

PUBLICATION OF COOK'S JOURNALS:  
SOME NEW SOURCES AND ASSESSMENTS

by Helen Wallis

In *A Tale of a Tub* Swift promised his readers a description of *Terra Australis Incognita* in ninety-six large folio volumes, compiled from 999 learned and pious authors, to be printed in 100,000 copies for the universal benefit of mankind. It would be idle to speculate whether those voyages which swept the southern continent from the map have collected their quota of 999 authors. Suffice it to say that the *Bibliography of Captain James Cook*, compiled by Miss M. K. Beddie of the Library of New South Wales, second edition 1970, lists 4808 separate items (including relics), held in the Library of New South Wales, together with selected items in other Australian collections. The items range from printed and manuscript accounts of the voyages to posters advertising the pantomime ballet "The Death of Captain Cook." Their various languages and imprints indicate Cook's commanding position as an explorer and a navigator who transcended nationality, gaining the interest and admiration of many countries and several continents.

The last thirty years have been a major advance in Pacific studies, leading up to the climax of Cook bicentenary celebrations, 1978 to 1979. The publication of the authoritative texts of the journals was the achievement of the Hakluyt Society and its chosen editor, John Cawte Beaglehole. The supplementary volume, the life of Cook, was in typescript when Beaglehole died in October 1971. Born and bred in windy Wellington, he had the advantage of being a man of the Pacific. Privileged to undertake the task of liaison, the British Museum (along with the National Maritime Museum) was also to become a centre of intelligence for Cook and his fellow circumnavigators. For this reason I venture to survey some recent discoveries and assessments.

The Publications: Hawkesworth's *Voyages*

The controversy over Hawkesworth's *Voyages* features as one of the more curious repercussions of Cook's first voyage. Until 1955, when Beaglehole's edition, *The Voyage of the Endeavour 1768-1771*, appeared in print, Hawkesworth's *Voyages* had remained the chief authority for Cook's first voyage and also for the preceding circumnavigations of John Byron (1764-66), Samuel Wallis (1766-68), and Philip Carteret (1766-69). Only for that of Wallis had Hawkesworth been supple-

mented by a new text, the Journal of George Robertson, master of the *Dolphin*, published by the Hakluyt Society in 1948 under the title *The Discovery of Tahiti*. For a hundred and twenty years, as Beaglehole observed, so far as the first voyage was concerned, Hawkesworth was Cook.<sup>1</sup>

Beaglehole tells in the words of Fanny Burney's diary, the well-known story how Hawkesworth came to be chosen "to write the Voyage." "My father has had a happy opportunity of extremely obliging Dr. Hawkesworth," she wrote on 15 September 1771. Her father, Charles Burney, had met Lord Sandwich, First Lord of the Admiralty, at Lord Orford's in Norfolk. Talking of the late voyage round the world, Lord Sandwich mentioned that he had the papers in his possession, but they were "rough drafts" and "he should be much obliged to any one who could recommend a proper person to *write the Voyage*." Her father immediately named Dr. Hawkesworth, and Lord Sandwich accepted the nomination. "The Doctor waited upon Lord Sandwich, and they both returned my father particular thanks for their meeting."<sup>2</sup> Edmond Malone was to claim that David Garrick the actor was responsible for securing Hawkesworth the commission,<sup>3</sup> and Nichols also mentions this.<sup>4</sup> The two reports were not mutually exclusive; as Beaglehole commented, the First Lord may well have asked advice of divers persons. I discovered by accident the evidence to support this assumption. Garrick was (in modern parlance) the second referee. In the margin of the Burney newspapers, the eighteenth-century collection of newspapers presented by Dr. Charles Burney to the British Museum, a letter which refers to Garrick's grievance carries a marginal manuscript note in Burney's hand: "It was D<sup>r</sup>. Burney, who in recommending D<sup>r</sup>. Hawkesworth to L<sup>d</sup>. Sandwich at Houghton, referring his Lord<sup>p</sup>. to Garrick for a confirmation of the character w<sup>ch</sup> he had given of D<sup>r</sup>. Hawkesworth as an ingenious writer and honourable man."<sup>5</sup> It is easy

<sup>1</sup>J. C. Beaglehole, ed., *The Journals of Captain James Cook*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: The Hakluyt Society, 1955-1967), I, ccliii.

<sup>2</sup>Annie R. Ellis, ed., *The Early Diary of Frances Burney, 1768-1778*, 2 vols. (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1889), I, 133-134.

<sup>3</sup>George B. N. Hill, ed., *Boswell's Life of Johnson*, 6 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1934), II, 247 n. 5.

<sup>4</sup>John Nichols, *Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century*, 8 vols. (London: Nichols, son and Bentley, 1817-1858), I, 140.

<sup>5</sup>*The Morning Chronicle*, 19 June 1773. For further comments, see Helen Wallis, *Carteret's Voyage round the World, 1766-1769*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: The Hakluyt Society, 1965), II, 464-465.

to see how the misunderstanding arose which lost Hawkesworth Garrick's friendship. On the strength of his recommendation, Garrick considered that Hawkesworth should have consulted him over the publisher and allowed him a cut of the profits.

This was a minor issue in the controversy which raged once the *Voyages* came out. Horace Walpole had commented in May 1773 on the public mood of expectancy in awaiting the publication: "at present our ears listen and our eyes are expecting East Indian affairs, and Mr. Banks's voyage, for which Dr. 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."<sup>6</sup> For his work of editing the three volumes, running to 1500 pages, Hawkesworth was to receive £6,000. When we compare this figure with the sum of nearly £10,000 raised by subscription in 1717 to 1720 to build the Senate House at Cambridge, we can say that this was one of the most lucrative literary contracts of the eighteenth century. The publication was a highly profitable enterprise for all concerned, as the *Voyages* turned out to be a best-seller. By the end of 1773, a second English edition and a New York edition had appeared. French and German editions followed in 1774. The work also came out in shilling parts, entitled *Genuine Voyages to the South Seas, publishing in sixty weekly numbers*.

Despite its commercial success, the *Voyages* aroused a storm of criticism. When Hawkesworth died six months later, in November 1773, his death was attributed to the abuse that he had received. It was rumored that he had taken an overdose of opium. Fanny Burney attributed his death to "the uneasiness of his mind, which brought on a slow fever, that proved mortal."<sup>7</sup> The critics of the *Voyages* ranged from the commanders themselves, the most reticent party in the controversy, to reviewers, literary men, and other public figures of the day. Some criticized Hawkesworth for his techniques of editing. Others disapproved of the content of the *Voyages*. Hawkesworth was also censured for accepting the commission on the terms agreed. It is evident, too, that shafts directed at Hawkesworth were aimed at the men behind him.

The criticisms of the content of the *Voyages* are wittily described by Beaglehole. Morality, theology, and geography had been affronted.

<sup>6</sup>Paget Toynbee, *The Letters of Horace Walpole*, 19 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903-1925), VIII, 277.

<sup>7</sup>Ellis, I, 262-264.

On the questions of morality, the account of Tahitian customs had brought blushes to the cheeks of all the ladies in England. None of them dared to admit that she had read the *Voyages*, especially when--to quote one of the writers of the time--"a lax magazine culled from the *Voyages* all the warmest passages to make a new art of love." You might have supposed from the criticism levelled against him that Dr. Hawkesworth had participated in the Tahitian customs--guilt by association. He had invited attack by suggesting that morality was relative, that what was immoral in one country was not necessarily immoral in another; he had said "these people had a knowledge of right and wrong from the dictates of natural conscience."

As to the theological issue, Hawkesworth had ventured unorthodox views in his preface. He explained that he could not attribute any of the critical escapes from danger "to the particular interpositions of Providence;" the dangers themselves were also part of the Divine order of things. When the *Endeavour* was stuck on the reef he considered that "we can with no more propriety say that providentially the wind ceased, than that providentially the sun rose in the morning." The reviewer in the *Annual Register* commented: "we could wish . . . that speculative opinions of dark and difficult subjects had been omitted; whatever their merit may be, we may truly say, *non erat his locus*." <sup>8</sup>

Thirdly, geography was affronted. Alexander Dalrymple took up the cudgels as its protagonist. Angry with Cook and the Admiralty because he had not himself been chosen to command the voyage, Dalrymple professed disbelief of Cook's report that there was no tropical southern continent. In an attack published as a letter to Hawkesworth, he vented his disappointment.<sup>9</sup> Hawkesworth answered facetiously in the preface to the second edition: "I am very sorry for the discontented state of this good Gentleman's mind, and most sincerely wish that a southern continent may be found, as I am confident nothing else can make him happy and good-humoured"<sup>10</sup> Dalrymple countered in a second letter, which he withheld from publication on the news of Hawkesworth's death.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>8</sup> *Annual Register for the Year 1773*, p. 267.

<sup>9</sup> Alexander Dalrymple, *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: J. Nourse, 1773).

<sup>10</sup> John Hawkesworth, *An Account of the Voyages*, 3 vols. (London: W. Strahan and T. Cadell, 1773), preface.

<sup>11</sup> Alexander Dalrymple, *Mr. Dalrymple's Observations on Dr. Hawkesworth's Preface to the Second Edition* (London: Privately Printed, 1773).

