Formal matters

Reading the materials of English Renaissance literature

Edited by Allison K. Deutermann
and András Kiséry

Contents

List of illustrations

6

Book, list, word: forms of translation in the work of Richard Hakluyt

Henry S. Turner

My aim in this chapter is to use the work of Richard Hakluyt as an occasion to introduce several problems pertaining to early modern English humanism and its global imaginary, problems that lead, in turn, to a broader reflection on how the category of 'form' might prove useful to historicist criticism, and especially as a way of reinvigorating theoretical commitments to materialism in early modern studies. Although I experience moments of impatience with some scholarship that appears under the materialist rubric, it also seems to me that for good reasons historicist criticism will always have to answer to a theory of materialism, and I believe that the category of 'form,' perhaps unexpectedly, will offer an important resource for new arguments.[1] In what follows, I will be focusing on three forms of writing that are central to Hakluyt's work and that lead us, in different ways, toward the paired concerns of material texts and literary forms that organize this volume: the form of the 'book,' the form of the 'list,' and the form of the 'word.' The first has been an especially rich object of analysis for literary critics in the last two decades and has arguably become the paradigm-defining form for the field. The second has not been closely studied by literary critics but has received some attention from historians of science.[2] The third is probably the oldest form of all, and is truly a model specimen for literary study across the ages; it was central to the emergence and definition of 'humanism' as a mode of scholarship, and it becomes an especially volatile form in the context of Elizabethan encounters with the New World – volatile because changeable, or unstable, or especially delicate, or unusually plastic, to adopt materialist metaphors that were fundamental to defining the formal integrity of the word in the period, as we shall see. In order to provide some definition to the arguments that follow, I will be treating all three forms as instances of 'translation,' in several senses: translation as a linguistic practice, translation as a way of thinking adaptively and analogically across different situations, and translation as a way of constructing or composing among diverse materials, a 'materialist' theory of translation that we find exemplified in Hakluyt's writing.

Hakluyt as translator

Richard Hakluyt is well known to early modernists, of course, for his *magnum opus*, *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffics, and Discoveries of the English Nation*, published in London in one volume in 1589 and then again in a revised and expanded three-volume edition from 1598 to 1600.[3] Despite the fact that the name 'Hakluyt' has become synonymous with the *Principal Navigations*, the work was in no sense a work of his own 'authorship.'[4] Hakluyt's art was rather the art of the fragment, and the *Principal Navigations* reminds us how important *editing*, or the *collection* of texts (etymologically a gathering together in one place), remained as a mode of textual authority at the turn of the seventeenth century. But the *Principal Navigations* also opens a window onto how important the work of the translator could be, for Hakluyt was also a remarkable translator, in several ways, all of which are important to understanding the forms of writing that he favoured, his place in the history of scholarship, and his role in English colonialist projects.

Perhaps the simplest place to begin any assessment of Hakluyt as a translator is to ask a two-fold question: what does it mean, in general, to 'translate'? And what specifically did it mean to translate in late sixteenth-century England as an ordained member of the Church of England, as an employee of the Crown, and as a man of letters invested in New World ventures, as Hakluyt was? England has always been a stepchild in the historiography of European humanism, especially the England of the late sixteenth century; and if we can consider Hakluyt as a species of humanist – a question that is no doubt open to debate, depending on one's definitions and frames of reference – then he is a type that I will conveniently but unoriginally call a 'material humanist.'[5] I offer the label to strike a contrast from our usual sense of humanist scholarship in the period, in order to remind us how insubstantial, how deracinated from substance and from concrete institutions, the history of humanism has often been in historiography. Even a humanism defined narrowly and 'correctly' around problems of philology, the archival recovery of classical Greek and Latin, and the *studia humanitatis* –what Kristeller loosely described as a 'literary' tradition distinct from theology or natural philosophy – was always more material than we tend to remember, a method concerned with the physical substance of manuscripts, books, and documents, of historical reconstruction through archaeological artefacts and other objects, of universities and desktops and instruments and other intellectual hardware. This sense of 'material humanism' was central to Hakluyt's translation work and indeed to his entire life project, whether through the physical documents he laboured to collect or through the globes and navigational instruments that he famously introduced to the study of geography at Oxford. But a notion of 'material humanism' was central, too, in a more familiar and more modern sense of the term, in that Hakluyt's particular area of expertise was, after all, the history of English international travel and trade, which even he recognized as a moment of proto-mercantilism and which we are apt to regard as the inauguration of a modern world system. So when we ask 'what does it mean to translate in the sixteenth

century,' we must also ask what it means to translate as a scholar caught up in this moment of wild enterprise and fascinated by an emerging 'global' imaginary.

Before pursuing the suspicion that in speaking of Hakluyt I am really speaking about ourselves, let me return to a conventional sense of translation and to Hakluyt's considerable skill as a translator of languages. On the basis of his own comments, modern scholars have attributed to him an advanced written knowledge of Greek, Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese, most of which he could probably also speak with some fluency.[6] While in Paris as Chaplain to the English Ambassador, Hakluyt was friendly with French botanists, travellers, instrument makers, and geographers, and he is known to have met with Don Antonio, the pretender to the Portuguese crown, and to have discussed matters pertaining to New World navigation directly with Portuguese pilots and captains.[7] Hakluyt himself translated, either in whole or in part, five separate editions of works from French, Portuguese, and Latin, including a book of dialogues that had first been translated into Latin from Malay, which Hakluyt probably undertook for the East India Company.[8] A single copy of Hakluyt's English translation of the Latin edition of Hugo Grotius's *Free Seas*, undertaken sometime between 1609 and 1616, also probably on behalf of the East India Company, survives in manuscript and was never published in his lifetime.[9] The *Principal Navigations*, meanwhile, and his long unpublished manuscript 'Discourse of Western Planting' both include assorted passages that Hakluyt translates from many of the aforementioned languages.

But this is only to speak of Hakluyt's own translation work – he was twice as active as a sponsor of foreign translations by others, often contributing to the costs of publication himself. Three examples will illustrate Hakluyt's networks of translation and commercial publication especially vividly, and in doing so they will indicate to us the signal role that the physical book played in what I am calling Hakluyt's 'material humanism.'[10] In 1586, while living in Paris, Hakluyt arranged for a French translation from Spanish by Martin Basanier of Antonio de Espejo's voyage to New Mexico, a book that Hakluyt had himself paid to have published in a new Spanish edition in Madrid in that same year, with 'a la costa de Richardo Hakluyt' displayed prominently on its title page.[11] Basanier dedicated his new translation of Espeio to Hakluyt, who promptly arranged to have Basanier's French translated into English, publishing it in London in 1587.[12] Also in 1586, Basanier and Hakluyt collaborated on an edition of René de Laudonnière's *L'histoire notable de la Floride*, printed from a manuscript borrowed from the French geographer André Thévet and issued with a dedication from Basanier to Walter Ralegh and a Latin poem in praise of Ralegh by Hakluyt himself.[13] Hakluyt then translated Basanier's French into English, publishing the work in London in 1587.[14] The last example is a famous one: in 1587, Hakluyt met the engraver Theodor De Bry, who was on a visit to England, and introduced him to John White, the illustrator who had accompanied Thomas Harriot as a scientific observer on Ralegh's Virginia voyages and who would subsequently return to the New World as first Governor of the ill-fated Roanoke colony. Hakluyt suggested to De Bry a grand international

edition of Harriot's account of Virginia, which had been published alone in 1588.[15] This new international edition (1590) was to be illustrated by De Bry's engravings of White's drawings and published simultaneously in Frankfurt in Latin, English, French, and German editions. The notes to the edition were to be translated into Latin from English by the botanist Charles de l'Ecluse – notes which Hakluyt himself then subsequently translated *back* into English from Latin for the English edition.[16]

