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The title page of the first edition of Hawkesworth’s *Voyages*. The first edition was issued on June 9, 1773. The 2,000 sets sold out very quickly and a second edition of 2,500 sets was called for almost immediately. The second edition was issued on August 3, 1773.
THE current essay has been occasioned by the location of two volumes of original printer’s copy\(^1\) used for preparation of the second edition of John Hawkesworth’s account of Captain Cook’s *Endeavour* voyage.

My purpose in preparing the current account is threefold: (1) to recount the finding of the volumes; (2) to describe the process of authenticating the volumes as the original printer’s copy used in the preparation of the second edition; and (3) to raise questions relating to the markings in the volumes that could lead to further investigation into the people and activities involved in both the correction of the first edition and the preparation of the second.

Comments, corrections and suggestions from readers are greatly appreciated.

Ronald L. Ravneberg
5642 Moorgate Drive
Columbus, Ohio 43235-2506
RRavneberg@aol.com

---

\(^1\) The document — manuscript, typescript or printed — given to the compositor to set into type for printing. (Carter, John. *ABC for Book Collectors*. Newcastle, Delaware: Oak Knoll Press, 1995.)
Captain James Cook. Printed for the frontispiece of the first volume of the official account of Cook's second voyage, *A Voyage Towards the South Pole and Round the World* … (1777).
Moderate and fair weather, at 11 am [May 27, 1768] hoisted the Pendant and took charge of the ship agreeable to my Commission of the 25th Instant, She lying in the Bason in Deptford Yard. … At 2 pm [August 26, 1768] got under sail and put to sea having on board 94 persons including Officers Seamen Gentlemen and their servants, near 18 months provisions, 10 Carriage guns 12 Swivels with good store of Ammunition and stores of all kinds.

James Cook

WITH these simple journal entries, penned by a little known Royal Navy lieutenant named James Cook, history’s greatest decade of exploration began. Between 1768 and 1779 Cook led three voyages to the Pacific Ocean, during which he canvassed that area of the world from 70° north to 70° south and explored more territory than any other voyager before or since.

On his first voyage of 1768-1771, Cook was the first to circumnavigate and map New Zealand, proving in the process that it was not part of the fabled *Terra Australis*. Cook then headed west and surveyed the previously unexplored east coast of Australia with an accuracy not completely superseded until the 20th century. After a near disaster along the Great Barrier Reef, he passed through the strait separating New Guinea from Cape York, thereby confirming its existence. Cook was accompanied on his first voyage by flamboyant Joseph Banks, a wealthy amateur botanist and Fellow of the Royal Society. Banks’ notoriety was such that when he returned to London he was greeted with so much acclaim that many referred to the expedition as “Banks’ Voyage.” Nonetheless, Cook’s reputation was ensured and he was soon to head back to the Pacific.

Cook’s second voyage, 1772-1775, was designed to circumnavigate the globe as far south as possible and determine once and for all whether
there was any great southern landmass. He became the first navigator to penetrate the Antarctic Circle and, although he could not reach it, predicted that an Antarctic land would be found beyond the ice barrier. Cook then undertook a series of vast sweeps across the Pacific, finally proving there was no ‘Great South Land’ by sailing over most of its predicted location. In the course of the voyage he visited Easter Island, the Marquesas, Tahiti, the Society Islands, Niue, the Tonga Islands, the New Hebrides, New Caledonia, Norfolk Island, Palmerston Island, South Sandwich Islands, and South Georgia, many of which he named in the process.

Cook’s third and final voyage, 1776-1780, was to explore the north Pacific in search of the hoped-for North-West passage from the Atlantic to the Pacific. In addition to determining that the passage was a fantasy, Cook charted the Northwest coast of America from Oregon to Alaska, discovered Christmas Island, and made what he considered to be his most valuable discovery — the Sandwich, or Hawaiian Islands, where he was tragically killed in February 1779 in a conflict with the local inhabitants.

The total impact of Cook’s voyages is difficult to comprehend. He changed the Pacific basin from terra incognita into known territory and extended the British Empire to include New Zealand and Australia. He produced the first detailed maps of Tahiti, New Zealand, the east coast of Australia, Hawaii and Alaska, and he carried with him young officers who would shape the next decade of Pacific exploration, including William Bligh and George Vancouver. Cook’s use of the marine chronometer validated the utility of using timepieces for finding longitude, and in an era when scurvy could claim up to half of a ship’s crew on a long voyage, his emphasis on keeping fresh vegetables and fruit on board virtually eliminated the dread disease.

Cook’s legacy endures to the present day. NASA’s space shuttles Endeavour and Discovery are named after two of his ships, and television’s Star Trek captain, James T. Kirk, is patterned directly after James Cook. Even Kirk’s trademark phrase, “To boldly go where no man has gone before” is lifted from Cook’s, “… ambition leads me not only farther than any other man has been before me, but as far as I think it possible for man to go … .”
Voyage Narratives

Relations of voyages and travels have at all times, and in all ages, since the invention of letters, been favourably received by the public: but, perhaps, in no age so well as in the present; writings of this kind being bought up with avidity and read with eagerness, more especially in this island, not only by the learned and polite, but also by the rude and illiterate.

Anders Sparrman
*A Voyage to the Cape of Good Hope*, 1785

The 18th century world learned of explorers’ discoveries through published narratives of their travels, and the official accounts of Cook’s three voyages form a cornerstone of any collection of voyages and exploration.

Such accounts were not always available in their own times, however. As Anthony Payne noted, “Today, it is difficult to imagine commencing any scientific project without familiarizing oneself with the available information, but in the mid-eighteenth century the navigator had little with which to prepare himself. Further, even if the information was in print, it might, in the days before systematic librarianship and sophisticated bibliographies, be effectively irrecoverable.”

Surprisingly to today’s mind, perhaps, the British Admiralty in the day of Cook did not publish official accounts of the expeditions it financed. Rather, it relied upon the private sector to do so. Following a process that relied upon a mix of author capabilities and political patronage, the Admiralty would select a writer who would then take the logs and journals from the voyage and work them into a coherent narrative of the voyages being published. The selected author, as

---

copyright holder, was then free to work out whatever deal was possible with printers and booksellers. Other than a desire to see that the narratives were published, the Admiralty seemed to take little interest in the details and finances of production.3

A complete set of the first editions of the official accounts of Cook’s three voyages. The narrative of the first voyage, by John Hawkesworth, was published in three royal quarto volumes in 1773; the narrative of the second voyage was published in two royal quarto volumes in 1777; the narrative of the third voyage was published in three royal quarto volumes and a folio atlas in 1784. All were printed by William Strahan. Also shown is the first biography of Cook, written in 1788 by Andrew Kippis.

3 Philip Edwards states the situation quite pointedly. “It almost beggars belief that Lord Sandwich, First Lord of the Admiralty, should have chatted with fellow-guest at Lord Orford’s about Cook’s first expedition, and have told him casually that he was looking for someone to ‘write the voyage’ — and then have accepted his fellow-guest’s recommendation of Dr Hawkesworth — and then have given Hawkesworth not only Cook’s papers but those of Byron, Wallis and Carteret — and then for us to find that Hawkesworth received so little in the way of direction that he felt himself free to organize and rewrite his material in any way he wanted, and resented being told very late in the day that he had to include all the navigational information which he had discarded as unimportant.” *The Story of the Voyage: Sea-Narratives in Eighteenth-Century England.* Cambridge University Press, 1994, p. 7.
With the exception of the second and third editions of the third voyage, all the official accounts of Cook’s voyages were printed by William Strahan, publisher of many of the key works of the period.4

William Strahan (1715-1785). A 1792 mezzotint engraved by John Jones after a 1783 portrait by Sir Joshua Reynolds. Strahan, a close friend of Benjamin Franklin and Member of Parliament, was one of the most successful printers in 18th century London.

John Hawkesworth

WHEREAS the account of the second voyage describes the historically most important of Cook’s voyages and the third voyage account is eagerly sought after by collectors for its wonderful engraved plates, John Hawkesworth’s account of the first voyage has the most interesting bibliographic story to tell.

Hawkesworth was a literary critic, essayist, editor of the Gentleman’s Magazine, associate of Samuel Johnson and man about town in 18th century London. Although he was by no means a literary giant, Hawkesworth had, according to biographer John Abbott, “a gift for understanding the public taste and writing for it.”

In September 1771, the British Admiralty chose Hawkesworth to compile the official account of Cook's first voyage and provided him with logs and journals for the four major voyages that had occurred since Anson’s ill-fated expedition three decades before. The plan was to include accounts of the voyages of Byron, Wallis and Carteret in a single volume and that of Cook in a second (which, in fact became two).

Free to secure the best arrangement he could from potential publishers, Hawkesworth sold the publishing rights to William Strahan and Thomas Cadell for the enormous sum of £6,000 plus twenty-five sets of the final published work, equivalent to nearly $700,000 today and

---

5 Hawkesworth to David Garrick, n.d. “Wed. Evening,” British Library Add. MS 28104, ff. 45-6. Additional detail about the transaction can be found in an undated letter written by Hawkesworth to “My Dear Madam” and held in the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University. “…Mr Garrick did not first recommend me to Lord Sandwich, and that I should have written the Book if there had been no such man as Garrick in the world. Soon after Captain Cooks return, my old & intimate friend Dr Burney, being at Hinchinbrook & hearing Lord Sandwich complain that he neither knew nor could hear of any person to draw up an account of the Voyages, mentioned me in such terms as his regard dictated. Lord S. expressed himself so relieved from a difficulty, desired Burney to communicate what had passed to me, which he did by a Letter in my possession and said he would send to know if I would undertake it when he came to town. No interest or solicitation therefore was necessary, as I had no Competition & Lord Sandwich was impatient to put the work in hand. … It is not true that I applied to Cadell or any other person, but it was publicly known that I was ready to receive proposals from the trade and did receive several which I rejected: when all was nearly ready for publication & after I had given Becket’s name to be inserted in the Advertisement as a publisher, Mr Strachan at once offered six thousand pounds: but before I had transferred my property to Strachan, in consequence of this affair, I saw Becket & he expressing his desire to be concerned, I asked him if he should think...
the highest amount paid for a copyright in the 18th century. In the following months, Hawkesworth edited the journals of Byron, Wallis and Carteret into separate accounts. He then blended Cook’s and co-voyager Joseph Banks’ journals with some of his own sentiments and produced a single first-person narrative that appeared to be the words of Cook.

