol. 2, pp. 475–7; Felicity Jane Stout, *Exploring Russia in the Elizabethan Commonwealth: The Muscovy Company and Giles Fletcher, the Elder (1546–1611)* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015), pp. 109–10, 196.

⁸⁶ Hakluyt, *Principall Navigations*, p. 504 (Yy5^v) (or p. 500 in the second state). See also Stout, *Exploring Russia in the Elizabethan Commonwealth*, pp. 108–9.

⁸⁷ Lloyd E. Berry, ed., *The English Works of Giles Fletcher, the Elder* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964), pp. 150–4; Edward A. Bond, ed., *Russia at the Close of the Sixteenth Century. Comprising, the Treatise 'Of the Russe Common Wealth,' by Dr. Giles Fletcher; and the Travels of Sir Jerome Horsey* (London: Hakluyt Society, 1856), pp. cxxii, 352–5; Stout, *Exploring Russia in the Elizabethan Commonwealth*, pp. 189–94. The book was published as *Of the Russe Common Wealth. Or, Maner of Governement by the Russe Emperour, (Commonly Called the Emperour of Moskovia) with the Manners, and Fashions of the People of That Countrey* (London: T[homas] D[awson] for Thomas Chard, 1591) (STC 11056). Although the book's authorship is not given on the title-page, Fletcher's dedication (A3^r–4^r) to the Queen bears his name, so it cannot have been considered surreptitious by him or his publisher.

⁸⁸ Hakluyt, *Principal Navigations*, vol. 1, pp. 474–97 (Rr3^v–Tt3^r). See also Bond, ed., *Russia at the Close of the Sixteenth Century*, pp. cxxvii–cxxviii; Robert O. Lindsay, 'Richard Hakluyt and *Of the Russe Common Wealth*', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, vol. 57 (third quarter, 1963), pp. 312–27; Stout, *Exploring Russia in the Elizabethan Commonwealth*, pp. 194–8; Felicity Stout, 'The Strange

The possible explanations for the removal of the Cadiz leaves might be better understood against the evolving international situation and tensions over the direction of foreign policy combined, most importantly, with the changing position of Essex at court, above all in his complex relationship with the Queen, in 1598–99.⁸⁹ In essence, and on the assumption that there was no standing prohibition in law or enduring order from the privy council, the inclusion of the Cadiz leaves was perfectly acceptable in the political circumstances prevailing in 1598, but not in those of autumn 1599. It might also be suggested that their removal at that time could have been due to prudential self-censorship or deferential tact, rather than the result of police action by external authority.⁹⁰

In the course of 1597 Henri IV of France, allied with England and the Dutch since 1596, began to consider a negotiated end to the war with Spain. Under the terms of the alliance the French could not treat separately with the enemy and early in 1598 an English delegation led by Robert Cecil went to France, as did Dutch envoys, to discuss the matter. The Dutch, however, would not countenance peace and England could not risk the defeat of the Dutch were they to be abandoned to confront Spanish power alone. The French thereupon withdrew unilaterally from the triple alliance and concluded an independent peace treaty with Spain at Vervins in April/May 1598.⁹¹ It was against this background that Essex wrote his *Apologie*, widely distributed in manuscript only and carefully kept out of print, giving an extensive and well-reasoned argument against ending hostilities combined with a robust defence of his own conduct, especially against

and Wonderfull Discoverie of Russia”: Hakluyt and Censorship’, in *Richard Hakluyt and Travel Writing in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Daniel Carey and Claire Jowitt (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), pp. 153–63.

⁸⁹ For Essex and Elizabeth, see Dickinson, *Court Politics and the Earl of Essex*, pp. 32–42, 115–20; Gajda, *Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture*, pp. 151–9. For an overview of foreign policy 1598–99, see Paul E. J. Hammer, ‘The Crucible of War: English Foreign Policy, 1589–1603’, in *Tudor England and Its Neighbours*, ed. Susan Doran and Glenn Richardson (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), pp. 256–60.

⁹⁰ Richard Dutton, ‘“Methinks the truth should live from age to age”: The Dating and Contexts of *Henry V*’, in *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, ed. Paulina Kewes (San Marino: Huntington Library, 2006), p. 191, makes a similar point in discussing the possible censorship of Shakespeare’s *Henry V*.

⁹¹ Alexandra Gajda, ‘Debating War and Peace in Late Elizabethan England’, *Historical Journal*, vol. 52, no. 4 (2009), pp. 855–6; MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I: War and Politics*, pp. 202–18; Wernham, *Return of the Armadas*, pp. 78–81, 194–8, 210–33.

accusations (notably by Burghley) that he was a blood-thirsty war-monger.⁹² There was much other debate over war and peace over the spring and summer of 1598.⁹³

With the withdrawal of the French it was obvious that the Spanish could now concentrate their undivided power against the Dutch and the entire Low Countries might come again under Spanish control – it was exactly this longstanding strategic fear that had led a reluctant Elizabeth to go to open war with Spain back in 1585.⁹⁴ Talks between the English and the Dutch took place during the summer of 1598, and eventually the Queen’s continued commitment to the war effort was secured. This was achieved without the involvement of Essex, who was absent from the discussions because he had withdrawn to his country house after an angry confrontation with the Queen over the appointment of a commander of English forces in Ireland. He was not seen again in public until the funeral of Lord Burghley in August, and he was not accepted back at court until September 1598.⁹⁵ This is a significant point, because while Essex was, and is, seen as an aggressive advocate of war, the strategic and military choices facing England were clear to the Queen and her other advisors, notably Sir Robert Cecil, and peace was not sought at all costs. The court was not rigidly split between war and peace factions; disagreements might mark genuine differences over how best to conduct the war, albeit often heated because of personality clashes and Essex’s impetuous temperament.

With Burghley’s death, the way was open for the much younger Essex to promote himself and his policies without the restraining influence of the most senior and venerable figure at court. It was by no means clear that Burghley’s son, Robert Cecil, would maintain his position without his father’s support. The policy associated with the pragmatic disposition of the Cecils towards a negotiated peace, to avoid prolonging or

⁹² Gajda, *Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture*, pp. 97–105; Hugh Gazzard, ‘“Idle papers”’: *An Apology of the Earl of Essex*, in *Essex: The Cultural Impact of an Elizabethan Courtier*, ed. Annaliese Connolly and Lisa Hopkins (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), pp. 179–80, 183–8, 194–6. At least forty-nine manuscript copies survive today.

⁹³ Gajda, ‘Debating War and Peace’, pp. 862–8.

⁹⁴ Hammer, *Elizabeth’s Wars*, pp. 115–22, 204–6; Hammer, *Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics*, pp. 39–46; Wernham, *Return of the Armadas*, pp. 233–4.

⁹⁵ MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I: War and Politics*, pp. 286–8, 517–19; Wernham, *Return of the Armadas*, pp. 235–42, 287–9.

extending the war beyond the kingdom's means, might therefore be checked.⁹⁶ In September the belligerence of Philip III, who had just succeeded to the throne of Spain after the death of his father, Philip II, made it clear that a peaceful resolution of the conflict was not under consideration at the Spanish court.⁹⁷ It was also apparent that a massive military expedition was now required to defeat the Irish rebellion, which Spain would continue to support, and Essex was widely seen as the natural candidate to lead this force.⁹⁸ Against this background Essex, suitably penitent and swearing his love and loyalty to the Queen, arrived back at court, even if his behaviour over the summer had permanently damaged his relationship with the Queen.⁹⁹ In the autumn of 1598, when the first volume of the *Principal Navigations* was completed, the continued prosecution of war on all fronts was, therefore, at the centre of policy. Hakluyt's appending of narratives of the Armada and Cadiz campaigns – his 'double *epiphonema*' – fitted the situation perfectly, the first a heroic tale of national self-defence, the second a daring attempt to bring the war to the enemy's territory itself. They were a perfect compliment to Hakluyt's dedicatee, the lord admiral, even if, as mentioned above, these deeds did not strictly come into Hakluyt's declared criteria for inclusion in the book.