If Dalrymple's criticisms were unfair, so also were some of the other comments on the *Voyages*. Hawkesworth could not please everybody. Literary critics thought that there was too much nautical information in the *Voyages*. Horace Walpole wrote: "I have almost waded through Dr. Hawkesworth's three volumes of the *Voyages to the South Sea*. The entertaining matter would not fill half a volume: and at best is but an account of the fisherman on the coasts of forty islands."<sup>12</sup> Of Hawkesworth's book, Dr. Johnson said to Boswell (7 May 1773): "Sir, if you talk of it as a subject of commerce, 'twill be gainful. If as a Book, that is to increase human knowledge, not much of that. Hawkesworth can tell only what Banks tells him, and he has not found much. But one Animal [presumably the Kangaroo]. BOSWELL. 'Many insects.' JOHNSON. 'Ray reckons of british Insects 20,000 species.' Banks might have staid at home and discovered enough in that way."<sup>13</sup>

The Commanders criticised Hawkesworth for the opposite fault, his omission of navigational details. 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.

The fourth count against Hawkesworth turned. on the nature of the commission. It was regarded as scandalous that Hawkesworth should pocket £6,000 for what one reviewer called "the easy Business of a few Months, transacted by a Man's own Fireside, whereas the commanders who had made the voyages at the risk of their lives and had written the original manuscripts obtained not one penny of profit from all the transaction."<sup>14</sup> As the commanders had not received fair recompense the injustice here lay in their treatment by the Admiralty. The critics were hitting at the Admiralty as much as at Hawkesworth.

The rights and wrongs of the controversy can now be assessed in the light of some new sources. First, the publication of the voyages

<sup>12</sup>Walpole's *Letters*, VIII, 303. In the same vein (pp. 300-301), "The Admiralty have dragged the whole ocean, and caught nothing but the fry of ungrown islands, which had slipped through the meshes of the Spaniard's net. They fetched blood of a great whale called *Terra Australis Incognita*, but saw nothing but its tail."

<sup>13</sup>Geoffrey Scott, ed., *Private Papers of James Boswell from Malahide Castle*, 18 vols. (Mount Vernon, New York: W. E. Rudge, 1928-1934), VI, 133.

<sup>14</sup>Letter to the printer from "Navalis," *Baldwin's London Weekly Journal*, 22 May 1773.

called forth a spate of letters which were printed in the correspondence columns of the London newspapers. Not a day passed in the summer of 1773 without letters appearing on the *Voyages*. These provide a running commentary on the progress of the controversy. Secondly, the manuscript journals of the circumnavigations of John Byron, Samuel Wallis, and Philip Carteret add to the evidence available for assessing Hawkesworth's style as an editor. Byron's manuscript journal appeared in the London sale-room of Messrs. Hodgson & Co. in 1957 and was purchased by the National Maritime Museum. This was the manuscript which Hawkesworth used, and it bears his annotations. It was edited by R. E. Gallagher and published by the Hakluyt Society in 1964. Samuel Wallis's journal was sold by his descendants and is now in the Mitchell Library (the Library of New South Wales), Sydney. This has not yet been published. Carteret's family papers came into the hands of Maggs Brothers in 1933. The journal and logs with other papers relating to the voyage were purchased by Sir William Dixson, and bequeathed by him to the Public Library of New South Wales as part of the Dixson Library. The remaining papers were bought by the National Maritime Museum.

These documentary sources have helped to solve the main problem of Hawkesworth's editing, the conflict of testimony. According to Hawkesworth, the accounts were read to the commanders, who are said to have perused and approved the manuscripts, and "such emendations as they suggested were made."<sup>15</sup> The commanders themselves denied this. It was not true, Cook asserted, that Banks and he had revised all the book. Moreover, in what they had revised, Hawkesworth would make no alteration.<sup>16</sup> Byron, Wallis, and Carteret are reported likewise to have protested against Dr. Hawkesworth's account, though their protest seems to have been made in private rather than in public. Dalrymple wrote of the commanders that "every man who had had any conversation with them must be satisfied that their silence cannot be construed as *acquiescence* of all the *sentiments* the Doctor has published."<sup>17</sup> In a page of rough notes Carteret explained that Hawkesworth's misrepresentations had driven him to write his own ac-

<sup>15</sup>Hawkesworth, I, vi, General Introduction.

<sup>16</sup>A conversation between James Boswell and Cook at Sir John Pringle's in 1776. Scott, XI, 218. See also Beaglehole, II, 661, for Cook's comments written during his visit to St. Helena in May of 1775, when he first saw Hawkesworth's *Voyages*.

<sup>17</sup>Dalrymple, *Observations*, p. 7.

count of his voyage which he intended to publish.<sup>18</sup> Carteret never managed to publish his own version, which formed part of the text for my edition published by the Hakluyt Society in 1965.

This conflicting evidence is difficult to reconcile with the fact that Hawkesworth was an honorable man, however misguided as an editor. A clue to the answer lies in an unsigned letter published in the *Public Advertiser* on 17 July 1773; written by a man who called himself "a Seaman," and claimed to have inside information. He stated that "Dr. H. submitted his Papers to the Examination and Correction (not of Scribblers, Witlings and Women) of a select Number of the most able and intelligent Seamen, of great Service and high Rank in their Profession." These men approved the "Stile, Manner and Contents." If the commanders themselves had seen the text, we would assume that the "Seaman" would have said so. Evidently, Hawkesworth handed his drafts to Lord Sandwich, who submitted them to competent naval men, possibly certain of the Lords of the Admiralty. Only part of the text was seen by the commanders; of the 1500 pages of text the greater part presumably was not read to them. The corrections which they did make were not incorporated. For these failures and omissions the blame must lie with Lord Sandwich. As First Lord of the Admiralty he should have safeguarded the rights of the commanders. On this view Hawkesworth wrote in good faith when he said that the accounts had been submitted to the Commanders. He may not have realized that the Commanders had not been the chief authority for approving the *Voyages*. They themselves were not free to complain. Another letter in the newspapers (from "Navalis") asserts that "they are enjoined, with the Spirit of a Tribunal resembling the Spanish Inquisition, an eternal Silence upon the Subject."<sup>19</sup>

Hawkesworth's faults of editing are consistent with this explanation. The "competent seamen" presumably did not notice any serious errors or omissions, whereas the men who had made the voyages and written the original journals would be well aware that the whole text had been altered by subtle or blatant changes of wording. On Byron's voyage the most interesting episode had been Byron's encounter with the Patagonian giants; the story had gone round that these men were nine feet high. What Byron wrote in his journal was "These People who in size come the nearest to Giants I believe of any People in the World."<sup>20</sup>

<sup>18</sup>Dixson Library, Carteret papers, MS 11a. Printed in Wallis, I, 3. See also II, 509.

<sup>19</sup>*Baldwin's London Weekly Journal*, 22 May 1773.

<sup>20</sup>Robert E. Gallagher, ed., *Byron's Journal of his Circumnavigation, 1764-1766* (Cambridge: The Hakluyt Society, 1964), p. 46.

Hawkesworth changed this to "these people may indeed more properly be called giants than tall men."<sup>21</sup> Although Carteret and Wallis had measured the man and found them to be not much more than six feet, Hawkesworth in his introduction said that the Commanders had proved that the giants existed.<sup>22</sup> For Wallis's voyage the visit to Tahiti was the most sensational episode. Wallis's relations with the Tahitian ladies, especially their "Queen," were described by Hawkesworth in terms which were embarrassingly sentimental. Where Wallis had written "The Queen", Hawkesworth changed this to "my princess, or rather queen." As Hawkesworth goes on to describe how on the Queen's orders the Tahitians carried Wallis to her house, the whole episode made him the butt of London wits.<sup>23</sup> With Carteret's voyage the changes comprise mainly a suppression of the facts on controversial subjects. Complaints made by Carteret against the Admiralty, Wallis, and the Dutch are omitted or toned down. There is no reference to the Englishman Nicholas Ray who held secret talks with Carteret at Makassar in Celebes. This suggests censorship on the part of the Admiralty rather than by Hawkesworth, whose journalistic instinct was to improve on a good story.<sup>24</sup>

For Cook's first voyage, which suffered the greatest alteration, Cook's own words, recorded by Boswell, are the best comment. Cook was said to have seen a nation of men like monkeys. Cook said "No. I did not say they were like Monkeys. I said their faces put me in mind of monkeys." He went on to explain that Hawkesworth made a general conclusion from a particular fact, and would take as a fact what they had only heard. "Why, Sir," said Boswell, "Hawkesworth has used your narrative as a London Tavernkeeper does wine. He has *brewed* it."<sup>25</sup>

Hawkesworth had been confident of his ability to fulfill the commission with credit. He called it "the most important transaction of my

<sup>21</sup>Hawkesworth, I, 31.

<sup>22</sup>Hawkesworth, I, xvi. See Also Helen Wallis, "The Patagonian Giants," in Gallagher, p. 191.

<sup>23</sup>Hawkesworth, I, 462. "Dr. Hawkesworth is still more provoking," writes Horace Walpole. "An old black gentlewoman of forty carries Captain Wallis across a river, when he was too weak to walk, and the man represents them as a new edition of Dido and Aeneas." Walpole's *Letters*, VIII, 292-293. See N. A. Rowe, *Voyage to the Amorous Islands* (London: A. Deutsch, 1955), p. 238 for further comment.

<sup>24</sup>Wallis, II, 473.