John Hawkesworth (1720-1773). Hawkesworth was a poet, playwright, literary critic, essayist, biographer and editor of Swift, translator, writer of oriental and domestic tales, naval historian, and “man about town” in mid-18th century London.

*it worth his while to give one thousand pounds for a fourth share of the Copy: this he declined with looks and gestures that strongly shewed his opinion that this sum was more than it was worth, having indeed just before estimated the whole as no more than two thousand pounds. After this I was surely at Liberty, notwithstanding any promise on Becket’s behalf, to transfer my Copy right to those who had offered me so much more than he thought its value. It is true that tho’ I fulfilled the essence of my promise to Garrick, I was negligent in the form, for Becket came to me not in consequence of my having communicated my treaty to him, but of seeing an advertisement of the Book without his name for the day after Strachan had made me the offer he inserted his own Name and Cadell’s at the bottom of the advertisement as the only publishers, presuming that an offer so advantageous would be accepted, & it was this that brought Becket to me in the India house, where I then attended almost every day from eleven to six so that I frequently sat up half the night and read proofs and write the remaining sheets of my work. for this breach of punctilio, in these circumstances I am content to hear all the blame is deserved. That my treaty with Strachan was in suspense some time appears from Letters between us, in which on his covering some unexpected expenses he said he thought his offer too much & urged me to take less.”*(Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University)
Hawkesworth’s Voyages

Hawkesworth, John. **AN ACCOUNT OF THE VOYAGES** undertaken by Order of His Present Majesty for making Discoveries in the Southern Hemisphere, and successively performed by Commodore Byron, Captain Wallis, Captain Carteret and Captain Cook, in the Dolphin, the Swallow and the Endeavour: Drawn up from the Journals which were kept by the several Commanders, and from the Papers of Joseph Banks, Esq.; by John Hawkesworth, LL.D. In three volumes. Illustrated with Cuts, and a great Variety of Charts and Maps relative to Countries now first discovered, or hitherto but imperfectly known. London: Printed for W. Strahan; & T. Cadell in the Strand. MDCCLXXIII.

HAWKESWORTH’S eagerly anticipated official account of James Cook’s first voyage to the Pacific went on sale on June 9, 1773 in three royal quarto volumes full of detailed (albeit a bit fanciful) descriptions and images of newly-discovered peoples, places and customs. Volume 1 contained accounts of the voyages of Captains Byron, Wallis and Carteret; volumes 2 and 3 contained the account of the *Endeavour* voyage of Captain Cook.

However, widespread criticism in the press made the publication a personal disaster for Hawkesworth. Some reviewers complained that the reader had no way to tell which part of the account was Cook, which part Banks and which part Hawkesworth. Others objected to Hawkesworth’s minimization the role of Providence in Cook’s avoidance of several disasters. Still others were offended by of the books’ descriptions of the voyagers’ sexual encounters with the Tahitians. The outcry in the press was so intense that it was said to have been a factor in Hawkesworth’s untimely death less than six months after the books appeared.
In spite of its faults, however, Hawkesworth’s *Voyages* became one of the most popular publications of the 18th century. Even at the publication price of three guineas for the set, the June first edition of 2,000 sets sold out very quickly and a reset second edition of 2,500 sets was published less than two months later on August 3, 1773.

First editions are seldom printed without errors, and Hawkesworth’s *Voyages* was no exception. Typesetting for volume 1 of the first edition was started at two points simultaneously, and volumes 2 and 3 were originally planned as a single volume. As a result, the first edition contained pagination inconsistencies and errors, in addition to the usual assortment of errata. Although the second edition included few editorial changes, it still required chapter renumbering, pagination and signature corrections, and a variety of other non-textual changes.

---

6 To the extent that the Bristol Library can be considered representative of the reading habits of 18th century England, Hawkesworth’s *Voyages* was one of the most popular published works of the day. The three volume set was the most requested item in the Bristol Library from 1773-1784, having been borrowed over 200 times. Kaufmann, Paul. *Borrowings of the Bristol Library, 1773–1784.* Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1960.

7 Although such long-range comparisons are always suspect, the computed buying power of three guineas (£3 12s) in 1773 is equivalent to over US$400 today. (http://www.eh.net/ehresources/howmuch/poundq.php)

8 According to Brian McMullin, the entire edition was reset, with the exception of two short sequences of type-pages that had not been distributed and were, therefore, available for re-use. McMullin, B.J., *Cook’s First Voyage and the Strahan Quarto Editions of 1773.* Bibliographical Society of Australia and New Zealand Bulletin, 1989, volume 11, number 1, pages 5-35.
The Find

In nature the bird who gets up earliest catches the most worms, but in book-collecting the prizes fall to birds who know worms when they see them.

Michael Sadleir
The Colophon, Number 3, 1930

LIKE many collectors of materials related to Cook, I routinely search the holdings of antiquarian booksellers for interesting publications about the good captain. In September 2001, I came across the following offering of a partial set of Hawkesworth’s Voyages from Derek Slavin, a bookseller in the United Kingdom:

London, Strahan & Cadell 1773. 1st editions, with extensive ink corrections. These are (corrected) proof copies of volumes 2 & 3, with no maps or plates. xv, 410; 395 (all renumbered) pp, Cr 4to. ½ contemporary calf, marbled boards, gilt. A good set, lacking volume 1. Calf and boards rubbed and soiled, internally VG, with volume 2 bound without a title page. Contemporary alterations throughout.

The description read like a book collector’s nightmare. Everything seemed negative — everything, that is, except the phrase, “corrected proof copies.” That intrigued me. Could these volumes be original “printer’s copy,” printed sheets of one edition containing corrections to be made by the typesetter in the preparation of a subsequent edition? Once the next edition is complete, such printer’s copy serves minimal purpose and there is little reason to assume it would survive.

The scope of the changes made between the first and second editions of Hawkesworth’s Voyages was thoroughly documented by Brian McMullin in 1989. I had McMullin’s article and knew what should be present in printer’s copy for Hawkesworth’s account. So I asked Slavin if

he could provide images of specific pages that would contain easily identifiable corrections. The images he sent seemed to confirm my suspicions, so I forwarded them to rare book dealer Derek McDonnell of Hordern House to see if they also thought that the volumes might be the bridge between the first and second editions.

McDonnell was very pleased with what he saw and based upon the preliminary images encouraged me to acquire the books. Without seeing the volumes up close he couldn’t be positive they were the original printer’s copy, but he felt the risk was worth it. On the assumption that the volumes were the originals, he asked if he could examine the books after I received them.

I also sent the information about the books to Brian McMullin and based upon what he saw, he concurred. In his response, McMullin identified additional characteristics he would expect to find if the books were the true printer’s copy:

It seems to me that you do indeed have what looks like printer’s copy for the second edition (the alternatives wouldn’t stand up: somebody made the changes by comparison with a published copy of the second edition; somebody made the changes independently, before the publication of the second edition). From what I can make out of the images … the marks are such as would be made within the printing house rather than without. And since there’s none of the engraved matter, only the letterpress, I can’t imagine it being anything other than printer’s copy for a new typesetting (or the copy from which printer’s copy was transcribed). … Are there any remnants of inky fingers to suggest that this copy has been in a printing house? I imagine that unbound sheets would be more useful for setting from, particularly if more than two compositors were involved, but then again I suppose that one could argue that it would be more useful to keep the leaves in the correct order by having them bound. Either way I think that the presence of stray ink marks where the leaves have been handled would be a good sign that the volumes had indeed been through the printing house. I certainly didn’t know of marked-up copies [when I prepared my article] … ; if it is what it seems then you’d of course expect only one copy to have been made, wouldn’t you?10

Buoyed by the encouragement of both McDonnell and McMullin, I bought the books.

Further communication with Slavin revealed that he had acquired the volumes at an auction in Hay-on-Wye, Wales several years earlier as part of a lot of “42 leather bound books.” Most of the books were unexceptional and the two Cooks weren’t even mentioned in the lot description. Slavin remarked:

---

10 Personal correspondence from Brian McMullin (Monash University).
Happy to admit they were a bargain, and it would have been a few hundred paid (£ for the lot), and although I knew they were something special (which the specialist book auctioneer and other booksellers present surprisingly didn’t!), I didn’t have much idea how to research and value them, so it wasn’t until late last year that I actually put them up for sale. … I hope very much that these turn out to be some real treasures.11

Slavin shipped the books the same day he received my order — the day before the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center. I had visions of finally discovering something important after it had been hidden for nearly a quarter of a millennium, only to have it get lost for the ages in the snarl of suspended airline schedules and piles of “suspicious” packages. However, the combined postal services of the United Kingdom and the United States took the insanity of the moment in stride and delivered the books in perfect shape a week later.

11 Personal correspondence from Derek Slavin (Derek Slavin – Rare & Collectible Books).
The printer’s copy for Hawkesworth’s *Voyages*. The volumes were described as having “extensive ink corrections, … no maps or plates, … all [volume 3 pages] renumbered, … rubbed and soiled, … Volume 2 bound without a title page,” and “alterations throughout.”
Are there any books, under any circumstance, that should be kept — perhaps even proudly or defiantly — in battered condition? I think there is a very small class of such books, and to argue for this exception is not at all to ignore or impugn the principle of “good to fine condition.” I am, of course, talking about books whose very purpose for being was practical; I am talking about useful books, that might legitimately show signs of having been used; I am talking about books that are “distressed,” in the manner of antique furniture, where evidence of age and long, hard service are judged not merely allowable, but desirable.

