



KENNETH ANDREWS

## Kenneth Raymond Andrews 1921–2012

K. R. ANDREWS, known to colleagues as Ken, died on 6 January 2012. He was born in London on 26 August 1921 to Arthur Walter and Marion Gertrude Andrews. He received his schooling at Henry Thornton School, Clapham, and went to King's College University of London in 1939, originally to study languages, but he soon switched to history. After a year he joined the RAF and served in Kenya and the Yemen. He returned to university after the war, graduated with a first in History in 1948, and was then taken on as a research student by C. R. Boxer who supervised his Ph.D. research on 'The economic aspects of Elizabethan privateering'. Ken proceeded briskly and the degree was duly awarded by the University of London in 1951.

After graduation, Ken became a teacher of history at what then was the Ealing Technical College where he catered mainly for A-Level and day release students. Having served this apprenticeship he received an academic position at the University of Liverpool for the short interlude, 1963–4, after which he was appointed in 1964 to a lectureship in the Department of History at the University of Hull to replace Ralph Davis, who had proceeded from there to the chair in Economic History at Leicester. At Hull, Ken advanced quickly from lecturer to senior lecturer and served 1979–88 (part-time 1986–8) as Professor of History. Although a Londoner through and through, and although burdened with a teaching and administrative load much greater than his academic counterparts at better endowed universities in the United Kingdom, Ken Andrews remained attached and loyal to Hull and published his best work from there. He also attracted some research students, including John C. Appleby

who followed Ken's lead both in investigating the holdings of the High Court of Admiralty, particularly as these related to Ireland, and in pursuing the history of piracy and outlawry in England.<sup>1</sup> It came as little surprise therefore when Ken announced at his retirement dinner that he intended to remain in Cottingham, having developed a great affection for the landscapes of the East Riding of Yorkshire.

Andrews was brought into the academic stream in 1963 when D. B. Quinn, who then held the Andrew Geddes and John Rankin Chair of Modern History at the University of Liverpool, supported him for a one-year temporary lectureship there. The two were already acquainted since their research interests overlapped, and Quinn had been acting as an unofficial mentor to Ken during his years at Ealing. As a historian Andrews was greatly influenced by Quinn not only in his choice of research subject but also in his methodology and mode of communication. Thus where Quinn had launched himself in 1940 as a scholar of English exploration with his two-volume Hakluyt edition on *The Voyages and Colonising Enterprises of Sir Humphrey Gilbert* and followed this up in 1955 with a further two volumes devoted to *The Roanoke Voyages, 1584–1590*, Andrews commenced his publishing career in 1959, while still at Ealing, with a Hakluyt edition on *English Privateering Voyages to the West Indies, 1588–1595*. A Hakluyt sequel followed in 1972 devoted to *The Last Voyages of Drake and Hawkins*. Both master and mature disciple were concerned to compile and annotate the evidence that would justify a reinterpretation of England's encounters with the wider world during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Therefore Andrews's 1978 tribute to his erstwhile mentor, following upon Quinn's retirement from Liverpool, might almost have been a description of his own work; Quinn, he then said, had reconstructed 'the foundations of history . . . not by the all-too-fashionable method of thinking up a bright idea and rummaging around for enough evidence to make it plausible, but by applying all the technical resources of research to clarify existing knowledge and supplement it with new, producing thereby a deeper and ultimately truer understanding of the past'.<sup>2</sup> The readiness with which both Quinn and Andrews dedicated themselves to the incremental advancement of knowledge through empirical investigation is surprising given that for

<sup>1</sup>J. C. Appleby (ed.), *A Calendar of Material Relating to Ireland from the High Court of Admiralty Examinations, 1536–1641* (Dublin, 1992); J. C. Appleby and P. Dalton (eds.), *Outlaws in Medieval and Early Modern England: Crime, Government and Society, c.1066–c.1600* (London, 2009).