The works that Hakluyt commissioned suggest how energetically he pursued geographical writing in other languages and how widely informed he became about the topic, through a network of authors, translators, editors, publishers, diplomats, pilots, merchants, factors, friends, and acquaintances that radiated from the centres of the European book trade: London, Paris, Frankfurt, and even Madrid – an unlikely place for a minister in the Church of England to publish, especially in 1586. In this sense, Hakluyt is positioned at the node of two distinct macro-networks of translation, one extending across and within Europe, the other extending outward much more broadly on a global scale, to the Far East as well as to the Northwest. Of the many separate translations to which we know that Hakluyt contributed in some way, we find three Dutch originals (somewhat surprisingly, Hakluyt does not seem to have known Dutch); John Florio's 1580 English translation of Jacques Cartier's voyage to Canada, from Ramusio's Italian translation out of French; Leo Africanus's *A Geographical Historie of Africa* [1600], translated by John Pory from Italian into English, and a translation from Syriac of Ismael Abu al-Feda's (1273–1331) thirteenth-century *Geography*, which a letter from Ortelius to William Camden tells us that Hakluyt was planning to arrange.[17] Even more remarkable is the example of the Codex Mendoza, a manuscript of Nahuatl pictographs produced in Mexico City in the early 1540s, probably by native scribes, which Hakluyt purchased from Thévet in 1587 while in Paris. The Codex eventually passed to Samuel Purchas, who claimed that Hakluyt had 'procured Master Michael Locke in Sir Walter Raleighs name to translate it' but that 'it seemes that none were willing to be at the cost of cutting the Pictures, and so it remained among his papers till his death.'[18] When we add to these books and manuscripts the many partial translations and word-lists collected in the *Principal Navigations*, the list of languages with which Hakluyt came into contact expands to global proportions: Greek, Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, Syriac, Malay, Nahuatl, Anglo-Saxon, Turkish, Russian, Inuit, or 'the language of the people of meta incognita,' Algonquin, the languages of the Saami people (Lapland), the native languages of Canada or 'New France,' the languages of Trinidad, and the 'naturall language of Java.'[19] I do not think I am exaggerating when I say that Hakluyt's desktop was probably the single most polyglot surface on the sixteenth-century planet. And it owes this extraordinary polyglot quality in no small measure to the form of the book: to the physical object, in all its variety and all its parts, that allowed him to collect in one place such a diversity of materials and such a complex network of mediating authorities.

But Hakluyt's involvement in translation does not stop here. For he was more than

a practitioner of translation: he also had a modest theory, as his dedication to Robert Cecil of his edition and translation of Antonio Galvao, *The Discoveries of the World from the first originall unto the yeere of our Lord 1555* (London, 1601; STC 11543), explains:

> For whereas a good translator ought to be well acquainted with the proprietie of the tongue out of which, and of that into which he translateth, and thirdly with the subject or matter it selfe: I found this translator [an anonymous version that Hakluyt has reworked] very defective in all three; especially in the last. For the supplying of whose defects I had none other remedie, but to have recourse unto the originall histories, (which as it appeereth are very many, and many of them exceeding rare and hard to come by) out of which the authour himselfe drew the greatest part of this discourse. And in very deede it cost me more travaile to search out the grounds thereof, and to annexe the marginall quotations unto the work, then the translation of many such bookes would have put me unto. (A3v)

Hakluyt presumes as a norm expertise in the original language of a document as well as expertise in what we now call the target language. But above all he assumes expertise in what he calls the 'subject or matter it selfe' — I do not want to lean *too* hard on the appearance of the term 'matter' at this point, since it functions as a fairly straightforward synonym (itself a kind of translation) for the notion of subject matter, from the common Latin *res* or 'thing.' And yet it is clear that for Hakluyt, as for us, translation involves a kind of passage or transfer of material from one form to another: that *some* word or figure is necessary to describe this process, and that, however conventional Hakluyt's terminology may be, it is nonetheless inscribed in a long history of philosophical concepts and determinations of concepts, through which translation is defined as a transaction between form and matter, as a process of giving form to matter and of re-mattering the form of language by transcribing it into new letters and new words. And in this particular instance we may hear an additional material and even technological emphasis, since Hakluyt has in mind specifically the technical vocabulary necessary for describing very particular things-in-the-world: concrete objects, ingredients, textures, tools, all the myriad things that a traveller might encounter when talking to other people in other places. People interact with the world; they use language to refer to the world while doing so; and a translator must become familiar with the specific words they use when they interact with the world in significant ways.

Here is another statement of Hakluyt's translation method, found now in a dedication to the reader in the 1589 first edition of the *Principall Navigations*:

> Concerning my proceeding therefore in this present worke, it hath bene this. Whatsoever testimonie I have found in any authour of authoritie appertaining to my argument, either stranger or naturall, I have recorded the same word for word, with his particular name and page of booke where it is extant. If the same were not reduced into our common language, I have first expressed it in the same termes wherein it is originally written, whether it were a Latine, Italian, Spanish or Portingall discourse, or whatsoever else, and thereunto in the next roome have annexed the signification and translation of the wordes in English. (p. 6, sig. *3v)

This passage adds some important details to Hakluyt's theory, since it casts translation as a variety of empiricism, an archival, scholarly activity designed for maximum accuracy and for what we could call 'transparent' rendering. Hakluyt's translation is a technical exercise, a 'proceeding' or 'method' in the sixteenth-century sense, and not an impromptu gesture. It is impartial and inclusive: 'either stranger or natural.' It is scrupulous in its word-for-word attention, evincing a proto-quantitative handling of the linguistic datum and offering translation as a kind of double-entry bookkeeping. He employs orthodox textual methods, carefully weighing the authority of his sources by comparing the internal consistency of a document, by evaluating its proximity to an event, or by establishing the 'truth' of a text by collation: collecting multiple examples and comparing them with one another. The practice of editing and of translating is, in this sense, a way of handling linguistic material so as to create a textual space in which truth may appear in the mouths of others. By deliberately preserving the original passage, incorporating it into his own text and only then following with an English rendering, Hakluyt invites comparison and an act of evaluation; joined to a system of notation, the page itself becomes an archive that does more than merely translate: it enables further translation from the reader and thus creates a space not for a specific translation but for the activity of translation in general, a constant referring back and forth between two forms, a circuit of endless reflection and refashioning. As a physical book, we could call the *Principal Navigations* a machine for translation.