Jack Matthews
*Booking in the Heartland* (1986)

As soon as the books arrived, I went through them page by page to better understand what they were. The books were indeed volumes 2 and 3 of the first edition of John Hawkesworth’s *Voyages*. Volume 1 is missing, although the present volumes are those that cover Cook’s voyage.\(^\text{12}\)

The books are bound in late 18\(^{\text{th}}\) century half calf over marbled boards and are in a totally unsophisticated state.\(^\text{13}\) As Brian McMullin anticipated, they are stitched from individual leaves, instead of being

---

12 Subsequent attempts to locate volume 1 through the bookseller in the United Kingdom have been unsuccessful; the first volume was not present in the original auction lot and the auction house has no record of where it acquired the volumes. In later correspondence, Derek Slavin added, “The missing volume definitely wasn’t for sale in the same auction — I looked at absolutely everything, and had I spotted it I would have bought the other lot as well.”

13 Although the bindings appear to be of the same general era as the text, it is not yet possible to state whether they are true contemporary bindings. After brief examinations, antiquarian booksellers Anthony Payne and Joe Felcone suggested that the bindings may be more typical of the period between 1790 and 1810. The binding could be slightly earlier; a copy of Stockdale’s 1784 London edition of *A Voyage to the Pacific Ocean* … identified by the author was bound virtually the same as the Hawkesworth Copy.
sewn from folded gatherings. Furthermore, the leaves were bound after the corrections were made (as indicated by some trimmed corrections).

Both volumes have gilt volume numbers (i.e., 2 and 3) and black morocco spine labels with gilt lettering that reads “Cook’s Voyage” (singular), possibly suggesting that they were originally part of the full set of Hawkesworth, and that binding was done prior to Cook’s return from his second voyage, or at least before publication of an account of either of his subsequent voyages. Or, perhaps the missing first volume was labeled with the voyages of Byron, Wallis and Carteret, while the second and third volumes contained “Cook’s Voyage.”

The trimmed page size is only 196mm by 265mm, significantly smaller than “typical” bound copies of the work.

The books have ink smudges on numerous pages, as Brian McMullin predicted. Some smudges are deep in the gutter, further indicating that they were made before the books were bound in their present form. Some of the smudges are actually fingerprints, suggesting that the pages were handled with ink-stained hands.

The books do not contain any maps or plates, although such engraved material would have been inappropriate in printer’s copy, as non-text sheets were printed separately and usually incorporated later by the buyer’s binder. Volume 2 is bound without a title page. Volume 2 also lacks pages 259-260 (one leaf), and pages 279-280 (one leaf). Also, a missing title page (assuming no edits) wouldn’t necessarily be unusual. The other missing leaves could simply have been lost before binding, as they were no longer parts of folded gatherings.

The books are marked up throughout. The copy changes appear to be made in a similar contemporary hand in both volumes. Most are directed to the page numbers, gathering signatures, chapter numbers and correction of errata; there weren’t significant text changes between the first and second editions.

---

14 Upon examining the gutter of volume 2, page 307 and volume 3, pages 781/377 and 507/103, one can see the lack of a gathering fold. In numerous other cases the individual leaves are bound crooked. Compound page numbers refer to the page numbers in volume 3, where the printed page number (e.g., 781) is manually overwritten with the corresponding revised page number for the second edition (i.e., 377).

15 Although the handwritten corrections were made before the volumes were bound, the loose sheets were in close proximity when marked, as some page markings have transferred to previous pages. For example, in volume 3 the inked page number 103 offset to the previous page, but is not in registration as would be expected if the sheets were bound prior to the correction being made.

16 Actual ink fingerprints (recognizable as such and not just as smudges) can be found in volume 3 on pages 706/302, 777/373, and others.
A section from the printer’s copy for Hawkesworth’s *Voyages* Contents of volume 3 showing corrections to chapter numbers and pagination. Chapter renumbering was necessary to correct a mistake in the first edition. Repagination of volume 3 was required because volumes 2 and 3 were paginated as a single volume in the first edition and as separate volumes in the second edition. Careless trimming by the binder resulted in parts of some corrections being cut off.

An inky fingerprint. Detail from volume 3, page 706/302 showing one of several inky fingerprints presumably made by press workers during the typesetting and printing of the second edition. Even before the volumes were received, the presence such fingerprints was anticipated by McMullin as evidence that the sheets had been used in a printing house.
A few weeks after they arrived, I took the volumes to the University of California at Berkeley, where I did a page-by-page comparison with second edition *Voyages* held at the Bancroft Special Collections Library. The staff of Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois, also checked several points against their second edition set.

The books then spent several weeks at Hordern House in Sydney, Australia undergoing detailed examination by Derek McDonnell. Upon completion of his review, Derek concluded:

> It is apparent that the two volumes are in fact printers’ sheets for the re-setting of the second and third volumes of the second edition.¹⁷

McMullin’s original article was based solely upon a comparison of the published editions, as the existence of a printer’s copy was unknown. Nonetheless, his detailed analysis served as an excellent guide, and I carefully checked the markings in both volumes against the points he identified. His 20th century article based upon direct observation of the printed works exactly described the results of the instructions written in my volumes over two centuries before.

I carefully checked both volumes against the points identified in McMullin’s analysis, including pagination changes, signature

---

¹⁷ Personal correspondence from Derek McDonnell (Hordern House). McDonnell’s opinion was later supported by Anthony Payne, a director of London antiquarian bookseller Bernard Quaritch, who briefly examined the volumes while attending the 2002 Conference on the History of the Maritime Book at Princeton University.
identifications and collations. Each page number change, signature change, and errata point he noted was manually marked in the volumes.\textsuperscript{18}

As I reviewed the books against McMullin’s article, I was fascinated by the technical discussions of effects that were achieved by simple markings in the volumes. For example, the first edition volume 2 ended with a single leaf, a complication for the binder. The problem was remedied in the second edition by getting rid of the Errata page (now corrected in the text) and adjusting the spacing between the lines of the Introduction so the final lines of text would fall at the bottom of the preceding page. The removal of that one leaf near the front of the volume shifted all the following signatures so that the single leaf at the end disappeared.

In his article, McMullin described the process as follows:

> In the first edition Volume II ends with a singleton, 3G1. Single leaves are always troublesome for the binder, and in setting the second edition Strahan overcame the difficulty by removing the leading in the standing type of the Introduction, so that the six lines from a4’ are now accommodated on a3’; with the elimination of the Errata (a4”) the account of Cook’s Voyage can now begin one leaf earlier, on a4’ rather than B1’.

The actual instructions to the printer, however, were much simpler — crossing out the text on the Errata page and placing a single comment at the top of the last page of the Introduction — “This page to be got in.”

One effect of the correction was a change in each subsequent signature from the point of the correction to the end of the volume (e.g., F2 became F, the next page became F2). Every such change is individually marked in the volumes.

When I communicated my findings to McMullin, he responded with a further confirmation of his earlier thoughts about the books:

> I’d say that what you’ve got is … printer’s copy — i.e. a marked-up copy of the first edition which was used in the printing house for setting the second edition, and I assume that the cutting-up into leaves was designed to allow the copy to be divided within the printing-house, the binding-up being done after setting was complete — and hence the absence of a few leaves, (lost within the printing-house).\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{18} Except one, that is. Surprisingly enough, the one page that almost every bibliographer and antiquarian bookseller knew was misnumbered in the first edition (i.e., page 189 in volume 2, which is numbered 191) is not marked in the volumes, although the revised signature identification of Bb2 is marked on the same page.

\textsuperscript{19} Personal correspondence from Brian McMullin (Monash University).
Errata noted in the first edition. All items noted were subsequently corrected in the second edition.

The marking at the top of a4' that, in conjunction with the elimination of the Errata (a4``), allowed volume 2 to begin one leaf earlier, thus necessitating the renumbering of all subsequent signatures.
Unexpected Corrections

The markings in the books fall into two categories — “expected” corrections based solely upon the bibliographic and printing requirements and described in detail by McMullin, and “unexpected” corrections.

The “expected” corrections all related to the structure of the books and included items noted on the Errata sheet, changes in pagination, and signature identification. Such changes were routine for any competent printing house and the printer in question, William Strahan, ran one of the top printing houses in 18th century London. With one exception, the “expected” items were corrected in the second edition.

There are seven other “unexpected” changes noted that were not related to the structure of the books, six of which did not make it into the second edition. One correction is editorial; the others are all navigational in nature and include four longitude corrections, one latitude correction, and one compass heading correction.

1. Volume 2, page 37, line 25 — adding the word “degrees” and a period after 83, deleting “though” and starting the next sentence “We ...”
2. Volume 2, page 282, line 9 — correcting the longitude from 174° to 147°
3. Volume 2, page 327, line 9 — correcting the longitude from 193° to 183°

20 After the Errata page items were handled, all of the pagination and signature markings would fall out automatically from the process of setting the formes of type.

21 One bibliographical change was simply missed by the second edition’s compositors. The marking correctly changes the last chapter pagination in the volume 3 Contents from page 781 to 377, yet the second edition was printed without any page reference whatsoever.
4. Volume 2, page 356, line 3 — correcting the longitude from 194° to 184°

5. Volume 2, page 358, line 20 — correcting the latitude from 36° to 35°

6. Volume 3, page 608/204, line 13 — correcting the longitude from 127° to 217°

7. Volume 3, page 653/249, line 2 — correcting the compass reference from “E. by E. and SE.” to “E. by S. and SE.”

Of the above corrections, only number six was changed in the text of the second edition, although the first two were noted on the second edition’s Errata page.22

The single “unexpected change” with editorial content. It represents little more than a minor change of syntax. The correction was not made in the second edition, although it was noted on the Errata page.

22 All seven unexpected changes were corrected in the 1785 octavo third edition, as were all additional errata noted on the second edition’s Errata page.