<sup>2</sup>K. R. Andrews, N. P. Canny and P. E. H. Hair, 'David Beers Quinn', Preface to K. R. Andrews, N. P. Canny and P. E. H. Hair (eds.), *The Westward Enterprise; English Activities in Ireland, the Atlantic and America, 1480–1650* (Liverpool, 1978), p. viii; as the coordinator of this jointly authored appraisal of Quinn I can testify that these were Andrews's words.

long periods of their careers each was committed to Marxism, in practice as well as ideologically. Quinn satisfied what he would have seen as his vocational responsibility when, in 1947, he published his short volume *Raleigh and the British Empire* in the Home University Library imprint; a series designed by scholars-of-the-left to reach people who had not enjoyed the opportunity to attend university. Andrews followed Quinn's example in 1967 with his lively and opinionated *Drake's Voyages* which was reissued in 1970 in a Panther edition directed at the general public.

For their mainstream work, however, each persisted with the meticulous collection of fresh evidence, possibly because investigation into the origins of Britain's overseas empire had been previously studied closely by a sequence of scholars who had exulted in the achievements of the great English mariners of early modern times and who had reached a broad audience at a time when the history of empire was both popular and academically fashionable. Andrews, like Quinn, appreciated that these earlier interpretations could be superseded only if it could be shown that the evidence on which they were based was deficient in one or several respects. Quinn and Andrews each showed respect for the labours of those who had previously worked in the field—the names of Alexander Brown, J. S. Corbett, V. T. Harlow, A. P. Newton and J. A. Williamson come to mind as proximate predecessors, with Hakluyt and Purchas being the best known names from earlier centuries. However, while they corrected those who had gone before them in matters of detail they also distanced themselves from their more jingoistic and/or romantic conclusions. Where Quinn had done so by displaying an interest in, and concern for, the native populations and cultures (native American or Irish) that fell foul of the acquisitiveness of English adventurers, Andrews alluded repeatedly to the plunder and piracy that was pursued by the well-known Elizabethan sea adventurers such as Drake, Raleigh and Hawkins, and he demonstrated that some of London's leading merchants and several senior figures at court invested in, and profited from, extra-legal activities. When Andrews insisted that several of 'the most successful businessmen of the age' who, in 1600, constituted 'the nucleus of the East India Company', had previously been active promoters of Caribbean raiding and African slaving, he was also upholding his more general proposition that England's capitalist system was based on theft from European competitors no less than from native populations.<sup>3</sup> This contention was analogous to the more frequently invoked Marxist mantra formulated originally by Eric Williams which

<sup>3</sup>K. R. Andrews (ed.), *English Privateering Voyages to the West Indies, 1588–1595* (Cambridge, 1959), p. 32.

held that Britain's Industrial Revolution had been enabled by profits from the slave trade.<sup>4</sup>

If the propositions expounded by Andrews dovetailed with his ideological preferences, he recognised that they stood no hope of winning scholarly, much less popular, acceptance unless he could sustain them with fresh evidence. Here his earlier interest in languages came to his assistance and he delved into Spanish archival sources, particularly in Seville, as well as in the records of the High Court of Admiralty, housed at the then Public Record Office, to gain a balanced view of England's overseas endeavours. His guide to the Spanish material was the American historian Irene A. Wright who had been long immersed in a projected three-volume Hakluyt Society edition of Spanish accounts of English voyages to, and intrusions in, Spanish America during the sixteenth century. When the advance of years prevented her from proceeding beyond a second volume she presented Ken Andrews with the remaining notes she had extracted from the Spanish archives.<sup>5</sup> Andrews gladly accepted and augmented this material for his volume *English Privateering Voyages to the West Indies, 1588–1595*. Here he used the Spanish evidence to corroborate the information he had gleaned from English sources, but he valued it particularly for the insight it provided on the impact—'psychological and economic, naval and military'—that repeated English attacks had exerted upon settler Spanish communities scattered across the Caribbean.<sup>6</sup>

Andrews's prime source on the English side to England's privateering activities during those years came from the files of the High Court of Admiralty. One of his signal achievements in his very first volume was in reaching an understanding of, and then explaining, how that very complex court had operated and what strands of information could be garnered from the various complaints, testimonies, depositions, interrogations, and summations of day-to-day activities that are included within the archives of a court that had a vast range of responsibilities and involved a broad community of interests. The work of the court, as he made clear, ranged from licensing privateers to tracking and deciding upon the distribution of the loot they captured and to adjudicating upon disputes—

<sup>4</sup>E. Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1944).