My final example comes from Hakluyt's dedication to Ralegh of René de Laudonnière's *A Notable Historie Containing Foure Voyages made by Certayne French captaynes vnto Florida* (London, 1587; STC 15316), where we find a third dimension to his theory. The Virginia enterprise was not going well, and Hakluyt seems to have believed that Ralegh would welcome a public expression of enthusiasm in the project and a reminder of its extraordinary potential:

> And no marvell though it were verie welcome unto you, & that you liked of the translation thereof, since no historie hetherto set foorth hath more affinitie, resemblance or conformitie with yours of Virginea, then this of Florida. But calling to minde that you had spent more yeares in France then I, and understande the french better then my selfe, I foorth with perceived that you approved mine endevour, not for any private ease or commoditie that thereby might redounde unto you, but that it argued a singuler and especiall care you had of those, which are to be employed in your owne like enterprise, whom, by the reading of this my translation, you woulde have forewarned and admonished aswell to beware of the grosse negligence in providing sufficiencie of victuals, the securitie, disorders, and mutinies that fell out among the french, with the great inconveniences that thereupon ensued, that by others mishaps they might learne to prevent and avoyde the like, as also might bee put in minde, by the reading of the manifolde commodities & great fertilitie of the places herein at large described & so nere neighbors unto our colonies, that they might generally be awaked and stirred up unto the diligent observation of everie thing that might turne to the avancement of the action, whereinto they are so cheerefully entred. (Dedication to Ralegh, no page.)

Within the polite gestures of patronage and praise, Hakluyt has embedded an entire political theory of translation, which now consists of more than a linguistic facility. This kind of translation requires the exercise of analogical comparison across sites and enterprises: Florida is like Virginia, in its geographical location, its geo-political encumbrances, its possible military and commercial benefits, its risks and dangers. This translation invites a kind of structural thinking, a grasp of co-ordinated efforts and complex integrations of men and materials, goals and wills. In Hakluyt's view, translation is valuable not for individual, personal gain but for the *common* good; it facilitates the organization of collectives directed toward a common purpose; by preventing conflict, it assists in the benevolent rule over other men.

Philology as materialism

If we return to the linguistic and technical dimension to Hakluyt's comments on translation, it is possible to locate him on the spectrum of humanist commentary on the subject and to begin to outline what I will now call a 'materialist' theory of translation lying at the core of Hakluyt's project. Broadly speaking, we may say that humanist theories of translation developed around several opposing terms, each of which enjoyed a rich history of elaboration and each of which tended to spread outward into other textual, ethical, and philosophical attitudes.[20] For the sake of clarity, we may identify on the one hand a philological and grammatical attitude toward translation, one that concerned itself with the problem of literal semantic meaning and that took as the object of its operations the word or *verbum*, considered as an individual morphological and denotative unit. On the other hand we find a rhetorical and oratorical approach to translation that attempts to capture an overall sense and to express it in an artful style; its concern is not merely with *verba* but with *res*, the 'content,' 'thought,' or 'matter' (a somewhat misleading term) of a larger compositional unit, which it apprehends as a dense, energetic texture of associations, figures, and ornaments. These work together across several levels to communicate the idea in its full presence, an approach to translation that is at once Structural and Orphic, as Glyn Norton has perceptively put it, and that is signalled by the long-standing technical humanist term for translation, *interpretatio*.[21]

Even in this second, 'oratorical' approach to translation, however, the notion of the literal continues to play a fundamental role; indeed, translation proper had long been distinguished from exegesis precisely on the basis of its literalist ambitions, and nowhere more so than in translations of Scripture, from Jerome forward. Translation was emphatically not a commentary or a supplemental addition: it was a faithful rendering through which all the resources of the source language lived anew in different clothing, and even the most accomplished humanist presumed that a propaedeutic immersion in the technicalities of philology – grammar, usage, historical morphology – would be necessary to produce a good or rhetorically 'full' translation. This required a full awareness of the physicality of the word, its particulate force and

seed-like potential, which could be scattered across into new sentences or ignited like a firework: these are the metaphors of Coluccio Salutati, writing at the end of the fourteenth century.[22] For Cicero, the translator was a kind of banker who could either count out his translation word for word, like coins, or pay the entire thing at once, as if by weight. Cicero himself preferred the latter approach, pointing out that this was the course he had followed in his own translations of Demosthenes and Aeschines, in which he worked, he claimed, as an *orator* more than as an *interpres* or translator in the word-for-word sense.[23]

It would be fair to say that Hakluyt shows little interest in the rhetorical or stylistic dimension of the texts that he translates but instead emphasizes their practical purpose – under the category of the 'practical' I would include the ultimate political effects of the act of translation which I have indicated above, as well as his concentrated interest in what we could call the text's 'informational' content. Something is being communicated by the word, and for Hakluyt it is vital that this something be captured and rendered as clearly as possible. In this regard we could characterize Hakluyt as an extreme literalist, a linguistic attitude that was of a piece with his empiricism, his overall historical purpose, his methodological fascination with the archive, and his general interest in technical details and particulars of all kinds. We have seen him declare this interest in his preface to Cecil in his translation of Galvao, above; and this same literalism manifests itself in those moments when Hakluyt begins to approach translation degree zero, collecting foreign morphemes and lexemes and arranging them in tabular form, much the way the botanists and mercantile agents collected specimens of natural substances and compiled lists of commodities (see Figures 6.1–6.4).[24]

Consider the many ways in which we could consider these lists to be forms of 'translation.'[25] Even at the level of the phoneme, the most literal moment of translation we could identify, we slip beneath the level of the signified to the 'matter' of language only to find that 'translation' has already begun its silent work. For the lists render sounds *into* words; they create the formal integrity that distinguishes a meaningful phonemic unit, and they do so, furthermore, in a visual or graphic and not an oral form – it is, after all, impossible to tell from the page how these words are to be pronounced. Before translation in its rhetorical and humanist sense can begin, even in the simplistic, literal, 'word-for-word' sense that Cicero rejects, the form of the word itself must first be stabilized. This invites a large question: for the humanist accustomed to working closely with languages, texts, and manuscripts, was the 'word' a coherent formal unit in the New World? Could the methods of philology apply on foreign terrain? Hakluyt seems fascinated by the virtual presence of strange sounds, by the act of rendering those sounds in new form and by the implications of what he glimpses through the process: the sheer fact of other languages, other *systems* of linguistic expression, complete and flourishing just over the horizon. At the same time, however, a peculiar effect of the list is to present the native word denuded of grammar and syntax, not to mention of inflection, connotation or other nuance: the signs stand for the *idea* of language, for a language that has been left behind, trailing roots clotted

Stephan Burrough. Traffiques, and Discoueries.

I obserued certaine wordes of their language, which
I thought good to set downe for their vse, that here-
after shall haue occasion to continue
this voyage.