The Errata sheet for the second edition provides some interesting information. Despite the fact that the second edition was almost completely reset, no new problems caused by the resetting were noted on the Errata sheet for the second edition; all of the errata listed had also existed in the first edition. Hawkesworth apparently was indignant that he was not more closely involved in the preparation of the second edition (and that changes previously noted in the printer’s copy had not been corrected!). At the foot of the second edition’s Errata page he states, “The second edition was printed very rapidly while I was absent, without knowing it was gone to press; these corrections therefore, most of which were communicated since my return by a gentleman who was some time resident at Batavia, could not be made but as errata.” Hawkesworth’s absence resulted in a partially uncorrected second edition. Ironically, for much of the two-month period between the first and second editions he was traveling with the man who commissioned him to prepare the Voyages, Lord Sandwich (First Lord of the Admiralty), and the two botanists from the voyage, Sir Joseph Banks and Daniel Solander.

The remaining question is, of course, who was the “gentleman who was some time resident at Batavia” who communicated the errata to Hawkesworth (most of which related to errors related to the area surrounding Batavia)? Could he have been Alexander Dalrymple, former Hydrographer of the East India Company (and later the Admiralty) and Hawkesworth’s nemesis? Correspondence with John Robson, Map Librarian at the University of Waikato (Hamilton, New Zealand) and author of The Captain Cook Encyclopedia and Captain Cook’s World: Maps of the Life and Voyages of James Cook R.N., certainly doesn’t rule out the possibility.

“I think it probably was Dalrymple. He would have called in at Batavia on more than one occasion when he was working between Borneo and Manila. From what I know of Dalrymple, he would have acquainted himself with the local geography and learned that it was not Wapping Island. And I can’t think who else it could have been to have been a Briton in that part of the world, to have learned the geography of the region and then to have had the ear of persons such as Hawkesworth to point out errors.

It is unlikely that captains of British trading vessels would have bothered to inform Hawkesworth. Nor were there any cartographers operating in Britain at the time who had been producing maps of the East Indies to my knowledge.

So my money is on Dalrymple. It certainly wasn’t Cook and I doubt very much whether Banks would have known (he used Wapping in his text).”
Failure to make corrections is particularly puzzling for the navigational entries, as a check with both the published journals and their original sources showed that all the marked changes were correct, and the fact they were not incorporated means that the second edition remained in error. This was more than perpetuation of simple typographical errors; such printed inaccuracies caused real navigational problems. Helen Wallis, former map librarian for the British Library, pointed out:

In England (as opposed to France with its Service Hydrographique), accounts of voyages necessarily served as handbooks of navigation since there was as yet no official government naval establishment responsible for publishing charts and pilot books. Thus the mutineers of the Bounty were able to seek Pitcairn Island as their refuge in 1790 because they had on board Hawkesworth’s volumes and read therein the report of Carteret’s discovery in 1767.23

Following through with Wallis’ example, the fact that Pitcairn Island provided refuge for the mutineers for so many years is undoubtedly due in part to the fact that nobody in the Royal Navy knew precisely where the island was; the map and text published in Hawkesworth’s *Voyages* placed Pitcairn over 200 miles west of its true position, and the printed latitude in the first edition disagreed with the map’s position by an additional 350 miles.24

One of several “unexpected” longitude corrections (in this case from 193° to 183°). Only one position correction was made in the second edition.

---


A reference to the presence of Hawkesworth’s volumes on the Bounty can be found in a small volume published by John Shillibeer in 1817 and entitled, *A Narrative of the Briton’s Voyage, to Pitcairn’s Island.* In his narrative, Shillibeer describes the Briton’s visit to Pitcairn Island, references an interview with last Bounty survivor John Adams, and mentions “several books belonging to Bligh which were taken out of the Bounty,” specifically noting the volumes of Hawkesworth’s account of Cook’s first voyage. (Shillibeer, J.: *A Narrative of the Briton’s Voyage, to Pitcairn’s Island.* Taunton: Printed for the Author by J.W. Marriott, 1817.)

24 The incorrect latitude for Pitcairn Island was corrected in the second edition of Hawkesworth. The longitude error was not changed, as the printed value agreed with Carteret’s calculated position and was not known to be incorrect.
Finally, although it’s not a correction per se, there is one additional “unexpected” marking. The half-title page in volume 2 includes a large script signature of the name “Mary” written in a contemporary hand. Other than a few insignificant flourishes here and there, it is the only significant marking not in some way related to the content of the volumes. On the chance that John Hawkesworth might have been responsible for the markings in the volumes, I checked to see if there was any person close to him who might be named Mary. There was. On May 12, 1744, John Hawkesworth married the companion who would accompany him for the rest of his life — Mary Brown. Nothing conclusive, of course, but it kept the research interesting.

Who is Mary? The large script signature on the Half-Title page in volume 2 is the only significant marking not in some way related to the content of the volumes. Is it possibly a reference to Mary Hawkesworth?
The Latitude Discrepancy

ONE of the “unexpected” corrections is a to a latitude entry that is off by a degree in both the first and second editions. The marked correction is especially interesting because it appears to be one of few instances where the correct latitude is recorded. Furthermore, the inaccurate latitude printed in the first and second editions is not a simple typographical error; it appears to be a faithful transcription of an incorrect entry that Cook himself may have recorded in his journal for November 25, 1769.

An examination of the maps of the area in question shows that according to the identified point in the text [“Bream head bore S distant 10 Miles; some small Islands (Poor Knights) at N.E. by N. distant 3 Lgs.”] Cook had to be at the position of 35°36’S as corrected in the printer’s copy. Had Cook been at the 36°36’S position printed in the first and second editions, he would have been approximately 70 miles south of Bream Head and Poor Knights and sailing on land.25

25 Hawkesworth anticipated the problem of inconsistencies between the text and the charts. In his General Introduction to the Voyages he stated, “Great care has been taken to make the charts and the nautical part of the narrative coincide; if there should be any difference, which it is hoped will not be the case, the charts are to be confided in, as of unquestionable authority.”
When I first noted the latitude discrepancy, I assumed it was simply a typographical correction like the other navigational changes. But when I checked the latitude entry against Beaglehole’s 1955 edition of Cook’s *Endeavour* journal\(^{26}\) I found that the published version also had the incorrect value of 36°36′ S. My next check was Wharton’s 1893 edition of Cook’s *Endeavour* journal,\(^{27}\) and it too quoted the incorrect value of 36°36′ S. Given that Beaglehole and Wharton had compiled their editions from different primary sources and both had come up with the same incorrect value, I began to wonder if the printer’s copy for Hawkesworth’s *Voyages* were the only place with the right latitude.\(^{28}\)

![Map of the Endeavour on November 25, 1769](image)

The position of the *Endeavour* on November 25, 1769 as noted in the text. “Bream head bore S distant 10 Miles; some small Islands (Poor Knights) at N.E. by N. distant 3 Lgs.”

But not everyone accepted Hawkesworth at his word. Alexander Dalrymple, who was denied the leadership of the voyage in favor of Cook, criticized Hawkesworth’s work, citing in particular some of the charting and navigational inaccuracies. In his *A Letter from Mr. Dalrymple to Dr. Hawkesworth Occasioned by Some groundless and illiberal Imputations in His Account of the Late Voyages to the South* published only a month after Hawkesworth’s work appeared, Dalrymple stated, “I only mention a few instances of the disagreement between the narrative and the charts which struck my eye, these are inexcusable, since they don’t depend on nautical knowledge, this indeed you do not pretend to have; but a man who presumed to write a Book of Architecture, when he hardly knew the difference between the pedestal and capital, would scarcely be excused by pleading his ignorance.” (p. 25)

\(^{25}\) Dalrymple, Alexander. *A Letter from Mr. Dalrymple to Dr. Hawkesworth Occasioned by Some groundless and illiberal Imputations in His Account of the Late Voyages to the South.* London, 1769.


28 The latitude discrepancy in question has been noted by others before, although apparently without any investigation into how it differed from other printed position errors. A first edition set of Hawkesworth’s *Voyages* held by the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Yale University has the latitude marked with an asterisk and the following note entered on the page, “*the Lat: here given 36°36′ S – must be a mistake as by the chart it is but 35°36′ – for Bream Head lies in 35°46′ S. Lat: & they steered thence to the Northward poor Knights Islands.*” Personal correspondence from Jill Haines (Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University).
A section of the “Chart of New Zealand” published in the first edition. The area in question is located at latitude 35°36’S as noted in the printer’s copy.

So I checked the original holographic sources, of which there are at least seven: (1) the Canberra Manuscript; (2) the Mitchell Manuscript; (3) the Admiralty Manuscript; (4) the Greenwich Manuscript; (5) the Official Log of the *Endeavour*; (6) Cook’s Holographic Log; and (7) the Palliser Hudson Copy of Cook’s Holographic Log. The first three are in journal form, the fourth is a hybrid of both journal and log, and the last three are in log form.29

The Canberra Manuscript30

The Canberra Manuscript is the only copy of the *Endeavour* journal written in Cook’s hand, and is the copy used by Beaglehole when he

---

29 According to Wharton, “A Log is the official document in which the progress of the ship from hour to hour is recorded, with such official notes as the alteration in sail carried, expenditure of provisions and stores, etc. A Journal contains this information in a condensed form, with such observations as the officer keeping it may feel inclined to insert.” However, as Beaglehole notes, “the border-line between the two [logs and journals] is far from strongly marked.”

30 The most comprehensive Cook bibliography is the *Bibliography of Captain James Cook R.N., F.R.S., Circumnavigator* (2nd Edition) edited by M.K. Beddie and published by the Council of the Library of New South Wales in 1970. Bibliographical items related to Cook are frequently referred to by their reference number in Beddie. The Canberra Manuscript is Beddie 574.
prepared his 1955 edition of Cook’s *Endeavour* journal. It originally belonged to Cook’s wife, Elizabeth, and quietly passed through inheritance and sale for over 150 years. It was generally unknown to the public until 1923, when it was auctioned by Sotheby’s. It now resides in the National Library of Australia in Canberra.