<sup>5</sup>I. A. Wright (ed.), *Documents Concerning English Voyages to the Spanish Main, 1569–1580* (London, 1932); I. A. Wright (ed.), *Further English Voyages to Spanish America, 1583–1594* (London, 1951); Wright's original interest had been in the Spanish Caribbean itself as shown in I. A. Wright (ed.), *Historia Documentada de San Cristobal de la Habana*, 2 vols. (Havana, 1930).

<sup>6</sup>Andrews, *English Privateering Voyages*, p. 2.

including international disputes—to which the activities of privateers and pirates inevitably gave rise.

This section of what is a very fine introduction to Andrews's first Hakluyt edition constitutes evidence of his concern to master whatever information proved necessary to understanding the mind and the world of all the different categories of people involved with Caribbean ventures. These people ranged from those who sponsored the ventures and those who designed, constructed and equipped the vessels, to those who manned the ships and chartered and commanded successive expeditions. Andrews was at pains also to establish the licit and illicit profits that each group made from its involvement, and what benefit accrued to the government, and to the servants of the Admiralty Court, from both privateering activity and piratical pursuits.

As he set about his task, Andrews found a ready-made audience among the members of the Hakluyt Society and those interested in naval history. However, he became somewhat disenchanted to find that as Britain was entering upon the post-imperial phase of its development he was considered by most historians of his generation to be traversing obscure, and for them irrelevant, pathways of the Elizabethan era. It was reasonable for Andrews to conclude that he was being isolated from the historical mainstream because, with Geoffrey Elton as the rising star in Tudor studies, the focus of research activity in political history was shifting chronologically from the reign of Queen Elizabeth to that of King Henry VIII, and thematically from parliament to the royal court and the administrative instruments of government. However, Andrews had hoped that economic historians would have embraced his work, only to find that as these came to attach increasing store on quantification they showed scant respect for subjects for which precise economic or demographic data were either not available or had never existed. He voiced his frustration retrospectively in writing to a colleague in 1985: 'they [Economic Historians] certainly never regarded me as one of them—did I ever say anything about the cloth trade or the Merchant Adventurers? My relationship with them was never any better than my relationship with the naval historians, who generally failed equally to see the connections between overseas trade and maritime warfare. My work has been a long uphill battle to bridge this gap, bringing commercial and naval history into a fruitful partnership, but few have understood—Ralph Davis was one of the few.'<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup>The quotation is from K. Andrews to Donald Woodward, 5 Sept. 1985, and supplied to me by Donald Woodward.

When he was confronted with the reality that the historical subjects to which he had devoted his life were even being dropped from the history and economic history undergraduate curricula of British universities, Ken Andrews saw the need to win readers for what he considered to be defining moments of Britain's historical past by educating them *ex nihilo*. Thus in successive publications he took to explaining the human and physical geography of the Spanish Caribbean and its climatic and seasonal variations; the intricacies of navigation during the early modern period; the design, construction and repair of sixteenth-century ships; and the financial instruments used to launch and profit from high-risk, but potentially high-gain, maritime ventures of the sixteenth century. Andrews saw the need for such explication even when writing for members of the Hakluyt Society who constituted a captive and well-informed audience. Then in his first monograph, *Elizabethan Privateering: English Privateering during the Spanish War, 1585–1603*, he located his chosen subject within a context that was familiar to readers of mainstream history, including professional historians.<sup>8</sup> Thus, when he set out to explain that privateering was piracy under another name, he described how a parsimonious Queen Elizabeth licensed English sailors, some of them former pirates, to attack Spanish ships because this was the only means, besides a formal declaration of war with its attendant cost to the state, by which English merchants could receive compensation for the losses they had suffered on those occasions when their cargoes had been seized by the Spanish authorities. He also made it clear that Elizabeth had a political purpose in mind when she licensed privateers to the extent that she hoped that this would prove an inexpensive way to persuade the Spanish government to desist from consolidating its military position in Flanders and thus threatening the security of England. Andrews also contended that however expedient such stratagems might have seemed to Elizabeth's government they were not generally favoured by London's principal merchants who previously had been profiting from peaceful trade with Spain and whose agents in Spain had been willing even to participate in Catholic worship whenever such compliance furthered their commercial ends. Such established merchants, he insisted, became reluctant privateers and risked their ships for such ventures only after open warfare between England and Spain made conventional trade impossible. Even then, he contended, they treated privateering as a supplement to, or a substitution for, orthodox trading activity.