If war and Essex's ostensible position at court seemed assured in late 1598, circumstances were much changed a year later, in the autumn of 1599, when Hakluyt finished the second volume of the *Principal Navigations*. An invasion scare had subsided in August 1599 and it was soon apparent that the Spanish threat had been much exaggerated. There was growing resentment from neutrals, notably the Hanseatic towns, but now the French as well, that their trade was suffering because of English naval operations against Spain. Peace overtures were received from the Archduke Albert, ruler

⁹⁶ Dickinson, *Court Politics and the Earl of Essex*, p. 87; MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I: War and Politics*, pp. 474–7, 555–7; Natalie Mears, 'Regnum Cecilianum? A Perspective of the Court', in *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, ed. Guy, p. 58.

⁹⁷ Paul C. Allen, *Philip III and the Pax Hispanica, 1598–1621: The Failure of Grand Strategy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), pp. 18–21.

⁹⁸ MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I: War and Politics*, pp. 408–14; Geoffrey Parker, *The Grand Strategy of Philip II* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), pp. 278–9; Wernham, *Return of the Armadas*, pp. 283–6. For English fear of Spanish intervention in Ireland, see John McGurk, *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), pp. 11–13.

⁹⁹ Gajda, *Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture*, pp. 153–5; MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I: War and Politics*, pp. 520–1.

of the Spanish Netherlands, in September 1599.¹⁰⁰ Moreover Essex, the chief exponent of continuing the war who had been fashioned into the great hero of Cadiz, was now in a desperate situation. Sent amidst high hopes in March 1599 at the head of a large army to suppress the rebellion in Ireland, his campaign there had stalled.¹⁰¹ His political position was becoming increasingly difficult, and he was slipping socially as well: Sir Robert Sidney and his sister the countess of Pembroke, for example, sensed their friendship with Essex was becoming a liability,¹⁰² and from August Sidney was receiving warnings that his association with the earl would be dangerous to Sidney's reputation at court.¹⁰³ On 7 September Essex parleyed secretly with the rebel leader, the earl of Tyrone, and agreed a temporary truce. For this Essex was strongly reproved by the Queen, and later that month he hurried to England without authorisation to defend himself at court. Still mud-stained from his journey, he burst into the Queen's private rooms, a staggering breach of etiquette and lack of respect. A conciliatory meeting took place a little later but Elizabeth's mood soon changed. Essex was rebuked and ordered to explain his conduct in Ireland. The following day, 29 September, Essex defended himself before the council, but to no avail, and he was confined while charges were prepared against him. In late November the council in Star Chamber condemned his handling of the Irish campaign and publicly justified his imprisonment,¹⁰⁴ at a time when the Queen was actively moving towards entering peace negotiations with Spain.¹⁰⁵ If the Armada campaign, in which England had repulsed an attempted Spanish invasion, posed no divisive political problems as it was

¹⁰⁰ Wernham, *Return of the Armadas*, pp. 264–82, 320–2. In 1598 Albert had married Isabella, daughter of his uncle, Philip II of Spain, whose dowry included the Spanish (Habsburg) Netherlands. Ruling together as the 'archdukes', their regime added yet another element into diplomatic considerations. Isabella had a claim to the English throne through her descent from William the Conqueror's daughter, Constance, and from John of Gaunt. See Luc Duerloo, *Dynasty and Piety: Archduke Albert (1598–1621) and Habsburg Political Culture in the Age of Religious Wars* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), pp. 61–70. Isabella did not in fact pursue her claim, and the archdukes' priority was a negotiated Anglo-Spanish peace, but Philip III's assertion of her right to the English throne fuelled Essex's fear of the unbridled ambition of Spanish power. See Gajda, *Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture*, pp. 104–7.

¹⁰¹ Hammer, *Elizabeth's Wars*, pp. 211–14; Wernham, *Return of the Armadas*, pp. 295–314.

¹⁰² Michael G. Brennan, *The Sidneys of Penshurst and the Monarchy, 1500–1700* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 110–11.

¹⁰³ Michael G. Brennan, 'Robert Sidney and the Earl of Essex: A Dangerous Friendship Viewed Through the Eyes of Rowland Whyte', *Sidney Journal*, vol. 32, no.1 (2014), pp. 23–26.

¹⁰⁴ Hammer, *Elizabeth's Wars*, pp. 215–16; Wernham, *Return of the Armadas*, pp. 315–18, 347.

¹⁰⁵ Wernham, *Return of the Armadas*, p. 322. The Queen informed the Archduke Albert in December 1599 of her willingness to conclude a treaty and that delegates could be sent to meet him in January 1600. The conference eventually met at Boulogne in May 1600.

a legitimate and unambiguous act of self-defence, the Cadiz campaign had problematical, far wider implications – it was taking the war to the enemy homeland and was the emblem of the forward, aggressive foreign policy, and the central role of the disgraced earl of Essex in this. The collapse of Essex’s personal position coincided, therefore, with a developing diplomatic situation that rendered the account of the Cadiz raid potentially and needlessly provocative to those working towards peace. The Cadiz leaves, the second half of Hakluyt’s tribute to his patron and his nation’s glory, would no longer, in the autumn of 1599, seem innocently celebratory and un-divisive. This is the most likely time for the censorship of Hakluyt’s first volume to have taken place, its title-page being reprinted without mention of the Cadiz raid and the account of the raid itself excised.¹⁰⁶

The suppression of the Cadiz leaves does not seem to be connected with other instances of censorship in the course of 1599. The greatest single act of print censorship that year was the so-called Bishops’ Ban, implemented by order of the archbishop of Canterbury, John Whitgift, and the bishop of London, Richard Bancroft, on 1 June.¹⁰⁷ This was designed to curb criticisms of authority, suppressing a number of satirical or otherwise controversial works (their titles or authors were specified) and requiring official approval before histories or plays could be printed. It was short-lived and, as far as can be established, it was perhaps an immediate response to the political turmoil occasioned by events in Ireland, in part intended to protect Essex, now on campaign there, from criticism and divisive controversies over his generalship.¹⁰⁸ Even if Whitgift was acting against writings perceived as generally undesirable, unmoved by his friendship with Essex or material hostile to Essex in particular,¹⁰⁹ the need to defend Essex and the interests of the crown were complementary in this instance: Essex was, after all, a royal appointee to a

¹⁰⁶ For the possible censorship at about this time of the eulogy to Essex and allusions to the Irish campaign in Shakespeare’s *Henry V*, see Janet Clare, *Art Made Tongue-Tied by Authority: Elizabethan and Jacobean Dramatic Censorship*, second edition (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), pp. 92–4.

¹⁰⁷ Arber, *Transcript of the Registers*, vol. 3, pp. 677–8; Richard A. McCabe, ‘“Right Puisante and Terrible Priests”: The Role of the Anglican Church in Elizabethan State Censorship’, in *Literature and Censorship in Renaissance England*, ed. Andrew Hadfield (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 75–94. Shuger, *Censorship and Cultural Sensibility*, p. 76, calls the ban ‘the single most sweeping act of censorship’ in the period 1558–1641.

¹⁰⁸ Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, pp. 198–217. Clegg discusses other interpretations that see the ban in the context of a more pervasive and stronger culture of censorship.

¹⁰⁹ William R. Jones, ‘The Bishops’ Ban of 1599 and the Ideology of English Satire’, *Literature Compass*, vol. 7, no. 5 (2010), p. 338, and McCabe, ‘“Right Puisante and Terrible Priests”’, p. 85, both question Essex-related interpretations of the ban.

crucial military office, so attacks on him could be seen as critical of the Queen, implicitly questioning her judgement and right to make such appointments.