COwghtie coteat, what call you | Keatykye, a stone.
this. | Sellowpe, siluer.
Poddythecke, come hither. | Solda, golde.
Auanchythocke, get the hence. | Tennae, tinne.
Anna, farewell. | Veskue, copper.
Teyrue, good morrowe. | Rowadt, yron.
Iomme Iemaufes, I thanke you. | Neybx, a knife.
Passeuellie, a friend. | Axshe, a hatchet.
Olmuelke, a man. | Leabee, bread.
Captrella, a woman. | Ieauegoar, meale.
Alke, a sonne. | Pencka, the winde.
Neit, a daughter, or yong wench. | Iowte, a platter.
Oyuie, a head. | Kemnie, a kettle.
Cyelme, an eye. | Keestes, gloues.
Nenna, a nose. | Sapege, shoes.
Nealma, a mouth. | Conde, a wilde Deare.
Pannea, teeth. | Poatsa, the labouring Deare.
Neughtema, a tongue. |
Seaman, a beard. |
Peallee, an eare. | Their wordes of num-
Teappat, the necke. | *ber are these as fol-*
Voapt, the haire. | *loweth.*
Keat, a hand. |
Soarme, fingers. | OFte, | 1.
Iowlkie, a legge. | Noumpte, | 2.
Peelkie, the thombe, or great toe. | Colme, | 3.
Sarke, wollen cloth. | Nellye, | 4.
Lein, linnen cloth. | Vitte, | 5.
Payte, a shirt. | Cowte, | 6.
Tol, fire. | Keydeem, | 7.
Keatse, water. | Kaffis, | 8.
Murr, wood. | Owghchte, | 9.
Vannace, a boate. | Locke, | 10.
Ariea, an oare. | Ostretumbelocke, | 11.
Nurr, a roape. | Cowghtnumbelocke, | 12.
Peyue, a day. | Colmenonbelocke, | 13.
Hyr, a night. | Nellynombelocke, | 14.
Peyuezea, the Sunne. | Vittie nombelocke, | 15.
Manna, the Moone. | Cowtenombelocke, | 16.
Laste, starres. | Keydemnombelocke, | 17.
Cozam volka, whither goe you. | Kafts nombelocke, | 18.
Ottapp, sleepe. | Owght nombelocke, | 19.
Tallye, that. | Coffreylocke, | 20.
Keiedde pieue, a weeke. | Colmelocke, | 30.
Ifckie, a yeere. | Nelly locke, | 40.
Kesse, Sommer. | Vitte locke, | 50.
Talue, Winter. | Cowtelocke, | 60.
Iowksam, colde. | Keydemlocke, | 70.
Parox, warme. | Kafftelocke, | 80.
Abrye, raine. | Oughchetelocke, | 90.
Youghang, yce. | Tewet. | 100.

25 Friday in the morning we departed from Saint Iohns Island : to the Westwards thereof,
a mile from the shoare, we sounded, and had 36. fadoms, and oazie sand.
Bb 3   Iuanê

Figure 6.1 The language of the 'Lappians', *Principal Navigations* (London, 1598–1600), Vol.
I, p. 293. (Courtesy of the John Carter Brown Library at Brown University)

32   The English Voyages, Nauigations, *M. Frobisher*. 2.

The 25. day of this moneth we had sight of the Island of Orkney, which was then East from vs.
The Sheld.   The first day of October we had sight of the Sheld, and so sailed about the coast, and ankered
at Yarmouth, and the next day we came into Harwich.

The language of the people of *Meta incognita.*

Argoteyt, a hand. | | Attegay, a coate.
Cangnawe, a nose. | | Polleuetagay, a knife.
Arered, an eye. | | Accaskay, a shippe.
Keiotot, a tooth. | | Coblone, a thumbe.
Mutchater, the head. | | Teckkere, the foremost finger.
Chewat, an eare. | | Ketteckle, the middle finger.
Comagaye, a legge. | | Mekellacane, the fourth
Atoniagay, a foote. | | finger.
Callagay, a paire of breeches. | | Yacken one, the litle finger.

Figure 6.2 The language of 'Meta incognita', *Principal Navigations* (London, 1598–1600),
Vol. III, p. 32. (Courtesy of the John Carter Brown Library at Brown University)

The language that is spoken in the Land newly discouered, called *New France.*

God		Gold	benyosco
the Sunne	Isnez.	the priuie members	assegnega
the Heauen	cames	an Arrow	catta
the Day		a greene Tree	haueda
the Night	aiagla	an earthen dish	vndace
Water	ame	a Bow	
Sand	estogaz	Brasse	aignetaze
a Sayle	aganie	the Brow	ansce
the Head	agonaze	a Feather	yco
the Throate	congueda	the Moone	casmogan
the Nose	hehonguesto	the Earth	conda
the Teeth	hesangue	the Wind	canue
the Nayles	agetascu	the Raine	onnoscon
the Feete	ochedasco	Bread	cacacomy
the Legs	anoudasco	the Sea	ames
a dead man	amocdaza	a Ship	casaomy
a Skinne	aionasca	a Man	vndo
that Man	yca	the Haires	boc hosco
a Hatchet	asogne	the Eyes	ygasa
a Cod fish	gadagourfere	the Mouth	heche
good to be eaten	guesande	the Eares	hontasco
Flesh		the Armes	agescu
Almonds	anongaza	a Woman	enrasesco
Figs	asconda	a sicke Man	alonedeche

S 2   Shooes

Figure 6.3 The language of 'New France', *Principal Navigations* (London, 1598–1600), Vol.
III, p. 211. (Courtesy of the John Carter Brown Library at Brown University)

Figure 6.4 The language of 'New France', *Principal Navigations* (London, 1598–1600), Vol. III, p. 212. (Courtesy of the John Carter Brown Library at Brown University)

with the dirt of foreign shores. If the lists record grammatical units and provide English grammatical equivalents for their semantic meaning, in other words, they also transport the word from its native setting back to an English reader; the effect is one of textual rapture, retrieving for a culture captivated by the written sentence the guttural sounds of speech and clothing the native tongue with the modesty of a Roman letter.[26]

Hakluyt, of course, never collected the language specimens himself: he relied on the expertise of others, often commercial agents and factors who were themselves positioned at an epistemological threshold in which competing systems of value jostled together. And as we can see from these examples, the matter of language and the matter of the world have begun to collapse into one another, as we enter another layer of the translation process. Strictly speaking, we find no natural things here, only deracinated names for objects that have in some sense already become – that are on their way to becoming – commodities. Certainly the word lists include the names of substances that are not *yet* commodities: flora, fauna, body parts, even social relationships. But these are paradigm classes for a series of as-yet-unrealized functions: to the mercantilist eye, everything depends on whether the objects can be functionalized, as substances are identified and enduring chains of commodities assembled across extremely long distances (see Figure 6.5). We could say that the lists are poised precisely at the point where the index passes over into sign, as the flat, descriptive record of the fact – the bare word – begins to shimmer with a potential significance that catches the European eye.[27] To translate these foreign words is to assist in the act of commodification, therefore, but it is also to grasp commodification itself a translation process, an alienation of substance through transfer and the addition of a supplementary form. Hakluyt understood the problem clearly enough, since his *Discourse of Western Planting* recommends, among scores of other interventions, the erection of sawmills that can convert the fantastic and even overwhelming varieties of trees that the English found in the New World, so that 'wee may with spede possesse infinite masses of boordes of these swete kindes, and those frame and make ready to be turned into goodly chests, cupboordes, stooles, tables, deskes &c.'[28] And should the natives resist, he suggests ominously to the Virginia Company adventurers, they must 'handle them gently, [for] while gentle courses may be found to serve, it will be without comparison the best: but if gentle polishing will not serve, then we shall not want hammerours and rough masons enow,

Figure 6.5 List of commodities and their origins, *Principal Navigations* (London, 1598–1600), Vol. II.1, p. 277. (Courtesy of the John Carter Brown Library at Brown University)

I meane our old soldiours trained up in the Netherlands, to square and prepare them to our Preachers hands.'[29]