<sup>8</sup> K. R. Andrews, *Elizabethan Privateering: English Privateering during the Spanish War, 1585–1603* (Cambridge, 1964).

Thus, Andrews explained, in a way that nobody had done previously, that there were various strands to Elizabethan privateering, and that London's leading merchants, who had profited considerably from privateering during the war years, resumed their traditional eastward-looking trade with Europe once peaceful conditions were restored. The marginal participants who had never drawn any distinction between trade and plunder had no 'normal' trade to return to after 1604, and Andrews explained how, in the absence of such, they persisted with unorthodox activity in the Caribbean and along the coastline of North America where conditions continued to be unruly and the power of Spain was less securely established. Here he anticipated the thesis that would be popularised and elaborated upon some years later by Robert Brenner.<sup>9</sup>

Whereas in *Elizabethan Privateering* Andrews was aiming to persuade professional historians of the relevance of his subject to their various interests, his *Drake's Voyages*, as was mentioned, was directed at a general audience and was more pedagogic and ideological in purpose in that it set out to inform and raise the political consciousness of a general public who had never had the opportunity to study history in a formal setting. In this volume, Andrews deployed to especially good effect his proven ability to detail and explain in simple language the complicated technicalities associated with forgotten crafts. Here also he set about demythologising the exploits of Drake and other Elizabethan mariners, and dispelled the romantic aura that had been cultivated by authors of previous centuries by exposing the brutal, ruthless, exploitative and temperamental sides to Drake's character. Not all was debunking, however, and Andrews cultivated a new respect for Drake's seamanship as this had been demonstrated both by his global circumnavigation of 1580, which Andrews ranked 'among the greatest feats of early European oceanic enterprise', and by Drake's ability to outwit and outmanoeuvre his Spanish opponents at close quarter and in confined space.<sup>10</sup> While he pointed, in several instances, to the lack of coherence in the various attacks that English adventurers launched against the Spanish presence in the Americas, and more particularly in the Caribbean, and to the inconsequence of individual assaults relative to Spain's military prowess, he showed how cumulatively these attacks undermined Spanish confidence in its ability to defend

<sup>9</sup>R. Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution; Commercial Change, Political Conflict and London's Overseas Traders, 1550-1643* (Princeton, NJ, 1993).

<sup>10</sup>K. R. Andrews, *Drake's Voyages: a Re-Assessment of their Place in Elizabethan Maritime Expansion* (London, 1970, Panther edn.), p. 98.

all its Atlantic (and even its global) empire. In this way he demonstrated how the success of Elizabethan adventurers laid the foundations for what would become a more significant English presence in the Caribbean in the seventeenth century.

However, as Andrews identified new reasons for lauding the achievements of Elizabeth's sea-dogs, he questioned the high-minded motives that had been attributed to them by the authors of previous generations who had cherished their memory either as the upholders of Protestantism and freedom against the tyranny of Catholic Spain, or as the progenitors of England's imperial power of the nineteenth century which its admirers had usually depicted as benevolent. To counter such presumption, Andrews reflected upon the economic crisis of the mid-sixteenth century and detailed how John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland, 'chiefly remembered as an unscrupulous plunderer of monasteries, guilds and chantries', had also patronised sea adventures and thus channelled into overseas endeavour the 'ambition, greed and ruthlessness' that he, and other members of the 'new nobility', had manifested when enriching themselves at the expense of the church. Their unscrupulousness, claimed Andrews, bore further fruit in Elizabeth's reign when 'the most active' of the 'great men in Court and Council ... formed a generation of gold-hungry men whose energy and greed was fortunately turned seawards into piracy, privateering, colonization, trade, exploration' and boosted 'the movement of maritime expansion'.<sup>11</sup>