It remains true, however, that Whitgift was Essex's most consistent friend at court and Essex had supported him against the Cecils in Whitgift's nomination of Bancroft as bishop of London in 1597.¹¹⁰ That Essex himself might use his influence with Whitgift, as the senior official concerned with the administration of censorship, can be seen in the instance of John Hayward's history of Henry IV, published by John Wolfe in early 1599.¹¹¹ This included a politically embarrassing dedication to Essex and within a week or so of its publication in February 1599, Essex had formally complained to Whitgift, who promptly ordered the excision of the dedication; a few months later the entire second edition was seized and burnt.¹¹² Another episode of censorship at the instigation of Essex is that of a surreptitious unauthorised printing of his *Apologie*,¹¹³ which, as discussed above, he had deliberately kept in manuscript since writing it in 1598. When in 1600 Essex found that printed copies were circulating, he asserted his innocence to the privy council on 9 May, saying that the pamphlet had been published without his 'liking or privity' out of malice by his 'secret enemies' (later that month Essex was reported as thinking that the manuscript used for printing must have been taken or copied by corrupt

¹¹⁰ Gajda, *Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture*, pp. 118–20; Hammer, *Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics*, pp. 80, 377.

¹¹¹ [John Hayward], *The First Part of the Life and Raigne of King Henrie the IIII. Extending to the End of the First Yeare of His Raigne. Written by I. H.* (London: [Edward Allde and Thomas Judson for] John Wolfe, 1599) (STC 12995). For this, the second edition, and the surreptitious editions purporting to have been published by Wolfe in 1599 (STC 12996, 12997, 12997a), see John J. Manning, ed., *The First and Second Parts of John Hayward's The Life and Raigne of King Henrie IIII* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1991), pp. 42–50.

¹¹² Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, pp. 202–4. The suppression of this book has been much discussed. See further, e.g., Richard Dutton, *Licensing, Censorship and Authorship in Early Modern England: Buggeswords* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2000), pp. 162–91; Alexandra Gajda, 'The Earl of Essex and "Politie History"', in *Essex*, ed. Connolly & Hopkins, pp. 239–47; Rebecca Lemon, *Treason by Words: Literature, Law, and Rebellion in Shakespeare's England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006), pp. 23–51; Manning, ed., *First and Second Parts of John Hayward's The Life and Raigne of King Henrie IIII*, pp. 17–34; Alzada J. Tipton, '“Lively Patterns . . . for Affayres of State”: Sir John Hayward's *The Life and Reigne of King Henrie IIII* and the Earl of Essex', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol. 33, no. 3 (Fall 2002), pp. 769–94.

¹¹³ Robert Devereux, second earl of Essex, headed A1^r, *To Maister Anthonie Bacon. An Apologie of the Earle of Essex, against those which falsly and maliciously taxe him to be the onely hinderer of the peace, and quiet of his countrey* ([? London: John Smethwick, 1600]) (STC 6787.7).

servants from ‘loose papers’ he kept under his bed).¹¹⁴ Essex himself, ‘very much troubled withal’, as Rowland Whyte told Sir Robert Sidney on 10 May, ‘sent to my Lord of Canterbury and others and to the stationers to suppress them, for it is done without his knowledge or procurement, and fears it may be ill taken. 2 are committed to close prison; what they will disclose is not yet known’; on 13 May Whyte added, ‘The Queen is offended that this apology of peace is printed’.¹¹⁵ The seizure was speedily achieved through the offices of Whitgift, who reported to Sir Robert Cecil on 10 May that about 210 of the 292 copies the printers had confessed to have produced were now in his hands and that the rest would soon be recovered.¹¹⁶ Both these instances demonstrate that censorship was not necessarily imposed by official decree, but could be brought about by personal considerations and influence.

Whatever the relationship between Essex and the Bishop’s Ban, it made no attempt to control publications relating to foreign policy, a context in which Hakluyt’s Cadiz leaves might be read. In fact the issues of war and peace were much discussed in print at this time. Numerous topical Dutch tracts concerning the Spanish war were translated and published in English, many by John Wolfe (whose concern seems to have been purely commercial, without the sponsorship of any particular interest at court). Not one of these was censored, nor were they printed clandestinely, and yet they were making an overt and controversial political point – to continue the war – or at least meeting the demands of a readership that was inclined towards war.¹¹⁷ The one important exception to this was the campaign in Ireland, a matter that was difficult to discuss or report openly in print at all in the 1590s.¹¹⁸ In June 1599 it was ‘forbidden, on pain of death, to write or speak of Irish

¹¹⁴ Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury, &c. &c. &c. Preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire. Part X* (London: HMSO, 1904), pp. 141–2, 156.

¹¹⁵ Michael G. Brennan, Noel J. Kinnamon and Margaret P. Hannay, eds, *The Letters (1595–1608) of Rowland Whyte* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2013), pp. 476, 480. Originals excerpted or summarised in Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Report on the Manuscripts of Lord de L’Isle & Dudley Preserved at Penshurst Place Volume 2*, ed. C. L. Kingsford (London: HMSO, 1934), pp. 459, 461.

¹¹⁶ Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, pp. 209–10; Gazzard, ‘“Idle papers”: An Apology of the Earl of Essex’, pp. 181–3; Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury . . . Part X*, pp. iv–v, 142–3. The only known survivor of this edition is now in the Huntington Library (call no. 60438).

¹¹⁷ Gajda, ‘Debating War and Peace’, pp. 871–7. For Wolfe’s publications 1598–1600, see also Huffman, *Elizabethan Impressions: John Wolfe and His Press*, pp. 157–60.

¹¹⁸ Andrew Hadfield, ‘Censoring Ireland in Elizabethan England, 1580–1600’, in *Literature and Censorship in Elizabethan England*, ed. Hadfield, pp. 149–64.

affairs' and any news that had been received was 'known only to the Council'.¹¹⁹ It is unsurprising, therefore, that in 1599 only one news item relating to the Irish war was printed, and none in 1600, whereas fourteen relating to the Continental wars appeared in 1599, eleven in 1600.¹²⁰ Ireland, however, was not regarded as a foreign conflict, but as a rebellion directly threatening the Queen's authority within her own realm.¹²¹

The removal of Hakluyt's Cadiz leaves, neither polemical nor partisan (and certainly not satirical), neither subversive of Essex, nor exaggeratedly supportive of him, cannot plausibly be related to the Bishops' Ban. Nor is there any evidence of a general move to curtail discussion of the Spanish war that might have encompassed a narrative of the Cadiz raid, which, aside from Essex's later role as commander in Ireland from March until September 1599, had no sensitive associations that might have invited censorship in an Irish context. If, therefore, the suppression of the Cadiz leaves by royal or official order seems unlikely, especially so if the existence of a permanent ban since 1596 is not established, what alternative explanations suggest themselves?

As we have seen, Hakluyt's account of the Cadiz raid was taken from that of Roger Marbeck, a royal physician seconded to the lord admiral. It is conceivable that the lord admiral, to whom Hakluyt dedicated his book, encouraged Hakluyt to include the Cadiz account, and it is unlikely that Hakluyt would have included an account of the Cadiz raid by an associate of the lord admiral without the latter's foreknowledge. Could the lord admiral, in the changed circumstances of autumn 1599, have had second thoughts and indicated to Hakluyt that the Cadiz leaves might be best removed? There was now a lull in Anglo-Spanish hostilities, with the military and financial resources of both sides seriously depleted, and the Queen and her council considered diplomatic solutions to end the conflict.¹²² The lord admiral soon disbanded his forces after the Spanish invasion fear passed in August 1599, and while he undoubtedly remained proud of his part in the Cadiz raid in 1596, he also recognized the constraints on England's ability to wage seemingly

¹¹⁹ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1598–1601*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London: Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer, 1869), p. 225.

¹²⁰ G. B. Harrison, 'Books and Readers, 1599–1603', *The Library*, fourth series, vol. 14, no. 1 (June 1933), p. 10.

¹²¹ McGurk, *Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland*, pp. 14–15.

¹²² Wernham, *Return of the Armadas*, pp. 319–20.

interminable war and that peace had to be considered.¹²³ In these circumstances it would have been realistic for the lord admiral to position himself away from drawing undue attention to the raid and its bellicose foreign policy implications.