Somewhat surprisingly, it suddenly appears that translation was always one of the best ways back to the problem of materialism, an observation I make for several reasons. First, because the primary relationship between word and meaning, or word and sense, that structures humanist approaches to translation takes, in Hakluyt's case, a distinctly substantialist turn; we could say that Hakluyt's encounter with foreign words accentuates a more general orientation toward language in humanist thought that emphasizes the concreteness and portability of meaning, the dense 'opacity' of the word, as Norton has put it, the kernel surrounded by a mystical shell.[30] Translation was, in other words, an important area in humanist thought where the relationship between sense and letter, or word and thing, or language and world became the subject of scrutiny and of philosophical elaboration – these are fundamental oppositions that we have inherited and that still structure many of our arguments about representation and epistemology, especially in literary and cultural studies and especially in their historicist varieties. Consider this comment from Thomas Norton's 1578 edition of his translation of Calvin's *Institutio Christianae*:

> I cõsidered how the author thereof had of long time purposely labored to write the same most exactly, and to packe great plenty of matter in small roome of wordes, yea and those so circumspectly and precisely ordered, to avoide the cavillations of such, as for enmity to the trueth therein contained, woulde gladly seeke and abuse all advantages which migh[t] be found by any oversight in penning of it, that the sentences were thereby become so full as nothinge might well be added without idle superfluity, & againe so niely pared that nothing could be minished without taking away some necessary substance of matter therein expressed.[31]

To Norton the word is *freighted* with meaning, and the translation is an unpacking – not in our colloquial, classroom sense, not a close reading or an analytic commentary, but in a physical sense: someone needs to unload the ship of words, take account of its stock of sense, and then reassemble the sentences in new forms, laying them into the book like a treasure chest or a storehouse.

So when another humanist, George Chapman, announces that he 'hardly dare referre' his translation of Homer 'to reading judgements,' I don't think we are listening too hard when we hear in Chapman's complaint about excessive literalism a whisper of anxiety about commercial publication and disdain for the common commerce of merchants and their dirty hands:

> how I have in my conversion prov'd,
> I must confesse, I hardly dare referre
> To reading judgements; since, so generally,
> Custome hath made even th'ablest Agents erre
> In these translations; all so much apply
> Their paines and cunnings, word for word to render
> Their patient Authors.[32]

'Custom,' 'Agents': these technical mercantilist terms pepper the pages of Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations*, and they are apt figures for the theory of word-for-word translation that Chapman is dismissing, as Cicero had dismissed before him as a kind of money payment. To translate word for word is to grub along in the substance of language, blindly ignorant of the spirit of meaning:

> To the Reader.
> Least with foule hands you touch these holy Rites;
>   And with prejudicacies too prophane,
> Passe Homer, in your other Poets sleights;
>   Wash here; In this Porch to his numerous Phane,
> Heare auncient Oracles speake, and tell you whom
>   You have to censure.

(A3r)

In Chapman's severely idealist vision of translation as a kind of prophecy or even as a type of metempsychosis, none are more guilty of profanity than the 'great Clerks' who can 'write no English verse': blinded by their own prejudices against English as a poetic language, they embrace a parochial translation style that conceals the full soul of the classical originals – and this despite their ostentatious and pretentious defence of the ancients as the source of all poetry:

> But, as great Clerks, can write no English verse;
>   Because (alas! great Clerks) English affords
> (Say they) no height, nor copie; a rude tongue,
>   (Since tis their Native): but in Greek or Latine
> Their writs are rare; for thence true Poesie sprung:
>   Though them (Truth knowes) they haue but skil to chat-in,
> Compar'd with that they might say in their owne;
>   Since thither the'others full soule cannot make
> The ample transmigration to be showne
>   In Nature-loving Poesie: So the brake
> That those Translators sticke in, that affect
>   Their word-for-word traductions (where they lose
> The free grace of their naturall Dialect
>   And shame their Authors, with a forced Glose[)],
> I laugh to see; and yet as much abhorre
>   More licence from the words, then may expresse
> Their full compression, and make cleere the Author.

(sig. A4r–v)

The indictment is severe, and richly expressed: the clerks are at once fatuous, myopic, hypocritical, ignorant, foolish, and tragic – if only they would look up from their dusty pages and savour the English language that rolls in their own mouths! One man's 'native' is another man's poetry: the uncanny mirror of translation suddenly throws its light to reveal an English that is, at least in the eyes of the clerks, little better than

Inuit or Algonquin or the 'natural language of Java,' as one word-list in the *Principal Navigations* describes it.[33] Chapman steps forward as a kind of smirking satirist-priest, rescuing the transcendent glory of true poesy by clothing it in the vestments of the mother tongue.

This is not Hakluyt's mode of translation. He is much closer to the customers and merchants, the agents and factors who collected the precious language-samples, transcribing them with painstaking effort and concentration. Imagine it: sixteenth-century seamen, months at sea, shivering in freezing temperatures, exhausted from epic battles with icebergs that surge up suddenly and batter the fleet, now standing on a crusty shoreline that is further north than they ever imagined travelling in their wildest dreams, straining to understand the speech of an Inuit chief dressed in seal-skin who is understandably agitated about the fact that his dogs have been stolen, his people captured, and his village scattered.[34] Who among them had the presence of mind to listen to the chief's *language*? Where did they carry the 'pen, yncke, and paper' to which the accounts refer?[35] It is incredible to think that these words were inscribed on to fragile substances in such extreme conditions, much less that they survived the seas, the floods, the shipwrecks that punctuate the English accounts. *This* is Hakluyt's translation: the sheer accident of fragile substances combining together under extraordinary circumstances to somehow endure their way back to London, to Hakluyt's desk, to the press, to archive and library and from there to microfilm and to our illuminated digital projections.

Translation as assemblage

By now it should be clear that I find in Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations* a somewhat different notion of 'translation' from what we might expect, one that has been proposed by the sociologist of science Bruno Latour, who has launched a materialist methodology of great subtlety and potential. For all the recent interest in Latour's work, the signature concept of his method is not, in my view, the notion of the 'hybrid,' or the non-modern, or the network, or even the strange 'agency' of things: it is the notion of translation that his work as a whole elaborates. We could even say that Latour's notion of 'translation' finds its root in a specifically early modern sense of the word, one that was utterly commonplace in Hakluyt's period. To early moderns, translation was a change of shape, as when a tailor or a glover re-uses the leftover fabric to fashion a new pair of gloves, or when Shakespeare – a glover's son – employs the term in a *Midsummer Night's Dream* to describe a weaver who has been transformed into a man with an ass's head: 'Bless, thee, Bottom, bless thee. Thou art translated!'