Such emotive language which had characterised the prose of Kenneth Andrews from the outset of his career was absent from his next major publication; his Hakluyt documentary edition of 1972 which attempted a reconstruction of the *Last Voyage of Drake and Hawkins* that led to the death of both sea adventurers. In this, more than in his earlier publications, Andrews drew upon archival holdings in Spain and France acknowledging again that he had been guided in his search of the archives in Seville by Irene Wright, but now also by Engel Sluiter from the University of California at Berkeley.<sup>12</sup> However, he stated that he was now no longer interested in presenting 'another interpretation' of what transpired in the West Indian enterprise of 1595–6, and while he occasionally offered his 'own opinion' both on the personalities involved and on the course of events, he left it to his readers to 'draw their own conclusions' from the 'representative documents and associated information' that he was plac-

<sup>11</sup> Andrews, *Drake's Voyages*, pp. 20–2.

<sup>12</sup> K. R. Andrews (ed.), *The Last Voyage of Drake and Hawkins* (London, 1972), p. xi.

ing before them.<sup>13</sup> In doing so he was confident that the addition both of fresh evidence from Continental archives and of previously neglected papers concerning Sir Thomas Baskerville (who commanded the fleet after Drake's death), would lead his readers to the conclusion that the purpose of this expedition of 1595–6, that included 1,000 soldiers as well as 1,500 sailors, was to dislodge the Spanish from the Isthmus of Panama and to establish an English presence there. One of the justifications for this undertaking, which Andrews regarded as an act of folly, was to divert Spain from assembling yet another Armada; this time probably to invade Ireland rather than England. This invocation by Andrews of considerations from high politics to explain developments at sea, suggests that he was again bidding for admission to the academic mainstream, as does the attention he gave to court factionalism to explain the choice of those officers who held positions of authority in this expedition. That Andrews was seeking to make peace also with naval historians is suggested by his inclusion of an essay by Commander D. W. Waters on 'The art of navigation in the age of Drake' to round-off this Hakluyt edition.<sup>14</sup>

All of this laborious assembling, augmenting, editing and reflecting upon evidence appertaining to England's overseas ventures, particularly in the Caribbean, during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries was regarded positively by scholars but Ken Andrews was coming to realise that he was correcting rather than adding to what had been done by others and that he would never contribute further to fresh knowledge unless he could balance what he had come to know of English overseas ventures with details of Spanish achievements. The opportunity to do so came with the award of a Nuffield Fellowship which enabled Andrews to spend a full year in Seville freed from his onerous teaching and administrative responsibilities at Hull. His investigations in poorly catalogued collections continued to be guided by the previous investigations of Engel Sluiter and Irene Wright, the latter by now deceased. However, Andrews went much further than either of these scholars in the book that resulted from his fresh research, *The Spanish Caribbean: Trade and Plunder, 1530–1630*. There he created a vivid picture of a sector of Spain's Atlantic Empire that had come to be little regarded by historians of his generation but which, as he made clear, was vital to the interest of Spain throughout the early modern centuries.<sup>15</sup> He demonstrated how Spain's early involvement

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 259–65.

<sup>15</sup> K. R. Andrews, *The Spanish Caribbean: Trade and Plunder, 1530–1630* (New Haven, CT, 1978).

with the Caribbean following the Columbus voyages became a natural extension of its earlier exploitation of the people and resources of the Canary Islands and was characterised by the same indiscipline and ‘colonizing attitude’ that, as David Abulafia has recently established in greater detail, had led to the destruction of the indigenous population of the Canaries.<sup>16</sup> Andrews then showed how in practice the Greater Antilles proved more fertile and productive than the Canary Islands had ever been, and were soon producing a range of commodities that found a ready market in Europe—some, such as cotton, medicinal plants, salt and pearls, that were native to the Caribbean and others, notably sugar and hides, that had been introduced there by the Spaniards at a huge cost to the natural environment. He further explained that the development that provoked greatest interest in Spain was the discovery of gold on the island of Santo Domingo with a resulting brief gold rush that hastened the demise of a native population which was already faring badly from Spanish contact.