I contacted the National Library of Australia and received the following response from Carmel McInerny, Curator of Manuscripts, Australian Collections and Reader Services:

> We have checked the entry in the journal for this date and can confirm that the reading is 36°36’S.31

I now knew why Beaglehole got it wrong.

### The Mitchell Manuscript32

The Mitchell Manuscript is written in the hand of Richard Orton, Cook’s clerk on the *Endeavour*, and is likely the journal copy sent to the Admiralty from Batavia before Cook’s return to England. It is the copy used by Wharton to create his 1893 edition of Cook’s *Endeavour* journal. In similar fashion to the Canberra Manuscript, the Mitchell Manuscript passed through inheritance and sale for 120 years before arriving at its current home in the Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales in Sydney.

In response to my query, I received the following from David Pollock of the State Library of New South Wales Information Request Service:

> … I have checked the November 25 1769 entry in the Mitchell Library copy of the Endeavour journal (our reference CY Safe 1/71, p.157) and can confirm that the Latitude written is 36 degrees, not 35.33

Warwick Hirst, Assistant Curator of Manuscripts at the Mitchell Library also stated,

> I have checked the Mitchell Library’s copy of Cook’s Endeavour journal (S1/71 - known as the Corner MSS in the handwriting of Orton, the ship’s clerk) and confirm that the entry says 36 degrees and not 35 degrees.34

I now knew why Wharton got it wrong.

---

31 Personal correspondence from Carmel McInerny (National Library of Australia).
32 Beddie 578.
33 Personal correspondence from David Pollock (State Library of New South Wales).
34 Personal correspondence from Warwick Hirst (Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales).
In other words, both the first and second editions of the official account were wrong; the authoritative published versions of Cook’s journal were wrong; the *Endeavour*’s ship clerk was wrong (having copied what Cook wrote); and Cook himself was wrong in the copy he prepared.

Two journal copies remained to be checked — the Admiralty Manuscript held by the British National Archives (formerly the Public Records Office) and the Greenwich Manuscript held by the British National Maritime Museum.

The Admiralty Manuscript\(^35\)

According to Beaglehole, the Admiralty Manuscript was the last, best and most careful copy of any journal of the voyage of the *Endeavour*, and is likely the journal copy handed over to the Admiralty at the end of the voyage. It is possibly the copy from which Hawkesworth worked, and now resides in the British National Archives.

Like the Mitchell Manuscript, the Admiralty Manuscript appears to be written in Richard Orton’s hand. Beaglehole notes that Orton copied Cook’s own journal as it was written, as evidenced by the Admiralty Manuscript’s failure to include some of Cook’s later thoughts and the fact that it was ready to send in its entirety as soon as the *Endeavour* reached port.

I contacted the British National Archives and soon thereafter received a response indicating that although they were unable to undertake research for individuals, they could spend a limited amount of time identifying and copying specific documents from their holdings.

Before I was able to detail my request to the National Archives, however, a limited edition facsimile of the Admiralty Manuscript\(^36\) appeared for sale on an Internet auction site. It seemed an appropriate time to add that particular book to my collection, so I joined the bidding and won the lot. When the book arrived, I turned to the appropriate date and once again found the incorrect value of 36°36’ S.

Did anyone get it right?

---

35 Beddie 575.
I then checked with the only remaining holographic copy of Cook’s journal — the one held at the National Maritime Museum at Greenwich. The Greenwich Manuscript was written by Richard Orton and others, using different inks and papers. It is part log and part journal, incomplete, and the “most corrupt” of all the manuscripts. It was kept for many years in the library at Windsor Castle before coming to rest at Greenwich.

I contacted the National Maritime Museum and Kiri Ross-Jones of the Manuscripts Department responded:

I have … found the following Cook journal: “JOD/19, Journal of Captain Cook’s voyage round the world in HMS Endeavour, 1768-71”

I have made a quick check of our microfilm version of this manuscript and have been unable to find the exact quotation that you give. However, the latitude is given as the following, for Nov 25 1769, “Latit. obs. 35.36’ degrees, …”

Finally I had a match. The Greenwich Manuscript was the first original source to agree with the printer’s copy. The exact journal entry couldn’t be found because the portion of the Greenwich Manuscript for the date in question was in the format of a log, and not a narrative journal.

It was time to check the rest of the logs.

---

37 Beddie 577.

The Official Log of the *Endeavour*\(^{39}\)

The *Endeavour*’s Official Log, according to Beaglehole, “is certainly the original of a good many of the other extant logs of the voyage,” and was left to the British Museum by Sir Joseph Banks on his death. Although the original now resides in the British National Archives, I elected to once again contact the Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales, to have them check their photostatic copy. Judy Nelson’s response, while not exactly what I was seeking, indicated that the Official Log correctly recorded the latitude:

For Beddie #584 (ML: A 3392), there are entries for Friday 24 November 1769 and Sunday 26 November 1769, but no entry for Saturday 25 November 1769. For 24 November, the entry is Lat. 35 35’ S and for 26 November, Lat. 34 55’ S.\(^{40}\)

The latitude is very close to that of the printer’s copy, but the date is off by one day, a discrepancy possibly due to the difference in the way the day is reckoned on board ship (i.e., noon to noon) and the manner in which it is reckoned on land (i.e., midnight to midnight).

### Cook’s Holographic Log\(^{41}\)

No complete holographic log in Cook’s hand exists. Only fragments are known — one covering the period from November 5, 1768 through May 8, 1769, and the other covering the period from February 18 to September 23, 1770. Unfortunately, neither fragment includes the date of the latitude discrepancy. The existing fragments, however, are important in determining the order in which the logs and journals were prepared, as textual analyses have shown that the Greenwich Manuscript and the Palliser Hudson Copy were both copied from Cook’s Holographic Log.

### The Palliser Hudson Copy of Cook’s Holographic Log\(^{42}\)

The Palliser Hudson manuscript is a virtually complete copy of Cook’s Holographic Log (including the periods for which no fragments in Cook’s hand are now known), and was a gift from Cook to Sir Hugh Palliser, Comptroller of the Navy and champion of Cook’s career.

---

39 Beddie 584.

40 Personal correspondence from Judy Nelson (Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales).

41 Beddie 579.

42 Beddie 576.
According to Anthony Payne, a director of London antiquarian bookseller Bernard Quaritch, the manuscript was sold to a private buyer by Christie’s (along with a manuscript copy of the journal of Cook’s second voyage) in November 1960 and was not available for direct review. However, Payne further noted that a microfilm copy of the manuscript did exist in the National Library of Australia.

So I once again contacted the National Library of Australia and received the following response from Graeme Powell, Manuscript Librarian in the Australian Collections and Reader Services:

I have checked the microfilm copy of this work, which is held at mfm G650. In this version of the logbook, the latitude for 25 November 1769 is 35 (degrees) 36 (minutes) South.44

All in all, an interesting pattern. It appears that all forms of the Endeavour journal (i.e., Canberra, Admiralty, Mitchell) carry the incorrect latitude, and all existing forms of the Endeavour log (i.e., Greenwich, Official Log, Palliser Hudson) carry the correct value (with a slight variation of a single minute of latitude).

Significance of the Latitude Discrepancy

On its surface, the tracking down of a single latitude discrepancy may seem a task that serves no end other than what Beaglehole describes as, “the sterile pleasure of pedantry [that] must be enjoyed in this case for its own sake.” However, such a finding: (1) corroborates previous investigations into the order in which the holographic copies of the Endeavour journals were made; (2) suggests that Cook himself might have made the latitude mistake; and (3) underscores the authenticity of the printer’s copy and the changes that were recorded but not carried into the second edition.

As noted above, the portion of the Greenwich Manuscript wherein the latitude in question was recorded correctly is in log form.45 Thus,

---

43 Christie’s [Sale] Catalogue of Important Books and Manuscripts from the Libraries of [among others] Commander P A Hudson (November 28, 1960) and the printed list of purchasers and prices realized describes the manuscript Log Book and Journal of Captain Cook’s First and Second Voyages bound in two volumes folio. It comprises a contemporary transcript of Cook’s own log of the Endeavour. The transcript is in two [possibly more] hands — “it seems probable that Orton, the clerk, was one writer, and the other hand (if only one) perhaps that of Lieutenant Zachary Hicks.” The catalog includes as frontispiece a facsimile of a leaf of the journal signed by Cook, and devotes a plate to the binding. Beaglehole, in his definitive The Journals of Captain Cook (Halkut Society), states “no complete holograph log by Cook is extant. There are two separate holograph portions and there is one virtually complete copy” which is the one offered for sale by Christie’s. It belonged originally to Sir Hugh Palliser, “the naval officer who early perceived Cook’s talents, and remained his friend.” The seller, Commander Hudson, was a direct descendant of Palliser. The manuscript was purchased for £53,000 by Reg Remington for the London bookseller Francis Edwards.

44 Personal correspondence from Graeme Powell (National Library of Australia).
because the log portion of the Greenwich Manuscript was copied from Cook’s Holographic Log, one could conclude that the missing portion of Cook’s original contained the correct latitude.

The next journal copy to be made was the Mitchell Manuscript, which, according to Beaglehole, has the appearance of the work “of a rather careless and lazy transcriber,” and contains numerous places where Cook had to insert words Orton had omitted. Otherwise, it was a copy of Cook’s holographic journal drafts, of which only a few fragmentary sections survive, and carried forward the incorrect latitude.

The Mitchell Manuscript and the Canberra Manuscript were prepared in approximately the same timeframe and it can be difficult to determine which was written first. Beaglehole cites content differences that indicate that the Canberra Manuscript followed the Mitchell Manuscript, which would indicate that it could not have been the source of Orton’s work in the Mitchell Manuscript. Therefore, when preparing the Mitchell Manuscript, Orton must have been copying from some other form of Cook’s prior work and the only other known sources appear to be Cook’s Holographic Log and his holographic journal drafts. Given that Cook’s Holographic Log apparently contained the correct entry, as evidenced by its accurate transcription into the Palliser Hudson Copy, the Mitchell Manuscript with its incorrect entry must have been copied from Cook’s fragmentary journal drafts.