No doubt many readers will be familiar with the arguments of Latour, whose fascinating case studies examine the many fine networks, assemblages, and collectives that compose the fabric of our world.[36] These assemblages and their links happen at the level of basic chemistry – atoms and molecules – and at the level of tools: the hand that holds the hammer simply is a different entity from the hand without it; the hand

with the sword different from the open palm (as the Inuit learned all too quickly). This juncture of hand with tool is a 'translation.' And translation creates assemblages among laboratory equipment and devices, too, and the networks of cities and ecosystems and of global commerce. Here is one of Latour's definitions:

> Instead of opposing words and the world, science studies, by its insistence on practice, has multiplied the intermediary terms that focus on the transformations so typical of the sciences; like 'inscription' or 'articulation,' 'translation' is a term that criss-crosses the modernist settlement [that philosophy or worldview that creates false oppositions, separating words from things, humans from non-humans, nature from 'society' and 'culture']. In its linguistic and material connotations, it refers to all displacements through other actors whose mediation is indispensable for any action to occur. In place of a rigid opposition between context and content, chains of translation refer to the work through which actors modify, displace, and translate their various and contradictory interests. (*Pandora's Hope*, 311)

Latour has a striking image for the translations that enable a scientific network: 'scientific facts are like frozen fish,' he argues, since they stay good only as long as the chains that transport or translate them from site to site and purpose to purpose remain unbroken.[37] For a stem cell to become a *specimen*, it must thrive in a growth factor and form physical, chemical bonds with other cells; for it to become *evidence*, it must enter into an enduring relation with a microscope; to become *fact*, computers, calculators, statistical equations, and many other actors must be added to the assemblage; to become *theory*, citations and sentences must climb aboard; to become *polemic*, politicians must wave their arms, polish their rhetoric, and broadcast their soundbites across the globe.

So what does this current notion of 'translation' have to do with Hakluyt, with the problem of form, and with early modern studies? In my view, Hakluyt practises a version of this translation, and all the evidence that he collects pertains to it. The *Principal Navigations* consists of innumerable reports generated by the enormous trading corporations of his day, reports that trace the long, rhizome-like networks that extended from outpost to ship, from factor to agent to merchant and finally to Hakluyt back in London. These networks are composed through many small translation points: points of intervention and mediation – points of *giving form* – in which one substance is joined to another, or modified, or combined. Agents and factors are deputized:

> for the whole body of this companie, to buy, sel, trucke, change and permute al, and every kind and kindes of wares, marchandizes and goods ... the same to utter and sell to the best commoditie, profit and advantage of the said corporation.[38]

The infinite variety of the world must be translated through the formal categories of number, weight, and measure; physical substances must be combined and compacted into a single coherent 'masse' and then transported through a network of distribution in which differing zones of value must be reconciled with one another. It is exactly like the process of verbal composition and translation that Thomas Norton has described.

We find in the *Principal Navigations* inventories of commodities and of the industrial processes necessary to produce them – fishes, furs, flax, hemp, honey, and *wax*, the perfect emblem of the metamorphic translation process – lists of geographic points of origin and distances to other trading sites, accounts of the many substances, men, and skills, and instruments necessary to the physical construction of the fleets.

I have written elsewhere in some detail about how travel narratives tend to work in Hakluyt, concentrating on the principle of 'value' that drives these narratives, a term that we can understand in both narratological and economic terms.[39] Perhaps it is going too far to ascribe to Hakluyt a version of the 'translation' theory I am describing, although as we have seen Hakluyt *was* an unusually self-conscious translator and the *Principal Navigations* seems to me to offer a perfect archive in which to work. And in a sense Hakluyt's 'art of the fragment,' as I have called it, could serve as a model for our own efforts. For we find in the many fragments that constitute the *Principal Navigations* all the many procedures of formal appropriation, of figurative transposition, of physical change and transformation that characterize the translation process and that come to constitute the early modern global imaginary as both an economic and a political system for early modern writers. This is Hakluyt's 'materialism,' a materialism of force and enduring chains of association, and of the networks of forms that give those translations meaning. And although Hakluyt is exemplary, he is by no means unique: we find in Bacon's work, for instance, another extremely subtle and complex engagement with the category of form, in several different senses, and we should remember that, when Bacon calls his new inductive method an 'Interpretation of Nature,' he is proposing science not merely as an active form of reading and writing or as a kind of formalism but precisely as a mode of 'translation' – *interpretatio* is *his* term, too, and one that shouldn't merely be rendered as the 'interpretation of Nature,' as is commonly done.[40]

Finally, it is worth making an observation about the epistemological model that follows from Hakluyt's practice and theory of translation as a mode of truthful discourse. Under the cover of classificatory schemes and other objectivist gestures, we may discern an active process of handling linguistic materials, a process of transformation, of *making* truth. In Hakluyt, truth rarely 'is': 'truth' is something done, which in turn implies a certain opacity or ambiguity around the precise 'content' of this truth, of what 'is' truthful or what things, ideas, or phenomena may be described in 'truthful' terms. This active, or praxical, or 'verbal' mode of truth, as we could call it, would seem at first glance to be entirely opposed to another mode of truth that flourishes in early modern travel writing: an empirical truth predicated on accuracy and referential transparency. Many of the documents printed by Hakluyt survive in the first place because they depend on this notion of quasi-scientific 'truth,' as measured by the quanta of information they contain.[41] But this active, praxical, or transformational notion of truth that we find in Hakluyt's translation procedures does not stand in *opposition* to proto-empiricist and scientific aspects of early modern travel writing: it is *essential* to it. It suggests that 'truth' is not something we should imagine

as a depth beneath a surface or as a latent content that must be found or investigated or communicated more or less faithfully, as conventional theories of translation often imagine: the truth of a text or of a situation ('Virginia') emerges through and by means of certain ways of operating, acting, talking, thinking, and writing. Indeed, what we often refer to as the 'political' dimension to early modern writing about the Atlantic world could be described as the sum total of forces that bind or dissociate chains of translation, and in this way manufacture truth about the world; the 'political' is distinguished by the quanta and the ontological mode of force that is implied in any act of translation and by the modes of truth – philosophical, legal, technical, linguistic, scientific, practical – that give those translations meaning. This suggests further that modes of truth are as important in the definition of the 'political' as modes of power and legitimate violence, if not more so: the 'political' is that which negotiates among competing modes of truth and the systems of value upon which they depend. This definition for the 'political' is one that I believe Hakluyt would have accepted, albeit translated into his own terms.

It may be surprising to learn that Hakluyt never travelled beyond France: although he was a charter member and shareholder of the Virginia Company, he remained an armchair geographer who voyaged to the New World only by proxy. By 1606, the name 'Hakluyt' has become synonymous with his book, *The Principal Navigations*, which was carried physically on to the ships as a source of historical, navigational, cultural, and linguistic information. By 1608, English adventurers began naming landmasses after Hakluyt: 'Hakluyt's Headland,' so named by Henry Hudson in his 1608 voyage to Greenland; 'Hacluits foreland,' cited in a 1614 dispute between the Dutch ambassador and the Muscovy Company over rights of trade in Greenland; 'Mount Hakluyt,' named by the captain of a Moscovy Company voyage to the same area in the Summer of 1615; 'Hakluyt's Ile,' named by William Baffin in Baffin Bay in July 1616.[42] 'Countreys new discovered where commoditie is to be looked for, doe better accord with a new name given by the discoverers, then an uncertaine name by a doubtfull Authour': so wrote Master Dionise Settle in his account of Martin Frobisher's 1577 voyage in search of the North-west Passage.[43] We could find no better epitaph for Richard Hakluyt: his name as a translation of the earth, inscribed on the maps of the world, and in the mouth of every seaman looking for a landmark.

Notes

1 I have developed some of the ideas that follow in more detail in Henry S. Turner, 'Lessons from literature for the historian of science (and vice versa): reflections on "form"', *Isis: Journal of the History of Science Society*, 101.3 (2010), 578–589, with additional bibliography.

