

the fair reputation of naval history of charges without notice of the errors

and that he has Hakluyt—namely, in the form in which, says he, a disclaimer,—and we deny the assertion,—or dishonesty inserted here to Hakluyt of the real individual passage,

Hakluyt cannot speak, because. nothing but the extract concerning the second voyage of Cabot the Venetian Sebastian; and the words “a Venetian John Cabot, a man who speak with more authority in the second place, Hakluyt added and altered a large amount of plausible given the passage thus bound him—compels an author to do so. But he does not peruse not a word from an extract of the latter part of the text;” and having to correct that information which is at the words, “a Venetian Sebastian” and he inserts the same altogether. In

1589, he had probably become acquainted with the second patent, which ascribed the plan of the expedition solely to John Cabot; and he, therefore, added to his note the words, “John Cabot, a Venetian,” where he speaks of the person who had caused the king to man and victual a ship. Even, therefore, if we were to admit, which we do not, that a discrepancy had been made out between the passages in Hakluyt and the real extract from the Chronicle of Robert Fabyan, we should be entitled to repel any accusations against his honesty, founded upon a basis so extremely erroneous.

The memorialist now comes to the consideration of the proof as to the “personal agency of the father in the discovery of North America, derived from the inscription on the map cut by Clement Adams, which Hakluyt states is to be seen in her Majesty’s Privy Gallery at Westminster, and in many other ancient merchants’ houses.”* And here he commences his examination by another unfair innuendo against this writer. “We approach the statement of Hakluyt,” says he, “with a conviction that he would not hesitate for a moment to interpolate the name of *John Cabot*, if he thought that thereby was secured a better correspondence with the original patent.” I have convicted him (it is thus he argues) of interpolating the quotation furnished by Stow from Fabyan, and there is a strong presumption he would not hesitate to alter the inscription also. “It would, certainly,” he remarks, “require less audacity to associate here the name of the father, as it is found in the patent, than to do that of which Hakluyt has already been convicted.”† To this indirect insinuation it may be calmly replied, that, as the first attempt to affix guilt upon Hakluyt has been shown to be a total failure, the inscription ought to be received from his hands with perfect confidence that we read it in his work exactly as it was copied by him from the original map of Sebastian Cabot, cut by Clement Adams. From the manner in which it is given, first in the original Latin, and then translated, it professes to be an exact quotation; and even were Hakluyt as guilty a person as the biographer represents him, it might be contended that he would have paused before he committed an act of interpolation, of

* See the proof stated. Supra, p. 21.

† Memoir of Cabot, p. 48.