It would follow that Cook too would have worked from his prior drafts when preparing what became the more polished Canberra Manuscript. Therefore, if both Orton and Cook used the preliminary journal drafts as the source of their work and both incorporated the same incorrect latitude entry, it follows that the source itself was incorrect. As Cook was the author of the drafts, it would appear that Cook himself miscopied the latitude from his Holographic Log.

When the final Admiralty Manuscript was prepared, it was copied in large part from the Canberra Manuscript, although it also shares certain similarities with the Mitchell Manuscript. Like its two sources, however, the Admiralty Manuscript perpetuated the latitude error.46

---

45 Some of the journal portions of the Greenwich Manuscript may have been copied long after the log entries. The Greenwich Manuscript was apparently in the possession of (owned by?) Augustus John Hervey, 3rd Earl of Bristol and a Lord of the Admiralty, before it ended up at Windsor Castle. Beaglehole speculates that Hervey may have had some of the copying done himself after Cook had made him a gift of the uncompleted document.

46 The latitude discrepancy was not corrected in the 1775 Dublin edition, although that is not surprising, as such pirate editions are generally direct copies of authorized editions (i.e., the 1773 first and second editions). It had also not been corrected by the time Anderson’s 1784 Folio edition went to press. However, the latitude was corrected in the authorized four-volume octavo third edition that appeared in March 1785.
The fact that the printer’s copy for Hawkesworth’s *Voyages* appears to be one of the only identified sources of the accurate information other than original log entries (including those in the Greenwich Manuscript) underscores the authenticity of the “unexpected” corrections and other markings in the printer’s copy.

**Endeavour Logs & Journals**

Sources from which the various logs and journals of the *Endeavour* voyage were prepared. Copies in shaded boxes contained the incorrect latitude value of 36°36’ S. All incorrect versions of the journal were ultimately derived from either Cook’s Holographic Log or the fragmentary holographic drafts of Cook’s journal, neither of which now includes the period around November 25, 1769. However, as all versions of the log that were copied from Cook’s Holographic Log record the correct latitude, it follows that Cook’s Holographic Log also recorded the correct latitude. Therefore, Cook’s fragmentary journal drafts appear to be the source of the latitude error.
Sources of the Corrections

Who made the corrections in the printer’s copy volumes, and when were they made? As noted earlier, correction of errata, repagination and signature changes would have been routine for any competent printer. Furthermore, it’s unlikely that anyone outside the printing house would have had the information to make all the technical corrections involving pagination and signatures. One can therefore assume that the markings related to the structure of the volumes originated within the printing house.

But what of the non-bibliographic corrections, especially given that all of the markings in the volumes except the “pencil comment” (described below) appear to be in a similar hand? One might be led to consider John Hawkesworth as the author, even though it’s unlikely that he would have had the knowledge to make the more technical printing house corrections.

Nonetheless, Hawkesworth is still worth consideration. To assist in that effort, Hawkesworth biographer John Abbott, Professor and Head of English at the University of Connecticut, graciously provided copies of some of Hawkesworth’s correspondence for handwriting comparison.47

Certainly there are distinct similarities between comments written in the two volumes and samples of John Hawkesworth’s handwriting. Ultimately, however, it would require better skills than mine to identify John Hawkesworth as the author of the markings.

In an ideal world, the changes in the text would be identified as being in Hawkesworth’s hand, and “Mary” would turn out to be Mary Hawkesworth. But as everyone knows, we live in a far from ideal world.

Who made the corrections in the printer’s copy for Hawkesworth’s Voyages? The above is a comparison of an entry in the printer’s copy and the addresses of two letters written by John Hawkesworth. Note the similarities of the “T” in the note to the “F” in the address at lower left. There are also strong similarities between the “P” in the note and the “R” in the address at lower right. Finally, the “loop” following the final “N” in the note is also present after the final “N” in the address at lower left. (Hawkesworth wrote the letter addressed at lower left to Benjamin Franklin on November 8, 1769, asking, among other things, to receive a “Pennsylvania” or “Franklin” stove. He misspelled Franklin’s name in the process.)

So, for the present, Derek McDonnell’s cautionary comments must hold sway:

The possibility that some of the annotation might be by Hawkesworth seems, and probably is, too good to be true, as does the hope of making any final decision about ‘Mary’ given our current understanding.48

Not the desired conclusions, perhaps, but the only appropriate ones given the information at hand.

If Hawkesworth didn’t make the content corrections directly, could they have been made inside Strahan’s firm? Did any of the navigational corrections require access to original logs and journals in order to identify errors? By carefully examining the nature of the individual corrections one can come up with a theory of the source and manner in which he corrections were identified.

As was noted earlier, one of the markings is purely editorial, and is not really a correction at all. While the change does restore the text to a

48 Personal correspondence from Derek McDonnell (Hordern House).
form similar to the original source (in this case the *Endeavour* journal of Joseph Banks), the meaning of the text is the same both before and after the correction. Therefore, consultation of the original source would not have been required to suggest the change.

Four of the navigational corrections represent large longitude errors (i.e., 10° to 80°), each of which is obviously wrong when compared to other nearby text references, and each of which could easily be explained as a compositor’s error with a single number (e.g., setting 193° instead of 183°, transposing 217° into 127°). Therefore, all four errors could have been caught and corrected by individuals in the printing house, even if they were unfamiliar with the details of navigation.

Alternatively, might individuals with access to original sources have suggested the corrections? Three of the corrections match the original sources and could have been made after checking, but one could not. The fourth change, reversing an apparent transposition error from 174° into 147°, was not checked against original source journals, all of which correctly recorded the value as 146°, not 147°.

The latitude discrepancy (described above) was not a typesetting error; it was a faithful transcription of an error in the original source used for setting the text. The mistake was also only a single degree of latitude, and could easily have been missed in reading the text, although a careful comparison with the printed text and maps would have betrayed the error. Consulting original sources with their incorrect entries, on the other hand, would have led one to believe that the printed value was already correct and need not be changed.

The final content correction, changing a compass reference from “E. by E. and SE.” to “E. by S. and SE.” is different. All three manuscript journals are in agreement that the correct compass reference is “East and East by South,” although there are slight variations in the way the information is recorded in the various sources. John Hawkesworth was not a man of the sea, and the format of the directions printed in his *Voyages* makes little sense, either in its original or its “corrected” form. Such an error would have been obvious to a true sailor, and the form of its change argues for the edit either being suggested by Hawkesworth or simply being performed inside the printing house by someone who knew little about navigation.

Thus, the one factor all seven marked corrections have in common is that none required a check against original sources. The editorial correction is consistent with its original source, but is little more than a
punctuation change. Three of the navigational corrections are consistent with original sources, but are all large enough errors to be caught in a casual reading of the text. The other three navigational corrections are inconsistent with the original sources.
A Possible Chronology

THERE is little doubt that the two volumes are printer’s copy used for the preparation of the second edition of Hawkesworth’s Voyages. All of the errata, signature changes, chapter corrections and repagination relate solely to the three-volume quarto second edition, and are not relevant to the four-volume octavo third edition.

While the volumes’ identity may be confirmed, at least two questions remain. Why were some marked items not included in the second edition, and why was printer’s copy retained and bound after its initial utility was long past? The following scenario could explain what happened.

The first edition of Hawkesworth’s Voyages was published on June 9, 1773. It contained errors, some of which were caught and included on an Errata sheet. Demand for the first edition was very high, and a second edition was called for immediately. A set of printed sheets was pulled in the Strahan printing house for use as printer’s copy for the second edition. All signature and pagination changes were marked on the sheets, which were then distributed among multiple compositors for setting the type.

For much of the two-month period between the first and second editions Hawkesworth was traveling with the man who commissioned him to prepare the Voyages, Lord Sandwich (First Lord of the Admiralty), and the two botanists from the voyage, Joseph Banks and Daniel Solander. While still on his junket, Hawkesworth probably read and corrected the first edition. He likely sent his changes to Strahan by letter, but the information arrived too late to be incorporated in the resetting of the text and after the corresponding sheets had been run off. Following his return to London, Hawkesworth apparently received additional input pointing out problems with the part of the text relating to Cook’s stay at Batavia. These corrections were forwarded to Strahan and incorporated
into the second edition’s Errata page, but were not marked in the printer’s copy. In a subsequent communication Hawkesworth voiced his indignation about not being more closely involved in the preparation of the second edition. His comment was printed at the foot of the second edition’s Errata page:

The second edition was printed very rapidly while I was absent, without knowing it was gone to press; these corrections therefore, most of which were communicated since my return by a gentleman who was some time resident at Batavia, could not be made but as errata.

The rest of the navigational errors were most likely caught by other readers in the print shop. Except for one, however, they were apparently found after typesetting of the appropriate sections was complete and the sheets run off. Nonetheless, the corrections were marked in the printer’s copy as they were identified, and retained by Strahan for possible use in preparing subsequent editions.

The second edition was published on August 3, 1773. It incorporated all first edition errata, all structural corrections marked in the printer’s copy, and the single corrected navigational entry.

When the third edition was prepared in 1785, the text was probably set using both the first edition printer’s copy and the second edition Errata sheet. All known errors were corrected in the third edition, including the latitude discrepancy, even though it was incorrect in the original journals. The 146° and compass heading errors were never changed because no checking was done with original sources. They remained incorrect in the third edition, because the printer’s copy was incorrectly marked.

By the time of the third edition, the late Captain Cook was a national icon not to be equaled until the days of Nelson. The original printer’s copy sheets would no doubt have seemed more significant than in 1773, so were retained and bound.49 Had there been subsequent editions, they would have been set from the corrected third edition.