2 See especially 'Listmania,' a focus section of *Isis* 103 (December 2012), 710–752, ed. James Delbourgo and Staffan Müller-Wille.

3 Hakluyt, *The Principall Navigations, Voiages and Discoveries of the English Nation* (London, 1589; STC 12625); Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations, Voiages, Traffiques and Discoueries of the English Nation* (London, 1598[–1600]; STC 12626). See also Hakluyt, *Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation* (London, 1599–[1600]; STC 12626a).

4 On this aspect of the *Principal Navigations* see esp. Mary Fuller, 'Making something of it: questions of value in the early English travel collection', *Journal of Early Modern History*, 10 (2006), 11–38, esp. 19, and Fuller, *Voyages in Print: English Travel to America, 1576–1624* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 11, 15, and 141–174; also David Harris Sacks, 'Richard Hakluyt's navigations in time: history, epic, and empire', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 67 (2006), 31–62, esp. 31; and Henry S. Turner, 'Toward an analysis of the corporate ego: the case of Richard Hakluyt', *differences*, 20.2–3 (2009), 103–147.

5 On Hakluyt and humanism see David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 70–82; Andrew Fitzmaurice, *Humanism and America: An Intellectual History of English Colonisation 1500–1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), esp. pp. 50–51 and 152–157, on Hakluyt and 'legal humanism'; on humanism and travel writing see Joan-Pau Rubiés, 'Travel writing and humanistic culture: a blunted impact?', *Journal of Early Modern History*, 10 (1–2), 131–168, esp. 141, 149–150, 154; also Anthony Grafton, with April Shelford and Nancy Siraisi, *New Worlds, Ancient Texts: The Power of Tradition and the Shock of Discovery* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992). Sacks, 'Hakluyt's navigations in time', examines the varieties of protestant attitudes in the *Principal Navigations* and shows there need be no contradiction between Hakluyt's 'classicism and his Protestantism', 36.

6 Hakluyt names these languages in the prefatory matter to the 1589 edition of the *Principall Navigations*: 'I fell to my intended course, and by degrees read over whatsoever printed or written discoveries and voyages I found extant either in the Greeke, Latine, Italian, Spanish, Portugall, French, or English languages' (sig. 2r). The best discussion of Hakluyt's translation work remains F. M. Rogers, 'Hakluyt as translator', in D. B. Quinn (ed.), *The Hakluyt Handbook*, 2 vols, Hakluyt Society Second Series, no. 144–145 (London: Hakluyt Society, 1974), Vol. I, pp. 37–47, from which much of my own account has been taken.

7 *Hakluyt Handbook*, Vol. I, pp. 37, 280; David B. Quinn and Alison M. Quinn, 'Introduction' to the *Discourse of Western Planting*, Hakluyt Society Extra Series, no. 45 (London: Hakluyt Society, 1993), pp. xvi–xvii.

8 Gothard Arthus, *Dialogues in the English and Malaiane Languages* (London, 1614; STC 810), trans. into English from Latin by Augustine Spalding, who was working with an initial manuscript translation that Hakluyt had prepared; see *Hakluyt Handbook*, Vol. I, p. 328, citing a Court of the East India Company meeting on 22 January 1614: 'A book of dialogues, heretofore translated into Latin by the Hollanders, and printed with the Malayan tongue, Mr. Hakluyt having now turned the Latin into English, and supposed very fit for the factors to learn, ordered to be printed before the departure of the ships.' Hakluyt's other direct translations are René de Laudonnière, *A Notable Historie Containing Foure Voyages made by certayne French captaynes unto Florida* (London, 1587; STC 15316), 'newly translated out

of French into English by R. H.'; Antonio Galvao, *The Discoveries of the World from the first originall unto the yeere of our Lord 1555, corrected, quoted, and now published in English by Richard Hakluyt* (London, 1601; STC 11543), reworking a pre-existing anonymous translation 'by some honest and well affected marchant of our nation,' as the dedication to Robert Cecil puts it (sig. A3v); Anon., *Virginia Richly Valued …Written by a Portugall gentleman of Eluas, employed in all the action, and translated out of Portugese [sic] by Richard Hakluyt* (London, 1609; STC 22938); and Grotius (below).

9 Hugo Grotius, *The Free Sea*, trans. Richard Hakluyt, ed. with introduction by David Armitage (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2004), pp. xxi–xxiii.

10 On Hakluyt's patronage networks (his own and others', especially within England) and the composition of the readership of the *Principal Navigations*, see David Harris Sacks, 'Richard Hakluyt and his publics, c. 1580–1620', in Bronwen Wilson and Paul Yachnin (eds), *Making Publics in Early Modern Europe: People, Things, Forms of Knowledge* (New York: Routledge, 2010), pp. 159–176.

11 Antonio de Espeio, *El viaie que hizo Antonio de Espeio …* (Madrid, 1586; 'y de nueuo en Paris el mesmo anno, a la costa de Richardo Hakluyt'); *Histoire des terres nouuellement descouuertes …* (Paris: chez veuve Nicolas Roffet, 1586).

12 Antonio de Espejo, *New Mexico. Otherwise, The Voiage of Anthony of Espeio …*, trans. into English by 'A. F.' (London, 1587; STC 18487).

13 René de Laudonnière, *L'histoire notable de la Floride* (Paris, 1586).

14 René de Laudonnière, *A Notable Historie Containing Foure Voyages made by certayne French captaynes unto Florida*, 'newly translated out of French into English by R. H' and dedicated to Ralegh (above).

15 Thomas Harriot, *A Briefe and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia …* (London, 1588; STC 12785).

16 Theodor de Bry, *America. Part i*. '*A briefe and true report of the new found land of Virginia …*' (Frankfurt, 1590; STC 12786). With 'the true pictures and fashions of the people in that parte of America now called Virginia … Translated out of Latin into English by Richard Hackluit. Diligentlye collected and draowne by Jhon White … now cutt in copper and first published by Theodore de Bry att his wone [sic] chardges.' On the translation of the notes see Rogers in *Hakluyt Handbook*, I, pp. 38–39.

17 *Hakluyt Handbook*, Vol. I, p. 300.

18 Ibid., p. 294.

19 *Principal Navigations* (1598–1600), Vol. III, p. 742.

20 See especially Flora Ross Amos, *Early Theories of Translation* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1920); F. O. Matthiessen, *Translation: An Elizabethan Art* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931); two studies by Glyn P. Norton, 'Humanist foundations of translation theory (1400–1450): a study in the dynamics of word', *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée*, 8.2 (1981), 173–203, and Glyn P. Norton, *The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France and Their Humanist Antecedents* (Geneva: Droz, 1984); Rita Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Theo Hermans, 'The task of the translator in the European Renaissance: explorations in a discursive field', in Susan Bassnett (ed.), *Translating Literature* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1997), pp. 14–40; and Massimiliano

Morini, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice* (Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2006), with additional bibliography.

21 Norton, 'Humanist foundations', 191.

22 Ibid., 182–183.

23 Cicero, *De optimo genere oratorum*, trans. H. M. Hubbell, LCL (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976), 5.14.

24 See Eric H. Ash's discussion of merchant advisers and experts, including Hakluyt: '"A Note and a Caveat for the Merchant": mercantile advisors in Elizabethan England', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 33 (2002), 1–31, esp. 26.