Or, might it be possible that Hakluyt's indebtedness to Robert Cecil lies behind the removal of the Cadiz leaves as well? Although Hakluyt had dedicated the first volume of the *Principal Navigations* to the lord admiral, he turned to Cecil for the second, which appeared in late 1599 (as he would for the third, in 1600).¹²⁴ A realistic, negotiated peace with Spain was favoured by Cecil, the leading figure at court advocating this policy, which finally came to fruition in 1604.¹²⁵ A downplaying of the Cadiz expedition which was so closely associated with Cecil's principal political rival, Essex, who was besides persona non grata at court now, would have done Hakluyt no harm, especially if he expected Cecil's support in obtaining preferment in the Church. He certainly suffered no ill consequences for having printed an account of the raid. In November 1599, a month after Hakluyt had dated his dedication of the second volume to him, Cecil was requesting that the next vacancy of a chaplaincy at the hospital of the Savoy 'be stayed for the preferment of Mr. Hackluyt, one of good note and merit',¹²⁶ while on 18 May 1600 the privy council, with Cecil and the lord admiral sitting, proposed Hakluyt, 'a learned preacher', to Archbishop John Whitgift for the living, should it become vacant, of Great All Hallows in recognition of Hakluyt's 'very great paynes in matter of navigacion and dyscoveryes, a labor of great desert and use', which would be 'for the good of her

¹²³ Kenny, *Elizabeth's Admiral*, pp. 229–32, 284–5. In 1604 the lord admiral was to lead the embassy to Spain to ratify the peace treaty ending two decades of war.

¹²⁴ For other books dedicated to Cecil, see Fox, 'The Complaint of Poetry for the Death of Liberality', pp. 243–4. Various aspects of his patronage are discussed in Pauline Croft, ed., *Patronage, Culture and Power: The Early Cecils* (New Haven: Yale University Press for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, 2002). Hakluyt perhaps hoped to receive greater support from Cecil. As Kenny, *Elizabeth's Admiral*, pp. 244–5, observes, the lord admiral's patronage generally 'tended to be rather negligent, and he gave little more than his name in return'.

¹²⁵ For Cecil's role in negotiating peace from 1598, see Pauline Croft, 'Rex Pacificus, Robert Cecil, and the 1604 Peace with Spain', in *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences*, ed. Glenn Burgess, Rowland Wymer and Jason Lawrence (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), pp. 140–54.

¹²⁶ Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury, K.G., &c. &c. Preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire. Part IX* (London: HMSO, 1902), pp. 397–8. See also Quinn, ed., *Hakluyt Handbook*, vol. 2, p. 313. In October 1601 Hakluyt signed himself 'Your Honors Chaplein' in the dedication to Cecil of his translation of António Galvão, *The Discoveries of the World from Their First Originall unto the Yeere of Our Lord 1555* (London: [Eliots Court Press] for George Bishop, 1601) (STC 11543), A4^r.

Majesty's service'.¹²⁷ Cecil and the lord admiral also recommended Hakluyt for the grant of a prebend at Westminster Abbey,¹²⁸ which he achieved in May 1602.¹²⁹ Hakluyt, it may be suggested, therefore withdrew the Cadiz leaves voluntarily out of deference to Cecil, his newer patron, because the shifting emphasis in foreign policy and court politics made prudent a distancing from the Cadiz raid and all that it stood for. In this, he was doing no more than were others, such as Raleigh, who had long enjoyed Cecil's support, in aligning himself with the political mainstream.¹³⁰

In terms of court politics at the time, it makes little difference whether the removal of the Cadiz leaves was due to the interference or wishes of the lord admiral or Cecil, or Hakluyt's deference to either of them, for the two were politically as one. As Sir Robert Sidney heard from Rowland Whyte, his agent at court, 'My Lord Admiral as you know can do nor will do nothing, but what may stand with Mr. Secretary's liking', while Cecil enjoyed the full confidence of the Queen, whose 'favor increases towards him, so careful he is of her business and service, and indeed the whole weight of the state lies upon him'.¹³¹

We know little of how readers at the time responded to the Cadiz leaves. There is no documentary evidence that they aroused hostility or caused political or personal

¹²⁷ *Acts of the Privy Council of England. New Series. Vol. XXX. A.D. 1599–1600*, ed. John Roche Dasent (London: HMSO, 1905), pp. 329–31. The others present at this meeting were the lord keeper, the lord treasurer, Lord North, and the lord chief justice. See also Mordechai Feingold, *The Mathematicians' Apprenticeship: Science, Universities and Society, 1560–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), p. 210; Parks, *Richard Hakluyt*, pp. 201–2; Quinn, ed., *Hakluyt Handbook*, vol. 2, p. 313 (misnaming the archbishop as George Abbot). The vacancy, dependent on the death of the incumbent, was not in the event filled by Hakluyt.

¹²⁸ The Queen responded that she would not grant any prebend at Westminster until one fell void. Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury, &c. &c. &c. Preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire. Part X*, pp. 436–7 (this document is undated, but is calendared under 1600).

¹²⁹ Joyce M. Horn, ed., *John Le Neve Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1541–1857 VII: Ely, Norwich, Westminster and Worcester Dioceses* (London: Institute of Historical Research, 1992), p. 75. For Hakluyt at Westminster Abbey, see Quinn, ed., *Hakluyt Handbook*, vol. 2, pp. 317–23, 329–31. Many of the archival references given by Quinn have since been printed in C. S. Knighton, ed., *Acts of the Dean and Chapter of Westminster 1543–1609*, 2 pts (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1997–99), *Acts of the Dean and Chapter of Westminster 1609–1642* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006).

¹³⁰ Hammer, *Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics*, pp. 362–3, 396–7; Nicholls & Williams, *Sir Walter Raleigh*, pp. 120–31. Raleigh dedicated his *The Discoverie of the Large, Rich, and Bewtiful Empyre of Guiana* (London: Robert Robinson, 1596) (STC 20634–6) to Cecil.

¹³¹ Brennan, Kinnamon & Hannay, eds, *Letters (1595–1608) of Rowland Whyte*, pp. 331 (12 September 1599), 399 (5 January 1600). Originals summarised or excerpted in Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Report on the Manuscripts of Lord de L'Isle & Dudley Preserved at Penshurst Place Volume 2*, ed. Kingsford, pp. 390, 427. For the closeness of Cecil and the lord admiral (who had also been on good terms with Cecil's late father, William Cecil, Lord Burghley), see Kenny, *Elizabeth's Admiral*, pp. 204–6.

offence. A contemporary record of their reception is found among the papers of Robert Beale, a clerk of the privy council employed in the peace negotiations of 1600, who died in 1601. At the beginning of a journal by an anonymous member of Essex's company in his flagship, the *Due Repulse*, is an annotation by Beale: 'Look M^r Hacluit first booke'.¹³² This is clearly a reference to the Cadiz leaves in the first volume of the *Principal Navigations*. In comparing the two Beale must have recognised that the two accounts offered different perspectives, with Hakluyt's author witnessing the raid from the lord admiral's *Ark Royal*, and the *Due Repulse* author actually involved with Essex in the fighting. Whether Beale was looking for politically relevant differences is impossible to say: none is apparent, but the *Due Repulse* journal naturally has much concerning Essex's part in the action. It might be that Beale, a man with scholarly interests and a fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, was simply curious about the historical record.¹³³ Lastly, it may be noted that Archbishop Whitgift's copy (at Lambeth Palace) contains the Cadiz leaves, while in Robert Cecil's (at Hatfield House) they are too short and could have been added much later, perhaps, if they were considered objectionable to him, because they were not originally present.¹³⁴

Essex and the Cadiz Leaves after 1599

In early 1600 numerous prints of an equestrian portrait of Essex, celebrating his heroic exploits and honours, were circulating and were called in (not, it would seem, for the first time), as Rowland Whyte told Sir Robert Sidney:

Some foolish, idle-headed ballad-maker of late caused many of his pictures to be printed on horseback, with all his titles of honor, all his services, and two verses underneath that gave him exceeding praise for wisdom, honor, worth,

¹³² 'A Jernall of the Spanishe actions begon and performed by the Erle of Essex and the L. Highe Admirall of Englande LL. Generalls of her Majestie's forces bothe by sea and lande', British Library, Add. MS 48152 (previously Yelverton MS 163), ff. 185–92.