<sup>25</sup>Scott, XI, 218.



life." He wrote to Dr. Burney that he hoped to make the work "another Anson's Voyage."<sup>26</sup> This was ambitious indeed. The account of Anson's Voyage (1740-44), published in 1748 ostensibly by Richard Walters, in fact written by Benjamin Robins, was acclaimed a masterpiece. Hawkesworth had two practical problems to overcome. The first was the timetable. He had little over four months for producing the text of Cook's voyage, so that Cook could approve it before his departure on the second voyage. Secondly (although this to him was no problem), he was ignorant of naval affairs. When taken to task by Dalrymple for not having read Dalrymple's book *An Account of the Discoveries in the South Pacific Ocean* he answered complacently, "I never had time to read for amusement, and my literary pursuits had not led me to that path in which alone this Gentleman seems to have wandered the greater part of his life."<sup>27</sup>

Hawkesworth's ignorance of naval affairs did not deter him from boldly rewriting the *Voyages*, paraphrasing almost every sentence and putting the whole into the flowing prose of the eighteenth-century essayist. Although the wording was his own, he decided to use the first person, so as to bring "the Adventurer and the Reader nearer together, without the intervention of a stranger." Yet he also ventured to intersperse "such sentiments and observations as my subject would suggest."<sup>28</sup> These comments of his own were not numerous," so he claimed, and were justified because the manuscripts were to be submitted to the commanders for their approval. Therefore "it would signify little who conceived the sentiments that should be expressed." His comments are inserted mainly in Cook's voyage because he wrote this first, and because for this voyage he had a second source which he liked better than Cook, namely Banks's journal. Sir Joseph Banks, scholar and gentleman, was more to Hawkesworth's taste than Cook. Hawkesworth accordingly incorporated Banks freely into Cook's account, troubled only by the thought that this might seem unfair to Banks, since the results appeared under another name, "but this objection he [Banks] generously over-ruled."<sup>29</sup> The resulting amalgamation of two men's minds in one voice produces an incongruous effect. The reviewer of the *Voyages* in the *Annual Register* for 1773 said, "Neither are we quite convinced

<sup>26</sup>Frances Burney, *Memoirs of Dr. Burney*, 3 vols. (London: E. Moxon, 1832), I, 269.

<sup>27</sup>Hawkesworth *Voyages*, 2nd ed. (1773), I, preface, sig. A 3<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>28</sup>Hawkesworth *Voyages*, I, iv-v, General Introduction.

<sup>29</sup>Hawkesworth, II, xiii-xiv.

by the Doctor's reasons, that it was altogether necessary to narrate in the first person."<sup>30</sup>

The work of editing had not been "the easy business transacted at a man's fireside," as Hawkesworth's critics alleged. A letter from Mrs. Hawkesworth to Mrs. Garrick tells of "that Mind whose powers have for a long time been exerted almost to agony, but manifestly so as to have really destroyed Ye Fragile Fabric of the Body."<sup>31</sup> The task had been beyond Hawkesworth's competence. His success as editor of *The Adventurer* (in association with Dr. Johnson) had "elated him too much."<sup>32</sup> Friends and enemies alike considered him to have been spoilt by his worldly success.<sup>33</sup> His ideas of morality led Dr. Johnson to refer to him, after they had quarreled as "some swelling moralist."

And then there was the business of the £6,000. The anonymous "Seaman" who wrote to the newspapers alleged that it had originally been decided to pay Hawkesworth a fee. "It was, however, afterwards thought more proper to give him the Property of the Book that he might make the most of it."<sup>34</sup> In his second letter of thanks to Dr. Burney, Hawkesworth had rejoiced that "the property of the work will be my own."<sup>35</sup> As the Commanders had not received great recompense, the injustice here was their treatment by the Admiralty, and critics of Hawkesworth were hitting indirectly at the Lords of the Admiralty.

The figure of £6,000 was in everyone's mind when Hawkesworth died. "I believe he has had reason to detest the fortune which only preceded detraction and defamation," Fanny Burney wrote after his death on 16 November 1773. Mrs. Piozzi comments similarly, "Poor Dr. Hawkesworth! hunted out of his Life for that unlucky six thousand Pounds which at last he never received. . . ."<sup>36</sup> As for Mrs. Hawkesworth, who lived on to gain the financial benefits of the publication,

<sup>30</sup> *Annual Register for 1773*, p. 267.

<sup>31</sup> Manuscript letter in the Hyde collection for which references I am indebted to Dr. R. E. Gallagher.

<sup>32</sup> Sir John Hawkins, *The Life of Samuel Johnson*, 2nd ed. (London: J. Buckland, 1787), p. 312.

<sup>33</sup> For example, Hawkins (see note above) and Edmund Malone, one of Hawkesworth's bitterest critics. See Sir James Prior, *Life of Edmund Malone* (London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1860), p. 441.

<sup>34</sup> Unsigned letter in *The Public Advertiser*, 17 July 1773.

<sup>35</sup> *Memoirs of Dr. Burney*, I, 269.

<sup>36</sup> Katharine C. Balderston, ed., *Thraliana. The Diary of Mrs. Hester Lynch Thrale (Later Mrs. Piozzi), 1776-1809*, 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), I, 328.

she wrote in a letter to Sir James Cadwell on 20 July 1776 that it had delivered "the *Coup de grace* to all my hopes of happiness on earth."<sup>37</sup>

It is paradoxical that Hawkesworth's literary reputation, which had been the equal almost of Dr. Johnson's, was destroyed by the book which also preserved his name for posterity. The *Voyages* were, and always will be, *Hawkesworth's Voyages*. For all his faults as editor, Hawkesworth's achievement is not unfairly summed up in the anonymous letter from a Seaman: "I am a Seaman and have a Right to judge of this Performance; upon the Whole I do say that it gives a very edifying and entertaining Account of the most extraordinary Voyages ever attempted, and furnishes a speculative Mind with a great Variety of new Features of human Nature. It may be called a real authentic Account of a new World, such as no European could have figured in his own Imagination."<sup>38</sup>

#### Cook's Second Voyage (1772-1775)

The Admiralty learnt its lesson from the controversy over Hawkesworth's *Voyages*. For Cook's second voyage their Lordships were prepared to allow the Commander to speak for himself. A major task for Cook on his return from the second voyage was therefore the preparation of his manuscript for the printer, although he was not expected to do this unaided. Discreetly, it was arranged that he should be helped by John Douglas, Canon of Windsor (he became Canon of St. Paul's in 1776). In an autobiographical memoir Douglas writes, "In 1776 & 1777 I prepared Cap<sup>t</sup>. Cooke's Voyage for the Press. I undertook this Task at y<sup>e</sup>. earnest Intreaty of Lord Sandwich, & on Condition of Secrecy. His Majesty acquainted with it. I did a great deal to y<sup>e</sup> Cap<sup>t</sup>. 's Journal to correct its Stile; to new point it; to divide it in to Sentences, & Paragraphs, & Chapters & Books. Tho little appears to be done by me, the Journal if printed as the Captain put it into my Hands, would have been thought too incorrect, & have disgusted the Reader."<sup>39</sup>

As Beaglehole points out, this was an understatement.<sup>40</sup> The style was changed in the process of polishing, although the matter was not

<sup>37</sup>Letter of Mrs. Hawkesworth to Sir James Caldwell, 20 July 1777. Printed in "Johnsoniana from the Bagshawe Muniments in the John Rylands Library . . ." Reprinted from *the Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 35 (1952), 223.

<sup>38</sup>Unsigned letter to the printer, *The Public Advertiser*, 17 July 1773.

<sup>39</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2181, fol. 42<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>40</sup>Beaglehole, III, cxliv.

drastically altered. It was Cook himself, moreover, who had divided the work into chapters, as shown by his draft,<sup>41</sup> and as stated in one of Cook's letters to Douglas.<sup>42</sup> Both Cook and Douglas agreed that some prudent editing of substance was also necessary. Cook wrote to Douglas on 10 January 1776, "The remarks you have made on Bits of loose paper, I find very just. With respect to the Amours of my People at Otaheite & other places: I think it will not be necessary to mention them at all, unless it be by way of throwing a light on the Characters, or Customs of the People we are then among; and even then I would have it done in such a manner as might be unexceptionable to the nicest readers. In short my desire is that nothing indecent may appear in the whole book, and you cannot oblige me more than by pointing out whatever may appear to you as such."<sup>43</sup>

The problem of what tense to use, past or present, also exercised Cook; and here he felt the dead hand of Dr. Hawkesworth. He wrote to Douglas on 9 March 1776, "As I intend to look over my whole Manuscript I shall have an opportunity to make such alterations as may appear necessary, to bring it, either to the present, or past times. If you will be so obliging as to give me your opinion in this matter--It was first written in the present time, but on find[ing] Dr. Hawkesworth had mostly used the past, I set about altering it, but I find many places has escaped me."<sup>44</sup> Other letters to Douglas show that the nautical sections were checked by Captain Campbell and Sir Hugh Palliser.<sup>45</sup>

Cook's main problem concerned his negotiations with the arrogant and cantankerous elder Johann Reinhold Forster, who had expected to be the official historian of the voyage, and at one stage a joint work had been considered.<sup>46</sup> Then Lord Sandwich proposed a separate scientific volume by Forster, but this plan also foundered, and Cook was able to write to Douglas on 23 June 1776, "It is now Settled that I am to Publish without M<sup>r</sup>. Forster and I have taken my measures accord-

<sup>41</sup>B. L. Add. MS 27889.

<sup>42</sup>26 April 1776. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 9.

<sup>43</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 3.

<sup>44</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 7.

<sup>45</sup>Letters of 26 April, 14 June, and 23 June 1776. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 9, 15<sup>v</sup> and 17.