It becomes clear from Andrews’s book why some Spaniards retained an interest in the Caribbean for its own sake even if it diminished in relative importance in the eyes of Spanish officials, and in the Spanish popular imagination, once Spaniards achieved even more spectacular successes in Central America and in Peru. Spanish achievements there, however, added a new strategic importance to the Caribbean, which Andrews describes as an ‘American Mediterranean’, because all the ships bearing precious metals from the New World to Spain had, of necessity, to pass that way. This also explains how, with the passage of time, smugglers, corsairs and privateers from other European nations were particularly attracted to the Spanish Caribbean with a view to lurking in places from which to attack the Spanish silver fleet on its return journey. The Spanish response was to give greater attention to administering and defending a part of its Atlantic Empire that had become a backwater, and their effort to recover their presence led ultimately to the conflict for the control of this area to which Ken Andrews would return in his next book.

This, his magisterial *Trade, Plunder and Settlement: Maritime Enterprise and the Genesis of the British Empire, 1480–1630*, which appeared in 1984, is the book for which the name of Kenneth Andrews is best known to economic historians, historians of colonial British America, historians of European expansion overseas and mainstream historians of early modern England.<sup>17</sup> Andrews had, by this stage, left the anger of youth and middle

<sup>16</sup>David Abulafia, *Atlantic Encounters in the Age of Columbus* (New Haven, CT, 2008).

<sup>17</sup>K. R. Andrews, *Trade, Plunder and Settlement: Maritime Enterprise and the Genesis of the British Empire, 1480–1630* (Cambridge, 1984).

age behind him, but this did not debar him from looking critically at England's imperial legacy, as he had done as early as 1939 when, as he put it himself, he had 'shocked his school-mates and masters by forecasting (without much argument or evidence) the downfall of the British Empire'. Now he insisted that his appraisal of that legacy was no longer 'motivated by any political or philosophical concern' because he had ceased almost twenty years before then to subscribe 'to any sort of Marxism . . . and to any sort of political movement ten years before that'.<sup>18</sup> Thus in 1984 as Andrews traced England's engagement with the wider world from the close of the Middle Ages, through the crisis of the 1550s, to the even greater economic crisis of the 1620s, he contended that he was being guided to his conclusions by the empirical evidence he had been assembling during his working life rather than by any ideological fixation. One of these conclusions was that it was 'the crude pursuit of riches' added to the 'insatiable thrust for fame and honour' that motivated the cast of adventurers whose risks and hardships he chronicled and whose efforts led ultimately, but not inevitably, to the creation of a British overseas empire.<sup>19</sup> Few, he contended, were inspired by the other 'sentiments'—the desire to uplift or evangelise foreign peoples, or to create model settlements, or to achieve economic self-sufficiency for England—that were 'invoked to explain, justify or recommend projects'. These latter were important, he suggested, only because they helped to win support in England for 'the idea of a maritime empire' in the decades before this had gripped 'the imagination of the English people'.<sup>20</sup> While Andrews was satisfied that communal, and even governmental, support for this grander project was ultimately secured, he remained convinced that a successful outcome was never assured given the disadvantages under which English seafarers worked as compared with various Continental competitors in such matters as ship design and construction, the training of mariners, the mobilisation of finance, and the securing of consistent support from the state. This led Andrews to conclude that while 'a British empire overseas' was born at some point in the early 1600s what emerged from the womb was 'a sickly child and all but still born', as compared with the vibrant empires of other European powers (now the Dutch as much as the Iberians) that then flourished.<sup>21</sup> This reality, he was only too well aware, had done nothing to stem the glorification of these early achievements