---

49 If the volumes were important enough to save, why were they carelessly bound and some markings trimmed in the process? Was volume 1 similarly retained? If so, why was it subsequently separated and where is it now? The questions abound.
The Pencil Comment

VOLUME 3, page 659/255, lines 10-25 contain what is undoubtedly the most intriguing marking to be found in the printer’s copy for Hawkesworth’s Voyages. It is the only entry in pencil and appears to be written by a different hand than the other corrections. It is also the only general comment directed toward the printed text, as opposed to a correction, per se.

The printed text in question relates an incident that occurred September 3, 1770, at Cook’s Bay on the western coast of the island of New Guinea in what is now Irian Jaya. Attacked by a defiant group of islanders, Cook refuses retribution despite, according to Hawkesworth, being “urged by some of the officers to … cut down the cocoa-nut trees for the sake of the fruit.” Cook curtly dismisses the proposal as “highly criminal.”

That such a comment occurs where it does is, perhaps, not as surprising as it might seem. The whole issue of violence toward indigenous natives is a sensitive one, and was raised by both Cook and Hawkesworth. In his journal entry for the day, Cook states that his decision to proceed without the coconuts “was contrary to the inclination and opinion of some of the officers, who would have had me send a party of men a shore to cut down the Cocoa-nutt trees, a thing that I think no man living could have justified; for as the Natives had attack'd us for meer landing without taking away any one thing, certainly they would have made a vigorous effort to have defended their property, in which case many of 'em must have been kill'd and perhaps some of our own people too — and all this for 2 or 300 green Coco-nutts which when we had got them would have done us little service, besides nothing but the utmost necessity would have oblige'd me to have taken this Method to come at refreshments.”

Hawkesworth, in his Introduction, goes on at length, and somewhat condescendingly, about violence toward native populations. “I cannot however dismiss my Readers to the following narratives, without expressing the regret with which I have recorded the destruction of poor naked savages, by our firearms, in the course of these expeditions, when they endeavoured to repress the invaders of their country; a regret which I am confident my Readers will participate with me: this however appears to be an evil which, if discoveries of new countries are attempted, cannot be avoided: resistance will always be made, and if those who resist are not overpowered, the attempt must be relinquished. It may perhaps be said, that the expence of life upon these occasions is more than is necessary to convince the natives that further contest is hopeless, and perhaps this may sometimes have been true: but it must be considered, that if such expeditions are undertaken, the execution of them must be intrusted to persons not exempt from human frailty; to men who are liable to provocation by sudden injury, to unpremeditated violence by sudden danger, to error by the defect of judgment or the strength of passion, and always disposed to transfer laws by which they are bound themselves, to others who are not subject to their obligation; so that every excess thus produced is also an inevitable evil.”
The printed passage is vigorously crossed out and accompanied by pencil marginalia. The scribbled comment is difficult to read, and some of it has been trimmed by the binder. One interpretation reads:

A very imprudent [improper?], ill timed display of your own Superiority of interest & humanity over your Officers — I suppose you reproved them at the time.

---

51 When was the “pencil comment” made? Trimming by the binder is evidence that the comment was written before the loose leaves were collected for binding. It is not possible, however, to know whether the comment was written before or after the leaves were used as the printer’s copy for the second edition.
The tone of what can be read seems to be critical of the printed text and makes reference to “you” and “your” in addressing its comments. It appears to be written to the author of the text, which could at first glance be either Cook or Hawkesworth. Despite the wording, however, it seems odd that the comment would have been addressed toward Cook, because the printed sheets of the first edition weren’t available until almost a year after Cook had departed on his second voyage to the Pacific, and the second edition was published almost two years before his return. On the other hand, the target might have been Hawkesworth, but the language doesn’t seem to fit.

As is the case of virtually all of the other “unexpected” corrections, nothing was changed in the second edition, although in this case that’s not surprising, as the nature of the pencil markings is more of comment than correction.

Who Was the Author?

What can one surmise about the author of such a comment? Two characteristics suggest themselves — familiarity and access. The style, content and intimacy (i.e., use of “you” and “your”) of the “pencil comment” point toward an author who was familiar with the key players in the incident. Furthermore, assuming that the comment was written during preparation of the second edition and not later, the author would have to have had access to the printer’s copy at a time contemporary with its preparation and use.

The number of people with such familiarity and access during the summer of 1773 was small. Cook was at sea, and Hawkesworth would have been an unlikely critic of his own work. One person with both familiarity and access was Joseph Banks, fellow voyager with Cook on the *Endeavour* and advisor to Hawkesworth during the preparation of his *Voyages*. Banks’ journal of the voyage was the source of much of Hawkesworth’s material, and Banks was even rumored to have paid

---

52 Hawkesworth compiled his account of Cook’s first voyage from the combined journals of James Cook and Joseph Banks. He also added his own interpretations and embellishments throughout, leaving the reader with no ability to decipher which of the three contributors was responsible for any given part of the text. However, it seems unlikely the marginalia would have been directed toward Banks, as the printed version of the crossed-out portion of the text closely matches Cook’s original journal and is quite dissimilar from Banks’ journal.
£1,000 to Hawkesworth to have his journal include in the official account.  

Could Banks have written the “pencil comment?” Although the hand of the marginalia bears some similarities to that of Joseph Banks as it appears in his holograph journal in the State Library of New South Wales, any definite association would be based more upon wishful thinking than upon knowledgeable conclusion. Derek McDonnell agrees:

The pencil annotation is provocative indeed … but, my first gut reaction is no to Banks (whose hand and style and character I know quite well). A lot of 18th century hands are very very similar.

During my original research on the volumes I didn’t consider anyone other than Banks, and after reaching the conclusion that he probably wasn’t the author I temporarily halted my investigation. Then, after having set aside the question of the authorship for over a year, I encountered another possible candidate. During a simple Internet search for images related to Sydney Parkinson (one of Banks’ artists on the *Endeavour* voyage) I ran across two letters written to Joseph Banks by John Fothergill, which were now in the Papers of Sir Joseph Banks collection of the State Library of New South Wales. The letters in question were written during the summer of 1773, in the period between the first and second editions of Hawkesworth’s *Voyages*. Although there was nothing apparent in the texts to link Fothergill to the “pencil comment,” several features of the handwriting appeared strikingly similar to the penciled marginalia.

Could John Fothergill have been the author of the “pencil comment?” He certainly met the criterion of familiarity; he was the most respected London physician of the time and was an associate of Joseph Banks, John Hawkesworth, and William Strahan. He also shared some of Banks’ interests (e.g., botany, Cook’s first voyage), and was a central character in the dispute between Hawkesworth, Banks and Stanfield

---

53 The amount is a substantial one, being equivalent to over $100,000 in today’s funds. In a letter written on 15 May 1773 to William Mason, Horace Walpole wrote: “… at present our ears listen and our eyes are expecting East Indian affairs, and Mr. Banks’s voyage, for which Mr. Hawkesworth has received d’avance one thousand pounds from the voyager, and six thousand from the booksellers, Strahan & Co., who will take due care that we shall read nothing else till they meet with such another pennyworth.” (Cook, op. cit., Vol. I, p. ccxlix) However, in his biography of Hawkesworth Abbott states that the £1,000 payment was apparently part of an earlier financial settlement and not related to the publication. (Abbott, op. cit., p. 233)


55 Personal correspondence from Derek McDonnell (Hordern House).

Parkinson over the disposition and publication of the late Sydney Parkinson’s papers and journal of the *Endeavour* voyage.\(^{57}\)

The Papers of Sir Joseph Banks web site had nine letters that were written by Fothergill between July 2, 1773 and March 9, 1778, covering a wide variety of topics, including some references to the Parkinson affair. I worked with printouts of the Internet letters over the course of the following year, but the high contrast images lacked the fine detail necessary for a proper analysis of the writing’s characteristics. However, in August 2004 I was able to visit the Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales and examine the original letters in person.

Armed with my previous research and a listing of the letters in question, I showed up at the Mitchell Library on a Saturday to log my request. I was told that Warwick Hirst, the Assistant Curator of Manuscripts and Original Materials and the person to whom I needed to speak, wouldn’t be back until Monday (my last day in Australia) and that I should call back then.

On Monday when I called, Hirst told me that the letters would be available to me that afternoon. When I arrived at the library, he escorted me upstairs into the staff area and directed me to a table where the letters were waiting in a clamshell case accompanied by the customary pair of cotton gloves. He told me to take whatever time I needed and to simply let him know when I was finished. He even granted me permission to photograph the letters as long as I didn’t use a flash.

Needless to say, the next couple of hours were a delight. The privilege of working with original materials related to key characters associated with Cook’s voyages, Benjamin Franklin, Samuel Johnson, William Bligh and other notables was heady stuff.\(^{58}\)

---

\(^{57}\) Hawkesworth described Fothergill’s role in a 1773 letter addressed to “My Dear Madam.”

“As to Parkinson tho’ f’ suit is in my name, it is at Dr Fothergill’s expense, who by his affirmation [the Quaker’s affidavit] alleges that the papers from which his Book is printed are Mr Bank’s property. that he saw them delivered to Mr Banks in consequence of the purchase & that Mr Banks afterwards lent them to Parkinson to read, upon his, [the Doc’] answering for no improper use being made of them; that the first thing Parkinson did with the papers was to copy them, and the next thing to print them. This was such justifiable cause for a suit & as to my affidavit it is only that Banks executed a Bill of Sale to me of Parkinson’s papers to make me plaintiff in the suit, & this fact, f bill of Sale to which Mr Wallace’s clerks, the Solicitor in f’ Cause, is a subscribing witness proves to be true beyond the possibility of a Cavil —” (Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University).