¹³³ For Beale and this manuscript, see British Library, *Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts: The Yelverton Manuscripts Part I Descriptions Additional Manuscripts 48000–48196* (London: British Library, 1994), pp. ix–xviii, 349–53; Hammer, 'New Light on the Cadiz Expedition', pp. 184–202.

¹³⁴ Neville-Sington & Payne, 'Interim Census', pp. 49, 52. Both have the 1598 title-page. Cecil's copy was renovated in 1712.

that heaven and earth approve it, God's elected, with such words as hath occasioned the calling of them all in again.¹³⁵

The persistent proliferation of such images caused great concern and in August the privy council moved to suppress all engraved 'pictures of noblemen and other persons' (often, it noted, printed 'with verses . . . not fytte to be used'), called in the offending portraits, and forbade publication of further engravings of 'any nobelmann or other person' without the approval of the archbishop of Canterbury, excepting only 'well done' pictures of the Queen.¹³⁶ This censorship was categorical and no particular portraits were singled-out. Rather than directed specifically against Essex, therefore, it reflects the crown's desire to quell all demonstrations of popularity as evenly-handed as possible, and among the portraits called in would probably have been a similar one of the lord admiral, published in late 1599 or early 1600.¹³⁷ Moreover this censorship occurred in the same month as Essex's release from house arrest (he had been free from actual imprisonment since March 1600), and although he was still excluded from court, there were hopes that he might yet be returned to royal favour.¹³⁸ It is, nevertheless, true that the authorities were fearful that Essex's popularity might provoke unrest if action was taken against him, and this was especially so at the time of his execution in February 1601.¹³⁹

¹³⁵ Brennan, Kinnamon & Hannay, eds, *Letters (1595–1608) of Rowland Whyte*, p. 418 (2 February 1600). Also in Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Report on the Manuscripts of Lord de L'Isle & Dudley Preserved at Penshurst Place Volume 2*, ed. Kingsford, p. 435.

¹³⁶ *Acts of the Privy Council of England. New Series. Vol. XXX. A.D. 1599–1600*, ed. Dasent, pp. 619–20; Roy Strong, *Gloriana: The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1987), p. 32. Prints were subject to the same licensing and censorship regime as books. Malcolm Jones, *The Print in Early Modern England: An Historical Oversight* (New Haven: Yale University Press for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, 2010), p. 4. The quality and suitability of portraits of the Queen in any medium were subject to the prior approval of her serjeant painter and all public officials were empowered to take action against poor or otherwise inappropriate portrayals of her. See *Acts of the Privy Council of England. New Series. Vol. XXVI. A.D. 1596–7*, ed. Dasent, p. 69; Strong, *Gloriana*, pp. 12, 14–15.

¹³⁷ Richard C. McCoy, *The Rites of Knighthood: The Literature and Politics of Elizabethan Chivalry*, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989), pp. 96–8. The portraits in question are taken to be the series, including Essex and the lord admiral (as earl of Nottingham), engraved by Thomas Cockson, which are described by Hind, *Engraving in England*, vol. 1, *Tudor Period*, pp. 239, 243–6, 249–50.

¹³⁸ Dickinson, *Court Politics and the Earl of Essex*, pp. 58–61; MacCaffrey, *Elizabeth I: War and Politics*, pp. 527–30.

¹³⁹ Kevin Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), pp. 449–50. For the problem of Essex's popularity, including the portraits, see Gajda, *Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture*, pp. 200–9. On 8 April 1601 Sir William Browne reported from Flushing that he had acted to prevent the sale in the town of portraits of

In late 1600 John Stow encountered no difficulties in publishing ‘An Abstract of the expedition to Cadiz 1596. drawne out of Commentaries written at large thereof, by a Gentleman who was in the voyage’ in the new edition of his *Annales of England*, which carried a dedication to Archbishop Whitgift dated 24 November 1600.¹⁴⁰ Although the composition and authorship of this account have not been conclusively determined, it describes the fighting on the Portuguese coast after Cadiz had been abandoned, which Marbeck did not witness (‘I minde to leave it to some other, whose chance was to be present at the action, as my selfe was not’).¹⁴¹ There are sufficient other dissimilarities in incidental detail to suggest that, even if comparable in overall tone and non-partisanship, Stow’s is not merely a re-rendering of the Marbeck/Hakluyt narrative,¹⁴² and on circumstantial evidence it has been attributed to George Buc, who served under the lord admiral on the Cadiz expedition (and previously in the Armada campaign).¹⁴³ If Hakluyt’s Cadiz narrative was censored in 1599, it is difficult to see why Stow’s escaped such problems in late 1600, unless the reasons for the censorship of Hakluyt were specific to particular political circumstances and to the various individuals involved in the publication of the *Principal Navigations*. Hakluyt was much closer to the court than Stow and would have been more sensitive to the social pressures facing an insider. Stow’s background was quite different and, although not radical or subversive, he worked

Essex ‘printed att Amsterdam on horseback, lyke those that were done when he was a good subject to mens judgment’. Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Report on the Manuscripts of Lord de L’Isle & Dudley Preserved at Penshurst Place Volume 2*, ed. Kingsford, p. 518.

¹⁴⁰ John Stow, *The Annales of England, Faithfully Collected Out of the Most Autenticall Authors, Records, and Other Monuments of Antiquitie, Lately Corrected, Encreased, and Continued, from the First Inhabitation untill This Present Yeere 1600* (London: [Peter Short and Felix Kingston for] Ralph Newbery, [1600]) (STC 23335) (Peter Short is identified as one of the printers in the STC corrigenda, vol. 3, p. 310), a2^{r-v}, pp. 1283–93 (Pppp3^{r-8^r}). Hammer, ‘Myth-Making’, p. 640, cites the later variant with the title ending ‘untill This Present Yeere 1601’ (London: [Peter Short and Felix Kingston for] Ralph Newbery, [1601]) (STC 23336). He suggests the ‘controversy about Cadiz did not finally begin to lose its special bitterness until the fall of Essex in February 1601’, which eased the publication of Stow’s account ‘later in that year’.

¹⁴¹ Hakluyt, *Principal Navigations*, vol. 1, p. 619 (Fff4^r).

¹⁴² Pace Hammer, ‘Myth-Making’, p.640 (n.106), who says, ‘A cursory examination shows that Stow based his narrative on Dr Marbeck’s account, just as Hakluyt did’.

¹⁴³ Eccles, ‘Sir George Buc, Master of the Revels’, pp. 428–31. This attribution has been followed by subsequent students of Buc(k), including Arthur Kincaid, ‘Buck [Buc], Sir George (*bap.* 1560, *d.* 1622)’, in *ODNB*, and W. R. Streitberger, *The Master of the Revels and Elizabeth I’s Court Theatre* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), p. 213.

outside the close confines of court patronage, the universities and the church.¹⁴⁴ While he was familiar to many leading figures of the day, Stow, unlike Hakluyt perhaps, would not have felt the need to tailor inclusion of his Cadiz narrative in this respect. Still, if there had been an enduring ban on publications on Cadiz since 1596, there seems to be no reason why Stow should have escaped it. It is improbable that Whitgift would have flagrantly allowed the publication of a work containing banned subject-matter and bearing a dedication to him in person. At a personal level, if Whitgift had been sympathetic to Essex in the past, he was by late 1600 unwilling to seek his rehabilitation at court.¹⁴⁵

In fact the publication of Stow's account after late November 1600 is the most persuasive evidence that the suppression of Hakluyt's Cadiz leaves, whether it was due to official censorship or various personal considerations as outlined above, occurred during the autumn of 1599, when the possibility of negotiating an end to the war with Spain seemed to be emerging. If so, this suggests that foreign policy and diplomatic considerations underlay the suppression, and that the Cadiz raid and its close association with a forward Continental strategic offensive against Spain are more relevant to the suppression than Essex's personal position at court. By August 1600, after the collapse of the peace conference convened at Boulogne,¹⁴⁶ there were no diplomatic or political reasons to continue the suppression and the leaves could be reinstated free of such immediate troublesome connotations. It may also be noted that in October 1599 the directors of the nascent East India Company suspended plans for a voyage to the East Indies when it became clear that official policy did not want to risk such a venture, a direct challenge to Iberian claims to a monopoly of trade in the region, becoming an impediment in possible peace negotiations with Spain. Preparations for the voyage resumed in September 1600, by which time such talks were no longer an issue.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁴ See Ian W. Archer, 'John Stow: Citizen and Historian', and Derek Pearsall, 'John Stow and Thomas Speght as Editors of Chaucer: A Question of Class', in *John Stow (1525–1605) and the Making of the English Past*, ed. Ian Gadd and Alexandra Gillespie (London: British Library, 2004), pp. 13–26, 119–25; Barrett L. Beer, *Tudor England Observed: The World of John Stow* (Thrupp: Sutton, 1998), pp. 1–22.