<sup>46</sup>Thus Daniel Wray comments in a letter to Lord Hardwicke (9 Dec 1775): "The basis of the book is to be *Captain Cook's Journal*, with proper additions from *Forster's* papers, who is to write it, but subject occasionally to correction." Nichols, *Illustrations*, I, 154-155.

ingly. When Captain Campbell has looked over the M.S. it will be put into the hands of M<sup>r</sup> Strahan and M<sup>r</sup> Stuart to be printed, and I shall hope for the Continuation of your assistance in correcting the proofs. I know not how to recompence you for the trouble you have had, and will have in the Work." The next day Cook was joining his ship at the Nore, and he ended his letter with his last words to Douglas: "I shall always have a due sence of the favors you have done."<sup>47</sup>

When *A Voyage towards the South Pole* was published, it carried in its "Author's acknowledgement" Cook's expression of gratitude to "some worthy friends" (unnamed), and a disavowal of any literary pretensions: "On reading over the Journal, I found I had omitted some things and others were not sufficiently explained; these defects are attempted to be made up by notes; In short, I have given the most candid and best account of things I was able; I have neither Natural, nor acquired abilities for writing; I have been, I may say, constantly at Sea from my Youth and have draged myself (with the assistance of a few good friends) through all the Stations belonging to a Seaman, from a Prentice boy to a Commander:- After such a Candid confession, I shall hope to be excused for all the blunders that will appear in this Journal." This is the earliest extant version of the passage as it appears in the "Admiralty" MS Journal before the wording was polished by Cook in his holograph Journal<sup>48</sup> and then further refined by Douglas for publication.<sup>49</sup> Cook never saw the two fine folio volumes bearing his name as author which appeared in May 1777.

The major recent discovery relating to the second voyage concerns not Cook but the Forsters. When Forster's negotiations with the Admiralty broke down, Reinhold was forbidden to publish until the official account appeared. In anger, he gave his son George the task of writing the voyage. George Forster's two volumes, *A Voyage round the world . . .*) were published in London in March 1777, six weeks before the official volumes appeared. This was followed in 1778 by J. R. Forster's hefty volume *Observations . . . on Physical Geography, Natural History, and Ethic Philosophy*. Beaglehole worked out by inference the extent of Johann's contribution to his son's book.<sup>50</sup> He welcomed in 1971 the news, reported by Michael Hoare, that the manuscript Journal

<sup>47</sup>B. L. Egerton, MS 2180, f. 17.

<sup>48</sup>P. R. O. Adm. 55/108, quoted by Beaglehole, II, cxxvi-cxxvii.

<sup>49</sup>B. L. Add. MS 27886, f. 1. Compare Cook, *A Voyage towards the South Pole, 1772-1775*, 2 vols. (London: W. Strahan and T. Cadell, 1777), I, xxxvi.

<sup>50</sup>Beaglehole, III, cxlix-cl.

of J. R. Forster had come to light in a large collection of Forster manuscripts in the Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin.<sup>51</sup> In his last letter to me, dated 8 June 1971, three months before he died, he commented that he was looking forward to seeing the text of this manuscript comprising Forster's holograph account of the voyage, to compare it with young George's book, and that he was planning to do some detective work to resolve the following problem. In the Sandwich papers there was a large set of specimens of J. R. Forster's work which he submitted when seeking nomination for writing the history of the voyage. The text is virtually the same as George's first three chapters. For the answer to this and other Forster problems and the publication of J. R. Forster's manuscript we await Michael Hoare's edition now being prepared for the Hakluyt Society.

The Forster father and son, especially the father, came in for much criticism in England on account of their uncompromising behavior. The astronomer to the expedition, William Wales, published a riposte to Forster, *Remarks on Mr. Forster's Account of Captain Cook's last Voyage round the World* (1778), which in turn drew from George a *Reply to Mr. Wales' Remarks* (1778). Writing of George's *A Letter to the Earl of Sandwich*, in which George complained that he and his father had not been sufficiently rewarded, John Nichols, the printer commented that it "serves but to confirm our general observation, that Foreigners, however glad to court, even to servility, the patronage of England, rarely make those returns which the liberality and candour of Englishmen demand . . ." <sup>52</sup> (in his patriotic fervor conveniently overlooking the contributions of other distinguished foreigners such as Dr. Solander and Dr. Sparrman!) Yet his long list of the Forster's publications in English and German indicated one type of return which the Forsters gave freely, their publication of the scientific results of the voyage.

The Forsters well deserve the revaluation of their merits now in hand. As M. Hoare has pointed out, George's essay "*Cook der Entdecker*", prefaced to his German translation of the third voyage, provides one of the more understanding assessments of Cook's character and achievements,<sup>53</sup> Hoare's recent biography of Johann Reinhold entitled *The Tactless Philosopher* (Melbourne: Hawthorne Press, 1976) ranks as a

<sup>51</sup>Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz (Berlin), MS Germ. Quart. 222-227.

<sup>52</sup>John Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, 9 vols. (London: Nichols, son & Bentley, 1812), III, 90-91.

<sup>53</sup>M. E. Hoare, "Cook the Discoverer," an essay by Georg Foster, 1787, in *Records of the Australian Academy of Sciences*, I, No. 4 (1969), 7-16.

major contribution to the literature on this difficult but able man. Dr. W. T. Stearn likewise gives the Forsters credit for awakening Germany to an interest in geographical discovery. He sees them as an important link in the chain of events which began with Cook and Banks and their scientific retinue setting out in the *Endeavour* in 1768, and took Alexander von Humboldt to the New World in 1799.

#### Cook's Third Voyage (1776-1779)

For the third voyage a full journal in Cook's own hand survived, covering events up to a month before his death, and Dr. John Douglas was again to be editor. Whatever there was in the way of preliminary drafts disappeared late in 1780. Philip Stephens, the Admiralty Secretary, wrote to Douglas on 14 November 1780 that he was sending him in three parcels "Cap<sup>t</sup>. Cook's Journals Log Books, & loose Manuscripts relative to this Voyage."<sup>54</sup> Captain King wrote on 16 December, "I have made all the enquiries but without effect for Capt. Cook's loose papers, they are not at the Admiralty, M<sup>rs</sup> Cook has not got them & the Clerke knows nothing of them, C. Gore is out of town but it seems unlikely that he can give any account; however on my return I will make another search."<sup>55</sup>

Of his commission to edit the texts, Douglas wrote as follows: "1783 . . . Lord Sandwich then at y<sup>e</sup>. Head of the Admiralty, had in 1781, prevailed upon me, to undertake the Task of preparing Cap<sup>t</sup>. Cook's 3<sup>d</sup>. Voyage for the Press, I employed my spare time, this & y<sup>e</sup> preceding Year, in that Work. The Plates not being engraved, I regulated my Progress accordingly, & began to print in July 1783. The Public never knew, how much they owe to me in this Work. The Cap<sup>t</sup>'s M.S.S. was indeed attended to accurately;<sup>56</sup> but I took more Liberties than I had done with his Acc<sup>t</sup> of the second Voyage; and while I faithfully represented the facts, I was less scrupulous in cloathing them with better Stile than fell to the usual Share of the Cap<sup>t</sup>. Andersons M.S. was also a fruitful Source of important Additions, & by being perpetually before me, enabled me to draw up a much more interesting Narrative than could have been extracted from Cap<sup>t</sup>. Cook's M.S. alone. My Introduction to the Voyage, & my Notes, still added more to y<sup>e</sup> value of the Publication. But while Justice was done to my Labors by the World

<sup>54</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 19.

<sup>55</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 21.

<sup>56</sup>First drafted as "The Cap<sup>t</sup>'s M.S.S. was my Ground-work."

in general, I received no proper thanks from those whose Duty it was to take the Lead in expressing Acknowledgements for my Assistance. Lord Sandwich had been removed from the Admiralty, & Lord Howe who was there when the Voyage came out, never had the Civility to take the least Notice of me; & far from consulting me on any part of this Business, treated me with an unaccountable neglect, nay seemed to take every step that could vex and mortify me. I engaged in the Work, merely to serve M<sup>rs</sup>. Cook, but her Interest & Cap<sup>t</sup>. King's, seemed to be very little consulted by Lord Howe, & his Advisers; and the only Person who was a great gainer was the Book-seller who published the Work. He indeed made a fortune by the Sale, while y<sup>e</sup>. Representatives of Cook & King were never attended to, and forced to accept of that share of the Profits w<sup>ch</sup>. a *Junto* of Cap<sup>t</sup>. Cook's declar'd Enemies thought proper to allot."<sup>57</sup> He commented further, "This Spring [1784] I was so busy correcting the Sheets of the Voyage, that my Health suffered considerably. My Labor having happily ceased by the Publication of the work in the Summer, after my Residence in June I went to Windsor. . . ."<sup>58</sup>

In his task as editor Douglas was assisted by Captain James King, who on the recommendation of Sir Joseph Banks was chosen to write the last part of the voyage, from the time when Captain Cook's journal ended (that is, a month before his death). The third volume of the text was therefore King's volume. The many difficulties which Douglas and King encountered in their joint task are revealed in Douglas's correspondence in the Egerton Manuscripts, which came to the British Museum in 1872. The preparation of the *Voyage* for publication was a matter of official regulation in which a number of influential people had a hand. Lord Sandwich as First Lord of the Admiralty undertook personal responsibility for the progress of the work. A committee which met at Banks's house supervised the choice of geographical names and the preparation of the maps and illustrations, although the Admiralty had the final word. When Lord Sandwich retired from office on 20 March 1782, he was succeeded on 30 March by Augustus Keppel (Viscount Keppel). Lord Keppel and Richard Howe, First Viscount Howe, alternated twice as ministries changed. Lord Sandwich, however, not only maintained his interest, but continued general supervision of the project. Acting as intermediary between Douglas and Lord Sandwich (and also Lord Keppel) was the Canon's friend and colleague, the Re-

<sup>57</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, ff. 48-49<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>58</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 50<sup>f</sup>.