\(^{58}\) When I was finished with my direct examination of the Fothergill letters, Warwick Hirst guided me to an exhibit area where the State Library of New South Wales was displaying a selection of its finest objects, including Joseph Banks’ original journal from Cook’s first voyage. The two volumes written by Banks (comparable in American terms to the handwritten notes of Columbus and Lewis & Clark combined) were wonderful in themselves, but they were only part of what was in the room. Incunabula (books printed before 1501), explorer’s journals, illustrated books, early maps of Australia … the room was full of world class publications and artifacts, and I was the only person present. It was a wonderful experience.
My onsite examination of the letters and subsequent review of the images I took reinforced my impression of the similarity of Fothergill’s writing with that of the “pencil comment” (e.g., letter forms, upward slant to right, use of dashes as phrase separators).
There is one other individual that could be a candidate for authorship of the “pencil comment,” and that is Hawkesworth’s general critic and nemesis, Alexander Dalrymple. As the first Hydrographer of the British Admiralty and advocate for the Great Southern Continent that Cook ultimately disproved, Dalrymple certainly had both familiarity and possible access to the materials of the voyage, and the critical tone of the comment is entirely consistent with other examples of Dalrymple’s writing. A comparison of the “pencil comment” with samples of Dalrymple’s correspondence in the National Library of Australia and the Huntington Library show strong similarities, but as of the date of writing nothing is conclusive.59

A sample of Alexander Dalrymple’s handwriting from a letter written to Joseph Banks and currently held in the National Library of Australia. As Derek McDonnell has noted, “A lot of 18th century hands are very very similar.”

There’s no specific information that would conclusively demonstrate that either Fothergill or Dalrymple had access to the printer’s copy, and definitive confirmation of either as the author of the “pencil comment” probably cannot occur without a more detailed handwriting analysis by a qualified professional (if even then).60

Perhaps future investigation will yet finally unravel this element of the story of the printer’s copy.

---

59 Dalrymple’s disdain for Hawkesworth is evident in his separately published Letter from Mr. Dalrymple to Dr. Hawkesworth … wherein he criticized multiple aspects of Hawkesworth Voyages. In one passage Dalrymple comments on the issue of violence similarly noted in the “pencil comment,” “I wish YOU more candour, and resign myself to Providence*, although, in the wisdom of its dispensations, I was prevented, by the secondary influence of narrow minded men, from compleating the Discovery of, and establishing an amicable intercourse with, a Southern Continent; which, notwithstanding your sagacious reasonings, (Introduction, p. 18.) I still think, from my own experience in such like voyages, may be done without committing murder. * Vide Dr. Hawkesworth’s Introduction, p. 19.” (Dalrymple’s Letter to Hawkesworth – pp 31-32.)

60 Assuming the reading of the Pencil Comment is correct (i.e., “A very imprudent [improper?], ill timed display of your own Superiority of interest & humanity over your Officers – I suppose you reproved them at the time”), one might be led to question Fothergill as its author. John Fothergill was a Quaker and would be expected to have used the less familiar forms of thy, thine and thee instead of the your and you that appear in the hastily scribbled marginalia.
Preserving for Posterity

THERE is a certain responsibility that comes with the location and identification of an item that holds a particular place in history — the responsibility of preserving that item for posterity.

Although the printer’s copy for Hawkesworth’s Voyages is currently in my collection of Cook materials, it doesn’t “belong” to me in the same sense that my car or house does. Rather, I see myself more as a temporary curator of the volumes, which have been around for more than two centuries and will no doubt survive much longer than I will.

Unlike the other items in my collection, all of which have their counterparts in other collections and libraries, the printer’s copy is unique; it represents an irreplaceable stitch in the fabric of the history of Captain James Cook and the exploration of the Pacific. For that reason, I believe it’s important that the information in the volumes be shared with anyone who has an interest.

The Printer’s Copy on CD

In the past, I had considered my library to be for personal use and enjoyment and hadn’t thought about how it might also be used by others. That has changed with the Hawkesworth Copy. My current goals for those books are: (1) that they are never “lost” again; (2) that appropriate scholars and collectors know of their existence and contents; and (3) that they eventually end up in the “right” library where they will be continue to be available to later researchers.

Bad things can happen to books. Many of today’s bibliographic treasures are rare because fire, flood, insects and neglect have been able to destroy most of the copies that once existed. To guard against such a loss of the Hawkesworth printer’s copy, I decided to make a digital copy
of the volumes so that the information they contained would still be available should anything happen to the books themselves.

Because of the fragility of their bindings, I didn’t want to subject the books to a photocopying or scanning process. That left digital photography. The two volumes were documented in a series of more than 400 images, beginning with their spines and covers and continuing with a separate high resolution image for each two-page spread.

The images show a small amount of focus shift and “fisheye” image distortion caused by the closeness of the camera and the fact that the books could not be supported in a fully-opened state. All in all, however, they are of sufficient quality to be enlarged for examination of individual markings and entries.

I then compiled a digital edition of the printer’s copy for Hawkesworth’s *Voyages* on two CDs that can be shared with appropriate collectors, scholars and researchers on a per-request basis.

**Going Into Print**

The next step was to let people know that the printer’s copy for Hawkesworth’s *Voyages* existed. But who would want to know? In general it seemed that there were several groups that might take interest in the volumes — those interested in the exploits of Captain Cook, per se; those with a more general interest in exploration and maps; bibliophiles and book collectors; and bibliographic professionals. The challenge was to get the word out to all who might be interested.

Because people with different interests read different publications, I elected to create several versions of the current essay for publication in a variety of periodicals.

Cook’s Log

Probably the best method of getting information to fans of Captain Cook is through *Cook’s Log*, the quarterly newsletter of the Captain Cook Society.

The society is international in scope, and *Cook’s Log* routinely carries articles about all facets of Captain Cook’s life and explorations.

The article I prepared for *Cook’s Log* was a moderately detailed version of the current essay that focused more on Captain Cook and collecting and less on some of the bibliographical details of the volumes.

It appeared in *Cook’s Log* in the first issue of 2003.

Mercator’s World

*Mercator’s World* (no longer published) billed itself as “the magazine of maps, geography and discovery.” It was published bi-monthly and was available by subscription and on newsstands worldwide.

Because *Mercator’s World* appealed to a broader audience with a strong interest in maps, I prepared a highly condensed article that focused on the implications of the “latitude discrepancy” but left out much of the other bibliographic detail.

The material appeared as a feature article in the January/February 2003 issue.

The Hawkesworth Connection, Mercator’s World, January/February 2003, volume 8, number 1, pp. 20-25.
**Fine Books & Collections**

*Fine Books & Collections* is a bi-monthly publication that focuses on the “best from the world of books, maps, manuscripts, and more.”

The article in *Fine Books & Collections* went into additional detail about some of the bibliophilic aspects of the volumes, including the timing and methods by which both the expected and unexpected corrections were communicated to the printer.

The material appeared as a feature article in the January/February 2008 issue.

---

**The Fellowship of American Bibliophilic Societies Journal**

The Fellowship of American Bibliophilic Societies (FABS) is an organization composed of 32 member book clubs and societies from throughout the United States and Canada.

The *FABS Journal* is published twice a year and is sent to the membership of all affiliated organizations.

The version I submitted to the *FABS Journal* had more of a book collector’s perspective and focused on those parts of the story that would most appeal to fellow bibliophiles.

The article appeared as the cover story in the winter 2003 issue.
The Bibliographic Society of Australia and New Zealand Bulletin

For me, the story of the printer’s copy began with Brian McMullin’s 1989 article in the BSANZ Bulletin. For that reason, it was an easy decision to look to the same journal as a source for getting information about the printer’s copy for Hawkesworth’s Voyages to those who were interested in book history and physical bibliography.

I originally sent the complete text of my essay to Ian Morrison, the editor of the BSANZ Bulletin, and asked if he thought any part would be of interest to his readers. His response was that, even though the BSANZ Bulletin was a refereed journal, he wanted to bypass the refereeing process and print the article exactly as presented.

The article appeared in early 2003.
Coming full circle. The Hawkesworth printer’s copy volumes now rest in a custom “clamshell” case to protect them from further wear and tear. Such containers are frequently called “Solander Cases” after their inventor, Daniel Solander, the naturalist who assisted Joseph Banks on Cook’s *Endeavour* voyage to the Pacific.
UNRAVELING the story of the Hawkesworth printer’s copy was necessarily a collaborative effort, as pieces of the puzzle resided in many places. Antiquarian booksellers from London to Sydney provided advice; academics from Melbourne to Connecticut shared comments and resource materials; special collections libraries at the University of California, Yale, Northwestern University, Indiana University, Oberlin College and the Ohio State University placed their resources at my disposal. The National Library of Australia, the State Library of New South Wales, and the National Maritime Museum at Greenwich researched their manuscripts and journals in response to my inquiries.

Everyone was willing to help, and without their individual investigations of primary materials in their care I would not have been able to transform a bookseller’s description of two timeworn volumes into a story of 18th century exploration and publishing. Research into the printer’s copy has been a great adventure that has taken me down some unexpected paths, as any good adventure should.

In a 1754 letter to Sir Horace Mann, Horace Walpole coined the word “serendipity” and described it as “always making discoveries, by accidents and sagacity, of things they were not in quest of.” So it has been with the printer’s copy. I ended up with a unique Cook item not because I was looking for it (after all, nobody knew it existed), but simply because I was looking.

From cryptic words in a bookseller’s description; to identification of a previously unrecorded (and unsuspected) original document; to identification of an error in every copy of the *Endeavour* journal; to questions yet unanswered … it’s all been great fun.
In a 1952 article entitled *Collecting Captain Cook*, Cook bibliographer Sir Maurice Holmes stated:

In assembling my Cook collection, I have had excitement in plenty, an excitement which in my case takes three forms. First there is the excitement of paying more than one can afford for a much desired book. This is a form of excitement reserved for the collector of modest means, and I have savoured it to the full in the acquisition of three or four of my most treasured pamphlets. At the opposite pole is the almost unbearable excitement of acquiring a real rarity for next to nothing. ... Lastly, there is the excitement of getting a book which one has come to regard as an ‘impossible’.61

The printer’s copy of Hawkesworth’s *Voyages* has enabled me to experience all three.

---

Further Reading
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