¹⁴⁵ Gajda, *Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture*, p. 151.

¹⁴⁶ Wernham, *Return of the Armadas*, pp. 324–30.

¹⁴⁷ Sir William Foster, *England's Quest of Eastern Trade* (London: A. & C. Black, 1933), pp. 147–8; Henry Stevens, ed., *The Dawn of British Trade to the East Indies as Recorded in the Court Minutes of the East India Company 1599–1603 Containing an Account of the Formation of the Company the First Adventure and Waymouth's Voyage in Search of the North-West Passage Now First Printed from the*

If it is difficult to establish exactly why the Cadiz leaves were removed, the bibliographical record indicates that any censorship must have been laxly or only temporarily implemented because the leaves survive in such a large number of copies.¹⁴⁸ In some copies in unrestored contemporary bindings it is possible to see the stubs left by the excision of the Cadiz leaves, yet the Cadiz leaves are present, their paper identical in condition and size to the rest of the book and the binding accommodating them perfectly, which indicates that the re-insertion could not have been done at a significantly later date.¹⁴⁹ (In rebound or much restored copies it is not always possible to say whether the Cadiz leaves originally belonged or not, although in some instances it is obvious that they have been supplied much later because they are smaller, re-margined, or in different condition from the rest of the book.) Booksellers may well have been complicit in the retention of the Cadiz leaves and it has been suggested that the excised leaves were available under the counter, so that early owners of the book often had them inserted or bound back in at the time of purchase or soon after.¹⁵⁰

The appearance of Stow's Cadiz narrative after November 1600 indicates there would by then would have been no pressing external reason to continue to hide the Cadiz leaves. If some still felt caution was necessary or prudent, it need not have extended into the next reign, because within a few months of the Queen's death in March 1603 there was another printing of Essex's far more controversial *Apologie*.¹⁵¹ The new king, James

Original Manuscript by Henry Stevens of Vermont with an Introduction by Sir George Birdwood (London: Henry Stevens & Son, 1886), pp. 10–12; Wernham, *Return of the Armadas*, p. 333. For Hakluyt's association with the company, see Anthony Payne, 'Hakluyt and the East India Company: A Documentary and Bibliographical Review', *Journal of the Hakluyt Society*, online (February 2021).

¹⁴⁸ Neville-Sington & Payne, 'Interim Census', pp. 47–76, record the presence or not of the Cadiz leaves.

¹⁴⁹ See, e.g., British Library, 683.h.5.6. Observed in other copies by Jackson & Unger, *Carl H. Pforzheimer Library: English Literature*, vol. 2, p. 437, who suggest that when the Cadiz leaves were 'ordered suppressed' they 'were cut out but not destroyed and in some copies which were unsold after Elizabeth's death the original leaves were re-inserted'.

¹⁵⁰ P. A. Neville-Sington, '“A very good Trumpet”: Richard Hakluyt and the Politics of Overseas Expansion', in *Texts and Cultural Change in Early Modern England*, ed. Cedric C. Brown and Arthur F. Marotti (Houndmills: Macmillan, 1997), p. 76. The proposal of William A. Jackson, 'Counterfeit Printing in Jacobean Times', *The Library*, fourth series, vol. 15, no. 3 (December 1934), p. 376, that there was an 'apparently contemporary' second printing of the Cadiz leaves, because 'not enough copies of the cancelled setting were preserved', has not been borne out by subsequent research. STC 12626 (note) does record the original on two stocks of paper (one with chainlines 20–25 mm apart, the other 27–30 mm apart), but this would seem simply to reflect a change or the use of mixed paper during its printing rather than a reprinting.

¹⁵¹ Robert Devereux, second earl of Essex, *An Apologie of the Earle of Essex, against Those Which Iealously, and Maliciously, Tax Him to Be the Hinderer of the Peace and Quiet of His Country. Penned by Himselfe in 1598* (London: Richard Bradock, 1603) (STC 6788).

I, was widely known to favour peace, proclaiming a cease-fire at sea in May and receiving a delegation from the Archduke Albert as early as June,¹⁵² and while this edition of the *Apologie* was not published surreptitiously, its potential sensitivity was recognised in the entry in the Stationer's Register for 8 June 1603, which included the proviso 'not to be printed till he [the printer] bringe Auctoritie for the same'.¹⁵³ Despite it being a clear attempt by sympathisers of Essex to influence policy when negotiations with Spain were imminent, no censorship was attempted, and the only dispute arising from the book's printing was within the Stationers' Company, which was apparently commercial in origin, not about the work's content.¹⁵⁴ Unlike 1599, the domestic and international political situation in 1603 was such that neither the monarch, nor, most importantly, Robert Cecil, for long working pragmatically towards ending the war, need have been unduly concerned about those (although there were many) wanting to pursue the aggressive policies of Essex,¹⁵⁵ and with the earl dead, there was, of course, no divisive figure of any stature around whom they might rally in rejecting peace moves. If the content of the *Apologie* was contrary to official policy, its publication cannot in 1603 have been regarded as a serious or actual threat to government authority. The relatively uncontentious Cadiz leaves would have been even less so.

A peace treaty with Spain was finally reached in August 1604, but for its opponents Essex's offensive strategy continued to represent an alternative foreign policy, especially after the Bohemian revolt in 1618 and the outbreak of war again on the Continent.¹⁵⁶ Appropriately Hakluyt's narrative was the principal basis for '*A briefe and true report of the Honorable Voyage unto Cadiz, 1596. of the overthrow of the Kings Fleete, and of the*

¹⁵² Croft, 'Rex Pacificus, Robert Cecil, and the 1604 Peace with Spain', pp. 140, 147–8.

¹⁵³ Arber, ed., *Transcript of the Registers*, vol. 3, p. 236.

¹⁵⁴ Gazzard, ' "Idle papers": An Apology of the Earl of Essex', pp. 190–1; William A. Jackson, ed., *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company 1602 to 1640* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1957), pp. 9–10.

¹⁵⁵ Croft, 'Rex Pacificus, Robert Cecil, and the 1604 Peace with Spain', p. 151. Croft identifies the sustained goodwill of the archdukes in Brussels after 1599 and, crucially, the surrender of the earl of Tyrone in Ireland in March 1603, as major factors in bringing about the propitious political conditions for peace in 1603. To these should be added the peaceful accession of James I, which greatly surprised many foreign observers. The skilful manoeuvring and diplomacy of Cecil (who remained in office and was soon ennobled by James) was central to securing this. For James's succession and the first year of his reign, see Clare Jackson, *Devil-Land: England under Siege, 1588–1688* (London: Allen Lane, 2021), pp. 88–109.