verend Dr. Antony Shepherd, F.R.S., Canon of Windsor from July 1777, who had secured through Lord Sandwich's patronage in 1768 the Plumian professorship of astronomy at Cambridge. As a friend and associate of Captain Cook, Shepherd in July 1774 had a group of small islands in the New Hebrides named after him. Douglas's letter to Shepherd of 12 January 1759 reveals that it was Shepherd who had secured Douglas as editor, presumably by proposing his name to Lord Sandwich.<sup>59</sup>

To illustrate the procedures from an example of special interest to this conference, on 20 November 1782 Douglas pleaded with Lord Sandwich for "a Reprieve of the condemned Name of King George's Sound, to be added to Nootka? . . . the World will wonder not to find it in Cap<sup>t</sup> Cook's Voyage. There seems to be a Propriety in giving an English Name to this first Discovery of English Navigators, so far North on the West Side of America; and I think it is the only Memorial to his Majesty, which Cap<sup>t</sup> Cook has given us, in exploring that Continent."<sup>60</sup> In a letter of 22 November 1782 Sandwich reported that Sir Joseph Banks had agreed "the denomination of *King Georges Sound* to be added or substituted to Nootka;" Lord Sandwich would therefore, speak to Mr. Stephens "(if he consents to it on behalf of the Admiralty) to get the plate altered accordingly." He was happy that his "interposition has been of use," and offered further help.<sup>61</sup> This explains why Roberts's General Chart is marked with both names, whereas the "Sketch of Nootka Sound" (Vol. III, pl. XXXVII, p. 279) and the chart of the northwest coast of America bear only "Nootka."

Many questions relating to place names and other issues minor and major were referred to Lord Sandwich, usually through Dr. Shepherd. The manuscripts were sent to Sandwich for perusal and approval. Thus on 9 February 1784, Lord Sandwich returned a section of the manuscript with the comment that he "should be glad to see the nautical part of the remainder as well as that which relates to the natives; as I have much curiosity to see what measures were taken to find out the passage thro' the Continent which was the principal object of the Voyage."<sup>62</sup>

<sup>59</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 64. "You first engaged me in the very laborious Task I have undertaken."

<sup>60</sup>Sandwich Papers, quoted by Beaglehole, II, cxcix.

<sup>61</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 59. Dalrymple had previously refused to agree. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 46<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>62</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 141<sup>r</sup>.

The maps and engravings were a major source of disagreement between the editors and the committee whose proceedings seem to have become more arbitrary with the succession of Keppel as First Lord. Banks and Webber supervised the engraving of the drawings while Alexander Dalrymple (none other) "at Lord Sandwich's desire," had direction of the charts and coastal views, with the exception of the general chart. Under the sole direction of the Admiralty this was being prepared by Lieutenant Henry Roberts, who had served as master's mate in the *Resolution* under William Bligh. King's letters to Douglas show increasing discord between Douglas, King, and Roberts on the one hand, and Banks and Dalrymple on the other. Writing on 25 July 1782, King reported in answer to a letter from Douglas that he had waited on Sir Joseph Banks "in order to procure you an exact list of the drawings & an Impression of those already engraved; I was received coldly, perhaps owing to my having desired the engraver of the Gen<sup>l</sup>. map not to proceed with it till further enquiry should be made whether the original plan of it should be altered in the way it was by M<sup>r</sup>. Dalrymple, or perhaps he expected your application should be made not thro' me." Sir Joseph then waited on Lord Keppel (King continued), and "the consequence was that his Lordship left the entire direction of the engraving of M<sup>r</sup>. Webbers drawings as well as of the maps to him, upon which Sir Jos. summoned M<sup>r</sup>. Roberts to lay before him the state of the Gen<sup>l</sup>. map; desired him to give the drawings to him & told him that he had nothing further to do with it; as he should make what alterations in it he pleased, & be responsible for the propriety of those alterations & for its being engraved; M<sup>r</sup>. Roberts finds himself very strangely treated by Sir Jos. & refused for the present complying with Sir Jos. request. Upon finding that it was the declared intention of Sir Jos & M<sup>r</sup>. Dalrymple to introduce tracts & alterations in this Gen<sup>l</sup>. map which would rest upon M<sup>r</sup>. Dalrymples authority only & that the motives for which, were to contradict some oppinions given by C. Cook, I begged Lord Duncannon would show Lord Keppel a few lines I wrote of the state of the publication, & that I took it for granted his Lordship would not authorise any alterations in maps without my being consulted. When I sent this to Lord Duncannon I did not know of the power that Lord Keppel had given Sir Jos. The answer I received was, that Lord Keppel could not recede from the promise he had given Sir Jos. When M<sup>r</sup>. Roberts found that I was too insignificant to be consulted in these matters, he declared he would have nothing further to do with the map, as long as it was to be altered at the pleasure of those who had used him so ill, & who even told him, that it was not to

be considered as a map of his drawing.”<sup>63</sup> King promised Roberts to intercede with Lord Keppel on his behalf, but desisted at Roberts' request; “a good & powerful friend of mine,” Roberts wrote, “has taken the matter into consideration, and will no doubt use his utmost means to promote my Interest. . . .”<sup>64</sup>

On 23 August 1782 Shepherd had a long conversation with Lord Sandwich and made no doubt of every difficulty being smoothed.<sup>65</sup> Shepherd's further discussion with Lord Sandwich on 25 August 1782 had to be communicated to Douglas *viva voce*. Once again he had no doubt of getting everything settled as Douglas wished.<sup>66</sup> On 15 September 1782 Shepherd reported that following consultations with Webber, Lord Sandwich had undertaken to obtain from Paris the supply of paper needed for printing the illustrations (which should have been ordered a year earlier).<sup>67</sup> Nine days later Shepherd sent the good news that Lord Sandwich “had obviated every difficulty relative to the publication and that it will now go on without any delay. Every person concerned in the affair is in good humour. . . . The Admiralty will advance the money for the Paper and it is written for--I believe L<sup>d</sup>. Sandwich will now have the entire settling the whole of this affair in every Branch and can with pleasure tell you, that he estimates Capt<sup>n</sup>. Cooke's merits as you & I do.”<sup>68</sup> (Such comments are significant for what they do not say. Who exactly were Cook's detractors?)

Many of the letters necessarily were concerned with the maps and engravings. No volume of discoveries can have had as much time and money expended on its illustrations as Captain Cook's third voyage, which when it finally appeared included two large maps and sixty-one engraved plates after Webber's drawings. The publication itself was delayed until 1784 because of the difficulties in securing the paper and in completing the work of design and engraving. Further, with Dalrymple dictating to Douglas and King in matters concerning the preparation of the charts and engravings, disagreements were inevitable. Dalrymple's

<sup>63</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, ff. 34-35.

<sup>64</sup>25 July 1782. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 32<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>65</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 39<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>66</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 41<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>67</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 45. Shepherd's letter of 9 September 1782 (f. 43) had reported: “The delay I now see will be in getting the paper from Paris, and the taking of a sufficient number of impressions, the Artists say that it cannot be done in less than a year--The paper should have been provided a year ago.”

<sup>68</sup>Letter of 24 September 1782. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 50.

association with Banks in geographical matters dated back to 1768, when Dalrymple supplied Banks with his first book: *An Account of the Discoveries made in the South Pacific Ocean previous to 1764* (printed in 1767). In 1772 the two were in active collaboration, as H. B. Carter has shown, because a copper-plate found recently in Dr. Solander's collections at the British Museum (Natural History) is engraved by John Bayly with a map of the Pacific Ocean by Dalrymple and was evidently commissioned and paid for by Banks (date of account 26 March 1772). Ten years later Banks and Dalrymple constituted a formidable alliance. Thus in a letter to Douglas of 16 September 1782 King wrote of two meetings at Mr. Stephens' respecting the general chart, reporting that "after some warm words Mr. Dalrymple at last gave up the having any concerns in it." This letter also contained "A List of the Charts & Sketches" planned for publication, with notes on the state of completion of each.<sup>69</sup> On 13 December 1783 King reported the results of other arguments: "At your desire Nootka sound will not be proceeded with till I give M<sup>r</sup>. Dalrymple farther directions. I have persuaded that Gentleman to have Adventure bay engraved & some other additions; but he & Sir Jos. are determined to have their Polar map & not mine, & to have none of the Hudson bay Companies discoveries inserted saying that these things are only proper in the General Chart."<sup>70</sup> This shows that the "Chart of the NW Coast of America and NE Coast of Asia" was the design of Dalrymple in collaboration with Banks, and explains the omission of any interior details of North America and of the name King George's Sound. Whatever Dalrymple's faults as cartographic editor, he was responsible for one important feature of the illustrations, the inclusion of "6 plates of views of the Land intended for nautical uses."<sup>71</sup> It is significant that these are inserted in the three volumes of text, whereas the other illustrations (asterisked in the List of the Plates) were normally bound in a separate volume, an arrangement contrary to King's wish and advice.<sup>72</sup>

<sup>69</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, ff. 46-47.

<sup>70</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 107<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>71</sup>Letter of Banks to Douglas, 30 March 1784. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 188.

<sup>72</sup>The separation of the illustrations from the text, which Nicol instructed the bookbinders to follow, was determined (Nicol asserted) by the "reputable part of the trade . . . who are all of the opinion, the ornamental plates should make a Separate Volume, & who mean to do them up in that way." G. Nicol to Douglas, 14 May 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 219. King's disapproval "of anything that may tend to separate the plates from the narrative" is reported in a letter from his brother Walter King to Douglas in May 1784. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 220<sup>r</sup>.