<sup>18</sup> Andrews, *Trade, Plunder and Settlement*, pp. vii–viii.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 31.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 31, 35.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 359.

that had contributed so much to the 'English nationalism' of his and previous generations. Therefore the final contribution of K. R. Andrews to correcting the distortions of his predecessors (and also those of some of his contemporaries) was in demonstrating that 'the involvement of England in the process of European overseas expansion was a natural consequence of her integral role in the commercial, political and cultural life of Europe'.<sup>22</sup>

Such a conclusion would have irritated the new right of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's generation no less than Andrews's previous Marxian explanations for the genesis of England's overseas empire had vexed academic supporters of previous Tory regimes. However, his ability to anchor his opinions in empirical evidence drawn from an extensive range of sources, his skill at situating his subject within contexts that were meaningful to political as well as economic historians, as well as his formal announcement that he had come in from the political cold, combined to explain why, in 1986, K. R. Andrews was elected a Fellow of the British Academy after he had been proposed by G. R. Elton, C. R. Boxer, D. C. Coleman, and Charles Wilson. Of these Elton was already the *doyen* of the political and constitutional history of the Tudor period; Boxer was the recognised expert on the history of Europe's overseas expansion; and Coleman and Wilson were authorities respectively on the economic and technological histories of the early modern centuries. Only such a combination could have done justice to the range of interests and competencies that K. R. Andrews had mastered during a long and productive career. In the citation he was credited with having 'effectively rewritten the history of Elizabethan expansion overseas, greatly enlarging and deepening what was thought to be a familiar story', in an extensive corpus of published work that bore 'the distinction not only of judicious powers of assessment but also of a lively and creative imagination'. Perhaps his most consequential achievement had been in convincing the then-recognised leaders of the different dimensions to early modern British history that the threads he had been weaving over a lifetime of scholarship had made a vital contribution to the better understanding of the subjects they had been explicating throughout their careers. On the other side it may have been their recognition of his achievements that provided Ken Andrews with the professional self-assurance that gave him the stimulus to engage in a final burst of archival investigation that brought his interests forward in time and culminated

<sup>22</sup> Andrews, *Trade, Plunder and Settlement*, pp. 363, 364.

in *Ships, Money and Politics: Seafaring and Naval Enterprise in the Reign of Charles I*, and which appeared when he was already 70 years of age.<sup>23</sup>

Belated peer recognition encouraged Ken Andrews forth from the cocoon within which he had sheltered for much of his life, partly because his first marriage, in 1949, to Hildegard Gurassa from Poland had brought him little happiness before it was finally dissolved in 1961. He was altogether more fortunate in his second marriage in 1969 to Otilie Schobrová née Kalman, from Olomouc, whom he had met when he was a British Council Lecturer to what was then Czechoslovakia. As his wife, Otti, as she liked to be called, was a great home-maker and fine cook, and together they became generous hosts to a small group of close friends. Through Otti also, Ken, or Andy as he was known to his new family, acquired two stepsons and two step-grandchildren. He thrived on these new connections, and became particularly close to Barbara, Otti's grand-daughter, who lives in Vancouver, to whom he proved supportive, especially in her academic endeavours after she had sustained severe injuries in a road accident about twenty years ago. A great void came into Ken's life when Otti died suddenly in January 2000. However, the broader interests he had developed in walking, chess, swimming, and listening to jazz continued to enrich his life. These, together with his continuing interest in England's ventures overseas and his enthusiastic involvement with the local U3A, sustained him for twelve further years.

NICHOLAS CANNY

*Fellow of the Academy*

*Note.* Given that I only once met Ken Andrews and exchanged but a few letters with him I am especially indebted to Donald Woodward, his former colleague at Hull, for supplying details and reminiscences on a shy but a loyal and principled man. Ken's stepson, Professor Jan Schober, also provided some insights on the private man. Hamish Scott offered invaluable support, advice and information at all stages as I prepared this memoir.

<sup>23</sup>K. R. Andrews, *Ships, Money and Politics: Seafaring and Naval Enterprise in the Reign of Charles I* (Cambridge, 1991).