¹⁵⁶ Thomas Cogswell, *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621–1624* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp.12–17, 93–103, 286–8; Mervyn James, *Society, Politics and Culture: Studies in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), pp. 461–3; Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*, pp. 112–15, 173–5, 199–201; Wernham, *Return of the Armadas*, pp. 413–14.

winning of the Citie, with other accidents, gathered out of METERANUS, Master HACKLUYT and others', edited by Samuel Purchas for publication in *Purchas His Pilgrimes* in 1625,¹⁵⁷ the year in which the duke of Buckingham ordered another attack on Cadiz, an action inspired by the 'famous victorie' of 1596. This expedition was a disastrous failure.¹⁵⁸

Reproductions of the Cadiz Leaves

In some copies of the *Principal Navigations* the absence of the Cadiz leaves has been rectified by various forms of reproduction of the original text.¹⁵⁹ One is known with the Cadiz leaves supplied in a seventeenth-century manuscript transcript,¹⁶⁰ and another with these leaves in '18th-century manuscript'.¹⁶¹ It is perhaps surprising that more are not like this, as, after all, the practice of supplying manuscript copies of missing leaves went back to the early days of printing and was not at all unusual.¹⁶² It may be that there was generally no need to resort to scribes to make good the deficiency since the book was readily available complete with the original leaves if desired. However, in the eighteenth century, by which time the book was said to be becoming 'scarce and obscure',¹⁶³ the

¹⁵⁷ Samuel Purchas, *Purchas His Pilgrimes*, vol. 4 (London: William Stansby for Henry Fetherstone, 1625) (STC 20509), pp. 1927–34 (X6x5^r–Y6y2^r). In a side-note Purchas said that 'M. Hackluit had published the large report of this Voyage written by one employed therein: out of which I have taken that which served our purpose' (p. 1927). See n.41 above for Van Meteren's *Historia Belgica* also drawn on by Purchas.

¹⁵⁸ Hammer, 'Myth-Making', pp. 640–2; Rodger, *Safeguard of the Sea*, pp. 357–9.

¹⁵⁹ The presence of reproductions in copies that lack the original Cadiz leaves is recorded by Neville-Sington & Payne, 'Interim Census'.

¹⁶⁰ Sold at Sotheby's, London, 15 December 1999, lot 463 (1598 title-page, book-plates of Frederick Fermor-Hesketh, d. 1955).

¹⁶¹ Item 41 in Catalogue 168 (1984) of the New York bookseller, H. P. Kraus (1598 title-page). Neville-Sington & Payne, 'Interim Census', p. 59.

¹⁶² David McKitterick, *Old Books, New Technologies: The Representation, Conservation and Transformation of Books since 1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p. 37. For an (extreme) instance of extensive manuscript production to complete a printed book in response to its suppression, see Richard Serjeantson and Thomas Woolford, 'The Scribal Publication of a Printed Book: Francis Bacon's *Certaine Considerations touching . . . the Church of England* (1604)', *The Library*, seventh series, vol. 10, no. 2 (June 2009), pp. 119–56.

¹⁶³ Oldys, *British Librarian*, p. 137. Oldys also reports disappointment that a reprint under his auspices had not appeared. He notes this abandoned edition in his (anonymous) life of Hakluyt in *Biographia Britannica*, vol. 4 (London W. Meadows [and others], 1757), p. 2472, giving a reference to 'the Proposals for reprinting by subscription, the Navigations &c. of the English Nation by Ric. Hakluyt, M.A. &c., in one vol. folio, printed on a half sheet, 1736' (no copy of this flyer seems extant today). See also Quinn, ed., *Hakluyt Handbook*, vol. 1, pp. 142–3. STC 12626a notes a vol. 1 title-page dated '1600' but printed c.1735, which is also discussed by Quinn, ed., *Hakluyt Handbook*, vol. 2, pp. 491–3, illustrated fig. 27 (p.

Cadiz leaves were reprinted in the early 1720s,¹⁶⁴ and again in c.1795,¹⁶⁵ so that incomplete copies of the *Principal Navigations* could be ‘perfected’. An advertisement in *The Post-Boy*, 21 February 1723, enables a reasonably close dating of the first reprint and provides one of the earliest instances of the conventional explanation for the removal of the original leaves as due to Essex’s disgrace:

Whereas a brief and true Report of the Honourable *Voyage unto Cadiz*, in 1596; of the Overthrow of the King’s Fleet; and of the Winning, Sacking, and Burning of the City; with all other Accidents of Moment thereunto appertaining, made by the Rt. Hon. the Earl of *Essex*, &c. printed in *Hackluit’s* Collection of Voyages in the Year 1600, was on that Earl’s Disgrace, for Reasons of State, Castrated out of the said Book, and thereby become extremely scarce. This is to give Notice, that a few Copies are printed for the Curious, and will be sold for 5 s. each, by *D. Browne jun.* at the *Black Swan* without *Temple-Bar*, and *James Woodman* at *Cambden’s* Head in *Bow-Street*, *Covent-Garden*.¹⁶⁶

Both versions of the reprinted leaves are carefully produced, but they cannot have been intended to deceive and are readily identifiable from their distinct typographical appearances when compared to the originals, or from the information provided in standard bibliographical descriptions (most obviously, the original leaves are paginated pp. 607–19; the early 1720s reprint pp. 607–20; and that of c.1795 pp. 607–‘417’

505). Henry Woudhuysen wonders ‘whether it might be associated with the unrealised 1736 subscription reprint’, and that perhaps one can ‘imagine a proposal on one side of the half-sheet and a trial title-page on the other’ (personal e-mail, 30 January 2021).

¹⁶⁴ Birch, *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, vol. 2, p. 98: ‘a complete copy of mr. Hakluyt’s work being discover’d about the middle of the reign of King George I [1714–27], that narrative was reprinted from it, in order to be re-inserted in the volume’; Oldys, *British Librarian*, pp. 158–9. This reprint is given its own entry in the online British Library English Short Title Catalogue (ESTC), citation no. T154572.

¹⁶⁵ Armstrong, ‘The “Voyage to Cadiz”’, p. 259. Watermark dates of 1790 and 1794 have been observed in some examples.

¹⁶⁶ The advertisement appeared again in *The Post-Boy*, 26 February 1723. With very many thanks to Henry Woudhuysen for drawing this reference to my attention and for allowing its publication here in advance of his own work on facsimile production.

(misnumbering p. 617).¹⁶⁷ The original state of the title-page of volume 1 (1598, mentioning Cadiz) was also reprinted c.1795.¹⁶⁸ Such remedial bibliographical treatment is not unusual. In the 1720s, for instance, the censored leaves from Holinshed's *Chronicles* (1587)¹⁶⁹ were similarly reprinted and made available to collectors.¹⁷⁰ Aside from compensating for difficulties in finding uncensored copies on the market, this reflects changing concerns among booksellers and collectors that demanded perfect textual completeness,¹⁷¹ even if, as in the case of Hakluyt or Holinshed, a reasonable historical explanation could be given for the missing leaves, rather than their absence simply being due to accidental wear and tear.

Further reproductions of the Cadiz leaves were made after that of c.1795, but these are less well documented and some might represent one-off attempts at rectification.¹⁷² The great Americana specialist, Henry Stevens (1819–86) regularly dealt in Hakluyt and commissioned a facsimile of the Cadiz leaves. There is, for example, a copy of the *Principal Navigations* in the Newberry Library, Chicago, which is annotated 'Voyage to Cadiz in Mr. H. Stevens's own facsimile'.¹⁷³ However, whether, as has also been claimed, Stevens commissioned the great facsimilist John Harris (1791–1873), for this

¹⁶⁷ Armstrong, 'The "Voyage to Cadiz"', pp. 258–9; Quinn, ed., *Hakluyt Handbook*, vol. 2, p. 495; STC 12626 (note). They can also be identified by the differing catchword and number of paragraphs on p. 607: the original has the catchword 'God' after eight paragraphs, the early 1720s reprint has 'Thus' after seven, and c.1795 has 'The' after ten. In the original, pp. 613, 615, and 617 have respectively the signature letters Fff, Fff2, and Fff3; in the early 1720s reprint pp. 607, 611, 615, 619 have respectively a, b, c, and d; in c.1795, there is only one signature letter, p. 613 having Fff. Like the original, the c.1795 reprint misnumbers p. 608 as '605' and its final page is blank, but it is more densely printed, and, unlike the original (and the early 1720s reprint), it comprises six rather than seven leaves in total.