Douglas had also to deal with a self-appointed collaborator in the person of Thomas Pennant, the naturalist and traveller. Pennant asked to see the texts, offered to contribute zoological comments, and sought to use the material in his forthcoming *Arctic Zoology*, whose publication in 1784 he proposed to delay until he had seen the whole of Cook's voyage, as his book would otherwise come out "hurried & imperfect."<sup>73</sup> King, whose text was mainly concerned, could see no objection to Pennant having the proof sheets.<sup>74</sup> He considered Pennant's contribution was "a real addition" to the zoological part of the work; and also it had the advantage of bringing volume III up to 400 pages (in fact 558 pages).<sup>75</sup> Pennant's participation in the enterprise, however, caused further friction with Banks. On 10 February 1784, Pennant wrote, "Both Sir J. Banks & M<sup>r</sup>. Dalrymple denied to me any knowledge of the drawings. But this I speak in confidence. I am sure they will not be forth coming if my name is used."<sup>76</sup> Again, on 9 May 1784: "I hope when you made enquiry after the mountainous Views of Sir Joseph Banks that my name was not mentioned. I fear he thinks me considerable enough to be an object of his jealousy: & I hear that there is now a certain murmuring. As I wish to live peaceably with him I would not give even a distant cause under the rose, I fear that the loose sheets I drew up for the use of Captn King might have got by mistake to Soho Square."<sup>77</sup>

Banks's sensitivities may explain an apparent restraint in the acknowledgment of Pennant's help in "enriching the third volume with references to his *Arctic Zoology* . . ." and in communicating some manuscript accounts of Russian discoveries.<sup>78</sup> Likewise Pennant does not refer in his *Arctic Zoology* to the special facilities granted him by Douglas and King for consulting their as yet unpublished materials. His concern that Cook's *Voyage* should appear first ensured that he could refer to the published work. This apparent discretion may explain why Pennant's role in the publication of Cook's third voyage and the pub-

<sup>73</sup>Letter of 25 April 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180 f. 208<sup>r</sup>; also letter of 11 November 1783, f. 92.

<sup>74</sup>Letter of 17 February 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 151<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>75</sup>Letter of 14 January 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 116<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>76</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 142<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>77</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 212.

<sup>78</sup>James Cook, *A Voyage to the Pacific Ocean*, 2 vols. (London: G. Nicol and T. Cadell, 1784), I, lxxxiv-lxxxv.

licizing of its zoological discoveries has been underestimated.<sup>79</sup> In fact the zoological comments on the northern discoveries were Pennant's, and he made corrections for the second edition.<sup>80</sup> He saw his *Arctic Zoology* as "supplemental" to Cook's *Voyage*, and for this reason had a number of copies issued at the same size.<sup>81</sup> The fourteen volumes of his *Outlines of the Globe* were also to be this size.<sup>82</sup> His literary device of taking "imaginary tours"<sup>83</sup> gave a framework to the *Arctic Geographer*, as his comment to Douglas (26 March 1784) well illustrates: "I have made *my* voyage along the coast of Sibiria, & must visit Kamtschatka first before I cross over to meet you at Cape Blanco; after which I shall attend you along the coast of America through Bering's Streights till you are forced back by the ice, which will be no sort of impediment to me in my air Balloon: I shall proceed directly by the mouth of the Copper river . . ." <sup>84</sup>

Pennant's Introduction to his *Arctic Zoology*, entitled "Of the Arctic World", includes long sections on Cook's voyage which provide the earliest independent geographical assessment of Cook's discoveries. Major issues of natural philosophy are discussed, as follows: "The late voyage of the illustrious Cook has reduced the probable conjectures of philosophers into certainty. He has provided that the limits of the Old and New World approach within thirteen leagues of each other . . . every other system of the population of the New World is now overthrown. The conjectures of the learned, respecting the vicinity of the Old and New are now, by the discoveries of our great navigator, lost in conviction . . . the real place of migration is uncontrovertably pointed out."<sup>85</sup> Of special interest among the illustrations is the engraving "Tomahawk & Bow" (plate VI, p. cxliv), illustrating "that most terrific Tomahawk of Nootka Sound, called the *Taaweesh*, or *Tsuskeeah*," and

<sup>79</sup>Thus Beaglehole, I, cciii, refers to the additions from Pennant and others as "padding." As noted above, King did not welcome the enlargement of his volume. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 116<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>80</sup>Pennant's corrections are set out in his letters of 3 and 12 July 1764, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, ff. 242<sup>r</sup> and 243<sup>r-v</sup>.

<sup>81</sup>Letter of Pennant to Douglas, 16 November 1763, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, ff. 93<sup>v</sup>-94<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>82</sup>Thomas Pennant, *The Literary Life of the late Thomas Pennant, Esq.* (London: B. & J. White and R. Faulder, 1793), p. 41.

<sup>83</sup>Pennant, p. 40.

<sup>84</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 185.

<sup>85</sup>Thomas Pennant, *Arctic Zoology* (London: H. Hughes, 1784), pp. clxvi-clxvii.

a small bow made of bone also from Nootka. The bow which was in the British Museum, Pennant describes in a letter, "On it is the whole chase of the savages so well done that I have every animal. Doct Solander sayed it should be engraved."<sup>86</sup> Furthermore, in his *Supplement to the Arctic Zoology*, (1787), Pennant commented that he had been reproached for not providing a map with the *Arctic Zoology*. He now supplied two, engraved by William Palmer who had engraved those in Cook's third *Voyage*. For Pennant's second map, covering the north Pacific, the Arctic Ocean, and adjoining continents of North America and Asia, he acknowledged particularly, "an admirable map of the American and Asiatic part, formed by the much-lamented, the late Captain James King." This is the map which Dalrymple and Banks had refused to use for their chart of the North Pacific.

Pennant's material reward for his collaboration comprised gifts of the volume and of the prints. When the *Voyage* came out he hastened to order another set: "on the strength of a promise from M<sup>r</sup> Stephens & a present from him of the prints of the preceding voyage I had half hung a room with them, therefore am under a necessity of getting this work."<sup>87</sup>

The many editorial concerns of Douglas and King are revealed day by day in the course of Douglas's correspondence. King asks Douglas to correct the estimate of Cook's discoveries on the North American coast from 4,000 to 3,500 miles, as more accurately estimated by Roberts.<sup>88</sup> He requests that if Douglas "should have any learned geographer in your eye," he would recommend Roberts to him "to settle the names of Oceans Seas Gulfs straits &c &c &c according to some fixt rule."<sup>89</sup> King confirms that the passage on the "mutinous refusal to drink the sugar cane beer" was not erased "in Capt Clerkes time but after C. Gore got possession of the M.S."<sup>90</sup> Webber provides an account of his visit to Nootka Sound.<sup>91</sup> From Samuel Wegg, F.R.S., Governor of the Hudson's Bay Company, Douglas obtains the journals and maps of Samuel

<sup>86</sup>Letter of 27 January 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 128<sup>v</sup> in which Pennant describes the bow as being "from George Sound," c. f. the more general attribution in his *Arctic Zoology*, I, p. sig. A4<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>87</sup>Letter of 3 July 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 242.

<sup>88</sup>Letter of 1 February 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 135<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>89</sup>Letter of 17 February 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 151<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>90</sup>Letter of 27 February 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 163<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>91</sup>Letter of 31 December 1783, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, ff. 112-113. Printed by Beaglehole, I, 319-320, note.

Hearne's expedition to northwest America.<sup>92</sup> He was to give the first account of Hearne's discoveries to the world; and Roberts used Hearne's map for compiling his General Chart. The argument as to whether the inhabitants of the Tonga (Friendly) Islands sang in parts drawn from a joint memorandum from Lord Sandwich and Dr. Charles Burney, which left the matter undecided, and this Douglas was to print.<sup>93</sup> Mrs. Cook makes a brief and anguished appearance in a letter of 19 June 1782, writing of "promising to set down what Particulars I knew of my late dear Husband . . . but I am not able to write [a] single word upon so distressing a Subject."<sup>94</sup>

Certain sensibilities had also to be taken into account. Douglas tactfully agreed to the request from Sir Hugh Palliser, Comptroller of the Navy, to omit Cook's critical remarks about the cordage: "it is well known [wrote Palliser, 5 March 1784] that there is no better Cordage than what is made in the King's Yards . . . The part propos'd to be omitted seems to convey a complaint of abuse or mismanagem<sup>t</sup>. in the Yards which is improper in Cap<sup>t</sup>. Cook in such a Work, besides he errs . . . It would require a long note to explain Cap<sup>t</sup>. Cook's Error it being out of his line."<sup>95</sup> King handled the diplomatic niceties of the affair of the Polish Baron Beniowsky, who was then in England: "I find that the Baron Beniowski is likely to have too strong a party in England to make it prudent for me to get into a controversy with him. If we had him on the banks of the Bolchoireka we should shew him the difference." He agreed to an innocuous rewording which referred to an "*exiled polish officer*" adding, "If you could get Beniowsky's real name, country, or situation in Kamtschatka from himself, I should like much to have it added as a note."<sup>96</sup> Douglas had even offered to visit that enigmatic individual, who was, from Coxe's account (wrote King) "a curiosity well worth seeing."

<sup>92</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 214<sup>r</sup>. Pennant on 26 March 1784 had recommended Douglas to secure Hearne's map, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, ff. 185<sup>v</sup>-186<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>93</sup>Memorandum forwarded by King, 12 February 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, ff. 145-146, also 149. A letter of 21 February 1784 from King gives further information. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 155: "I agree with you that the musical note would have come more properly at the friendly islands." In fact, King had instructed "Insert Book 5, Chapt. 7, page 26, in parts" and so it appeared in the context of the music of the Sandwich Islands. *Voyage*, III, 143-144.