25 For a beautiful meditation on the list as a form, and especially as a form for the idea of the infinite, see Umberto Eco, *The Infinity of Lists: An Illustrated Essay* (New York: Rizzoli, 2009) esp. pp. 113–118 and 371–377. I would characterize Hakluyt's lists as falling somewhere between the 'practical' and the 'poetic,' in Eco's terms, and their interest as forms of translation resides in the degree to which they are simultaneously both; I would also disagree with Eco's characterization of the practical list as a finite form (p. 116).

26 As Hakluyt put it, in his dedicatory letter to Ralegh of his Latin edition of Peter Martyr's *De orbe novo* ... (Paris, 1587; 'labore & industria Richardi Hakluyti'): 'Not undeservedly, therefore, ought the memory of that outstanding man Peter Martyr Anglerius of Milan to be particularly sacred and precious to every right-thinking individual. For he has published to the whole Christian world in his learned commentaries all that the Spaniards have achieved, whether praise- or blame-worthy, in a space of four and thirty years, on land and on sea ... Nor does he relate his facts disjointedly as most others have done, nor in a language, as most often happens, unknown to educated men, nor baldly or frigidly, but he depicts with a distinguished and skilful pen and with lively colours in a most gifted manner the head, neck, breast, arms, in brief the whole body of that tremendous entity America, and clothes it [*induit*] decently in the Latin dress familiar to scholars.' Translated from Latin in E. G. R. Taylor (ed.), *The Original Writings and Correspondence of the Two Richard Hakluyts*, 2 vols, Hakluyt Society 2nd ser. 76–77 (London: Hakluyt Society, 1935), Vol. II, p. 363.

27 See, for instance, Hakluyt's comment in the *Discourse of Western Planting* that 'they of Canada say that it is the space of a moon (yt is to say a moneth) to saile to a lande where Cynamon and cloves are gathered, and in the frenche originall which I sawe in the kinges Library at Paris in the Abbay of Saint Martines yt is further put downe that Donnaconna the kinge of Canada in his barke had traveled to that Contrie where Cynamon and cloves are had, yea and the names whereby the Savages call those twoo spices in their owne language are there put downe in writinge' (chapter 17, item 5; pp. 83.2002–84.2008).

28 *Discourse of Western Planting*, chapter 16, pp. 79.1883–1886.

29 Dedication of *Virginia Richly Valued* to the Virginia Company adventurers (15 April 1609; *Hakluyt Handbook*, Vol. I, p. 323; Taylor, *Original Writings*, Vol. II, pp. 499–503). Original STC 22938, sig. A4r.

30 Norton, 'Humanist theories', 178. Cf. Miles Smith's introduction to the King James Bible: 'Translation it is that openeth the window, to let in the light; that breaketh the shell, that we may eat the kernel' (qtd in Morini, *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice*, p. 50). Smith draws on a long tradition of Christian hermeneutic, broadly Augustinian in orientation, one neatly captured in the *Super Thebaiden* (attr. Fulgentius): 'Not uncommonly poetic songs are seen to be comparable with nuts. For as in a nut there are two parts, the shell and the kernel, so also there are two parts in poetic songs: the literal and the mystical senses. The kernel lies hidden beneath the shell; beneath the literal sense lies the mystic understanding. If you wish to have the kernel, you must break the shell; if the figures are to be made plain, the letter must be shattered. The shell is tasteless; the kernel is flavorful to the taster.' Qtd in Robert P. Miller (ed.), *Chaucer: Sources and Backgrounds* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 5. My thanks to András Kiséry for pointing me to these references.

31 *The Institution of Christian Religion, written in Latine by M. John Calvine, and translated into English according to the authors last edition, by Thomas Norton* (London, 1578; STC 4418), 'The Preface', sig. *iiv; cited by Amos, *Early Theories*, pp. 123–124.

32 *Homer Prince of Poets: translated according to the Greeke, in twelve bookes of his Iliads, by Geo: Chapman* (London, 1609; STC 13633), 'To the Reader', sig. A4r.

33 *Principal Navigations* (1598–1600) Vol. III, p. 742.

34 See Christopher Hall's, Dionise Settle's, and Thomas Ellis's accounts of Martin Frobisher's voyages (1576, 1577, 1578) in search of the North-west Passage, his encounter with the Inuit of 'meta incognita' (Nunavut province in northern Canada), and his battles with ice, *Principal Navigations* (1599–1600), Vol. III, pp. 29–32, 32–29, and 39–42; sigs C3r–C4v, C4v–D2r, and D2r–D4v.

35 *Principal Navigations* (1599–1600), Vol. III, pp. 35, 36; sigs C6r, C6v. The mariners may also have used small notebooks or writing tables with specially treated, erasable pages that did not require ink but rather some form of sharp stylus, apparently a common writing technology among merchants; see Peter Stallybrass, Roger Chartier, J. Franklin Mowery, and Heather Wolfe, 'Hamlet's tables and the technologies of writing in Renaissance England', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 55.4 (2004), 379–419, and H. R. Woudhuysen, 'Writing-tables and table-books', *Electronic British Library Journal*, 3 (2004), 1–11.

36 See in particular: Latour, 'Circulating reference', in *Pandora's Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999) pp. 24–79, and 'Drawing things together', in Michael Lynch and Steve Woolgar (eds), *Representation in Scientific Practice* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1990), pp. 19–68; Latour, *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987), and *Aramis, or the Love of Technology*, trans. Catherine Porter (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996).

37 Latour, *We Have Never Been Modern*, trans. Catherine Porter (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), p. 119.

38 Hakluyt, 'Articles conceived and determined for the Commission of the Merchants of his company resiant in Russia ...' (1 May 1555), *Principal Navigations ...* (1599–1600), Vol. I, p. 259.

39 Along these lines see Turner, 'Corporate ego', 103–147.

40 E.g. the title page to the second part of the *Instauratio Magna*, 'Novum organum, sive indicia vera de interpretatione naturae' (*Franciscy de Verulamio, summi Angliae cancellarii instauratio magna* (London, 1620; STC 1162), pp. 35; also pp. 42, 47, etc.)

41 We find in the *Principal Navigations*, and in an Atlantic context in particular – a pattern that is worth noting but that I am not yet able to explain – that the term 'truth' is often used as an intensifier to mark this empirical, referential gesture; the phrase 'in truth', for instance, is common throughout the documents that Hakluyt collects pertaining to North America in particular, including Florida. 'In truth' a certain shore is very dangerous, or a particular

bird has a white head, or a group of native people is very courageous, or a member of the expedition party had departed in a different direction, and so forth: the phrase is both an intensifier and a conjoining construction, one that allows a narrative or a report to continue while at the same time covering over the narrational movement, or the active narrational *process*: 'in truth' points toward a domain outside the narrative to which the report is presumed to refer, either the truth of an event or of the narrator himself as eye-witness or reliable mediator for the account. It is as if the fact of narration – the condition of reported speech, the epistemological burden of passing on an account of a state of affairs that is impossible to verify but that cannot be allowed to exist *only* in writing – generates a demand for 'truth' not as an assembled process but as an assertion, an invocation, even a tic of discourse.

42 *Hakluyt Handbook*, I pp. 322–323, 328, 330, 331.
43 *Principal Navigations* (1599–1600), Vol. III, p. 39, sig. D2r.

Part III

The matters of writing