¹⁶⁸ Quinn, ed., *Hakluyt Handbook*, vol. 2, pp. 491–2. Watermarks dated 1794 have been noted in this.

¹⁶⁹ See nn.82–3 above.

¹⁷⁰ McKitterick, *Old Books, New Technologies*, pp. 42–9. For Holinshed, see also Keith I. Maslen, 'Three Eighteenth-Century Reprints of the Castrated Sheets in Holinshed's *Chronicles*', *The Library*, fifth series, vol. 13, no. 2 (June 1958), pp. 120–4; John Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, second edition, vol. 1 (London: Nichols, Son, and Bentley, 1812), pp. 249–52; STC 13569 (note). The bookseller James Woodman, a partner in the reprint of the Cadiz leaves advertised in 1723, was also involved in one of the three competing sets of reprints of the censored Holinshed leaves produced in the 1720s.

¹⁷¹ For ideas of completeness and 'perfection', see McKitterick, *Old Books, New Technologies*, pp. 41–2; McKitterick, *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order*, pp. 144–7.

¹⁷² STC 12626 (note) reports a photographic facsimile of 'muddy and flat appearance'.

¹⁷³ Newberry Library, Case folio G 12 .38, bound by W. Pratt for H. Stevens & Son in 1888 (1599 title-page). Another copy bound by Pratt for Stevens, in 1882, with the Cadiz leaves in (unattributed) facsimile, is at Columbia University, Seligman 1599E H12 (1599 title-page). Neville-Sington & Payne, 'Interim Census', pp. 70, 72. For Stevens, see Wyman W. Parker, *Henry Stevens of Vermont: American Rare Book Dealer in London, 1845–1886* (Amsterdam N. Israel, 1963). After Stevens's death (1886) the business carried on under his son, Henry Newton Stevens.

purpose is uncertain.¹⁷⁴ Stevens did indeed employ Harris,¹⁷⁵ but, while Harris used lithography on occasions,¹⁷⁶ his true metier was manuscript facsimile and his work was painstaking, expensive and slow.¹⁷⁷ The length of the Cadiz narrative (thirteen pages of text in the original printing) in relation to the value of the *Principal Navigations* in the 1850s would have made such a facsimile unviable when usual prices for the *Principal Navigations* ranged between about £5 and £10,¹⁷⁸ whereas Harris is recorded as being ‘rewarded’ as much as £12 for the production of an individual facsimile leaf.¹⁷⁹ Harris typically supplied single missing leaves, especially titles-pages, for much rarer, often earlier, or more expensive works, as can be seen from the catalogue of his stock sold in 1857 to benefit his family after his retirement because of the loss of his eye-sight.¹⁸⁰ If Harris did produce a Cadiz leaf facsimile, none was offered in this sale, although his business was continued for a while by his son, John Alfred Harris.

¹⁷⁴ Armstrong, ‘The “Voyage to Cadiz”’, p. 259, and Quinn, ed., *Hakluyt Handbook*, vol. 2, p. 495, ascribe the Stevens facsimile to Harris, c.1850, but with insufficient documentation. Armstrong is vague about the medium, saying that it was ‘exact’ on ‘old paper’, although ‘close examination of the paper and the impression shows it to be the facsimile which it really is’. Quinn calls it a ‘type-facsimile’.

¹⁷⁵ For Stevens and Harris, see Henry Stevens, *Recollections of James Lenox and the Formation of His Library*, ed. Victor Hugo Paltsits (New York: New York Public Library, 1951), pp. 60, 79–80, 110.

¹⁷⁶ Harris is recorded as saying in 1851, ‘I have within the last 10 or 12 years had recourse to lithography’, which had been ‘beneficial, particularly when more than one copy was wanted; but I occasionally find even this process irksome and uncertain, and frequently at this present time have recourse to my own . . . manuscript process . . . in producing fac-similes’. *Exhibition of the Works of Industry of All Nations, 1851, Reports by the Juries on the Subjects in the Thirty Classes into Which the Exhibition Was Divided* (London: William Clowes & Sons for the Royal Commission, 1852), p. 405.

¹⁷⁷ McKitterick, *Old Books, New Technologies*, pp. 105–8. For Harris and his facsimile work, see also Susan Danforth, *A Matter of Taste: Discrimination in Nineteenth-Century Book Collecting. Catalogue of an Exhibition of Rare Books from the John Carter Brown Library* (Providence: Associates of the John Carter Brown Library, 2008), pp. 56–61; Janet Ing Freeman, ‘Harris, John (1791–1873)’, in *ODNB*; P. R. Harris, *A History of the British Museum Library 1753–1973* (London: British Library, 1998), p. 151; Emma Smith, *Shakespeare’s First Folio: Four Centuries of an Iconic Book* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 323–6.

¹⁷⁸ Lowndes, *Bibliographer’s Manual*, vol. 2, p. 972. The most expensive listed by Lowndes was £22 1s (with the rare map), the cheapest £3 5s.

¹⁷⁹ Robert Cowtan, *Memories of the British Museum* (London: Richard Bentley & Son, 1872), pp. 335–6 (this ‘difficult undertaking’ was for ‘the 97th folio of a rare edition of the Spanish Chronicle of Don Rinadlu’s’); Ronald B. McKerrow, *An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students*, second impression, with corrections and additions (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928), pp. 236–7.

¹⁸⁰ S. Leigh Sotheby and John Wilkinson, *Catalogue of a Very Important Collection of Early English Bibles . . . &c. The Property of a Gentleman, Going to America . . . To Which Are Added, with Permission, One Hundred Fac-similes of Early Typography, Admirably Executed by John Harris*, London, 20 August 1857, lots 665–766 (the anonymous ‘Gentleman, Going to America’ was Henry Stevens, who arranged the auction).

Conclusion

A bibliographical analysis of the *Principal Navigations* reveals that the voyage to Cadiz was removed from many copies after the first volume had been printed. It cannot explain exactly why this happened, although censorship of some form can reasonably be inferred. Explanations have to be sought elsewhere, and to a large extent these have to be conjectured, as is more often than not the case in reconstructing the contingencies behind specific acts of early modern censorship.¹⁸¹ In examining Hakluyt's text, his patrons and the political context in which the *Principal Navigations* was published, this essay does not pretend to offer a definitive answer, but it has indicated that the story might be more nuanced and complex than simply attributing the removal of the Cadiz leaves to the censor's knife. The uncritical linking of their suppression directly to the political fortunes of one individual – the earl of Essex – fails to allow for the probable temporary nature of the suppression and the wider context of patronage and foreign policy in which it occurred. The assumption that it was necessarily imposed by outside decree also needs to be questioned and the possibility of politic self-censorship considered instead.¹⁸² Lastly, in describing the history of the *Principal Navigations* as a physical object, it may be remarked that while from the early eighteenth century booksellers and others were able to offer a contemporary (c.1600) political reason for the missing Cadiz leaves in certain copies, this absence might nonetheless be regarded as a defect, an imperfection that could be rectified through the use of various forms of reproduction to fulfil a desire for 'completeness' even if the original historical and bibliographical integrity of a particular copy was thereby lost.¹⁸³

¹⁸¹ Shuger, *Censorship and Cultural Sensibility*, pp. 2–3. For an insightful case-study of censorship that probably occurred but cannot be conclusively documented, see Cyndia Susan Clegg, '“By the choise and inuitation of al the realme”: *Richard II* and Elizabethan Censorship', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 48, no. 4 (Winter 1997), pp. 432–48.

¹⁸² Cf. the discussion by Richard Burt, '(Un)Censoring in Detail: The Fetish of Censorship in the Early Modern Past and the Postmodern Present', in *Censorship and Silencing: Practices of Cultural Regulation*, ed. Robert C. Post (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 1998), pp. 17–41.

¹⁸³ For a discussion of original condition and changing ideas about perfecting old books and appropriate restoration, see John Carter, *Taste & Technique in Book Collecting*, corrected reprint with an epilogue (London: Private Libraries Association, 1970), pp. 171–88.