<sup>94</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 28. This concerned an inquiry from a Mr. Farquharson.

<sup>95</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 171.

<sup>96</sup>Letter of 15 March 1784. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 179<sup>r</sup>. Earlier letters of 8 and 13 March 1784 also relate. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, ff. 173, 177.



As with other assignments as litterateur, Douglas had undertaken the work of editor on condition that his anonymity be preserved. He was outraged when the *Morning Chronicle* of 18 January 1783 came out with an extraordinary and ill-natured report: "It is unfortunate for this country, that she is never so happy in the choice of her Navigators, as France," the writer began, comparing the "excellent exotick accounts of Condamine, Bellin, Bougainville, &c, to Anson and Cook, who had to have Benjamin Robbins [*sic*], Hawkesworth and Dr. Douglas to edit their journals. Surely these Marine Gentlemen's narrative must have been better told by themselves than by those uninterested in their scenes of pleasure and distress." This observation is certainly verified in Parkinson's "Narrative. . ." Writing the following day to his friend William Strahan the printer, Douglas expostulated: "I suppose you have read . . . the very strange Paragraph in which I am announced to the Public as employed in *finishing grammatically* Cap<sup>t</sup>. Cook's Voyage. After all my Care & Study to have my Name kept back, it equally mortifies & surprises me, to be thus made the sport of News Papers." He was sorry that the printer and editor Mr. W. Woodfall "should have given his Sanction to such a heap of inconsistent Abuse. It begins with insinuating that Cap<sup>t</sup>. Cook was unfit for the Service to w<sup>ch</sup>. he was appointed. It soon after speaks of D<sup>f</sup>. Hawksworth as having tarnished his Journal, & then it proceeds to suppose him incapable of writing a Journal, by saying I had *digested* that of his former Voyage & am now *finishing* that of the last."<sup>97</sup> Asking Strahan to enquire after the source of information, Douglas commented, "It is calculated to have some dirty purpose."

What was behind the attack remains unknown. A few days earlier Douglas had received the disquieting news that Thomas Cadell had been dropped as publisher, and in a letter to Shepherd of 12 January 1783 Douglas offered his resignation. "I really begin to suspect that it will be agreeable, that *I* should offer to resign, in order to prevent my being formally dismissed."<sup>98</sup> He probably never sent this letter (which we find preserved in his own correspondence), as William Strahan (printer for the third *Voyage* and joint publisher with Cadell for the second) reported in a letter of 14 January that Cadell's name would be retained (after Nicol's), but George Nicol was to have the sole management and the profit of the publication.<sup>99</sup> Friends of Banks (of unknown

<sup>97</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 68.

<sup>98</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 64.

<sup>99</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 66.

identity) were party to the arrangement, and Banks gave the instructions but was stated not to be personally responsible: "it was not by the interference of Sir Joseph." Whether the newspaper attack was connected with this other affair remains unknown.

The last anxious weeks before publication in 1784 are fully documented by letters to and fro. Publication day was fixed for 4 June 1784, the King's birthday. Webber reported to King on 6 March 1784 that on Banks's orders he had had to tell the engravers "whatever plate was not finished this month must be laid aside."<sup>100</sup> On 2 June, congratulating Douglas on his "deliverance," Nicol reminded him that he had only eight days (exclusive of Sunday) for finishing the work, and believed that "no similar Business was ever undertaken, in double the time."<sup>101</sup> The Earl of Hardwicke, well-known for what was teasingly called his "spite against the South Sea" (as Daniel Wray called it,<sup>102</sup>) had written in May from Bath, "I have ordered Cadel to send me Cooks Voyage when it comes out, but then I bid *Adieu* to those Discoverys, the Denouement is too melancholy."<sup>103</sup> On 14 June, "I am possessed of Cap<sup>t</sup>. Cookes last Voyage, for w<sup>ch</sup> the Public is much indebted to the *Anonymous but Public Spirited Editor*. I do not wonder, that the Plates are first looked over, as they are the best performed of any annexed to the Discoverys of that unfortunate Officer. I hope yr Great Friend at Windsor will take yr laudable Labors into his Serious Consideration before the Reward may have lost its Flavor & Merit."<sup>104</sup> The King was indeed appreciative, as a letter from Nicol (17 July 1784) reveals: "When I had the honour of seeing the King on Thursday last, I was happy to hear his Majesty heartily joining the general Voice, (which is so justly loud) in praise of the Introduction to the Voyage, & the Merits of the Editorship."<sup>105</sup>

By that time a second edition was in preparation, for the first had been sold out, it is said, in three days. The second was entrusted by the Admiralty to their own stationers (Laurence and Winchester) at the recommendation of Lord Howe, and also (it was believed) of Sir Joseph

<sup>100</sup>Letter from King to Douglas, 8 March 1784, B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 173<sup>v</sup>. This order was made despite delays for paper.

<sup>101</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 233.

<sup>102</sup>Nichols, *Illustrations*, I, 140.

<sup>103</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 224.

<sup>104</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 234.

<sup>105</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 247<sup>v</sup>.

Banks, and Mr. Hughes was recommended by the admiralty as printer,<sup>106</sup> to the disappointment of Strahan. These new arrangements occasioned cryptic comments, and presumably were one of the reasons for Douglas's complaint about the junta of Captain Cook's declared enemies. Who were these men, besides Lord Howe, who evidently was considered one? Are they to be identified with some of those who on 28 July 1785 determined the division of the profits arising from "the Sale of Capt<sup>n</sup>. Cook's last voyage; agreed in the Presence of Lord Sandwich, Lord Howe, Sir Joseph Banks, and M. Stephens?"<sup>107</sup>

Another awkward issue arose from criticism of King's editorial work. In a letter from Christ's Hospital, 17 July 1784, William Wales, who was entrusted with the revision of the second edition, informed Douglas that "some cruel, and, I believe, unjust reports have been propagated relating to the 3<sup>rd</sup> or Capt. King's vol. of that work. These reports represent that Vol. as a mere piece of book-making; and that it is principally made up of scraps from Pennant's Arctic Zoology, and Krachenmicow's Hist. of Kamtchatka. And pains have been taken . . . to get these suggestions disseminated in the Monthly publications . . . it will not be difficult to guess where these reports originate."<sup>108</sup> Wales thought that King should know of the reports unless he was too ill. King, who had gone to Nice for his health, was in the last months of consumption. He died there on 16 November 1784 at the age of 34.<sup>109</sup>

The disappearance of "the running Journal" which King, while he commanded the *Discovery*, wrote as far as the Cape of Good Hope, made it difficult to Beaglehole fully to assess King's skills as an editor.<sup>110</sup> The major recent discovery concerning the third voyage has been the recovery of this journal. Reference O.D. 279 MCL 15, it was run to earth by Commander Andrew David in 1972-73 in the Sailing Directions archives of the Hydrographic Department. The Journal has the immediacy of the on-the-spot report, as opposed to the flowing, man-

<sup>106</sup>Letter of Andrew Strahan (son of William) to Douglas, 1 July 1784. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 240. Nicol had declined any concern in the printing. The printer chosen was Henry Hughes.

<sup>107</sup>Memorandum in the hands of Banks. Beaglehole I, cc.

<sup>108</sup>B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 251.

<sup>109</sup>Douglas received the news in a letter of 30 November 1784 from James's brother, E. King. B. L. Egerton MS 2180, f. 111.

<sup>110</sup>Notes by King inserted at the beginning of his *Log and Proceedings*, Adm. 55/116 refer to this journal, and are printed by Beaglehole, I, clxxix, clxxxii. On King's editing and the disappearance of his journal, see Beaglehole, I, clxxii, cciii.

nered prose of the printed version. I am now editing this Journal for publication by the Hakluyt Society and will append to it Douglas's correspondence, as documentation for the publication of the third Voyage.<sup>111</sup>

As the extracts from the letters show, some questions remain to be answered. For example, half the profits from the sales of the third voyage were allocated to Captain Cook's family, a quarter to the executors of Captain King, for his heirs, one-eighth to the legal representatives of Captain Clerke, one-eighth to William Bligh, after one hundred guineas were deducted for the use of Anderson's executors.<sup>112</sup> What recompense then did Douglas receive? Whatever he had expected in the way of attention (he had received instead "unaccountable neglect"), it was presumably not monetary reward, but notice in the way of preferment. As Lord Hardwicke commented, his "Great Friend at Windsor" should be mindful of his hard labors and accomplishment and Hardwicke's recommendation on his behalf did receive in January 1785 an encouraging reply from the King. Douglas himself by 1786 had almost given up hope ("all my friends are dead," he told Boswell, who replied "no Doctor your best friend is alive, yourself, your own merit"). In September 1787 he obtained his due reward with appointment to the see of Carlisle, and gained also in January 1788 the deanery of Windsor. In 1788 he was assisting James Bruce in the preparation of his *Travels in Abyssinia*. In 1791 the bishopric of Salisbury was unexpectedly offered him in exchange for Carlisle, and he happily returned to his circles in southern England, his ambitions now fulfilled.<sup>113</sup>

Secondly, there are questions relating to the work on the engravings, for which Douglas's correspondence ranks as an important source. What payment did Webber receive for his services in supervising the engravings for publications? On the voyage he was to receive 100 guineas a year as his salary, but the beneficiaries from the publication of the third *Voyage* were restricted to the officers or their heirs and executors. Webber went on to publish sixteen of his drawings as colored aquatints. A set of these is bound up with the volume of plates in

<sup>111</sup>Referring to the difficulties and delays over the production of the volumes, Beaglehole writes: "Some of these could be documented, though this is not the place." I, cciv. He cited mainly those documents which referred to the preparation of the second *Voyage* for publication, and those which dealt with issues relating to events of the third *Voyage*.

<sup>112</sup>Beaglehole, I, cc. note.

<sup>113</sup>William Macdonald, *Select Works of the Right Reverend John Douglas . . . with a biographical memoir* (Salisbury, s.n., 1820), pp. 77-80.

Banks's copy of the plates of the third *Voyage*, pressmark BL 1899. n.l., and another set is in King George III's Topographical Collections pressmark K. Top. cxvi. 68.7 tab 74. An unrecorded collection of fourteen ethnographical and natural history drawings relating to the second and third voyages (including drawings by Webber) was recently discovered and on exhibition in London.<sup>114</sup> Aquatints from his work are also in the King's Topographical Collection, K. Top cxvi. 69-71.

Other questions relate to the maps and charts. First there is Bligh's accusation that "None of the Maps and Charts in this publication are from the original drawings of Lieut. Henry Roberts, he did no more than copy the original ones from Captain Cook who besides myself was the only person that surveyed and laid the Coast down, in the *Resolution*. Every Plan & Chart from C. Cook's death are exact Copies of my Works."<sup>115</sup> This complaint seems to have been well-founded, although Bligh did benefit financially from the publication. (Also what was there behind Bligh's acrimonious comments on King, otherwise so well regarded?<sup>116</sup>)

I must also report that Commander Andrew David has found in the Hydrographic Department a number of charts and views which were not known when R. A. Skelton and Beaglehole were preparing their lists. These relate to the third voyage and include a sketch survey of Prata Reef by Edward Riou and a survey (possibly by Bligh) of the coast of Japan drawn by Henry Roberts, which differs from the chart published in the third *Voyage*, volume III. A chart of the Sandwich Islands by Edward Riou which has been destroyed indicates that Riou also undertook original survey. The relationship between Bayly's maps and Bligh's has also to be established. Bayly's observations and charts were consulted by those preparing the third *Voyage*, and are referred to in critical tones. Some of his charts have come to rest in Vancouver Maritime Museum. Of interest also are the large volumes of charts from Banks's collections, with their Pacific and world maps which record Cook's voyages and those which followed, pressmark Maps 181.m.l.

<sup>114</sup>These and other drawings are being studied by Rüdiger Joppien in his work of collaboration with Bernard Smith, who is preparing the catalogue of drawings and paintings done on Cook's voyages. Details of exhibition as follows: Drawings from Captain Cook's Voyages. An unrecorded collection of fourteen ethnographical and natural history drawings relating to the second and third voyages. Hartnoll & Eyre Ltd., 13 September to 1 October 1976. Catalogue by Rüdiger Joppien.

<sup>115</sup>Beaglehole, I, lxxviii, ccxv-ccxvi.

<sup>116</sup>Beaglehole, I, lxxviii. R. T. Gould, "Bligh's notes on Cook's last voyage," *Mariner's Mirror* 14 (1928), 371-385.

(transferred from 1735.i.14.). An appendix on the various charts to be added to the Cook corpus will be included in my Hakluyt Society volume.

### A New World Revealed

The trials and tribulations of the editors were drama of a different order from the heroic and desperate events of the voyage itself. Yet the publication of the third voyage was an achievement remarkable of its kind, and a fitting memorial to Captain Cook. Through the pages so devotedly written, checked, and rechecked by Douglas and by King, Cook's countrymen caught an impressive glimpse of that "new world, such as no European could have figured in his own Imagination." The engravings after Webber, with those of Buchan and Parkinson for the first voyage and of Hodges for the second, gave Europeans a visual impression of the South Seas and north Pacific shores with their exotic inhabitants. Webber's and Hodge's engravings were to form the decor for John O'Keefe's pantomime, *Omai: or a Trip Round the World*, first performed on 2 December 1785, and hailed as a great success. Its French counterpart *La Mort du Capitaine Cook*, set at Hawaii, opened in Paris in October 1788, and an English version was put on at Covent Garden in 1789, with other productions in the provinces. There was no decline in interest as the years passed by. In 1803 the "Otaheite and South Sea Rooms" of the British Museum could still be described as one of the sights of London,<sup>117</sup> while the Leverian's Museum's Sandwich Room provided a spectacular display of Pacific culture.

Two hundred years later the activities of the bicentennial, from 1968 until 1979-1980, have sought to provide a fuller and more authentic picture of the new world, which in the 1780s and 1790s was only partially revealed and was distorted by the mannerisms of the time. The volumes of text give the immediacy which editing wrote out of the original *Voyages*. General exhibitions have been held in the National Maritime Museum, the British Museum (to commemorate Captain Cook's first voyage, 1968), the Australian Museum (1970), the Mitchell and Dixson Galleries of the Library of New South Wales ("The Opening of the Pacific," 1970); and more specialized ones, such as "No Sort of Iron" (New Zealand, 1969). These have all sought to give the impression of what it was like to be with Cook on his voyages, to see

<sup>117</sup>James Malcolm, *Londinium Redivivum*, 4 vols. (London: J. Nichols and Son, 1802-1807), II, 520-531.

with his eyes, and to interpret in the light of modern scientific knowledge. The British Museum (Natural History) has revealed the wealth of botanical and zoological material brought home, of which so little was seen by the eighteenth-century European. Among relatively recent discoveries is the male figure, a sorcerer's familiar spirit, found wrapped inside the head of the Chief Mourner's dress brought home from Tahiti. This figure was on display for the first time in the British Museum exhibition of 1968. The recovery of the cannon from the Great Barrier Reef in January 1969 by an expedition of the Philadelphia Academy of Natural Sciences added a suitable bicentennial footnote to one of the most dramatic moments of the first voyage.

Various of the exhibitions have included sections on the sequel to the voyages which brought about the European settlement of new territories in the Pacific, and which eventually destroyed the South Sea paradise which had delighted the European intellectual of the 1780s. There was a certain irony in the fact that Banks and Solander dried their botanical specimens in the proof sheets of *Paradise Lost!*<sup>118</sup> For the third voyage, an irony of another kind may be recorded; in the Deptford Collection of Prints (BL 578.m.11no. 91), "The Discovery, convict ship (lying at Deptford). The Vessel which accompanied Capt. Cook on his last Voyage. Drawn & Etched by Edw. W. Cooke, 1828. London, 1829." As a testimonial to Cook's great gifts as a seaman and leader of men, there was the record of later achievements of Cook's men: "What officers you are, *you men of Captain Cook.*"<sup>119</sup>

Reenactments on the spot have supplied the equivalent of the eighteenth-century pantomime and ballet. One of the most notable was the arrival of *Endeavour II* at Botany Bay, in the presence of H.M. the Queen on 29 April 1970. A few weeks earlier, on 20 March at Government House, Wellington, the Queen had conferred on John Beaglehole the O.M. [Order of Merit] and he thus became the successor to Rutherford as the second New Zealander O.M. Other commemorative occasions included a program of readings at the National Portrait Gallery on 11 July 1969 (which John Beaglehole was able to attend).<sup>120</sup> It ended

<sup>118</sup>Reported by W. T. Stearn. The sheets were lent to the British Museum exhibition of 1968. Catalogue 26.

<sup>119</sup>Charlotte Barrett, ed., *Diary and Letters of Madam d'Arblay, 1778-1840*, 6 vols. (New York: Macmillan Co., 1904-1905), IV, 378. William Windham's words to James Burney.

<sup>120</sup>Devised by Helen Wallis, produced by Peter Orr, read by Gary Watson and Dennis McCarthy, performed in front of Webber's portrait of Cook.

with what must be one of the most moving tributes to Captain Cook, the reminiscences of an old Maori Te Horeta at Whitianga, New Zealand, who recalled meeting Captain Cook many years before in November 1769, at Mercury Bay: "In the days long past, when I was a very little boy, a vessel came to Whitianga . . . There was one supreme man in that ship. We knew that he was Lord of the whole by his perfect gentlemanly and noble demeanour. He seldom spoke, but some of the goblins [the small boy thought the seamen must be goblins] spoke much. But this man did not utter many words: all that he did was to handle our mats and hold our spears . . . He was a very good man and came to us . . . patted our cheeks and gently touched our heads . . . My companions said 'this is the chief which is proved by his kindness to us.' " And Te Horeta would repeat the old Maori proverb: "A *rangatira*--a nobleman--cannot be lost in a crowd."<sup>121</sup>

DR. HELEN WALLIS is presently Map Librarian of the British Library, formerly Deputy Keeper in charge of the Map Room at the British Museum. Pacific exploration has been one of her special fields of research dating back to work for her doctorate on "The Exploration of the South Seas, 1519-1644." Her edition of *Carteret's Voyage round the World* in two volumes was published by the Hackluyt Society in 1965. In 1968, she organized the Bicentenary exhibition on Captain Cook's first voyage on display in the King's Library of the British Museum. She is now a member of the committee organizing the joint British Museum-British Library exhibition on Captain Cook and the South Sea to be held in the Museum of Mankind, February to November, 1979. Other activities include Chairmanship of the Commission on the History of Cartography of the International Cartographic Association. She is a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London.

<sup>121</sup>John White, *Ancient History of the Maori* (Wellington: G. Didsbury, 1887), pp. 121, 129. This is an abbreviated version as given by Beaglehole, "On the character of Captain James Cook," *Geographical Journal*, 122 (1956), 429.